

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**  
**AGENDA**  
**June 5, 2014 - 4:00 PM**  
**Council Chambers - Rouss City Hall**

**1. POINTS OF ORDER**

- A. Roll Call
- B. Approval of Minutes – May 15, 2014 meeting

**2. CONSENT AGENDA**

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. **BAR-13-595** Request of Leicester Square, LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction and a request to demolish an existing structure less than 75 years old at the properties located at 10 East Leicester Street and 412 South Loudoun Street. (***Continuation - remaining items for consideration are: roofing, exterior lighting, and porch details***)

**5. OTHER DISCUSSION**

- A. Review draft guidelines pertaining to substitute materials.

**6. ADJOURN**

**\*\*\*APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE MUST BE PRESENT AT THE MEETING\*\*\***

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
MINUTES**

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, May 15, 2014, at 4:00p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street, Winchester, Virginia

**POINTS OF ORDER:**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Rockwood, Mr. Bandyke, Mr. Walker, Mr. Serafin, Ms. Jackson,

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** Will Moore, Nasser Rahimzadeh, Carolyn Barrett

**VISITORS:** Tim Machado, Eugene Smith, John Willingham, Lanita Byrne, Eric Lowman, John Barker, Bill LesCallett, Greg Tookes, Stephen Melling, Sandra Bosley

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Chairman Rockwood called for additions or corrections to the minutes of May 1, 2014. Mr. Walker moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**BAR-14-286** Request of Union Jack Pub for a Certificate of Appropriateness to extend the rear deck and railing at 101 North Loudoun Street.

Tim Machado of Designs Concepts stated the owner would like to extend raised the deck past the walk-in cooler. It will not be a seating area, but will instead be used to plant an herb garden. It will match the existing construction and the materials are not composite or synthetic. Mr. Walker asked if they would be painting the unpainted portions of the existing structure deck. Mr. Machado said the stairs and the rail would be painted. Chairman Rockwood asked if there would be any pressure treated wood and Mr. Machado said there would be for the framing underneath. Ms. Jackson asked about the appearance of the planters to be used. Mr. Machado did not have any information regarding the planters. Mr. Moore suggested that the Board could act on the request for the deck as presented and that staff will check with the owner about the planters. If determined that these will require review, they can be presented in a subsequent application.

*Mr. Bandyke made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to **BAR-14-286** request to extend the rear deck and railing at 101 North Loudoun Street as drawn with the intention that it is only to support greenery and not people, paint color to blend in with current paint scheme. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0.*

**BAR-14-291** Request of Eugene B. Smith for a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement windows and an over-door canopy at 221 South Cameron Street.

Mr. Smith presented his plans to replace windows and build a canopy over the door on the Clifford Street side. The canopy would have wood framing and be painted to match the house. There was some discussion pertaining to the canopy materials and how it would be constructed. Mr. Smith described how it would be attached to the house and that he would like to have the option to use a copper roof. Mr. Bandyke asked about the pane configuration for the windows; the drawing includes an example of a 1/1 window, whereas the windows in the photos are 2/2. Mr. Smith stated that this was just an example of the Marvin wood window. The actual pane configuration will match the existing windows.

*Mr. Bandyke made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to **BAR-14-291** to replace existing windows with Marvin, two-over-two double-hung wood windows with true muntins; paint to match the existing colors; removal of storm windows; and, to build a small canopy as submitted, with materials to be wood and with either a copper or standing seam metal roof. Mr. Walker seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0.*

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**BAR-13-595** Request of Leicester Square, LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction and a request to demolish an existing structure less than 75 years old at the properties located at 10 East Leicester Street and 412 South Loudoun Street. *(Continuation - remaining items for consideration are: roofing, exterior lighting, and porch details)*

Mr. Willingham presented the request for the roofing on the project. Porch details and lighting will be presented at a later date. He stated he would like to use architectural shingles on the primary roofs and standing seam metal on the porch roofs. He stated that it will be a nice accent and fit in with the neighborhood. He stated that it is the same primary roofing material that was approved for another project on the Board's agenda at 314 South Kent Street.

