

**Norman Historic District Commission Meeting
Verbatim Minutes of July 7, 2014, for Item 16:
Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 434 Chautauqua.**

HDC Commission Members: Cameron Brewer Anna Eddings Russ Kaplin Chesley Potts Neil Robinson – Chair Scott Williams Rangar Cline, David John and Loy Macari and were absent.	City of Norman Staff: Lisa Krieg – Acting Preservation Office Jolana McCart – Admin Tech IV Applicant Kash Barker & Nina Barker Architect Hollie Hunt
--	--

Chesley Potts abstained from this item due to a conflict of interest.

Chair Neil Robinson: Now we come to Item 16, Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 434 Chautauqua which was returned back to the Commission from the City Council. Chesley has to leave us now. And we have a staff report?

Lisa Krieg: Yes. Just to bring everyone up to date on the history of this application. On May 5th the Norman Historic District Commission considered a Certificate of Appropriateness for modifications of the property at 434 Chautauqua. A request was made for the following alternations that we will be reconsidering tonight. Those were to remove the dormer peaks on the front elevation, continue the existing mansard roof with wood shingle siding on the second floor in a continual plane the full width of the house. This shows the front elevation of the structure here. This portion of the application was denied by a unanimous vote of the Commission. A letter was provided to the applicant that outlined the reasons for denial and I will read to you from that letter.

“Regarding the request to modify the second story front elevation as presented in the drawings, the Commission voted unanimously to deny the request. The request was based on an assertion that the proposed modifications would return the house to an earlier form. The Commission denied the request, stating that based on the evidence presented, they did not see proof that the modifications proposed were returning the house to an earlier form.

After a lengthy discussion, Commissioners acknowledged that it was possible that 434 Chautauqua had been modified over time, which is common for houses of this age. But Commissioners also stated that the elements proposed for modification – the front porch and the mansard roof on the front elevations – were character defining features of this structure. They said that even if these features had been added later, the changes had occurred many decades ago and had acquired their own historic significance over time. Removal of these elements would completely alter the structure’s historic integrity as it is viewed from the street.

Commissioners said that they were not persuaded that there was conclusive evidence of an earlier roof form. They added that the structure had been the subject of two historic/architectural surveys conducted in 1988 and 2004, both of which designated it as a contributing structure to the Chautauqua Historic District in its current form.

Lastly, several Commissioners referenced the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, which is Section 1.4 of Norman's Historic Preservation Guidelines, which addresses changes to historic building over time.

Section 1.4.4 Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation: Acknowledges Changes Over Time. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

The denial of the COA was appealed by the applicants to the Norman City Council and placed on the June 24, 2014 Agenda.

Based upon the presentation of new evidence by the applicant at that meeting, the Norman City Council remanded the application back to the Norman Historic Commission for consideration.”

And that's where we are tonight. As I stated earlier, the application before us is – looking at the front elevation of the structure – the applicant proposes to remove the gambrel tops above the windows and to extend the mansard gambrel roof in a continuous plane across the front. The drawings that the architect provided – Mark I hope you don't mind me using your drawings – you can see the details in questions are illustrated very well.

The property was constructed in 1920 and as I mentioned it was listed as a contributing resource to the Chautauqua District in both the 1988 and 2004 surveys. In both of these surveys the structure is described as having a cross gabled Gambrel Style roof with cross gable dormers. The cross gable dormers are distinctly different than a typical wall dormer in that they are constructed usually without side walls - and those are the little gables above those windows. In this particular structure it is a very unique element in that the cross gable dormer actually continues in a vertical plane while the gambrel continues the flare causing this little inset where the windows are. In both the 1988 and 2004 surveys the cross gable dormers were listed as defining features.

As with many structures within the Chautauqua District, and Norman as a whole you will see – and here you can see the gable coming out. And again this illustrates that. The stylistic interpretation of different houses in the districts a lot of times are done to reflect a prevalent style that the designer or homeowner was going for but also different elements of different styles are picked up. This is a very good example of that in that the structure itself both has defining elements of the Craftsman/bungalow style with ribbon windows, the exposed rafter tails on the front of it. It also has defining elements of the Dutch Colonial Revival with the gambrel roof. As you start to look at the different details of this house you see the defining elements of the gables and you also see where

they have picked up elements such as the shadow line by the doubling up of the shingles and the use of the shingles instead of corner boards which is picked up from the Shingle Style. As the Commission considers modification to this it needs to be pointed out that one of the proposed modifications was actually listed as a defining element with the gables. The drawings as submitted show the gambrel roof and the windows. Removal of the gable and extending the fascia all the way across. The windows will be inset slightly to allow for the flair of the gambrel coming out. The information here is the information provided by the applicant at the City Council meeting. And I will answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Robinson: Any questions for staff?

R Kaplin: I didn't get to attend or listen to the Council meeting. They sent this application back to us based on what?

