

NEW BUSINESS

2024-0237

Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness - File No. PHDC2024-0003 - to move the existing residence further from the road and to construct an addition at 947 E. Tienken Rd., zoned R-1 One Family Residential, Parcel No. 15-02-426-005, Designhaus Architects, Applicant

(Staff Report prepared by Kristine Kidorf dated 4-16-24, Application, Designhaus Letter of 2-29-24, Plans dated 4-10-24, Location Map, HDC minutes of 1-11-24 and Draft HDC minutes of 3-14-24 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record.)

Present for the applicant was Ralph Putman, owner, and Mike Pizzola, Designhaus Architects.

Chairperson Thompson introduced this item and noted that it was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to move the existing residence at 947 East Tienken Road further from the road and construct an addition. He invited the applicants to the table and requested Staff comments.

Mr. McLeod explained that earlier this week after the meeting packet was completed, Staff received plans from the applicant's architects relative to the placement of the barn. He noted that this has been a source of conversation over the years with its proximity to Tienken Road. He stated that this portion of the request would have to be handled by the Commission either as a continuation of this discussion at a future date or as a whole separate application. He explained that Staff feels that it should be a part of the whole approach to the site; and noted that Ms. Kidorf already had her staff report completed and packets had been sent out by the time the plans arrived. He suggested that the Commission could discuss them today.

Chairperson Thompson noted that he had big concerns not having the barn as a part of this request, and he commented that he was glad to hear there was movement on that issue. He stated that his preference would be for the Commission to hold off until there is a whole packet; however, he invited the applicants to address their changes, or comment on what they are looking at for the barn.

Mr. Putman stated that the barn is completely on the right-of-way and is not on his property. He expressed concern that he could spend a lot of money on the barn and the Road Commission might want to tear it down. He added that he wanted to know who is liable for the barn because it is getting into poor shape and is right next to the road. He noted that something needs to be done to the barn sooner rather than later. He commented that he cannot go on with the project without a complete plan for a garage or some sort of parking inside, as it is too much money. He stated that he is trying to save the house, but it is so close to the road.

Mr. Pizzola stated that with the house being moved and an addition constructed, there is no garage proposed. They intend to move the barn on the property the

best they can and utilize it for parking. He discussed that they do not want to attach it to the house, but noted that then it becomes a question of being an accessory structure and would present challenges meeting setback requirements with an accessory structure in the front yard. He asked if the Board might have the opportunity to waive the dimensional variance or if they would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a variance.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the plan that was submitted, noting the current location of the barn and the proposed location; and he stated that the architect is correct that it would be a conflict with the Zoning Ordinance regarding accessory structure in the front yard. He pointed out that in speaking with Ms. Kidorf, there was an occurrence in 2010 in the Winkler Mill District where there was an accessory structure on a vacant piece of property that was moved. He commented that while he cannot speak for the ZBA, this is a very unique situation; and one of the ZBA's missions is to decide on a case-by-case basis whether there are unique circumstances or practical difficulties. He pointed out that this is a historic structure within the road right-of-way; and moving it would maintain essentially the same relationship pushed back. He added that the ZBA would have to chime in on the matter and he would also bring the Building Department into the discussion to determine what their stance would be.

Chairperson Thompson asked whether the order would be to consider a Certificate of Appropriateness and then go before the ZBA, or for the HDC to wait to see what Building, Planning and the ZBA decides.

Mr. McLeod responded that the normal protocols for a Planning item would be for the ZBA to go first, then the Planning Commission if it is a non-historic property. He commented that he would imagine the same sequence would apply here. He suggested that the HDC could provide some guidance in terms of what they feel is appropriate from their perspective while not making an official decision. Then it would move to the ZBA, and if successful or even not successful, it would come back to the HDC.

Mr. Tischer stated that he sits on the ZBA, and would say on first glance that there is a practical difficulty and a unique circumstance in that it is sitting in the right-of-way. He commented that while there are multiple members on the ZBA, there are a number of factors that check the boxes for him personally as being a practical difficulty.

Mr. Pizzola noted that when digging into the portion of the home that was going to be removed, Mr. Putman found that the flooring is actually in good shape and he stated that they want to try to save some of that floor and incorporate it into the new as best as they can.

Mr. Putman explained that the rear portion of the house was very unique and had a hand hewn beam around the top and bottom, and the joists are a beautiful white oak. He noted that the structure and roof is really bad and he was just going to try to save the beams and four joists.

Mr. Pizzola added that new windows would be used to match and the new addition would be what is proposed. He noted that with the change of the barn

and the new circumstances they would come back with new renderings and an updated plan set.

Dr. Stamps asked if the applicant should withdraw or the HDC vote to postpone or deny, as it sounds like there will be changes.

Mr. McLeod responded that with the new information presented, the application will continue to evolve; therefore, it would be a simple postponement.

Dr. Stamps and Mr. Putman discussed the nature of the hand hewn beams and floor boards, and how that section was originally constructed. Dr. Stamps thanked Mr. Putman for wanting to save, preserve, and protect this unique structure. He mentioned a couple of structures, one on Woodward by Lone Pine, and Hunter House in Birmingham, noting that they have big verticals and there are not too many of those structures left. He commented that anything the Commission can do to help preserve this would be smart; and he added that it is not just a farmhouse but a farm stead with barn, corn crib, and chicken coop.

Ms. Lyons commented on the rendering showing the new locations and roof lines, and commented that she would also like to see it from the other side. She stated that she would support moving the barn back, which while they could not approve, they could comment that it is appropriate and she would vote to support that.

