

**North End Huntington Heights
Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes
October 9, 2008**

Present: Chip Carpenter, Mary Kayaselcuk, Phil Shook, Robin Stippich, Tracy Touchberry, Deirdre Wells,

Absent: Fred Whittaker.

Chairman Shook opened the meeting and welcomed community members to the meeting, and noted that public comment would be available for each item on the agenda, as well as for any additional proposals from those in attendance.

The first item discussed by the Board concerned allowing the administrative review of screening elements for waste receptacles and hvac units. The Chairman noted that the installation of screening is a benefit to the neighborhood and should be encouraged. The Board feels that if the proposed screening elements meet certain criteria, city staff should be able to approve the project on the spot rather than making the property owner go through the application process.

Charles Mcbee of 348 52nd Street addressed the Board. He asked if existing fences or screening would need to meet the requirement for staining or painting. Chairman Shook answered that regulations cannot be enforced retroactively. The requirement for these screening elements will be the same as those that exist for fences. The guidelines allow the wooden fence to cure for one year before staining, painting or sealing.

Ms. Wells made a motion to accept the modification of Section IV.E. to read:

Administrative Review may be obtained for waste receptacle screening if the following attributes are met:

1. Area screened off maybe no more than 8 feet long or 8 feet wide
2. The fence type must be one of the following:
 - a. Picket
 - b. Board and Batten
 - c. Shadow box
 - d. Cast/Wrought iron
 - e. Vinyl or PVC fencing
 - f. Stockade
3. Maximum height of the fence and placement of the finished side shall be as stated in Section IV. E (fencing) Board Review Items 2 and 4.
4. The screening must be placed abutting the house or auxiliary building
5. Treated wood, if used, shall be painted or stained to be compatible with the house, or fencing, within one year of approval.

Ms. Stippich provided a second

In favor: Kayaselcuk, Touchberry, Carpenter, Stippich, Wells, Shook

Opposed: none

Motion carried 6:0

The next item on the agenda was a proposal to rescind the requirement for replacement windows to have permanently adhered exterior window muntins.

Chairman Shook reviewed the background of this proposal. The requirement for fixed exterior muntins was approved at the October 2007 guideline update. In January 2008 the requirement was suspended because of concern in the community regarding an inability to obtain windows that meet the new criteria. The criteria were passed with the understanding that these type of windows were readily available, and with only a modest price differential. Staff research found that fixed exterior muntins windows had fallen out of favor in the window replacement market, and were difficult to find. When found, the option was expensive windows that generally increased the cost between \$150 and \$250 dollars. This cost is in addition to having to upgrade to a higher end composite type window. The Board took this financial hardship into consideration and suspended the requirement, agreeing to give it a full review at the October 2008 guideline meeting.

Mr. Shook noted that property owners should be aware that the original hemlock windows in a house are nearly the best made windows available. They can be repaired and insulated around framing to produce a similar R-value to new thermal windows for about the same or less cost. The Board would advise homeowners regarding vinyl windows that they tend to deform and function improperly within a short period of installation. Many new windows are in fact replacing poorly crafted vinyl windows that are not very old.

Mr. Bill Freudenberg addressed the Board. He stated that as a property owner he was unable to replace the dilapidated windows in his house last year because the exterior muntins requirement made the project prohibitively expensive. He produced an estimate showing the premium for this option to be \$150 per window, but the muntins were not permanently affixed. He stated that he was not successful in locating any windows with the permanent muntins at any price. Mr. Freudenberg asked the Board to vote to rescind the permanent exterior muntin requirement.

Mr. Carpenter made a motion to strike the requirement that replacement windows have permanently fixed exterior muntins. Ms. Wells provided a second.

In favor: Kayaselcuk, Touchberry, Carpenter, Stippich, Wells, Shook

Opposed: None

Motion carried 6:0

Ms. Kayaselcuk and Mr. Carpenter stated that homeowners should investigate the repair and rehabilitation of existing windows rather than replacing original windows. There are ample resources available online, and through the Park Service in particular, that provide detailed guidance in this matter.

The Board also noted that the vintage glass, and sometimes the frames, can be reused by glaziers. Sometimes they will actually buy the glass.

Mr. Shook asked the audience if there were any additional items for discussion. Hearing none, the meeting adjourned at 6:30.