

**Norman Historic District Commission Meeting
Verbatim Minutes of May 5, 2014, for Item 20:
Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 434 Chautauqua.**

HDC Commission Members: Cameron Brewer Rangar Cline Anna Eddings David John Neil Robinson – Chair Scott Williams Russ Kaplan, Loy Macari and Chesley Potts were absent.	City of Norman Staff: Susan Atkinson - Historic Preservation Officer Jolana McCart – Admin Tech IV Applicant Kash Barker and Architect Hollie Hunt
---	---

Chair Neil Robinson: Now we come to Item 20, Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 434 Chautauqua.

Susan Atkinson: I will give a brief staff report then turn it over to the architect, Holly Hunt who is here along with her client Kash Barker.

You will recall the Commission reviewed and approved the proposal to make some changes to an existing addition to the rear. I believe we saw this two months ago. Back in March. Basically the new owners are seeking to deconstruct some awkward construction that may have taken place throughout the years to allow them to go forward with kitchen renovations and to get rid of some of the awkwardness that was discontinuous floor heights and strange roof angles. Lots of interior stuff.

Now they are back to discuss with us the proposed revisions to the front of the house. This is to kind of just to get you oriented. This is a set of drawings that deal with all 4 elevations of the house. This is a house like many of its era which has had some changes over time. Some are legible in that you can follow them and see what happened first and what happened next and some it's not so easy to tell exactly how that worked.

At issue before the Commission this evening is particularly the front elevation. The house now has – we might describe it two ways – gambrel roof and also as a mansard roof. The architect and I talked about this quite a bit. The gambrel describes this shape roof. Some people think of it as a barn shaped roof. Mansard refers to when a roof line like this is actually pierced by dormers. So we actually have two things going on. The building material on the exterior of the upstairs is cedar shake siding which staff feels was an attempt at the time this was applied to the house to mimic something from the late Victorian era called shingle style. We know the date of construction of this house was sometime between 25 and 29. At the very, very late post Victorian era. None the less one of the things we see in Norman is houses that blend lots of stylistic traditions that were found in late 19 early 20 centuries.

What has happened over time in this case is some of the stylistic decisions – here again this is not a true gable but almost false front that creates a false eyebrow over two sets of

triple windows here in the front. But there is some awkwardness here in how this structure works functionally. How it sheds water. How it's finished. This is kind of an oddball finish for a corner with these shingles tacked on to the end. There have been some drainage problems have created moisture problems which have created critter problems over the years.

So I think the motivation in this case in part is to deal with the maintenance issues that have been long mandated over. So backing up a sec, one of the ways that the applicant proposes to address these maintenance issues is to remove these little false dormers and remove the inset and to remove the way the windows are inset now.

The other piece of the motivation here is to kind of open the porch. As you can see right now, the porch is screened and is a rather unusual construction for porches found in Norman. Rather than the typical style of handrails and balusters, this one is actually enclosed with wood siding. The property owner would like to remove the wood siding and go back to a more traditional system of baluster and handrail and unscreened porch. The architect can tell us a little more about that proposal and their motivation.

This is an interior shot. I'll let the architect tell you a little more about it. They have done a little exploratory surgery to try and determine what changes that have taken place to the structure over time. So with that, are there any questions of staff?

Chair Robinson: Is the shingle façade that is on here – are they all around?

S Atkinson: Just on the gambrel end. This is a cross gable structure – east/west wing of the house is just wood siding. Just a second floor application of the wood shakes. Other questions for staff?

Rangar Cline: So to itemize everything: to remove the false gables...

S Atkinson: The proposal is to remove the recess of the windows and to make those changes to the second floor front elevation and to make the changes to the front porch.

Jolana McCart: When was the house built?

S Atkinson: 1925/29.

Kash Barker: 1918/1925 I was thinking.

S Atkinson: Ok so it's a little older.

K Barker: I believe it's 1919. It appears on what ever map...

S Atkinson: 1925 Sanborn map.

J McCart: And is this a contributing structure?

