

MINUTES
Joint Meeting of the
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
February 16, 2022

The City of Wyoming Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) met on Wednesday, February 16, 2022 in the City Building Conference Room. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Cathy Ramstetter, Chair of the HPC. Attendance was as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Cathy Ramstetter, Chair
Gene Allison
Maureen Geiger
LaBecca Hall
Rachel Kennedy
Melissa Monich
Jim Walton

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

Gene Allison
Mark Browning
Dean Lutton, Alternate

ABSENT:

Scott Kyle

STAFF:

Tana Bere, Community Development Specialist

OTHERS:

Tom & Jill Lange, 631 Burns Avenue
Sally Noble, Architect, 413 Wyoming Avenue
Coral & Thomas Dill, 96 Burns Avenue
Sara Aschliman, Architect, 432 Springfield Pike
Jerome Guest, 102 Burns Avenue
Rod Sidley, Architect, 436 Springfield Pike

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Allison moved to approve the November 17, 2021 HPC-ARB meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Browning. Mr. Allison and Mr. Browning voted yes. Mr. Lutton abstained. The motion passed.

Mr. Lutton moved to approve the January 19, 2022 HPC-ARB meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Walton. All members voted yes. Mr. Allison and Ms. Ramstetter abstained. The motion passed.

631 BURNS AVENUE: APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT A REAR ADDITION ON A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Ms. Bere introduced the request for Historic Review. Tom and Jill Lange, owners of the subject property, as represented by Architect Sally Noble, requested Historic Review to construct a one-story addition to the rear of their home. The addition is designed with a stone base to match the original stone foundation, clapboard siding to match the current siding, and flat membrane roof with railing to mimic the front porch details. The home is located on a corner lot and each frontage is considered a front yard. The proposed addition exceeds 25% of the existing front elevation along Wentworth Avenue, and therefore required Historic Review. The home was constructed in 1890 and the property is classified as contributing to the Village Historic District.

Additionally, the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) granted the applicants a variance for the front yard setback at their February 8, 2022 meeting. The property is required to meet front yard setbacks on both the Burns Avenue and Wentworth Avenue frontages, and those setbacks are determined by the existing front yard setback of the residence on the adjoining lot fronting the same street. This means that the front yard setback from the Wentworth frontage must be equal to or greater the front yard setback of the house at 215 Wentworth, which is 49 feet. The proposed addition would be 17.3 feet from the Wentworth frontage at its closest point, which is in line with the Wentworth setback of the existing house at 631 Burns Avenue (i.e. it does not encroach further towards Wentworth than the existing house). The proposed addition failed to comply with this setback requirement and a variance was sought on this basis.

Ms. Lange explained the reason for the addition is to add a main bedroom and bathroom on the first floor. All the existing bedrooms are on the second floor, and this addition would allow them to age in their house.

Mr. Allison asked about the existing evergreen trees along Wentworth Avenue and if they will remain. Ms. Lange said there are a group of evergreen trees near the fence that will not be disturbed but there is likely one evergreen on the side of the house that will be removed and replanted. Mr. Lange explained that most trees near the proposed addition will remain, and the foundation will be hand-dug to protect the root systems.

Mr. Allison asked if a flat roof is proposed. Ms. Noble explained that the one-story flat roof is purposely done to keep all the windows on the second floor intact. There is a 2' decorative railing proposed on top of the roof to match the existing front porch railing. Ms. Ramstetter questioned what materials will be used for the railing and how does it mimic the front porch. Mr. Lange answered the railing will be wooden, painted, and have square balusters. It is

intended to mimic the railing on the bottom of the porch, not the top. Ms. Ramstetter shared a comment from Mr. Kyle who could not attend tonight's meeting. He suggested there could be more relationship drawn between the new railing and the decorative railing of the front porch roof. Mr. Lange said he is comfortable doing a standing seam metal roof to match the front porch. Mr. Allison said either matching the existing shingles on the roof of the house or standing seam to match the existing porch is acceptable.

Mr. Browning said it appears the clapboard siding matches the current addition because the siding on the original portion of the house is a different material. On the plans it shows the proposed foundation to have clapboard siding and he asked what the intent was. Mr. Lange clarified the exposed foundation will be hand-dug with a block foundation and stone veneer to match the existing foundation.

Ms. Ramstetter shared Mr. Kyle's comment about the windows. He said reuse of the previous addition windows is understood from an economic standpoint, but the proportions seem inconsistent with the rest of the historic house. Ms. Lange said the windows viewed on the rear elevation are the same windows that are seen presently in the addition. They are Marvin windows which are wood, double-hung, and found throughout their house. Since one of those windows would be a bathroom window, they do not want it to be as large. They had the same reasoning for the bedroom windows and want them consistent with the scale of the addition when viewed from Wentworth Avenue.

