

March 2, 2018

Members, City of Richmond Planning Commission  
Matthew Ebinger, AICP—Acting Principal Planner  
Land Use Administration Division  
900 East Broad Street, Room 511  
Richmond, Virginia 23219-1907

RE: SUP-024779-2017

Dear Mr. Ebinger and Members of the Planning Commission:

The Church Hill Association (CHA) is writing regarding the Special Use Request (SUP-024779-2017) that relates to lot coverage for the development of a two-story carriage house to be attached to the residence at 101 North 29<sup>th</sup> Street. This letter informs you that on February 20, 2018, the Association membership voted to oppose this SUP after careful and lengthy consideration of many factors.

The current Code related to lot coverage for this property states that R-6 Single-Family Attached Residential District shall not exceed 55 percent of the area of the lot. However, the request for 101 N 29<sup>th</sup> Street is for almost total lot coverage: 91 percent. Much concern exists that this excessively high lot coverage could set a precedent in our historic and architecturally unique neighborhood. Approval could lead to other similar SUP applications requesting much higher lot coverage than defined in City Code.

The original two-story carriage house was demolished over 38 years ago and obviously did not exist when the City changed the Code to limit lot coverage to 55% [Code of the City of, VA, Chapter 30, Zoning, Article IV, Division 7, Sec.30-412.6, Lot Coverage]. Therefore, the “grandfather” status should not be considered as a basis for rebuilding a two-story structure that will occupy almost all the remaining lot. Likewise, a recommendation of 38 years ago by the City’s former Bureau of Zoning Authority to reconstruct this carriage house should not be considered valid today and used as another basis for approval as this guidance was made well before the new City Code. In addition, it should be noted that this property has changed ownership many times over these 38 years, and the current owner acquired this property only in 2003, many years after the demolition of the carriage house.

Jennifer Mullen, Attorney, presented the project to CHA’s Historic Preservation and Land Use Committee twice in January and then on February 20th to the Association. Margaret Freund, owner, also attended the Committee’s initial January meeting.

Please let us know if you have questions.

Sincerely yours,  
*Genni Sasnett*  
Genni Sasnett  
CHA President

C:  
Jennifer Mullen, Attorney  
Barbara Cotter, Chairperson, Historic Preservation and Land Use Committee of CHA

**Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR**

---

**From:** Trish Bernal [trishbernal@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 14, 2018 11:40 AM  
**To:** Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR  
**Subject:** SUP 101N. 29th Street

Mr. Ebinger,

I am writing to voice my concern about the requested SUP for the property at 101 N. 29th Street. As a longtime (20 year) resident of Church Hill I am appalled that the City would even consider allowing someone to cover 91% of their property in an area zoned R-6.

Shortly after moving into my home I dealt with a similar issue when the attached neighbor attempted to build a 35 foot two story addition to the back of their house. I was fortunate in the fact that CAR was able to get the size of this addition down to a single story 15 foot addition, more in keeping with the historic nature of the neighborhood.

Allowing this structure at 101 N. 29th Street to proceed at this important gateway to the east end of our cherished Church Hill Old and Historic District would be a travesty.

Regards,

Patricia Bernal  
Church Hill Resident

## **Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR**

---

**From:** Larry Horton [horton103@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 10:57 AM  
**To:** Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR  
**Subject:** RE: SUP 024779-2017 Margaret Freund 101 N 29th St

RE: SUP 024779-2017 Margaret Freund 101 N 29th St

We are Larry & Sandra Horton we live at 103 N 29th St and our house is attached to 101 N 29th St. we have lived in this house for 30 years.

Some back ground on this project: Margaret Freund made application to CAR before contacting her neighbors or making a presentation to the CHA. Her 1st application of conceptual review was a 4 story addition from the top of the roof to the alley that would have totally blocked our view-air-light. The 2nd conceptual review was a metal 4 story elevator shaft next to our porches which again would have blocked our view-air-light. We went through 4 conceptual reviews and 3 CAR meetings before we got to the 2 car garage that we have now.

