

Historic District Review Committee

Staff Report
April 12, 2010

Action Items

CAPP 2010-0002 Madison: New Residential Construction in the Waterford Historic District: MCPI 304-46-4671.

Background

On Monday, March 8, 2010, the Loudoun County Historic District Review Committee (HDRC) deferred for a second time a decision on Certificate of Appropriateness 2010-0002 as submitted in the application dated December 11, 2010 and revised February 16, 2010 and February 25, 2010. The initial deferral occurred on Tuesday, February 16, 2010.

During the March 8, 2010 meeting, the HDRC directed the applicant to submit a revised application with the changes listed below to bring the application into compliance with the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance (Zoning Ordinance) and the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines: Waterford (Waterford Guidelines):

- 1.) A plat with the revised proposed location based on Village Conservation Overlay District (VCOD) and Countryside Residential- 2 (CR-2) setbacks and dimensions that meet the Zoning Ordinance lot coverage requirements,

And revised elevations showing:

- 2.) The correct change in grade on all elevations, a clear depiction of how the applicant proposes to address this change, including any exposed foundation and any necessary retaining walls, and removal of the proposed pit and surrounding balustrade,
- 3.) A main block that is similar in massing, width, and scale to historic residences in the district of the same style and design (symmetrical, 5-bay, main block with a central entrance) and directional expression and on a similar lot size with similar setbacks,
- 4.) The correct rooflines at the intersection of the main block, west wing, and rear ell in the drawing of the rear elevation,
- 5.) Redesigned fenestration with a compatible rhythm of openings in the west elevation of the west wing and an attic window in the gable peak of the east elevation of the main block,
- 6.) Complete detailed drawings for the proposed dormers, windowsills, front and rear porch details, stone front entry feature, rear entry steps, roof-wall junction (cornice and rake), and front door surround taking into account all

recommendations made in the Staff Report. All details should relate to the formal, yet simple, design of the proposed house and follow traditional and historic precedents found in the Waterford Historic District, including the attachment of the rear enclosed porch to the rear roof.

- 7.) A complete materials list providing the dimensions, materials, type (relating to windows and doors), and treatment (e.g. painted) for all materials and details proposed for the residence, including but not limited to porch details; all windows, doors, and trim; foundation; cornice and rake; and corner boards.

In a letter dated March 9, 2010 notifying the applicant of deferral, Staff listed these submittal requirements and provided a deadline of 5:00 p.m. Friday, March 19, 2010. Staff emailed and mailed this letter to the applicant the same day.

The applicant submitted revisions to the proposed application by the March 19, 2010 deadline, including a plat showing a revised proposed location and dimensions and revised plans with a revised grade depiction, decreased width and west wing depth, and redesigned fenestration (items 1 through 5 listed above), both dated March 19, 2010. The revised submission did not include detailed drawings and a complete materials list as required in the deferral letter (items 6 and 7 listed above).

Analysis

In this analysis, Staff will address, in order, items 1 through 5 included in the deferral letter. Since the applicant did not provide the requested information for items 6 and 7, a specific review of details and materials is not included in this report. A general analysis of newly proposed changes depicted on the revised elevations is presented under "Additional Comments" to provide the applicant with an opportunity to include revisions in a subsequent submittal should the HDRC act to defer this application.

1.) The plans must depict a revised proposed location showing setbacks and a footprint that meets lot coverage requirements of the Zoning Ordinance

Lot Coverage

According to the Zoning Referral letter dated April 5, 2010, there are no zoning issues associated with this application. The applicant meets the maximum lot coverage requirements. For the subject property, the lot coverage must be less than 2,605.5 square feet. The proposed residence has a footprint of 2,320.4 square feet using the plat measurements (or 2,329.4 square feet using the elevation measurements).¹

¹ A discrepancy exists between the width of the rear one-story porch depicted on the plat (14 feet 9 inches) and the width depicted on the elevations (15 feet 9 inches). This must be corrected on revised submissions.

