

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
STAFF REPORT  
December 15, 2015 Meeting**

4. **CAR No. 15-144** (W. Hinden)

**3305 – 3307 East Marshall Street  
Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District**

**Project Description:**

**Replace existing front porch,  
construct new rear 2 story porches,  
and install new windows and doors.**

**Staff Contact:**

**M. Pitts**

The applicant requests approval for exterior modifications as part of the rehabilitation of a double residential building in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. The structure was notably altered throughout the years including replacement of the front porch, changes to the windows to include installing inappropriate sized windows and closing window openings, and removal of the rear porches. Staff has evidence of alterations throughout the years through previous enforcement activity and Commission reviews from the 1990s.

The applicant is proposing to replace the 2 story porch which currently spans all eight bays of the façade with two separate 2 story porches over the three outer bays on both ends of the façade. The applicant is proposing to leave the two center bays open. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to replace all windows and reopen the windows which have been closed with CMU blocks. The applicant will be installing eight 32" by 60" and thirty-eight 32" by 72" windows to fill the historic openings. All of the proposed windows will be double hung, 1/1, aluminum clad wood windows.

At the rear of the structure, the applicant is proposing to install two, 2-story wooden porches in the location of the historic rear porches. The proposed porches will match the porches located at the adjacent double house (3309-3311 East Marshall) except they will not have a roof. The applicant is proposing to install a Richmond rail system. Additionally, two steel six panel doors will be installed on the second floor at the rear in existing door openings.

The applicant is proposing to "white wash" the front and rear porch systems with a semi-transparent stain and paint the fascia, door, and porch trim a gloss white.

**Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.**

**Front Porches:**

The *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines* state that the entire porch should be replaced if it is too deteriorated to repair or is completely missing; replacements should match the original as much as possible (pg. 67, #4). The historic front porch is missing from this structure as the current porch is a modern alteration which was constructed by a

previous owner. For this reason, staff supports the removal of the existing front porch.

The Guidelines further state that the replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. Below is a photograph of the property from the 1977 Historic Richmond Foundation Church Hill Survey.



**3305-3307 East Marshall Street  
Historic Richmond Foundation Church Hill Survey (1977)**

The above photograph is pictorial documentation of the front porch prior to the 1990s alterations. The first floor porch appears to match the first floor porch of the identical, adjacent house at 3309-3311 East Marshall. As documented in this photograph, the historic porch spanned the entire façade and had five round columns rather than the proposed square posts which were located every two bays. Additionally, the second floor balcony appeared to have substantial square piers vertically aligned with the porch columns. Staff recommends that the applicant should base the reconstruction of the front porch on this photographic evidence rather than modifying the existing altered porch.

### **Window and Door Replacement**

The Guidelines state that the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows should not be changed by cutting new openings, blocking out windows or by installing replacement sash that do not fit the original window (pg. 65, #8). A previous owner of this property altered the windows on this property by blocking some windows in with CMU blocks and installing inappropriately sized windows that did not maintain the historic glazing patterns. The previous owner

came before the Commission in 1995 as a result of enforcement activity and stated that he would work with staff to replace the non-historic windows with more appropriate windows over a period of four years though it appears that only 7 windows on the front façade were changed to a more appropriate size and 1/1 configuration. Staff recommends approval of the proposed window installation as it returns the windows to an appropriate size and glazing pattern and reopens in-filled window openings.

The applicant is also proposing to reopen a boarded door opening at the rear and install a new steel door. As is evident by the size of the door opening, a transom was historically located above the door. Staff recommends approval of the proposed door installation as it restores an existing opening with the condition that a single lite transom be installed above.

### **Rear Porches**

Though there is no pictorial evidence of the exact design of the rear porches, there is a physical evidence of rear porches on the structure as there is ghosting of the posts on the brick at the rear. The applicant is proposing to locate the porches as indicated by the ghosting. Additionally, the identical double house next door still retains its rear porches and is an appropriate model for the form of proposed porches. For these reasons staff, recommends approval of the proposed rear porches as submitted.

### **Painting**

The Guidelines state that though stains are usually not appropriate for use on historic building exteriors, an exception to this guidance is the recommended use of opaque stains on pressure treated wood elements including rear and side porches (pg. 59, #10). For this reason, staff recommends the use of an opaque stain in a color to be administratively approved by staff rather than the proposed white wash semi-transparent stain. As the Guidelines note that gloss paint can be used on doors and trim (pg. 59, #8), staff recommends approval of the proposed gloss white paint for the doors and trim as proposed.

It is the assessment of staff that the application, with the conditions noted above, is consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation in Section 30-930.7(b) of the City Code, as well as with the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*, specifically the pages cited above, adopted by the Commission for review of Certificates of Appropriateness under the same section of the code.