



Meeting Minutes for September 14, 2021

The Burlington Historic Preservation Commission met virtually via ZOOM on Tuesday, September 14, 2021 at 7:00 PM. All staff and applicants presenting at this meeting were sworn to tell the truth to the best of their ability.

Members Present:

James Euliss, Chair
Brian Pennington, Vice Chair
Wendy Geiss
Kristina Meinking
Russ Vandermass-Peeler

Members Absent:

Lori Bryan
Josh Adkins

Guests:

N/A

Staff Present:

Jamie Lawson, Principal Planner
Conrad Olmedo, Planning Manager

I. Call Meeting to Order

Mr. James Euliss, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM.

Chair Euliss made a motion to excuse the absences of Members: Ms. Lori Bryan and Mr. Josh Adkins.

Mr. Brian Pennington, Vice Chair, seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

II. Approval of Previous Minutes

Review of the Meeting Minutes for August 10, 2021.

Ms. Kristina Meinking, Member, stated some of the discussions had been truncated in the minutes and that there were important standards to consider.

Mr. James Euliss made a motion to table the minutes until the next meeting.

Mr. Brian Pennington seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

III. Applications for Major Certificates of Appropriateness

ITEM 1: HD-21-38: A request by ATO Investment Properties LLC for corbels, a fence and staining brick at 511 West Davis Street, PID 126662. The property is located in the Conditional Residential 965 (CR 965) and in the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) Zone District.

This item was continued from the August 10, 2021 meeting date.

Ms. Jamie Lawson, Principal Planner, presented the application to the commission. Ms. Lawson explained the previously approved application in comparison to the new application.

Ms. Lawson explained that the applicant has requested to change the fence material to wood which was previously approved for brick and iron, with no change to the fence height approved by the HPC. Ms. Lawson indicated that other portion of the application to whitewash and limewash the building and install corbels had not been acted on by the HPC previously.

Ms. Lawson indicated that Staff had coordinated with Mr. Mitch Wilds with the State Historic Preservation Commission at the request of the HPC. In communication to Ms. Lawson, Mr. Wilds advised that the corbels and the painting of the brick would not meet the United States Secretary of Interior Standards and the City of Burlington standards because painting is prohibited and corbels would change the aesthetic too greatly. Ms. Lawson communicated that Staff recommended denial of the corbels and limewashing but approval of the fence material change.

Mr. John Plagueman, Architect, and Mr. Olajide explained that the building was suggested to be demolished. Mr. Plagueman and Mr. Olajide explained that the changes they are wanting to make to the exterior will benefit the overall aesthetic of the neighborhood. Mr. Plagueman and Mr. Olajide explained that the building is currently an eyesore and the City Council members had expressed interest in making the building a more aesthetically cohesive component of the neighborhood.

Mr. Olajide further explained that the fence being proposed matches the neighborhood and that many homes in the neighborhood have similar picketing. Mr. Olajide explained that limewashing will protect the brick for hundreds of years and will help even the mismatching brick. Mr. Olajide explained that painting of the stucco was approved in a previous application.

Ms. Lawson informed that there was no public comment via call or email.

Chair James Euliss confirmed that there was no conflict of interest.

Commission members held discussion about the difficulty of the decision between following the standards strictly and what would be best for the entire neighborhood.

Mr. Plagueman emphasized that the state bases their opinion on the theoretical and often do not know what the buildings actually look like.

Ms. Wendy Geiss, Member, expressed that in the Glencoe District the two-toned chimneys are common due to repairs that have been made over the years and explained that it embraces the history of the building instead of covering it up.

Ms. Lawson explained that the Commission is quasi-judicial and that prior Commission precedence is not a factor for this item. Ms. Lawson explained that requests before the Commission are considered on a case-by-case basis.

Commission members decided to vote on each item separately.

Findings of Fact (Fence):

- B11-1. Fences in front yards are discouraged. Retaining walls constructed of stone or brick should be retained and encouraged.
- B11-5. Fences in the front or front side yards should be constructed of wood picket, brick, stone, or cast iron. They should not be over three feet high. Pickets should be stained or painted.
- B11-6. Solid fences which block the view of the property are not allowed in front yards. Split rail, basket weave, and horizontal board fences are inappropriate styles and must not be used.
- B11-7. Materials and styles of fences should coordinate with appropriate nearby buildings and fences. Wood fence designs should be in keeping with the character of the house.
- B11-10. Vertical privacy fences are acceptable in, side and rear yards. They should not be over seven feet high. The structural member of any fence should be turned to face the property of the person erecting the fence.
- B11-11. Privacy or security fences along a side yard must not extend beyond the midpoint of a building. Those along the side street must not be over four feet high, according to City zoning code.

Ms. Meinking made a motion to approve the findings of fact.

Mr. Pennington seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Motion for Fence:

Mr. Euliss made a motion to approve the fencing.

Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler, Member, seconded the motion.

Approve unanimously.

