



Meeting Minutes for August 9, 2022

The Burlington Historic Preservation Commission met on Tuesday, August 9, 2022, at 7:00 PM. All staff and applicants presenting at this meeting were sworn to tell the truth to the best of their ability. The meeting may be viewed online via YouTube's Playlist, "Historic Preservation Commission Meetings:"

<https://youtu.be/HEd-ygGmCAQ>

Members Present:

James Euliss, Chair
Brian Pennington, Vice Chair
Lori Bryan
Wendy Geiss
Russ Vandermass-Peeler

Members Absent:

Kristina Meinking
Josh Adkins

Staff Present:

Jamie Lawson, AICP, CZO, Planning Director
Conrad Olmedo, AICP, CZO, Planning Manager
Brianna Smith, Planning Office Manager

I. Call Meeting to Order

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

Mr. Euliss notified the Historic Preservation Commission of Mr. Josh Adkins resignation from the commission. Mr. Euliss thanked him for his service and time on the Historic Preservation commission.

Vice Chair Pennington made a motion to excuse Ms. Meinking from this meeting.

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

Approved unanimously by the following Members: (Euliss, Pennington, Bryan, Geiss, Vandermass-Peeler).

II. Approval of Previous Minutes- June 8 & June 14, 2022, Historic Preservation Commission

Ms. Geiss, Member, made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 8 & June 14, 2022, Historic Preservation Commission Meeting.

Ms. Wendy Geiss had a correction to the June 8, 2022, minutes. There was an incorrect identification of who was speaking in the denial for vinyl windows, the minutes stated that Ms. Geiss had made the denial, but it was Ms. Kristina Meinking.

Ms. Geiss made a motion to approve the June 8, 2022, minutes with the amendment to correct the identification. Ms. Lori Bryan seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously by the following Members: (Euliss, Bryan, Geiss, Vandermass-Peeler).

Mr. Brian Pennington abstained due to being absent from the June 8, 2022, meeting.

Ms. Wendy Geiss made a motion to approve the June 14, 2022, minutes. Ms. Bryan seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously by the following Members: (Euliss, Bryan, Geiss, Vandermass-Peeler).

Mr. Brian Pennington abstained due to being absent from the June 8, 2022, meeting.

III. Applications for Major Certificated of Appropriateness

ITEM 1: HD-22-040: A request by Mr. Jaime Lucero to replace wood siding with vinyl siding, replace the windows and rotted wood beneath the siding, remove trees, replace the gutters, and install a driveway and sidewalk at 516 West Front Street, PID 126672. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and in the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) District.

Mr. Euliss asked for any conflicts of interest amongst the commissioners, none were received.

Ms. Jamie Lawson, Planning Director gave a staff report of the property and stated that the request is a retroactive request, due to the work already completed. Ms. Lawson gave a brief description of the propped work the applicant would like to complete on the home.

Ms. Lawson, Planning Director, was sworn to tell the truth to the best of her ability.

Applicant, Mr. Jaime Lucero and Contractor, Mr. Don Honeycutt were in attendance and were sworn to tell the truth to the best of their ability.

Mr. Don Honeycutt stated that the goal for the property was to bring the property up to an acceptable energy level. Mr. Honeycutt also stated that the Mr. Lucero wanted to keep the property the same style and wanted to replace the windows, replace rotted wood, repair the moisture barrier, and keep the same style but change the siding to vinyl siding.

Mr. Honeycutt pointed out, in the photos provided, the different attachments on the property and explained that the goal was to make the property look like it was all one plane instead of

multiple attachments with vinyl. Mr. Honeycutt also explained that they wanted to replace the poles on the front porch with weight bearing vinyl poles, keeping the same style of the original home.

Mr. Honeycutt stated that Mr. Lucero was unaware the home was in a historic district when he bought the home. Mr. Honeycutt stated that Mr. Lucero was willing to dye the driveway to match the surrounding sidewalk, since it had already been installed. Mr. Honeycutt stated that the color of the vinyl was flexible if approved.

Ms. Lawson inquired about tree removal that had been indicated in the application.

Mr. Honeycutt responded that they wanted to remove an overgrown tree on the right side of the property.

Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler inquired if the tree was a Crape Myrtle. Mr. Honeycutt responded that he believed that it was. Mr. Honeycutt stated that the applicant was willing to replace with something similar.

