



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 17, 2016**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO HPC APPROVAL  
APPROVED BY THE HPC ON \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |                      |
|--|--|----------------------|
| <b>Call to Order</b>                               |  | <b>7:00 p.m.</b>     |
| <b>A. Roll Call</b>                                |  |                      |
| Present:   | Doyle, Jacks, Hall, Lucibello, Martinez, Mayor, Peterson, Urda, Grinnell (non-voting)  |                      |
| Absent:  | Anderson (non-voting)  |                      |
| Student Members:                                   | Shura  |                      |
| Staff Present:                                     | Planning Team - Gabrielle Mattingly, Erin Venard   |                      |
| <b>B. Minutes</b>                                  | Approve the minutes of the August 24, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, as amended.   |                      |
|  | Motion by: Doyle<br>Second by: Urda<br>Abstain: Martinez   | Approved<br>(8 to 0) |
| <b>C. Old Business</b>                             |  |                      |
| <b>D. Certificates of Appropriateness</b>          |  |                      |
| <b>D1.<br/>COA # 16-4092<br/>6 N. Columbia St.</b> | The petitioner, Erik Haugsnes, on behalf of the owner Jack Haugsnes, requests approval of COA # 16-4092 in order to recess the existing entry door on the west elevation to create a landing at the top of the stairs, rebuild and change the dormer on the east elevation, add a new entry and roof over the entry on the east elevation, create new window openings on the east and north elevations, and replace several existing windows throughout the property located at 6 N. Columbia Street.        |                      |
|  | <p>Erik Haugsnes, spoke as the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resides at 625 Wherli Drive uses 6 N. Columbia as mailing address as it is parents home</li> <li>• Requesting minor alterations to the home to inhabit it and make it more accessible for parents</li> <li>• Most changes I am making are removing elements (glass block, jalousie windows) that were installed in the last 4 years. I am trying to revert it back to the old style with newer materials.</li> </ul> |                      |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I am adding a door to the rear and an awning over the door where I will be able to make at grade access into the lower level of the home</li><li>•</li></ul>  |
|  | <p>Historic Preservation Commission inquired about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hall: I live at 212 n. Columbia and I have always thought the house was neat and congratulations on the work so far.</li><li>• Peterson: Just to clarify, we only have right of comment to what faces the street?</li><li>• Grinnell: Yes, we have jurisdiction to what faces the street and if there were to be something in the side or rear of the home that is viewable from the street. For example, if an addition was put in the back and the roof line in the back exceeds the roof line in the front, it is the roofline you can see. So there is some things on your application that I can see you are trying to match the style of the home, but we cannot necessarily say yay or nay over.</li><li>• Peterson: I am okay with the south elevation, I am not a fan of some of the windows in the rear, but that is the rear. One of the things that I do not believe is covered in these drawings is what exactly is being changed to the front entry? You are relocating it?</li><li>• Erik: Exactly. We came in about 8 years ago to the City to petition to repair the concrete stairs in the front. There were differing opinions as to how that repair was to be done. As it exists today, there is no landing, so we want to avoid any dangerous issues and bring it into code compliance. That is the reasoning for moving the door back three feet. I will be using the same door and the same side lights. It will look different because it will be in shadow instead of right on the front façade of the house, but I thought it was the best solution I could come up with.</li><li>• Peterson: I understand, but by taking the door and sidelight and pushing it in these drawings measure 4 ½ feet.</li><li>• Erik: It is 3 feet inside so the door can swing open and then the thickness of the wall is 1 ½ feet.</li><li>• Peterson: Okay, so now what you are creating in the inside of that niche is new exterior material? This is not addressed on your drawings. What is that new exterior material around the new entry door?</li><li>• Erik: The inside of the room is currently the same face brick that you see on the exterior of the home. So the wall is just going to be brick just like the outside of the house.</li><li>• Peterson: Oh it is existing brick?</li><li>• Erik: Yes, it is an all brick screened in porch. It is an indoor/ outdoor porch.