S Atkinson: Yes it is.

Scott Williams: I'm a little confused here. Is the drawing.... The way the application is worded makes it seem that the sloping gambrel/mansard aspect is original but I don't think it is.

S Atkinson: Let's bring the architect up to answer questions. Holly, if you would join us at the podium and state your name for the record. Are there any other general questions for staff? Holly is you would join us at the podium.

Holly Hunt: My name is Holly Hunt, Krittenbrink Architects and also Kash Barker, home owner, is here to answer your questions.

What we – in my education of architecture history and so forth, yes and the presupposition that we have all made on this house is that this mansard form, architecture idea, was not original. And so therefore as we have gone ahead with the project we have done some exploratory surgery in hopes we may prove a more original form previous to what we see today.

Susan, if you go to that one picture which appears to be a hidey-hole. See the gutter there? We are going right behind those shingle shakes. What we found when we pulled off some of those shingles and got inside what I would call a mansard – and I call it that because it is attached at the actual interior wall structure rather than a continuation of a gambrel roof – which is typical of a Shingle style.

This is the structure holding these wood shakes onto the exterior. What we see here and through me getting up into the attic, getting my clothes full of fiberglass, we found this pine sheathing. 1x6 pine sheathing. It runs continuous up the interior of that gambrel and we hoped that we would find here is the original 4 inch wood shingles. We did not. Therefore, we cannot prove that this wasn't the original but we still believe that even that the homeowners at the time's best attempt to come up with some stylized version of their home trying to give it some kind of architectural style. This would not have been the choice of the original architect that would have done this. Since we can't prove it, let's move on. That's what we found.

Just wanting to be completely open with you all, we investigated, we respect what you are trying to do here an significant historical preservation. Another reason I believe it would not have been done this way is because this type...What we have here was created - by what I would consider a mansard is a single plane at a slope but that would run continuous in a standard architectural occupation. But because of these little roof peaks that showed the roof joists that run continuously along this plane. Even behind these peaks. Susan, I thought I had sent you one from the attic.

S Atkinson: I didn't see it.

H Hunt: I can prove that but either way that is so. Also, we can't see that in the picture but this board does not run at a mitered angle to the straight fascia board here. That creates a little hole...a little triangle...that creates the critter problem. Birds, squirrels, everything is able to penetrate right here. They can penetrate this roof right there, leading you to believe they were tacked on later even whenever they created this gambrel form be it what it may. I don't believe these are part of that. Because those roof structures go on continuously and because that fascia was not designed for that kind of continuation. Because of that we are having critter problems. Because of that we are shedding water. This house was sold to the current owner 2 years ago and the paint job the previous owner did hide a lot of the deterioration of the shingles. They have extreme water damage to these shingles.

So what we propose is to continue this plane the whole length of the house. In doing so we will leave the windows in the exact same plane that they are on an interior wall to merely make little insets for those windows to belong. We will address that sill in order to be water proof weather proof and probably incorporate planter shelves or something to help mitigate that. But in order for us to create this continuous roof line, we really will save and preserve the original materials that we find on this house. Which we don't totally dislike. It's a quality and we like the wood cedar but they are going to deteriorate at this rate and even worse if we don't have some kind of modification. And I will just say, as a Commission, the homeowners and I understand that you are not trying to be stewards of good and bad design. You are stewards of history. We understand that. With that being said, in order to do so at 434 Chautauqua, we believe modifications need to be made and that's what brings us to you today. So that's that.

On the porch, again, we know this is not typical. We believe that this neighborhood was built as a community and this porch that we find today...it's very closed off. In fact it's dark. This porch. We will preserve – see the roofing structure below? – we will preserve all that original roof structure. We will redo the gutters. We tighten it up a little and repaint and restore that portion but where we want to make changes again is this region. Open up this façade to the street by creating mission style craftsmen railing. Top and bottom rails. Beautiful. We will maintain the structure here. It's hard to see but right there, that dark shadow line, is basically almost as if it is a sill. It's a cap to the original base of that column. And so above we got wood siding and it's so massive – so there we would like to reconstruct what we consider a time relevant tapered cedar column to help support that roof. And again bring back that porch to the original idea. Something that is clearly appropriate.