L Krieg: The information that the applicant has provided, and which he will give to you, they felt that it was new and significant and it was remanded back to the Commission for consideration.

C Brewer: Based on the new evidence provided at the Council meeting?

L Krieg: Yes.

Chair Robinson: Any more questions? At this point we invite the applicant to present the new things.

Mark Krittenbrink: Good evening. I am Mark Krittenbrink, Krittenbrink Architects, and with me is Holly Hunt. I was thinking how to start this since it is my third visit. Like a good dog I keep coming back. I thought that since Holly is with me I would go with a Beauty and the Beast theme. Ultimately I hate clichés and avoid them like the plague.

Lisa, thank you for giving that history. I would like to give a little different history. The owners, Nina and Kash Barker, are with us tonight and they will come up and speak later. Nina and Kash bought the house in 2013. They felt that it needed some restoration on the outside and a lot on the inside. The plan turned out to be three fold. One would be take 6/7 rooms along the back, consolidate/renovate the second floor of the back and to restore the front porch that had been turned into a screened in porch and then to remove the elements that we feel were added after the original construction. We looked at it and felt that it was valid and reasonable. We researched it and did some plans. Looked at existing conditions. We had Susan Atkinson meet us onsite. She said that she was not seeing it. We had taken some pretty strong liberties with it to what we thought was there originally there. She said she wasn't seeing this and could not support it. If I can't support it I know the Commission probably won't. So we said that we would do some selective demolition and we will see what is underneath the – it's really not a gambrel roof since a gambrel roof is constructed differently. This is a mansard. Let's see what is under there, hoping that we would find siding that had been original to the building and then we would make

our case. But we didn't. And so we thought we have this existing mansard on the front that is deteriorating and would have to be repaired or replaced if we wanted to keep it. The shingles are gone. So what if we worked within the existing mansard style in keeping the mansard roof but cleaning it up where it was presenting difficulties for us. We met with Susan on that and honestly we felt she was in favor of it. Not putting words in her mouth but we felt pretty confident that we had struck a good compromise. And we came to the committee that night and you rejected us on the screened in porch and that mansard. We came back and re-presented evidence on the screened in porch because at that time the ship had sailed on the mansard roof. It was already in the process of going to the City Council which was their next recourse. We came back and we showed photos showing the front porch - I think you all remember the porch boards that were rotting underneath - and you felt that we had made our case that the porch had been an open porch and we got you to approve that.

We take responsibility for maybe not being as prepared as we should have been for that first meeting of this committee. We felt that we had a good plan and did not see running into the opposition that we ran into. Certainly didn't see coming back a third time to address it. I felt like if we had presented it better perhaps we wouldn't be here again tonight. We did feel like for taking it to City Council it made us explore more and let's go with something more real. We feel pretty confident, actually as did the City Council, that the dormers and the mansard had been added after the original construction. And I think that we can prove this all to you tonight. The question will be at the end of that how you choose to take that information.

This is the presentation that we did at City Hall. This is the front of the building. I think that everyone is familiar with it by now. We now know that the screened in porch is coming out and we know how that is going to look. Let me say this. Based on the evidence that we have found, we are not presenting the vision that you had seen before. We are presenting something different. I don't know if that creates problems with the notification. We did not have that. The Council said that they we think that you have made your point that it has been added on. If you have new evidence to share with us you should go back and share with the committee. Neil was there and thought that it was a good idea and actually so did the owners. That was direction that we took. But we had already missed the deadline for this meeting and you all did some fast work to get us onto the agenda tonight. I would like to go through what we found and what we are proposing.

You are familiar with the house. I point out that here is the roof structure and here is the parts that we have issues with. The mansard and the dormers. That's looking at the court of the house. Notice this roof structure. Right here. It's a small skirt roof that runs all the way around the building. This is what is there. There isn't the best representation. You have the skirt roof that runs all the way across and you have this. And you have the dormers as Lisa has determined. Now a gambrel roof is going to.. I would like to point out. If you stand and look at this house you see this wall plate. This wall line. It goes straight up and hits right there. You have a full plate height. A gambrel roof by design is one that comes and encroaches like that. Think of every barn in the Pennsylvania countryside. That's a gambrel roof. It does not face off of that point. Historically this is

not a gambrel roof. You can see that this point which was there. And we feel like this was the original house and was added on three or four times. And we suspect that the last was by the same owner that did some horrific things. But in any case, I want to point that out. And this is what we proposed originally and was rejected.

