

**MINUTES**  
**Joint Meeting of the**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**April 2, 2020**

The City of Wyoming Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) met on Thursday, April 2, 2020 remotely via the Zoom online video conferencing platform and the meeting was webcast to the public via Facebook Live. The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. 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  
Cathy Ramstetter  
David Sparks  
Jim Walton

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:**

Gene Allison  
Mark Browning  
Scott Kyle  
Dean Lutton, Alternate

**STAFF:**

Megan Statt Blake, Community Development Director  
Tana Pyles, Community Development Specialist  
Lynn Tetley, City Manager

**OTHERS:**

Sara Aschliman, Architect for 30 Clark Avenue

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Members introduced themselves to new HPC members Zach Green, Chris Magee, and David Sparks.

**REVIEW OF 30 CLARK AVENUE – APPLICATION FOR TWO-STORY ADDITION AND ONE-STORY PORCH ON A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Ms. Statt Blake introduced the request, which is to demolish the existing single-story rear addition, and replace it with the proposed two-story addition, as well as a one-story porch on the property at 30 Clark Avenue. She clarified the request is before the ARB and HPC because of the proposed new construction (alteration), not for the demolition. The proposed demolition does not meet the special review threshold, however, the proposed addition does

meet the alteration threshold as defined in Section 1336.02 of the Code. The property is listed as a contributing property within the Village Historic District and is a Colonial Revival style built circa 1930. She explained the Hamilton County Auditor records show it was built in 1936 but sometimes there are discrepancies and she is using circa 1930 as the build date. There was a former one-story porch off the west side and rear that was demolished around the year 2000 and is currently a patio.

Ms. Statt Blake described the proposal in more detail. She explained the single-story front porch addition wraps around the side and is integrated into the two-story addition built off the back of the house. The two-story addition is slightly inset from the existing side building line of the house and will comprise the majority of the rear elevation, which includes also includes a small one-story porch off the driveway.

Ms. McTurner asked Ms. Statt Blake if she received any communication from the neighbors to the west of the subject property. Ms. Statt Blake said she had correspondence with the neighbors located at 24 Clark Avenue, specifically related to the variance request that is going before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) this month. The request is for a side yard setback variance to allow the single-story porch addition to encroach into the 10' required side yard setback by 3.5'. The correspondence with the neighbor has been to share the plans and answer any questions they had. Ms. Statt Blake then explained how neighbors are notified and the public participation through the public hearing at City Council on April 20<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Allison inquired as to whether the chimney addition would require an additional variance. Ms. Statt Blake explained that there is a provision in the Zoning Code, Section 1183.10, which allows certain projections into side and rear yards. The proposed chimney meets these requirements and therefore does not require a variance to the side yard setback.

Ms. Aschliman introduced her proposal, saying she arrived at the proposed design after reviewing the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties*. She referenced the guidelines for new construction and additions to existing structures, and developed the proposed design to ensure it's appropriate to the existing fabric, while still serving the client's needs. She considered the existing shapes, massing, and roof slopes to attempt to match in detail but not mimic the original structure. The proposed materials are intended to either match or complement the existing house. The character of the house is simple and the design is intended to match the classic simplicity, while still accentuating the existing house. The painted brick will remain as is, and the new siding elements will be painted similar to the siding that was on the house. The proposed windows will be double hung, and the windows on the house are not original and will not be changed on the front or sides of the house. The proposed design uses the footprint of the former side porch as a reference point for the new porch location.

Mr. Allison asked if the new addition will shorten the turnaround space coming from the garage, how the residents will maneuver out of the driveway, and if the driveway is shared

with to the neighboring property. Ms. Aschliman responded that the driveways touch but are not shared and the residents are not concerned with the reduced turnaround because they usually back out of the driveway. Mr. Allison asked about plans for the existing chimney at the rear northeast corner of the house and recommended the chimney is removed due to its proximity to the addition and potential ventilation issues if used in the future.

Ms. McTurner referenced the letter submitted by the applicant and questioned if the paint on the brick veneer had been tested for lead-based material. Ms. Aschliman responded that she is not aware of any lead testing. Ms. McTurner recommended having the brick tested due to the date of the house. The proper handling of hazardous materials is a necessary assurance before moving forward with a recommendation to City Council.