This is that shadow line I was referring to. It's just you know wood painted so just above that we will be removing that siding and coming in with a cedar column. We will repaint and all of it will appear to be that which it was very long ago. That is our goal. The homeowner's goal. You can see that we will be maintaining this structure a low shed roof in there. And will preserve the wood siding below. Also keep the brick stairs and

iron railing that's there. We will just work around that. What you don't see in the picture is that fantastic triple window and a beautiful mission Craftsmen door.

That is our proposal. Any questions?

Chair Robinson: Could we go back to the picture of the front of the house? So as I understand it, the placement of the windows as they sit now remains as is but the plane of the fascia will go all the way across and they will be in there kind of in a little inset area similar how they are now but with a different design. And then these little top parts come off and go back to the slope of the original roof that they now cover up?

H Hunt: That's right. Susan will you go back to the architect designs? What we will do at about a 2 - 4 inch relief which will probably be determined on site and how we can incorporate the wood siding and continue it in the best way and most authentic. We will just pop a little recess for that window – will be shown. This base...will continue...what this gives us...this continuous fascia board...is no more breaks that will prevent water from shedding onto them.

Chair Robinson: And the roof angle above it being the roof angle above it is the existing angle?

H Hunt: Yes. And we know that below the dormer peaks the structure of the roof- which is sound – is continuous. So basically we are talking about new roof decking and shingles.

Rangar Cline: Did you say the windows would be set back about 6 inches?

H Hunt: I think that at its greatest angle, you maybe got 7. And at the least amount you have at least an inch and a half.

Scott Williams: I think that it is more than that. Could you go to that close up?

H Hunt: It may be.

R Cline: You will retain the plane at the angle of the wall then?

H Hunt: Yes. If you can just imagine..going continuously and we will then puncture holes horizontally to those windows.

S Williams: It looks more like a foot at the bottom.

H Hunt: The base? It was pretty narrow when I was up there pulling shingles off. I think a lot of this project will be dependent upon getting there into this structure and a lot will be known that isn't now.

S Williams: I have some questions about the porch. Besides the column piece you have talked about, did you find any indications that would leave you to believe the porch had been open at one time?

H Hunt: I would just say based upon – for one thing the screens are old – based upon the vernacular landscape of this area I just have a hard time believing that screening it would have been the preferred way for the people that built the home. I feel more likely it was a conventionality of a more modern homeowner. Regardless, we would like to maintain that openness to the street. Openness to the community. And we feel like a home at this time sought to do so. We want to get back to that.

S Williams: Did you see any in the lower wall beneath the screen. Did you see anything newer or like it was added?

H Hunt: Not in my survey of the foundation. Although this is a different foundation than the main house. Obviously because it doesn't have a basement beneath it. It was built to be like that. A porch. So no, I don't find a different material. I don't find a different form. What I hoped to be there is the central quaint look structure in between that wood siding above that break that has been clad overtime. That's what we assume. Until we rip off that cladding like we did above we can't be sure.

S Williams: So you didn't try taking some off the home on the inside of the porch to see?

H Hunt: No sir.

J McCart: Susan, what did the survey say about this?

S Atkinson: The survey didn't make any mention of the porch not being original. The survey kind of took a look at what was there and talked about its form. So it wasn't very useful in making any statement about changes over time.

Chair Robinson: Is the footprint on the Sanborn Map the same?

S Atkinson: Yes.

H Hunt: I will say that the foundation of the screened porch, or the porch, is original to me. It's cinder block covered in wood siding. Not the same decorative block found in the rest of the house. But looks to be of the same period.

Chair Robinson: Does the break that appears in this...right there...is that what that is? And the same thing over here? Does it appear then that this siding was applied at a different time? Or is it a structural element that was built in? Can you tell?