Ms. Kennedy asked if the door on the current back porch is original to the home. Ms. Lange said it is not original and they added that door to appear like it had always been there.

Mr. Browning asked about the eve and extension to the gutter line, which appears to be larger than what is on the plans. Mr. Lange confirmed there will be a similar gutter to what is currently there.

Ms. Ramstetter reminded the Members of their duties and responsibilities when approving an application when a building has historic significance. They must ensure such a Change would not be detrimental to the public interests of the City and its intent to preserve the character of the City's Historic District and the buildings located therein or to Historic Properties or other properties of Historic Significance; the proposed Change and the remaining site shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort or general welfare; the proposed Change shall not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted nor substantially diminish or impair property values in the neighborhood; adequate assurances are provided that measures shall be taken to remove all materials resulting from the Change, to control hazardous materials which may be exposed as a result of the Change and dispose of these materials as may be required by Federal, State and/or local regulations, and to leave a clean and presentable site at the conclusion of the work, and in its sole reasonable opinion, the

exterior elevations of any Proposed Replacement Construction or New Construction are consistent with the Design Guidelines adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Lutton made a motion to approve the application as presented with the addition of the stone clad foundation, seconded by Ms. Hall. All members voted yes. The motion passed.

96 BURNS AVENUE: APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT A REAR ADDITION ON A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Ms. Bere introduced the request for Historic Review. Coral and Nicholas Dill, owners of the subject property, as represented by Architect Sara Aschliman, requested Historic Review to construct a two-story addition to the rear of their home and a new window on the front sunporch. The proposed addition exceeds 50% of the existing side elevation, and therefore requires Historic Review. The house was built 1927 and the property is classified as contributing to the Historic District. Additionally, the proposed addition will require a side yard setback variance and it will be reviewed by the BZA at their March meeting.

Ms. Aschliman explained that the main programming for the project is add a first-floor family room and mudroom. The second floor will have a primary suite and second-floor laundry. They looked at several options such as an attached and detached garage, but the proposed design preserved the most rear yard, kept the work to the rear of the building, and best matched the existing form and detailing. The driveway is currently two ribbon strips which does not fit modern vehicles and is impractical. The goal is the expand the driveway and to park their cars closer to the rear yard. No garage is proposed at this time.

Ms. Aschliman said the floor level of the addition will have a step-down as you enter the family room. The foundation line will drop there, and the plans show siding down to the new foundation line that will match the existing. Ms. Kennedy asked if the rear addition and sunporch were constructed at the same time because the materials appear to be the same. There are vertical board and batten slabs. Ms. Aschliman confirmed the sunporch is original and the only change is adding a window. The proposed addition will have horizontal siding.

Ms. Geiger asked what color they are painting the addition. Ms. Dill explained they have not decided on a color, but the color scheme will not be offensive. Ms. Ramstetter said she was surprised how visible the addition will be from both Burns Avenue and Durrell Avenue. Ms. Geiger said she has a concern that the addition will look like it does not belong. Ms. Dill said the existing house is brick and the addition is siding so they will not match exactly but they will work with their designer to make the transition as seamless as possible. She added that it would be nearly impossible to find brick to match the original. Mr. Lutton asked if the addition is in line with the adjacent house on the corner. Mr. Dill said it is very close and it would hide some of the addition, especially in the spring and summer months.

Ms. Ramstetter said that color was removed from Chapter 1336 of the Code, and she does not believe they can dictate color. Ms. Bere said she thought it was in their purview because

it plays a role in the impact of the addition. The members decided not to recommend a specific color but urge the applicants to choose a color that allows the addition to blend in.

Ms. Kennedy stated that since the addition is being attached to the original structure, there are additional aspects to consider. When an addition is added to the rear, it will change the original structure. Ms. Aschliman explained that the windows will not be reused and there will be minimal demolition to attach the addition. She did not discuss keeping the exposed brick on the first floor with her clients, but they could consider it. The brick on the second floor would be in a closet and they did not plan on removing the brick. Ms. Kennedy asked about the plan for the original windows in the bathroom and kitchen. Ms. Aschliman said they would like to keep the one in the bathroom as an interior borrowed-light window and the other window would be used for something decorative. The new windows will match the detailing of the existing.

Mr. Guest asked about the measures that will be taken to preserve the mature trees. Mr. Dill said the machinery will come up their driveway to access the backyard and the house is the pinch point. The trees should not be disturbed. Mr. Lutton confirmed that the large tree in the backyard, which appears in aerial imagery had already been removed.

