

Washington Road in a manner that it does not detract from the rural appearance/streetscape of Washington Road.

The Building Department has found the submitted plot plan and construction drawings to be in compliance set forth in Zoning Ordinance 200, Section 20.

Conditions:

The structure will contain the materials and be constructed in accordance with the elevation plans provided HDC this evening, with the date revised 4/24/01. Plans include a naturally weathering cedar-shake roof, with a red brick façade and limestone around the windows, and rock-faced limestone around the front door and gables. The windows will be aluminum clad on the outside and of a sand color. The cupola will be stained the same color as the rest of the house exterior.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Cockey, Dziurman, Heyniger, Hill, Root, Sieffert

Nays: None

Absent: Kilpatrick

MOTION CARRIED

Approved

DISCUSSION

2000-0694 1631 W. Avon - Proposed garage demolition

Mr. Dziurman excused himself as a member of the Commission as he is involved with this project, and joined the property owner at the table. Mr. Bill Church was present as the property owner and is here for discussion and guidance. This is a discussion item only, no action is being asked. Mr. Dziurman explained that the applicant would like to split the lot that the historic resource sits on and in order to do that, requires the removal of an inappropriate garage. The applicant would like to have a carriage house attached to the house. The applicant is also reviewing removing the aluminum siding and restoring it to wood siding. Mr. Dziurman sees this as a significant advantage to the HDC because a resource will be restored, the removal of an inappropriate garage, which allows the property owner to build another house next to the existing resource. The design of the new house will be complimentary to the existing farm house. The placement of the new house will be farther from the road, allowing the existing historic house to be showcased. The design has not yet been formulated, but the idea is there. Before the applicant proceeded with the design, he wanted to make sure that the HDC was supportive of the idea. The short term

project is that the garage must be demolished, and the long term is that another house will be built probably next year. Mr. Church pointed out that the proposed new home will be a farm house style in keeping with the existing structure.

Ms. Hill commented that the lot is a corner lot and asked about a curb cut onto Avon Road, and is not sure whether the applicant could select which way the house fronted. The applicant indicated the address would be on Avon Road and there are already two curb cuts for the driveway. He would take advantage of these curb cuts for the new house.

Mr. Cockey commented that the Zoning Ordinance is basically designed to force houses to be in alignment with some limited amount of discretion. If the applicant wishes to vary from this restriction, he will need a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ms. Sieffert questioned the widening of Avon Road at this site. Mr. Anzek explained Avon Road is planned to become a three-lane road, but would not include any more right-of-way.

In response to a question, the applicant indicated the existing lot is 323 feet wide, and is proposing the westerly split would be 110 feet wide, and the remaining frontage where the existing house is would be 213 feet wide. The applicant then explained different alterations that have been completed and that splits were done on the property. The new siding was completed in 1978.

Mr. Cockey indicated in terms of the existing garage, he does not feel it is very appropriate for the house and elimination would be a benefit. In terms of locating another garage in the rear of the existing house, Mr. Cockey feels this would be acceptable. Mr. Church explained he envisions a carriage house style garage. Mr. Cockey commented that the existing structure is a good example of a typical farm house, and that the garage should be appropriate for a late 19th century mid-west farm house as opposed to a late 19th century urban carriage house.

A comment was made that the proposed structure will be reviewed carefully by the Commission because of the location.

Mr. Dziurman indicated he would welcome the Commission's approval of the demolition of the garage, but is here tonight to present the entire project so the Board understands what is proposed. The applicant is willing to return to the Commission to receive approval at a later date.

Ms. Sieffert questioned after the parcel is split, if the resulting vacant parcel would still be under the jurisdiction of the HDC. Mr. Dziurman indicated this

is really a gray area and wonders about the same thing. This issue should be researched. Ms. Hill believes that once the parcel is split, the resulting parcel would probably not be considered historic because the original parcel is not in a contiguous district. Ms. Hill inquired about the removal of any trees. The applicant indicated there may be an evergreen which might have to be removed as part of the driveway. Ms. Hill agreed that the existing garage is not an historic structure, and does not have a problem with demolition.

Mr. Cockey commented he would be less supportive of a lot split that resulted in a lot being formed that is in close proximity to an historical resource, that would not be under the purview of the HDC. If however, the property split resulted in the HDC retaining some jurisdiction over the newly created lot, Mr. Cockey would be more supportive of the split.

Mr. Anzek indicated he would ask the City Attorney for an opinion on whether the HDC should have any say in a lot split of an historic property.

It is the consensus of the Commission that it is not appropriate to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the garage tonight because the item was not advertised in advance. The request should be heard at a later date.

(RECESS 8:20 - 8:23 p.m.)

Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2000-0695

Mr. Anzek explained that Ms. Hill requested staff do some investigation into the site, as several trees were removed from the front yard, additional grading was accomplished, and the stone wall on the eastern side of the driveway was removed and rebuilt. The Forestry Department was contacted relative to the trees and staff ascertained that the tree removal permit was amended to allow the trees in front be removed. This was with the understanding there would be replacement trees. Staff met with the property owner who explained that the stone wall crumbled on him and he tried to rebuild it. Ms. Hill commented she has received complaints relative to the work being done on the property and indicated she feels the stone wall was part of the site feature of that particular resource. The Certificate of Appropriateness does not include anything regarding the driveway, trees or the site feature. The minutes do not include discussions relative to these issues either. The findings for this project were vague, in that they just