



Staff Report
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

5. COA-109606-2022	Final Review	Meeting Date: 4/26/2022
Applicant/Petitioner	William Gallasch	
Project Description	Replace a slate roof with faux slate.	
Project Location		

Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
Standards for Rehabilitation #7, pg. 59	<i>Repair damaged elements instead of replacing them. Use materials that match the original in type, or use physically and chemically compatible substitute materials that convey the same appearance as the surviving elements or sections. Use available documentation when reconstructing</i>	The applicant proposes to replace a slate roof with synthetic majestic slate rather than repairing the existing, original slate roof. Staff finds that the use of synthetic slate as a substitute material for authentic slate is not a compatible material for

	<i>missing elements. Pictorial, historical or physical documentation can be helpful.</i>	the district and will not resemble historic slate effectively.
Standards for Rehabilitation #4, pg. 59	<i>Retain original roof shape, size, materials and related elements including cupolas, chimneys and weather vanes; if replacement is necessary, consideration for use of slate, wood and metal, with respect to color and patterns, should be given.</i>	<p>The applicant proposes to remove the original slate from a faux mansard roof and turret. The applicant is not proposing to alter the existing roof form.</p> <p>The existing slate roof features varying sizes and shapes of slate, including rectangular, diamond, and scalloped arranged in decorative designs. There roof also features a turret with a metal finial. Staff believes that replacement with faux slate would not be able to visually resemble these patterns. Staff recommends against the replacement of the original slate with synthetic slate.</p>
Substitute Materials, pg. 60	<i>The use of synthetic materials that will alter the appearance, proportion and/or details of an historic structure is strongly discouraged</i>	<p>Staff finds that roof is highly visible from W. Grace Street and <u>recommends denial of the installation of synthetic slate on the main roof</u>. Staff finds that the proposed Majestic Slate does not effectively replicate the appearance of historic slate. In addition, staff has concerns regarding the durability of the synthetic slate, which can be easily damaged, which in turn would further reduce its resemblance to historic slate.</p>

Figures



*Figure 1. 1634 W. Grace Street
Front Facade*



Figure 2. Existing Slate roof. Design