

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
January 27, 2015 Meeting**

4. **CAR No. 14-133** (A. Ogburn)

**2818 E. Marshall Street
Church Hill North Old & Historic District**

Project Description:

**Repair front porch
Replace windows
Construct rear porch and deck**

Staff Contact:

K. Chen

The property, located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District, is the center unit of a three-part row. The flanking houses are still largely intact but the subject property has been significantly altered. These alterations include the removal of the decorative elements from the roof cornice; the alteration of the size of two window openings and removal of a third opening on the second story; the removal and replacement of the full length first story windows with a picture window; and the reconstruction of the front porch incorporating brick piers and wrought iron posts. The application requests permission to reconfigure the window openings on the façade, to remove the porch awning and restore the dentiled cornice, turned posts, and picket balustrade, and to construct a balcony and deck on the rear of the property.

Staff recommends the approval of the project with conditions.

The new windows on the façade should have 2/2, simulated divided light sash and the proposed rear balcony and deck should conform to the guidance presented on page 49 of the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*.

Porch. The owner proposes to remove the metal awning, brick piers, metal posts, and brick and concrete steps. The porch cornice will be repaired and the dentil molding will be repaired or restored (depending on condition). New turned posts, a picket balustrade, new concrete steps, and metal handrail similar to those found at the adjacent houses will be installed.

Windows, first story. The owner proposes to remove the picture window and restore the full length windows on the first story. The windows will match those found on the adjacent houses in length, width, and placement. The segmental arch will be restored but the new, window sash will have a square top with a segmental-arched wood infill above the window head.

Windows, second story. The owner proposes to restore the windows to the original number, length, width and placement based on the adjacent houses. The new openings will have square heads rather than the segmental arch observed on the adjacent properties.

Windows. The owner proposes to use a Legacy, cellular PVC material window that will be customized to fit the restored openings. The windows should have 2/2, simulated divided light sashes.

While not requested as part of the application staff would also suggest that the façade can be repainted to cover the extensive brickwork that may be required to restore the openings. A color can be approved by staff.

Rear Elevation. On the first story, the owner proposes to install a pair of French doors centered in the elevation and remove an existing door located in the narrow alleyway between the buildings. On the second story, the owner proposes to install a new door in an existing door opening and enlarge the window opening. The rear elevation's first story is not visible from the public right-of-way and therefore does not come under the Commission's purview. Staff does recommend the retention of the multi-light door on the second story. The second story window opening appears to be an existing alteration (the adjacent properties do not appear to have windows in this location).

Rear balcony and deck. Rear balconies exist in the area and there is currently a stoop with stairs that lead to the back yard from the second story door. The deck and balcony will be acceptable if they conform the guidance offered on page 49 of the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*.

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. Staff recommends the conditional approval of the application as presented.