LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT

PUBLIC HEARING AND WORK SESSION: 4 JUNE 2012
AGENDA ITEM 3C

BAR Case No. THLP-2012-0039: Modifications to existing building at 6 W. Market St.
Owner requests to add a salvaged historic door with sidelites and pediment, enlarging two 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 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: This commercial storefront building is a contributing structure in the Old and Historic 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 previous approved certificate of appropriateness, TLHP-2009-0096 was granted in 2009 that showed a much simpler entry door and added windows all the same size to make the elevation more symmetrical and balanced.
The changes to the approved certificate of appropriateness being requested are to

a. add sidelights and large pediment to the entry door
b. add a small pediment above the existing rear side entry door
c. leave the existing number of windows, but to widen the windows on the first floor
d. wrap a simple beltline fascia from the front around to the side
e. leave the existing roofline with no added parapet
f. use a salvaged historic door as the new side entry door, no example has been submitted as of the writing of this report

Site Development/Zoning Issues: The ownership of the adjacent alley has not been definitively determined, therefore the applicant needs to be mindful of making improvements that could encroach onto property he may not own or have the rights to use.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

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.
    iv. Maintain the existing glazed surface area.
b. Pane configuration
    i. Maintain the original or historic number and arrangement of panes

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 change the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of original or historic windows.

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.**

Staff Assessment:
Windows on the second floor have already been replaced with simulated divided lites in a pattern of six-over-six 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, but they were replaced in 1975 so it is unclear what the pane configuration was original to the building.

Since this is a secondary elevation it is appropriate to alter the window sizes to bring them into balance as shown in the approved TLHP-2009-0096, but the new proposal calls for wider windows on the first floor, with a different pane configuration bringing the total on the building to three different pane configurations and a larger door and entry treatment.

- These changes will alter the appearance of the building orientation and add conjectural historic features of a wider window that did not previously exist anywhere on the building, which is not appropriate.
- The applicant stated that more light was desired into the building, staff suggests returning to the previously approved certificate which allowed an additional window on the second floor and to allow the applicant to use one-over-one windows like those on the front of the building which have no muntins to block light.
- Using a half glass simple door as on the previously approved certificate will also allow more light. Muntins are not necessary as the front façade of the building makes use of large plate glass whose use became a sign of prosperity near the end of the 19th century when this building was built.

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:

- **One-over-one double hung wood windows are also appropriate on this building since the existing front windows are one-over-ones**
- **A simple beltline fascia on the side of the is subordinate to the front façade and PVC is not an appropriate material for trim and exterior decoration, but wood is appropriate**
- **Building orientation should not be changed with new additions and conjectural architectural features should not be added that a create a false sense of historical development**

Staff recommends approval of TLHP-2012-0039 subject to the plans submitted April 19, 2012 as part of this application material set and subject to the following conditions:

- **Maintaining the current shed roof line is appropriate and preferred over changes.**
- **The windows on the first floor are appropriate as approved or as one-over-one windows, but they should not be enlarged.**
- **The all wood new or salvaged side door would be appropriate to have a single lite or a 2/3 full glass door.**
- **There should be no large pediment or sidelites on the new side entry door.**
- **A wood beltline fascia should be simple and painted to match existing trim. There shall be no PVC used in exterior use in the project.**
- **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 19, 2012 as changes to the approved certificate of appropriateness dated August 20, 2009 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).