

**Minutes**  
**November 1, 2007**  
**North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00

**Members present:**

Mary Kayaselcuk, Phil Shook, Deirdre Wells, Fred Whittaker

**Members Absent:** Stephen Hudak and Carolyn Hughes notified the Chairman and staff that they would be unavailable for the November 1, 2007 meeting.

**Staff present:**

David Watson

The minutes of the October 4<sup>th</sup> regular meeting and the October 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Guideline Review were reviewed and approved with minor editorial modification.

COA-07-198 Ray and Barbara Miller. 312 62<sup>nd</sup> Street.

This is a request to replace four double-hung 6/6 windows with four 6/6 double-hung thermal windows with muntins fixed to the exterior pane.

Chairman Shook reviewed the guideline section regarding replacement windows. The Board noted that the proposed windows were in harmony with the existing window style. The applicant stated a desire to keep the house looking as original as possible, and therefore did not desire to wrap the window trim. Mr. Whittaker asked if this application fell under the new guidelines regarding windows. Staff stated that it did, and Chairman Shook stated that the application as submitted met the criteria of the new guidelines.

Ms. Kayaselcuk made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Wells provided the second.

Motion passed unanimously.

COA-07-199. Robert Savage. 5712 Huntington Avenue

This is a request to replace existing dark colored three-tab shingles with white EnergyStar Certified shingles.

Chairman Shook read the guideline section discussing roofing modifications. He noted that while the roof was no longer slate, the change of color from dark to light was significant enough to require Board review. Mr. Savage noted that in the late 1970's he removed the original slate roof and installed fiberglass shingles. Mr. Whittaker stated that the proposed shingle color was a radical departure from both the former slate roof, and the fiberglass roof that replaced it. Such a change alters the historic perspective of the house. Chairman Shook concurred, stating that this is not a vernacular house, craftsman, or rancher where white roofs are common. The energy savings concerns of the applicant could be met using a light grey shingle. Mr. Whittaker noted that there were several EnergyStar Certified shingles that were light grey. The Board and

applicant found consensus in the selections *Prestige Coal* or *High Definition Aspen White* from the Elk Roofing catalog.

Chairman Shook opened the discussion for public comment.

David Galinski suggested the applicant consider the installation of a ridge vent if the house had a ventilated soffit. Mr. Whittaker noted that the house does not have a soffit and the ridge vent would not be applicable in this situation. Staff noted that solar powered attic fans were available should the applicant feel additional ventilation was necessary. The Board stated that such vents should be placed facing away from the street.

Ms. Kayaselcuk made a motion to accept the application as amended to allow the installation of light gray shingles that match the Elk Roofing Catalog colors of either *Prestige Coal* or *High Definition Aspen White*.

Ms. Wells provided the second

The motion passed unanimously.

COA-07-200 Larry and Robin Stippich. 5208 Huntington Avenue

This is an application to install a stick built shed in the rear/side yard.

Chairman Shook reviewed the regulations pertaining to accessory structures.

He noted that the shed was a gable end 6x12 foot shed. The roof pitch is 6/12 and the siding matched the existing structure.

Mr. Whittaker stated that this application should not have been accepted without a site plan, and that he was not satisfied with the level of detail provided in the application.

The application was briefly tabled while staff retrieved site plan from a previous application submitted by Mr. & Mrs. Stippich that showed the shed footprint location was retrieved and provided to the board.

Chairman Shook asked Mrs. Stippich if there was adequate clearance around the shed to provide ease of access to the rear yard. He stated that this consideration will not be a factor in the approval of the application, but wanted to bring it to her attention. Mrs. Stippich stated that she felt the access provided would be adequate. The retrieved site plan verified that access was adequate.

Mr. Whittaker asked for clarification of the roof pitch. Chairman Shook responded that at the previous meeting the board requested that the roof have a pitch of no less than 6/12, as shown in the current application. Mr. Whittaker stated that his preference would be for an 8/12 but that he could live with the 6/12 pitch as that was within the parameters given by the board. Mrs. Wells asked for clarification regarding the siding. Mrs. Stippich responded that the aluminum siding on the house is wider than the vinyl siding that will be on the shed. Mr. Whittaker stated that the 3/8" sheeting on the shed seemed very thin and might pose some problems in situations of high wind. He also stated that he is providing this information for the applicant's benefit and that it was not a factor to be considered in the approval process.

The board and applicant discussed the shed door. Chairman Shook asked the applicant's preference. He stated that two smaller doors might work better, and would require less extensive framing than would a single large 4' wide door.

Mrs. Wells made a motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for a shed that will be located as shown on the provided plat. The building will not exceed a 6'x12' footprint, nor exceed 7' in height at the eaves. The siding will be compatible with the house and the roof pitch will be 6/12 with rake and soffit boards.

Ms. Kayaselcuk provided the second.

The motion passed unanimously.

COA-07-201 David Galinski and Chris Schappell 5500 Huntington Avenue.

This is an application to install French doors and a pergola on an existing carriage house. Chairman Shook read the pertinent guideline section. He noted that the proposal will not be visible from the street due to the existence of a 6' fence around the yard. The improvements would allow the adaptive reuse of a structure that is not functional as a garage. Mr. Whittaker stated his opinion that the application did not have sufficient detail, stating that he would like to see a full site plan and complete elevations of the proposed structure shown from all relative angles. He did not object to the merits of the application but to the fact that he felt that the application fell short of the requirements for submission provided in the application packet. Mr. Galinski stated that the elevation he provided noted all measurements. Mr. Whittaker stated he expected to see a scaled drawing not only for this application, but all submissions. Chairman Shook stated that a plat was not required for this submission because the footprint of the building would not change. Mr. Whittaker disagreed and contended that the addition of a pergola, though it is not an area under roof, constituted an increase in the building footprint. Mrs. Wells disagreed with Mr. Whittaker. Chairman Shook and Mrs. Wells stated that they saw no need to defer or table the application due to the lack of a site plat. Mrs. Kayaselcuk asked if there was a site plan on file in the planning department from a previous application. Staff affirmed that there was. She suggested that staff retrieve this plat for the benefit of the board. A five minute recess was called while staff retrieved the requested documents.

Upon review of the site plan, Chairman Shook asked if the bricked area would extend to the walkway at the back of the house. Mr. Galinski stated that the brick would extend to the edge of the pergola and adjoin the walkway.

Mr. Galinski was asked about the style of columns. He stated that he would like to use plain round columns between 10" and 12" in diameter. He had not made a decision, pending discussion with the board. Chairman Shook suggested the consideration of pilasters against the garage. Mr. Galinski stated that he liked that idea.

Mrs. Wells made a motion to accept the submitted application amended to allow the use of columns sized between 10" and 12" in diameter with an option for pilasters on the wall.

Mr. Whittaker provided a second.

The motion passed unanimously.

#### Old Business

The Board discussed the Byars' suggestion that all ARB criteria should require a building permit. Chairman Shook stated his opinion that education would be more productive than ordinance changes. Staff noted that such a requirement would most likely not be allowable because we cannot require a building permit for one part of the city, but not another.

#### New Business

Staff reviewed with the Board new procedures in place to increase public awareness of the Board.

Mr. Whittaker asked about tracking new residents in the area and having a member of the Board deliver a copy of the guidelines in person.

Mr. Whittaker repeated his insistence that all applications must be submitted according to the rules stipulated in the application packet with no exception.