16.COA-055873-2019PUBLIC HEARING DATEJune 25, 2019PROPERTY ADDRESS521 Saint James StreetDISTRICTJackson Ward	Commission of Architectural Review STAFF REPORT APPLICANT KB Properties	Richmond         STAFF CONTACT         C. Jones		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION Construct a new, semi-detached residence on a vacant lot.				
<ul> <li>PROJECT DETAILS</li> <li>The applicant proposes to construct a new, semi-detached, single-family residence on a vacant lot.</li> <li>The proposed residence will be two stories in height, two bays wide and generally rectangular in form. The building will have a third-story section with a rooftop deck. The second story roof will generally be flat and the third-story section will have a shed roof.</li> <li>On the façade the applicant proposes a two-story projecting square bay, an entry stoop with a single door, and a metal canopy. The square bay will have paired, one-over-one windows. A single window will be located above the door. Design elements include a solid panel on the front bay projection to create a continuous vertical element between the two stories.</li> <li>On the rear elevation the applicant proposes a pair of full glass doors, a pair of double-hung, one-over-one windows on the second story, and a pair of awning windows on the third story.</li> </ul>	The City of Richmond assumes no liability either for any errors in the information provided regardless of the cause of such or staken, or action not taken by the user in reliance upon any maps	for any decision made, action		
<ul> <li>The applicant proposes to use a grey lap siding on the exterior of the first and second stories of the building and white channel siding on the third story. The applicant proposes solid wood and glass doors. The cornice will be flat metal in medium bronze.</li> <li>The applicant also proposes down lighting over the doors.</li> </ul>				
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW				

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" on pages 44, and 46-56 of the Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines utilizing the Guidelines presented below.

## PREVIOUS REVIEWS

The Commission has not reviewed this project, but reviewed the almost identical attached dwelling (519 St. James) at the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## SURROUNDING CONTEXT

The surrounding area is primarily residential in character. The majority of the buildings are attached or semiattached, two stories in height and either two or three bays wide, with shed roofs. Most buildings are either frame or masonry construction. The three-bay buildings typically have a full-width porch, while most of the twobay buildings have a projecting bay and entry stoop. An exception to this pattern is the former school at 508 Saint James which is a free-standing, three-bay, brick building with a central entry porch.

## STAFF COMMENTS

Staff recommends that the following be submitted for final review:

- A window schedule with updated material specifications that meet the *Guidelines*.
- The location of the HVAC equipment and information about any screening.
- Any site improvements, including a fence.
- A detailed context elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS			
Siting, pg. 46, #s2-3	2. New residential infill construction should respect the prevailing front and side yard setback patterns of the surrounding block. The minimum setbacks evident in most districts reinforce the traditional street wall.	According to the proposed site plan provided by the applicant, the face of the proposed building with be aligned with the neighboring building at 523-525 Saint James Street.	
	3. New buildings should face the most prominent street bordering the site.	The proposed building faces Saint James Street, the prominent street bordering the site.	
Form, pg. 46 #s1-3	1. New construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the historic district.	The proposed building is mostly rectangular in form. Staff finds that this is in keeping with other residential properties in the historic district.	
	2. New residential construction should maintain the existing human scale of nearby historic residential construction in the district.	The proposed building is two stories in height with a third-story rear section and roof terrace. Staff finds that this is generally in keeping with the human scale of the existing buildings. The third-story section is uncommon for this area. Staff finds the recessed third-story section and roof terrace at the front are features not commonly found in the Jackson Ward Historic District, though variations in height and number of stories is a pattern often found. Staff finds that a third story at the front of the house would be more in keeping with the Guidelines.	
	3. New residential construction and additions should incorporate human- scale elements such as cornices, porches and front steps into their design.	The applicant proposes a two-story square bay on the façade and a one-story entry with two small steps and a modern, metal awning. Staff finds these elements are in keeping with the residential character of the area.	
Height, Width, Proportion, &	1. New residential construction should respect the typical height of surrounding residential buildings.	The proposed building is two-stories in height with a third-story section and roof terrace. The proposed two-story section is 23'-9" from grade to bottom of	

Massing, pg. 47, #s1-3		the eave, a foot or two taller than the surrounding buildings. The third-story section will be 34 feet to the roof peak, approximately twelve feet taller than the neighboring buildings.	
	2. New residential construction should respect the vertical orientation typical of other residential properties in surrounding historic districts.	The proposed building will have vertically aligned openings on the façade, similar to the neighboring residential buildings.	
	3. The cornice height should be compatible with that of adjacent historic buildings.	The streetscape provided by the applicant indicates that the two-story section will be compatible with the height of the surrounding residential buildings. Staff requests a more detailed context elevation with dimensions for final review.	
Materials and Colors, pg. 47, #s 2-3	2. Materials used in new residential construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the district.	The applicant proposes lap and channel siding, metal elements - including the cornice line and canopy - and white trim pieces. Staff finds the materials and color palette to be in keeping with the modern design of the building.	
	3. Paint colors used should be similar to the historically appropriate colors already found in the district.		
New Construction, Doors and Windows, pg. 56	2. The size, proportion, and spacing patterns of doors and window openings on free standing, new construction should be compatible with patterns established within the district.	The front and rear elevations will have horizontally and vertically aligned window openings, in keeping with the patterns found in the district.	
	4. Because the material cannot be manufactured to model effectively the appearance of historic windows, vinyl windows are not appropriate for buildings in historic districts.	The applicant proposes to use a window made of cellular PVC, which is not an approved material for use in City and Old Historic Districts. <u>Staff recommends the applicant submit details for a window that meets the Commission Guidelines for final review.</u>	
Mechanical Equipment, HVAC Equipment, pg. 68	The visual impact of new mechanical equipment should be minimized to protect the historic character of the district.	The applicant has not provided information about the location of the HVAC equipment. <u>Staff requests</u> the location of the HVAC equipment and information about any screening be submitted for final review.	

## FIGURES



Figure 1. 521 St. James Street



Figure 2. 521 St. James Street



Figure 3. 500 block St. James St, odd side



Figure 5. 500 block St. James St, odd side



Figure 4. 500 block St. James St, even side



Figure 6. 500 block St. James St, odd side