

**Minutes**  
**November 5, 2009**  
**North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board**

The meeting was called to order at 6:03

**Members present:**

Chip Carpenter, Mary Kayaselcuk, Daniel Peters, Robin Stippich

**Members Absent:** Deirdre Wells notified staff that she would be absent. The Board has two vacancies.

**Staff present:** David Watson, Sheila McAllister

**Review of the minutes.** Minutes of the September 3, 2009 meeting and the October 8, 2009 Guidelines Update meeting were reviewed and approved with minor modifications.

**Old Business**

The Board reviewed the 2009 Guidelines to ensure staff updates and edits were correct. Mr. Carpenter expressed for the record his thanks and gratitude to Phil Shook for his efforts to draft the original guidelines and his service over the past decade to ensure that they were up to date and reflected relevant changes in building materials and technologies. The Board also expressed their gratitude for Mr. Shook's efforts.

**Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness (COA):**

Mr. Carpenter noted that he was informed by staff that the applicant for COA-09-223, Allen Stambaugh, would be late and moved this application to the end of the agenda.

**COA-09-224** 343 59<sup>th</sup> Street. Jennifer Mitchell. This request is for the installation of new siding on a detached single car garage.

Mr. Carpenter called for the staff report.

Staff provided the following information along with photographs in a PowerPoint presentation: The principal structure was built in 1910. City records do not confirm a date of construction for the garage. The asbestos shingle siding on the garage has deteriorated and is falling off. There does not appear to be any layer of siding beneath the shingles. It is likely that these shingles are the original siding for this structure. The request is to cover the existing siding with new siding or remove the existing siding and install new siding. The applicant is proposing to use vinyl siding with a profile to mimic the profile of the aluminum siding on the second story of the principal structure.

The Guidelines state that siding must be replaced with material having the same width and design as the original siding and that material should match that of the original siding. In the section addressing new construction, the Guidelines state the size and scale of a new accessory building shall compliment and be compatible with the original house and/or neighboring buildings.

In comparing the application request to the Guidelines, staff noted that the existing asbestos shingle siding appears to be original to the structure and that the manufacture of this type and style of siding ceased several decades ago and is not available. The proposed siding will match the reveal of the clapboard aluminum siding on the upper story of the principal structure.

Staff concluded the report with a recommendation of approval for the proposed siding/residing of the accessory structure with clapboard vinyl siding or cement board type siding as the request conforms to III.G.1 of the Guidelines noting that the stipulations noted in IV I. 1&2 cannot be applied to this request as the large asbestos shingles are no longer available.

Beyond that which was requested in the application, staff encourages the applicant to consider using cellular PVC trim or similar synthetic material in areas where the original wood trim needs replacement such as fascia board, door and window framing, and brick mold. Staff also encouraged the applicant and Board discuss potential repair and replacement options for the doors on this structure should the framing and/or door units be found in poor condition.

Chairman Carpenter stated that if a door needed to be replaced, it would be best to do so prior to the installation of siding as adjustments could be easily made for non-standard door sizes. The applicant stated that the door was in a poor state of repair and they would like to replace it. Mr. Carpenter stated that door replacement is a common repair and is permitted by right if the new door is the same design. Noting that the three-light configuration in the personnel door would be difficult to find today, Mr. Carpenter recommended going with a horizontal type fenestration that complimented the windows in the carriage doors. Staff was instructed to review any proposed door type for appropriateness and was authorized to give administrative approval for an appropriate submission.

Ms. Kayaselcuk made a motion to approve the application as submitted and for the replacement of the personnel door upon review by staff.

Mr. Peters provided a second.

Aye: Peters, Stippich, Kayaselcuk, Carpenter

Nay: none

Motion carried 4:0

**COA-09-225** 348 57<sup>th</sup> Street. Frank Sockriter and Diana Powers. This request is for the replacement of all windows in the house with vinyl thermal windows.

Mr. Carpenter called for the staff report.

Staff noted the following points along with photographs in a PowerPoint presentation: The structure was built in 1915 and the windows appear to be original. The fenestration includes 3/1 double-hung windows and three pane casement windows. The applicants are potential buyers of this property and as part of closing requirements for a rehabilitation loan the mortgage company is requiring the replacement of the existing windows. The replacement scheme calls for the replacement windows to match the design of the original windows. The window trim is flat board and can be wrapped at the applicants' discretion.

Section IV. J of the Guidelines allows vinyl windows and requires that casement windows be replaced with the same design window.

Staff concluded a recommendation of approval of the application as presented as it meets the criteria for approval in Section IV.J. of the Guidelines, noting that the fixed picture windows proposed by the applicant are the same style and appearance of the casement windows.

Chairman Carpenter stated that while he is comfortable with the window replacement proposal, he wished to inform the applicants that it is possible to overhaul the existing windows at a cost that is usually less than that of replacement and that the energy performance is close to that of thermal windows. He also noted that the old windows are made of fine old growth hemlock and cypress, a high quality material that is generally unavailable or prohibitively expensive. These types of windows have the benefit of being infinitely repairable.

As time and resources were noted to be limited for the applicants at this time, staff recommended that the applicants keep the old windows and store them under the house if possible for later use should they wish to pursue tax credit options or replace the new vinyl windows should they wear out.