Setbacks

The proposed setbacks depicted on the plat meet the VCOD and CR-2 requirements of the Revised 1972 Zoning Ordinance. These setbacks include an 8 foot front yard and a 9 foot side yard. The applicant noted on the plat that a front yard setback of 5 feet 5 inches and a side yard setback of 3 feet are preferred.

Front Yard Setback

Staff finds that since the lot is considered raw land, the front setback of 8 feet as identified by Zoning Staff using the VCOD requirements is an appropriate front yard setback. The average setback of the two houses on the same side of Janney Street is in keeping with the existing streetscape and reinforces the character of the adjacent dwellings.

Furthermore, the 8-foot setback places the proposed building further back on the lot, which would decrease the imposing feel of the proposed 59-foot 3-inch long front elevation. This would also help meet the general guideline that a new building in the Waterford Historic District should become a background design that does not draw attention to itself at the expense of its historic neighbors.

Side Yard Setback

Based on the side yard setbacks of historic and non-historic houses along Janney Street and that the subject property is considered vacant, staff finds that it would be appropriate to locate the proposed house along the east side of the lot, leaving a larger yard on the west side. Therefore, Staff finds that the CR-2 requirement of a 9-foot side yard setback from the east lot line is appropriate and will maintain the spacing along the historic streetscape.

2.) The plans must depict the correct change in grade on all elevations.

Depiction of the change in elevation from the northeast corner to the northwest corner of the proposed building on the revised plans has been improved. The revised plans continue to depict the first floor level of the west wing stepped-down 2 feet from the first floor level of the main block in an attempt to accommodate the grade change. An additional foot of exposed foundation is illustrated at the northwest corner. Therefore, the depicted grade change accommodation is approximately 3 feet on the front (north) elevation and 3.5 feet on the west (side) elevation. Staff notes, however, that the existing grade change is 5 feet to 6 feet.

Staff notes that while the depiction of the exposed foundation is improved, there are still inconsistencies. The illustration of the west side of the west wing foundation shows approximately 1.5 feet of exposed foundation with full basement windows, an improvement over the prior submission. However, this exposed foundation height is different from the height of the exposed foundation on the north and south elevations of the west wing, which are both 1 foot high. A similar error is noted on the north, south, and east elevations of the main block. At the northeast corner of the front (north)

elevation and the rear (south) elevation of the main block, the exposed foundation is depicted as 0.5 feet high, but on the side (east) elevation, the exposed foundation is 1.75 feet high.

The applicant does not sufficiently address how the change in grade from the east end of the building to the west end of the building will be addressed and the revised plans continue to inaccurately depict the grade change on all elevations. The Guidelines recommend minimizing grade changes and preserving existing landforms and features in their natural state. Artificially contouring the landscape should be avoided (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements: Landforms and Features, Inappropriate Treatment 1, Guidelines 1 and 2, p. 38.) Therefore, a proposal to maintain existing grades as much as possible would meet the Guidelines. **The revised submission must include a visual depiction and/or written description of how the applicant proposes to address the remaining grade change of 2 feet to 3 feet from the east end of the proposed residence to the west end. The revised plan must depict correctly and accurately the exposed foundation on each elevation.**

Staff notes that if retaining walls are necessary to support grade changes made by the applicant, then they must be shown on any revised plans and reviewed by the HDRC and receive an approved CAPP (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements: Fences and Walls, p. 45.)

3.) The plans must depict a main block that is similar in massing, width, and scale to historic residences in the Waterford Historic District of the same style and design (symmetrical, 5-bay, main block with a central entrance) and directional expression and on a similar lot size with similar setbacks.

