

# 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
$\qquad$
OWNER'S NAME: Stead Fest Ventures, LLe
AND ADDRESS: 11533 Busy St. Suite 115
TEL NO: $80 y-822-606^{5}$
CITY, STATE AND ZIPCODE: R.enod VA 23235
EMAIL: SteadCastrenturis LLC e

River Mill Developement / Bowen Buiding Systems,ing
ARCHITECT/CONTRACTOR'S NAME: _ TEL. NO: 804-644-2520
AND ADDRESS: PD . क्x 1088
EMAIL: reginae bowan buildinjsystam.
CITY, STATE AND ZIPCODE: chesterfield UA 23832
Would you like to receive your staff report via email? Yes $\square$ No $\square$

## REQUEST FOR CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

I hereby request Conceptual Review under the provisions of Chapter 114, Article IX, Division 4, Section 114-9306(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 cerlificate 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.)


MAY 272016
3:02 KC

(Space below for staff use onlv)
Received by Commission Secretary
APPLICATION NO.
DATE
SCHEDULED FOR $\qquad$
Note: CAR reviews all applications on a case-by-case basis.

## DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK AT 713 N $24^{\text {TH }}$ Street:

The applicant proposes to demo existing structure and rebuild a new single family residence on existing lot located at $713 \mathrm{~N} 24^{\text {th }}$ Street located in the Church Hill Historic District.

## SITING:

Proposed structure will follow existing foot print with exception of addition to rear of dwelling that has already had a variance approved. See attached letter. Also spoke with David Duckhardt in Zoning with regards to variance still applying to new structure. Previous plans to renovate and add addition to rear of 713 N24th St. as I am keeping with same foot print of previous plans even with rebuild.

## FORM:

The form of the proposed dwelling is indicative of several historic dwellings located within the Church Hill North District. Particularly, the proposed form is very similar to $715 \mathrm{~N} 24^{\text {th }}$ St. (see photo below), Attached to proposed dwelling.


## SCALE:

The proposed dwelling maintains the existing human scale of the neighborhood and does not overwhelm pedestrians at the street level.

## HEIGHT, WIDTH, PROPORTION \& MASSING:

The proposed dwelling respects the typical height of the houses on the 700 block of North $24^{\text {th }}$ Street. Rebuild of $713 \mathrm{~N} 24^{\text {th }}$ will match existing height and width of the existing dwelling at $713 \mathrm{~N} 24^{\text {th }}$ Street. is unusually short for two story dwellings in the Church Hill Dictrict.

The proposed dwelling respects the vertical orientation and massing pattern typically found in the neighborhood.

## MATERIALS, COLORS, \& DETAILS:

## Exterior Cladding

The proposed dwelling with be clad in Hardie Plank fiber cement smooth lap siding with a $7^{\prime \prime}$ reveal in the color Boothbay Blue that is similar to the CAR color palette Leisure Blue, SW\#6515.



All of the window and door trim will be Hardie trim prefinished smooth in the color artic white. (Replicating same scale as trim on $715 \mathrm{~N} 24^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ ).

| Itat hawn | 1 n |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Pmyta | 12 nt maxts |  |  |  |  |
| wath | 350 | 45 in | 5.5 th | 125. | 1125 n. |
| Pes /rallet | 210 | 200 | 160 | 120 | 80 |



## Doors and Windows

The front door will be a Pella Smooth Fiberglass Twin $1 / 2$ Light, clear glass door painted the color \#SW2844 Roycroft Mist Gray.


The front door will have a single light transom the same width as the door. The rear doors will be Pella Smooth Fiberglass $3 / 4$ " Light Clear Glass in pre-painted white.


Mahogany-Grain, Oak-Grain, Smooth Fiberglass or Steel

## Trim

The front porch columns and trim will be Fypon cellular polyurethane in the color white.

## Windows

ProLine® double-hung windows with simulated divided light feature aluminum clad exteriors
PELLA 12200 See floor plans for window sizes


## Decking

The front porch will be Azek tongue and groove cellular PVC in the color oyster. The porch will be constructed on brick piers. A wood lattice panel will be located between the piers.


Rear steps will be constructed of poured concrete to replicate existing rear steps of existing structure.

## Roofing

Front Porch Roof : IPDM Roof membrane (Black)
Front Porch Railing: refer to elevations page w/reference photo of attached structure at $715 \mathrm{~N} 24^{\mathrm{TH}}$ St current railing.


