



Project Name/Address: 2020 Eastwood Drive
designated landmark, Kennedy Dairy Horse Barn

Application Type: Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alteration/addition

Legistar File ID # [41825](#)

Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: March 30, 2016

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Jon Brakebill, Filament Marketing, LLC

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alteration/addition to a landmark

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is a landmark site located adjacent to Atwood Avenue.

Relevant Ordinance Sections:

- 41.18 STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.** A certificate of appropriateness shall be granted only if the proposed project complies with this chapter, including all of the following standards that apply.
- (1) New construction or exterior alteration. The Landmarks Commission shall approve a certificate of appropriateness for exterior alteration or construction only if:
 - (a) In the case of exterior alteration to a designated landmark, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
 - (b) N/A
 - (c) N/A
 - (d) In the case of any exterior alteration or construction for which a certificate of appropriateness is required, the proposed work will not frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City's historic resources.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Analysis and Conclusion

This request came before the Landmarks Commission on March 14, 2016 and the Commission voted to refer the action to a future meeting to allow the Applicant time to make revisions that may meet the standards. A public hearing was noticed and held on March 14, 2016; however, because a public hearing is not required in this case, the revised design will be reviewed by the Landmarks Commission without a public hearing.

The Applicant is requesting to add a second floor addition to the existing concrete block one story element of the landmark building. The barn structure was constructed in circa 1904. The date of construction for the cinderblock addition is unknown, but it was present when the landmark designation was prepared in 1985.

The proposed addition would sit on top of the existing block addition and have three distinct masses with the center mass having a different expression in siding color and type and pitched roof. The center mass also cantilevers over the south wall of the existing addition and is held away from the barn eave on the north side. The masses near the north and south ends are stepped back from the addition walls below. The addition roof is proposed to be flat and intersect the existing barn structure gable roof parallel to one side.

A brief discussion of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation follows:

1. The use of the property is not being altered by the request. The building was adaptively reused as office space in 1985 and will continue to serve as office space. The distinctive barn form is being altered by the proposed addition.
2. The historic character of the property is largely being retained and preserved. The purpose and construction date of the existing concrete block addition is unknown, but it was constructed to complement the use of the historic barn structure. Providing a second floor addition to this existing previous addition will alter the appearance. The addition mass has been pulled away from the roof eave to allow the barn roof form to remain unobscured. The center mass of the addition adds a feature that is distracting to the pure barn form. The plane of the addition siding should be in line with or inset from the exterior plane of the existing block addition below instead of projecting out from the plane of the block to allow the addition to have a light touch and not feel top heavy. There are other massing options that may allow the barn form to be less affected by the addition that should be discussed.

3. Conjectural features are not being added. The addition of the second floor to the previous one story addition is being realized in a different material so that the addition reads as the progression of changes to the building over time.
4. The purpose and construction date of the existing concrete block addition is unknown, but it was constructed to complement the use of the historic barn structure. While the addition may not be historically significant, it is part of the history of the landmark.
5. The roof form is a distinctive feature of this building. The revised design allows the roof form to remain unobscured at the eaves. Other distinctive materials, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the historic barn structure will largely remain.
6. The historic features of the barn structure will remain.
7. Chemical or physical treatments are not being proposed.
8. Archaeological resources are not known to be located on this site and the construction of the addition will not require site disturbance.
9. The revised addition allows the roof form which is a character defining feature of this building to remain visible at each gable end. The massing of the proposed addition has been revised to allow the roof form to remain unobscured. The center mass of the addition adds a feature that is distracting to the pure barn form. There are other massing options that may allow the barn form to be less affected by the addition that should be discussed. The proposed new work is compatible with the existing materials.
10. The proposed second floor addition could be removed in the future and the form and integrity of the property would be largely unimpaired.

Recommendation

Staff believes that at a minimum, the design could be revised in the following ways to better meet the standards:

1. The plane of the addition siding should be in line with or inset from the exterior plane of the existing block addition below instead of projecting out from the plane of the block to allow the addition to have a light touch.
2. Simplify the addition massing so that the parapet height is the consistent on the entire addition.
3. Simplify the addition expression so that there is one siding type and color.
4. The Applicant shall consider alternate addition massing options.

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition to the landmark are not met with the proposed design; however, it is possible that the Applicant will provide revised drawings at the meeting of April 4, 2016 for Commission review which will relate to the comments in this staff report. Staff recommends that the Landmarks Commission refer the request to a future meeting so that staff and the Commission have time to thoroughly review the revised drawings pursuant to the approval standards or the Applicant has time to work with staff on a design that will meet the standards.