The Waterford Guidelines state that massing should relate to existing adjacent historic buildings. When a building footprint is larger than these precedents, then the Guidelines recommend that examples of historic buildings that grew over time should be considered for guidance on how to reduce the perceived mass. The construction of additions over time is often represented by a series of differing masses and varying and intersecting rooflines. At the same time, the precedent of one primary mass with one or more secondary masses should be followed (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Massing, Guidelines 1-4, p. 58.)

The applicant decreased the massing, scale, and the overall width of the proposed residence from the February 25, 2010 submission. The proposed width of the main block decreased from 45 feet 3 inches to 43 feet 6 inches. The width of the west wing, 15 feet 9 inches, remained the same, resulting in an overall front elevation width of 59 feet 3 inches. Originally proposed at 63 feet and reduced once to 61 feet, this revision results in a 3-foot 9-inch reduction in the overall width from the initial submission and a 1-foot 9-inch reduction from the previously reviewed submission (2/25/10). The proposed depth of the main block, 30 feet, remained the same.

It appears that the height of the proposed main block may have changed from the 32 feet 2 ¾ inches as depicted on the February 25, 2010 submission. The revised height is unclear since the height depicted for the front (north) and rear (south) elevations is 34 feet 6 7/8 inches and for the side elevations (east and west) is approximately 32 feet 3 inches. As found in the previous staff report dated March 8, 2010, a reduction in the height of the main block helps reduce the mass and scale of the proposed residence as recommended by Staff and the HDRC to meet the Guidelines. Therefore, Staff encourages the applicant to maintain the 32 feet 2 ¾ inch height as proposed in the February 25, 2010 submission.

The proposed depth of the west wing has been reduced from 30 feet to 22 feet and the height from 32 feet to 29 feet. In addition, the west wing has been recessed an additional 2 feet from the front of the main block, increasing the setback from 6 feet to 8 feet. These changes reduce the massing and scale of the proposed residence. The front door and porch on the wing have also been moved to the rear (south) elevation of the west wing. Moving the porch to the rear of the house is in keeping with the formal, yet simple style of the residence. Staff previously stated that the front porch helped break up the mass of the front elevation; however, the increased recess of the wing has the same effect. The dormer has also been removed. Considering the height reduction, the dormer on the west wing is not a feature necessary to break up the mass of the roof.

The applicant refers to the Guideline, "Flexibility in the width may occur due to different construction eras and styles, as well as placement on the lot" when making justification for the proposed width (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Height, Width, and Scale, Guideline 2, p. 60). Staff notes that since the applicant elected to design the proposed residence in a style typically found in Waterford, a symmetrical five-bay, side gable, main block with a central entrance, then the width and depth of the main block should be in keeping with historic houses of the same style. Staff also notes that this Guideline allows taking placement on the lot into consideration when evaluating width.

Though the applicant has reduced the overall mass and scale, the width and depth of the proposed main block is still wider and deeper than historic houses in Waterford of similar design and setback (Table 1). Historic symmetrical 5-bay houses with shallow setbacks (ranging from 8.6 feet to 16.1 feet) similar to the 8 feet setback required for the proposed residence have main blocks with widths ranging from 31.8 feet to 37 feet and depths ranging from 18.1 feet to 24 feet (Photos 1-4). The proposed main block of the residence is 6.5 feet wider and 6 feet deeper than the largest of these houses. The entire width of the proposed residence is 19 feet wider than the entire width (main block and wing) of the Monroe Hough House, which is 40.3' wide.

The widths of the associated lots described above range from 50 feet to 110 feet. The Monroe Hough House stands on the widest lot, which is approximately 0.5 acres. This house is the only similarly styled house with a shallow setback and a side wing in the Waterford Historic District.

