

**Minutes
Emergency Meeting
January 17th, 2008
North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00

Members present:

Steven Hudak, Carolyn Hughes, Mary Kayaselcuk, Phil Shook, Deirdre Wells, Fred Whittaker

Members Absent: The Board has one vacancy.

Staff present: David Watson
Sheila McAllister

Call to order 6:00pm

COA-08-204. Brian and Kristen Boucher 340 56th Street. Replacement of a front door. Chairman Shook reviewed the application and reviewed the relevant section of the guidelines. The Board noted that an oval glass in the window was more characteristic of the Queen Anne style. The Boucher's house is Craftsman in nature. One of the defining characteristics of the Craftsman tradition is the use of rectangles. As such, a rectangular glass in the door would be more appropriate for this house. The applicant asked if there was a problem with fiberglass. Mr. Whittaker stated that this would not be a problem and that he applauded the choice of fiberglass because it is a very durable and low maintenance item. Wood, on the other hand, is perishable. He further stated that there are many fiberglass doors of the appropriate style available from numerous vendors. Mrs. Wells added that her research found several compatible choices at Lowe's. Chairman Shook showed the applicants several sample patterns for doors that are appropriate to the Craftsman tradition. The Bouchers stated that they will submit a choice for their door for the February 7th, 2008 meeting.

Mrs. Wells made a motion to table the application until February so that the Bouchers could choose a Craftsman style door for the Board to review. Mr. Hudak provided the second, and the motion passed unanimously.

COA-08-203. David and Karen Hammond. 337 55th Street.

The Hammonds explained that they discovered extensive termite and wood rot damage in the process of routine maintenance. Several main structural supports were in fact gone. The siding will need to be entirely removed in order to survey and repair the damage. They also stated that windows placed in the third floor bedroom as part of a rehabilitation after a fire were too small and needed to be replaced with windows that comply with fire safety standards. Much of the emergency concerns were discovered near the Christmas holidays and needed to be addressed immediately.

The application covered a long list of items. Each was reviewed and voted on separately. Public comment was solicited for each section.

Siding.

Chairman Shook read the following from the application: *New siding on the entire exterior – we plan to replace the 4” aluminum siding with premium vinyl cedar shakes. To add interest to a large, disproportionate exterior, we want to install 7” straight shakes on the bottom floor and 7” rough vinyl shake on the upper floors broken up with a band of white between the first and second floors and white corner trim. The old shed behind the house will be sided to match. The original siding was 4” clapboard on the first floor with cedar shake on the second floor, but the exterior proportions do not make this a good option.* He then read the related section of the guidelines.

The Chairman also noted that Section IV of the Guidelines states *The Board reserves the right to take exception to exact wordings and to accommodate unique situations provided the decisions reflect the overall intent and purpose of these guidelines.*

The application packet provided showed photographic examples of the proposed siding and physical samples were brought for the Board’s review as well.

A photo of a nearly identical house in the neighborhood was shown to the board. The houses differed in that the Hammond’s house had significant alterations to the roofline as the result of a fire in the 1980s.

Chairman Shook noted that the choice of a multi-patterned shingled siding could be appropriate for a Craftsman style home. However he noted that in the Huntington Heights neighborhood that a more typical application was to have a stucco first floor, or a broad board siding, with the shingles starting on the second story. Noting that the structure has already been significantly altered from its original state, he stated that this style might not be applicable. Chairman Shook noted that the Craftsman style usually incorporated a uniform shingle style over the entire structure and asked if the applicants had considered this option. The applicants responded that they preferred the two shingle types divided by a white band.

Mr. Whittaker stated that he supports the applicant’s proposal for the new siding, especially in light of the fact that the house has already been significantly altered from its original design pattern. He then made a motion to accept this portion of the application as presented. Mrs. Wells provided a second. The motion passed unanimously.