</li><li>• Peterson: So the whole existing room was exterior porch?</li><li>• Erik: Correct. I was also thinking of putting wood white painted to match the rest of the white wood that is used on the walls. I thought if I painted it a lighter color it might look more appropriate even if it is in shadow.</li><li>• Jacks: The front door was originally recessed?</li></ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erik: The porch has the front door that I am relocating but the entry was originally 10 feet back. You would walk up into the porch, but the porch had the French door on it.</li> <li>• Peterson: What is the use of the room now? Is it heated?</li> <li>• Erik: There are two more doors, it is exterior it is not heated. Essentially you walk through three front doors to get inside.</li> <li>• Grinnell: So it is a higher style/ version of the prairie four square. Which typically often had the door from the outside porch whether it was enclosed or not and then it had a three foot area/walkway and then it had your crystal type/engraved fancy door.</li> <li>• Peterson: So visible from the street, there is still material around the relocated entry unit?</li> <li>• Erik: Yes, there will be a foot on each side to keep it symmetrical around the opening which will be the wood material and the rest brick wall</li> <li>• Peterson: Would you entertain the idea of stucco?</li> <li>• Grinnell: There is two trains of thought here, if you already have the brick then try to find matching brick, but if you are going to make a change then make it big enough of a change that 50 years from now that someone would know that not this is not an original style to the house. Stucco would be appropriate for that time period, but there is not stucco in the house now.</li> <li>• Martinez: Well, beeboard was used a lot as well in that time period.</li> <li>• Peterson: What will you be doing with the floor?</li> <li>• Erik: It is a concrete floor now we are planning to leave it is as concrete floor.</li> <li>• Peterson: Understood, I thought this recess was being pushed into an interior space. Not a concrete deck so I understand.</li> <li>• Hall: Are there any questions from staff or any other comments on the petition?</li> <li>• Grinnell: I did have Bryan Ogg (research historian) take a look at this property and he was able to determine that it was on the 1926 map, but not the 1921 and it was purchased in 1925 so that helps us to determine the time period.</li> <li>• Jacks: Will the dormer change be seen from the street (south elevation)?</li> <li>• Erik: Technically yes, I am taking a hip dormer and making it a gable.</li> <li>• Jacks: That is just roofing material?</li> <li>• Erik: Yes, there is just not enough light to make that usable space so we are moving the windows up.</li> </ul> |
|  | <p><b>Public Testimony: None</b></p>  |
|  | <p>Motion to approve COA # 16-4092 in order to recess the existing entry door on the west elevation to create a landing at the top of the stairs, rebuild and change the dormer on the east elevation, add a new entry and roof over the entry on the east elevation, create new window openings on the east and north</p>  |

|   |   |                                       |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
|   | elevations, and replace several existing windows throughout the property located at 6 N. Columbia Street.   |                                       |
|   | <p>Motion by: Martinez<br/>         Seconded by: Doyle</p> <p>Ayes: Doyle, Jacks, Hall, Lucibello, Martinez, Mayor, Peterson, Urda<br/>         Nays: None<br/>         Absent: None</p>  | <p>Approved<br/>         (8 to 0)</p> |
| <b>D2.<br/>COA # 16-4280<br/>6 N. Wright Street</b>   | The owners and petitioners, Robin and Karl Schoene, request approval of COA # 16-4280 in order to remove the existing rear addition and construct a new two story addition for the property located at 6 N. Wright Street.  |                                       |
|   | <p>Robin Schoene, spoke as the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chose not to speak</li> </ul>   |                                       |
|   | <p>Historic Preservation Commission inquired about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peterson: In general, my reaction is this done as we all would like it to be as if it were original and that is what we are all shooting for. This is one of the bigger projects that we have looked at and it is simple to move forward with.</li> <li>• Hall: I agree, I commend you on the design choices, material, and architectural interest. I think this is great.</li> <li>• Jacks: Is there an addition to the house for the kitchen?</li> <li>• Robin: Yes, in 1998</li> <li>• Jacks: Was it approved by the board?</li> <li>• Erin: Yes it was.</li> </ul> |                                       |
|   | <b>Public Testimony: None</b>   |                                       |