Table 1: Dimensions and Setbacks of Houses of a Style Similar to the Proposed Construction, Waterford, Virginia, 2010

| House Name | Address | Width | Depth | Setback | Side Wing | Lot Width | Lot Depth | Lot Acreage | Historic |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| Bank House | 40149 Main St. | 37.0' | 24.0' | 15' | No | ~75' | >275' | ~0.6 | Yes |
| William James House | 40187 Main St. | 31.8' | 18.1' | 8.6' | No | ~50' | ~100' | ~0.1 | Yes |
| Edward Dorsey House | 40203 Main St. | 36.5' | 21.1' | 10.5' | No | ~75' | >215' | ~0.4 | |
| Monroe Hough House | 40189 Patrick St. | 40.3 ^{b*} | 20.5' | 16.1' | Yes | ~110 | ~205" | ~0.5 | Yes |
| The Dormers | 15635 Second St. | 40' | 20' | 138' | 25' ^a | ~225' | >275' | ~1.7 | Yes |
| Mill End | 40090 First St. | ~40' | ~20' | ~90' | Yes | ~300' | ~300' | ~1.6 | Yes |
| Dunne Residence | 40171 Janney St. | 43.5' | 30' | 5.3' | No | 83.67' | 140.57' | 0.27 | No |
| <i>Madison Residence (Proposed)</i> | <i>40153 Janney St.</i> | <i>43.5'</i> | <i>30'</i> | <i>8'</i> | <i>15.75'</i> | <i>102.92'</i> | <i>100.73</i> | <i>0.24</i> | <i>No</i> |

^a The total length of two wings off the main block of The Dormers.

^b This width includes a one-story wing.



Photo 1: This frame symmetrical 5-bay house at 40187 Main Street has a main block that is 31.8' wide and 18.1' feet deep, and has a setback of 8.6'.



Photo 2: The brick Bank House (40149 Main Street) has a 5-bay symmetrical main block that is 37' wide, 24' deep and a 15' setback from the street.



Photo 3: This frame house at 40189 Patrick Street is the only symmetrical 5-bay house in Waterford that has a side wing and is close to the street. It has a total width of 40.3'. The main block is 20.5' deep and it is set back 16.1'.



Photo 4: This brick house at 40203 Main Street is similarly styled to the proposed residence, but the main block is 36.5' wide and 21.1' deep and it is set back 10.5' from the street.

Historic, symmetrical, 5-bay houses with deep setbacks (ranging from approximately 90 feet to 138 feet) and wings similar to the proposed residence have main blocks with widths of approximately 40 feet and depths of approximately 20 feet. The proposed main block of the residence is 3.5 feet wider and 10 feet deeper than these houses. These lots are between 225 feet and 300 feet wide, and more than 1.5 acres in size.

The revised dimensions of the proposed main block are the same as the main block of the neighboring circa 1990 Dunne residence, 40171 Janney Street, which is 43.5 feet wide and 30 feet deep. This 0.27-acre lot is nearly 84 feet wide.

The revised plans still propose dimensions for the main block and an overall width that are larger than neighboring historic residences and those of similar style located in Waterford. With the proposed side wing, the overall width of the proposed residence is also greater than the non-historic circa 1990 residence on the neighboring property.

4.) The rooflines at the intersection of the main block, west wing, and rear ell in the drawing of the rear elevation should be corrected.

The applicant made this correction. As noted under item 3, the applicant reduced the width of the west wing from 30 feet to 22 feet and the height from 32 feet to 29 feet. This change corrected the rooflines.

5.) The fenestration shall be redesigned in the west elevation of the west wing so that it is compatible with the rhythm of openings of historic buildings.

Additionally, an attic window should be added in the gable peak of the east elevation of the main block. (Note: The applicant made additional fenestration changes in the revised submission. These changes are addressed in the “Additional Comments” section.)

The ratio of solids to voids, rhythm of the openings, and proportion of the openings in new buildings should be compatible with adjacent historic buildings in each elevation (*Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Doors, Windows, and Shutters, Guidelines 1-3, p. 68*).

