

## Commission of Architectural Review Submission Application

City of Richmond, Room 510 – City Hall 900 East Broad Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219 PHONE: (804) 646-6335 FAX: (804) 646-5789

12 COPIES OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION ARE REQUIRED FOR PROCESSING YOUR SUBMISSION	
LOCATION OF WORK: 228. N. 32nd St. RVA 23223	DATE: 3/28/16
OWNER'S NAME: Thomas A. Watermorth	TEL NO.: 94-517-9093
AND ADDRESS: 3169 & E. Bread St.	EMAIL temmyaliterwirtheighta com
CITY, STATE AND ZIPCODE: Lichniana, VII. 23223	
ARCHITECT/CONTRACTOR'S NAME: JA Peregu Roffing & Carsinchia and Address: 3544 Pacetown Rd.	TEL. NO.: 04-457-2312
AND ADDRESS: 3544 Yacetown Rd.	EMAIL: S-PEREGOY(Whotinail.com
CITY, STATE AND ZIPCODE: Sandy Hose VA 23153	, 
Would you like to receive your staff report via email? Yes No	
REQUEST FOR CONCEPTUAL REVIEW	
I hereby request Conceptual Review under the provisions of Chapter 114, Article IX, Division 4, Section 114-930.6(d) of the Richmond City Code for the proposal outlined below in accordance with materials accompanying this application. I understand that conceptual review is advisory only.	
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS	
I hereby make application for the issuance of a certificate under the provisions of Chapter 114, Article IX, Division 4 (Old and Historic Districts) of the Richmond City Code for the proposal outlined below in accordance with plans and specifications accompanying this application.	
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK (Required):  STATE HOW THE DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES INFORM THE DESIGN OF THE WORK  PROPOSED. (Include additional sheets of description if necessary, and 12 copies of artwork helpful in describing the project. The 12 copies are not required if the project is being reviewed for an administrative approval. See instruction sheet for requirements.)	
Aller St. March	
Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent	
Name of Owner or Authorized Agent (please print legibly): Thomas 12- had-erworth	
RECEIVED	
(Space below for staff use only)  APR 0 4 2016  Received by Commission Secretary	N NO
Accelerated by Commiscouri Courtering	
DATESCHEDULE	) FUK

Note: CAR reviews all applications on a case-by-case basis.

To the members of the Commission of Architectural Review board.

Myself and Mr. Ruckart own attached single family row houses at 228 and 226 N 32nd St respectively. We have begun and were subsequently served with a stop work order for work being performed to secure and mitigate damage to our mansard roof system. Our homes burned in 1989 and were shortly thereafter renovated (outside of any review process) by a previous owner. That owner used substandard materials when repairing the home and in the case of our mansard roof, he used concrete shingles without first providing a waterproof barrier beneath. Needless to say, our homes have sustained considerable water damage as a result. We have since contracted with S.P. Peregoy Home Improvement, who specializes in historic roofing, to repair our mansard roof and provide us with a high quality, long lasting, period correct, attractive roofing solution. After much discussion we took Mr. Peregoy's recommendation to install a copper, standing seam roof. Mr. Peregoy sold us the roof due to the long standing reputation of copper, standing seams on roof systems with steep slope and showed us examples of other, historic roofs in the neighborhood with a similar albeit, original material.

We have attached many of the examples all from the St. John's historic district of copper, standing swam roofs all visible from the public right of way.

After reading the regulations in the commissions web page, 2 points were important in selecting and or changing a roofing material. First I noted that the board would prefer to see that the material be same as original. Because our shingles were concrete, once can certainly assume that those were not original to the home. The original material was either likely made of slate or stamped metal. Due to the nature of our leaking issues, Mr. Ruckart and I both agreed that metal would be a better solution and last longer with fewer issues. Because that stamped metal is no longer readily available we're formally requesting that the copper standing seam be allowed. While it may have a brilliant appearance currently, the material will soon patina and have a more homogeneous appearance with the surrounding structures.

Finally, later in the reading of the commissions roofing regulations it specifically addresses standing seam roofs should only be used on applications with a significant slope. We would like to place the argument that a mansard roof does indeed have a significant slope common with other standing seam applications in the immediate area.

We would ask that the commission pay careful consideration to our request to continue to install our copper, standing seam mansard roof at 228 and 226 N 32nd St. We appreciate the opportunity to have our case heard in a timely fashion as our homes are currently exposed to the elements as a result of our failure to submit for a permit. We've certainly had a comprehensive education on the permitting process and will make sure to apply before starting work in the future.

Respectfully,

Tommy Waterworth and Brad Ruckart



































