

MINUTES
Joint Meeting of the
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
August 19, 2020

The City of Wyoming Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) met on Wednesday, August 19, 2020 remotely via the Zoom online video conferencing platform. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Bobbie McTurner, Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. Attendance was as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Gene Allison
Zach Green
Chris Magee
Bobbie McTurner, Chair
Cathy Ramstetter
David Sparks

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

Gene Allison, Chair
Mark Browning
Scott Kyle
Dean Lutton, Alternate

STAFF:

Megan Statt Blake, Community Development Director
Tana Pyles, Community Development Specialist

OTHERS:

Donald Schehr, Designer for 129 Springfield Pike
Amy & David Groff, Property Owners of 129 Springfield Pike
Liz Galvin, Architect for 5 Clark Avenue
Sara Aschliman, Architect for 18 Wyoming Avenue
Lisa & Mike Maisel, Property Owners of 18 Wyoming Avenue
Maria Gomez, Neighbor at 22 Wyoming Avenue

REVIEW OF 129 SPRINGFIELD PIKE – APPLICATION FOR TWO-CAR DETACHED GARAGE REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION LOCATED ON AN INDIVIDUALLY DESIGNATED HISTORIC PROPERTY

Ms. Pyles introduced the request, which is to demolish the existing two-car garage and replace it with an enlarged two-car garage on the property at 129 Springfield Pike. The property consists of a two-story single-family home built in 1906 and is an individually designated historic property. The Inventory Form lists the style as American Foursquare and describes the structure as an excellent example of frame colonial revival. It was noted at the

time of the inventory, that the carriage house was no longer standing and there was a garage located at the back of the property.

Ms. McTurner asked if any board or commission members had questions for staff. Mr. Allison asked if the proposed garage meets all setback requirements. Ms. Pyles explained that the setbacks appear to be met on the proposed site plan. A survey-based site plan was not included in this submittal and will be required to confirm the minimum setbacks are met prior to permit issuance.

Mr. Allison questioned if the man door on the rear left elevation steps out onto pavement or if there will be a hard surface outside that proposed door. Ms. Groff, property owner, explained the man door is going to step out onto poured concrete, which is currently asphalt. Mr. Browning stated the foundation plan shows a poured concrete landing.

Mr. Schehr, designer, shared the intent is to replace the existing garage, which is in poor condition, with a new garage that is more functional than the current structure. The existing garage has a raised panel overhead door arrangement. The proposed design includes a carriage style garage door that they believe is aesthetically pleasing, as well as more compatible with the period of when this home was constructed.

Mr. Allison questioned if any exterior lighting is proposed. Mr. Schehr stated there will likely be lighting on the front of the garage and on the side of the garage above the man door. Mr. Allison asked if there are storm water runoff issues associated with the current garage, and if the proposed garage will tie into the existing storm water drainage system. Ms. Groff replied there are not drainage issues which they are aware of and the property is very level.

Mr. Lutton asked if gutters are planned for the new garage and commented he did not see gutters on the existing garage. Mr. Schehr responded that they anticipate gutters on the new garage. Mr. Lutton suggested using downspouts to distribute and manage storm water away from the neighbor's property.

Ms. McTurner asked the members if there is any discussion in regard to the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties*. Ms. McTurner stated it appears to meet the criteria of Section 1336.04(b)-(c) in the Codified Ordinances, which outlines when City Council may approve an application for alteration/demolition of a historic property. She explained that even though the building is associated with an individually listed property, the structure is noncontributing and there are no significant changes. The driveway remains the same, the footprint of the garage will be moderately increased, the materials on the new garage are sympathetic with hardy plank and carriage style shingle. She added the applicants will want to test for lead-based paint on the garage before removal.

Mr. Allison moved to recommend approval of the garage replacement construction as submitted, with the following three conditions of approval: a survey must be submitted with the construction documents, the garage design will consider the gutters and downspouts to ensure storm water is controlled on the property, and the light fixtures on the exterior of the garage be coach lights or similar fixture.

Mr. Kyle seconded the motion, and all members voted yes. The motion passed.

