

MINUTES
Joint Meeting of the
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
May 18, 2022

The City of Wyoming Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) met on Wednesday, May 18, 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

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

Gene Allison
Scott Kyle
Dean Lutton, Alternate

ABSENT:

Mark Browning
Jim Walton

STAFF:

Tana Bere, Community Development Specialist

OTHERS:

Timothy Harkavy, 4 Worthington Avenue

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Monich moved to approve the March 16, 2022 HPC-ARB meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Allison. All members voted yes. The motion passed.

4 WORTHINGTON AVENUE: APPLICATION TO CHANGE THE ROOF MATERIAL ON A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Ms. Ramstetter introduced the request for Historic Review. Harkavy Properties LLC, prospective owner of the subject property, as represented by Timothy Harkavy, is requesting Historic Review to replace the damaged slate roof with an asphalt shingle roof. Their preferred roof material is the Owens Corning Onyx Black asphalt shingle. The multi-family

building contains four units and is one of the two buildings located on the property. Only the building fronting Worthington Avenue sustained significant damage from the fire that occurred last August. The proposed Change to the roof is not an in-kind replacement and exceeds 25% of the roof as viewed in the front elevation, therefore requires Historic Review. The property is classified as contributing to the Village Historic District. Additionally, Josh Harkavy (also with Harkavy Properties LLC) had a preliminary Historic Review on March 16, 2022.

Mr. Harkavy added that their focus is to renovate the building and to change as little as possible. The roof, dormers, and rafters sustained most of the fire damage. He contacted Infusion Roofing to re-tarp the roof to prevent further damage. They are in the process of interviewing contractors to complete the work but everything else in the improvement budget has been listed. Ms. Kennedy asked if Harkavy Properties has done other historic preservation work. Mr. Harkavy said they only do historic preservation work and lately have been doing work in Over-the-Rhine.

Ms. Kennedy asked for a summary of the preliminary review of this project. Ms. Bere said the main question was whether an alternative roof material would be considered due to the prohibitive cost of slate. Mr. Lutton added that the detached garage at 18 Wyoming Avenue was referenced as a good example of using an asphalt shingle that complements the slate roof on the house. Mr. Harkavy said the estimate to replace the existing slate roof like-for-like was \$321,510.00, which is not economically feasible. Ms. Kennedy asked if he received any other quotes for the roof replacement. Mr. Harkavy said he only contacted one company for a quote but there are only two local companies that could do the work.

Mr. Allison asked how much of the roof has been lost to the fire. Mr. Harkavy said approximately 30% of the roof has been damaged and it would be impossible to match the existing, undamaged slate with new slate; the entire roof would have to be replaced. Mr. Kyle questioned why the proposed shingle selection is onyx black when the existing roof color is gray. The onyx black is a very distinct color and is not appropriate for the building. Ms. Ramstetter said she noticed many roofs on Worthington Avenue that are no longer slate but have a shingle with more dimension. Mr. Harkavy said he is not set on a specific shingle and would like to match the appearance of existing roof as close as possible. Ms. Ramstetter asked how the onyx black shingle resembles slate. Mr. Harkavy said it lays flat like slate.

Ms. Bere explained that she had reached out to the roofing company that worked on 18 Wyoming Avenue and they said Grand Manor Black Pearl shingles were used on the garage. She relayed this information to Josh Harkavy a few weeks ago. Mr. Lutton said it worked well for this project and they did a good job of matching the slate roof on the house. He thinks the shingles for 4 Worthington Avenue should be more dimensional than the proposed shingle selection.

Ms. Kennedy asked Mr. Harkavy to explain the quote he received for a slate roof and to itemize the costs. Mr. Harkavy said it only includes removing the old slate and installing new slate. Ms. Kennedy asked if anyone was aware of grants for preservation work. Ms. Bere said she was not aware of any. Mr. Harkavy added that historic tax credits are not easy to receive.

Mr. Harkavy said the damage was contained to the roof and he has abated the mold caused by the water damage. He added that all other repairs will be in-kind replacements. Mr. Lutton added it is important to keep the ridge cap and valleys red, and to find a better shingle that mimics slate. Having material samples to compare would be helpful.

Ms. Ramstetter questioned the plan for the roof on the building which fronts Springfield Pike. Mr. Harkavy stated the slate roof will be maintained and he will save the usable slate shingles from the damaged building for future repairs.

Ms. Kennedy questioned why Mr. Harkavy would not make the investment in a slate roof when they last much longer than a shingle roof. Mr. Harkavy said he needs to balance the amount of debt on the property. If he had to put a slate roof on the building it would make the renovation infeasible, and they would list the property. Ms. Kennedy asked if all the properties in their portfolio operate separately. Mr. Harkavy replied that was correct.

Ms. Geiger recalled when the Rec Center was proposed on Worthington Avenue. The City considered demolishing these two buildings to make room for it. She thinks it is great that someone wants to protect these buildings and improve them. Ms. Monich agreed with Ms. Geiger's comments regarding protecting these buildings when we can. She is comfortable approving an asphalt roof due to the impracticability of matching the original roof and to see the project more forward. Ms. Ramstetter echoed these comments.

Mr. Kyle said he does not agree that the shingles should be dimensional. The shingles should be thicker with a regular pattern, and he does not have a problem with a flat shingle. Ms. Geiger pointed out that it is hard to see the roof and it is the most noticeable when viewing it from Springfield Pike. Mr. Lutton added that if you cannot see the shingles up close then the color is more important than the thickness of the shingle. Ms. Hall said she is comfortable with a material that is not dimensional and has a color that better matches the existing slate. She agreed that the cost of a new slate roof is not practicable.

Mr. Allison asked whether there is enough slate to cover the portion visible from the street. Mr. Harkavy said he does not know a roofer that would do that and provide a warranty for the work. Ms. Geiger commented that most of the slate that is still in good condition would likely become damaged when removing the nails. Ms. Kennedy asked if a quote could be provided for having new slate installed on the public-facing portion and shingle on the rest. Ms. Geiger said contractors would not warranty using two different systems.

Ms. Geiger asked if Mr. Harkavy has a construction schedule. Mr. Harkavy replied they have a schedule, but it is dependent on the contractor and they have not bid the project yet. He has time to figure out the roofing material and it will not hold up the other improvements.

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. She asked the members if there is a motion to approve, approve with conditions, deny, or continue the request. Ms. Bere advised the members to be specific if it is approved with conditions so staff can enforce them. It should not be left up to staff to decide if the shingle selection mimics the existing slate roof.

Mr. Allison made a motion to allow the case to be continued to allow the applicant to find shingles that better match the existing slate roof and to provide samples. Mr. Scott seconded the motion. Ms. Geiger, Ms. Hall, and Ms. Ramstetter voted no. All other members voted yes. The motion passed.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. Bere provided an update on the revisions to the Design Guidelines. She is editing the first draft and anticipates the update will be completed in the coming weeks.

Ms. Bere reminded the members to submit properties for Historic Preservation Awards online. The deadline for nominations is June 15, 2022.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Allison moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Kyle. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tana Bere,
Community Development Specialist
Secretary of the May 18, 2022 HPC-ARB Meeting

Cathy Ramstetter,
Chair of the May 18, 2022 HPC-ARB Meeting