

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
January 23, 2018, Meeting**

7. **COA-028143-2017** (S. Tuttle)

**2207 Venable Street
Union Hill Old and Historic District**

Project Description:

**Rehabilitate the existing structure
and replace an existing 2nd story addition
with a new 2-story addition.**

Staff Contact:

C. Jeffries

The applicant requests approval to rehabilitate a single family dwelling in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The building is a two-story, three-bay residential structure built ca. 1882. The applicant is pursuing rehabilitation tax credits for this project. The majority of the proposed work is in-kind repair and replacement which does not require Commission review including the repair of the existing cornice, repair of the brick foundation, the removal of aluminum siding and repair of existing wood siding, repair of the porch and in-kind replacement of missing elements, and the restoration of the sidelights and transoms at the front door. The work which will require the Commission's review is the removal of an existing 2nd floor addition, the construction of a new 2-story addition, the creation of two new window openings on the sides of the structure, and the installation of 2-over-2 wood windows on the front façade and a one-over-one window on the rear elevation.

Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions. In general, the proposed work meets the Standards for Rehabilitation contained on page 59 of the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines* which emphasize the retention and repair of historic materials and in-kind replacement. The applicant is proposing to retain the historic elements of the structure and replace missing or deteriorated elements in-kind. The proposed work also meets the Standards for New Construction contained on page 46-51 of the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. The Sanborn Maps suggest that the 2nd story addition being removed was constructed between 1905 and 1925. The evolution of the rear elevation is unclear but may have included a one-story rear porch that has been removed. The new addition is located on the rear of the dwelling and differentiated from the existing dwelling.

The applicant is proposing to add one window opening on each of the side elevations of the main structure. The *Guidelines* state that the addition of new windows along a secondary elevation will be considered by the Commission on a case-by-case basis (pg. 69, #8). As one of the windows is required for egress and the side elevations are minimally visible, staff recommends approval of the proposed new window openings.

The applicant is also proposing to replace a window on the existing rear one-story addition with a one-over-one wood window. Staff has located a photograph that indicates the original window had a six-over-six lite configuration. In addition, the remaining windows on this elevation are six-over-six. As the *Guidelines* recommend the architectural appearance of original windows be used as a model for new windows (pg. 69, #10), staff recommends that Window 'E', shown on the proposed first floor plan, be a six-over-six wood window with true or simulated divided lites with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar.

The Commission's approval should be conditioned upon the work being performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions. In addition, the applicant should submit any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service to CAR staff for administrative review and approval. Staff also recommends that any new paint colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval.

It is the assessment of staff that, with the conditions above, the application is consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation and New Construction outlined in Sections 30-930.7(b) and 30-930.7(c) 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.