

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
September 23, 2014 Meeting**

10. **CAR No. 14-101** (D. Seibert)

**2305 Venable Street
Union Hill Old and Historic District**

Project Description: **Rehabilitate front porch, construct new deck, repair windows, install new window sashes, install new doors, construct new parking area and privacy fence**

Staff Contact:

K. Chen

The applicant seeks approval for the rehabilitation of a two-story residence in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The building is in poor condition and many of the architectural features are missing or deteriorated. The applicant proposes to rehabilitate the front porch by retaining and repairing the existing turned posts and replicating the existing rail where it is missing. The existing 1/1 wood, sash windows on the façade will be repaired and retained. On the rear (South Elevation) the windows are missing. Sashes that are too deteriorated and missing will be replaced with aluminum-clad, wood sash windows with a 1/1 light configuration, like the historic sash found on the façade. The windows will be appropriately sized to fit the existing openings. The front door, transom, sidelights and trim will be repaired and retained. The missing doors on the rear of the house will be replaced with 6 and 4 panel steel doors. A new rear deck and privacy fence will be constructed.

Staff recommends approval of the project. The proposed work is thoroughly described in the project documentation and is entirely consistent with the Guidelines for rehabilitation, however, no drawings were provided and specifications for the new windows were omitted.

A few required modifications, based on the condition of the elements, were not described in the application. No description was given for the repair of the porch roof, the main roof on the house, or the repair of the front and rear cornices.

Staff requests that the Commission allow Staff to work with the applicant as permit documents are developed and missing information is provided or the applicant can return to the Commission with additional information.

It is the assessment of staff that the application is consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation outlined in Section 114-930.7(b) 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.