H Hunt: It certainly looks to me as through it was added later. However, I can't be sure only because it's kind of a – the way it was built – is kind of a mass. And that cedar - excuse me wood siding – runs continuously so you see that also from the inside the

porch. And it's cladding a whole portion of whatever is holding up that roof. It's thicker than the exterior walls of the home and not just by the wood siding...it's larger. It's about 8 inches thick – that above portion I should say.

Chair Robinson: The upper part. Could it be surrounding a column inside there? Is it that thick?

H Hunt: It may, and if upon you all's judgement, we may seek to find such. We've done that above because we were so convinced it is not the original form. I think we would be willing to do so.

S Williams: The cap there that you just pointed to. Is it wood? Or is it concrete? That one.

H Hunt: It is wood.

S Williams: You don't see any cap between the porch floor wall? I guess you could say that wall under the screen and the foundation area? There's not a cap that is similar? No there. Lower. Like if you come over to the right where that pushes. Is that something right there? Is that a cap?

H Hunter: This becomes the wood structure. It does penetrate this wall. It does. It penetrates and comes out and extends beyond about this same distance as you see here. Although this thickens to the back because below here it sits upon cinder block.

S Williams: So the foundation wall sits back a couple of inches from the wall above that?

H Hunt: Correct.

Chair Robinson: So it's almost a ledge across there.

H Hunt: Yes. So we would seek to remove only this portion above from here to there. Remove the screens. The low walls...upon the screen removal, yes, we achieve that opening. But this portion as well we think was added on at the time of this. And still doesn't do justice...the homes...historic...

David John: You are going to take these sidewalls off also?

H Hunt: Yes. Same condition.

D John: There's not a column in the corners right now?

H Hunt: No.

D John: Are there any signs on the floor?

H Hunt: You can see perhaps on the exterior elevations. From the side profiles you can see both. Here on the... to the upper right... you can see a little longer because the porch recesses into the house. And then on the upper left we see a short portion of the roof. So there where you can see the railing which shows up almost black. That's the portion where that low partial wall with siding would be removed and cut in with a new wood railing.

S Atkinson: One of the issues I do want to make sure the Commission aware of on the issue of porch railings. Because the first floor elevation of this house is very high – it's above 30 inches – which is the cutoff for a requirement from building permits side. The height of a handrail has to be 36 inches. And that's pretty tall for what you see in these neighborhoods. That's a lot taller than we would probably generally see a 30 inch high handrail. That's a pretty typical height. So the extra 6 inches is a lot. It's something I want you to be aware of. I talked to the building permit folks. We have only encountered this one other time in Commission review. And at that point the property owner was not given any other option. So what they ended up doing was – and this is across the street from Cameron's house – 430 S Lahoma – so they ended up doing a parallel rail system so there is a 30 inch rail then some airspace with some support and then the top rail is 36 inches. It's still high but that transparency allows it to be a little less overwhelming. That's one way this could be approached. Another way...so that's not how it is drawn in the drawings cause we really haven't had a chance to talk about this. But another way ...we could probably negotiate an agreement with the building permit folks but that would be the property owner signing something saying they accept the liability - perceived liability - of a lower handrail. So that's something to tuck into your hat but that would be a design issue the Commission would have to address in the form of the porch.

H Hunt: And if I may, the break is at 42 inches above the finished floor of the screened porch. So I believe we could achieve that.

S Atkinson: This is 42 inches?

H Hunt: Yes. No. Actually on the columns. To the right. That little shadow line break on the column that reaches to the roof of the porch.

S Williams: On the corner to the very right.

H Hunt: Right there.

D John: My question was there isn't a column there now. Right?

H Hunt: It may be encased in there.

D John: But it's an 8 inch wall, right? So there really isn't an inside portion to that column if there is one.

H Hunt: That's right.

D John: Is there original flooring inside the porch? Is it concrete?

H Hunt: No. It's wood.

D John: So you couldn't tell on the structure if there had been a column?