Ms. Lawson inquired if the tree was dead or diseased.

Mr. Honeycutt responded that it wasn't, just overgrown and encroaching on the home and powerlines.

Ms. Lawson inquired about discussion of the gutters on the home.

Mr. Honeycutt stated, if permitted, they would install gutters on the home. If not allowed, they planned to cover the overhang to keep water away from the foundation of the home and to protect the ground from rain beating down on it.

Mr. Honeycutt stated that on the back of the home is a porch with a screen around it that the applicant would like to take down and have an open porch.

Ms. Lawson recommended that it was hard to give comments to the Historic Commission due to lack of photos or additional info for some of the items. Ms. Lawson stated that it may be best to stick with what is currently on the property and for the applicant to submit another application.

Mr. Pennington inquired when the home was purchased by the applicant. Mr. Lucero responded a month ago.

Mr. Pennington inquired that when Mr. Lucero purchased the home that he was unaware of the Historic zoning. Mr. Lucero responded that he didn't know. Mr. Pennington stated that the realtor should have informed the applicant that the home was in the Historic District. Mr. Lucero responded that the realtor informed him about the Historic Districting after he purchased the home.

Mr. Honeycutt stated that Mr. Lucero was unaware of the Historic District until he received a letter about it. Mr. Pennington stated that the home being in the Historic District would have been disclosed by the seller that the purchaser would have signed.

Mr. Pennington inquired about when the driveway was installed. Mr. Lucero responded a week after he bought the home.

Mr. Pennington inquired if there was a permit to install the driveway. Mr. Lucero responded that there was not a permit for the driveway. Mr. Pennington inquired if Mr. Honeycutt installed the driveway. Mr. Lucero responded that Mr. Honeycutt did not install the driveway that he did it himself.

Mr. Pennington inquired if the applicant removed steps from the home and installed concrete steps to the home. Mr. Honeycutt responded that yes concrete steps were installed. Mr. Pennington stated that the installation of those steps would have required a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to do so.

Mr. Pennington stated that he didn't believe the Historic Preservation Commission could approve the vinyl windows or the siding because they are exclusively excluded in the Historic Design Standards.

Ms. Geiss stated that she believed the sidewalk would have also required a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to install and that the sidewalk is non-conforming as well.

Mr. Pennington stated that he believed that Hardiboard was the way to go with the vinyl siding not being an approved material. Mr. Pennington also stated that if a home nearby had the vinyl siding, it was most likely done before the design standards were in place.

Ms. Geiss gave the recommendation that the Hardiboard currently on the house could be restored and repainted. Ms. Geiss stated the importance of maintain the Folk Victorian style of the house.

Mr. Honeycutt inquired about the windows and if they could be replaced with vinyl. Ms. Geiss responded that the windows would need to be wood windows. Ms. Geiss also stated that the current wood windows could be restored and that vinyl windows weren't allowed.

Ms. Geiss inquired about what the Mr. Lucero was going to do about the driveway. Mr. Honeycutt stated that it was planned to put a stain on it to match the sidewalks.

Mr. Pennington stated that the driveway looks wider than what would have been approved Mr. Lucero had submitted an application to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Pennington inquired if staff had received any public comments about the property. Ms. Lawson stated that staff received calls about the work that has transpired on the property due to lack of COA notification.

Public Comments:

Ms. Molly Whitlatch, 912 W Davis Street spoke that she understood how much work it takes to keep up with a historic property. Ms. Whitlatch stated that after hearing about the item that she looked up what the Secretary of Interior Standards had to say about replacing materials and features like on Mr. Lucero's property. Ms. Whitlatch gave a brief reading of the standards that the Historic Preservation Commission has modeled their standards after. Ms. Whitlatch stated that if they approved this property to have vinyl, how could they not approve other property owners to have vinyl on their homes. Ms. Whitlatch stated that the materials on the home are easily accessible from businesses in the area. Ms. Whitlatch also gave a brief description about the distinctive quality this home has and stated that Preservation Burlington has grants and resources available to help the applicant restore this home. Ms. Whitlatch stated that she was in opposition of the application as it stands.

Ms. Geiss commented that the home was over 100 years old and built in 1918 and stated that there are historic tax credits for restoration of historic homes.

There was no one else from the public present.

