



Staff Report
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

2. COA-106339-2022	Final Review Meeting Date: 2/22/2022
Applicant/Petitioner	Datapro Investments, Inc.
<p>Project Description</p> <p>Modify previously approved plans to rehabilitate an existing building and build an addition onto the roof and rear; and to construct a new, connected, mixed-use addition on the corner.</p> <p>The Commission approved with conditions an application for this project at the September 22, 2020 Commission meeting.</p> <p>This staff report will provide an overview of the project, past reviews by the Commission, and will only provide a staff analysis of the revisions made between the September 22, 2020 Commission approved plans and the Special Use Permit plans approved by City Council Ord. No. 2021-208 on January 10, 2022, specifically modifications to the rear of the building to address SUP conditions regarding off-street parking and trash collection.</p>	
Project Location	
Address: 3101-3105 E. Marshall	
Historic District: St. John's Church	
<p>High-Level Details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission approved plans to renovate an existing two-story mixed-use building and build rooftop and rear additions. The approved renovation includes the removal of the non-historic masonry on the ground floor of the existing structure and the installation of a storefront window and door system. • The approved plans also include rear and rooftop additions (second and third floor) to the existing structure. The additions will be set back from the existing roof line and will extend past the rear wall of the building. Full-width, open porches will be attached to the rear of the addition and extend over ground-level parking. • Based on the Special Use Permit, the applicant has made alterations to the exterior of the building since this application was last reviewed by CAR (Sept 2020), specifically: enclosing a portion of the first-story rear façade with brick to screen trash; reducing the size of the first level of the rear addition; and removing a brick pier that was required by the approved CAR conditions. • There are still unresolved conditions from the previous CAR review that must be met, many of which can be administratively approved by staff at the permitting stage. 	

Staff Recommendation	Approval, with Conditions
Staff Contact	Alex Dandridge, alex.dandridge@richmondgov.com , (804) 646-6569

PREVIOUS REVIEWS

The Commission previously reviewed applications for this mixed-use development at the following meetings:

- **August 27, 2019:** The Commission **conceptually reviewed** this application.
- **October 22, 2019:** The application returned for final review. The Commission voted to **defer** the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to make design changes in response to Commission feedback.
- **November 26, 2019:** The application returned for final review. The Commission voted to **defer** the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to respond to staff and Commission comments.
- **January 28, 2020:** The application returned for final review. The Commission voted to **approve the application with conditions**.
- **August 25, 2020:** The application returned to the Commission for approval for modifications to the previously approved plans. Per the applicant, these modifications were the result of changes requested during the Special Use Permit (SUP) review process. The Commission voted to **defer** the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to respond to Commission and staff's concerns.
- **September 22, 2020** the application returned for final review. **The Commission voted to approve the application with the following conditions:** Staff notes that some of these conditions have been met, while some remain unresolved. Unresolved conditions have been incorporated into staff's conditions of approval for this review.

UNRESOLVED CONDITIONS:

For 3105 East Marshall Street:

- The applicant provide additional information about the condition of the rear CMU section and the need to demolish it, including that there are no feasible alternatives to demolition or opportunities to retain it, for review and approval by PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair;
- The design of the rehabilitated historic storefront match the historic photograph including, but not limited to, the wood panels below the windows and the pilasters separating the bays;
- The windows surrounding the door be a consistent size;
- The interior floor plans be updated with the dimensions of the east elevation inset and submitted to staff for review and approval; and
- The brick pier at the corner be retained as a terminating element to unify the overall design.

For 3101-3103 East Marshall Street:

- The applicant submit a fully dimensioned elevation with exterior heights to staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval;
- The revised plans reflect the panels aligned with the window openings as indicated with a note on the plans;
- The applicant provide detailed drawings of the proposed storefront design and the revised plans be submitted to PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval; and
- The applicant submit the following for approval:
 - A line-of-sight drawing to determine the extent of the visibility of the new rooftop additions;
 - An accurate dimensioned site plan be submitted with all setbacks indicated on a physical improvements survey rendered at a legible scale;
 - A detailed roof plan with the location of the HVAC units indicated and a line-of-sight drawing from East Marshall Street and North 31st Street;
 - Information about the gutters and downspouts; and a key to the plans and elevations.