I want to address this in two points. One is the dormers. If you look at the dormers. Notice this shadow line. Right? That wall plane does not run high. If this wall had been built at the same time you would have run the shingle line straight up. You can see it right there. There's a gap there that if you drive by the house you can see it. This whole inset plane around the windows where its happening twice, it comes up here to the ridge line and is furred out. There would be no reason to do that if you had built it at one time. You would have run those shingles straight up. Furthermore, look at the fascia. You can see that it has been cut and open. Again you would not have done that if it was an original structure. What I think this indicates pretty clearly is that this was running all the way across and they came in and added this and cut the fascia board there and you have an open end. That is in four different locations where that happened. You have the open end right there. Again a blow up of the same thing. You can see the open space and the awkwardness of the detail. Nothing lines up. You see there...the fascia coming around where it has been cut and the shingle has been taken down to it and left open. This is looking at the inside. This is the backside of the dormer. You can barely see the flashing here of where that dormer attaches. Again, if they had built that dormer in the original construction, they would have scabbled it on to the outside. It would have been built into the groove but instead it is completely scabbled on to the outside. You can see some of the flashing there. As if it were added at a certainly different point. It's not original construction. It's not part of the original roof. So that's my case for that.

Now let's look at the mansard. Look at this roof. It is clearly the original roof that has gone on around and you can see the rafters everything that runs all around. Here it runs around the front and here you can see where this vertical plane, the mansard is sitting on top of it. Ok. Look and see how the mansard fits the roof. Right. It was built on top of it. That skirt roof existed. We got all the structure underneath it showing it existed. Then they scabbled the mansard on top of that. If it were a mansard it would come down and the underside of the mansard would be the roof structure that you see. You wouldn't have built this group and then this group next to it. It's two different styles and you just wouldn't have done it. This group would have come down here and the underside. This whole roof structure would have been part of the mansard. But it's not. It's built on to the top of the skirt roof, which I think is the wrong term. Right there. You can see the detail and how awkward that flashing is. You can look at this. And see how awkward that flashing is where it hits because it part caulk, park flashing, part shingle. And look at the installation of those where all those little sliver cuts of the shingles. You wouldn't have done that purposely, you would have done that retrofitting. Again, look at the roof that was there. The skirt roof. And look how that mansard sits on top of it. There's extra flashing to cover it. You see. But you can see where it is built on top of the roof below. Again, the roof that was there and where the mansard has been scabbled on. Again, a window – this is the original roof plate – and look at how that roof has been tucked up underneath that existing sill. If that would have all been built at one time, that sill would

not be sitting on top of that roof. When we look at this, we see that changes are you had the house, the skirt roof, and went on up straight and had a gable roof on top. What we didn't find was siding nailed to this sheathing below. We did find lots of nail holes. So something was nailed to that before. Is that it? OK. So. Can you go back to.....I'll tell you when to stop. So we feel that we have the siding going up, we have the skirt board and if you remember from the diagram I showed you on the elevations, that point goes straight up and hits the head plate at the top second floor. That mansard has been scabbed on. Looking at that then, what we would like to do then. I'm sorry but we just got this done, and I will pass this around. Here is the skirt roof that is existing and here is what we believe was existing before with the shed roof above. This is the porch as we have already addressed it. This is what we feel our research shows. The dormers were added on. The mansard roof was added on. You drive around in this neighborhood, and I have done it. I've driven from Symmes to Lindsey; from Elm to Flood. There is not another mansard house in that whole area. You wouldn't have been building this house the way it looks now back when this house was built. So we feel that the mansard and the dormers were clearly an addition. The owner wants to take this back to what they feel, and we think we have proved, to what it was historically. It's a cleaner style. It's a style they want. It's a style that I believe was there and we are looking at this mansard which is a deteriorated structure. I mean there is nothing there that we are going to reuse. And you would not rebuild it sitting on this skirt. I mean you wouldn't do it. It's an insane detail. So I guess I'm here to ask. I hope I have made my point. I am here to answer any questions.

Chair Robinson: Are there questions for the applicant?

C Brewer: Can you go back to the original proposal that was proposed in May? Just in comparison to what we have here. I do realize that it is what we are considering but....

M Krittenbrink: So, Cameron, what you have.... this skirt roof runs around and this pops out a little more and this dies in the top of it. We were going to clean it up if we brought it out. And if you go back....the front...this sloping out towards you. Again, getting rid of the skirt roof that we think is original. And then the shingles coming out. It's hard to read but this is coming out at an angle.

L Krieg: So what this is depicting is that the actual mansard itself is gone. It's a vertical plane with siding.

Chair Robinson: And the vertical plane would be at the point where that mansard roof/peak sits at now.

M Krittenbrink: Would you move forward one.

L Krieg: In the plane where the windows are in presently.

M Krittenbrink: Yes.

Chair Robinson: So the windows remain in the same plane.

M Krittenbrink: Yes the same windows.

Chair Robinson: In fact the windows are the same. You aren't replacing them

M Krittenbrink: Exactly.

R Kaplan: Could you go back to the photo that shows the cross gable and the window. So in your theory the above window. Where is the original plane of the wall above the window? Right where it is?

M Krittenbrink: Yes cause that's straight.

R Kaplan: And that's in line with the wall on the first floor?

M Krittenbrink: Yes.

Chair Robinson: Mark on that upper level where that furring strip comes out. That is actually a piece that was added. There's not a 2x6 or something that is back there.

