

Attn: Marianne Pitts

Case# COA-021086-2017 101 N 29th St

We are the adjacent-attached owners of the subject property. We have lived at this residence for 29 years. The applicant has yet to discuss these proposed changes as a courtesy. Although the current application is not as massive as the first the applicant has continued to ignore comments by the commission members and staff reports – we remain in opposition to the proposal. This is the 3rd submission with 4 elevations.

We outline our issues as follows:

- 1 The proposal depicts an 8 foot wide elevator tower adjacent to our porches; this will infringe and block our view from our porches. Our porch is 8 feet wide. We will be unable to maintain (paint or repair) any damages to our porch with a wall adjacent to ours. It will also block air and sunlight to our property.
- 2 The brick wall along our property line is currently braced to prevent failure which would cause a sink hole and catastrophic damage to our property. If approved we would request engineered stamped PE drawing to assure our property is stable.
- 3 The enclosing of the existing porches changes the historic nature of the dwelling that is a primary elevation. The applicant shows fake railing and attempts to mask the porch enclosure. The subject property is a prominent structure that is located on the Franklin Street gateway to the historic neighborhood and should be preserved as such. The materials include metal, aluminum clad materials, steel columns and wire cables on the rear balcony hardly historic materials. The rear balcony is not original to the house and no ghosting is visible.
- 4 The garage opens to the 11.2 foot alley and to access would require trespassing on property to the east. There is a telephone pole in the alley entrance. Why not enter from Franklin St as proposed twice by staff. No materials shown for garage door.
- 5 The improvements covering the entire lot would increase storm water and water quality issues.
- 6 No location shown for HVAC equipment and trash re-cycle containers.
- 7 Violates zoning requirements:
 - a. Height 35' elevator shaft appears to exceed height (4 stories)
 - b. Rear 5' set back appears to comply not sure about the garage height appears to be about 28-30 feet.
 - c. Side set backs are 3' not in compliance, improvements shown are to the property line
 - d. Lot coverage shall not exceed fifty-five (55%) percent of the lot clearly not in compliance
Lot is 20x24 = 2480 sq feet
House is 20x83 = 1660 sq ft
55% coverage of the existing lot is 1364 sq ft

Existing improvements are 296 sq ft above lot coverage allowed. This requirement alone does not permit any improvements as existing structure is too massive for the lot.

In closing we do not believe this proposal is in keeping with the intent of the St. John's Old & Historic District and therefore we are against the application as submitted.

Larry & Sandra Horton

103 N 29th St

Richmond, VA 23223

August 18, 2017

Commission of Architectural Review

Attn: Marianne Pitts

Re: 101 N. 29th Street, COA-021086-2017

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 wrote to the Commission expressing my concerns for the previous revision of the plans, but the latest revisions are worse and I oppose them for the following reasons:

- The side porches are the most significant feature of the existing structure, visible as one approaches the corner from the east or the south, which is a major gateway to the historic district. The latest plan shows an ugly hybrid of fake railing in front of an enclosure of dark metal walls and casement windows in place of the existing side porches. It looks like a modern, cheap addition has been built inside of the old porch. The porches should remain open, following Commission guidelines not to enclose porches on primary elevations. If the applicant were to win approval for enclosure, then I would urge a return to the previous plan (Plan B I believe, dated May 26, 2017), but with the entire enclosure being of wood or a composite that emulates wood—and painted white, or “alabaster”. That is, the windows should match the painted wood trim and panels.

- The upper rear porch is now dominated by an 8-foot-wide elevator tower, which creates an unsightly mass and blocks air and light from the neighboring porches. I preferred the previous alternative that expanded across the width of the building and was similar to the rear porch on the attached home, with boxed columns and full Richmond rail to match the adjacent home. That option is more harmonious with other buildings in the district. I understand that CAR guidelines may prohibit the addition of any structure unless there is the “ghost” of a similar pre-existing structure, in which case there can be no upper balcony/porch on the rear.
- The garage addition still faces the alley and does not provide sufficient entrance space or a location for the trash receptacles and mechanical equipment. Moving the entrance to the Franklin Street side, where there is already a curb cut, would alleviate these problems.

Thank you for your attention and consideration,

Carol S. Wharton
19 N. 29th St., Unit C
Richmond, VA 23223

cwharton@richmond.edu

From: epinewood@aol.com
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Subject: Case # OA-021086-2017 101 N. 29th St.
Date: Thursday, August 17, 2017 7:37:45 PM

Commission of Architectural Review

August 17, 2017

Att: Marianne Pitts

Re: Case No. COA-021086-2017 101 N. 29th Street

Dear Ms. Pitts:

We are the owners of 103 ½ N. 29th St. We have reviewed the latest plans submitted for 101 N. 29th St. and continue to feel that they are not appropriate. As we have stated in our two previous letters, the changes proposed both in scale and materials are not in keeping with the historic district. For many years great care has been taken to ensure that this important area in Richmond's early history keeps its distinct appearance. 101 N. Franklin St. is important both because it faces N. 29th St. and is at the intersection with Libby Hill Park, but also because of its lengthy frontage on Franklin Street. The plans proposed to the back of the house both in design and materials change its look totally and we do not feel are appropriate. The changes proposed are also detrimental to the property immediately adjacent to it. We hope this will not be permitted.

Sincerely,

Anne Geddy Cross

Elmo G. Cross, Jr.