Chairman Rockwood stated that the consideration of substitute materials is under discussion. He stated that he recognizes that there are other properties where shingles were used in places that predate when the Board was formed. It is an area that is becoming of concern to the Board. He had hoped to see a metal roof on this project. Mr. Willingham said he had consulted with an architectural historian and that this is a new project and not a renovation project. Chairman Rockwood said that there are many aspects to the project that make it clear to the observer that it is not a mimicking of an older design. He felt they were sufficiently designed to make them distinct.

Mr. Bandyke said because it is new, it would look a lot classier with a metal roof. Mr. Serafin said they are large planes and a metal roof on the building would give it scale and would be more sympathetic to the older buildings in the area. Chairman Rockwood said they would be visible behind the older buildings on the street. Mr. Willingham said shingles have been approved in other areas. Mr. Walker said that architectural shingles are acceptable in situational matters if they are not as prominent.

Chairman Rockwood said it was a difficult situation and he appreciated that they had worked with the Board on this project. There have been many aspects to this project, including site layout, building orientation and garages with which the applicant has worked cooperatively with Board. He asked the Board members if they had any other comments or discussion. Ms. Jackson said she understood the need for compromise. She stated she was not comfortable with saying that it should be one or the other since it is not a preservation project but is new construction.

Chairman Rockwood asked for a motion on the roofing request. The porch details and lighting items were deferred to a later date. Mr. Moore stated a point of order that, unless the applicant was willing to use materials other than submitted, then a motion should be made on the actual request for architectural shingles on the main roofs and metal on the porch roofs. If the motion was for denial, they need to state, per the ordinance requirement, the reason for denying the request.

*Mr. Bandyke made a motion to deny the request for **BAR-13-595** by Leicester Square LLC for use of architectural shingles because:*

- *The proposal is inconsistent with brochure 7 (New Residential Construction) of the Winchester Historic District Design Guidelines, page 7 pertaining to roofs, which states: "1) When designing new houses, respect the character of roof types and pitches in the immediate area around the new construction; and 2) For new construction in the historic district, use traditional roofing materials such as slate or metal. This design relates better to the visual image of historic shingle patterns than thin asphalt types."; and,*
- *The proposal is inconsistent with the same brochure, page 10 pertaining to materials and textures which states: "The selection of materials and textures for a new dwelling should be compatible with and complement neighboring historic buildings."; and,*
- *Because of the scale and proportion of the main roofs, the material would detract from the character of the Historic District.*

Mr. Bandyke asked if it was appropriate to include a recommendation with the motion. Mr. Moore stated that the Board may include recommendations in conjunction with a motion to deny.

*Mr. Bandyke further recommended that standing seam metal would be an appropriate material for the primary roofs on the structures.*

*Mr. Serafin seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 4-1, with Ms. Jackson in opposition.*

**BAR-14-78** Request of Lanita R. Byrne for a Certificate of Appropriateness for patio fencing and to install planters at 165 North Loudoun Street.

Ms. Byrne re-presented her request. This request was tabled at an earlier date to wait for a proposal to rewrite the zoning ordinance pertaining to the area of the cafe. The planters which would secure the fence have not been installed yet. Mr. Moore reminded the Board that they had been prepared to approve the fence design and planter boxes request previously. They had decided to wait because of the question about reducing the depth of the enclosure and whether or not the applicant would have had to revise the design of the planter boxes as a result.

Staff is asking that the Board act on what is submitted because the status of a possible Ordinance amendment is uncertain. As long as the application is open, she is using public space without the requisite permit. She may have to come back at a later time with revisions if necessary.

*Mr. Walker made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to **BAR-14-78** for the fence height and design of the planter boxes and fence as submitted. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion.*

Chairman Rockwood clarified that the Board is not approving the 17 foot depth of the enclosure.

*Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0.*

**BAR-14-215** Request of Oakcrest Properties, LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new two-family dwelling at 314 South Kent Street. (*Continuation - remaining items for consideration are siding and trim materials*)

Eric Lowman reviewed the project and materials previously presented. He was accompanied by Bill LesCallett, a representative of LP Building Products. Mr. LesCallett spoke about the production and materials of the LP SmartSide siding product in question.

The Board asked questions about how the product would be installed, durability, warranty and appearance. There was discussion about new/substitute materials and the character of the Historic District.

John Barker stated that he was confused. It is a little inconsistent that architectural shingles are okay here, but not for the Leicester Square project. HardiPlank was okay for Leicester Square, but it sounds like substitute siding might not be okay here.

Mr. Walker stated that situational approval is important. Just because a material is approved at one location in the Historic District does not mean it will be okay in all situations because of scale, location and other factors.

Mr. Lowman stated that this siding material is being used on another of their projects at 609 South Kent Street, which is outside the District. The siding should be on in another 4-6 weeks. He asked if it would be helpful to see the product installed.

Board members agreed that it would be helpful. Chairman Rockwood asked if they are requesting the matter to be tabled.

Mr. Barker stated that they would prefer it to be tabled rather than denied.

*Mr. Bandyke made a motion to table **BAR-14-215** until the applicant has a sample installed at 609 South Kent Street. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0.*

**BAR-14-231** Request of Kee Construction Services, Inc. for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows at 12 North Washington Street.

Stephen Melling stated that the request had been tabled previously in order to wait for a sample of the window. He stated that they were unable to secure a sample and that time is of the essence.

He stated that they are amending the request to now propose all wood windows to match existing.

*Mr. Walker made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to **BAR-14-231** request to replace existing windows with all wood windows with the light divisions to match existing. Mr. Serafin seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0.*

**DISCUSSION:**

The Board reviewed and discussed the draft guidelines pertaining to substitute materials. Chairman Rockwood stated that, overall, it was a very good document. He stated that he is glad to see language stating a preference for traditional materials. Some suggestions were made to strengthen the language pertaining to context of applications and to make it clear that approval of a material in one instance does not imply that the material is okay in all instances.

Mr. Moore stated that brief lists of substitute materials that may be appropriate in some instances and that are inappropriate in all instances was included. These were not meant to be all-encompassing; if the Board has additional suggestions to expand the lists, it would be helpful. Chairman Rockwood suggested that Mr. Walker and Mr. Serafin might be able to help with this because of their expertise. Mr. Moore stated that staff would work to incorporate the suggestions and return with a revised draft.

**ADJOURN:**

With no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:56pm.

CERTIFICATE #: BAR-13-595  
DATE SUBMITTED: 12-11-13



Rouss City Hall  
15 North Cameron Street  
Winchester, VA 22601

Telephone: (540) 667-1815  
FAX: (540) 722-3618  
TDD: (540) 722-0782  
Website: www.winchesterva.gov

APPLICATION  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

LEICESTER SQUARE, LLC  
JOHN WILLOUGHAM  
925 MEADOW CT  
WINC, VA 22601

Please print or type all information

<u>540-532-6259</u> Telephone	<u>HARMAN CONSTRUCTION INC. - Bill Wiley</u> Applicant (use reverse to list additional applicants)
<u>bwiley@harmanconstruction.com</u> E-mail address	<u>1024 PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD</u> Street Address
<u>[Signature]</u> Owner's Signature (use reverse to list additional owners)	<u>HARRISBURG VA 22801</u> City State Zip
<u>443.759.0641</u> Telephone	<u>PATRICIA N. ADAMS</u> Owner Name (as appears in Land Records)
<u>patricia7585@gmail.com</u> E-mail address	<u>1601 BOLTON ST.</u> Street Address
	<u>Baltimore MD 21217</u> City State Zip

owner/applicant as of 5/1/14

PROPERTY LOCATION  
Current Street Address(es) 10 E. LEICESTER ST. & 412 S. LOVORN ST. Use VACANT  
Zoning: RBI Year Constructed: N/A Historic Plaque? Y ( ) N (x) Number: \_\_\_\_\_

TYPE OF REQUEST - Submit TEN(10) copies of all materials needed for each request, and any additional information with this form.