Main Roof: IPDM Roof Membrane (Black)
Stairs: refer to elevations plan sheet

Retaining Wall: Poured concrete. Refer to elevations plan sheet
Gutters: White K Style gutters


| K-StYLE GUTTER |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A $_{\text {Hilich }}^{\text {(tack }}$ | $3^{1 / 81}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 35/8" | 47/8" | 57/8" | 71/4" |
|  | 4" | 5' | 6 | $7{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 8" |

Downspouts: Rectangular White Aluminum



 REAR ELEVATION


FRONT ELEVATION

City of Richmond
Department of
Planning and Development Review
Zoning Administration

May 9, 2016
Steadfast Ventures, LLC
11533 Busy Street, \#115
North Chesterfield, VA 23235
Attin: Dusty Carey
RE: $\quad 713$ North 244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street - Administrative Variance (07A-16)
Dear Mr. Carey
Your Administrative Variance has been approved, as it has been determined that
a. The strict application of the ordinance would produce undue hardship:
b. Such hardship is not shared generally by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity,
c. The authorization of the variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property, and the character of the zoning district will not be changed by the granting of the variance; and
d. The variance granted by the Zoning Administrator shall be the minimum necessary to relieve the hardship.

I base these findings on the following:

- The adjacent property owner(s) most directly impacted has been notified via US. Mail and has not expressed any opposition to the proposal as shown on the plans.
- The addition does not detract from, and is consistent with, the residential and historic character of the neighborhood.
- The addition will not be detrimental to adjacent property through the affecting of light, access or safely.
- Adjoining properties and properties within the block have improvernents a similar distance from the property line.
- The hardship is also due to the unique characteristic of this lot being exceptionally narrow.

Now. therefore, be it resolved by the Zoning Administrator that a request for an Administrative Variance from the side yard (setback) ( $2.21^{\prime} \pm$ vs. $3^{\prime}$ ) along the northern property line is approved.

- There is no encroachment (gutter, downspout, roof overhang, etc.) onto the adjoining property.
- Any rain collection system be designed to direct runoff from the adjacent property.

You have two (2) years to obtain the necessary permit to implement this approval or your Administrative Variance is deemed

cc: Roy Benbow, BZA Secretary Richard Morton, GIS Analyst, DP \& DR

# C. E. Duncan \& Associates, Inc. 

2609 Rocky Oak Road
Powhatan, Virginia 23139
(804) 598-8240 Fax (804) 598-9240

May 5, 2016

Steadfast Ventures, LLC<br>11533 Busy Street, Suite 115

North Chesterfield, VA. 23235
RE: 713 North $24^{\text {th }}$ Street
Dear Sir,
You asked our office to evaluate the structural condition of the above referenced location. The structure is an attached two story townhouse. The structure is built upon a brick foundation bearing directly upon soil. There is a one story section of structure built at the rear. The interior of the structure is completely gone and the crawlspace area is visible. The front portion of the house with the stairs and the rear one story floor are still present. It appears from a visual inspection of the framing that the house is unstable and at risk of failure. There is visible damage, mostly from moisture, to the remaining floor framing. The attached structures common support beam is also failing. It appears this structure has had some remediation in the form of additional piers to support the beam. The balloon framing of the exterior walls is showing signs of distress and has been pieced together in places. The brick foundation has bowed in areas and collapsed in others. The front porch is leaning significantly and the front right pier has been replaced with a wooden post. The front right column is leaning or hanging and carries no load. The front porch roof framing is moisture damaged. Based upon the level of damage to the structure, we recommend demolishing the structure to the ground. You could then install a new footing and foundation that would adequately support a two story frame building. The foundation could incorporate the salvaged bricks from the original foundation as a veneer to maintain the required look. The front porch could also be constructed on block piers with the same salvaged bricks for the required look. The house would be constructed of dimensional lumber as required to support the loads. The common beam or girder would need to be replaced with a new beam that is adequately supported to carry the common load. It would also bear upon masonry piers bearing upon concrete footings. The front elevation of the structure could be restored using newer structurally adequate materials. Based upon the degree of damage and the lack of adequate support systems, it is our opinion that the structure cannot be "repaired" but will need to be re-built. In addition, the front concrete retaining wall and steps are collapsing. This falls under the same recommendation. It should be removed and replaced. The concrete has suffered too much damage and settlement to be adequately patched or repaired.

Sincerely,

Carl E. Duncan, P.E., L.S.