This shows the intent of the applicant was not to restore an old carriage house but to build a Mac mansion with no green space. The applicant only changed to the 2 story garage when CAR would not allow the first 3 proposals. The space in the house has already been increased by allowing the 2 porches on Franklin Street to be enclosed as part of the interior of the house. (which will increase the square footage of the existing house) During this approval process many of our neighbors wrote to CAR in opposition to the project and continued to write each time changes were made.

None of these proposals meet the zoning ordinance of today, which is why we are here. If built the lot coverage will be 91% of her property with no green space. The BZA report issued in 1980 that gave the owner, at that time, permission to rebuild was 38 years ago and included 3 apartments. As we know, there have been lots of changes to the Church Hill neighborhood in the last 38 years and hopefully these changes are for the good. The house is a gateway to Church Hill from the east end and this will change the character of our neighborhood.

Just to make sure everyone understands CAR only approved this project with the understanding that the applicant clear up the zoning issue. We are against the proposed SUP.

Larry & Sandra Horton  
103 N 29th St

**Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR**

---

**From:** epinewood@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 14, 2018 5:26 PM  
**To:** Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR  
**Subject:** SUP-024779-2017

Members, City of Richmond Planning Commission

Mr. Matthew J. Ebinger

Secretary of the Planning Commission, City of Richmond

900 #. Broad St., Richmond VA 23219

Re: SUP-024779-2017

Dear Mr. Ebinger and Members of the Planning Commisison,

We are the owners of 103 ½ N. 29<sup>th</sup> St.. We have consistently opposed the plans proposed for 101 N. 29<sup>th</sup> St.. The plans proposed have not been in keeping with the historic district in terms of materials or scope. They would affect both our neighbors, the Hortons, and our back yard in terms of light and air. The proposed garage would be out of scale and affect the narrow alley behind our properties.

Each time the CAR made a decision the applicant seemed to refuse to accept the decision. This continues today.

We hope that you will reject the proposed SUP and put an end to this. The Church Hill Historic District is a true gem which should not be undermined. Once you start undermining historic districts, the whole process is vulnerable.

Sincerely,

Anne Geddy Cross and Elmo G. Cross, Jr.

**Anne Geddy Cross**  
**epinewood@aol.com**

March 14, 2018

Matthew Ebinger, AICP, Secretary  
Members, City of Richmond Planning Commission  
900 East Broad Street, Room 511  
Richmond, Virginia 23219-1907

RE: SUP-024779-2017

Dear Mr. Ebinger and Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing regarding the Special Use Permit listed above that relates to lot coverage for the development of a two-story carriage house to be attached to the residence at 101 N. 29<sup>th</sup> Street. I own a condo directly across Franklin Street from the property in question. My windows are at the level of the second-floor side porches. I oppose this SUP because I believe that the current Code related to lot coverage is more appropriate to the neighborhood, the designated old and historic district of Church Hill.

The current Code states that property coverage shall not exceed 55 percent of the lot area, whereas the SUP requests coverage of 91 percent. I am concerned that such extensive coverage would set an undesirable precedent in this neighborhood. The SUP would allow the construction of an attached two-story garage that faces and extends all the way to the rear alley. This does not allow green space for trash receptacles or for cars to enter and leave the garage without backing onto the neighboring property. While I believe that the garage or carriage house would be more historically appropriate if it opened onto Franklin Street, where there is already a curb cut, I understand that that might be more difficult because of the slope of the street. However, if the opening is to be on the alley, there should be an apron that allows space for egress to the garage and for trashcans to be placed away from the sidewalk. Adhering to the City Code would accomplish this goal.

Thank you for your attention and consideration,

Carol S. Wharton  
19 N. 29<sup>th</sup> St., Unit C  
Richmond, VA 23223

[cwharton@richmond.edu](mailto:cwharton@richmond.edu)