



## Commission of Architectural Review

2. COA-186772-2026	Meeting Date: 6/23/2026
Applicant/Petitioner	Mose Franck
Project Description	Replace 11 Vinyl windows in-kind
Project Location	
Address: 2822 E Marshall St	
Historic District: Church Hill North	
<p>High-Level Details:</p> <p>The applicant is proposing to replace 11 extant vinyl windows in-kind on the rear and side elevations of a masonry free standing Italianate dwelling ca. 1880.</p> <p>The extant building is located on a corner lot, and the sides and rear of the building are highly visible from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>There is a small 1920s masonry outbuilding located at the rear of the building as well.</p>	
Staff Recommendation	
Staff Contact	Alex Dandridge, Alex.Dandridge@RVA.gov, (804)646-6569
Previous Reviews	None.
Staff Recommendations	<p>Denial of the installation of new vinyl windows.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the applicant consider alternate replacement window materials that have been approved by the Commission such as aluminum clad wood with simulated divided lights. Staff finds that windows with a two-over-two or one-over-one pane configuration would be appropriate.</p>

# Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
<p>Building Elements, Windows, Window Maintenance, pg. 69</p>	<p>9. The architectural character of windows should not be altered by inappropriate materials or finishes that radically change the sash, depth of reveal, muntin configuration, the reflective quality or color of the glazing or the appearance of the frame.</p> <p>10. The architectural appearance of original windows should be used as a model for new windows. Changes in the sash, depth or reveal, muntin configuration, frame or glazing is strongly discouraged. New glass should not be tinted or receive reflective coatings.</p> <p>11. Because the material cannot be manufactured to model effectively the appearance of historic windows, vinyl windows are not appropriate for historic buildings in historic districts.</p>	<p>The applicant proposes to replace 11 extant vinyl windows with varying pane configurations in-kind. The application states that the windows have deteriorated and are creating energy efficiency and safety concerns. Having been installed 15 plus years ago, the windows were installed pre-district designation.</p> <p>Because vinyl windows are not manufactured to resemble the appearance of wooden windows (including depth, muntin profile, and sash width) the <i>Guidelines</i> state that vinyl windows are not appropriate for use on historic buildings. Staff finds that approving a non-conforming window material in-kind would be in conflict with the intent of the guidelines, which aim to preserve the integrity and character of old and historic districts, rather than perpetuate a condition that has caused erosion of the district's historic character.</p> <p>The extant windows are inappropriate replacements. They feature grid in-between glass muntins, shallow profiles, and inappropriate rail widths, including a narrow bottom rail. Furthermore, staff was unable to locate photographic or physical documentation that demonstrates the original side and rear windows featured any of the extant pane configurations, some of which are more typical of other building styles. Given the context of the district, staff believes the side and rear windows originally featured a two-over-two pane configuration.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends denial of the installation of new vinyl windows. Staff recommends that the applicant consider alternate replacement window materials that have been approved by the Commission such as aluminum clad wood with simulated divided lights. Staff finds that windows with a two-over-two or one-over-one pane configuration would be appropriate.</u></p>

*It is the assessment of staff that, with the conditions above, the application is not 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.*

# Figures



*Figure 1. 1950s image of 2822 East Marshall Street. Side and rear windows are not visible in this image, or difficult to determine pane configuration due to the angle of the photograph.*



*Figure 2. Extant vinyl windows on one of the side, subject elevations.*