Windows:

Chairman Shook read the applicant’s proposal as follows *Rewrap windows – they are currently wrapped with aluminum and they will be rewrapped with white vinyl. Install new vinyl replacement windows – six side windows currently have only storm windows and need windows installed. Four windows on the third floor (two are on the front) do not match the others in the house and, when opened, are too small to exit in the event*

of a fire. These will be replaced to meet life safety codes. We will replace all other windows to match. All existing storm windows will be removed. It was noted that the third floor bedroom windows would have to be replaced to meet life safety requirements. He then read the relevant section of the guidelines, noting that the Guidelines require the grill to be affixed permanently to the exterior of the pane.

The Board noted that the all window trim had been previously wrapped and that would allow wrapping of the new windows. The house has four window styles among the total of thirty windows. The proposed new windows will all be 4/1 GBG (grill between glass). The settling of the exterior walls has caused some window frames to distort, while others are in a state of significant decay. These window frames will need to be removed and rebuilt. Mr. Whittaker asked for clarification of the resizing of the third floor windows. The applicant stated that the type of window to be used is specifically designed to allow the panes to be easily removed. Once removed, the opening would be of sufficient area to meet the life safety requirements.

Mr. Whittaker stated that the proposal to replace all windows would result in a uniform fenestration where currently none exists. He noted that having external muntins is a very different look from standard GBG panes and, more importantly, is more historically accurate. However he is aware that there are extenuating circumstances in play with this case due primarily to the extreme nature of the revealed structural damage and the expense being incurred to make the necessary repairs. Given these expenses and the time sensitivity of the project, he would be willing to make an exception in this case to allow GBG panes instead of exterior muntins.

The chairman noted that the meeting rail (center horizontal framing on a double-hung window) on the window sample provided was of the same proportion as the top and bottom rails. The period window for this house and the neighborhood in general had a visibly narrower meeting rail and asked if the applicant had taken that into consideration. They responded that the windows had not yet been ordered, and that they would specify that criteria when the order is placed.

The Chairman noted that the extent of the repairs to be carried out will require significant reframing of both the house and windows. This is not typical of normal window replacement application, where an old window can be removed and a new one place into the existing opening with little or no modification. The proposal before the Board is more closely described as new construction as opposed to standard home improvement work. Mr. Whittaker stated that unquestionably that muntins applied to the exterior of the glass are more expensive (than standard GBG) but not painfully so if one can find the right vendors. However, given expediency necessary in this case, we will have to go with the GBGs. He further stated that the Board's objection to GBG windows is historically based. The GBG is a noticeably modern development that does not fit into a historical neighborhood. Mr. Whittaker again commended the applicants for making all the windows uniform as this is a clear improvement over the current situation. Mrs. Wells made a motion to accept the application for windows modified to require a meeting bar that is visibly thinner than the sash. Mr. Hudak provided a second.

The motion passed unanimously.

Soffit: Chairman Shook read the applicant's request as follows *Recover the soffits and porch ceilings with 2" vinyl bead board – the soffits are currently covered with vinyl and are not hiding any interesting architectural details. The roof of our home burned up in a fire in the '80s and the replacement roof does not have any details appropriate to the house.* The Board noted that any rafter tale or architectural details that might be under the current soffit would have been destroyed in the fire that burned off the roof in the 1980s. Mr. Whittaker made a motion to accept this section of the application as presented. Mrs. Wells provide a second. The motion carried unanimously.

Fence: Staff noted that this item was struck from packet mailed to the Board because at the time of submission backing documentation was not provided. The Chairman stated that the required documentation was provided at the time of the meeting and it could be discussed at this time. He read the applicant's request as follows *Install new side gates/fencing – existing gates are dilapidated and too small to fit the green trash can. The new gates/fencing will match that of our neighbors at 341 55th Street. (This work has been completed by the contractor so he could get his equipment into the back yard.)* Mrs. Wells made a motion to approve the fence as shown in the picture provided by the applicant, noting that it would need to be stained or painted within a year of installation. Mr. Hudak provided a second. The motion passed unanimously.