<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition	<input type="checkbox"/> Sign (specific type) and # _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Exterior Change
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Freestanding	<input type="checkbox"/> Siding
<input type="checkbox"/> Addition	<input type="checkbox"/> Wall	<input type="checkbox"/> Roofing
<input type="checkbox"/> Fence	<input type="checkbox"/> Projecting	<input type="checkbox"/> Windows/Doors
<input type="checkbox"/> Wall	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Paint
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Hearing Date(s) 12-19-13 \* 02-20-14 \* \* 5/15/14

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS IS: \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ DISAPPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ TABLED \_\_\_\_\_ WITHDRAWN

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary, Board of Architectural Review

\* 2/20/14 - approved as submitted w/ following exceptions:  
1) roofing, 2) ext. lighting, 3) porch details

\* 5/15/14 - proposal for arch. shingles on all primary roofs + s.s. metal on all porch roofs denied

Rouss City Hall  
15 North Cameron Street  
Winchester, VA 22601

Telephone: (540) 667-1815  
FAX: (540) 722-3618  
TDD: (540) 722-0782  
Website: [www.winchesterva.gov](http://www.winchesterva.gov)

May 16, 2014

Leicester Square, LLC  
925 Meadow Ct  
Winchester, VA 22601

Mr. Willingham:

On Thursday, May 15, 2014, the Board of Architectural Review acted on the following request:

**BAR-13-595** Request of Leicester Square, LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction and a request to demolish an existing structure less than 75 years old at the properties located at 10 East Leicester Street and 412 South Loudoun Street.

On a vote of 4-1, the Board denied the use of architectural shingles for **BAR-13-595** because:

- The proposal is inconsistent with brochure 7 (New Residential Construction) of the *Winchester Historic District Design Guidelines*, page 7 pertaining to roofs, which states: "1) When designing new houses, respect the character of roof types and pitches in the immediate area around the new construction; and 2) For new construction in the historic district, use traditional roofing materials such as slate or metal. This design relates better to the visual image of historic shingle patterns than thin asphalt types."; and,
- The proposal is inconsistent with the same brochure, page 10 pertaining to materials and textures which states: "The selection of materials and textures for a new dwelling should be compatible with and complement neighboring historic buildings."; and,
- Because of the scale and proportion of the main roofs, the material would detract from the character of the Historic District.


The Board further recommended that standing seam metal would be an appropriate material for the primary roofs on the structures.

The decision only applies to the proposal for roofing materials. Other portions of the application that have received previous approval (accessory structure demolition, site design and layout, building elevations, etc.) remain in effect. Items remaining for consideration are porch details and exterior lighting.

The decision may be appealed to the Common Council of the City of Winchester within 30 days of the Board's decision per Section 14-9-1.1 of the Zoning Ordinance. Also, because the disapproval was accompanied by a recommendation, you may again be heard by the Board if, within 90 days, the application is amended to comply with the recommendation per Section 14-4-4.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions at 667-1815, ext. 1413.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "William M. Moore".

William M. Moore  
Planner

*“To provide a safe, vibrant, sustainable community while striving to constantly improve the quality of life for our citizens and economic partners.”*

## Will Moore

---

**From:** John Willingham <john@willinghamenterprises.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 16, 2014 3:27 PM  
**To:** Will Moore  
**Subject:** BAR 13-595

Will - I would like to submit to you for the next BAR meeting that as a compromise from the motion made to deny my roofing request that I submit the following:

1. Metal roofs on the Loudoun St duplexes - matches the dominant roof type on this street.
2. Arch shingles on the 6 rear units which matches the dominant roof type on this street. Additionally, we will include metal on the porch roof for these six.

