

Minutes
September 4, 2009
North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board

The meeting was called to order at 6:03

Members present:

Chip Carpenter, Phil Shook, Robin Stippich, Deirdre Wells

Members Absent: Mary Kayaselcuk notified staff that she would be absent. The Board has two vacancies.

Staff present: David Watson

Review of the minutes. Minutes of the August 7, 2009 meeting were reviewed and approved.

Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness (COA):

COA-09-222. 6312 Huntington Avenue. Timothy Davis. Replacement of a slate roof with slate colored architectural style shingles.

Mr. Carpenter called for the staff report.

In the report it was noted that there had been numerous unsuccessful attempts to repair the roof in the past. Each attempted repair resulted in damage that accelerated the deterioration of the roof substructure. Further, there were multiple leaks in the roof. Staff noted that the request complied with the Guidelines section IV.B1b that allows the replacement of slate shingles with architectural dimensional asphalt shingles.

Mr. Shook inquired about ventilation in the attic, noting that heat in the attic impacts asphalt and fiberglass shingles differently than slate. Mr. Davis stated that there is a vent located between the two upper dormers.

The applicant informed the Board that the garage has a new slate roof that was installed after a tree fell on the garage and damaged the roof. The garage roof is not part of this application.

Mr. Carpenter called for public comment.

Bea Dahlen, 6306 Huntington Avenue, spoke to the Board.

Mrs. Dahlen stated her opinion that the slate roof can be repaired, and that it is important to maintain the original character of the house. Mrs. Dahlen expressed concerns that the different type of roofing material on the garage and house would clash.

Karl Dahlen, 6306 Huntington Avenue, spoke to the Board

Mr. Dahlen stated that he has lived in his house for twenty years and estimates he spent about \$10,000 maintaining the roof on his house. His opinion is that the roof could be repaired for a comparable, if not cheaper, amount than a replacement.

Carolyn Hughes, 335 60th Street, spoke to the Board

Mrs. Hughes discussed state tax credits that are available for restoration and preservation of structures in historic districts. She noted that the savings can be substantial and advised the

applicant to check into the program and see if the tax breaks might make it more feasible to repair the shingles rather than replacing the whole roof.

Ann Gardner, 6300 Huntington Avenue spoke to the Board.

Ms. Gardner stated that she recently had her roof replaced, noting that the original slate roof had been removed and replaced with asphalt shingles some time ago. After considerable research, she found a synthetic slate type shingle that looks good and is holding up well. Ms. Gardner told the applicants that it might be to their advantage to check into this type of product.

The applicant noted that there are a variety of roof types in the neighborhood. Mr. Carpenter agreed, stating that many houses replaced slate roofs years ago before there was an ARB, and other houses did not have slate to begin with. Ms. Wells added that the Guidelines regarding roof repair are fairly flexible, and that it is the Board's duty to make sure that property owners know all the options that are available prior to making a major change in a roof.

The applicants stated that they have no problems with the guidelines and that their request is within the parameters of the guidelines.

Mr. Shook noted that when a slate roof is replaced, it is a significant and expensive undertaking. Roof slates are hung on slats. These slats must be covered with solid roofing material in order for conventional shingles to be applied. Mr. Shook stated that since the homeowners have received several estimates regarding repair and/or replacement, they are fully knowledgeable about the options available as well as the associated costs. The applicants thanked Mr. Shook for his statement and noted that the primary determinants behind replacing the slate were that the roofing companies could not give a fixed estimate. They could only start work and see what is involved as they started removing slates and inspecting the underlying conditions. They were cautioned that the expenses could be quite significant.

Mrs. Wells asked about the visibility factor of the garage, and if the different roof would stand out. The applicants stated that the garage is in the rear of the property and not overly visible from the right-of-way. Mr. Shook stated that it is fairly common in the neighborhood to find garages with different roof types than those found on the primary structure.

Mr. Carpenter asked the applicant to inquire with the roofing companies one more time about the feasibility of repair of the existing roof, even if a COA for replacement is given. The Board acknowledged that the applicants put considerable forethought into this application and carefully weighed their options.

Mr. Shook made a motion to accept the application as presented. Mrs. Wells seconded

Aye: Shook, Stippich, Wells, Carpenter.

Opposed: none

Old Business

The Board discussed proposed modifications to the Guidelines. Modifications are noted in boldfaced type.

III. G. Accessory Buildings (GARAGES, GARDEN SHEDS, GAZEBOS)

2. Fenestration and Doors: Windows shall match original house muntins spacing and detailing. Door detailing shall be compatible with original house doors. A building greater than 80 square feet shall have at least one window (garages and sheds) **at the ground floor level.**

H. Roofing.

4. Roof mounted solar panels.

- a. **The solar panel may not be visible from the front of the house nor from the side facing a street if the property is a corner lot.**
- b. **Panels may only be installed on the rear roof.**
- c. **Panels shall be uniformly colored**
- d. **Roofing under the panels must comply with standards set forth in the Guidelines.**
- e. **The panels must be parallel to the existing roof and the bottom surface may not extend more than six inches above the roof surface.**
- f. **The panels shall be fixed and not moveable.**
- g. **The Board recommends, but does not require, the use of solar shingles, tiles or film that mimic the natural roofing product as closely as possible.**

Staff submitted the following recommendation for change:

E. FENCES, WALLS, AND RETAINING WALLS

A Certificate is required unless work is confined to repair or replacement of components of existing wood, iron, or chain link fencing (See Section III.D.9). The board recommends historically original retaining walls in front and side yards shall be maintained (retaining wall may be covered with grade, but not removed)

Administrative Review: May be obtained for ~~waste receptacle~~ screening **or fencing** if the following attributes are met:

1. The fence type must be one of the following:
 - a. Picket
 - b. Board and Batten
 - c. Shadow box
 - d. Cast/Wrought iron
 - e. Stockade
2. 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.
3. The screening must be placed abutting the house or auxiliary building
4. Treated wood, if used, shall be painted or stained to be compatible with the house, or fencing, within one year of approval.
5. Vinyl or PVC fencing is allowed.

Board Review: The Board will review the application for the following attributes:

1. Fence/wall type is one of the following:
 - a. ~~Picket~~
 - b. ~~Board and batten~~
 - c. ~~Post and rail~~
 - d. ~~Shadow box~~
 - e. ~~Cast/wrought iron~~
 - f. **a.** Brick or stucco walls
 - g. **b.** Cement, brick, or paver retaining walls
 - h. **c.** Chain link –Use of chain link fencing is limited to rear yard only. Vegetative screening of chain link fencing is encouraged.
 - i. ~~Vinyl or PVC fencing~~
 - j. Single loop or double loop wire picket
 - k. ~~Stockade~~

The Board discussed allowing staff review of fence applications and accepted staff recommendations to expand administrative approval of fence applications. It was noted that there would be little or no net difference in the approval of a fence application whether or not it was Board reviewed or administratively reviewed. Allowing administrative review for fences will make the process easier for property owners in the Historic District.

The Board elected not to follow staff's recommendation to expand administrative review of replacement windows.

Mrs. Wells will submit a statement regarding energy efficient upgrades in the Historic District that will be attached as Appendices 3.H.

New Business

No new business was brought before the Board.

Adjourn.

