



Staff Report
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

4.COA-155369-2024	Final Review	Meeting Date: 10/22/2024
Applicant/Petitioner	Sarah Koenig	
Project Description	Construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit in a rear yard.	
Project Location		
Address: 2120 M Street		
Historic District: Union Hill		
<p>High-Level Details:</p> <p>The applicant requests conceptual review of the construction of a two-story, rear accessory dwelling unit (ADU) in the rear yard of a two-story, frame, Greek Revival Style dwelling built circa 1856, otherwise known as the R. A. Joseph House.</p> <p>The ADU will be 572 square feet with a 19'6" x 14'8" footprint. It will be clad in yellow pine horizontal lap siding. The roof form will be a shallowly pitched gable roof with architectural shingles.</p>		
Staff Recommendation	Approval, with Conditions	
Staff Contact	Alex Dandridge, alex.dandridge@rva.gov, (804) 646-6569	
Previous Reviews	<p>The Commission conceptually reviewed this application at the September 2024 meeting. Overall, the Commission was in support of the project, but had a few recommendations. The Commission recommended that the applicant consider mimicking some of the primary buildings front porch detailing on the ADU's porch. There was concern over the use of asphalt shingles on a low pitch roof, as leaking could be an issue. Consider the feasibility of asphalt shingles on the roof of the ADU. Consider a hipped roof on the ADU rather than the proposed shallow gable. Could increase the pitch of the ADU's proposed gable roof. Could use either the proposed pine siding, or a composite, fiber cement siding with a smooth finish could be acceptable. Stay away from K-Style gutter. A square or half-round gutter could be more appropriate.</p>	
Conditions for Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff recommends that the concrete curb be repaired/replaced in-kind to match the existing in color, height, and width. 	

Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
<p>New Construction, Residential Outbuildings, pg. 51</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outbuildings, including garages, sheds, gazebos and other auxiliary structures, should be compatible with the design of the primary building on the site, including roof slope and materials selection. 2. Newly constructed outbuildings such as detached garages or tool sheds should respect the siting, massing, roof profiles, materials and colors of existing outbuildings in the neighborhood. 3. New outbuildings should be smaller than the main residence and be located to the rear and/or side of the property to emphasize that they are secondary structures. 4. Prefabricated yard structures are discouraged. Screening will be considered as a mitigating factor for the installation of these structures. However, prefabricated structures will still be reviewed for compatibility using the criteria developed in this section. 	<p>The primary dwelling has a main hipped roof and a rear wing with a shallowly pitched gable roof. The ADU will have a shallowly pitched gable roof that matches the shallowly pitched gable roof of the rear wing. Staff finds that the roof form of the ADU will be compatible with the roof form of the primary building.</p> <p>During the conceptual review, the Commission asked the applicant to consider the roof form and increasing its slope. The applicant has not revised the roof form as the proposed design mimics the slope the rear addition on the primary building. The Commission also asked the the applicant consider incorporating detailing seen on the primary building's front porch on the small, covered porch of the ADU. The applicant has not revised the plans to reflect this consideration, as the porch on the ADU will be kept simple to keep the ADU subordinate in design.</p> <p>The ADU will be constructed in the rear yard, which is an appropriate location for an auxiliary building, and will be clad in horizontal, yellow pine lap siding like the primary building and will be painted the same color. Staff finds that the massing, material, and location of the ADU is appropriate for the district.</p> <p>During the conceptual review, the Commission advised the applicant that they could use wood or fiber cement siding. The applicant has revised the plans to used fiber cement siding rather than the originally proposed fiber cement siding.</p> <p>The ADU will have double-hung, one-over-one aluminum clad wood windows. The windows will be vertically aligned and generally consistent in size. There will be one larger window on the second story left side elevation. This window will serve as a means of egress. The left side elevation will not be visible from M Street or North 22nd Street.</p> <p>There will be a small porch with a shed roof on the south elevation which faces the primary building.</p> <p>The Commission recommended that a K-Style gutter be avoided; however the applicant has not revised the plans and is proposing this style as it is consistent with the design of the gutters on the 2012 rear addition on the primary building.</p> <p>Staff finds the overall design and detailing of the proposed ADU to be simple in style, compatible and subordinate to the primary building on the site.</p>
<p>New Construction, Fences & Walls</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fence, wall, and gate designs should reflect the scale of the historic structures they surround, as well as the 	<p>There is an existing wooden privacy fence on top of a concrete curb at the rear and sides of the property. The applicant proposes to extend the existing fence along the sides of the yard to the alley to surround three sides</p>

	<p>character of nearby fences, walls, and gates.</p> <p>2. Fence, wall, or gate materials should relate to building materials commonly found in the neighborhood.</p>	<p>of the proposed ADU. A new gate and concrete stairs will be installed along 22nd Street in conjunction with the fence extension. A portion of the existing concrete curb will need to be repaired/replaced.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends that the concrete curb be repaired/replaced in-kind to match the existing color, height, and width.</u></p>
--	---	---

It is the assessment of staff that, with the conditions above, the application 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.

Figures

Figure 1. 2120 M Street Façade.



Figure 2. 2120 M Street, side elevation.



Figure 3. Rear yard as seen from alley.



Figure 4. Rear yard as seen from alley. Existing concrete pad.



Figure 5. The existing privacy fence to be extended.

