

From: [Ann from Virginia](#)
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Cc: [maarn95](#); [Marian Fields](#)
Subject: 2209 Venable Street, COA-020167-2017
Date: Sunday, August 13, 2017 10:38:32 PM

Ms. Pitts,

Will you please see that each commission member gets a copy of this letter...which I am sending to you quite early as I won't be around for the upcoming CAR meet.

Thanks, as always...

Ann

Commission Member

Re: 2209 Venable St, Application COA-020167-2017

The Commission of Architectural Review derives its authority from the Richmond City Code which provides that designation of an old and historic district overlays all other zoning (Introduction, Handbook and Design Review Guidelines). Commission members are appointed to provide the means by which city council may protect the heritage of the city (Introduction, Handbook and Design Review Guidelines).

A short time ago - perhaps two years, maybe three - a violation pertaining to what's commonly known as a "painted lady" came before the commission. Richmond has no painted ladies in the district in which the violation occurred; and so the commission found that since painted ladies are not part of the historic heritage of that district (indeed, of the city), the application was denied.

This application is similar in that there are no two story accessory residences to be found elsewhere in Union Hill...and this application is for a two story residence...and commission members are tasked with consideration of accessory residences within the district (Standards for New Construction, Siting, Handbook and Design Review Guidelines).

Further, Standards for New Construction, Siting, 3 (Handbook and Design Review Guidelines), states that "New buildings should face the most prominent street bordering the site." Whether the most prominent street is determined to be Venable Street or Burton Street, the proposed new residence does not face any street bordering the site.

I refer you to the letter I submitted to you commission members when an application for a new two story residence at this address first came for a COA, asking again that you resolve the issue of the state's Department of Historic Resources approval of said building, as inclusion of such letter implies - although the letter's only reference to a

"...separate, new construction on the property" is to approve that building's siding. There is no letter from DHR that specifically addresses whether the new construction on the property was part of the original submission to DHR and thus approved by DHR. I urge you to request that a copy of the original submission to DHR and that organization's subsequent approval of the new construction on the property be made part of any application for a COA in order to clarify whether DHR approved the new building in its entirety...or just its siding.

As submitted, the proposed building does not reflect the heritage or character of Union Hill: it is not compatible with the district's historic features; it is not inconspicuous; and it doesn't respect the context in which it is proposed to be built (multiple sources, Handbook and Design Review Guidelines).

And just what kind of stoop or front porch is that anyway?

Respectfully,
A Wortham
Union Hill

From: [Nancy Lampert](#)
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Cc: [Chen, Kimberly M. - PDR](#); [Ann from Virginia](#); [Liz Opalak](#); marianhfields@gmail.com
Subject: COA-020167-2017; 2209 Venable Street
Date: Thursday, August 17, 2017 2:33:53 PM

Good Afternoon Ms. Pitts,

Could you kindly provide copies to all Commission members?

Thank you,

Nancy Lampert

Commission Members:

I am writing in opposition to the above referenced application.

The Guidelines state that "new outbuildings should respect the siting, massing, roof profiles, materials and colors of existing outbuildings in the neighborhood."

The proposed structure does not respect the (height), massing and roof profiles of any similar outbuildings along the unique two block corridor of Venable/Burton Streets. (Photos provided)

The applicant has provided historical data to indicate that there were such structures, but NONE exist today. I have provided photos of all outbuildings in the Union Hill District, and all are one story structures. If two stories are allowed, let the Commission be historically accurate and allow for outside privies, outside kitchens, and outside barns with haylofts.

The proposed two story structure is not an architectural form found in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicant has provided photos of two story outbuildings outside the Union Hill District only. There are no such structures located within this District. Indeed, the applicant has constructed a similar structure on the rear of the lot where he resides (photos provided). The applicant resides in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District, where many of his examples are. The architectural forms found in the Church Hill North District are not the forms found in the Union Hill District. This is exactly what makes each District unique.

This application is asking the Commission to consider an outside structure as a new construction. The subject lot is not an "infill" vacant lot, and should not be considered as such.

More importantly, consistency should be the standard for all approval and denial processes. Two years ago an application (2015-090) was denied that proposed to construct a two story accessory structure at the rear of the lot, similar to what the applicant is proposing. A later application (2016-001) was approved for a one story structure.

A perception "on the street" is that there is a standard for home owners and a standard for investor/developers. There is a certain "greening" of the Union Hill Old and Historic District that is not being allowed in other Church Hill Districts. As such, the contributing characteristics of the Union Hill District are being compromised.

I respectfully request that the Guidelines be upheld and this application denied.

Thank you,

Nancy Lampert











BEWARE
OF
DOG

CVWMA
(804) 340-0900
www.cvwma.org

95R 102840

PROPERTY OF
CITY OF
RICHMOND



dish

ALL SECURE











PRIVATE PARKING
BOWLER
AUTHORIZED PARKING ONLY
TOWING ENFORCED BY
ON TIME TOWING, INC.
CALL (804) 539-8697 FOR
LOCATION AND INFORMATION
CONCERNING RETURN OF VEHICLE

Bowler
Bowling & More
100-100
←







907

Handwritten graffiti in black ink, featuring stylized letters and symbols, including a circle with a cross inside.

Handwritten graffiti in orange/red ink, consisting of stylized letters and a horizontal line.

Large handwritten graffiti in black ink, featuring stylized letters and symbols, including a circle with a cross inside.



N 21ST ST
800

CARRINGTON ST
200

2000