RESOLVED CONDITIONS:**For 3105 East Marshall Street:**

- The character-defining architectural elements including but not limited to the cornice line details, decorative elements, the faux mansard, and stepped parapet walls on the front and east side elevations are not increased in height, removed, or altered in any way; and
- The brick infill for the windows on the east elevation be recessed from the original opening and any decorative elements, such as exterior sills and headers, be maintained.

For 3101-3103 East Marshall Street:

- The new masonry be differentiated from the historic masonry in tone, size, and bond pattern, and the final masonry specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; and
- The final materials specifications including the parking screening.

NEW CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (added since CAR approval in 2020)

- Staff recommends that the hardscaping within the 4 parking areas underneath the rear projection of 3101-3103 E Marshall be a material that is compatible with the district, such as, granite, brick, or even unstamped concrete; final material submitted for staff review.
- Staff recommends that the visible portion of the existing buildings rear wall remain intact and be repaired as necessary using a similar brick and mortar composition, color, and reveal; final specifications to be reviewed by staff.
- Staff recommends approval of the transom window, and that the window be an approvable material submitted to staff for review.
- Staff recommends that the rear three story brick pier be retained in the plans to unify the overall design.

PREVIOUS, UNRESOLVED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**For 3105 East Marshall Street:**

- The applicant provide additional information about the condition of the rear CMU section and the need to demolish it, including that there are no feasible alternatives to demolition or opportunities to retain it, for review and approval by PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair;
- The design of the rehabilitated historic storefront match the historic photograph including, but not limited to, the wood panels below the windows and the pilasters separating the bays;
- The windows surrounding the door be a consistent size;
- The interior floor plans be updated with the dimensions of the east elevation inset and submitted to staff for review and approval; and
- The brick pier at the corner be retained as a terminating element to unify the overall design.

For 3101-3103 East Marshall Street:

- The applicant submit a fully dimensioned elevation with exterior heights to staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval;
- The revised plans reflect the panels aligned with the window openings as indicated with a note on the plans;
- The applicant provide detailed drawings of the proposed storefront design and the revised plans be submitted to PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval; and
- The applicant submit the following for approval:
 - A line-of-sight drawing to determine the extent of the visibility of the new rooftop additions;
 - An accurate dimensioned site plan be submitted with all setbacks indicated on a physical improvements survey rendered at a legible scale;
 - A detailed roof plan with the location of the HVAC units indicated and a line-of-sight drawing from East Marshall Street and North 31st Street;
 - Information about the gutters and downspouts; and a key to the plans and elevations.

Staff Analysis

Special Use Permit Revisions

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
Standards for Site Improvements, Sidewalks & Curbs, #4-7	<p><i>4. Brick or granite pavers are the most appropriate choice in most Old and Historic Districts.</i></p> <p><i>5. Existing granite curbing should be retained whenever possible.</i></p> <p><i>6. Sidewalk design should allow for the installation of appropriate urban landscaping.</i></p> <p><i>7. Sidewalks and curbs should be built of common building materials found throughout the District. Generally, simple paving designs are more compatible with the diverse building styles and better unify the various elements found on streets throughout Old and Historic Districts. The use of more than two paving materials within an area is discouraged.</i></p>	<p>The applicant proposes four (4) parking spaces underneath the rear, second-story projection of the proposed building at 3101 - 3103 E. Marshall Street. The plans do not indicate the material of the hardscaping used within the parking area, but do visually indicate it will be a different material than the hardscaping within the alley.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends that the hardscaping within the 4 parking areas underneath the rear projection of 3101-3103 E Marshall be a material that is compatible with the district, such as, granite, brick, or even unstamped concrete; final material submitted for staff review.</u></p> <p>There are other hardscaping alterations proposed within the existing right-of-way surrounding the property required by the Special Use permit, such as removing a concrete apron and replacing with brick pavers to match the surrounding, replacing the existing brick at the entrance to the alley behind the property with new brick to match the existing, installation of new granite curbing where existing is disturbed, and new planting beds in the alley. While these alterations are not within CAR's purview, staff believes the materials are in-keeping with the local historic district.</p>
Standards for New Construction, Materials and Colors, #2, pg. 47	<p><i>Materials used in new residential construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the district.</i></p>	<p>The rear trash enclosure has been altered based on the SUP approval to be more substantially screened. The trash enclosure will now be screened with a brick enclosure, rather than the originally approved wooden privacy fence and will be highly visible, adjacent to the sidewalk along N. 31st Street.</p> <p>Staff is supportive of this change in screening material.</p>
Materials and Colors, # 1-2 pg. 47	<p><i>1. Additions should not obscure or destroy original architectural elements.</i></p> <p><i>2. Materials used in new residential construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the district.</i></p>	<p>The massing of the rear façade of the proposed side and rear addition to the existing building has been reduced based on the SUP, as a unit on the first level of the building has been removed.</p> <p>Originally the rear wall of the existing building was proposed to be completely obscured by the rear addition, however, with the aforementioned alteration to the rear, it appears that the first level of the existing building's rear wall will remain exposed, and will be minimally visible from the right of way. <u>Staff recommends that the visible portion of the existing buildings rear wall remain intact</u></p>

