



LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT

PUBLIC HEARING: 21 MAY 2012
AGENDA ITEM 6D

BAR Case No. THLP-2012-0039

Owner requests to add a door with sidelites and pediment, replacing two windows with larger windows and adding beltline fascia to the side of an existing late 19th century commercial building.

Reviewer: Kim K. Del Rance, LEED AP

Address: **6 W Market Street**

Zoning: B-1, H-1 Overlay District

Applicant/Owner: Michael J. O'Connor

Site Description: This commercial building faces Market Street on the lot lines for Market Street and a side alley that acts as the driveway and dead end entry to other small businesses, including a bank and the rear of the Lightfoot Restaurant. There is a party wall to the commercial building to the east and according to the 1998 survey the facades of both buildings have previously been altered before the survey in the 1970's to appear as one building. Both buildings front Market Street and the side of 6 W Market Street has a secondary entrance toward the rear of the building on the west side which has street parking up against the building.

Context: The building is a contributing structure in the National Register District and contributes to the pedestrian streetscape and the rhythm of the street with its lack of setback and large glazing areas facing the street. The building footprints appear on a Sanborn map of 1886 and the side of the building along the driveway/alley is a secondary elevation with wood siding and a front façade of painted and unpainted brick. The beltline fascia was added to the front before 1998 when the two buildings were meant to look like one giving a more unified appearance. The first story of each façade is unpainted brick and the second story of both buildings is painted the same blue as the wood siding on the west elevation side toward the driveway/alley. Nearby buildings have varying window patterns, amounts of glazing and material choices, but all face Market Street with their building sides much less decorated and detailed than their facades.

Description of Proposal:

The owner is requesting to replace an existing wood one-over-one window with a new entry door with side lights and pediment, to add a small pediment above the existing side entry door and replace two one-over-one windows with two multi-lite windows giving the board three possible widths of 4'6, 5'6 or 6'6 to select from. These are the following requests:

1. Replace existing one-over-one wood windows with multi-lite wood windows.
2. Replace existing wood side entry door with new wood door and a small pediment above entry.
3. Replace one existing one-over-one wood window with a new wood multiple lite door with divided sidelites on either side. A new large and decorative pediment will be added above the new door and sidelights.
4. Simplify and wrap the front beltline fascia from the front façade of the building facing Market Street to extend along the side of the building above the new windows and doors.

STAFF ASSESSMENT

Modifications to Existing Buildings - Old and Historic District Design Guidelines (2009) Chapter V

Windows

Page 55 states "Replace historic windows in kind only when they are missing or beyond repair. Replacement units must replicate materials, operation, and pane configuration. If replacement, due to deterioration, is approved, replace the unit in-kind by matching the:

- a. Design, dimension, and operation of the original sash
 - i. Maintain the original dimensions and shape of the window.
 - ii. Match the height and width of the original opening.
 - iii. Match the width and depth of the historic meeting rail.
 - iv. Maintain the existing glazed surface area.
 - v. Retain associated details such as arched tops, hoods, and decorative elements.
- b. Pane configuration
 - i. Maintain the original or historic number and arrangement of panes
- c. Materials
 - i. For existing contributing buildings in the OHD, replace windows with the same historic or traditional materials.

Inappropriate Treatments for Windows from page 56

- Do not install replacement windows or sash that do not fit opening or that change the amount of glazed area.
- Do not use materials or finishes that change the sash, depth of reveal, muntin configuration, reflective quality and color of glazing or the appearance of frame.
- Do not change the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of original or historic windows.

Windows on the second floor have already been replaced with what appears to be simulated divided lites in a pattern of six-over-nine as the elevation drawings in the application packet show. However, the photographs submitted show the existing windows on the west side of the building were all one-over-one windows. According to the guidelines listed above all of the windows should remain in the same one-over-one pattern as the originals unless it can be shown that the six-over-nine configuration is historically accurate.

- The new windows should remain in their original locations and configuration if they cannot be repaired, replacement as guided by statements above is appropriate.

