

## Chapter 9, Guidelines for Rehabilitation: Additions

<b>Section:</b>	N/A	<b>Title:</b>	N/A	<b>Source:</b>	HPC Workshop
				<b>Date:</b>	3/22/18
<b>Public Comment:</b>	Overall concern that this section is too prescriptive and needs to open up to more possibilities on a case by case basis. The Federated Charities building is a great example of an addition that could not be built under these guidelines.				
<b>Response:</b>	This entire chapter was evaluated. There is nothing that would prohibit the example noted from being constructed under these design guidelines, but it is also an excellent example of an addition.				
<b>Section:</b>	A	<b>Title:</b>	Typical Additions	<b>Source:</b>	HPC Workshop
				<b>Date:</b>	3/22/18
<b>Public Comment:</b>	Add language addressing additions for non-residential buildings. For consistency with Chapter 6, language addressing commercial, industrial, and service buildings as well as worship and educational institutions may need to be addressed.				
<b>Response:</b>	Additional language addressing non-residential additions was added.				
<b>Section:</b>	C	<b>Title:</b>	Effect on Historic Wall Openings	<b>Source:</b>	HPC Special Workshop
				<b>Date:</b>	2/15/18
<b>Commissioner Comment:</b>	Review the use of affect/effect.				
<b>Response:</b>	The edit was proposed as a result of a previous comment. Title will remain "Effect on Historic Wall Openings."				
<b>Section:</b>	E	<b>Title:</b>	Additions that are not Permitted	<b>Source:</b>	HPC Workshop
				<b>Date:</b>	3/22/18
<b>Public Comment:</b>	Concern about not permitting stories to be added to the elevations of contributing or significant resources that are visible from the street. This is too broad and should be on a case by case basis provided there is a clear break between old and new.				
<b>Response:</b>	Language to this effect was added.				
<b>Section:</b>	G	<b>Title:</b>	Scale and Massing	<b>Source:</b>	HPC Workshop
				<b>Date:</b>	3/22/18
<b>Public Comment:</b>	Stating that additions cannot be taller than the existing building seems to be inconsistent with the guidelines for new construction which permit taller buildings. Consider a less restrictive approach that addresses relationships between buildings and appropriate infill.				
<b>Response:</b>	It is appropriate to consider additions to historic buildings more strictly than new infill construction, especially when an addition would potentially be visible from the street because there is greater opportunity for the historic character of that building to be negatively affected. Language permitting taller additions at the rear/set back with no or limited visibility from the street as potentially appropriate if the historic character of the building is not negatively impacted was added.				
<b>Section:</b>	H	<b>Title:</b>	Preservation of Setting	<b>Source:</b>	HPC Workshop
				<b>Date:</b>	3/22/18
<b>Public Comment:</b>	Concern about 30% greenspace requirement.				

**Response:**

This section was edited to refer back to Chapter 8. It is the consensus of the Commission to maintain the 30% standard.