

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2024-0015

Discussion regarding 947 E. Tienken Rd., Ralph Putman, Owner

(McLeod memoranda dated 3-7-24 and 1-2-24, Designhaus letters dated 2-29-24 and 12-11-23, plans received 2-13-24 and 12-15-23, Draft HDC minutes from 1-11-24, Location map, and Photos had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record.)

Vice Chairperson Granthen introduced this item and noted that it was a continuation of the previous discussion regarding 947 E. Tienken Road. She invited the applicants to the table.

Present for Ralph Putman, owner of the property were Andrew Miller and Mike Pizzola, representing Designhaus.

Mr. Miller noted that they came before the Commission two months ago and received comments regarding the first iteration designed for the property. After the comments, noting that the addition was above the historical house, they dropped it down and also made an indent where the old and the new separate from each other. He pointed out that the siding is changed as well, and the roof slope is lower. He stated that from the road you still see the historical building and the addition gets lost behind the landscaping and is buried into the ground with the walkout basement on the back. He noted that the original house will not be touched and it will see replacements of windows and siding.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked the applicant to review the landscaping.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the overall goal is to not see the addition in relation to the existing house. He pointed out that there are several mature trees and no existing trees would be cut down. He stated that there are a number of walnut trees in the area that are relatively large on the property and also on the property Mr. Putman owns behind it and next to it. He mentioned that Mr. Putman is adamant about preserving the natural landscape and has been cutting out Oriental Bittersweet vines all the way to the back of the property to make it better and prevent the spread of that invasive plant. He noted that they propose some modest landscaping to screen it with a tiered effect with evergreens and some understory plants to give an effect throughout the seasons and provide several aspects to buffer the proposed addition. The intent would be to keep the existing house open to the road with native plantings, grasses and perennials and buffer the back with more native plants to blend into the fabric of the neighborhood.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked for Commissioner questions and comments.

Mr. Tischer noted that he was not in attendance in January, but read the minutes and looked at the initial plans, and he thought there was no way that the initial proposal would go forward. He commented that this is better in comparison and at least the historic part will be front and center. He thanked the applicants for proposing to move the house back and make it more of a

conforming structure zoning-wise, and stated that it would be an improvement.

Mr. Miller stated that as the house sits right now there is no foundation under it, and trying to keep the house in the existing location increases the efforts.

Mr. Tischer commented that he would assume that they would put metal through it and move the house back.

Mr. Miller responded that they even spoke with Mr. Putman and with the retaining wall on the back he wants to source it all as naturally as they can.

Mr. Tischer stated that some of the members were on the Commission when Mr. Putman came before them a year or two ago and he had a concept in his head and no drawings; and he commented that he is glad the Commission gets to see something before he puts in an application to make an actual determination.

Dr. Stamps asked Ms. Kidorf for her comments relative to the mass and size of the addition and how it will align with the Department of Interior Guidelines. He noted that while it looks great, they are tripling the square footage of the little historic house.

Ms. Kidorf responded that she shares the concerns with the size of the addition, although reducing the height has helped tremendously. She pointed out that it also seems like the addition might be in a slope so that the bulk of the addition would be below the existing house. She commented that she also wanted to make it clear that the site plan alludes to both sections of the home being moved but it is really just the two-story gable portion which is one-and-a-half stories and there are not really two stories being preserved. She added that the wing part is not being preserved but it is being somewhat recreated with the proposed addition the way it is designed. She noted that the way it has been revised to retain or reinstall the cobblestone on the existing historic portion of the house and use a more compatible stone on the addition is good.

She noted that it really comes down to the details of what will be done to the existing one-and-a-half story and what will be the materials, trim and renderings. She stated that she would probably want to see closer to construction drawings with a bit more detail as to what will happen with the trim and the window. She acknowledged that the building has not been painted in many, many years, but historically the siding would have always been painted.

Mr. Pizzola stated that they can do that.

Mr. Tischer asked if the wing was original or was added on later.

Ms. Kidorf responded that while it has been some time since she looked at the survey card, she believes that the gable one-and-a-half story is actually newer than the one-story portion.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the rear portion was added on, and commented that with that intent in mind, they are doing nothing but following that spirit by removing

that portion and modernizing it while keeping the front original house. He pointed out that the original photograph shows some of the additional buildings identified as contributing factors, along with the outhouse, the privy, and the chicken coop; and he stated that Mr. Putman still has those on site and it is his intent to relocate those as they were back in a photograph on display. He added that they would look into painting the structure something that would be more conducive of the area so it would blend in.

Dr. Stamps commented that the outbuildings are a crucial piece as this is not just a farmhouse but is a farmstead, with all of the components from the outhouse to the chicken coop and corn crib. He mentioned that the barn is in the County right-of-way, and he stated that he does not want to see the barn abandoned. He noted that the road view is actually the side of the house. He commented that he is fine with leaving the orientation the way it is as long as the resource is preserved.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the chimney is new. He explained that there used to be a central fireplace in the building with a chimney that was replaced, and the current chimney is the second chimney.

Mr. McGunn asked if the intent is to move the entire existing structure back.

Mr. Pizzola confirmed that is correct. He added that this would free up the right-of-way for municipal purposes.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked for Mr. McLeod's input.

Mr. McLeod stated that they have had a number of conversations regarding the barn within the right-of-way; and he noted that unfortunately it is one of those situations where no one really wants to take ownership of it. He explained that the Road Commission has basically acknowledged that it is in their right-of-way, but they are not touching it; and in conversations with the owner, he feels the Road Commission should do something with it. He stated that ideally, the barn would be moved backwards or moved to the north along with the house structure as well as an opportunity to shore it up. He commented that the concern is that something could happen such as a car accident, and you would want to try to move the barn if given the opportunity to do so. He noted that it has been an ongoing conversation, but unfortunately it is just one of those things where no one is stepping up to say that they will move it.

Mr. Miller confirmed that it is in limbo. He stated that they would like to incorporate it somehow, but they do not know who has ownership; and he commented that the owner does not want to take ownership if it is someone else's responsibility.

Mr. Pizzola stated that the owner did go in and try to shore it up by jacking it up and putting some temporary footings underneath because it is getting to the point where something needs to be done with it. He commented that they will revisit that in the near future.

Dr. Stamps suggested that the owner be encouraged to maintain his connection

with Pat McKay at the Museum as they have a team of amateur archaeologists trained on the Van Hoosen property that may recognize things an average backhoe digger or construction person might not recognize. He commented that it might be a win-win opportunity to preserve some items for the Museum.

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that there was no motion for consideration this evening on this item, and thanked the applicant team for sharing the plans. She stated that the Commission looks forward to seeing them the next time.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the Putmans should be back soon as they spend the two coldest months of the year in Alabama.

Discussed