

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
August 22, 2017, Meeting**

11. **COA-020167-2017** (S. Tuttle)

**2209 Venable Street
Union Hill Old and Historic District**

Project Description: **Construct an accessory dwelling unit
at the rear of the property.**

Staff Contact: **M. Pitts**

The applicant requests approval to construct a two story accessory dwelling at the rear of a property developed with a single family dwelling in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The primary building is a two-story, three-bay residential frame structure with a side gable roof built ca. 1882. The applicant has pursued rehabilitation tax credits for the rehabilitation of the primary structure and the construction of a rear addition which was approved by the Commission on November 22, 2016. The applicant has received Part II approval from the Department of Historic Resources which included review of this proposed related new construction.

The applicant is proposing to construct a two story frame structure with a gable roof sited at the south east corner of the property. The applicant came before the Commission on July 25, 2017, for approval of this outbuilding. The Commission deferred the review of this project to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the Commission's and staff's concerns regarding the compatibility of the roof form, the window design, the awning design, and the mix of materials. In response to the concerns, the applicant has modified the plans as follows:

- The applicant has reduced the pitch of the gable roof to be similar to that of the primary structure and the approved rear addition. The height at the roof ridge has been reduced by approximately one foot.
- The lite configuration of the second story window on the south elevation has been changed from 2/1 to 1/1. The square windows remain as previously proposed.
- The awning has been reduced in length by 4 feet to 8 feet.
- The structure will be clad in fiber cement lap siding. The applicant is no longer proposing the board and batten siding.

The proposed structure will be setback approximately 9' from Burton Street which runs south of the property and functions as an alley as no primary structures address this block of Burton Street. The structure will measure 13'-9" wide by 22' long and will be approximately 21' in height at the roof ridge. The applicant is proposing lapped cementitious siding, and the roof will be clad in shingles. On the east elevation, the applicant is proposing two full lite doors with a metal shed roof awning supported by simple brackets and two small aluminum clad fixed or casement windows on the second story. On the south elevation, the applicant is

proposing three small wood fixed or casement windows on the first story and a 1/1 aluminum clad window on the second story. On the west elevation, the applicant is proposing two small wood fixed or casement windows on the second story. The north elevation will not be visible from the public right of way.

Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions. Staff has reviewed the proposed structures under the Commission's guidelines for residential outbuildings found on page 48 of the Richmond *Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* note that outbuildings should be compatible with the design of the primary building on the site including roof slop and materials selection (pg. 48, Residential Outbuildings #1). The applicant is replicating the gable roof form found in the primary structure and utilizing the frame construction. The applicant has altered the roof slope to be more consistent with that of the primary structure and the CAR approved addition. Additionally, the applicant is proposing one cladding for the structure rather than the previously proposed mix of board and batten and lap siding. Staff recommends the siding be smooth, unbeaded cementitious siding with a reveal differentiated from the reveal of the siding on the primary structure.

The *Guidelines* note that new outbuildings should respect the siting, massing, roof profiles, materials, and colors of existing outbuildings in the neighborhood (pg. 48, Residential Outbuildings #2). Though the structure is taller than the surrounding outbuildings, the Sanborn map from 1905 does show a two story outbuilding at 2213 Venable. The applicant has designed the structure with a width similar to existing outbuildings which minimizes the impact of the structure's massing. The *Guidelines* state that new outbuildings should be subordinate to the primary structure and located to the rear or side of the property (pg. 48, Residential Outbuildings #3). The structure is approximately 7 feet short at the ridge than the primary structure and is located at the rear of the property which helps to emphasize that the structure is a secondary structure. As details of the proposed roof shingles were not provided, staff recommends these details be provided for administrative review and approval.

The *Guidelines* note that the size, proportion, and spacing patterns of window and door openings on free standing new construction should be compatible with patterns found in the district (pg. 49, Doors and Windows #3). The Commission had expressed concerns with the proposed square windows. The applicant has provided examples of square windows found on outbuildings and primary structures throughout the district. As a grouped set of square windows as proposed for the visible south elevation is not a spacing pattern found in the district for smaller windows, staff recommends the spacing be altered to have three individual evenly spaced windows.

The Commission's approval should also be conditioned upon the work being performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions. In addition, the applicant should submit any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service to CAR staff for administrative review and approval.

It is the assessment of staff that, with the conditions above, the application is consistent with the Standards for New Construction outlined in Sections 30-930.7 (c) 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.