M Krittenbrink: There is about a gap of $\frac{3}{4}$ inch to an inch underneath it. You can see it from that shadow line. But we know that all of this is scabbed on top of the original roof sheathing.

Chair Robinson: Was that – do you have a picture of that interior there? That's the one that we saw?

M Krittenbrink: Yes.

R Kaplan: Could we go back to that interiorIf, in your view, if that dormer had been original, what would that look like if not like that?

M Krittenbrink: I think that you would see it presented with framing and such inside and you would have had roof framing for the dormer to frame into. They would not have just scabbed the weight of it onto a roof plane. There would have been some kind of internal framing that they would have nailed in to.

R Kaplan: That would carry the load directly down to the wall plane.

M Krittenbrink: Just giving you something to attach in the roof plane as you are nailing it up. Probably right Russ. Carrying that load up as opposed to every time it hits this sheathing board it kind of gives it uniform loading.

Holly Hunt: See the decking is breaking away there.

M Krittenbrink: Which is probably by the undo pressure that it wasn't built to house.

Chair Robinson: Thank you. Any other questions? Well this was sent back to us from the City Council to reconsider based on the information that the architect has presented. I think at this point that we probably should hear from anyone else in the audience that would like to comment on this project. Anyone from the audience who would like to say anything?

Kash Barker: My name is Kash Barker and this is Nina Barker. We live at 434 Chautauqua. We moved to the neighborhood September 2013. We had driven by this house several times prior to that. We really didn't think it looked like the rest of the neighborhood anything else in the neighborhood. We didn't think that it looked like a historic structure. We passed by it several times when it was for sale but we ended up looking at the inside and we thought there was something that we could do based on the inside. It's a great Craftsman Style home on the inside and there are some great Craftsman Style elements like Mark said on the outside. But there are just some other stuff going on there that we don't think is indicative of what that home really was. We really truly believe that. We are very much into the historic tenor of the neighborhood. We want to absolutely keep that as much as we possibly can. You guys don't care about the inside of the house but we also want to do that on the inside of the house with furniture and everything else. That's a big deal to us. So we think absolutely that this rendering is what you would have seen if you would have walked by the house in the 1920's. I know that's one of the things that is important to the historic district. If we were to walk down the neighborhood in the 1920's what would it look like. We have gone around to our neighbors, not just on Chautauqua. We have actually gone twice. The first time was when we were going to go to City Council. We got 18 signatures then and 18 plus in phone calls for the original design. Then we took this rendering and this photographic evidence over the weekend. Unfortunately it was the July 4th weekend. We did not hit very many people. We got 20 signatures on Chautauqua and Lahoma. We have one of our neighbors here 2 houses to the north. The support has been overwhelming in terms of transforming what is currently there to something that looks more historic. We have been very humbled by how important the neighbors feel that this project is. I'm not sure what else....

Nina Barker: We did have overwhelming support. There was a very tiny handful of people who didn't say no because they didn't want to go against the Commission. Either because they had friends or had been on the Commission so they kind of also didn't want to hear what we had to say. They kind of shooed us off and we understand. We have friends and we don't want to go against them. We just wanted people to see that we wanted to make it architecturally sound. I have worked on a lot of construction projects for the government and something that is architecturally sound is important to me. I was furloughed in October of last year and took the time to attack the basement which was another DIY project. As I first started to clean out the trash and got to the bottom of the drywall cause at some time people lived in the basement. There was a bunch of black mold. So I'm thinking that I have to get rid of this. I talked to people and I say that I am going to do this and they say I need to buy all this stuff so I don't breathe in the mold or

get one of those dumpsters. And as I wrap a piece of insulation and break it piece by piece. Throw it away. And then my dogs got sick and Lady almost died and is on IVs for like 2 days because of the bacteria that she inhaled in the basement. That kind of craftsmanship has perpetuated. When the contractors ripped off the back portion of the second floor of the house they said they had never seen anything like that. So I go to the visqueen and check in to see what is there and things are not lining up. When I removed the wallpaper in the breakfast nook and there was no glue along the edges.

K Barker: So it's not at all surprising from the back of the house that there would be this crazy stuff on the front of the house. Just different cobbled up projects that you are seeing today.

N Barker: We just want to make it right. Please help us make it right.

Chair Robinson: Thank you. Any other comments?