H Hunt: No. I think what you are referring to is some type of masonry bulk that would be continuing the structure up to the roof. No that's not evident. The foundation is a continuous 8 inch block that runs from the house foundation out 9 feet or so and then back.

D John: And there isn't an interior portion for that column. Because that column is going to have to hold a lot of weight.

H Hunt: Not really. It's holding its own roof so it's not a ton of weight. I believe there is some weight on that foundation. Yes.

S Atkinson: One of the things to think about is that you are losing this support member with the proposed design. This is a pretty long span without support. It's just something to think about.

S Williams: That's why we have a lot of sagging porches in the district.

S Atkinson: That's true.

H Hunt: The actual screens the way they are made to me don't lend structural support there. That beam running beneath...and...

S Atkinson: Hollie are you saying this section here does not supply any support? It just holds the screens?

S Williams: I don't agree with that.

H Hunter: That's the way it looks to me. This piece of wood here runs continuous the inside beadboard ceiling and inside the porch. It also goes continuous up to...we are seeing the end of the roof structure there. They dovetail right into this piece and it appears to me that it's a 2/12. So I don't know that's doubled up which would certainly be able to handle that span. But that's something we would have to investigate. Take a closer look at. It's certainly a large piece of lumber that spans the entire frontage there.

Chair Robinson: The triple window that you show in the drawing there behind the steps. That is the existing window, right? On the lower floor?

H Hunter: Yes.

Chair Robinson: And the offset to the right is the door?

H Hunt: Yes. This plane - the dining room – it actually is closer to you by maybe 5 feet than this plane. The upper interior wall of the 2nd floor is on the same plane as this lower portion. So this mansard overhangs about 24 inches in front of this plane but the interior wall is continuous. So the structure of the wall is a single plane from under this roof to the base.

S Williams: So when on the exterior elevation number 2 we are missing a sight line on the back of the porch?

H Hunt: Right. My graphics...we should see a corner here.

Chair Robinson: So I see. It would be as it is here.

H Hunt: That's right if it wasn't for....

Chair Robinson: Got it. When you were inside the roof structure there, the slop of the roof...the distance in there..is the distance? The sheath wall we saw is the wall of the dining room. That goes on up?

H Hunt: Actually no. What you saw.. the pine sheathing...right here. Goes all the way up. What you saw to the left... you saw this and to the right the pine sheathing...

Chair Robinson: Were those 2x4's that the mansard roof is sitting on?

H Hunt: No. More like 1x6's. Shall we go back? To me they seem very meager. What do you think?

Chair Robinson: Hard to tell.

S Williams: Hard to tell.

H Hunt: These here are 6. Looks like they got a piece with a little notch out of it. I'm sorry for the lighting in this photo.

S Atkinson: Made worse by the projector.

Chair Robinson: What is this down here? Is that the top of the deck below?

S Atkinson: If you look at the monitor you can see it better.

H Hunter: It's actually the flashing. This is the flashing from that metal there. That's the flashing wrapping and that inset where it's trying to cut back to its original slope. Increases in slope to get back to that. Then again you see the sheathing and the difference in the sheathing.

Chair Robinson: Are there any further questions? Thank you.

Chair Robinson: We've heard the discussion. What would be the pleasure of the Commission in this?

S Williams: I think the way the house is right now is the way it was originally. Having worked on a house in this neighborhood on Lahoma, the construction techniques at that time and the way things were jury rigged, I believe this is the historical way the house was... the way it is now. I don't believe the mansard gable type roof as drawn here is what they had done originally because you can tell it is a little too elaborate to do afterwards. And seeing that on these sheathing boards here there is no indication of any kind of finish layer on top of it leaves me to believe that the way the gambrel I guess, or mansard aspect with a little bit of angle on it, is original. I think the way the application is drawn at the moment would create dark holes in there with the set back so far. I think it would do a disservice to the house and again I think it's original. And the porch...

S Atkinson: You don't think it's original or non-original? I want to understand what you just said.

S Williams: I don't think the way the application is drawn currently is the way it was.

S Atkinson: Ok.

