



Addition at 238 S. Kenilworth

Project Summary

Historic Preservation Committee Review

The project being considered at 238 S. Kenilworth is an addition to add much needed space on the first floor that includes an expanded Family Room and an enlarged Kitchen that has a stronger connection to the existing home with direct sight lines and an open plan to the existing Living and Family Rooms in the front part of the house. The first floor will also include a new Mud Room and a relocated Powder Room. On the second floor, the additional space will allow for a new Master Suite leaving the existing rooms for use as bedroom and office space.

The addition extends largely into the side yard (south), but does include a small expansion into the back yard for the Mud Room. On the south, the addition extends just past the existing wrap-around front porch, allowing for a new entry to the porch from the addition. The existing home is over nineteen feet off the property line, obviously well in excess of the minimum six foot side yard setback. The addition moves the home closer to the property line, but still retains a generous setback of over ten feet.

Per the discussion during the presentation to the ARC, it wouldn't appear that there are many questions about several of the HPC Guidelines...particularly regarding compatibility, being on a secondary or tertiary façade or changing the historic character of the building. There were, however, requests for clarification on a couple of points.

The first, which was not well developed yet at the time of the ARC presentation, was the goal of distinguishing the addition from the original home. As shown in the attached drawings, the exterior treatments have been developed so the addition will use subtle changes in siding to make that distinction, while also retaining original trim boards to suggest where the original home ended in relation to the addition. For the siding, the existing home has a base of shingle siding with a transition to narrow plank siding at roughly the level of the first floor. The upper gables return to the shingle siding. For the addition, the shingle base would be replaced with a wide horizontal siding to match the exposure of the original shingle base (which is significantly wider than the siding at the rest of the home.) A transition trim would be added at the level of the porch, matching the porch thickness. This is slightly higher and wider than the original transition, which would help link the porch and the new addition, suggesting both as additions to the original home (the porch being an earlier addition). Above that would be the narrow plank siding. But rather than that plank siding extending to the eave, a transition to shingle siding would occur at the level of the window sill of the second floor. The extension of the shingles below the gables would be a further definition of the new work versus the original.

The second area of clarification was regarding the development of a couple of features of the home. The first was the unique roofline, which nicely breaks up the massing of the roofline with a series of gables and partially hipped roofs. To address this, a gable similar to those on the original home has been added to the west façade. That gable has been integrated into the overall elevation with a change



in window configuration on the second floor, which allows the gable to sit both over the new windows and the door on the first floor, creating centerline reminiscent of that which is on the existing front façade (which is over the front picture window). This location also pushes the gable to the south side of the new roof, which gives it better spacing from the existing gables so it complements them without competing with them.

The second question was around the treatment of the existing bay on the south side of the home. First, there was some discussion of whether an addition off the back of the home would be a better alternative than altering the bay. We spend some time discussing and evaluating this, but came back to the design as proposed for two reasons. First, the unique siting of the house on the north side of the lot leaves, as noted above, an exceptionally large side yard. That space is largely unusable to the family because it sits between the two houses making it impractical as a play space (lest you break a window) or a gathering space (which is uncomfortable, being wedged between two houses with the neighbors windows looking down on you.) As such, it is never used. That, as opposed to the current back yard, which is generous and comfortable with nice trees and landscaping making a great space for barbequing and entertaining. So the addition off the side of the house preserves the more usable and valuable property, while taking advantage of underused space for the addition. The second consideration was the use of the house inside. The current configuration unifies the kitchen with the current Family and Living Rooms, making those existing spaces integral to the regularly used spaces of the home visually and functionally. An addition off the back of the home, which CWDesign has done on many occasions because there was no other option, pushes the kitchen further back in the house, which divorces it from the front of the home. Time and time again, additions off the back of the home result in the front rooms of the home being largely abandoned. This renovation as proposed is exciting because it will maintain the original rooms of the home as integral parts of the living space for the family in its daily life....and what better way to preserve the history of the home than have people experience it every day.

The last point of discussion regarding the bay was whether there might be some value in preserving the existing shaping on the first floor (with the diagonal walls) in the addition. This was considered during the design refinements, but was thought to compete with the strategy for the siding (described in detail above) which uses a transition from horizontal siding to shingle siding to distinguish the addition from the existing home. Given the other points of discussion, we thought that maintaining the distinction was more important to reinforce, thus the design as proposed.

Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to speaking with you further at the meeting on December 8th.