Mr. Allison asked if the expanded driveway will be constructed with asphalt or concrete. Ms. Aschliman said they have not worked out those details yet. Mr. Allison questioned if a variance is needed for the expanded driveway to go to the property line. Ms. Bere said driveways are allowed to be placed on the property line, similarly with patios. Mr. Allison questioned if there will be landscaping to soften the expanded driveway because from the street it will be a significant change. Ms. Kennedy said she would like asphalt to be avoided since the current ribbon driveway is concrete.

Ms. Ramstetter reminded the members that this property is considered contributing to the Village Historic District and of the five criteria of when an Application for Historic Review can be approved.

Mr. Lutton made a motion to approve the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Browning. All members voted yes. The motion passed.

432 SPRINGFIELD PIKE: APPLICATION TO ALTER THE FRONT PORCH ON A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Sara Aschliman, Architect, current lessee, and prospective owner of the subject property, is requesting Historic Review to reconstruct and expand the front existing porch. The porch is located on the front and side of the building. Changing any portion of a porch on a front or side elevation, which is not an in-kind replacement, requires Historic Review. The house was constructed in 1896 and the property is classified as contributing to the Village Historic District.

Ms. Aschliman explained that converting of the property from residential to a commercial use called the "Work+Shop", has requirements such as having accessible bathrooms and a ramp. She went through several design iterations of where those improvements could be located, and the best option was to use the dilapidated side porch to add two accessible bathrooms. The location would not intrude into the meeting or kitchen space and allowed the ramp to be placed on the northern elevation between the house and Wyoming Community Coffee (WyCoCo). It was important that the proposed ramp was covered so it made sense for the project to evolve and to construct a new front porch to connect them. A central component was to have the ramp user enter from the front door like everyone else. Additionally, the project includes infilling the area between the kitchen bay addition and proposed bathrooms. The scope of work also included repairing and painting the siding as well as replacing the windows. The sidewalk along the northern property line will be expanded in width and extended to the parking lot behind the building, where an accessible space is proposed.

Mr. Sidley stated he believes this a unique opportunity to modernize this building and applauded Ms. Aschliman for her efforts. The project will enhance the community and most of the improvements, like energy efficient windows, are necessary to meet the commercial building code.

Ms. Ramstetter shared that the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties* is in the process of being updated to reflect the newly adopted ordinance and several other changes were previously approved by the HPC. The updated guidelines include additional recommendations specific to accessibility. It recommends that appropriate solutions are selected for specific historic properties to provide a high level of accessibility without compromising the significant features of the overall character of the property. Ms. Ramstetter said she appreciates the attention that was given to where people utilizing the accessible ramp would enter.

Mr. Allison asked about the plan for signage and lighting. Ms. Aschliman said she has not committed to anything yet, but she wanted to come back to the ARB to discuss signage. One thought is to have a pier sign at the end of the driveway like the WyCoCo sign. On the front elevation, she is considering placing a Work+Shop sign above the entry, or a fin sign off the southwest corner because it would be high enough to be seen from Springfield Pike traveling north. Mr. Allison said there will be multiple tenants which makes the address the most important aspect.

Ms. Aschliman asked for opinions on the front yard materials. She intended to keep it grass but overtime it has turned into mud, and she is looking for something more durable. She is considering open-weave pavers and high-end faux turf with the goal to have it still feel like greenspace. Mr. Browning asked if she intends on having tables. Ms. Aschliman said she is planning on having tables on a portion of the front yard. Ms. Geiger asked if she has considered planters and agreed the lawn has not held up to the activity. Ms. Aschliman said

she has planters in the rear seating area at WyCoCo; and may use those to provide vegetation and a barrier between the seating area and public sidewalk/street. Mr. Browning suggested a combination of grass or groundcover and a paved area for the seating.

Ms. Ramstetter inquired about the plans for the outdoor seating area behind WyCoCo. Ms. Aschliman shared that the seating area will be removed and it will become utilitarian access. She plans to expand WyCoCo into the Edward Jones building and will have additional parking from the current spaces for Edward Jones plus by utilizing the spaces taken by the outdoor seating area. Mr. Lutton asked if the parking lot behind the house is for WyCoCo parking or tenants of the Work+Shop. Ms. Aschliman said the parking is currently used by WyCoCo staff and the tenants of the leased second floor. Going forward the accessible parking space will be used by patrons of either establishment and the remaining spaces are to primarily serve the Work+Shop. She has plans to eventually expand the parking in the rear and connect the city-owned lot to the School Board lot.

