

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
STAFF REPORT  
November 22, 2016, Meeting**

11. **CAR No. 16-167** (N. Smith)

**314 North 21<sup>st</sup> Street  
Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District**

**Project Description:**

**Modify plans for a previously  
approved porch reconstruction.**

**Staff Contact:**

**M. Pitts**

The applicant requests approval to modify previously approved plans for the reconstruction of the front porch on a dwelling in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District. This application was the result of enforcement activity as staff was alerted that the porch reconstruction was not occurring per the Commission's August 25, 2015, approval and that windows on the façade were replaced without review or approval. Subsequent to the notice of violation being served, the applicant abated the violation regarding the windows by reinstalling the original windows.

On August 25, 2015, the applicant was approved to reconstruct the front porch of the home with the condition that the porch plans be revised to replicate the historic bell-cast roof form. This condition was included as the Commission had photographic and physical evidence in the form of ghosting on the structure of the historic roof form. The porch was reconstructed with a low sloped hipped roof similar to the porch roof at 310 North 21s Street instead of the bell-cast roof. The applicant is requesting approval of the existing condition.

**Staff recommends denial of the project.** The *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines* state that porch replacements should match the original as much as possible (pg. 67, #5). Additionally, the Guidelines note that available documentation including pictorial or physical evidence should be used when reconstructing missing elements (pg. 55, #7). As there was both physical and photographic documentation of the original porch roof form, staff cannot recommend approval of an alternate roof form that does not effectively convey the character defining features of the original roof including its shape.

It is the assessment of staff that the application is not consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation outlined in Sections 30-930.7(b) of the City Code, as well as with the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*, specifically the page cited above, adopted by the Commission for review of Certificates of Appropriateness under the same section of the code.