LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT:  Dilworth

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY:  323 Rensselaer Avenue

SUMMARY OF REQUEST:  Renovation and Addition

OWNER:  Oak Leaf Development

APPLICANT:  Adam Getchell

Details of Proposed Request:

Existing Conditions
The subject property is a single story dwelling constructed in 1905 with a gable roof and full width front porch supported by two columns. The site has a significant slope from front to back and is adjacent to an office development and a renovated single family home. The existing siding appears to be wood shingles. Existing homes along the street are 1 and 1.5 story bungalow type designs. Mature trees do not exist on the property. Due to the poor condition of the home the engineering report recommends reconstruction of the foundation.

Proposal
The proposal is a renovation of the entire home including foundation repair and expansion. Additional interior space will be enclosed within three new shed dormers and a new gable including a small addition to the first floor at the rear. The front existing gable will be raised approximately 2 feet. The existing exterior chimney will be repaired and the second chimney removed. The front porch will be redesigned, adding two columns and decking. Windows will be replaced with 3/1 and 2/1 design windows. The applicant is also proposing to remove the existing siding and replace with a cementitious material and reuse brick from the existing home. The porch will have wood decking.

Proposal-Updated for November 13, 2013 Hearing
Based on comments from October. The applicant has submitted revised elevation drawings to show the amount of change to the existing structure including dimensions. Exterior materials will be a combination of cedar shake siding to match current style and reclaimed brick for the foundation.
Policy & Design Guidelines for Additions

HDC Design Policy requires that Additions be evaluated according to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>the relationship of the project to its site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>the relationship of the building to those around it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massing</td>
<td>the relationship of the building’s various parts to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenestration</td>
<td>the placement, style and materials of windows and doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td>the relationship of fenestration, recesses and projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback</td>
<td>in relation to setback of immediate surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>proper historic materials or approved substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>the overall relationship of the project to its surroundings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Analysis
The project meets the Guidelines for Fenestration, Massing, Size, Scale, and Context. Details to consider are:


The guidelines for setback and landscaping are not applicable.

Regarding materials, the Guidelines (pages 48-49) state:

Traditional Building Materials

1. The use of historically traditional building materials is strongly encouraged in all renovation, addition and new construction projects in Local Historic Districts.

2. Historic precedents in the visual context of any project indicate appropriate choices for building materials.

3. All building materials must match the character of the existing structure and/or the streetscape in design, texture and other visual qualities.
Non-Traditional Building Materials

1. The Historic District Commission considers substitute siding to be inappropriate for use in a designated Local Historic District, and does not allow its use on an historic structure within a Local Historic District.

2. The use of the following substitute siding materials is considered incongruous with the overall character of local historic districts, and is prohibited.
   - Vinyl
   - Aluminum or other metal sidings
   - Masonite

3. Cementitious board products are rarely considered appropriate for the main structure on a property. The Historic District Commission will consider these products on a case by case basis.

4. All proposals for the use of other non-traditional building materials for projects in Local Historic Districts will be judged on a case-by-case basis by the full Historic District Commission. The Commission will determine how well the proposed material and its proposed use are contextually appropriate in design, texture and other visual qualities.

5. The use of substitute or replacement building materials will not be considered as an alternative to routine maintenance.
323 Rensselaer Historic Committee Submission:

- This is not a demolition, even though it was previously approved for demolition by the Historic Committee.
- We are keeping 90% of existing structure, by expanding the footprint in several areas to accommodate a new foundation, and expanding the roofline by approximately 3’. There is no demolition of any aspect of original footprint of the structure besides replacement and repair of the foundation as required by engineer.
- We are not removing any trees on the property or changing the grade. There is currently very little vegetation surround the house that is not intrusive growth. There is very little space surrounding the house to add additional trees, small bushes and shrubs will be added at the front and driveway side upon completion.
- The materials on the exterior of the home will be very similar to the style and appearance of what is currently on the house. The completed structure will have exposed rafter tails with bead board, cedar shake siding and tongue and groove pine decking.
- In elevations shown, windows are drawn to scale in order to represent actual size/style of the wood windows, not actual construction.
PROPOSED SITE PLAN

NOVEMBER 2013
OCTOBER 2013

New Roof Height: 3'- 1" higher than current height. Neighbors house app. 1'-3" higher at peak.

Extend & Repair Chimney to match existing.

Architectural Shingles

Standing Seam Metal Roofing

Open Rafter Tails With Bead Board

James Hardi Lap Siding

Stone Cap For Brick Columns

Reclaimed Brick Foundation

Front Elevation

1/8" = 1'-0"
NOVEMBER 2013

6'-0" Difference in current elevation

Increase on left by commercial parking lot & retaining wall

5'-0"

3'-0" Bump out at driveway

3'-0" Difference in proposed elevation

STREET VIEW OLD & NEW
RIGHT ELEVATION

New 2'-7" increase in width