West Elevation of West Wing

Revised fenestration in the side elevation of the west wing includes the reduction of four bays to three bays. This ratio of solids to voids is not compatible with adjacent historic (and non-historic) buildings, or historic residences in the Waterford Historic District. Historically, the side elevation of a residence had fewer windows, usually a total of four or less (not including the attic window) windows arranged in two or less bays. Staff recommends decreasing the number of bays to two, removing the inner bays. Referencing the windows in the rear (south) elevation of the rear ell, which is the same width as the wing, is recommended since the fenestration in this elevation meets the Guidelines.

The applicant must include window dimensions on any revised plans.

East Elevation of Main Block

The HDRC included in the resubmission requirements that a square attic window as originally proposed for the gable peak be added to the east elevation of the main block. A similar window is proposed for the west elevation of the west wing. The applicant did not make this change on the plans dated March 19, 2010. Staff continues to recommend reinstating this attic window in the peak to break up the perceived mass of the wall surface in the gable end and to follow the historic precedent of attic windows in gable peaks.

Staff also recommends adding the attic window back in the west elevation of the west wing that the applicant proposed on the initial submission.

The applicant must include dimensions for the central, second story window, and the attic window on any revised plans.

Staff also notes that the use of shutters would be a detail that adds visual interest and a human scale and will reduce the perceived width, depth, and mass of the proposed house. Shutters should be wood or wood composite, scaled to fit the related window opening, and mounted on hinges, not screwed to the wall, to meet the Guidelines (*Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Height, Width, and Scale, Guideline 3, p. 60; Doors, Windows, and Shutters, Inappropriate Treatment 8, p. 67*,

Guidelines 14 and 15, p. 69; and Architectural Details and Decoration, Guidelines 1 and 2, p. 73).

Additional Comments

Dormers

The applicant decreased the height of the dormers as recommended in the deferral letter. However, Staff is unable to evaluate whether the proposed reduction in dormer size is sufficient to be scaled proportionately to the scale of the roof because both the proposed dormer and roof heights are inconsistent on the submitted elevations. The applicant reduced the height of the proposed dormers from 8 feet 6 inches to 8 feet on the front (north) and side (west) elevations, while the height on the side (east) elevation is depicted as 6 feet. The proposed roof height on the front (north) elevation is different from the side (east and west) elevations. Staff notes, however, that the profile of the 8-foot dormers depicted on the west side elevation (which is the most appropriate height) continues to create massive dormer profiles that may be out of scale with the roof.

The Guidelines recommend the use of dormers for new construction since they reduce the perceived mass of the roof by breaking up the large sloping surface. The dormers, however, should be scaled proportionately to the scale of the building and roof mass and should follow the rhythm and window size of historic precedents (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Roof Form and Materials, Guidelines 1 and 2, p. 63).

To follow historic precedent and traditional building techniques, the clapboard siding on the dormers should be horizontal, not diagonal. The diagonal siding as proposed on the dormers does not meet the Guidelines (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Architectural Details and Decoration, Guideline 1, p. 73).

The applicant removed the proposed dormer from the west wing. As stated previously in this staff report, this removal meets the Guidelines.

Rear One-Story Porch

The applicant moved the front porch proposed for the west wing to the rear. As noted earlier in this report, since the applicant increased the proposed recess of the west wing from the facade of the main block from 6 feet to 8 feet, this proposed change is acceptable.

When considering details for the porch, Staff notes that to be in keeping with the simple, yet formal style of the proposed residence, the details should be more classical rather than Victorian. This porch style will also be in keeping with historic porches in Waterford (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Front and Rear Porches, Photo Caption, p. 70). Staff also recommends that the applicant consider a hipped, rather than shed, roof for the porch. Hipped roofs are more typical of historic porches and have a more refined design that would be appropriate for the style of the proposed

residence (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Front and Rear Porches, Guidelines 1- 3, p. 70; Architectural Details and Decoration, Guideline 1, p. 73).