Discussion:

Discussion was had about the different resources available to the applicant to restore the home. The Commission expressed their desire to see this home restored properly to the historical standards.

Mr. Pennington stated that it would be in the interest of the applicant to separate the fixing of the already poured driveway and to bring the rest back to a future meeting.

Ms. Lawson stated existing standards, upgrades that the applicant could do, and recommended consulting with staff before making any updates. There was discussion with Mr. Lucero about a damaged part of the home. Ms. Lawson stated that if the house was kept the same with similar materials, the home could be repaired. Ms. Lawson also gave the applicant details about applying for a COA.

After discussion between staff and the Historic Preservation Commission, Mr. Lucero decided to separate the different projects to be able to have some of them approved. With the goal to potentially submit another application for the other projects.

Mr. Honeycutt inquired if a decision could be made regarding the overgrown tree. Mr. Lucero was advised to get in contact with Mr. Jason Barnhill, City Horticulturist to discuss the plan to keep the integrity of the tree by the commission. If the tree is to be removed, staff is recommending replacing the tree with an approved species, subject to Mr. Barnhill's recommendation.

Discussion was had about the driveway that was installed. Mr. Pennington inquired if the applicant had filed a permit for the driveway. Mr. Lucero responded that no permit was filed and

that he had been advised that a permit was only required for the walkway not the driveway. Ms. Lawson stated that both the driveway and walkway required permit.

Findings of Fact:

The following findings of facts were included in the staff report as part of the application:

- 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.
- C7-1. Damaged or deteriorated wall materials should be repaired whenever possible.
- C7-2. Replacement materials should match the original wall materials in size, shape, and texture.
- C7-3. Sandblasting and other abrasive treatments that can damage historic wall materials are not acceptable. Harsh chemical strippers which damage the surface or grain of the wood should not be used. (See section 13 page V-36, on paint removal)
- C7-4. The original siding should not be replaced or covered by artificial siding such as aluminum, vinyl, asphalt, asbestos, masonite, or pressboard that would not have been used on the original structure.
- C8-1. Original window and door elements such as sash, glass, sills, frames, casings, hardware, weather- stripping, lintels, architrave's, and shutters should be repaired and retained rather than replaced.
- C8-2. When the repair of a window or door is not feasible, the replacement should match as closely as possible with the original window or door in material, scale, character, and appearance. New windows or doors should have matching sash, glass, sills, frames, casings, and muntin patterns. New sash should be made of wood, not metal. Existing window casings and trim should be retained.
- C8-3. The pattern, arrangements, and dimensions of doors and windows on the principal elevations should be retained, unless restoring the appearance of the structure to its original design. On other facades, where not easily visible from the street, new openings should be proportionately the same as existing openings with matching elements. Window and door openings should not be enlarged or reduced to fit stock windows or doors.
- C8-4. Windows or doors with snap-in muntins should be avoided. They do not look real, do not cast a shadow like real muntins, and do not match the character of historic windows.
- C8-5. Jalousie windows and sliding windows are inappropriate.
- C9-1. Original should not be destroyed when storm windows or doors are installed.
- C9-2. Storm windows and doors should blend with the building rather than appear to be tacked on. The shape and general appearance should match the existing window or door as closely as possible. Storm doors should have full view glass with no meeting rails or muntins. Storm windows should have a meeting rail which aligns with the meeting rail of the window to which it is applied.

