



Staff Report
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

3. COA-115911-2022	Final Review	Meeting Date: 9/27/2022
Applicant/Petitioner	Amanda Seibert	
Project Description	Construct a new duplex and garage on a vacant lot.	
Project Location		
Address: 961 Pink St.		
Historic District: Union Hill		
High-Level Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant proposes to construct a two-story, duplex on a vacant lot. The new residence will be traditional in design, 3 bays wide, and a full width, two story, covered front porch with square columns. The front façade will have a projecting gabled roof over the front porch clad in shingles. Siding will be Hardie plank Smooth siding. The applicant is also proposing to construct a two-story garage with a second-story living space. 		
Previous Reviews	<p>This application was conceptually reviewed by the Commission at the May 2022 meeting. Specifically the Commission recommended the following be revised prior to the final review of the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rear garage design feature a roof form that is more compatible with the duplex, and be reduced in scale. The Commission also expressed that they would support the rear garage reading as its own structure given its positioning in relation the duplex and differing architectural style. Questions were raised about the trellis detail on the rear garage. Material selection in regards to the use of shingles/ shakes within the face of the gable be revised, as well as the set of three windows on the gable face. Front façade of the duplex be revised to be a more simplified design, including reducing the number of columns and cornice detail. 	

	Subsequently, this application was reviewed by the Commission at their August 23, 2022 Meeting. The Commission deferred the application finding that the comments from the conceptual review had not been adequately addressed. Specifically the Commission asked that the plans be revised to include a simplified material selection within the front and rear gable. There were differing opinions on the varying architectural details such as column placement on the two story, full-width, covered front porches.
Staff Recommendation	Approval
Staff Contact	Alex Dandridge, alex.dandridge@rva.gov , (804) 646-6569
Staff Recommendations	None.

Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
Siting, pg. 46, #2-3	2. <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>	The proposed duplex will have a set back consistent with dwellings in this area. However, the gable face on the front façade will project over the second story front porch.
Form, pg. 46, #1-3	1. <i>New construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the historic district.</i> 2. <i>New residential construction should maintain the existing human scale of nearby historic residential construction in the district</i> 3. <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>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 dwellings, but also the existing and proposed new construction on the block.</p> <p>The new duplex and garage will both feature a trellis feature between the first and second floors. This feature being on the rear of the duplex, and the north elevation of the garage.</p> <p>The two-story, full width, and covered front porch will feature 4 columns on each level between each window and entrances. During the Conceptual review of this application, the Commission requested that the front façade design be revised to be “less busy”. One of the Commission’s suggestions was to reduce the</p>

		<p>number of columns on the front porches. The Applicant did not include this revision for the August 2022 final submission. At the August meeting, the Commission was generally split on the recommendation to reduce the number of columns on the front façade.</p> <p>Staff was able to locate a few examples of new construction with two-story, full-width, covered front porches that feature four columns on each level (see figures 7 & 8).</p> <p>Staff finds that there is precedent for the proposed front porch design in new construction within City Old and Historic Districts.</p>
Height, Width, Proportion, & Massing, pg. 47, #1-3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. New residential construction should respect the typical height of surrounding residential buildings.</i> <i>2. New residential construction should respect the vertical orientation typical of other residential properties in the surrounding historic districts.</i> <i>3. 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>
New Construction, Doors and Windows, pg.49 #3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>3. 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 2/2 windows and single pane transom windows over the exterior doors.</p> <p>There are no rear doors proposed on the building, however staff believes that this elevation will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>The front and rear gable faces will each feature a single window.</p>
New Construction, Materials & Colors, pg. 53, #2, #5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>2. Materials used in new construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the surrounding neighborhood.</i> <i>5. 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</i> 	<p>The proposed dwelling will be clad in HardiPlank horizontal siding and shingle siding within the gable faces of the duplex. The foundation will be parged. Staff finds the material selection to be compatible with the district, with the exception on shingles and board and batten which are not common in the district, however have been approved on new construction on the subject block.</p> <p>In the August 2022 submission of this application, the design feature two cladding materials within the front and rear gable faces of the duplex. The Commission expressed concern over this material selection, finding</p>

	<p><i>appearance and visual impact on the surrounding district.</i></p>	<p>that one material would be more appropriate for the district.</p> <p>The applicant has revised the plans to include one material in the front and rear gable faces of the duplex. Staff supports this revision, and believes that the revised design is in-keeping with cladding designs approved on the subject block, and will further the commission's request from conceptual review to have a "less-busy" façade.</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 equipment will be located on a secondary elevation.</p>
<p>New Construction, Residential Outbuildings, #'s 1-3, pg. 51</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Outbuildings, including garages, sheds, gazebos and other auxiliary structures, should be compatible with the design of the primary building on the site, including roof slope and materials selection.</i> <i>2. Newly constructed outbuildings such as detached garages or tool sheds should respect the siting, massing, roof profiles, materials and colors of existing outbuildings in the neighborhood.</i> <i>3. New outbuildings should be smaller than the main residence and be located to the rear and/or side of the property to emphasize that they are secondary structures.</i> 	<p>The proposed garage will have a similar gable roof form to the proposed main dwelling.</p> <p>The proposed garage is much larger than historic examples of outbuilding in the district.</p> <p>During the conceptual review, the Commission noted that the proposed garage is quite large, and due to its placement diagonal to the duplex, it will be visible from pink street. Due to these factors, the Commission recommended that the applicant either decrease the scale of the garage, or have it read more as its own independent structure.</p> <p>The applicant has revised the design of the garage by including dormer windows that are wider than originally proposed to better relate to the proportion of the garage.</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



Figure 7. Examples of double front porches, N. 29th Street



Figure 8. Examples of double front porches, N. 29th Street