Mr. Peters made a motion to approve.

Ms. Stippich provided a second.

Aye: Daniels, Stippich, Kayaselcuk, Carpenter.

Nay: none

**COA-09-223** 343 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. Allen Stambaugh. This request is for the retroactive approval for the enclosure of a rear facing two level porch.

Mr. Carpenter, noting that Mr. Stambaugh had still not arrived, stated that the Board should proceed with COA-09-223 and allow staff to provide as much information as possible to enable discussion. With that, he asked for the staff report.

In a PowerPoint presentation, staff presented the following information:

The structure is a duplex built in 1920 and the request is for a retroactive COA to enclose the rear porch. The original picket spacing on the railings on the rear porch did not meet current code requirements, and the applicant stated that this resulted in an incident where a child's head became stuck between the rails. The property owner remedied this situation by enclosing the area. However, this action requires a building permit, and a permit will not be issued without ARB review

#### **Guideline Review:**

The Guidelines consider a porch enclosure as an addition. Section III of the Guidelines addresses this action as follows with these specific points:

*Contemporary design for alteration, additions, and new buildings will not be discouraged when such alterations, additions, and new construction is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property.*

*While the relationship of an addition to the original structure is important, as a general guideline, thirty (30) percent of the structure's original footprint area should be the maximum allowable sum total footprint of all subsequent additions combined. Decks and porches shall be treated as unenclosed living space and be subject to the thirty (30) percent guideline provided. A prime factor in determining whether that percentage guideline will be applied will be the height of the proposed deck or porch to the mean ground elevation.*

*Exterior wall materials of proposed additions and modifications should match or compliment the composition, color, and texture of the exterior wall material on abutting structures.*

#### *Size and Placement of Doors and Windows (Fenestration)*

*Doors: The size and placement of exterior doors shall relate to the size and placement of original structures whenever possible.*

*Windows: the size, style, and placement of windows shall match the size, style, and placement on original structures.*

Staff provided the following review in relation to the Guidelines:

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

The windows installed on the addition are a contemporary style unique to the original structure. Consideration must be given to size and scale in relation to the structure to determine appropriateness

Staff made the following recommendation:

*Staff notes that the enclosure of a rear porch does not compromise the historic integrity of the structure and recommends approval of the proposal in general. However, specific details of the project must receive further Board consideration.*

*The Board must determine if the contemporary windows in a non-visible location fit within the provisions noted at the beginning of Section III where it is stated that the use of contemporary designs will not be discouraged, or to follow the provisions noted in b.3 of the same section that calls for new windows to match existing windows.*

The Board noted that the windows are completely out of character for the house in particular and the neighborhood in general. It was also noted that the two double-hung type windows utilized were completely different patterns from the 1/1 style in the rest of the house. The Board noted that the only mitigating factor in the project was that it is not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Peters stated that in his opinion the fact that the project is not visible from the right-of-way is an important item for consideration. He noted that there are a number of architectural districts in the region that do not regulate work that cannot be seen from the right-of-way. The Board noted that the purpose of the Board is to protect the historical integrity of the neighborhood and that includes backyard areas. The Board also noted that no attempt was made by the applicant to initiate a review or a preliminary review by the Board or staff. That work has begun prior to a Board hearing does not merit consideration in the approval process.

The Board inquired about the code enforcement process regarding this project. Staff explained that the enclosure of a porch requires a building permit, the same as any other location in the city. However, because this house is in a historic district a COA must be approved by the ARB prior to the issuance of a building permit. Mr. Peters asked what would happen if the Board denied the request. Staff answered that the project would remain stopped until such time as the applicant provided plan revisions necessary to acquire a COA and a building permit. Staff further noted that the building

permit process typically includes several levels of inspection such as footings, framing, and electrical. Since none of these inspections had been performed on the nearly complete structure, it is likely that a certain amount of dismantling will be required beyond any Board decision. Mr. Peters expressed concern that a denial may result in the unfinished product staying in a state of disrepair for an extended period of time that will result in further dilapidation.

Mr. Carpenter stated that his only concerns with the project are the window choices and the placement of the windows. If a plan were submitted that enclosed the porch using windows that were the same as those on the existing house, then Mr. Carpenter stated he would be very much inclined to approve it. However, if a plan were submitted that proposed the same fenestration as that which was built by the applicant, the Board would have denied a COA in that case because the windows deviated significantly from not only those in the structure, but window patterns throughout the neighborhood.

Ms. Kayaselcuk made a motion to deny the application based on noncompliance with Section III e. of the guidelines that require windows in an addition the size, style, and placement of windows shall match the size, style, and placement on original structures.

Ms. Stippich provided a second

Aye: Stippich, Kayaselcuk, Carpenter  
Nay: Peters

Motion carries 3:1

### **New Business**

Staff asked the Board for permission to administratively approve COA applications that have expired, but otherwise have not changed and are still consistent with the guidelines. Staff gave a recent example of a soldier who had a plan approved but was shipped overseas for a year and was unable to act on the project. The project had not changed, and the guidelines upon which the approval was granted had not changed either. The Board stated that they were comfortable with a staff review of such applications.

Adjourn.

