



**LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT**

**PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING: 17 DECEMBER 2012
AGENDA ITEM 7b**

BAR Case No. TLHP-2012-0132 303 King St – Removal of part of addition and alterations to existing historic building

Reviewer: Kim K. Del Rance, LEED AP
Address: 303 S King Street
Zoning: R-HD, H-1 Overlay District
Applicant/Owner: Paul Reimers

Description of Proposal:

Owner requests to remove addition with concrete block foundation. Existing original building to be repaired, rear door added, remaining wood windows to be restored, asphalt siding to be removed and replaced with James Hardie Artisan fiber cement horizontal siding.



1975 historic survey photo above

Site Description:

From the 1998 historic survey: This house at 303 S King Street stands within the original 1759 Nicholas Minor Plans and appears on all historic maps of Leesburg, although this building history is not known. A very charming and important nineteenth century Vernacular building, it contributes to the character of the historic district in style, scale and design. The rear addition does not have the current extension beyond the edge of the main building on any Sanborn maps through 1930. Aerial photos from 1937 and 1957 are not clear enough to distinguish the house. Therefore, the side addition with concrete block, attached to the rear part of the main building must date between 1930 and 1975. The asphalt siding material was popular as early as 1930 through the 1960's and was an inexpensive way to cover damaged wood siding usually on deteriorating buildings. The early Sanborn maps show an addition to the rear with a porch on the side flush with the house, not extending past the front as this addition does.

Context:

King Street is one of the original streets depicted in the 1795 Nicholas Minor Plan of Leesburg and generally follows the route of the Carolina Road. South of Royal Street is small scale and vernacular residential and commercial buildings from the nineteenth century. The area south of the railroad was known as Georgetown with a few early nineteenth century structures, but most are from the period of growth from the turn of the century. The street has retained a high level of architectural integrity and is an important entrance to the southern section of the historic district.

Site Development/Zoning Issues: This application does not qualify as a demolition as defined in Zoning Ordinance section 7.5.8.B. but instead is considered an alteration.

APPLICATION OF THE GUIDELINES:

H-1 Old and Historic District Design Guidelines

VIII. PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS FOR DEMOLITION AND RELOCATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES A. Demolition

p. 126 Removal of less than 40% of the exterior wall or roof surface is considered an alteration to a building, and property owners need to follow the guidelines for obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness in Chapter I of this document.

If the addition being removed is less than 40% of the total building exterior walls and roof surfaces this is would be considered an alteration. This addition being removed is 19 feet in length of wall out of the total perimeter of 120 feet, making it less than 16% of the total wall surface. The roof area being removed is 62 square feet out of the total of 680 square feet, making it less than 10% of the total roof area.

V. GUIDELINES FOR THE PRESERVATION AND MODIFICATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES: STYLE AND DESIGN

p. 47 "Wooden windows are important historic elements and should be rehabilitated." "Porches or porticos define the facades of many Leesburg dwellings and should be retained."

Retaining and restoring the wood windows on the historic structure is appropriate as is retaining and repairing the existing front porch.

p. 48 Determining the Contributing/Non-Contributing Status of Existing Buildings

The existing building is considered historic and important on both the 1975 and 1998 historic surveys. In deciding whether altering this structure by removing the rear addition is appropriate, the decision of whether the addition has attained historic significance and is contributing to the overall significance of the building is to be made by the following below.

"In the very rare instance of a building's questionable status, the BAR will evaluate whether or not that building contributes to the historic character and integrity of the Old and Historic District in accordance with the following steps:

1. Is the building or structure designated historic in the CLG grant-funded building survey for the property?" Yes – the following questions are to decide the significance of the addition only

"2. If the building or structure is designated as historic in the CLG grant-funded building survey for the property, is it a resource that contributes or does not contribute to the architectural and historic integrity of the property, neighborhood, and historic district? A building or structure is considered to be non-contributing if it does not have or retain integrity of any of the following:

a. Location: By being able to interpret the structure in its original location, it is possible to understand why the property was created and its contribution to the broader history of the area.

b. Design: Defined as a combination of the elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. Integrity of design is applied to historic districts through the way in which buildings, sites and structures relate to one another and the rhythms of the streetscape.

c. Setting: The physical character of the property in which the building is situated and the building's relationship to surrounding features, open space, and adjacent structures."