REVIEW OF 5 CLARK AVENUE – APPLICATION FOR ONE-STORY FRONT PORCH REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Ms. Pyles introduced the request, which is to demolish the existing front porch and stoop, and replace it with the proposed one-story porch on the property at 5 Clark Avenue. The property consists of a two-story single-family home built in 1875 and is located in the Village Historic District. The style of home listed on the Inventory Form is Eastlake with a renovation. The property was considered contributing to the District at the time of designation.

The property had a two-car garage and enclosed porch addition off the west of the house in 1960, and had a two-story addition off the east of the house prior to that. In 2013, the house changed in use from a two-family to a single-family dwelling. The proposed porch spans the front elevation to include the duplex addition to the east, where the stoop is currently.

Ms. McTurner asked Liz Galvin, architect for 5 Clark Avenue, if she had anything she wanted to present to the board and commission. Ms. Galvin shared that when her clients first engaged her on the project, they said someone had put a Greek revival porch on the side of their restrained Victorian house. The porch is rotting and they wished to replace it with something that is more contextual. Ms. Galvin explained the proposed design has replicated the style of the existing porch because her research suggested it is the original porch to the house. She discussed with her clients the possibility that the structure is no longer a contributing property because of the two prior additions. The intent of the project is to have a functional porch, which is code complaint and ties the east duplex addition to the rest of the house.

Mr. Allison inquired if the porch roof will be removed and portions reassembled, or if it is a total demolition of the roof including the detailing. Ms. Galvin responded she is not certain the condition of the detail that is just beneath the porch roof. The roof itself, box gutters, and columns are going to be replaced among other things. Mr. Allison commented the column on the far right has already been removed. Ms. Galvin continued that some aspects might be salvageable but it would be much easier to remove everything from a construction standpoint. Tom Churchwright, homeowner, is also the contractor and his plan would be to remove the roofing and rebuild it entirely with a slight angle for drainage. However, they understand the goal of preservation is to maintain as much as possible, and they are willing to look at what is still intact. If the existing detailing is in good condition and can be maintained then they will maintain it.

Ms. McTurner asked what material is proposed for the duplex addition on the east side of the house. Ms. Galvin stated they have not yet determined if the material will be a hardy plank but the intent is to provide a lap siding. Mr. Browning acknowledged that rebuilding the small porch on the east end is an effort to make the house look less like a duplex. He questioned if there was thought given to eliminating that porch entirely and changing the secondary door to a window. If that portion of the porch was not rebuilt, the cost savings could be used to rebuild the roof of the two-story addition to be more compatible

architecturally with the original structure. Ms. Galvin explained she discussed the door in question with her clients at their initial meeting. They were not all aligned on that particular aspect of the design, and agreed to maintain the door for now. There is a second staircase which leads directly to that door, and eliminating the door would create egress challenges with the current interior layout.

Ms. McTurner added that it could be argued that the home once being a duplex is a part of its story with the boys returning home from WWII and the need for multifamily housing. Ms. Galvin stated according to her research this one-story addition was completed in 1896, with a second story added sometime after that.

Ms. McTurner commented she found the research informative and appreciated that the design is sympathetic to the original house without attempting false historicism. The new horizontal siding, Tuscan elements of the duplex addition, and porch improvements will unify the façade. She does not have recommendations regarding materials and technologies used for replications other than bonafide millwork. Ms. Galvin asked if there are any restrictions against using products that are not real wood products, specifically for the columns. Mr. Browning stated he does not believe there are any restrictions from using a substitute. Further, you are more likely to achieve a historically accurate and properly proportioned component by using such products.

Ms. Ramstetter moved to recommend approval of the one-story front porch replacement construction as proposed, finding that the alteration request would meet the provisions of Section 1336.04(b)-(c).

Mr. Browning seconded the motion, and all members voted yes. The motion passed.

REVIEW OF 18 WYOMING AVENUE – APPLICATION FOR TWO-CAR GARAGE & REAR ADDITION, AND DEMOLITION OF DETACHED GARAGE LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Ms. Statt Blake introduced the request for 18 Wyoming Avenue which is located in the Village Historic District. The request is for the one and a half story two-garage addition, one-story rear addition, and demolition of the existing detached two-car garage. The existing garage is located in the rear yard at the northeast corner of the property. The proposed addition and attached two-car garage is located in the central/western portion of the side and rear yard. Therefore, the request is not replacement construction and the members are being asked to review separately the demolition of the detached garage, and the proposed addition.