For the benefit of the new members, Ms. McTurner explained the role of the HPC and ARB and the broader considerations made by City Council in reviewing this request, per Section 1336.04 (a) of the Code. She then outlined the sequence of review, as provided in Section 1336.04 (b) of the Code, specifically Subsection 1336.04 (b) (1) whether the building has historic significance or is contributing to the Historic District. In order for City Council to approve an alteration or demolition it must determine that the building to be altered or demolished does not have historic significance as defined by the Code, or otherwise meets additional provisions.

Ms. McTurner reiterated that the property is listed as contributing to the Village Historic District, and she reviewed the National Park Service's Seven Aspects of Integrity. Colonial Revivals were popular during the first half of the twentieth century, and the City has a beautiful collection of this style. Specifically, 30 Clark Avenue is relatively simple and does not have the elaborate sidelights, dormers, or other elements Colonial Revival often have. Since listing on the National Register in the mid-1980s, the integrity of the building has been moderately diminished due to removal of the enclosed side porch and the replacement windows throughout the property. However, the property contains enough integrity to convey its significance as a vernacular Colonial Revival.

The members then reviewed the alteration application point-by-point with Section 1336.04 (c) of the Codified Ordinances, which describes the conditions under which City Council may approve an application for alteration/demolition of a Historic Property, as follows:

*City Council may not approve an application for Demolition unless each of the following are true:*

- (1) Such Demolition 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 in other parts of the City;*
- (2) The proposed Demolition and the remaining site shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort or general welfare;*

- (3) *The proposed Demolition 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;*
- (4) *Adequate assurances are provided that measures shall be taken to remove all materials resulting from the Demolition, to control hazardous materials which may be exposed as a result of the Demolition 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 compatible with the appearance of surrounding properties, AND*
- (5) *In its sole reasonable opinion, the exterior elevations of any Proposed Replacement Construction are consistent with the Design Guidelines adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission.*

Mr. Browning stated his initial reaction to the design was positive, however, there is concern regarding the wraparound porch on the front and west elevation. He believes it significantly alters the basic character of the house. The proposed porch across the front resembles two-story houses built in the 1960s and 1970s throughout the City. Additionally, the side porch is very close to the adjacent property line and he asks how practical and enjoyable the placement is for the residents. Ms. McTurner added that she agrees that the wraparound porch negatively impacts the historic character of the house. Furthermore, other than the material of the proposed chimney, her only other concern in the design is the wraparound porch.

Ms. McTurner stated that the property has pleasant asymmetric design elements such as the front gable projection and front door off-center, which is unusual for other Colonial Revivals in Wyoming. Ms. McTurner referred to the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties*, specifically page 39 which addresses porches, quoting it urges "Front porches, steps and stoops are significant to the Village Historic District and should be retained during the building of additions". She continues to quote page 38 of the Design Guidelines, which states, "Historic exterior architectural details should be maintained and preserved whenever possible". She stated that the removal of the original stoop would negatively impact the original design and would categorize the property as noncontributing in the Village Historic District. The proposed side porch placed in the location of the original porch, along with the rear addition, would be visible when approaching the property from east on Clark but would have minimal impact on the design of the original home.

Mr. Lutton shared that when researching Colonial Revivals, there is a spectrum of different styles and a number with wraparound porches. He likes the verticality that the porch and fireplace add while keeping the simplistic nature of the front façade. He suggests reducing the depth of the front portion of the porch to lend to the flatness of the façade. He agrees with Mr. Browning and appreciates the wraparound porch which is similar to other porches on Clark Avenue. He called attention to the large side yard of the neighboring property to the west and does not feel an encroachment from the porch addition would have a negative impact to either property.

Mr. Allison asked Ms. Aschliman if the existing brick will be repainted or remain the same. Ms. Aschliman responded the brick will remain the same color but there might be touchup painting from usual construction activity. Mr. Allison asked about the proposed black standing seam roof and how it will integrate into the existing color scheme. Ms. Aschliman explained they plan to keep the existing shutters but change the color. She explained final colors of the design have not been selected and the roof color is up for discussion.

Mr. Allison asked if the proposed fireplace, which is shown in stone, would be more compatible to the existing house if composed of brick. Ms. McTurner commented that the fireplace should be brick to be compatible with the materials in the area, as referenced throughout the Design Guidelines. Ms. Aschliman stated she agreed with the comments, however her clients specifically requested the stone but she would discuss it with them. Mr. Kyle added he does not think the stone is out of character with the Colonial Revival style given the fact it is integrated with the porch.