Findings of Fact (Corbels):

- C1-1. Original architectural details should be retained if structurally feasible. Original exterior features such as cornices, brackets, railings, shutters, siding, window architrave's, and doorway pediments are an essential part of a building's character and should not be removed.
- C1-2. Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired or restored rather than replaced. If replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, or other visual qualities
- C1-3. Architectural components and details that are not appropriate to the historic character of the structure should not be added. The owner should never try to make a building look older than it is by using details belonging to a previous period.
- C1-4. Architectural components, such as fascias, soffits and columns, should not be replaced or covered by materials such as plywood, vinyl, and aluminum that would not have been used nor been available in the original construction.

Vice Chair Pennington asked that robust historic documentation of the exterior of the building, as constructed, and in its current state be provided.

Mr. Conrad Olmedo, Planning Manager, suggested that photos of the buildings' current state be provided to Staff.

Chair Euliss agreed with the suggestion and requested a photographic record of the building in its current state be provided to staff.

Vice Chair Pennington shared his approval of the application of the corbels with the knowledge that there will be a detailed record of the building in its original state and that following a doctrinal adherence to the standards would not in the best interest of the district.

Ms. Meinking expressed denial of both the limewashing and the corbels based on the guidance provided from the State Historic Preservation Office.

Vice Chair Pennington made a motion to approve the findings of fact.

Ms. Meinking seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Motion for Corbels:

Vice Chair Pennington made a motion to approve the corbels with the condition that photographic record be obtained.

Mr. Russ Vandermass- Peeler seconded the motion.

Ayes: Euliss, Pennington, Peeler,

Noes: Geiss, Meinking

Motion Approved.

Findings of Fact (Limewashing):

- C12-3. Sandblasting or other abrasive surface preparation methods that can damage historic materials is not allowed.
- C12-4. Materials such as brick, stone, wood shingles, and certain metals, which have historically been unpainted, should not be painted.
- C13-1. Strong chemical paint strippers which can permanently damage the surface should be avoided.
- C13-2. Sandblasting and other abrasive surface preparation methods that can damage historic materials are not allowed.
- C13-3. Removing all old paint should be avoided unless there is a strong reason to do so, such as an obscured architectural detail, paint peeling, or cracking.

Chair Euliss made a motion to approve findings of fact.

Mr. Russ Vandermass- Peeler seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Motion for Limewashing:

Chair Euliss made a motion to approve the limewashing.

Vice Chair Pennington seconded the motion.

Ayes: Euliss, Pennington, Peeler

Noes: Geiss, Meinking

Motion Approved.

ITEM 2: HD-21-46: A request by Mr. Baltutis for modifications to the roof line, removal of the gable and installation of a widows walk at 702 West Davis Street, PID 126079. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and in the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) Zone District.

Ms. Lawson presented the staff report on the item.

Mr. Ian Baltutis, Applicant, provided testimony that the original aesthetic of the neighborhood will be revived if the widows walk is restored. Mr. Baltutis explained that the parapet was enclosed due to leaking in the 1980's and that new material to be used will prevent leakage. Mr. Baltutis explained that the fencing of the widows walk will match the original wood fencing of

the existing front porch, which he explained was salvaged after damage during the depression. Mr. Baltutis also discussed how this work will return the roof/roofline to its original structure and form.

Findings of Fact:

- C5-1. Original roof forms, pitches, rafter details, molding, trim, and soffit boards should be retained.
- C5-3. Raising or lowering the roof pitch, or removing original features, such as dormers, turrets, balustrades, bargeboards, quarter round, cornices, brackets, weathervanes, or lightning rods are not allowed.
- C5-4. Features such as dormers or balustrades may be added if they are appropriate for the style of the building.
- C5-5. Deteriorated roof covering should be replaced with new materials that are compatible with the old in composition, size, and texture after reestablishing the structural stability of the roof. Replacement roofs should be dark in color. White or very light shingles are not acceptable.
- C1-1. Original architectural details should be retained if structurally feasible. Original exterior features such as cornices, brackets, railings, shutters, siding, window architrave's, and doorway pediments are an essential part of a building's character and should not be removed.
- C1-2. Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired or restored rather than replaced. If replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, or other visual qualities.

Chair Euliss made a motion to approve the findings of fact.

Vice Chair Pennington seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Motion for Roof Modification, Removal of Gable, and Widows Walk Installation:

Vice Chair Pennington moved to approve the application.

Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

IV. New Business

CLG Grant Update

Ms. Lawson reported that FY 21 Historic Preservation Grant was approved to update the Local Historic Overlay District Design Standards. Ms. Lawson explained that the grant amount will be \$22,000 and that a Request for Proposals for consultant selection will be issued in Fall of 2021. Ms. Lawson explained that the update is expected to be completed in 2022.

V. Other Business

- a. ASU status update – Ms. Lawson explained that the report was drafted and will be submitted to the State for review.
- b. CLG Training – Ms. Lawson discussed with Members to complete training sessions so that credit can be obtained to maintain the City’s CLG status.

Mr. Euliss mentioned that he will be meeting with Ms. Kristi Brantley from the State Historic Preservation Office to get more information about the repercussions from the homes that have been requested to be removed from the Local Historic Overlay District.

VII. Adjournment

END OF MEETING