James Rhodes: I would like to make a comment. I am the neighbor 2 houses to the north. And I have looked at this for 27 years. And I would urge you, if you haven't, to drive by. Neil, I know that it is on your way home. It is an eyesore. It has been an eyesore for 27 years. When I first moved into this neighborhood it was a multi-family dwelling where students resided. There were students living on the first floor, second floor and third floor. The first floor being the basement. There were 3 different apartments carved into it. About 1990 some ex-hippies moved into it with their children. They tried to restore it. Especially the inside. I know I talked to him many time about it and he felt that the house had been built higgely piggely. I don't have any architectural evidence to back me up, but if I think that if you look at that twin peak whatever gambrel or I don't know what roof it is. That twin peak very awkward looking arrangement. I've always assumed that a sleeping porch was enclosed at some time but I'm not sure that is right. All I know is that it doesn't look right. It looms over the street. It's too tall. It's not appropriately positioned I don't think. And the twin peaks just don't add to it. It has looked the same since I have lived here for 27 years. But it's always looked awful. Looked as if it has been added on piecemeal. I know from the interior work that it had been added on piecemeal. If you go inside now you can see how awkward it is. I wish you luck in trying to...I very much support this. If you get north of Juniper many of those houses have been turned into multi – including our house – and students lived there. The house 2 doors north of us the same way. It's not like the neighborhood south of Juniper which is very pristine. All the houses were kept as single family dwellings. This house has suffered over time. I would support these efforts to restore it into some sort of ascetic design. It's just not there right now. I would urge you to drive by it. It has never fit the neighborhood.

Rick Poland: 425 Chautauqua. I've lived there since 1992. I was in this house between 88 and 90. A band called the Street People lived there. It wasn't very nice on the inside. But you know, all of that is irrelevant. Personally, and I may make myself out to look like a fool, but I have always felt it was an attractive house. I liked the whole thing. It is totally unique. But whether we like it or not is totally irrelevant. They have brought up

some evidence that some additions have been made. Certainly you can tell from the back that some things were done that were not good. And that's all gone away at this point. If you do decide to approve this plan, I just hope that you make it really clear that it is based on not just some kind of fact that people don't like it or the people in that neighborhood voted as a majority to change it. I hope we don't get into the situation where it's, well you know, most of the people on the block don't like this so we are going to do away with it. They have brought evidence and they feel very strongly that these changes were made and they weren't original and I don't know how that tie into the Guideline that say changes over time becomes part of the property. And I appreciate that they have good intentions with the property and I am very happy that they do so. I just hope that if you do approve what they ask for that you make it very clear that it doesn't have anything to do with a neighborhood vote. Some people will just tell you that it looks good.

David Dollarhide: 645 S Lahoma. I just want to reiterate what Poland has just said. I think that what concerns me is the process that this has come back to the Historic District Commission from the Council. And the process of going from door to door to solicit support for the changes you want is absolutely counterintuitive if you think about it. Your considerations are legitimate and Mr. Krittenbrink has made a strong case that these changes have been made over the years and they are badly designed and they are poor changes. That's with realm of your considerations as member of this Commission. But what I am opposed to is trying to do it by majority vote. Because what is – let me throw out a for instance for you – what if some of the rent lords in the District all of a sudden wanted to take a poll of the students who live in those homes. What if they come in and say I think that there should be more than 3 cars allowed parked in the front yard. And everyone in our block agrees with it. You are just opening a Pandora Box if you are considering what is popular and what isn't. I think that is totally legitimate to question the validity of the design of the house, but am certainly opposed to the way the applicants have solicited support among the neighbors.

Chair Robinson: I want to thank you for your input.

K Barker: Can I make a statement?

Chair Robinson: Sure.

K Barker: Again 434 Chautauqua. I didn't mean to offend anyone in the neighborhood by going around and discussing the changes. My wife and I thought that the neighbors would want to know the condition of the home and the evidence that we found. You can absolutely choose to ignore it if you like. There certainly was no ill intent. I am disappointed that it was presented that way. We presented the evidence, not just this rendering. We showed pictures – not just of this rendering. We didn't just say does this look pretty please sign. We showed the evidence of some of the pictures that you saw today.

Chair Robinson: Anybody else?

Vicki Dollarhide: 645 S Lahoma. I didn't feel any ill intent when you worked the neighbors. The problem with the petitioning and "majority rules" kind of aspect of this is that we have a very strong process here. And I am such a believer in the HD and so many years went into and so much thought went into the Guidelines. And they are what matter here. And I don't think that we can lose sight of that. And I am afraid that this kind of petition thing with the neighbors will set a precedent that will undermine those well thought out Guidelines. Those are what we need to consider and not how many people adjacent to the house or in the neighborhood have a different opinion. But these Guidelines are so important and I would hate to see that kind of change in the process undermined.

Chair Robinson: Anyone else? OK. I would like state for the record here we attempt to the best of our abilities to adhere to the Guidelines and the discussion about who likes the idea and who doesn't while it's OK, we really can't take that into our consideration. We have to see how it applies to our Guidelines and render a decision on that basis. So that's where the Commission is coming from.

The City Council sent this back to us to hear to hear the additional information from the applicant. Mark Krittenbrink presented additional information that we didn't have last time. And that's what we are looking for here. There are several issues to resolve and I would certainly entertain some discussion from the Commission about it having seen what Mark has presented. What would be the sense of the Commission here?

