

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
August 28, 2018 Meeting**

4. **COA-039283-2018** (V. Reinikovas)

**2712 East Leigh Street
Church Hill North Old and Historic District**

Project Description:

**Renovate a former horse stable and
construct an addition on the rear.**

Staff Contact:

C. Jones

The applicant requests approval to renovate a historic 2,600 square foot horse stable, recently used as a church, and construct an 890 square foot addition on the rear of the building. Site improvements, including parking and screening, are also planned. The applicant is also applying for a Special Use Permit and for the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit through the Department of Historic Resources and the National Park Service. In 2014 the first story façade windows were replaced without Commission approval, enforcement action was not taken by staff at that time.



2712 East Leigh Street.

Staff recommends approval of the following:

Masonry Repair: Staff finds the proposed masonry repair on the east elevation to match the existing is in keeping with the *Guidelines, Masonry* (pg.90).

Site Improvements: Staff finds the proposed parking is consistent with the Guidelines which recommends that parking be confined to the sides and rears of buildings, between two adjacent buildings and be screened with landscaping (pg. 77 #s 1-4).

Changes to Openings: The *Guidelines* state that the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows should not be changed (pg. 69, #8). The applicant is proposing to change three openings on the south elevation, including enlarging two windows on the first story. Staff found photographic evidence that the window to the left of the door was once a larger opening and recommends approval of the proposed window opening. Staff also recommends approval of enlarging the window to the right of the door to create a more consistent appearance.

Replacement Windows: The applicant is proposing to install aluminum clad wood windows in the existing openings. Staff recommends approval of the aluminum clad windows to be used in the current window openings (pg. 69 #11).

Addition: The Guidelines state the additions should be subordinate in size to their main buildings, as inconspicuous as possible and located at the rear or on the least visible side of a building (pg. 46, *Siting*, #1). Staff finds that the addition is located on the rear of the building and is differentiated by a narrow hyphen. The Guidelines further state that new construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the historic district (pg. 46, *Form*, #1) Staff finds that the addition is compatible in form and massing, and that the side gable roof is similar to the gable roof form of the historic building, but also helps to differentiate the addition from the historic building. (pg. 46, *Form*, #1).

Staff recommends approval of the following with conditions:

Roof Material Replacement: Staff recommends approval of the removal of the asphalt shingle roof and the use of standing seam metal on the condition that the material is submitted to staff for administrative approval (pg. 46, #5).

Screening Fence: The *Guidelines* state that rear yard privacy fences should mimic traditional fence designs (pg. 78, #9). Staff recommends that details of the proposed fence, including a detailed site plan with the location of the fence and materials, be submitted for staff review and approval prior to installation.

Doors: The applicant is proposing to replace the existing door. Staff recommends the doors fit the existing openings and details of the new doors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval prior to installation (pg. 46, *Doors and Windows*, #4).

Addition: The applicant proposes to utilize a mix of masonry and cementitious siding on the exterior of the addition. The applicant also proposes a mix of materials below the first floor transom windows on the west elevation and one of

two windows in the second story of the east and west elevations. Staff recommends approval of the mix of materials with the condition that area under the windows be a solid finish to mimic the proposed solid materials and finish on the east and west elevations. Staff also recommends the window pattern on the addition be a more uniform and regular pattern reflective of the openings on the existing building (pg. 49, *Doors and Windows*, #1). Staff recommends the applicant submit revised plans for the addition for administrative approval.

Staff requests additional information on the following:

Mechanical Plans: The *Guidelines* state that the visual impact of new mechanical equipment should be minimized to protect the historic character of the area and that new HVAC units should be placed in side or rear yards so as to minimize their visual impact, and equipment on the ground should be appropriately screened with fencing or vegetation (pg. 68, #s 1-4). The site and roof plan supplied by the applicant does not indicate where new HVAC equipment will be located. Staff recommends this information be submitted to staff for administrative approval.

Elevations: The applicant did not provide dimensioned elevations. Staff requests the applicant provide dimensions of the proposed elevations and new addition. Staff also requests clarification of the gable roof addition as shown on the site plan. Staff recommends the addition roof gable be perpendicular to the existing building as shown on the elevations.

Additional Staff Recommendation: Staff further recommends approval provided that the work be performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions; and any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service be submitted to CAR staff for administrative review and approval.

It is the assessment of staff that the application, with the conditions noted above, is consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation and New Construction outlined in Section 30-930.7(b) and (c) of the City Code, as well as with the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*, specifically the pages cited above, adopted by the Commission for review of Certificates of Appropriateness under the same section of the code.