

Minutes
February 5th, 2009
North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board

The meeting was called to order at 6:00

Members present:

Chip Carpenter, Mary Kayaselcuk, Phil Shook, Robin Stippich, Tracy Touchberry, Deirdre Wells, Fred Whittaker.

Members Absent: None.

Staff present: David Watson

Review of the minutes. Minutes of the January 8, 2009 meeting were reviewed and approved without modification.

Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness (COA):

COA-09-215 was tabled because the applicant had not yet arrived.

COA-09-216. Vicki LaBarre. 317 55th Street. This request would allow the construction of a detached garage in the rear yard.

Ms. LaBarre stated that this garage will be built in the former footprint of a carriage house that was previously demolished. Chairman Shook asked Ms. Wells to read the applicable guideline section hearing for the case. Ms. Wells then reviewed the guidelines for the construction of a new garage. It was noted that the plans before the board are not for a replica carriage house. Ms. Wells noted that the application stated that the siding on the garage would be identical to the siding on primary dwelling, and a picture of this clapboard siding was provided in the application packet. However, the application summary called for Dutch lap siding. The applicant stated that the intent was to use the clapboard siding that will match the primary dwelling. The term "Dutch Lap" was used in error. Ms. LaBarre assured the Board that the correct matching clap board siding would be used on the garage.

Ms. Wells and Mr. Whittaker asked if the placement of the garage would meet city setback requirements. Staff stated that because the proposed structure would be located within the footprint of the former carriage house, it would meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The new structure could be smaller than the former structure and still comply with the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Wells asked if there were any more comments from the Board regarding the proposed structure. Mr. Shook asked for clarification regarding the windows, noting that the window style is different on each floor with the more intricate designs being on the second and third floor. Ms. LaBarre stated she has retained the services of an artist to duplicate the pattern of the upper story house windows on the new garage window.

Ms. Wells asked if there were other concerns regarding the structure before she began a discussion concerning the driveway. Mr. Shook stated that though the applicant had satisfied the guideline requirement (*that a structure larger than eighty square feet must have a window*) regarding fenestration, he would like to make a suggestion for a second window based on his observation that accessory structures dating back to the period in which the primary structure was built generally had windows in the lower story wall. Mr. Shook then provided books showing examples of period garages with lower story windows, noting again the plan as submitted met the requirements of the Guidelines. Ms. LaBarre stated that she did not want an additional window on the wall, noting that the plans already called for a divided nine-light window in the door. She also noted that the window would be facing a fence. Mr. Shook repeated that the installation of a second window was a suggestion, not a requirement. Ms. LaBarre stated again that she did not want the window, and asked why she would want a window facing a fence that would be unseen. Mr. Shook stated that the window would be historically accurate, and may be of value to succeeding property owners. Ms. LaBarre stated that she intended to stay in the house for the rest of her life, noting that if after her passing succeeding owners wished to have a window in the garage, they could install one at that time. Mr. Shook stated again that this was merely a suggestion, and that it appears that the applicant does not wish to follow this suggestion.

Mr. Whittaker asked if a window should be required for the sake of historical authenticity. Ms. LaBarre restated that the plans call for a window in the side door, and asked if the board wanted an additional window, given that the window would be facing a fenced in yard. Mr. Whittaker stated that the second window would be to make the structure historically accurate. Ms. LaBarre asked Mr. Shook if she was going to be required to install the second window. Mr. Shook stated that the plans as submitted met the requirements of the guidelines and that the second window was only a suggestion.

Revisiting the window shown in the plan that will be located in the gable, Mr. Shook stated that the muntins must be fixed and not removable.

Ms. Wells moved the discussion to address the personnel door. Noting that the presented plans call for a divided nine-light window in the door, she asked if there was a door with a similar pattern on the house. The doors on the house are solid. Ms. LaBarre stated that she had a solid door in her basement left over from a previous remodel. She further stated that "since it appears that I am going to be forced to put a second window in the garage, I might as well go with the solid door that is original to the house." (24:11). At this point the exchange between the applicant and Mr. Shook became heated. Ms. Wells moved the discussion back to the side door. Ms. LaBarre asked that if she were to change her plans to put in a solid personnel door and a second side window, would that satisfy the Board? Ms. Wells stated that she could not be required to place a second window in the structure, that it was her choice. Ms. LaBarre stated that over the years, the doors on the house had been replaced numerous times, and that she was not entirely sure what style of door was original to the house.

Mr. Whittaker made a motion to approve the application as presented with modifications to include the following:

- 1) The dormer window will be designed to match the appearance of the upper story windows of the primary structure, using fixed muntins.
- 2) The personnel door will be solid, and match the doors on the primary structure.
- 3) A window will be placed in the middle of the wall (left side elevation) that will match the window on the dormer.
- 4) The cupola will not exceed in height that which is shown in the plan, but can be shorter.

Ms. Wells provided the second.