S Williams: I don't feel that the house is an eyesore. I have been in Norman since 2001 and have always seen the house as distinctive. I think it's positive that's it's not other houses in the neighborhood. It may be that it is not in the original condition but I don't feel that the house is such a hideous nature that it would benefit being taken back to its if that was the case to the original state. I think that it's part of the Guidelines are in place for and also the Sectary of Interior Standards Section 1.4.4, acknowledge changes over time. I think these changes, if they are changes, we don't really know. I can see evidence for and against it. But again I think the changes have reached historic significance and I think the house is distinctive and attractive. I think the illustration is very plain and we would lose some unique and distinctive in the neighborhood if it is allowed the proposal was approved.

L Krieg: I would just like to remind the Commission that the charge that you have tonight is determining whether the information that has been provided by the applicant is substantive enough to prove that the structure itself had an original form other than the existing form. And that those changes, even though they occurred over time, are not historical significant. What we are charged with the Secretary of Interior Standards that acknowledges the changes over time and the historical significance that they acquire over that time. Not if we like what is being proposed or if we think the structure is unique and needs to be retained. We have to have a finding of fact to change what is there to a previous period with the evidence that is presented that it wasn't originally in that condition.

C Brewer: I think that the main issue at hand here is 1.4.4. We have seen evidence of changes and of what I have seen I believe that there is evidence that there have been changes, but if those changes have occurred over a matter of weeks, months or years we have no evidence of that without original photos of the house based on time periods. I do believe that while the dormers and peaks were added, that could have been the same craftsmen that did the original structure of the roof line and so without any further evidence of when those additions took place, it's hard to go against that particular guidelines in my mind.

A Eddings: I agree with Cameron in that the applicant has presented evidence of changes but not evidence that the changes took place after the period of significance. It is possible that these changes have acquired significance over time. I think they were trying to make the house look more Dutch Colonial which was popular in the 1920's as well as this standard type of Colonial Revival occurred up through the 1940's, which is within the period of significance of the District. It is very possible that they made the changes during the period of significance.

R Kaplin: How long does it take to be in the period of significance and when did this happen. That is my primary struggle. I think given the overall history of the property it's likely it was added at one time and is not the original form. Then the question is how old is it? If it is an improvement or not is really irrelevant.

Chair Robinson: The only really hard evidence that we have is the 1988 survey that showed that it existed then and it refers to the cross gable dormers as a defining feature. Which it would have if it contemplated it as a Dutch Colonial Revival.

R Kaplin: Remind when the district was formed?

L Krieg: 1995

Chair Robinson: So this would have been the initial survey that the district was....

L Krieg: Not necessarily. The City did multiple surveys in the late 80's of numerous areas which included the Chautauqua area.

Chair Robinson: The house was built in 1920. I do think that it's probably based on what we have seen that strange arrangement of the dormers and gambrel were probably added at a later point. How much later or when we don't really know. I do think that a lot of the construction shown there was obviously cut- to- fit and paint- to- match. It was made to fit what was there. But that's something that leads us back to the Secretary of Interior Standards that acknowledges changes over time. Which leads us to a direct conflict with a desire for restoration. If someone is coming in saying what was done, we believe essentially took the structure out of one classification, Craftsman Bungalow, and put it into another. That may be the case. Well in that case then I guess it's our charge to determine what's trumps one or the other. Is it more important to adhere to the changes over time standard or more important to adhere to original standards? I don't really know

how to answer that other than that both are valid points. Then the question is how do we determine what would be the best application of the Guidelines in order to resolve this dispute. I don't know. Does the Commission have anything to say about this? What makes one more important than the other?

A Eddings: One important thing to consider when trying to peel back the layers as to what has been done to a house, is that whatever you do in that process, you do not add something that was probably never there originally. When you are facing what you are going back to on conjecture, then in order to preserve the integrity of the house it's often sacred to preserve what is already there to prevent from adding false history. Although they have shown evidence that what they are going back to, they do have sound basis, but it's just not 100% proof.

R Kaplan: (comments were made about the windows, but could not understand.)

C Brewer: What is still difficult to me is that I cannot see the separation between those two ideas because we don't know what is original. The additions or the changes could have happened over a matter of months and I consider that original to the house. Whether it was original by the same homebuilder or whether it was somebody different even if it was a matter of months I would still consider that original. Without the clear distinction and evidence...

Chair Robinson: Or it could have been done in 1987 which is outside the period of significance. We don't have any real direct evidence. That would make it easy. We are still left with the issue on how we determine on our best estimate of what is appropriate on this particular structure. I think Anna had a good point about it. I think we have the two surveys – 1988 and 2004 –both refer to the cross gable dormers as defining features of that Dutch Colonial Revival.

L Krieg: They were done by two different consultants.

R Kaplan: It's safe to say that both of the surveys were not done in the period of significance. They are almost not relevant other than we know where it is today.

L Krieg: I need to clarify that the surveys are what was utilized to establish the period of significance by looking at the body of the neighborhood as a whole and then the structures were separated. That was how the period of significance was determined.