Rear Two-Story Porch

In the submittal dated February 25, 2010, the applicant proposed a 9-foot deep bump out from the rear of the main block in an attempt to break up the mass of the main block. In this proposal, the first story was enclosed with a second-story covered porch above. According to submitted floor plans, the enclosed first story was proposed to provide additional space for a library in the southeast corner of the residence. In the newest proposal dated March 19, 2010, the applicant proposes that both stories will be open and serve as porches. The depth of the proposed double hung porch is 6 feet 4 inches.

Staff noted in its report dated March 8, 2010 that double hung porches, also referred to as work porches, were traditionally attached to the rear ell, not the main block, as these porches served as exterior work areas while the rear ell served as interior domestic areas. Double-hung or two-tiered porches in rear ells are found on historic buildings in the Waterford Historic District. Porches on new residential construction are appropriate if they are a prevailing condition of adjacent structures. Porches also reinforce the human scale of a building. The porch, however, should reflect the size, materials, proportion, and placement of historic porches in Waterford. Porches on secondary elevations are appropriate where they will shield the house from sun during the summer (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Height, Width, and Scale, Guideline 3, p. 60; Front and Rear Porches, Text and Guidelines 1- 3, p. 70; Photo, p. 71). Therefore, since the enclosed first story no longer functions as a method to break up the mass of the main block while adding interior space to the first floor, then a more appropriate location for the double hung porch would be attached to the rear ell.

Staff notes that the applicant revised the proposed roof form by moving the attachment of the roof lower on the slope of the main block. While this is an improvement, the attachment is still not typical of historic double-hung porches. The Guidelines for Porches state that the roof form and pitch should relate to neighboring historic examples and follow historic precedents to meet the Guidelines (Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Roof Form and Materials, Guidelines 1 and 2, p. 22). As stated in the previous staff report, the beginning of the secondary roof should be closer to the end of the main block roof so that no siding is necessary between the two roofs. Photo 5 provides an example of how the porch roof should be attached.

Staff notes that no door is proposed to provide access to the second story of the proposed rear porch.

Fenestration

Front Elevation of West Wing

The applicant revised the windows proposed for the second story of the front elevation of the west wing. Initially, two symmetrical double hung windows were proposed. **Currently, a string of four windows, approximately 4 feet by 10 ½ feet total, is proposed.**



Photo 5: Example in Waterford of how a double-hung porch is typically attached to the roof of a rear ell. Notice that the main roof is built up a small amount near the end to accommodate the attachment and change in roof slope on the porch.

This window type is not characteristic of residences of the proposed style, particularly in the front elevation or in the second story. It creates a rhythm of openings that is not compatible with adjacent historic buildings, especially those of this simple, yet formal style. The window height, placement, and ratio of solids to voids are also not compatible (*Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Doors, Windows, and Shutters, Guidelines 1- 3, p. 68*). Returning to the previously proposed windows continues to be an appropriate solution. Since the west wing is smaller than the main block, then two shorter double-hung windows the same width as the windows proposed for the first story below would meet the Guidelines.

Window dimensions and details are not included in this revised application. To completely review the proposed windows, all window details and dimensions must be included on any revised plans and in the materials list.

Rear Elevation of Main Block

The fenestration on the rear elevation of the main block follows a rhythm and proportion of openings and a ratio of solids to voids that are compatible with historic neighbors. However, the applicant changed the design of the sashes in the proposed first story triple windows from square, four-pane sashes (March 8, 2010); to 6/6 double hung sashes in the current submission,. **As with the front elevation of the west wing, this window type is not characteristic of residences of the proposed style. The windows as initially proposed were more suitable.**

Window dimensions and details are not included in this revised application. To completely review the proposed windows, all window details and dimensions must be included on any revised plans and in the materials list.

Rear Elevation of Rear Ell

The applicant revised the fenestration in the rear elevation of the rear ell from two bays of paired double hung windows to two bays of single double hung. This revision meets the Guidelines.