- *a, b and c: The addition is on the side of the rear section and while visible from the street, it does not contribute significantly to the streetscape. The design and setting of the addition are not significant to the overall historic character.*

"d. Materials: The choice and combination of materials reveal the preferences of those who created the property and the availability of particular types of materials and technologies and help define an area's sense of time and place. It is necessary that buildings retain key exterior materials dating from the district's period of significance in order to properly convey the history of the district's development.

e. Workmanship: This aspect can apply to a structure as a whole or to its individual components and provides evidence of the builder's labor, skill, and available technology.

f. Feeling: Results from the presence of physical features that when considered together convey the district's historic character. The original materials, design, workmanship and setting can, for example, either convey the feeling of a mid-nineteenth century working class neighborhood or a warehouse district of the same time period.

g. Association: The presence of physical features that remain sufficiently intact to link a district's historic character to an important historical event or person and to convey such to an observer."

- The change in foundation materials from the original structure and the addition shows the addition to be much later than the date of the house. The asphalt siding predates the 1975 survey, but wood siding, likely the original siding, is on the exterior walls that are now the interior of the larger rear addition. The windows in the addition do not match the configuration of the windows on the original structure and do not convey the historic feeling of the original structure. The windows on the extension do not continue the character of the original house.
- As can be seen in the 1975 photo, the addition was not visible due to landscaping and the character of the house was not affected.

p. 62 Porches and Doors, continued

6. "Replace historic doors that are beyond repair with a new door(s) of the same size, design, material and type as used originally, or sympathetic to the building style."

- The rear door is missing, due to the fact that it is the rear door and will not be visible from the street, a door that is compatible with a vernacular house is appropriate. The proposed door is an appropriate door.

p. 68 A. Wood

"...wood is used in major elements such as framing, siding, and shingles. Wood siding with a reveal of four to six inches is most common in the OHD, although more narrow examples may be found on late nineteenth century structures and wider examples on some Colonial-era and early Federal-era buildings."

--Guidelines for Wood--

1. Retain original and historic wood features that define the overall character Leesburg's OHD and many of its buildings such as siding, shingles, cornices, and brackets.

2. Retain original or historic wood windows including frames, sash, and trim when possible.

3. Repair rotted or missing sections rather than replace the entire element, matching the existing materials and detailing.

4. Replace wood elements only if they are deteriorated beyond repair. Wood that appears to be in bad condition because of peeling paint or separated joints often can, in fact, be repaired. If the wood has deteriorated beyond repair and replacement is necessary:

a. Match the original in material, texture, dimensions, and design.

b. Base the design of reconstructed elements on pictorial or physical evidence from the actual building rather than from similar buildings.

c. If the applicant sufficiently demonstrates that it is impracticable to match the original in material, texture, dimensions and design, then the BAR may consider an alternate material if the new material does not create a different historic appearance and the new replacement materials are consistent with the original in finish, quality, and appearance.

d. Do not use cement fiberboard or other synthetic or alternative materials if it is architecturally incompatible with the historic structure.

- The original wood siding can be seen on the rear of the original building inside the rear addition proposed to be removed. Matching this original siding profile and material is the most appropriate way to treat a historic building in Leesburg.

STAFF ASSESSMENT

This house is important to the integrity and architectural feeling of the Old and Historic District. The removal of the poorly maintained rear side addition does not affect the architectural integrity of the original building. The restoration of the wood windows is appropriate and preferred as is restoring and matching the original wood siding on the original house to remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings that:

- The removal of the rear side addition will not damage the architectural character or integrity of the original structure to remain.
- The restoration of original wood windows is appropriate and preferred
- The original wood siding should be matched in material, texture, dimension and design
- The rear wood door is sympathetic to the architectural style of the original structure

Staff recommends approval of TLHP-2012-0131 subject to the drawings and materials submitted by Paul Reimers as part of this application material set dated November 19, 2012 with the following conditions.

- The siding will be of wood to match the original siding on the rear of the original building inside the rear addition

DRAFT MOTION

(Based on the BAR's discussion at the meeting, any changes to the language of either part of the motion should be incorporated as necessary.)

I move that TLHP-2012-0132 be approved subject to the application submitted by Paul Reimers on November 19, 2012 and subject to the findings and conditions of approval as stated in the December 17, 2012 Staff Report (or as amended by the BAR on December 17, 2012).