Ms. LaBarre emphasized that she was concerned that the lower level window would present a security risk to the structure. Mr. Shook asked if she preferred not to have the window. Ms. LaBarre responded that she did not want the window because of security reasons, that she lives by herself and is afraid.

Ms. Wells noted that a motion had been made that needed to be voted on, but she asked Ms. LaBarre why the proposed window is objectionable to her, but the window in the door was not. Ms. LaBarre stated that she did not consider the door window in security terms until the discussion of the second window began. Her preference now is to have the solid door and no window.

Staff stated that the Board was still free to discuss the motion on the floor, and that an amendment could still be made. Ms. Stippich stated that she had a concern regarding the cupola, noting that she had not seen a similar feature on other structures in the neighborhood. Mr. Carpenter stated that they observed such a cupola on a garage on 64th Street. Ms. LaBarre stated that she would like to have a somewhat shorter cupola, round if possible. Mr. Whittaker stated that he had no problem with the cupola and asked if it would be functional, noting that these structures work very well in providing ventilation. Mr. Whittaker also stated that a rectangular cupola is more historically appropriate because the primary structure is characterized by angular features. There are no curved features on the house. Ms. LaBarre said that cupola would be functional, but stated that she may want to redesign it to be shorter. Ms. LaBarre asked if she could get approval for a shorter cupola tonight. The Board noted that leeway could be given to the applicant by conditioning that the cupola may extend to a height up to that which is shown in the approved plan.

Ms. Wells stated that a motion had been made and would like to call for a vote. Mr. Shook added that he would like to discuss the motion further. He stated again that he wanted the applicant to understand that the second window was a suggestion, and that she did not have to install this window if she did not want to. Mr. Whittaker told Mr. Shook that his point has been heard, and that if he objects to the window, he should vote against it.

Ms. Wells asked for a roll call vote.

Voting for the motion: Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Carpenter, Ms. Touchberry, Ms. Kayaselcuk, Ms. Stippich, Ms. Wells, Mr. Shook.

Voting against the motion:
None

Motion carried 7:0

COA-09-215. John Patterson. 326 64th Street.

This is a request to build a second floor balcony over an existing porch roof.

Mr. Carpenter reviewed the relevant section of the guidelines.

Mr. Carpenter asked Mr. Patterson to review his application for the Board. Mr. Patterson stated that some years ago, perhaps the mid 1970s, there was a walk-able balcony above a porch. At a later time the porch was enclosed, and the balcony removed. He would like to restore the upper balcony onto the enclosed porch. The balcony will be built over a rubber roof slanted at a 2" pitch to facilitate drainage. Ms. Wells asked if PVC would be used for the rail. The applicant stated that he did not like PVC and preferred wood as he felt it is more appropriate for a house of this age. Mr. Whittaker was appreciative of the applicant's efforts to maintain historical integrity, but noted that cellular PVC is virtually indistinguishable from wood. He noted as an aside that the applicant may also want to consider synthetic material such as Trex for the underlying supports, but noted that this is not pertinent to approval.

Mr. Shook noted that the railings and corner posts are of different heights, but the photo simulation shows everything at the same level. Mr. Patterson stated that the computer photo-sim seems to be washed out at the top, and does not clearly show that the posts are indeed higher. The Mr. Whittaker stated that the support poles should have caps, such as copper or cellular PVC. The rails should also have a bevel. Both of these modifications will prevent water from ponding and creating maintenance issues.

Ms. Wells made a motion to accept the application as presented modified to include caps on the posts, and beveled railings. Mr. Carpenter provided the second.

Voting for the motion: Mr. Whittaker, Ms. Carpenter, Ms. Touchberry, Ms. Kayaselcuk, Ms. Stippich, Ms. Wells, and Mr. Shook.

Election of Officers

Mr. Shook noted that elections are normally held at the January meeting, but were deferred because several members were absent from that meeting.

Mr. Shook asked for nominations for Vice Chair. Mr. Shook nominated Deirdre Wells for Vice Chairman. Ms. Kayaselcuk provided a second.

Election of Deirdre Wells as Vice Chairman

Aye: Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Carpenter, Ms. Touchberry, Ms. Kayaselcuk, Ms. Stippich, Ms. Wells, Mr. Shook.

Nay: None

Mr. Watson asked for nominations for Chairman.

Mr. Whittaker nominated Mr. Carpenter. Mr. Shook provided the second.

Election of Mr. Carpenter for Chairman

Aye: Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Carpenter, Ms. Touchberry, Ms. Kayaselcuk, Ms. Stippich, Ms. Wells, Mr. Shook

Nay: None

Congratulations were offered to Mr. Carpenter.

Second item of New Business: Ms. Wells noted that we need to continue the distribution of guidelines to new property owners. Mr. Watson asked if it would be desirable to wait until Spring, and warmer weather, to provide the Board with the new guidelines. The Board agreed.

There being no more items for discussion, Mr. Carpenter adjourned the meeting.