Photos of adjacent properties will be included as additional evidence for this compromise.

Please advise if you need anything else.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPad



METAL

SHINGLES

METAL

METAL

METAL

FLAT

SHINGLES

SHINGLES

SHINGLES

SHINGLES

SHINGLES

SHINGLES


SHINGLES

SHINGLES


SHINGLES







1 SOUTH  
1/4" = 1'-0"



2 EAST  
1/4" = 1'-0"

BAR-13-595  
 Per 5/16/14 email  
 ROOFING FOR  
 THESE 3 UNITS:  
 ARCH SHINGLES FOR  
 MAIN ROOFS  
 METAL ROOFS  
 FOR PORCHES

No.	Date	Description



PRELIMINARY PLAN  
 NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION  
 \*\*\* FOR HARMAN CONSTRUCTION USE ONLY \*\*\*

**HARMAN**  
 construction inc.  
 1024 Pleasant Valley Road, Hanover VA 22801  
 Phone: (540) 434-4459  
 Fax: (540) 434-4209

STONERIDGE  
 DEVELOPMENT UNIT 1-3  
 WINCHESTER, VIRGINIA  
 ELEVATIONS

Date: 10/1/13  
 Drawn By: D SMITH  
 Checked By: J ELLINGER

Sheet Number:  
**A-201**



BAR-13-595  
 per 5/16/14 email  
 ROOFING FOR  
 THESE 3 UNITS:  
 - ARCH SHINGLES FOR  
 MAIN ROOFS  
 - METAL ROOFS FOR  
 PORCHES

No.	Date	Description

PRELIMINARY PLAN  
 NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION  
 \*\*\* FOR HARMAN CONSTRUCTION USE ONLY \*\*\*


**HARMAN**  
 construction inc.  
 1024 Pleasant Valley Road, Harrisonburg, VA 22801  
 Phone: (540) 434-4159  
 Fax: (540) 434-4209

STONERIDGE  
 DEVELOPMENT UNIT 4-6  
 WINCHESTER, VIRGINIA  
 ELEVATIONS

Date: 10/1/13  
 Drawn By: D SMITH  
 Checked By: J ELLINGER

Sheet Number:  
**A-201**

# Winchester Historic District Design Guidelines



## SUBSTITUTE MATERIALS

This brochure serves as an amendment to the adopted [Winchester Historic District Design Guidelines](#), published in 1999 in a series of seven brochures. The intent of this brochure is to update or reinforce existing guidelines pertaining to the use of substitute materials.

New building materials routinely become available for use. Each of these can change the character of a building depending on the nature of the material, the material it is intended to replace, and the prominence of where the material is placed. In the mid to late 20th century, vinyl, aluminum, and asphalt shingle siding, synthetic frame windows, and thin asphalt roofing shingles came into common usage. These materials are usually inconsistent with the historic character of buildings in the District. More recently a variety of composition board sidings have been developed. While these materials more closely resemble traditional wood siding, they often lack the subtle visual characteristics that define the overall historic character of a building.

As stated in Brochure 1, *Owning Property in the Historic District*, and in Article 14 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance, the [Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation](#) remain as the primary guidance for the Board of Architectural Review when considering an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Secretary's Standards, plus its related Technical Guidance Publications (including its Preservation Briefs), are largely weighted toward guidance pertaining to preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of existing, contributing resources. Guidance as to additions and new construction is much more limited.

**Standards applicable to additions/new construction:**

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.

The consideration of the use of substitute materials will generally fall into one of three categories: 1) Replacement/Rehabilitation of Existing Appropriate Materials; 2) Replacement/Rehabilitation of Existing Inappropriate or Synthetic Materials; or, 3) New Additions or New Construction. The appropriateness of such materials will vary depending on the intended application.

