



Staff Report
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

10. COA-111562-2022	Final Review Meeting Date: 5/24/2022
Applicant/Petitioner	Amanda Seibert
Project Description	Construct a new single family, two story detached house on a vacant lot.
Project Location	
Address: 965 Pink St.	
Historic District: Union Hill	
High-Level Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant proposes to construct a two-story, single-family detached residence on a vacant lot. The new residence will be traditional in design with a front facing gable roof and a full width front façade porch and a small second story front façade porch Siding will be Hardie plank Smooth siding. 	
Staff Recommendation	Approval with Conditions
Staff Contact	Alex Dandridge, alex.dandridge@rva.gov , (804) 646-6569
Previous Reviews	<p>This application was conceptually reviewed by the Commission at the March 2022 meeting. The Commission made comments addressing the depth of the front porch, recommending that the depth be reduced to better align with the historic precedent in the district. Comments were also made in regard to the proposed front façade shutters; the Commission stating that they should be operable if included in the final design.</p>
Conditions for Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff recommends that the front porch be further reduced, or the projecting portion be removed, final design submitted for chair and vice chair approval. Staff recommends that the plans be updated to demonstrate the shutters will be operable prior to applying to a building permit.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff recommends that all final color and material specification be submitted to staff for review and approval.
--	---

Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
Siting, pg. 46, #2-3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>New residential infill construction should respect the prevailing front and side yard setback patterns of the surrounding block. The minimum setbacks evident in most districts reinforce the traditional street wall.</i> 	<p>The proposed dwelling will have a set back consistent with dwellings in this area. However, the front porch will project out much further than the proposed new construction at 967 Pink Street. Staff notes there are varying setbacks in this district.</p>
Form, pg. 46, #1-3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>New construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the historic district.</i> <i>New residential construction should maintain the existing human scale of nearby historic residential construction in the district</i> <i>New residential construction and additions should incorporate human-scale elements such as cornices, porches and front steps into their design.</i> 	<p>While the new construction is narrower and deeper than any remaining historic dwellings in the immediate area, Staff finds that the subject property is located in an area at the northern edge of the Union Hill Old and Historic District which has very little historic fabric left to serve as context for new construction.</p> <p>The front façade will incorporate architectural elements appropriate for City Old and Historic Districts such as a front porch and stairs, a front facing gable roof, and a visible metal front porch roof.</p> <p>The front porch will project feet from the front façade, and 12 feet from the front façade adjacent to the front entrance. Based on the Commission's comments during the conceptual review of this application, the applicant has reduced the projecting portion of the front porch by two feet. Staff supports this reduction.</p> <p>However, staff notes that It is uncommon to have a single-story, full-width front porch with a projecting bay in the district. Generally front porches have the same set back the full width of the front façade. Uniformity in the setback front porches enhances the pedestrian realm of the block.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends that the front porch be further reduced, or the projecting bay be removed, final design submitted for chair and vice chair approval.</u></p> <p>Staff finds that given the transitional nature of this block, being near the edge of the district, the proposed new construction is compatible with the district featuring elements associated with not only the few existing historic</p>

		<p>dwellings, but also the existing and proposed new construction on the block.</p>
<p>Height, Width, Proportion, & Massing, pg. 47, #1-3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>New residential construction should respect the typical height of surrounding residential buildings.</i> 2. <i>New residential construction should respect the vertical orientation typical of other residential properties in the surrounding historic districts.</i> 3. <i>The cornice height should be compatible with that of adjacent historic buildings.</i> 	<p>New construction will generally respect the height of surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Proposed new construction will respect the vertical orientation of other residential properties in the surrounding district.</p>
<p>New Construction, Doors and Windows, pg.49 #3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>The size, proportion, and spacing patterns of doors and window openings on free standing, new construction should be compatible with patterns established in the district.</i> 	<p>The size, proportion, and spacing patterns of the doors and window openings are compatible with the district.</p> <p>The applicant is proposing shutters on the front façade. The Commission advised that the shutters be operable, however that is not specified in the plans that have been submitted. <u>Staff recommends that the plans be updated to demonstrate the shutter will be operable prior to applying to a building permit.</u></p>
<p>New Construction, Materials & Colors, pg. 53, #2, #5</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Materials used in new construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the surrounding neighborhood.</i> 5. <i>Rooftop mechanical equipment should be located as discretely as possible to limit visibility. In addition, appropriate screening should be provided to conceal equipment from view. When rooftop railings are required for seating areas or for safe access to mechanical equipment, the railings should be as unobtrusive as possible, in order to minimize their appearance and visual impact on the surrounding district.</i> 	<p>The proposed dwelling will be clad in HardiPlank horizontal siding and faux cedar shakes within the face of the gable. The foundation will be parged. Staff finds the material selection to be compatible with the district.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends that all final color and material specification be submitted to staff for review and approval.</u></p> <p>The main roof will be clad in asphalt shingles. While asphalt shingles are not appropriate for the district, Staff believes that there is precedent for approving asphalt shingles on new construction.</p> <p>HVAC unit will be located in the rear, and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.</p>

Figures



Figure 1. 1924-1925 Sanborn Map



Figure 2. Historic image of original structure on the subject parcel. Demolished 1981



Figure 3. View north on Pink St.



Figure 4. View south Pink St.



Figure 5. 967 Pink St.



Figure 6. New construction across the street