S Williams: I believe the way it was with those decorative hips I think that's what they did originally and that's what they wanted. And the holes where the water and animals get in was just the craftsmanship of that time. They just didn't think too much about it. I have seen from working on other houses in this area it doesn't surprise me at all.

The porch the way the hand railing and balustrades are drawn right now aren't craftsmen. And just looking at it I feel the way the porch is now is the way it was done originally. Unless there is more indication that you will find if you take some of the siding off the inside of it to look and there is a footprint for an original square column as drawn on the application that there is an no indication of it, then that leads me to believe that it wasn't a solid square type column ever. With the proportions and the way the siding is leads me to believe without finding any evidence that there might have been a column there in the corner at one time, I think the way the house is now is original.

Unknown: Do you think there was a screen?

S Williams: I think so. Screens in the 20's were common. The only thing that leaves me a little curious is exterior elevation #2. Upper right hand corner. We do see the porch is deeper on the south side than the north side. There is that inset. We can imagine that line coming down and showing us the dining room. I guess you could say. Just where the roof ends there. So that's the only thing that makes me curious and kind of doubt or perhaps have some concern about the originality or the way it is right now. Because it is

deep and why did they enclose or why would they have that porch at one way totally enclosed there. It doesn't make sense for wind or air coming through. So that 's what leads me open to an argument that the porch was open at one time. But that's the only possible indication to me.

Chair Robinson: Changing the fascia on those dormer things which are obviously appliquéd on top of the original but it does look as if that the sheathing board didn't appear to have ever had anything on it. Any kind of exterior finish material which would lead you to believe the mansard was put on and it could have been decided on site as they were building it. They decided they wanted to dress it up at that point . Who knows. It's a possibility. But the construction materials obviously...who knows where they picked those up. I think the obvious...the problem with the porch...if you look at the break lines that are there. Especially the lower one that extends beyond. That could have been an extension from the original deck of the porch that was at one time open with a railing above it. That's a possibility. As you said about the other side too. There does seem to be a little bit of an indication that there might have been something different about that porch at some point. But it's hard to tell at this point.

S Williams: I've seen porches that have had half walls instead of having a balustrade and sometimes what they would so is have a wall with a break to let air to come through and water to run off. So with it extending over a little bit I can see it as a way of having water runoff. I mean, yes it is not unusual to have a half wall with siding on it for that period. The top of the column – I guess that 42 inches - with a break there does seem unusual. Why would they do that if they were going to build a wall all the way up? Why didn't the sheathing go all the way up? Again if there's not big square footprint, how did it look if there was a column there.

Chair Robinson: OK. Anyone else have comments or questions? First I should ask if there is anyone else who would like to speak to this issue? No? I would entertain a motion on this of some kind.

S Williams: I make a motion to deny the application.

Chair Robinson: There is a motion to deny the application. Is there a second?

D John: I second it.

Chair Robinson: Anyone care to speak on this motion?

S Atkinson: I want to remind the Commission that they have a couple of different options when faced with a questions such as this. Certainly you can proceed with the motion and second that is on the floor to deny the application as presented. If there are modifications to the proposal you would entertain...one of the things that we sometimes do is discuss with the applicant or their representative what those modifications might be. In which case the Commission can postpone a decision without making a denial. If the Commission makes a denial then the application leaves us and the applicant has the

right to appeal the denial to City Council. But the process starts again. If the Commission doesn't make a decision but ops to table the decision for more information then we can keep this discussion going and have some back and forth with the applicants and the Commission. And of course the other option is approval. I just wanted to make sure everyone understood what their options available to you are.

S Williams: Can I revise my motion?

S Atkinson: First thing to do is withdraw your motion.

S Williams: I withdraw my motion and would like to amend it to deny the part of the application that has to the roof. I believe that it is original. I think it can be modified to keep the water and animals from getting in. But as far as the motion is concerned, I would like to deny that part of the application. And then the porch. I would table that for more information upon further investigation.

S Atkinson: We will come back and get a more concise motion. But to make sure I understand where you are going with the porch.