Ms. Statt Blake added that the property is listed as Proto Modern and built circa 1890. This is different than the County Auditor's records, which show the house as being built in 1915. It is not uncommon for there to be a discrepancy of built dates. It is listed as contributing to the Village Historic District. Sara Aschliman, architect, provided refined descriptions in her submittal. She describes the home as colonial revival façade with craftsman and foursquare details, including exposed rafter tails, large roof overhand, wide cedar shake columns, and hipped gable roof.

Mr. Allison commented on the proposed circular drive, noting the front yard is not as deep as other houses on Wyoming Avenue. He asked if this has gone before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) relative to the curb cuts, loss of an on-street parking space, and impact of the circular drive. Ms. Statt Blake responded it has not been reviewed but is scheduled to go before the BZA at their September 8th meeting. Mr. Allison posed the question if the circular drive is not approved by BZA, would the applicant still pursue the addition as shown. Mike Maisel, property owner, responded that if the circle drive is not approved, they would then move the driveway toward the western property line to serve the new garage. Their current driveway is a shared drive and the access point is directly across from the Middle School driveway.

Mr. Browning stated the design criteria for new garages is often looking at consistency with the surrounding area. Typically, garages in the area are found to the rear of the house like where the existing garage is sited. The proposed layout places the garage back from the front of the house but the circular drive provides a more direct sightline from Wyoming Avenue to the front facing garage. He would have preferred keeping the garage at its current location, and having cars back straight out to a point and use the existing driveway. He added the circular drive makes the front facing garage more prominent which should not be the intent, and creates the possibility of cars parking in the front lawn creating a visual disturbance. He likes the design but it is very difficult to bring the garage forward and not compromise the original structure.

Ms. Aschliman, architect, shared more information on the request. She explained the garage drove the design because the current shared driveway is not ideal. The existing driveway is very narrow and there is a significant depression in pavement due to the grade change. The existing garage is small for their current vehicles, and they have to back out down the narrow driveway. When they were looking at rebuilding the garage, it made sense spatially to move it to the other side of the house. The reasoning for the circular drive is to avoid backing out of the garage onto Wyoming Avenue, and believes it adds more character and symmetry than a bump out.

Mr. Lutton asked about the existing vegetation and what would be removed. Mr. Maisel responded that the large backyard tree, shown on Google, was removed last year. The six oak trees on the western side of the property are in front of the proposed garage and will remain. Mr. Lutton stated the existing vegetation will help soften and minimize the impact of the new garage.

Mr. Allison asked if the applicants have spoken with their neighbors at 22 Wyoming Avenue regarding the changes to the shared driveway. Maria Gomez, property owner of 22 Wyoming Avenue, stated she is in favor and is excited about the proposal. She said by no longer sharing a driveway, it will be safer for her young children.

Mr. Kyle inquired about the alternate options shown on the plans. Ms. Aschliman stated the options are up for discussion. The original design (front elevation) was designed with the intention to make it appear as a detached garage that was later connected. The alternate designs have a little more massing that directly attaches. Mr. Kyle commented the original design looks more appropriate with the main ridge of the garage higher than the ridge of the addition. Mr. Allison also stated he preferred the original design because it is not trying to replicate the house.

Mr. Kyle stated he does not have an issue with the demolition of the existing garage given its condition and proximity to the adjacent property. Mr. Sparks and Mr. Browning also agreed with the demolition since the garage does not have much historical significance. Ms. McTurner added that many of the garages in the Historic District appeared in the 1930s and 1940s when people started to get their first car. The Maisel's garage is similar to what is seen throughout the District, although it had been modified with the man door, two garage doors, and aluminum siding likely in the 1980s or 1990s. The garage appears to be heavily modified and non-contributing.

