

MINUTES
Regular Meeting
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
April 21, 2021

The City of Wyoming Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) met on Wednesday, April 21, 2021 remotely via the Zoom online video conferencing platform. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by David Sparks, Chair of the April 21, 2021 meeting. Attendance was as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMBERS:

David Sparks, Chair
Gene Allison
Maureen Geiger
Cathy Ramstetter
Jim Walton

ABSENT:

Zach Green

STAFF:

Tana Pyles, Community Development Specialist

OTHER:

Jerry & Sarah Williams, 86 Oliver Road

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Geiger moved to approve the March 17, 2021 HPC meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Ramstetter. All members voted yes. The motion passed.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF CHAPTER 1336: HISTORIC DISTRICTS, HISTORIC PROPERTIES, AND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES; ALTERATION AND DEMOLITION GUIDELINES AND REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA

Ms. Pyles introduced the item which is continuing to revise Chapter 1336 of Wyoming's Building Code, governing historic alterations and demolitions, based on the discussions from the March HPC meeting. She displayed a markup of Chapter 1336 and explained the main revisions from the previous draft.

Ms. Pyles explained that the first major change shown in the draft ordinance is adding a new section called "Historic Review Thresholds". This revision was made to separate the review thresholds from the definitions section, making the code easier to navigate. The current thresholds are included in this section until the Commission decides if they want to change the criteria for requiring Historic Review. Another new section is "Historic Review Threshold Calculations", which was added to spell out how the threshold is measured. The Commission

will need to determine what method of measurement is most appropriate and should be used on all applications. Under the application portion of the ordinance, I added that preliminary reviews are available prior to applying for Historic Review and fully developing plans, which is already included on the HPC webpage. Under the application requirements, I added to Item 6 which asks the applicant to explain how their proposed project augments or continues the historic character. I added a tenth item that requires the applicant to show how they calculated the percent of change.

Mr. Allison and Ms. Ramstetter discussed what happens if an applicant measures the thresholds incorrectly. Ms. Pyles explained that with these changes they will have to show their calculations, and staff will check them. The main concern is if calculations are done incorrectly and underestimate the amount of change.

Ms. Ramstetter said that approval process listed in the application section, especially the City Manager component, is somewhat confusing. Ms. Pyles explained the review process needs to be modified and will include those changes in the next draft of the ordinance. She will look into the possibility of providing a hyperlink to the section describing the review process in more detail. Mr. Allison added that the public will need to be notified for the joint HPC and ARB review.

Ms. Geiger asked how the disposal of hazardous materials relates to Historic Review. Mr. Allison said the ordinance needs to include a statement that when altering a structure there may be lead paint, asbestos, or other hazardous material given the age of homes in the Historic District and to ensure they are disposed of properly. Ms. Ramstetter suggested this subsection be rewritten and clarify who is monitoring the disposal of hazardous materials.

Mr. Allison asked if archeological sites need to be included since they have never received an application for one. Ms. Pyles said she was not sure and would look into this.

The Members discussed how the review thresholds should be calculated. Mr. Allison asked if we should get rid of the percentage piece and have all projects go for Historic Review. By removing the calculations, it simplifies the process and increases engagement. Ms. Geiger said Wyoming is not Glendale and our residents will not be happy if now small projects require a full review. Ms. Ramstetter commented that she does not want to review a dozen applications at each meeting but if the review process is shortened (no Council approval in most cases) then it could be less impactful to a project timeline. Mr. Allison asked how long does building permit review and approval typically take. Ms. Pyles said we tell applicants it usually takes ten working days once we have all the necessary information.

Mr. Sparks asked what projects are usually under the review threshold. Ms. Pyles explained many rear additions and smaller bump-outs do not meet the 50% side elevation threshold. An example is the proposed addition at 50 Elm Avenue, which the architect has requested a preliminary review to enhance the design despite not being required to have Historic Review. Mr. Sparks said that we will either be reviewing everything or continue to use the review

thresholds to only review the more impactful projects. Mr. Walton confirmed that the City verifies threshold measurements when they appear close to the 25% or 50% requirements.

Ms. Pyles suggested the Members focus on defining the review threshold and seek guidance from the ARB on how to best measure them. Mr. Sparks said it would be difficult to specify every scenario that would require Historic Review if we do not use thresholds. Mr. Allison suggested simplifying the thresholds to 25% or more of the front elevations rather than exterior walls. Mr. Sparks said using the term exterior walls is an attempt to distinguish it from the roof. Ms. Geiger said if we have the front elevation include the entire façade with the roof then it would make it a lot easier. Mr. Sparks pointed out the biggest issue is still how to measure the slope of the roof or turret. Ms. Geiger suggested using something as simple as Google Street View and measure it on a flat plane. Ms. Ramstetter suggested referring the calculations to the ARB for guidance.

The Members agreed to keep the thresholds at 25% front and 50% side but revise how façade is defined. Ms. Pyles will bring a revised draft ordinance back to the HPC at their next regular meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. Pyles gave an update on returning to in-person meetings and that City Council will discuss the topic next week. The HPC does not have to follow what Council chooses to do but we anticipate all in-person meetings will have to resume in July. The Members decided to continue meeting remotely.

Ms. Pyles informed the Members of a Bed and Breakfast application for 333 Oliver Road (Stearns Estate). A Bed and Breakfast is a Special Use which requires review by the Planning Commission and approval from City Council. Additionally, the property is within the Reduced Density Residential Overlay. Changes to the exterior of either parcel will require Historic Review and is when the HPC will see this application. Mr. Williams, owner of 86 Oliver Road, asked if the new owners have submitted plans to the HPC. Ms. Pyles said the prospective owners have not submitted anything to the HPC and their application will be reviewed at Planning Commission on May 3, 2021. Mr. Williams said it sounded like the 30-day review cycle is a standard. Ms. Pyles clarified the 30-day period, which the Members were discussing previously is the review timeframe for reviewing and issuing permits. Permit applications and issuance happen after zoning has been approved.

Mr. Walton explained that the Historical Society is advertising and selling historical house plaques. They have sold these in the past but have recently started again because they found a new company that could make high-quality plaques at a reasonable price. The previous company went out of business.

Ms. Pyles shared the next regularly scheduled meeting is on Wednesday, May 26, 2021. Since we are rotating the Chairperson, Mr. Walton will Chair the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Allison moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Geiger. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:13 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tana Pyles,
Community Development Specialist
Secretary of the April 21, 2021 Meeting

David Sparks,
Chair of the April 21, 2021 Meeting