J McCart: That's pretty concise.

S Atkinson: OK. You are fast. So your pending more information on the porch is some exploratory surgery from the inside of the porch to see what the form is inside there. Then pending that, you are asking the applicant to come back to the Commission and let us know their findings. Then either revise their proposal for the porch or just go with what they have.

K Barker: Can I get clarification on the roof? So you are suggesting that absolutely nothing about the roof structure you are OK with?

S Williams: Exactly, I don't think that this is in any way, shape, or form original. I think the way the roof is now is the way it was built.

K Barker: ?? there is evidence to suggest otherwise.

R Cline: There is also one thing in our guidelines..Section 1.4 of the Secretary of Interior Standard: *Acknowledge Changes Over Time. Most properties change over time; those changes have been acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.* Which means even if the porch has been modified shortly after construction and has been like that for a long time, you are looking at something historic even though it is a slightly later modification.

J McCart: That's what I was going to ask. The survey found he structure significant. So even if the porch was added on before the survey, doesn't that take precedence over what was originally there?

Chair Robinson: That depends on the difference and magnitude of what was covered up.

R Cline: It could depend on when it was done. If it was done in the 1920's, the age goes along with the neighborhood.

Anna Eddings: We are usually talking about as a cutoff date as to when alterations can be significant go with the period of significance of the district which is up to 1940. That means that any alterations made up to 1940 would have acquired historic significance.

S Atkinson: I would also want to make sure that both the applicant and Commission understand that the screening issue is a pretty low key issue. The screens can be removed or installed. We provide for that in our guidelines. Screens by themselves don't tend to have architectural significance. So if one of the issues is having more an open form porch, the screens could be removed without losing any character of the existing house. That's just an observation.

K Barker: It would look kind of silly. I would argue to take the screens off that porch design.

Cameron Brewer: So it would be within the guidelines to remove the door that is screened in also?

S Atkinson: Yes. We don't have that many occurrences of screened doors when they are porch doors as opposed to the house. So I think perhaps following the logic of your question, if you remove the door of the screened porch does that start to kind of unravel the form that is there. I think that is a fair question. I think that that is what the applicant is also eluding to that the form of the porch and the screens are kind of integrated.

K Barker: I'm also alluding to that you are allowing the change of one thing but not the change of another. Just seems bizarre.

S Atkinson: Well one thing I think is that it's the Commissions job to do is to figure out which are the most character defining features. That's what we ask them to do. That's what they are doing in this deliberation.

R Cline: So which thing are we thinking about approving?

S Williams: I wouldn't approve anything at this point on my recommendation to the Commission. I still have my doubts about the porch's originality as well as any renovations that might have been done to it over time, because without further evidence it's hard to tell. I would say with my motion that I would not totally deny that but I would like to see more evidence as to what that might have been. If the porch is original or if it might have had another form at some time. Both of your comments about modifications becoming historic and part of the character of the house are also valid. But in this case I don't think that porch being enclosed, if it were, did look somehow different originally. I wouldn't personally feel we would need to be so rigid on that. I don't know if the

character of that porch, if it were enclosed later, was so significant as to the house. But I do feel the roof character is significant. That's why we need more information about the porch.

A Eddings: It would be hard to approve a porch design the way it is now without knowing more of what it was originally. It seems now you are putting a Craftsman-like porch on what looks to me more of a colonial style. I don't think it fits with the original character.

Chair Robinson: So we have a motion to deny a portion of the application to the roofline and essentially table the porch alterations pending more information.

S Williams: Correct.

Chair Robinson: Can we split it like that?

S Atkinson: You do it all the time.

Chair Robinson: So I think I understand the motion. Does anyone else have any questions? Do we have a second?

D John: I'll second.

Chair Robinson: So to be clear – the discussion is that to deny the application to alter the roof line on the basis that it appears that this is the original, based on the evidence that we have at this time, and that to change it would be a significant alternation of the structure that is a contributing structure from its period and then to table the decision on the porch until we get more information to make a determination one way or another in terms of its originality to the structure. We have a motion and a second. Any more discussion?