Anne Geddy Cross
epinewood@aol.com

Anita Garcia-Stein
109 N. 29th St.
Richmond, VA 23223
August 18, 2017

By e-mail: Marianne.Pitts@richmondgov.com
Commission of Architectural Review
Department of Planning and Development Review
City of Richmond, VA
Attention: Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary

101 North 29th Street – Request for Conceptual Review Dated July 28, 2017
Case 14 # COA-021086-2017 101 N 29th St

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In answer to the captioned Request for Review, I submit the list of objections below. These objections are the same as ones I have expressed in answer to two prior requests that the owner submitted. The owner's latest proposal responds to the prior objections in only a small and inconsequential way. I recommend that you withhold approval until more significant changes are made in the direction requested.

Elevator Tower. The proposed elevator tower would block a substantial part of the principal view of the property's next door neighbors. The tower protrudes in such a manner as to make it appear to be a "spite" structure especially if its exterior is "cementitious."

Porch Fill-In. The proposed porch fill-in is still the most objectionable feature. It so dwarfs the other residences on the block as to make it appear a commercial site. It will cause the other residences block to appear distressed rather than charming and somewhat rural. Removing the porch fill- in actually would enhance this property because it would increase the space that could be allocated to fresh air and vegetation. Why not turn this space into a screened-in porch with a desirable southern view? There is lots of interior dining and lounging space without the infill.

Massive. The building area and volume are too massive relative to the area of the lot. This design is not appropriate for a residential block. It is recommended that this situation be improved by (In addition eliminating to the porch fill-in) shortening the garage and studio space.

Please continue to encourage the developer to harmonize the structure with the look of the rest of the neighborhood.

Thank you for your attention.

Anita Garcia-Stein

From: [Thomas Layman](#)
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Subject: Fwd: From Thomas Layman, 2822 East Franklin Street
Date: Thursday, August 17, 2017 3:15:13 PM

August 16, 2017

Marianne G. Pitts,
Commission of Architectural Review
City of Richmond
900 East Broad Street, Room 510
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Reference: 101 North 29th Street

Dear Ms. Pitts,

I am enclosing my two previous emails to you as a record of my continual opposition to the latest application. These application plans still are not a reflection of the requirements from CAR to make changes in homes in the St. John's Old & Historic District.

The intersection of East Franklin and North 29th has many people in cars, trolleys and buses traveling to and from the view at Libby Hill Park. This same intersection (East Franklin Street) is a short cut from Williamsburg Avenue to East Broad and 25th Street. These changes to the side and rear of 101 North 29th Street would be quite visible and not right for the age of this house and others on this street.

As a retired person, who looks out of his windows and walks daily, I notice visitors examining porches and windows on North 29th Street. To me, they treat this street like the Duke of Gloucester Street in Williamsburg. Furthermore, last week I observed a group of about 20 young people meeting with an instructor in Libby Hill Park. Afterwards, with pad and pencil they went to inventory the style of nearby houses. I imagine they were identifying Doric, Ionic or other column styles; the number of window panes and so forth. The latest plans for 101 North 29th on the East Franklin Street side show metal casement windows with fake railings and the porches appear to be closed-in. **This is not right. I can not think that students one day would try to identify Marvin or Anderson windows in our historic area. Fake railings are on recently-built apartment/condo complexes in the Shockoe Bottom.** They do not belong in this historic district on any old houses--especially houses built before 1900.

Again, my previous two emails show my opposition with similar reasons. I did not wish to repeat myself in this email.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Layman

Begin forwarded message:

From: Thomas Layman <tlayman@mac.com>
Subject: From Thomas Layman, 2822 East Franklin Street
Date: June 25, 2017 at 9:24:02 PM EDT
To: Marianne.Pitts@richmondgov.com

June 25, 2017

Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary
Commission of Architectural Review
City of Richmond
900 East Broad Street, Room 510
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Reference: 101 North 29th Street

Dear Ms. Pitts,

On March 27th, I sent you an email detailing why I was in opposition to the proposed plans at 101 North 29th Street. After looking at the revised plans, I am still against these plans. Yes, a few changes have been made, but the closing in of the balconies and the use of metal around the windows is not in character with my historic neighborhood. Recently, every property owner was sent a notice from CAR to get in touch if we are to make exterior changes. We do not want the standards to be weakened and have properties look half fake and half real.

Furthermore, the requested additions and changes to the house at this location, (North 29th Street and East Franklin Street) is an area where buses and trolleys pass by often. And this intersection to Sugar Bottom will be a future gateway to the Riverfront. The side and back of this property will stand out.

Historic Church Hill is becoming a foodie destination and new businesses are opening. Tourism is bringing in additional taxes and income. Our property values are going up. Let's respect our architectural values for our "old and historic" district.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Layman

Enclosed is my previous email:

Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary
Commission of Architectural Review
City of Richmond
900 East Broad Street, Room 510
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Reference: 101 North 29th Street

Dear Ms. Pitts,

I am the property owner of 2822 East Franklin Street. My the eastern side of my house is across from 101 North 29th Street.

Having examined the proposed plans, I am against it.

- This neighborhood, with its uniqueness and in keeping with CAR's restrictions for the history of St. John's Church Old and Historic District, makes this proposal totally out of character.
- East Franklin Street from North 29th Street to Sugar Bottom is destined to have more traffic to link up with the Riverfront. Visitors coming up the hill will see an addition that does not meet CAR's standards.
- The large brick box on the back is especially out of character. The use of metal and double-paned windows are not appropriate for our neighborhood.
- What happens to future developers who will come to CAR and say if this property at 101 N. 29th Street can do this, why can we add or build with the same look and materials?
- The garage opening is right on the narrow alley. It seems impossible for two cars to enter.
- Re-read the history of the efforts of Elizabeth Scott Boccock, Douglas Fleet and others to make this historic area what it is today. My neighbors and I are doing our part to keep Church Hill unique in our city. We have visitors from all over coming daily on trolleys and buses along 29th Street to "The View" of the James River.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Layman