A Eddings: And those surveys were done by professional architectural historians usually through CLG funds. And in their opinion the features were significant and important enough to the house for them to mention in its design as they saw it during the period of significance of the district.

Chair Robinson: One of the issues I have with the construction as it now stands is if you are a contractor trying to reconstruct this it would be difficult to do that with the way it is built. It seems that you would need to come in and reconstruct some of this interior

framing to make it work. You could certainly do it and return the shingles although there are places on the detailing where the shingles come down to the lower roof that would be really hard to do right. So I mean that in a way we are asking if you adhere to that and keep it, that appearance will have to change on necessity because it's not the right type of construction or techniques to use.

S Williams: But it can be done.

Chair Robinson: Yes it can be done no doubt. But is it reasonable to ask someone to reconstruct a – I don't know what to call it – cut- to- fit- paint- to -match element of the structure to make it look something like what we have there. I really don't know. I wouldn't want to be the contractor trying to determine that.

L Krieg: One question that I have and it is evident in this photo and then this one. At this point we don't have any proof that this was the way it was constructed either at the original time or at whatever time it was possibly added it. It may be some kind of modification done...with the flashing here, it may have just been the owner trying to stop a leak and it was simply cobbled up there. And so we have no proof to show when these things were done and what methodology it was done to address a particular situation. It very well could have been constructed like this originally or added at the later date. The Commissions needs to decide if there is appropriate proof to determine.....

S Williams: I still feel that the changes over time have attained historical significance.

M Krittenbrink: May I re-address? Is that appropriate? Lisa, how many houses in this neighborhood do not contribute or are noncontributing?

L Krieg: There are some....

M Krittenbrink: Can you describe what one of those might be?

L Krieg: Not off the top of my head.

M Krittenbrink: This isn't a historical structure. It's an old house so it contributes more than a 2 story hip roof duplex would. So I think that it's important to note that any historical house in this neighborhood is going to be listed as contributing.

L Krieg: No that is incorrect. There are some houses that are listed as non-contributing but they still have to adhere to the Guidelines.

M Krittenbrink: We were asked to prove that these roof additions were done after the fact. I think that the only real proof that we have tonight. We have proof that the dormers were added and we have proof that the mansard was added and were not original construction. We looked at the Western History Collection. We went after the City Council meeting the fellow that was there said to go look at the Historical House. Kash and Nina did and found no evidence of it. So I see no evidence. We cannot date the

mansard or date the work added on all we can prove is that it wasn't original and we would like to take it back to the original. Unless someone can tell us that it was done outside the 50 year limit, I don't what else we are supposed to do from a representation stand point other than prove that it isn't original. And we researched it and found no information when the mansard was built. Nor do I believe the City has that information, correct? When the mansard was added.

L Krieg: No.

M Krittenbrink: I would just like to throw that out that we were asked to prove that it was an addition and I feel like we have done that. And this is what the owners want to do is take it back to historical - what it was originally. There's no proof as to when the other happened.

S Williams: Aside from that, I don't feel the evidence is overwhelming that these aren't original and that these weren't made within the time period of significance. I still feel the house has been there long enough with these changes that they have become significant. I think that by altering that you are altering entire streetscape. It's not like it was done 2 years ago or 20 years ago. Obviously the shingles and so forth have been on there longer than that. So I still feel we should uphold Section 1.4.4 and acknowledge changes over time. I would like to put forth a motion to deny the application.

Motion by S Williams to deny the application as presented; **Second** by C Brewer.

Chair Robinson: Any more discussion?

A Eddings: I would like to point out that often times when these buildings in a historic district were designated as non-contributing, it was based on it being very clear what had been to them after the period of significance. Usually you can tell 1950's alternations, 1960's alternations are very obvious. It's not obvious that these are 50's or 60's alternation. It could have easily been done in the 40's based on other architectural historian's professional judgment. 20's/30's or 40's. I think there are probably changes that can be made to this form that would not change the character defining features, but as proposed, removing the peaks and mansard roof would change the character.

Chair Robinson: Anyone else?

C Brewer: Continuing on with the thought that we continually reference Sec. 1.4.4, it's just as important to discuss 1.4.5. (*Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation – Preserve Distinctive Features. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*) We had discussed this at the May meeting. These are clearly distinctive features of the house. They were changes, assuming they were changes, they were changes that added distinctive features to the house. It's important that we reference that as well.

A Eddings: The original features listed under Guideline Section 3.2.1 that are important to preserve includes things like siding, shingles, cornices, brackets, pediments - the roof peaks are kind of a form of pediments – columns, balustrades, and architectural trim. The roof peaks and mansard roof are as visually prominent as features that are specifically called out in the Guidelines as things to preserve.