- C9-3. Raw metal storm window and door frames are not appropriate. The frames should be painted wood or painted or baked enamel finish aluminum.
- C9-4. When possible, interior storm windows are encouraged.
- C12-1. The placement of color should be appropriate to the architectural style of the structure.
- B2-4. Mature, healthy trees should remain intact and undisturbed on a site, unless they are causing the structural deterioration of a building. A mature tree is defined as being four (4) inches or larger in diameter in West Burlington and as being fifteen (15) inches or larger in diameter in Glencoe measured four (4) feet above the ground.
- B2-7. Trees larger than four (4) inches in diameter in West Burlington or larger than fifteen (15) inches in diameter in Glencoe³ which are dead or diseased should be replaced with a similar type tree, except where the replacement would cause structural damage to the building.
- B2-8. When a tree is removed, the tree stump should be ground and the soil should be leveled and seeded.
- C5-10. Built in gutters that are important to the architecture of the structure should be repaired rather than removed when they become deteriorated.
- C5-11. Gutters and downspouts should not conceal or interfere with architectural trim.
- B4-1. Appropriate paving materials for walks are concrete and brick. Stone walks are also appropriate in West Burlington, while gravel walks are also appropriate in Glencoe.¹ Simulations of natural materials are not allowed.
- B4-3. Consideration should be given to the ratio between green areas and man-made or paved areas.
- Large expanses of paving are discouraged.
- B4-4. Front walks which lead directly from the public sidewalk to the front door should be maintained, except where originally oriented in another direction. Additional walks needed for access should be appropriate in placement, scale, and materials.
- B4-6. New walks or driveways should be constructed to avoid the damaging or killing of a mature healthy tree or other major landscape elements.
- B4-7. Walks should be flush with the grade of the front yard and with the public sidewalk. However, concrete or brick steps should be provided where the building lot is elevated above the level of the street.
- B4-8. Appropriate materials for driveways in the West Burlington Historic District are concrete, asphalt, brick or gravel; and for driveways in the Glencoe Historic District are concrete and gravel.¹ New concrete driveways should be tinted slightly so that they will match the shade of the public sidewalk.
- B4-9. Curb cuts required for driveways should be kept to the smallest openings that are functional.
- B4-10. New driveways should be added only to provide access to parking areas at the rear of the lot. If a new driveway is planned next to an existing driveway on an adjacent lot, a planting strip should be left to avoid a wide expanse of pavement.
- B4-11. New driveways should minimize changes to existing landscape features such as retaining walls, walkways and major landscaping.

Motion:

Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the removal of the tree at the corner of the property, subject to the owner planting a tree that is on the approved species list, pending the approval of the City Arborist.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

Motion was passed unanimously (Euliss, Pennington, Vandermass-Peeler, Bryan, Geiss)

Mr. Pennington made a motion to approve the driveway and walkway, pending the tinting to match the color of the districts existing sidewalk and pending a permit for the driveway.

Ms. Geiss seconded the motion.

Motion was passed unanimously (Euliss, Pennington, Vandermass-Peeler, Bryan, Geiss)

Mr. Lucero choose to withdrawal the other requests in the application and will potentially apply after reviewing the standards.

Discussion was had about paint color and the commission directed Mr. Lucero to Sherwin Williams for historic colors and to Preservation Burlington for advice with restoration.

Ms. Lawson stated that she will be issuing COA paperwork and that Mr. Lucero is to display the COA is to be displayed while work is being done. Ms. Lawson also reminded Mr. Lucero to check with staff prior to doing any other work.

Ms. Molly Whitlatch asked if the new guidelines would go into effect immediately upon approval. Ms. Lawson confirmed that is correct.

IV. New Business

a. Legislative Amendments – Landmark Applications

Ms. Lawson stated including in the packet were some changes to state statutes for Landmark Applications that appear to be clerical in nature.

V. Other Business

a. Historic Design Standards

Ms. Lawson stated that the standards went to the Planning and Zoning Commission for review. The Planning and Zoning commission had two meetings to discuss and they made a recommendation. The standards then went to a City Council Work Session in July and during that meeting there were a few additional recommendations which were included in the Design Standards. The item was noticed for the August 16 Public Hearing.

b. Minor COA Update

In the commissioner's packet for them to look over. Nothing new for the commissioners to discuss.

c. Welcome Packet – Historic District

The commission discussed sending welcome packets to residents in the Historic District. There was a brief discussion about realtors' responsibility with notifying the buyers that the homes are in the Historic District and about notifications to residents about the LHO district overlay. Discussion was had about giving out hard copies or an electronic version. Ms. Lawson stated the different types of notification the city has access to that could be used to give information about the district.

d. CLG Training

Ms. Lawson stated to the commission that training is required to attend on an annual basis. The most recent CLG Training had Mr. Conrad Olmedo, Ms. Jamie Lawson, Mr. Brian Pennington, and Mr. Byron Brown in attendance. The commission was encouraged to continue to attend trainings. Trainings are available for commission members to attend virtually.

e. HPC Member Appointment & Reappointment

Applications are still being taken for Historic Preservation Commission. Appointments will be in September. Ms. Lawson also encouraged the commission to consider being apart of the Design Consultation Committee.

VI. Adjournment:

Mr. Pennington, Vice-Chair, made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Geiss, Member, seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

END OF MEETING