Ms. Hall asked how will guests know there is an ADA entrance on the north side of the house since it appears somewhat hidden. Ms. Aschliman said the sidewalk will be extended to the new parking behind the house and ADA space will be closest to the sidewalk, which leads to the ramp. She first considered a lift which would not require as much space as a ramp and would be less expensive, however after she collaborated with some community members with disabilities this was the selected design. Mr. Browning added that it is a nice feature that the ramp will be covered.

Mr. Lutton called attention to the narrow width of the driveway leading to the parking lot. There appears to be enough room to turn around, but it will become difficult if multiple vehicles are trying to enter and exit at once. Ms. Aschliman says that situation, plus wanting to remove the driveway from Springfield Pike is why she wants to expand the rear parking in the future.

Ms. Kennedy said she had concerns about the changes to the porch. The existing porch is not original to the house, but the size and foundation could be. Mr. Lutton said there are different foundations for the house and porch which signifies the porch is not original. Ms. Kennedy asked if there was a porch originally and if it had been removed at some point. Ms. Bere said there was not an Inventory Form for this property to reference. Ms. Aschliman stated that the house at 22 Wyoming Avenue is very similar to this house but has a porch which appears original. Ms. Kennedy said the bay window on both houses are a prominent feature and the proposed porch would diminish the appearance and change how the house presented. Mr. Lutton said his biggest concern of the porch spanning across the front elevation was the bay window getting lost by the roof.

Ms. Kennedy asked Ms. Aschliman to explain why the ramp could not be constructed on the south side of the house. Ms. Aschliman said the ramp could be constructed there but it was not the most functional option. In that location, the restrooms would have to be located

elsewhere, the porch would be expanded into the front yard, and it would eliminate the driveway which would require new access and parking immediately. The ramp at the northern side allows for cross traffic between business and utilizes dead space, while keeping the southern side available for future improvements.

Mr. Walton went downstairs the Wyoming Historical Society to research what information they had on the property. He shared photographs of the property but only one had the date and it was taken in 1970. It did not show a different porch. Ms. Geiger commented that the proposed porch looks like it could be original to the house.

Mr. Sidley commented that the ramp integrates well with the building and ties into the new porch. Ms. Kennedy referenced the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties* which explains that porches and steps should not be enclosed to create additional interior space. She said that is why she wanted to understand if the proposed bathroom could be located elsewhere like where the existing breakfast nook addition is. Moreover, it was stated that only one accessible bathroom is required to meet the building code. Ms. Aschliman said adding two accessible bathrooms made the most sense because she plans on expanding the building, and at that point it will be required. She said the breakfast nook was the first place she considered but adding two bathrooms would not leave space for a kitchen. The kitchen will be used by caterers and a tenant intends to use the kitchen as a classroom space.

Ms. Kennedy said the proposed project changes three elevations and creates a completely different front façade of a historic property. Ms. Hall added that the porch is being lost by enclosing it to provide a location for the new bathrooms. Ms. Aschliman said there should be some flexibility from the Design Guidelines to achieve the goal of converting the house to commercial. Additionally, she was the only respondent for the Request for Proposals for the redevelopment of the site when the City released it in November 2019. She said the City was accepting proposals for the demolition of house as well as reuse.

Ms. Monich asked the members if they have any design suggestions for Ms. Aschliman. Mr. Browning asked if she investigated pushing the parking to the east and adding the ramp and bathrooms to the back of the building. The ramp could be connected by a corridor to the front entrance. Ms. Aschliman said she considered that idea and was not ideal because it significantly reduced the size of the kitchen and changed where guests entered.

Ms. Ramstetter reminded the members that this property is considered contributing to the Village Historic District and of the five criteria of when an Application for Historic Review can be approved.

Ms. Geiger made a motion to approve the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Allison. Ms. Kennedy abstained, and Ms. Hall voted no. All other members voted yes. The motion passed.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. Bere provided an update on the multi-family building located at 4 Worthington Avenue. She had toured the building and the fire damage was more extensive than what the City originally thought. She displayed pictures of the fire and water damage. The owners of the property are still exploring their options and will apply for Historic Review once a direction is chosen.

Ms. Ramstetter discussed a potential training opportunity and explained that Wyoming residents, Becky Johnson and Sue Moriarty, have offered to give a presentation or tour on Wyoming's History. The members said they are very interested, and Ms. Ramstetter will coordinate next steps.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Lutton moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Hall. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:56 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tana Bere,
Community Development Specialist
Secretary of the February 16, 2022 HPC-ARB Meeting

Cathy Ramstetter,
Chair of the February 16, 2022 HPC-ARB Meeting