

Minutes
April 1, 2010
North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board

The meeting was called to order at 6:00

Members present:

Chip Carpenter, Mary Kayaselcuk, Robin Stippich, Drew Velkey, Deirdre Wells.

Members Absent: The Board has two vacancies

Staff present: David Watson

Review of the minutes. Minutes of the March 18, 2010 were reviewed and approved.

Public Hearing

COA-10-237 343 52nd Street. Rear porch enclosure.

The Chairman requested the staff report.

In November of 2009 the Board voted to deny a retroactive COA for the enclosure of the rear porch at this property because the window selection and placement did not meet the Guidelines. The denial was upheld by City Council.

This request for a COA is substantially different than the previous request as the plan calls for the restoration of the upper level of the porch to the historically original condition, and only enclosing the lower level. The fenestration proposed for the lower level uses double-hung windows similar to those found in the rest of the house instead of the casement windows previously proposed. Staff reviewed section III Guidelines for consideration of additions, new building uses, and modification.

This project will restore the upper level of the porch to its historical use and condition. The enclosure of the lower porch will be augmented to match more closely the original structure.

The modifications discussed in this application are not visible from the public right-of-way. The detached garage on this property as well as a detached garage on an adjacent property provides heavy screening from adjacent properties.

The guidelines regard the enclosure of a porch as an addition.

The porch enclosure does not increase the footprint of the house.

The primary structure had Dutch lap aluminum siding installed prior to 1999. The vinyl siding on the addition is Dutch lap, but of a slightly different width.

The roof on the addition will use three-tab shingles to match the three-tab shingles on the primary structure.

The door location appears to align with the original rear door.

The windows installed on the addition are 1/1 double hung.

The Board discussed the application, noting that the J-channel around the window would be more appropriate if the coloring matched the siding, or if the window framing were slightly wider.

Dr. Velkey noted that the window on the rear of the addition does not align with the other window on the addition. However, it was noted that the window height did align with the window on the main structure.

Ms. Wells asked if the rails would be the original 24" that were removed earlier. Mr. Stambaugh stated that this was the case. Staff opined that Mr. Stambaugh might be required to install railings that meet the modern building code requirement of 36". In such case, if a motion is made to approve, flexibility should be given to meet the 36" requirement. Ms. Stippich suggested wording to allow the project to meet the building code while matching the style of the original.

Mr. Carpenter opened public comment.
There was no public comment.

Ms. Wells made a motion to allow the restore original railing to second floor porch, or similarly designed rails that meet modern building codes requirements; enclose first floor porch according to elevations submitted provided that the J-channel trim shall match the siding.

Mr. Velkey provided a second.

Aye: Kayaselcuk, Stippich, Velkey, Wells, Carpenter

Nay:

Motion carried 5:0

New Business

Steven Hudak, 71st Street approached the Board to discuss the property at 5600 Huntington Avenue. Specifically, he informed the Board that the courts have mandated that the carriage house must be restored or demolished. Mr. Hudak inquired if there were any resources available for the property owner as this property is on the historic registry. It was also noted that the property was for sale. Mr. Carpenter stated that emergency stabilization to a structure is permitted without Board review.

Ms. Wells reminded the Board that this property was discussed at the Board about two years ago. At that time, the Board noted that the current owner has owned the house for nearly twenty years, and that the emergency that has developed today was known during this time.

The consensus opinion of the Board was that there is nothing within the Board purview to provide assistance beyond offering moral support. Photographic documentation should be taken of the structure prior to demolition, should that occur. The Board recommended that the property owner perform their due diligence, which may include consultation with a structural engineer, and devise a plan of action.

Mr. Hudak thanked the Board for their time.

Hearing no more New Business or Old Business, the meeting was adjourned.