Mr. Kyle commented that the porch as it wraps around the front of the house detracts from the simple façade and character of the house. He does not have an issue with the side and rear components of the porch and house addition. Overall, he thinks it is a well-designed addition. Ms. McTurner commented she agrees with Mr. Kyle's comments.

Ms. McTurner recognized Mr. Lutton's previous points but stated when reviewing a contributing property in the Historic District, you have to be careful with alterations visible from the street or the property may become noncontributing. The purpose of the ARB and HPC is to try to avoid losing a contributing property. She urged for the recommendation not to include the front porch component. Ms. Aschliman clarified the intent of the design is for elements to be additive and not subtractive and the porch could be taken down at some point. Therefore, they aren't removing any historical significance with this project because it could be restored to the original façade. Ms. McTurner responded that adding the front wraparound porch substantially changes the design of the original vernacular Colonial Revival, further diminishing the integrity, as it would read as a different style. To remain contributing, the house needs to convey its significance as vernacular Colonial Revival.

Mr. Magee asked if there were options for the proposed porch, such as an altered roofline and color, which would be more typical of the colonial style that would add an attribute to the design. He added that there is a large condenser unit in front of the house and asked whether more equipment will be added or if screening is planned. Ms. Aschliman stated she would like to relocate the unit as part of the overall project. Ms. McTurner responded to Mr. Magee's question regarding options for the porch, and agreed that other Colonial Revivals did have wraparound porches, however, this house never did and it would create a sense of false historicism.

Mr. Sparks asked if the existing asphalt roof which appears to be a taupe color and the proposed black standing seam roof would integrate well together. Ms. Aschliman said the

back portion of the roof will need to be replaced, and she will look at replacing the entire roof with a dark zinc-colored roof.

Mr. Lutton asked if the porch is removed on the front, what is the extent the side porch can extend to the front building line. Mr. Allison asked what will happen to the existing front porch since it appears in poor condition. Ms. McTurner suggested the existing front porch be restored or replaced in-kind. She stated the side porch should not extend beyond the front façade and final plans reviewed by staff. Mr. Browning agreed with Ms. McTurner's statements. Mr. Magee asked if we could look at the previous porch and recommend the proposed porch maintain the same footprint. Ms. Aschliman stated the screened porch primarily to the rear is very important to her clients. She would present the concept of a smaller side porch to soften the side elevation to her clients.

Ms. McTurner moved to recommend approval of a modified one-story porch and the proposed two-story addition, finding that with the requested modifications, the alteration would meet the provisions of Section 1336.04(b)-(c). The following design modifications and considerations will be made:

1. The proposed front porch will not be included. Only the side porch will be pursued and final details will be determined with staff.
2. The existing front porch stoop will be preserved, and can be minorly modified as needed.
3. The proposed black metal roof color will be reconsidered.
4. Lead-based paint testing will be conducted and any present lead-based paint will be handled appropriately and in accordance with EPA requirements.
5. The A/C condenser located in the front yard will be relocated or screened.

Mr. Browning seconded the motion, and all members voted yes, except for Mr. Lutton who abstained. The motion passed.

Ms. Aschliman exited the meeting.

A written report on the action of this meeting will be provided to City Council and a public hearing on the proposed alteration is scheduled to be held at the April 20, 2020 City Council meeting. Property owners within 200 feet of this property will be notified via mail of the public hearing. Ms. McTurner will present the alteration request at that meeting.

#### **APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Allison moved to approve the November 20, 2019 HPC meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Walton. All HPC members voted yes, except for Ms. McTurner who abstained. The motion passed.

Mr. Kyle moved to approve the March 5, 2020 ARB meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Allison. All ARB members voted yes, except for Mr. Lutton who abstained. The motion passed.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Ms. McTurner asked that Ms. Pyles email the HPC members regarding the National Register Nomination training, and Ms. Pyles confirmed she would.

**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 Pyles,  
Community Development Specialist  
Secretary of the April 2, 2020 HPC-ARB meeting

---

Bobbie McTurner,  
Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission

---

Gene Allison,  
Chair of the Architectural Review Board