Mr. Putman mentioned that there is a big walnut tree and a historic shed in proximity that he would not be sure how close he could get to.

Ms. Lyons commented that they will need a more detailed site plan once they have all the information that shows what trees will have to come out.

Chairperson Thompson commented that they are making progress. He stated that the remaining details need to be figured out, ZBA issues sorted out and Building consulted. He noted that he could agree with Commissioner Lyons that he could support this and they are moving in the right direction.

Mr. Tischer stated that he would echo his colleague's comments that they are moving in the right direction; and suggested from a ZBA viewpoint that they try to limit the number of variances needed to help their situation.

Mr. Putman mentioned that the when the house was restored or redone in the 1960s, much of the interior was torn out, and they are just trying to save beams, vertical boards and floor joists. He and Mr. Pizzola invited the Commissioners to come out for a visit.

Ms. Altherr-Rogers asked if Mr. Putman was considered the owner of the barn.

Mr. Pizzola stated that he would have Reichert survey to dig deeper into this; he commented that he assumed that the original property went to the center line of the road. He asked if there was anything that could be available funding-wise, grants or historical preservation credits that might help cover the cost of some

of this work.

Ms. Kidorf responded that there is a State Historic Tax Credit; however, she did not know if it would be available in this instance because there would be a move and an addition. She stated that in her mind it would meet the Secretary of Interior Standards, but she did not know if it would meet the standards in the State Historic Preservation Office's mind as they are pretty strict and getting stricter by the second. She explained that most of the grants are for nonprofits, and are unfortunately not for private homeowners. She suggested that Mr. Putman explore online what may come up. She asked if the HDC decided to postpone the application, whether they would have the materials ready to come back for the June meeting.

Mr. Pizzola responded that Reichert may be four to six weeks out, so they would most likely need more time.

Ms. Kidorf stated that the HDC needs to be careful of the 60-day rule; and suggested that the applicant agree in writing to a full postponement to a later date or they could withdraw the application and come back with a full application.

Chairperson Thompson added that they would still need to go to the ZBA first.

Ms. Kidorf stated that she would suggest withdrawing the application for now and resubmitting with a more complete application when ready.

Extensive discussion ensued as to whether to act on this submission as part one or to wait for a full packet as the plans may change. Mr. Putman stressed that he was trying to get things going as quickly as he can because he needs to get the roof replaced on the original to make it more sound and not leak.

Ms. Kidorf noted that she did not want to see vinyl siding on the moved part of the wing and wanted to see the wood siding carried over for all parts of the house that are moved. As such, she suspects it will look different in the renderings. She noted that there were also questions on whether the roof of the one-story portion would stay the same as the whole roof; or if the profile would change to accommodate the full-width front porch. She stated that they just do not have enough information.

Ms. Lyons stated that she would like to see the whole package, especially since changes are being discussed. She commented that one thing that has not been said yet tonight is the first submission was for a very large house, and she feels the new design incorporates the Commission's feedback very well. She thanked the applicant for doing an amazing job. She stated that there are a lot of moving pieces giving her concern in thinking about a vote today.

Mr. Tischer asked if they might be prepared to come back in June with new renderings for the house itself and the barn would have to wait for the ZBA.

Mr. McLeod stated that he would not have an issue if they came back in June with changes being made, and the barn in its current location.

Dr. Stamps suggested that he had some questions regarding the roofing, vinyl siding and windows, and asked if that should be discussed tonight. He commented that the vinyl siding does not go well.

Discussion moved on to the siding, windows and chimney for the original one-and-a-half story. Ms. Kidorf also noted that it is proposed to reuse the original siding as best as possible and pointed out that the drawings show vinyl windows. She stated that the windows should be wood, and original windows kept if they are repairable. She added that there was a proposal for cementitious trim board soffit and fascia, which is also not appropriate and should be wood. She noted that this should be the same for the one-story portion since that is now being moved and should have wood siding and windows. She stated that the cedar or wood shingle roof has deteriorated beyond repair and the Commission should determine whether they will accept an asphalt shingle that looks like a wood shingle; and she commented that she would recommend that this is probably fine in this instance. She discussed siding on the addition which is proposed to be vertical board and batten and cementitious siding, which she thinks is compatible and shows that it is an addition to the original house, along with the use of new materials for the porch columns all a part of the addition. She suggested that it would be her recommendation for the foundation of the 1-1/2 story any of the rubble or stone on the existing be salvaged and used to face the new concrete or concrete block.

Chairperson Thompson stated that the proposed conditions Ms. Kidorf just reviewed would have to be included for him to move forward. He noted that he wanted to emphasize that this is going in the right direction, and he would fully support postponing.

Mr. Tischer moved a motion to postpone the request for certificate of appropriateness and direct the applicant to come back with updated plans as discussed in the meeting this evening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lemanski.

After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Thompson announced that the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kidorf noted that submission should be made May 28th and include the barn in order to have enough time to make the next meeting.

A motion was made by Tischer, seconded by Lemanski, that this matter be Postponed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Altherr-Rogers, Elias, Granthen, Lyons, Stamps, Thompson, Tischer, Lemanski and McGunn

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PHDC2024-0003, that the Historic Districts Commission **POSTPONES** the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for moving of the house back from the road and constructing an addition as proposed at 947 E. Tienken Road, Parcel Identification Number 70-15-02-426-005, to allow the applicant to come back with updated plans as discussed in the meeting this evening.