Ms. McTurner moved into discussion of the garage addition. She shared the Village Historic District has quite a few colonial homes, but there are none exactly like this property with the craftsman characteristics – clipped gables, rafter tails, and thick shake columns. The aspect of the proposal that stands out is the increased massing by having the garage moved forward. The proposed garage almost reads as three bays, which is same number as the house. Along Wyoming Avenue, there are a few houses that are two bays wide but the majority of the houses are three bays wide. With the proposed addition, the house essentially reads as a five or six bay home impacting the integrity of the property, streetscape, and immediate neighborhood. Mr. Magee agreed the fundamental issue is the massing and asked if consideration was given to locating the garage in the rear with a different driveway configuration.

Ms. McTurner commented that the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties* discusses how garages should remain close to the historic location. In the Village District, garages are located in the back of the property and accessible by a one lane driveway along the side of the property line. There are some examples within the District of properties with front facing garages that are highly visible from the street, but those do not exist on any contributing properties within the District. She believes the proposed addition will significantly impact the integrity and architectural significance, causing the home go from a contributing building to a non-contributing building.

Mr. Lutton asked if there is an example of attached garages that are historically contributing and how those are designed. Ms. McTurner responded there are not examples for this age of house because people were still using public transportation. For a property to remain contributing, it has to convey the time and place in which it was constructed. Mr. Lutton suggested shifting the garage back further, while still connecting to the house in some manner, leaving the original house as the prominent mass. Elevations can be deceptive to

how prominent a feature is when pushed back from the front façade. He suggested providing a prospective or other more realistic view that shows the massing and conveys the character. Ms. McTurner agreed there is potential for a design solution.

Mr. Browning suggested the new garage should not be as sympathetic to the architecture of the main house and work to decrease the scale. Mr. Kyle added that from an architectural standpoint, the main elevation is worked into the existing elevation with consistent details. He proposed changing materials or other elements to help differentiate the garage addition and allow the house to retain its prominence.

Mr. Allison echoed the comments on the impact of allowing vehicles to be parked in the front of the house. He stated he is more in favor of relocating a drive straight to the proposed garage and not allowing cars to pull in front of the existing house to preserve its historic presence. Mr. Sparks asked if a side entrance garage would be more appealing visually. Ms. McTurner responded it does not look like enough space to allow for a side entrance garage.

Ms. Aschliman asked if they change the building program by relocating the garage towards the rear and locating the addition towards the front, will massing still be an issue. Mr. Allison responded he thinks there would be similar comments if it was a two-story addition because it would change the scale of the house but if it was a single story there would like be more flexibility. Ms. Aschliman commented on Mr. Lutton's early point where a 2D elevation does not portray the design accurately and she needs to create a 3D rendering or perspective. She was being conscious of it not creating a building line addition and pushed the garage back significantly.

Ms. McTurner suggested to table the item and have an informal meeting to discuss design options. Ms. Aschliman agreed a working session would help to find a solution. Ms. Statt Blake confirmed the working session would not make a recommendation and the proposal will come back before the ARB and HPC. A final recommendation from the HPC and ARB is needed by September 11th for the item to go before City Council at their September meeting.

Ms. McTurner moved to table the application for 18 Wyoming Avenue.

Mr. Allison seconded the motion, and all members voted yes. The motion passed.

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Sparks moved to approve the May 6, 2020 HPC-ARB joint meeting minutes, seconded by Ms. Ramstetter. All HPC members voted yes. The motion passed.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION AWARD NOMINATION

Ms. McTurner introduced the Historic Preservation award nomination at 212 Grove Avenue. Mr. Allison is familiar with the property and is in favor of moving forward with this nomination. Ms. McTurner shared that when speaking with the property owners, this was their vision of preservation.

Mr. Allison moved to recommend the approval of the Historic Preservation Award nomination for 212 Grove Avenue.

Mr. Magee seconded the motion, and all members voted yes. The motion passed.

She said this was the only nomination and is hopeful next year there are more nominations. Mr. Magee asked if there was a list of previous Historic Preservation Award winners to reference. Ms. Statt Blake stated staff can add that list to the HPC webpage.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. McTurner shared she would like the commission develop a succession plan for when she steps down from chair of the HPC or resigns in the coming months. In addition, she believes educational opportunities for the new members would be beneficial and should be explored.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kyle moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Browning. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tana Pyles,
Community Development Specialist
Secretary of the August 19, 2020 HPC-ARB meeting

Bobbie McTurner,
Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission

Gene Allison,
Chair of the Architectural Review Board