		<p><u>and be repaired as necessary using a similar brick and mortar composition, color, and reveal; final specifications to be reviewed by staff.</u></p> <p>On a site visit, staff observed that the rear façade has an existing door opening and two bricked in windows, all which have unpainted granite, lintels.</p> <p>Plans submitted do not reference these masonry openings, but rather a new masonry opening with a vinyl transom window. <u>Staff recommends denial of the use of a vinyl window.</u></p> <p>While new masonry openings and transom windows are generally not encouraged in city old and historic districts, staff believes that the existing rear wall will only be minimally visible from the alley, and obscured by the cantilevered, second story addition and vehicles. Furthermore, a traditional sized window in this location could be problematic given the close proximity of parking directly out of this window.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends approval of the transom window, and that the window be an approvable material submitted to staff for review.</u></p> <p>Staff notes that the original approved plans had a three-story brick pier at the corner as a terminating element. This element has been removed since the last approval. Staff recommends <u>this rear three story brick pier be retained in the plans to unify the overall design.</u></p>
--	--	--

Staff Analysis

Outstanding conditions of Approval from previous review

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
3105 East Marshall Street - storefront rehabilitation and rear and rooftop additions		
Secretary of the Interior Standards, pg. 4-5	<i>The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</i>	The applicant also proposes to demolish a one-story rear mass. This was not previously approved by the Commission under COA-067376-2020 or COA-077183-2020. Staff recommends the applicant <u>provide additional information about the condition of this section and the need to demolish it, including that there are no feasible alternatives to demolition or opportunities to retain it, for review and approval by PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair.</u>
Technical Preservation Briefs #14,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A rooftop addition is generally not appropriate for a one, two or three-story building—and often is not</i> 	The applicant proposes to construct a rooftop addition on top of a two-story building. The addition will be set back from the front roof

<p>New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns, Rooftop Additions</p>	<p><i>appropriate for taller buildings.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A rooftop addition should be minimally visible.</i> • <i>Generally, a rooftop addition must be set back at least one full bay from the primary elevation of the building, as well as from the other elevations if the building is freestanding or highly visible.</i> • <i>Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height.</i> • <i>Generally, a rooftop addition is more likely to be compatible on a building that is adjacent to similarly-sized or taller buildings.</i> 	<p>line of the existing building and will extend past the rear wall to create a third story.</p> <p>The applicant has reconfigured the roof for the two rear additions. Staff requests the applicant <u>submit a line-of-sight drawing to determine the extent of the visibility of the new rooftop additions.</u></p> <p>Staff has concerns that there does not appear to be a gutter proposed for the 3105 East Marshall Street addition and requests the <u>applicant provide additional information about how they intend to manage rain water from this section.</u></p>
<p>New Construction, Storefront Facades, pg. 49, #1</p>	<p><i>Historically, storefronts were defined by simple piers, large storefront windows, a cornice, a signboard and/or attached signage, and awnings. The new storefront should be compatible with other historic storefronts within the district.</i></p>	<p>The applicant has submitted a complete window and door schedule for the rehabilitation. Staff notes that the historic storefront and the approved plans had pilasters separating the bays and wood panels below the windows. <u>Staff recommends the design match the historic photograph including, but not limited to, the wood panels below the windows and the pilasters separating the bays, and that the windows surrounding the door be a consistent size.</u> Staff recommends that a detailed drawing of the store front design reflecting these details <u>be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to applying for a building permit.</u></p>
<p>Height, Width, Proportion, & Massing, pg. 47</p>	<p><i>New residential construction should respect the typical height of surrounding residential buildings.</i></p>	<p><u>Staff requests a fully dimensioned elevation with exterior heights be submitted to staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval prior to resubmitting for a building permit</u></p>
<p>3101-3103 E. Marshall Street - New rear, side, and rooftop additions</p>		
<p>Height, Width, Proportion, & Massing, pg. 47, #1-3</p>	<p><i>New residential construction should respect the typical height of surrounding residential buildings.</i></p>	<p><u>Staff requests a fully dimensioned elevation with exterior heights be submitted to staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval prior to submitting for a building permit</u></p>
	<p><i>New residential construction should respect the vertical orientation typical of other residential properties in surrounding historic districts.</i></p>	<p>The revised plans include the removal of a vertical bay of windows from the second and third stories and relocation of the windows on the first story (ground floor). Staff understands that the applicant had to recess the side entrance and reconfigure the interior spaces, resulting in the removal of this vertical row of windows. <u>Staff recommends approval of the revised fenestration pattern.</u></p>
	<p><i>The cornice height should be compatible with that of adjacent historic buildings.</i></p>	<p>The proposed cornice line for the addition will be taller than the surrounding historic buildings. Staff notes not all of the exterior dimensions of the proposed new construction were provided. <u>Staff requests a fully dimensioned elevation with exterior heights be submitted to staff and the Commission</u></p>