Driveway: Chairman Shook read the applicant's request as follows *Install driveway – our home currently does not have a driveway. We would like to add an apron and two concrete strips long enough to park two cars on the left side of the house. Drawings are enclosed to show the feasibility of this improvement.* Mr. Whittaker noted that the driveway apron shown on the plat was fairly narrow and recommended that it be widened as much as the city would allow. Mrs. Wells made a motion to approve this section of the application as presented, modified to allow a wider apron. Mr. Hudak provided a second. The motion passed unanimously.

Deck: Chairman Shook read the applicant's request as follows *Replace existing deck with new deck 4' deeper than original deck as shown on plat. (Work has been completed as an emergency repair due to the unsafe condition of the old deck).* Mr. Whittaker does not have an objection to the deck, noting that it is in the rear and not visible from the public right of way. Mrs. Wells stated that while she did not object to the deck, she cautioned the applicants that there appeared to be very little ventilation under the deck and this may cause moisture problems in the future. There was no objection from the public.

Mr. Whittaker made a motion to approve the deck as submitted. Mrs. Wells provided a second. The motion passed unanimously.

Porch: The work on the porch had been completed prior to the submission of an application for a COA. The Hammonds explained that the porch was falling and needed emergency stabilization. Chairman Shook asked if the decking on the porch was tongue and groove. The Hammonds responded that it was not. They stated that they

referred to an older copy of the guidelines that they acquired at the time of purchase two years ago, and were unable to download the new guidelines from the city website (*editorial note – the link to the 2007 guidelines was broken during a citywide website update*). They further stated that they were under time constraints to secure the unstable porch before the Christmas holidays. Chairman Shook noted that in the past, emergency repairs have come up as a result of porches and stairs being in poor condition. All that the Department of Codes Compliance requires is safe ingress and egress to the dwelling. A repair to only the steps would provide this minimum. It was not necessary to replace the entire porch at that time. Code Enforcement should have provided you with this information.

Mr. Whittaker stated that the Board has a long record of requiring tongue and groove decking. He stated that he understood the time constraints that the applicants were under. His objection to the non tongue and groove decking is based on the fact that the appearance is not historically appropriate to the neighborhood. He also stated that the railings on the new porch are overbearing and are not historically accurate. The railing that was shown in center of the steps in the picture of the old porch was an appropriate style. While it is not necessary to replace the rail in the center of the steps, placing that style rail on each side of the step would be historically accurate. The skirting around the new porch is a solid front. Lattice would be more appropriate, and it would provide an important benefit of better ventilation. Mr. Whittaker recommended the use of vinyl lattice because of the low maintenance considerations associated with synthetic materials.

Mr. Whittaker stated that the floor is not appropriate, but he believes that the applicants followed what they believed to be the correct guidelines. He expressed concern with the city the current guidelines were not available on line.

The Board discussion concluded that porch could be approved as submitted with the following modifications:

Remove the solid skirting and replace it with lattice.

Remove the current railings on each side of the steps and replace with a style that matches the old railing as shown in the submitted photograph. The pickets on the railing should be square, not turned.

During the call for public comment, David Galinski of 5500 Huntington Avenue suggested that the applicant consider PVC railings as a low maintenance alternative to wood.

Mr. Whittaker made a motion to approve the application for the front porch modified to the following:

Remove the vertical siding and replace it with lattice of a style described in the Guidelines.

Remove the current railings on each side of the steps and replace with a style that matches the old railing as shown in the submitted photograph, or a picketed railing. The pickets on the railing should be square, not turned.

Mrs. Wells provided a second. The motion passed unanimously.

Door: The door was approved as presented with minimal discussion.

Motion to Approve: Fred Whittaker

Second: Carolyn Hughes

Motion passed unanimously.

Prior to adjournment, Chairman Shook advised the applicants that there is a market for the old window glass in their house. (Habitat for Humanity's) Restore will take it, and there are other vendors who might purchase it.