|   | Motion to approve COA # 16-4280 in order to remove the existing rear addition and construct a new two story addition for the property located at 6 N. Wright Street.  |                                       |
|   | <p>Motion by: Peterson<br/>         Seconded by: Doyle</p> <p>Ayes: Doyle, Jacks, Hall, Lucibello, Martinez, Mayor, Peterson, Urda<br/>         Nays: None<br/>         Absent: None</p>  | <p>Approved<br/>         (8 to 0)</p> |
| <b>D3.<br/>COA # 16-4282 130<br/>N. Loomis Street</b> | The petitioner, Chris Masonick of Restore Construction, on behalf of the owner Thomas Hartmann, requests approval of COA # 16-4282 in order to change the reveal and the profile of the siding for the property located at 130 N. Loomis Street.  |                                       |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
|  | <p>Chris Masonick, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners had an emergency the contractor came to speak.</li> <li>• These changes came because of a fire. The question would be can we do a different border (cedar shake design) that did not exist before the fire? This work was started before approval.</li> </ul>  |
|  | <p>Historic Preservation Commission inquired about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peterson: Some of the new siding has already been done? The building department missed it?</li> <li>• Erin: Correct they did come in for a permit, the COA was somehow missed. It should have been flagged as historic, but somehow it was not caught.</li> <li>• Peterson: I do not have any problems with the cedar shake portion, but I do have some problems with some of the changes that have been made.</li> <li>• Erin: Now that this has happened and it wasn't caught, staff wise we have to be supportive of the change because it has already happened because it is still in the range of change of what we would expect.</li> <li>• Grinnell: Hardboard board and cedar is allowed in the historic district and it truly is an upgrade from the aluminum siding that would have existed. Peterson is raising the question that had it come before the HPC, we would have said that 5 inches it a little wider then what this style home would have had, it probably would have been thinner. But, it is an error that has already happened so since it is still within the range of material we will have to accept.</li> <li>• Hall: Now that there is a different reveal on the hardboard of the porch roof, but we have different siding on the porch knee wall?</li> <li>• Petitioner: We will address it, we will match the existing material.</li> <li>• Hall: There seems to be three different materials.</li> <li>• Petitioner: We will address that that is just due to the stopping of construction.</li> <li>• Lucibello: Will you keep the flare detail on the porch knee wall?</li> <li>• Petitioner: We will.</li> <li>• Martinez: Where is the petitioner living?</li> <li>• Petitioner: Temporary home the insurance has only given us to the end of the month.</li> <li>• Martinez: Will we be able to get the petitioner back in by the end of this month?</li> <li>• Petitioner: We hope.</li> <li>• Jacks: What is staff recommendation?</li> <li>• Erin: We are in support, although it is a different reveal, normal reveals are 3-5 inches so it falls within the range.</li> <li>• Hall: This was aluminum siding prior to the fire?</li> <li>• Erin: Correct</li> <li>• Hall: So this is actually an historical upgrade.</li> </ul> |

|                                       |   |                      |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------|
|                                       | Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.   |                      |
|                                       | <b>Public Testimony: None</b>   |                      |
|                                       | Motion to approve COA # 16-4282 in order to change the reveal and the profile of the siding for the property located at 130 N. Loomis Street.   |                      |
|                                       | Motion by: Martinez<br>Seconded by: Lucibello<br><br>Ayes: Doyle, Jacks, Hall, Lucibello, Martinez, Mayor, Peterson, Urda<br>Nays: None<br>Absent: None   | Approved<br>(8 to 0) |
|                                       |   |                      |
| <b>E. Reports and Recommendations</b> |   |                      |
| <b>F. Correspondence</b>              |   |                      |
| <b>G. New Business</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erin: We need to select a vice chair (fill in for chairman) and a secretary (roll call) for the commission (for one year).</li> <li>• Hall: At this point we would like to ask for volunteers?</li> <li>• Jacks: I will volunteer as vice chairman.</li> <li>• Hall: Secretary?</li> <li>• Doyle: I will volunteer.</li> </ul> |                      |
| <b>H. Adjournment</b>                 |   | <b>7:41 p.m.</b>     |