

**MINUTES**  
**Joint Meeting of the**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**September 5, 2023**

The City of Wyoming Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) met on Tuesday, September 5, 2023 in the City Building Conference Room. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Gene Allison, Chair of the ARB. Attendance was as follows:

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Gene Allison  
Maureen Geiger  
Rachel Kennedy  
Melissa Monich  
Jim Walton

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:**

Gene Allison  
Mark Browning

**ABSENT:**

LaBecca Hall  
Scott Kyle  
Dean Lutton, Alternate  
Cathy Ramstetter

**STAFF:**

Tana Bere, Community Development Specialist

**OTHERS:**

Daryl Sams, 117 Stearns Avenue, Rain-Away Exteriors  
Neil & Pamela Kool, 127 Stearns Avenue

**CONTINUED DISCUSSION: 127 STEARNS AVENUE: APPLICATION TO CHANGE THE ROOF MATERIAL OF THE RESIDENCE ON A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Ms. Bere provided the background on the request and summarized the prior HPC-ARB review from the August 16, 2023 meeting for those that were not present. She explained the members discussed the design guidelines on roof replacements and that they were conflicting and not as clear as they should be. They recognized their decision would set a precedent for future applications. The members considered the substantial financial burden of slate roofs and questioned if the repairs could be made over a period of time. The

members did not know the extent of the damage or the reasoning for the roof replacement. They wanted to know if the slate could be salvaged and put back on the roof or if it was possible to at least keep the slate on the portions visible from the street. It was said that the slate looked like it was in good condition but rather the valleys and flashing were causing the leaks. The members agreed that the ridge treatment was distinctive and should be maintained or replicated. They discussed the possibility of salvaging the slate and said there are many residents that would find it valuable. They debated if the applicants knew they did not have a permit before starting the work and how they got to this point. It was also recognized that the homeowners received a Historic Preservation Award last year for their past preservation efforts. The members would have been more receptive to the initial request if they had tried to keep some of the historic details.

Neil and Pamela Kool, owners of the subject property, explained that they were not aware their contractor did not receive a permit and apologized to the members. Ms. Kool said when they purchased the property, they put a budget in place to focus on fixing the exterior. They did not know that the roof would require review and beginning without a permit was an oversight.

Mr. Kool said materials have evolved and that is why asphalt shingles have become so common. It is more economical but also architecturally they have evolved to look like slate. But the main reason for the project is because he uses the third floor as office space, and it needs to be insulated. They decided that since the roof is already 150 years old and has lived its life, replacing the roof made the most sense.

Mr. Kool added that he never thought there would be an issue replacing the slate roof with asphalt shingles but since being notified of the requirements, they have considered different options. Replacing the roof in-kind with slate would cost roughly \$125,000, which he said is significant and not feasible. A basic asphalt shingle roof would cost in the \$25,000 range. They are proposing a nicer shingle with architectural detailing. He explained the shingle they are proposed is currently on the rear addition and showed the members photos of how similar they look.

Mr. Kool explained that their slate is very basic and does not provide much architectural value. However, they agreed the existing rolled ridge cap adds detailing, and they want to replicate it with rolled galvanized metal, but it may not be quite as wide as the existing ridge cap. Mr. Allison asked what the valleys are proposed to be. Mr. Sams said the valleys will be a black metal to match the shingle. The tin around the dormers will remain as well as the box gutters.

Mr. Allison asked about the leaks mentioned in the revised application. Mr. Kool said the leaks are concentrated in a couple of areas, but the one in the front by the dormer leaks consistently and that is the location of his office. He said they have done some minor repair work since they moved in two years ago, but he believes it will be constant with a roof of this age.

They discussed the insulation in the rafters and ventilation. Mr. Allison said he is not in favor of seeing the box vents on the new roof because that will change the aesthetic of the roof. Mr. Browning agreed with Mr. Allison and suggested using expanding foam to solve the ventilation/installation issue.

Mr. Allison asked about salvaging some of the slate. Mr. Kool said he is happy to give the slate away, but they would have to pay the cost of labor to remove it piece by piece. Mr. Walton said that DuraSlate and Burnaker Brothers collect slate and may be interested. Mr. Kool said he knows there is a market for slate, but one factor is the grade of slate. His slate, which is black, typically has a lifespan of 150 years and it has reached that. Ms. Monich said that is an important factor in this request.

Mr. Browning said he appreciates the applicants keeping the rolled ridge cap feature. He does not have an issue with the proposed shingle since it does a good job resembling slate and maintains the design of the valley and ridge treatments. He referenced the Design Guidelines which says that a replacement roof should be made of materials that resemble or closely match the original roof material. Ms. Kennedy said that the guidelines also say that whenever possible original roofing materials and design elements should be retained. Mr. Browning says he does not disagree that whenever possible they should be retained. However, the section goes into further detail saying this applies when a structure is being added to or altered these features should be duplicated; he explained that an example of this could be putting an addition on and tying into an existing roof.

Mr. Browning made a motion to approve the roof replacement provided that the new ridge detail is rolled and compatible with the existing ridge, ventilation boxes are not visible from the street, black metal valleys are used, and the porch roofs are standing seam, seconded by Ms. Geiger. Ms. Kennedy voted no, and all other members voted yes. The motion passed.

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

Ms. Bere reminded the members that Fall Festival is October 7, 2023 and we are looking for more volunteers to work the HPC booth.

The members discussed the roof at 4 Worthington Avenue. Ms. Bere said they still need to make corrections and will not receive their permeant certificate of occupancy from Hamilton County until they do so.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Monich moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Browning. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tana Bere,  
Community Development Specialist  
Secretary of the September 5, 2023, HPC-ARB Meeting

---

Gene Allison,  
Chair of the Architectural Review Board