Porches and Doors

Regarding doors, page 62 states the following:

5. Retain and repair existing historic or original door(s) on all elevations.
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.

Orientation

Page 86 also adds the following:

b. Maintain the original orientation of the structure. If the primary entrance is located on the street facade it should remain in that location.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation - Appendix A

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. **Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.**
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
 - The existing side door is now boarded over and it is unclear if the original door is still available for repair. Repairing the original is the preferred method, but if replacement is necessary then replacing it with the same material and style is appropriate according to the guidelines quoted above.
 - The new side door as shown is more decorative than the original storefront entry and could be considered as re-orienting the building to the side street, which is not appropriate. The adding of conjectural architectural features not on the existing storefront façade is not appropriate unless it can be shown these are historically accurate for this building. Simplifying the door, eliminating sidelites and pediment for a much simpler entry is more appropriate so as not to re-orient the building to the side street. It is appropriate for the storefront entry to remain the main entrance.
 - It may be appropriate for the new door to have full glass or 2/3 glass to allow more natural light without detracting from the original storefront entry. Single lites are preferable to multiple lites to be in character with the existing storefront treatments.
 - The new side entry door location would be more appropriate by replacing an existing window location instead of creating a new opening.
 - Adding a beltline fascia may be appropriate if simple and not detracting from the original beltline cornice on the main storefront façade.

Materials- Old and Historic District Design Guidelines (2009) Chapter VII

Page 109 states "Duplication of historic finishes to the point where new construction is not distinguishable from old is not recommended." Also the following:

- b. Doors should be constructed of wood (which may be metal-clad) or metal and should match the style of the building. On storefronts, use painted wood or painted metal doors with large areas of glass.
 - c. Windows should be constructed of wood, a wood composite or metal and should be appropriate to the style of the building.
- The wood doors and windows submitted are appropriate in their materials. As stated above the single lites are appropriate as opposed to multiple lites, unless it can be shown multiple lites were used originally on this building. At the time of this building using single lite windows was an improvement over multiple lites as the manufacturing processes of glass had improved to allow for larger panes of glass.

Site Development/Zoning Issues: Ownership or access to land directly in front of the new proposed side entrance must be addressed before an entrance can be placed in this location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION/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.)

Based on the findings that:

- **Ownership or access privilege to the land serving the new side entrance must be clarified**
- **One-over-one double hung wood windows are more appropriate in proportion and configuration than divided lite windows on this building since the existing windows are also one-over-ones**
- **A simple beltline fascia on the side of the building is not specifically addressed in the guidelines and is subordinate to the front façade cornice and PVC is not an appropriate material for trim and exterior decoration and wood is appropriate**
- **Building orientation should not be changed with new additions and conjectural architectural features should not be added that create a false sense of historical development**

Staff recommends approval of TLHP-2012-0039 subject to the unsigned and undated plans submitted as part of this application material set and subject to the following conditions:

- **Ownership or access privilege to the land serving the new side entrance must be clarified**
- **The replaced windows are appropriate as one-over-one windows and the location of the existing windows should not be altered. Their size can be expanded to match the existing windows on the second floor if necessary for the use of the building.**
- **The all wood new side door would be appropriate to have a single lite or a 2/3 full glass door with no divided lites.**
- **There should be no pediment or sidelites on the new side entry door which should be located in place of an existing window instead of cutting a new opening.**
- **A wood beltline fascia should be simple, painted to match existing trim and not decorative to ensure the original orientation remains facing Market Street. There shall be no PVC used in exterior use in the project.**
- **The existing side door should be repaired, but replaced only if repair is impossible.**
- **It is encouraged that the owner restore the original storefronts of these two buildings removing the materials and configuration that makes them appear as one.**

DRAFT MOTION

I move that TLHP-2012-0039 be approved subject to the plans submitted by Michael S. O'Connor on April 23, 2012 and subject to the findings and conditions of approval as stated in the May 21, 2012 Staff Report (or as amended by the BAR on May 21, 2012).