Elevation/Plan Inconsistencies

In addition to errors previously identified in this staff report, Staff notes the following errors on the submitted elevations dated March 19, 2010:

- a.) The width of the rear one-story porch is shown on the elevations to be 15' 9" and flush with the west wall of the west wing. On the floor plan and plat, this width is shown as 14' 9" and recessed 1' from the west wall of the west wing. (Recessing the porch from the side elevation of the wing is appropriate and follows historic precedent for porch design.)
- b.) The front corner board on the east side of the west wing (the side that connects with the main block) extends the height of the main block rather than the height of the wing.

Details and Materials

This application has undergone a series of revisions over the past three months. However, each revised submission has been incomplete; lacking details, measurements and a complete list of proposed building materials. Staff reiterates that detailed, measured drawings of all architectural features and a materials list are necessary for a complete review and analysis of the CAPP application. Furthermore, the HDRC must have a complete application to consider and act upon to ensure that what is approved by the HDRC is constructed in compliance with the approved CAPP. Staff cannot recommend approval of a CAPP application unless detailed, measured drawings and a complete list of materials are submitted for review. The items listed below are all items under the purview of the HDRC when reviewing a CAPP application.

The detailed drawings must consist of the following items:

- a.) Rear one story porch details (including dimensions and materials for porch posts, balustrade (if necessary), steps (if necessary), cornice, ceiling, flooring, finish board beneath flooring)
- b.) Rear two-story porch details (including dimensions and materials for porch posts, balustrade, cornice, ceiling, flooring, finish board beneath flooring)
- c.) Dormer details
- d.) Front door frame details
- e.) Front entry feature/step details

- f.) Cornice, frieze, fascia, and rake details
- g.) Any additional architectural features or details

The materials list, including dimensions and types (e.g. window type), must consist of the following items:

- a.) Siding
- b.) Roof
- c.) Dormers
- d.) Chimney (brick color and type, mortar color and type)
- e.) Cornice, Frieze, Fascia, Rake
- f.) Doors
- g.) Windows
- h.) Porch elements (roof, cornice, balustrade, flooring, ceiling, finish board beneath flooring)
- i.) Foundation (stone color and type, mortar color and type)
- j.) Trim
- k.) Corner boards
- l.) Entry steps/stoops
- m.) Any additional architectural features or details

Staff recommends that the applicant refer to the staff reports dated February 8 and March 8, 2010 and the Waterford Guidelines for assistance regarding these details. In general, the materials and details should be in keeping with the simple, yet formal, style of the house to meet the Guidelines (*Waterford Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Architectural Details and Decoration, Guidelines 1 and 2, p. 73*).

Findings

1. The orientation and complexity of form of the proposed new construction meet the Guidelines.
2. The revised plans are incomplete due to errors, inconsistencies, omissions, a lack of detail, and a deficient materials list. Proposed architectural details and materials could not be evaluated due to insufficient information.
3. The 8-foot front and 9-foot side yard setbacks for the proposed residence as prescribed in the VCOD and CR-2 regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, are in keeping with the historic character of Janney Street, and meet the Guidelines.
4. The grade as depicted on the proposed elevations does not clearly depict how the approximate 5-foot to 6-foot decrease in elevation from the northeast corner to the northwest corner of the proposed residence will be addressed. The depiction of the exposed foundation is inconsistent on each elevation. Therefore, the proposed grade changes and the resulting exterior treatment of the foundation is not accurately depicted on the plans and cannot be evaluated against the Guidelines.

