

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
STAFF REPORT  
September 26, 2017, Meeting**

6. **COA-022645-2017** (H. & P. Lozito) **2514 East Marshall Street  
Church Hill North Old and Historic District**

**Project Description:** **Rehabilitate a single family home.**

**Staff Contact:** **C. Jeffries**

The applicant requests approval to rehabilitate this two-story brick Italianate home in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The rehabilitation includes in-kind repair and replacement of deteriorated wood elements and the in-kind replacement of the front door, which has been administratively approved. The proposed work also includes the following:

- Replace an existing privacy fence with an 8ft high wooden privacy fence on the rear and side.
- Install a wooden picket fence in the front yard.
- Replace a door on the north elevation with a two-light wood door. Replace a wood panel with glazing in a second door on the north elevation, and seal the door closed.
- Replace one six-over-six wood window in the rear with a one-over-one wood window.
- Replace the side porch in-kind, and replace the front porch soffits, columns and flooring to match the existing.
- Repoint limited areas of the exterior brick that are in disrepair.

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

**Fences:** The applicant proposes to install a wooden picket fence, painted white, on the existing concrete curb in the front yard of the structure. Staff was able to locate a photograph from 1977 which shows a picket fence in the front of the home. As the *Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines* state that physical or photographic evidence should be used to reconstruct missing elements (pg. 57 # 7), staff recommends that design of the picket fence match the 1977 photograph as closely possible, to be administratively approved by staff. The applicant also proposes to install an 8ft high wooden privacy fence to replace an existing wooden privacy fence. Staff notes that the proposed fence will require zoning approval as it exceeds the height restrictions for fencing, and a fence of this height is not typically found within the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Due to the high visibility of the lot, staff recommends that the fence be painted or opaquely stained a color to be administratively approved.

**Doors:** The applicant is proposing to replace a modern replacement door (Door B) on the north elevation with a wood door with two lights, of a design to match the existing wood door (Door C) on the same elevation. The applicant is also proposing to replace the upper panel on this original door (Door C) with glass and seal the door closed from the inside. Door C may have originally contained glazing in the upper panel and staff supports the reconstruction of this missing element. The *Guidelines* state that replacement doors with leaded, beveled, or etched glass are strongly discouraged (pg. 69). Staff recommends that the glass in the side doors be clear and not include leading or bevels.

**Window:** The applicant is proposing to replace one six-over-six wood window with a one-over-one wood window to match the existing windows on the rest of the home. The *Guidelines* note that windows should only be replaced when they are missing or beyond repair (pg. 67, #7). Based on the 1977 photograph, the current windows are replacements as the original windows on the front façade were two-over-two and the two-over-two windows on the first story are still existing. In addition, staff believes the six-over-six window may be one of three original windows remaining in the structure. A neighboring house of a similar design possesses six-over-six wood windows on the side and rear elevations. This use of varying light configurations is also consistent with historic patterns. Based on this information and the photographs submitted by the applicant of the existing window, staff recommends that the original window be retained and repaired if necessary.

**Porches:** The application states that the side porch is no longer sound and needs to be replaced. The applicant is proposing to replace the porch in-kind. The porch does appear to be in disrepair and staff supports its replacement with an exact match. The applicant is also proposing to replace the porch columns, soffit, and flooring of the front porch. Based on the 1977 photograph the original porch columns were likely replaced as the current columns and railing do not match those seen in the photograph. The *Guidelines* note that the replacement of front porches should match the original as much as possible (pg. 71, #5). As evidence of the original porch exists, staff recommends that any elements replaced on the front porch match the 1977 photograph and all replacement elements be painted to match the existing porch.

**Repointing:** Staff supports the proposed maintenance and repair of the existing masonry. Staff recommends that the new mortar have the same hardness as the existing mortar. The applicant may wish to consult the National Park Service's Preservation Brief 2 for additional information on repointing mortar joints on historic structures.

It is the assessment of staff that the application, with the conditions noted above, is consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation outlined 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 page cited above, adopted by the Commission for review of Certificates of Appropriateness under the same section of the code.