### **1) Replacement/Rehabilitation of Existing Appropriate Materials**

The Secretary of Interior's Standards and existing *Winchester Historic District Design Guidelines* continue to serve as the guiding documents for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Original materials should be retained and repaired as needed wherever practical. All repairs should match the original work in design, material, texture and workmanship. Where replacement is necessary due to excessive deterioration or damage, appropriate replacements should match the historic conditions in design, materials, appearance and workmanship to the greatest degree practical.

In general, substitute or synthetic materials will not be approved for replacement or repair of original or otherwise appropriate materials on existing structures. For example, replacement of deteriorated wood siding with fiber-cement siding is not appropriate. Preservation Brief 16, [The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors](#), is a good resource for examining the limited circumstances that warrant consideration of use of substitute materials.

### **2) Replacement/Rehabilitation of Existing Inappropriate or Synthetic Materials**

This category is intended to address rehabilitation of structures that were constructed or modified with non-traditional materials prior to the adoption of the Historic Winchester District. Examples may include structures that were fitted with vinyl, aluminum, or asphalt shingle siding, synthetic frame windows, or thin asphalt roofing shingles prior to the requirements for obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness. This category is not intended to provide a means of redress for work that was done in violation of the Ordinance.

Owners of such properties are encouraged to remove synthetic materials where they have been previously installed and to reclaim and restore any underlying original materials or replace with traditional materials. However, it may be appropriate to replace previously applied synthetic materials with substitute synthetic materials that better replicate original/traditional materials found in the District. For example, it may be appropriate to upgrade from vinyl or aluminum siding to fiber cement siding (a composite material made of sand, cement and cellulose fibers), or to upgrade from thin asphalt shingles to "architectural" shingles (also known as "dimensional" shingles; a multi-layer, laminated shingle which gives more varied, contoured visual effect to a roof surface).

### 3) New Additions or New Construction

Synthetic materials generally do not replicate the defining characteristics - warmth, patina, texture, light-reflecting qualities, etc. - of traditional materials. An abundance of such materials detract from the District's character. Traditional materials remain preferred for additions or new construction; however, certain substitute materials may be appropriate when they are compatible and complementary to materials on adjacent historic structures. Such materials should replicate the workability of original materials (i.e. substitute siding should be adhered and applied in traditional patterns such as wood siding commonly found in the District).

#### FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

When using substitute materials, avoid combinations that contribute to a patchwork appearance. For example, use a uniform application of primary wall-cladding material on all sides of the building rather than different materials on various elevations. Creating a false façade (such as using traditional materials on a front elevation and substitute materials on secondary elevations) is generally not appropriate. However, a combination may be appropriate to differentiate separate elements (such as addition from the original structure).

Examples of possible applications of substitute materials:

<p><b><u>MAY be appropriate</u></b></p> <p>Fiber cement or engineered (composite) wood siding Architectural (dimensional) shingles Wood frame windows with fiberglass or other durable cladding <b>Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS)</b> _____ _____</p> <p><b><u>Inappropriate</u></b></p> <p>Vinyl or aluminum siding Thin asphalt shingles Vinyl/plastic/aluminum frame windows _____ _____</p>
--

When considering the application of substitute materials, the Board shall consider the prominence of such features in relation to the primary structure (for additions) and adjacent properties and, in general, Standard #9 pertaining to differentiation of old and new work and compatibility with regard to massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The relationship of a building to its site and its surrounding neighborhood is a significant dimension of its character; as such, ***the context of the application is important***. Just as a particular roof dormer, ornate cornice, or porch column on an historic structure may be appropriate in one application but not another, approval of use of a substitute material in one application does not imply a precedence by which it is appropriate in other applications without regard to context. Such materials, when used judiciously, can effectively complement other properties in the District without becoming defining characteristics themselves.