



Staff Report
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

4. COA-115907-2022	Final Review	Meeting Date: 8/23/2022
Applicant/Petitioner	Andrea Almond, 3North	
Project Description	Increase the height of an existing masonry wall and infill an existing opening.	
Project Location		
Address: 1839 Monument Avenue		
Historic District: Monument Avenue		
High-Level Details: <p>The applicant requests permission to alter the height of an existing brick wall at the rear of a brick Colonial Revival dwelling circa 1908.</p> <p>Existing brick wall & lattice is 7' 10". Applicant proposes to replace lattice with brick, increasing the height of the wall to 8'.</p> <p>New brick will be differentiated from the existing by a rowlock course of brick and thicker mortar joints, Brick finish will be similar in appearance to the historic.</p> <p>An existing opening along Meadow St. is proposed to be infilled using brick.</p> <p>The applicant must obtain a zoning variance to allow for the additional height.</p>		
Staff Recommendation	Partial Approval	
Staff Contact	Alex Dandridge, alex.dandridge@rva.gov , (804) 646-6569	
Previous Reviews	The Commission has reviewed other exterior work at this property within the last year, including a rear porch enclosure and rear side addition.	
Conditions for Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denial of the removal of the existing lattice, existing opening, and framing. • Approval of the wall height extension using brick, with the condition that it be done from within the interior of the wall, as to not disturb the existing lattice work, door and door frame. • Staff recommends that any replacement wooden features 	

Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
Standards for Site Improvements, Fences & Walls, pg. 78	<p><i>Streetscape elements are the most public aspects of any historic district, and as such they belong to the community as a whole. Therefore, it is particularly important that these elements support and reinforce, rather than detract from, the overall historic character of the district. In general, the more public the site feature, and the more closely located to the front of the site, the more strongly compatible historic design will be encouraged.</i></p> <p><i>1. Original fences and walls should be retained and maintained whenever possible.</i></p> <p><i>6. A new fence or wall should be constructed using materials and designs appropriate to the District. Height restrictions are governed by the Zoning Ordinance.</i></p>	<p>The applicant proposes to remove the existing top portion of trellis from the masonry wall, replacing it with brick. A side opening will also be infilled using brick.</p> <p>Staff was unable to locate any photographic documentation demonstrating that the lattice portion of the wall is not original. However based on a photo obtained from the early 90's (Figure 7), it is likely that the lattice, door, and framing have been replaced/repared in-kind over the years.</p> <p>Furthermore, on a site visit, staff observed that the wooden lattice feature is likely a part of the historic design, as the trellis is inset into the wall. (Figure 5)</p> <p>Due to the walls location adjacent to a highly visible portion of the public right-of-way, and that the trellis, door, and door frame are likely original features, or based off of original designs of the wall, <u>staff recommends denial of the removal of the lattice, existing opening, and framing.</u></p> <p>On a site visit, staff observed that many portions of the existing lattice are deteriorated beyond repair and must be replaced. <u>Staff recommends that any replacement wooden features including lattice, framing, and trim be replaced in-kind.</u></p> <p>The wall height extension will be done using brick and mortar which are appropriate materials for the district and are compatible with the primary dwelling and subject wall.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends approval of the wall height extension using brick, with the condition that it be done from within the interior of the wall, as to not disturb the existing lattice work, door and door frame.</u></p>
Standards #10, pg. 59	<p><i>While it is acceptable to use salvaged materials as in-kind replacement, adding features or salvaged architectural elements that suggest an inaccurate or undocumented sequence of construction should be avoided because this confuses our understanding of the evolution of Richmond's historic built environment.</i></p>	<p>The existing opening along Meadow Street is proposed to be infilled using brick and will be inset within the existing opening. The granite step will be preserved in place. All wood framing around the door opening will be removed to accommodate the new brick.</p> <p>The design as proposed will tell the visual story of the original openings on the wall,</p>

		However, staff believes the existing door is not deteriorated beyond repair and can be retained, and fixed in place if the owner wishes for it to not be operable.
--	--	--

Figures



Figure 1. Existing person door along Meadow Street



Figure 2. Lattice deterioration



Figure 3. Lattice deterioration



Figure 4. Lattice deterioration



Figure 5. Lattice inset into existing brick wall indicating that it is an original design compnant of the wall.



Figure 6. Lattice deterioration



Figure 7. 1990's. Door framing and door appear to be slightly different from the existing but lattice element still present.



Figure 8. Lattice deterioration.



Figure 9. Photo from Historic Richmond Survey (ca. 1977)