H Hunt: I know it's not my turn to speak but I did find a photo I was referring to about how I feel the roof is not original. Can that come to the Commission at this time? Please pass this around. This is a picture of the example that I was saying where the roof joist go beyond. You can see flashing right here as you look close. So you can see where the roof joist goes continuous and again this break in the fascia board. And the critter problem. But furthermore I want to say, craftsmanship being good or bad this is poor design.

Chair Robinson: Do they need to come to us to just repair that portion of the roof?

S Atkinson: No. We certainly encourage ordinary maintenance and repair on structures as desirable activity for property owners. There is a little tolerance to make some modification where either poor materials have been used. One of the things that I responded to initially when I looked at this house from an application point of view was the sort of an unusual use on the corner of cedar shakes kind of as a corner treatment as to

any other way the corner might have been finished. That just stuck me as clumsy craftsmanship. To be honest about it. Those are some examples that the property owner could make some modifications to that would improve the overall performance of the structure that would deal with the critter and water issues. That would probably even tidy up the design a bit but not change the character defying elements that I think the Commission is responding to their comments. So there is certainly room to improve what is here. I think anybody that deals with old houses knows that just because it is old does not mean it was well done. We have all experienced that in our own lives. So one of the ways we address these structures now is how can we make modifications that respect design yet improve performance. There are always ways to do that.

C Brewer: So is that a modification that needs to be made in the application or is that something within design and construction that can happen outside an application?

S Atkinson: Well you know there are a couple layers of decision making going on here., There is from the design point of view from what is it the applicant and his architect are seeking to do. How does this body make a decision. My recommendation is that I think there is more work we need to do to figure this out. If the Commission makes a denial to any piece of the application or the application as a whole, that's the final decision. The owner can appeal that decision to City Council or they can do something else or come back with a different design. It's a new application, new fee, it starts all over.

C Brewer: That's where my question is coming from. Would it be preferred by the applicant to make a modification to the roof line with keeping the character defying characters of the roof line or all together deny the application?

K Barker: This picture shows a pretty clear indication that this structure isn't even lined up with this structure. That would tell me that this thing is not part of the original part of the roof. So based on that evidence we are going to go to City Council. This is beyond a craftsmanship kind of issue. I would say the original craftsman would not have put this kind of roofline against that kind of roof line and have it butt up like that. No chance. So if this is going to get denied here we will absolutely go to City Council. I think that is really strong evidence. If we didn't have that strong of evidence we would probably try to do something else.

S Atkinson: OK. Jolana reminds me that we have a motion and a second on the floor.

Chair Robinson: We do. Is there further discussion?

R Cline: I would add one thing in support of the motion. I think the proposed design would remuddle this. Basically you are taking something that there is an argument that it might not be original and extending it and putting in window inserts. So in a sense you are not only changing something historic but you are making it into something it never was. I think the design is flawed in that way.

K Barker: Just so we don't have to keep going through... if the issue is removing these things. But then trying to redesign something here maybe that's one issue. Or if it's this and this combined then maybe there is something else we can reconsider. Does that make sense? If this is part of the problem maybe we can reconsider. This is a separate issue maybe we should make that distinction.

S Williams: No. I don't believe it is. I'm sorry. I think the way it is now is the way it was originally. From what I see, was it original that the eave line went through? Why is it set back now? They wouldn't have gone in there and cut that out to put little dormer gables on there. If that line had originally gone through because it's further out than the window, they wouldn't have gone back in there and cut that out. I don't think that continuous line is original. I think that step back is and I think they just have shoddy craftsmanship.

H Hunt: We aren't denying the fact...

S Atkinson: At this point we are just arguing back and forth. There is a motion and second on this floor.

Chair Robinson: Yes, there is. If there is no further discussion among the Commission members I would say we should proceed to call the question.

J McCart: Are you ready for a vote?

Chair Robinson: Yes.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed with a unanimous vote.