COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT July 24, 2018 Meeting

5. COA-037936-2018 (A. Ogburn)

813 North 24th Street Union Hill Old and Historic District

Project Description: Construct a single family dwelling on a vacant lot.

Staff Contact:

C. Jeffries

Proposal: The applicant requests approval for the construction of a single family dwelling on a vacant lot in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicant is proposing to construct a two story, Italianate inspired home with a front projecting bay. The proposed structure will match the adjacent setbacks and will be approximately 18 ½ feet in width. The dwelling will be set on a low parged CMU foundation. The smooth, un-beaded fiber cement siding will have a 7" reveal. There will be a 1-story, 1-bay entry porch with PVC colonial columns and a hipped roof with charcoal black architectural shingles. There will be ranked, 1/1, vinyl windows. The front door will be a half-lite paneled door with a transom above. At the rear of the structure, there are French doors to access a rear deck and a single window aligned over a single window. The gable roof will be clad in white TPO. The windows and all of the trim unless otherwise noted will be PVC. The cornice detail, including corbels and fascia, will be PCV.

Surrounding Context: The residential character of the east side of the subject block consists of 2 story structures in a mix of Greek Revival, Italianate and Late Victorian single family and double houses. The structure to the north of the property is a 3-bay, frame, Italianate home and to the south is a 4-bay, frame, Late Victorian double house. The structures on the west side of the street are primarily 2 to 2 ½ story new single family homes constructed prior to the establishment of the District and a row of three Late Victorian, 2-story, brick houses.

Previous Reviews: The proposed design was conceptually reviewed by the Commission on May 22, 2018, and the Commission had the following comments:

- The Commission expressed concern with the visibility of the proposed gable roof, suggesting that a false mansard roof might be appropriate.
- Commissioners expressed concern regarding a gutter being installed over the decorative cornice on the front of the structure.

In response to the Commission's comments, the applicant altered the plans as follows:

- The plans note that an internal gutter will be constructed on the façade.
- A square fixed window on the side elevation has been replaced with a small double hung window.
- A privacy fence is depicted in the plans.

• The applicant has submitted a photograph of a historic home on Venable Street with a similar roof form.

The applicant is seeking **Final Review** for this project. 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* utilizing the checklist below.

S=satisfies	D=does not satis	sfy NA=not applicable	
SDNA□□□The application structures.	New infill construction should a side yard setback patterns in the states the proposed structure will r	e surrounding district	
	Where the adjoining buildings has setback for the new building sho pattern for the block etback is consistent with the historic	ould be based on the historical	
	New buildings should face the r the site	nost prominent street bordering	
The structure addresses North 24 th Street.			
The project is of has modelled the North 24 th Stree applicant has de	New construction should use a that found elsewhere in the combination of massing, a projections and roof shapes that a similar scale to the single family l e proposed development on the lat et by incorporating the entrance p monstrated that the proposed cross d the gable will be minimally visible	district. Form refers to the size, symmetry, proportions, t lend identity to a building. homes on the block. The applicant e Victorian row houses at 822-826 porch and bay configuration. The s gable is consistent with roof forms	
The proposed pr	New construction should inco such as cornices, porches and f oject incorporates human-scale ele a cornice, and front steps as part o	ront steps. ments including an entrance porch,	
	New construction should re surrounding buildings	espect the typical height of	

The typical heights of the surrounding buildings are 2 stories. The proposed structure is two stories and close in height to the nearest surrounding buildings.

New construction should respect the typical width, organization of bays, vertical alignment and symmetry of surrounding buildings.

The proposed project maintains the vertical orientation on the façade and the 2-bay orientation found on the historic houses on the block.

\boxtimes	

The size, proportion, and spacing patterns of doors and window openings should be compatible with patterns established in the district.

The proposed windows on the façade are vertically aligned and symmetrically placed which is consistent with patterns in the district. The windows on the side elevations are vertically aligned. The rear windows are vertically aligned.



Porch and cornice heights should be compatible with adjacent buildings

The porch and cornice heights are compatible with the adjacent structures.

Materials used in new construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the district. Vinyl, asphalt, and aluminum siding are not permitted.

The proposed construction will use fiber cement siding, PVC trim and cornice, architectural shingles, TPO, vinyl windows, and PVC porch posts with wooden railings and composite decking. The Commission may wish to consider whether the proposed use of PVC and vinyl is compatible with the district. <u>Staff recommends that the TPO noted in the application or flat lock metal be used on the front porch roof, rather than the standing seam metal noted on the plans.</u>

It is the assessment of staff that the application, with the noted conditions, is consistent with the Standards for New Construction outlined in Section 30.930.7(c) of the City Code, as well as with the *Richmond Old and Historic District's Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*, specifically the pages cited above, adopted by the Commission for review of Certificates of Appropriateness under the same section of code.