		<u>Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval prior to resubmitting for a building permit.</u>
Materials and Colors, pg. 47	<i>Materials used in new residential construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the district.</i>	The applicant proposes a mix of masonry, cementitious panels, and large panels of glazing. Staff notes the <u>previous plans had the panels aligned with the window openings, and that there is a note on the plans regarding alignment of the windows and panels.</u> Staff recommends the revised plans reflect this design feature.
New Construction, Storefront Facades, pg. 49	<i>Historically, storefronts were defined by simple piers, large storefront windows, a cornice, a signboard and/or attached signage, and awnings. The new storefront should be compatible with other historic storefronts within the district.</i>	The Commission previously approved a storefront system with brick piers, a subtle cornice line at the same height as the historic building, and a single transom above the windows. Staff recommends the applicant <u>provide detailed drawings of the proposed storefront design and the revised plans be submitted to PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval prior to resubmitting for a building permit.</u>
New Construction, Doors and Windows, pg. 49 #1	<i>The size, proportion and spacing patterns of door and window openings on a new addition should follow patterns established by the original building. Windows on most commercial and residential properties throughout Old and Historic Districts have a vertical orientation.</i>	The applicant has redesigned the glass hyphens on East Marshall Street and North 31 st Street to be framed plate glass with sections of masonry. Staff understands the entrance doors on North 31 st Street need to be recessed so they do not encroach onto the public right-of-way. Staff recommends approval of the change in design for the hyphens with the conditions that <u>the final specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval.</u>
Standards for New Construction: Corner Properties – Residential, pg. 48	<i>Secondary elevations of corner properties should reference massing similar to other corner locations in the historic district.</i>	Staff also notes that heights of the windows on the East Marshall and North 31 st Street elevations appear inconsistent, and <u>recommends the applicant align the heads and sills of the windows on the front and side elevations.</u> Staff recommends the applicant <u>provide detailed drawings of the proposed storefront design for the side elevation and the revised plans be submitted to PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval prior to resubmitting for the SUP application.</u>
Standards for Site Improvements, Parking Lots, pg. 77	<i>Parking lots should be broken up as much as possible with interior landscaped islands and should be well screened from the public right-of-way and adjacent properties.</i>	The applicant has changed the screening materials from composite trim to vertical Trex fencing. Staff finds that Trex composite fencing is not a common material found in the historic district for fences or screening and <u>recommends the applicant work with staff to determine a more appropriate screening material.</u>
Mechanical Equipment, pg. 68	<i>The visual impact of new mechanical equipment should be minimized to protect the historic character of the district.</i>	The applicant has revised the location of the rooftop HVAC equipment and also proposes a hardi panel enclosure. Staff believes the HVAC enclosure will be visible and <u>requests the applicant submit a detailed roof plan with the location of the HVAC units indicated and a line-of-sight drawing from East Marshall Street</u>

		and North 31 st Street to PDR staff for review and approval.
Admin Approval of Gutters and Downspouts	<i>New gutters and downspouts should be as unobtrusive as possible and should be painted a color that is compatible with the building, such as the body of trim color.</i>	The applicant has removed the downspouts from the East Marshall Street elevation and rear addition. Staff is concerned about water runoff and <u>requests the applicant provide additional information about the gutters and downspouts for this section of the building prior to submitting the revised plans for the SUP.</u>

Figures