5. The revised (March 19, 2010) plans show a decrease in the overall width and side wing depth of the proposed residence from the original submission. The traditional, symmetrical, five-bay residence proposed emulates the style of several historic residences in Waterford. However, the overall mass, width, and scale of the proposed residence remain out of scale with these historic precedents. The main block is the same size as the main block of the neighboring circa 1990 residence at 40171 Janney Street, which does not have a side wing. Therefore, the overall width of the proposed residence is 15' 9" greater than the modern neighboring residence.
6. The Guidelines state that new construction should follow historic precedents. The horizontal directional expression of the proposed residence is in keeping with other historic residences of similar style in the Waterford Historic District. However, the main block of these historic houses is smaller in scale than the proposed residence and sited on larger lots with deeper setbacks or on hilltops. The entire width of the proposed residence is 19 feet wider than the historic Monroe Hough House at 40189 Patrick Street, which is the most similar in design and siting to the proposed new residence in the Waterford Historic District.
7. The fenestration on the façade (north), side (east), and rear (south) elevations of the main block; the rear of the west wing; and each elevation of the rear ell meet the Guidelines. However, the triple window in the rear (south) elevation is not characteristic of historic window types. In addition, attic windows in the gable ends of the proposed residence are in keeping with historic building details and should be added to break up the perceived mass of the east elevation of the main block and the west elevation of the west wing.
8. The fenestration on the front (north) and side (west) elevations of the west wing do not meet the Guidelines and should be revised to be compatible with adjacent historic buildings.
9. To be consistent with the Waterford Guidelines, the proposed rear two-story porch should be located on the rear ell, not the main block. The attachment to the roof of the proposed rear two-story porch does not follow traditional building methods and does not meet the Guidelines.
10. The relocation of the porch and door and removal of the dormer are acceptable since the applicant recessed the west wing an additional 2 feet for a total of 8 feet and reduced the height, which serve to break up the mass of the front facade.

Recommendation

Staff recommends deferral of the application so that the applicant may submit new plans that meet the Waterford Guidelines for the HDRC's evaluation. Staff notes that the location and square footage of the proposed residence depicted on the plat submitted March 19, 2010 do meet the Zoning Ordinance.

In order to meet the Waterford Guidelines, the new plans should include revised elevations showing:

- 1.) The correct change in grade and exposed foundation heights on all elevations, with a clear depiction (illustration or written) of how the applicant proposes to address this change, including any necessary retaining walls,
- 2.) A main block that is similar in massing, width, and scale to historic residences in the district of the same style and design (symmetrical, 5-bay, main block with a central entrance) and directional expression and on a similar lot size with similar setbacks,
- 3.) Re-designed fenestration with a compatible rhythm of openings in the front (north) and side (west) elevations of the west wing, attic windows in the gable peaks of the east elevation of the main block and the west elevation of the west wing, a door providing access to the rear two-story porch, and a compatible window type in the first story of the rear (south) elevation,
- 4.) Complete detailed drawings for the proposed rear one-story and two-story porch details, dormers, front door surround, stone front entry feature, rear entry steps (if necessary), roof-wall junction (cornice and rake), and any additional architectural features taking into account all recommendations made in the Staff Report. All details should relate to the formal, yet simple, design of the proposed house and follow traditional and historic precedents found in the Waterford Historic District,
- 5.) A complete materials list providing the dimensions, materials, type (relating to windows and doors), and treatment (e.g. painted) for all materials and details proposed for the residence, including but not limited to siding, roof, dormers, chimney, cornice, frieze, fascia, rake, doors, windows, porch elements, foundation, trim, corner boards, entry steps/stoops, and any additional architectural features or details.

Suggested Motions

1. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee defer Certificate of Appropriateness 2010-0002 for new residential construction at 40153 Janney Street in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Waterford Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the findings included on pages 13-14 of the staff report dated April 12, 2010*

OR

2. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee approve Certificate of Appropriateness 2010-0002 for new residential construction at 40153 Janney Street in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Waterford Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the findings included on pages 13-14 of the staff report dated April 12, 2010 and with the following conditions...*

OR

3. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee approve Certificate of Appropriateness 2010-0002 for new residential construction at 40153 Janney Street in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Waterford Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the findings included on pages 13-14 of the staff report dated April 12, 2010.*

OR

4. *I move alternate motion...*