R Kaplan: I would like to say something eloquent but I can say this eloquently. I'm torn that I have clean Guidelines telling me what to preserve. But what I can't say eloquently is that preserving in preserving history I feel what we are also preserving is the craftsmanship and durability that was integral in this historic structure of homes. I think that there is evidence that there are exhibits of poor craftsmanship and that poor craftsmanship may be very well old enough to be historically significant, but that does not mean that I personally think that we should preserve hodge-podge. Preserving the overall style, that I can see. But the details of how do you make something that looks like that drain water and not rot and be financially viable.....

Chair Robinson: I kind of concur with you in that area. It's not really incumbent upon us to preserve hodge-podge. It's really not. Just because somebody did something that wasn't a good idea in 1935 does not mean that we need to preserve it. It's still a bad idea in 2014. That being the case, and I feel like we are in a really difficult decision. On one hand we really do need to preserve what we have and what we can and adhere to the Guidelines as we can. But we are also charged with this focus element of preserving something that is sustainable. And preservation is something that really isn't sustainable. So I feel like in this case, as much as I would like to go along with the experts who deemed these cross gable dormers defining features, I have to feel like the experts didn't have the opportunity to look at it closely and get up inside and take a close look at what had been done. I don't know that they would have necessarily changed their minds but it might have had an impact on how they viewed it. But, that being the case, I think that we really do have to make a decision based on today. We need to move forward to make a decision so the applicants can decide on how they want to proceed.

L Krieg: Neil, can I ask you a question. The Guidelines are very clear that an applicant or owner can undertake ordinary maintenance and repair. In the letter that was sent to the applicants that was actually addressed because it was raised at the May meeting. It said that the Commission agreed that areas of deterioration can and should be repaired. Staff commented during this discussion that undertaking ordinary maintenance of historic structures provides opportunities for property owners to correct minor design flaws that may have caused deterioration due to water and insect damage. Maybe this is an opportunity the Commission to work with the applicants in addressing the areas they feel need ordinary maintenance and repair and doing some minor modifications to that to allow the durability of the structure to continue.

S Williams: I agree with that.

Chair Robinson: Yeah. The corollary of that is that once your start into these old structures and taking things off you discover that what you thought you had is not what

you had through various things like termites. I agree with you and that is certainly something that we could work the applicants on for sure.

N Barker: May I ask a question. In my online research, I don't know what kind of bearing other historic commissions have, but they are older and I feel like they are like grandpas and kind of serve as a mentor. In the northeast there are a lot of Victorian homes, Italian homes that are restored over time and a lot of those have also been modified over time and there have been instances where an Italian home had a French mansard roof added were made to keep those if they were properly added. In those instances they said they were woven into the fabric of the home. The ones that were not properly added, were allowed to be taken off and go back to what the rest of them look like. I feel like that is a very comparable situation to what we have in that they tried to make it look like something but it wasn't woven into the fabric of the home. Had it looked like Rick's house, then I would totally understand but when you have all these weird additions and you have the original skirt roof but the added on gambrel or mansard or whatever you want to call it – hodge-podge weekend work. Do we want to save it because it was there for a long time or do we want to go back in following the precedence of other historic commissions.

Chair Robinson: Thank you. Any further discussion?

C Brewer: So when you say the Commission can work with the applicant in making repairs to minimize future deterioration to the home, what does that mean?

L Krieg: In the case that Neil was referring to the cross gables, if that is in fact the way it is constructed in the interior there is not appropriate support, obviously the owner can add support to that. If it is leaking, possibly it's a flashing issue that needs to be addressed. There are houses all over the district that have gables on them that do not leak. The method of construction could be looked at to see if there is a simple modification of the gable that could be done that is causing that issue they are having. Such as with the fascia that has an open hole. Well. You can close it. I think the Commission can see what it is that the applicants, other than they don't agree that this particular manifestation of the front was the original structure, but what are the nuts and bolts repair that you need to do to maintain the property short of tearing it off.

A Eddings: I think someone should explore the possibility that even though to correct the problems the applicant may need to do things beyond ordinary maintenance but they could come back to us with things that correct the problems but are less drastic design change than what has been shown.

Chair Robinson: The problem that you get into when you open these old structures up is how do you retrofit something that works with what you got and very often what are you going to find that you end up taking off the front anyway and reconstruct it from the sill up. Because there is no real way to get in there and fit things. Maybe there is. I don't know. It gets into at what point do you recognize that this is not a salvageable arrangement for framing or whatever and we are going to rebuild the frame that would

have a façade like this. But in the meanwhile what is under the facade is brand new. That can happen. Or it can be that you find that there is something that can be shored up and work with. You just aren't going to know until you get into it. It's one of those things that we try to allow when people are in the midst of a project and they have to come back to us with changes because they find elements like that that are unknown that they come across and if there are signify elements that require significant changes to the structural elements that hold things up then they can come back to us if necessary and try to accommodate that with what we know once the construction has actually started.

Are we ready to call the question?

J McCart: And the motion is to deny the application.

A roll call vote was taken and passed with a vote of 4 to 1, with Chair Robinson voting against.

Prepared by Jolana McCart
HDC Recording Secretary