COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT March 27, 2018, Meeting

18/19. COA-031755/031756-2018 (Sojo Enterprises) 3613-3615 East Broad Street Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District

Project Description: Construct 2 new, 3-story single family dwellings.

Staff Contact: K. Chen

Proposal: The applicant requests approval for the construction of 2 new detached single-family house on vacant lots in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. From East Broad Street, the proposed structures appear to be a 2-story frame structure set on low, parged block foundations. Each structure has a 3-bay façade and a full façade front porch with square posts, a standing seam metal shed-roof, and Richmond rail. The façade has a box cornice and a standing seam metal gable roof with rear shed roof rising to 3-stories in the rear. The rear of the dwelling is not visible from a public right-of-way. The dwellings will have 2/2, aluminum clad wood windows and cementious siding.

Surrounding Context: The proposed new construction will be located on the south side of East Broad Street on a narrow lot between two historic houses. The house to the west is a 2-story, 3-bay, frame building with a full façade porch and false mansard roof. The house to the east is a 2-story, 3-bay, frame building with stuccoed façade, a full façade porch, a decorative cornice and shed-roof. The majority of the houses on this dead end block of Broad Street are frame with a mixture of shed and false mansard roofs. Directly across the street, on the north side of Broad is a large, modern apartment development. There is a recently completed dwelling at 3607 and another under construction at 3625.

Previous Reviews: This is the Commission's first review of this project.

The applicant is seeking **Conceptual Review** for this project. Conceptual review is covered under Sec. 30-930.6(d) of the City Code: The commission shall review and discuss the proposal with the applicant and make any necessary recommendations. Such Conceptual Review shall be advisory only. Commission staff reviewed the project through the lens of the "Standards for New Construction: Residential" on pages 46-51 of the Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines.

	S=s	atisfie	D=does not satisfy	NA=not applicable
S	D	NA	New infill construction should respect the side yard setback patterns in the surroundir	

S=satisfies

A context site plan was not included so it cannot be determined if the front yard setback is in line with the prevailing set backs on the block.					
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐					
pattern for the block The adjacent properties have similar setbacks.					
New buildings should face the most prominent street bordering the site					
The structure addresses East Broad Street.					
New construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the district. Form refers to the combination of massing, size, symmetry, proportions, projections and roof shapes that lend identity to a building.					
The project utilizes elements found on structures on the block including a low foundation, a full façade porch, and a 3-bay, symmetrical façade. The majority of the houses on the block have decorative cornices and shed roofs or false mansard roofs. The proposed front gable with a box cornice and shed roof rising to the rear is similar in form to the new construction at 3607 E. Broad Street.					
New construction should incorporate human-scale elements such as cornices, porches and front steps. The proposed project incorporates human-scale elements including a front porch, a simple cornice, and front steps.					
New construction should respect the typical height of surrounding buildings					
Though not dimensioned the context elevation suggests that the new buildings will be slightly shorter than the adjacent houses. The rising slope to the rear is exaggerated in the elevations. A perspective drawing showing the true relationship of the rising slope to the adjacent houses should be provided for final review.					
New construction should respect the typical width, organization of bays, vertical alignment and symmetry of surrounding					
buildings. The proposed dwellings are similar in width to the adjacent houses and maintain the 3-bay configuration, vertical alignment, and symmetry of the surrounding buildings.					
□ □ The size, proportion, and spacing patterns of doors and window openings should be compatible with patterns established in the district.					
The typical fenestration pattern in the district includes evenly spaced ranked windows. The proposed façade fenestration is consistent with patterns in the district. While the rear of the structure incorporates a more contemporary design with 3-story porches and					

paired doors. The vertical alignment of the windows is not maintained on the side elevations (east and west) facing the property line between the two new buildings.					
Porch and cornice heights should be compatible with adjacent buildings					
In the un-dimensioned context elevation provided, the porch deck and roof appear to align with the adjacent houses. There are a variety of cornice heights on the block because of the different roof forms – decorative cornice with a shed roof and false mansards. The proposed box cornice and gable roof are set lower than the adjacent houses. Staff finds the proposed porch and cornice heights when compared to the adjacent buildings are compatible with the variation found on adjacent structures in the district.					
The proposed frame construction with a low parged foundation and aluminum clad wood windows is consistent with new structures in the District.					

The following items will need to be included for final review (please refer to the Commission's New Construction Checklist and Required Dimensions document for additional details):

- 1. Dimensioned elevations to include the height from grade
- 2. Dimensioned context site plan
- 3. Dimensioned context elevation
- 4. List of windows and doors to include size, material, and design
- 5. Description of all materials (attach specification sheets if necessary)
- 6. Statement of how the Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines informed the proposed work.