

North End Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board  
Minutes  
June 5, 2008

Board members present: Steve Hudak, Carolyn Hughes, Mary Kayaselcuk, Phil Shook, Deirdre Wells, Fred Whittaker

Absent: Tracy Touchberry

It was noted that Ms. Touchberry had notified staff regarding an outside conflict which would prevent her attendance at the meeting.

COA-08-209. 326 66<sup>th</sup> Street. Jo Ann Gonclaves.

This is a request for the retroactive approval of two bay windows with thermal type windows of exact design type. Mr. Shook reviewed the guidelines for window replacement and noted that the work performed was not of a historical nature. Mr. Shook noted that the application did not include pictures of the old windows and asked Ms. Gonclaves if the new windows were the same. She answered that they were the same. Staff noted that the windows would have qualified for an administrative review if the materials were identical. The original were wood and the new windows are a composite material.

Mr. Whittaker made a motion to accept the application as presented.  
Mr. Hudak provided the second.

In favor: Whittaker, Hudak, Hughes, Kayaselcuk, Wells, Shook.  
Opposed: None

COA-08-210. 331 53rd Street. Andra Raitch

This project will remove a poorly conceived second floor garage addition that was built prior to the establishment of the ARB and rebuild this upper floor with pitched roof in harmony with the existing primary dwelling.

Mr. Shook reviewed the application and reviewed the guidelines.

Mr. Whittaker stated that the proposed project was a significant improvement over the existing conditions. He also commented that the application packet was one of the best he has reviewed while serving on the board.

The applicant representative was asked if the lattice work shown on the current structure would also be placed on the renovated structure. The representative was uncertain if that would be desired. Mr. Shook stated that the Board could go ahead and allow, at the owner's discretion, the installation of lattice of identical style of that which exists today and it could be either wood or PVC.

Ms. Wells made a motion to accept the application as presented with the additional approval of lattice work of identical spacing pattern to the original. The lattice may be installed, or not, at the owner's discretion.

Mr. Whittaker provided the second.

In favor: Whittaker, Hudak, Hughes, Kayasecuk, Wells, Shook

Opposed: None.

COA-08-211 312 62<sup>nd</sup> Street. Ray and Barbara Miller.

This application is an expansion of a previously approved application to replace four windows. The Millers would like to replace the remaining windows with windows identical to those previously approved. Mr. Whittaker noted that he was impressed that the applicants stated a desire to use applied muntins even though not required. Mr. Whittaker opined that the applicants must not find the cost of doing this prohibitive.

Mr. Whittaker made a motion to approve the application as presented.

Ms. Wells provided a second.

In favor: Whittaker, Hudak, Hughes, Kayasecuk, Wells, Shook

Opposed: None.

### **Old Business:**

Mr. Shook asked if a new list of property closings had been generated so that Guidelines could be sent to new property owners. Staff responded that the quarter will close on June 30<sup>th</sup>, and within a few days of that time a new report will be generated.

Mr. Whittaker asked staff if information requested regarding the updating of the Guidelines had been obtained. Staff stated that the updating of the guidelines was permissible at any meeting the Board chose to do so. The regulations can be modified "at will." While the Board is required to hold an advertised public meeting every year to solicit input from the community, it is not limited to that one date to make the changes deemed necessary. Mr. Whittaker stated that this needs to be in the Guidelines.

Ms. Hughes stated that she would like to know if the Millers would be willing to share the costs with the Board associated with the replacement of their windows. Staff will make an inquiry, noting that there is no obligation on the Miller's part to divulge the information.

### **New Business:**

- I. Eric Shaw of 323 52<sup>nd</sup> Street approached the Board. He introduced himself as a new neighbor and wished to get a sense of the Board's opinion regarding improvements under consideration for his property. Specifically, he discussed the installation of a new driveway where one currently does not exist. The Board stated that driveways should be in harmony with the neighborhood and similar to

those driveways already in the neighborhood. Mr. Shaw also discussed the repair and/or replacement of windows. He was assured that if he wished to repair the original windows that it was feasible. Several people in the neighborhood have undertaken such projects with success. Mr. Whittaker stated that should Mr. Shaw choose to go this route be advised that taking notes while working will be of tremendous help as the project unfolds.

- II. Mr. Whittaker stated that he wished to make the Board aware of an issue that was brought to his attention. There is a property that is sliding into a state of disrepair and clutter that seems to be brought on more by an owner facing the challenges of aging, rather than willful neglect. Mr. Whittaker suggested that the Board try to think of ways to tactfully address these issues with the owner. We have a responsibility to the community not to let this house become an eyesore.
- III. Mr. Hudak stated that he would like to consider requiring the screening of residential trash receptacles.
- IV. Mr. Hudak asked if the Matador restaurant would need to submit a new site plan for rebuilding. Staff stated that a site plan would only have to be submitted if the footprint of the original building was expanded. Staff also noted that the Board does not review commercially zoned property.
- V. Mr. Shook shared with the Board three applications that had been submitted for two vacancies on the Board. The board blank application has multiple board preferences can choose. Two of the three applications noted the NEHH ARB as first choice, while one application had it noted as a third choice. The Board unanimously stated that all other criteria being equal, we should make offers to the two parties who make ARB service their first choice.