

LIBERTY HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMISSION
Meeting Summary
April 20, 2021
Zoom Video Conference & 3rd Floor Conference Room
4:00 pm

Present via Video Conference: Matt Grundy, John Carr, Vern Drottz, Mike Gilmore, Dail Hobbs, Clay Lozier, Martha Reppert, Brett Rinker, Doug Wilson

Absent:

Applicants Present via Zoom: Randy Elkins for 400 E Kansas, JD Nelsen for 340 Harrison Ave., Tyler Arthur for 518 W. Kansas, Alexander Gray for 102 N. Morse, Mark Buhlig for 226 N. Jewell.

Staff Present: Jeanine Thill Community Development Manager and Katherine Sharp, Planning & Development Director/Moderator

Chairman Grundy called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Carr to approve the April 6, 2021 meeting summary as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Drottz. The motion passed 9-0-0.

HDRC Case #21-006J Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations at 400 E. Kansas, Jewell Historic District

The applicant said a double hung window can be done in the kitchen if necessary. Vice Chairman Carr commented that he is comfortable with the casement window provided that it has a faux checkrail, as it may be easier to operate. The casings around the window and doors should match the rest of the house and it should also have a sub sill. Vice Chairman Carr said that would satisfy the appearance for the new window and door. Commissioner Rinker said he agrees with Vice Chairman Carr that the casement window can look like a double hung and agrees with the ease of use. Chairman Grundy said that he also agreed. Commissioner Wilson asked if there was a photo of the exterior of the kitchen window. Staff said there was not an exterior photo. He said the existing window looks taller than it is wide. He said we may want to look at what it looked like originally. The window measurements are 42 W X33 H according to Mr. Elkins. The photo makes it look wider than tall. Mr. Elkins said he can provide photos with the simulated check rail. Commissioner Wilson asked if he should have two casements. Vice Chairman Carr said with a double casement when the two come together in the middle it could create a mullion. He said that particular part of the house was probably an addition. Vice Chairman Carr said with the applied checkrail and addressing the casing and sub sill it would match the fenestration of the home. Commissioner Drottz said that he agrees.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Carr to approve the application with the stipulation that the new casement windows have a faux check rail and the casings duplicate what was original and add a sub sill. With the outlined stipulations the application meets the UDO and Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hobbs. The motion passed 9-0-0.

HDRC Case #21-003PH Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations at 340 Harrison, Prospect Heights Historic District

Mr. Nelsen said he will emulate the top balcony rail with the front porch rail. He will replace the shingles on the roof and will replace the gutters with an aluminum 6 inch gutters. Also they will replace the flat roof with like in-kind materials with additional flashing on the parapet walls. Vice Chairman Carr said he has several concerns. He commented that it is a shingle not a hand-split shake. He added that he would rather see a shingle than a shake. Also on the drawing the applicant is showing a staggered application and it should be a straight line. He feels strongly that they are singles and the vertical lines should be straight. Also, the top plate should be larger than a 1x. A 2x with a slight bevel might pick up the original design of the first floor porch rail. Also they show a 4x4 on top of the original, it is a 2x and a 1x4 on the inside and outside of the porch. The bottom has a flat 1x4 and a 2x4 underneath. The drawing does not duplicate what is on the first floor porch railing. The 6X6's on either side are not appropriate. The rail should tie into the parapet wall. There should not be a corner cap, the shingles should overlap. Mr. Nelsen said they put in flashing, not a corner cap to prevent water. On the post there is an existing 4x4 post on the railing – he put the 6X6's in there because it is a separate entity to the parapet. The 4X4's were incorrect. 6X6 is too massive. In an ideal situation it should tie right into the parapet with no vertical post at all. Vice Chairman Carr commented that he believes that the rail they are replacing is not original and no rail at all would be okay, as it was never designed as a balcony and porch. If they put in a rail it should duplicate what is on the front porch. Mr. Nelsen said that it was hard to know the exact sizes of the boards so he made estimates of sizes. Vice Chairman Carr commented that there is a perfect pattern and if he duplicates all of those elements of the front porch railing then it will look good. Mr. Nelsen said the top plate is proposed to be cellular PVC. Vice Chairman Carr said he would suggest that it be heavier than a 1x. If he switches to 5/4 it would be closer to duplicating the top rail of the front porch. Commissioner Drottz agreed and did not have anything to add. Commissioner Wilson asked if the upstairs dormer rail isn't appropriate, and the existing rail rots then the Commission shouldn't approve a new and improved improper feature. He added that in the historic survey photo of the home the balcony rail appears to be there. We have a responsibility to get it back to its original. Mr. Nelson said his concern would be that it would be a safety hazard if it wasn't there as the homeowner has younger children and safety should be considered. Mr. Nelsen commented that the front railing system height does not meet code, but his understanding is because it is in a historic district there are exceptions. Ms. Sharp said since we don't have historic evidence that the railing wasn't in the dormer area, we should consider replacing the existing railing appropriately. Vice Chairman Carr said he does not know for a fact that the rail wasn't original to the balcony. He agrees that we do not have documentation to substantiate it and he has no recollection of anything but the existing rail being there. Commissioner Drottz asked for the sill height of the existing dormer windows. Mr. Nelsen said it is 6 inches on the exterior and on the interior it is 18 inches. Commissioner Drottz said the rail is actually a safety feature. On the spacing between the slats, it is not up to standard but it needs to emulate the bottom, with 3.5 inches in between. Commissioner Wilson asked if they can replace a rail to a short rail. Ms. Sharp said in historic homes we allow them to have a lower rail.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Carr to approve the application with the stipulations that the railing duplicates the front porch railing exactly. And that the shingles should be shingles and not hand split shakes and aligned horizontally. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Drottz. The motion passed 9-0-0.

HDRC Case 21-008D Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations at 518 W. Kansas, Dougherty Historic District

Mr. Arthur said that the proposed window would have a wood removable interior grid. Vice Chairman Carr asked what exterior muntins would be used. The 192 Contour SDL would be the model that the applicant would propose to use. Vice Chairman Carr said he would be comfortable with the east side having SDL's. In the past the Commission has approved similar windows at 232 W. Franklin.

Mr. Arthur said they are no longer requesting removal of the window from the West elevation. Commissioner Rinker said with the clarification that the muntins of the SDL's on the exterior of the windows and without removing the west elevation widow, then he supports this application. Commissioner Drottz agreed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Rinker to approve the application to replace the existing windows with the stipulation that they have exterior muntins and we deny the removal of the exterior window. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hobbs. The motion passed 9-0-0.

HDRC Case #21-009D Consideration of an After the Fact Certificate of Appropriateness for new french doors in rear of the home at 102 N. Morse, Dougherty Historic District

Vice Chairman Carr said the new doors seem to be appropriate. He added that it is unfortunate that the transom window was not replaced, as it is smaller than the new doors. The key is that the application of the exterior casing around the door and transom window that we see looks to be pretty good. He commented that this house has had substantial modifications since the 1980s. Chairman Grundy said he agrees with Vice Chairman Carr.

A motion was made by Commissioner Gilmore to approve the application as presented because it meets the UDO and Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Carr. The motion passed 9-0-0.

HDRC Case #21-004J Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations at 226 N. Jewell, Jewell Historic District

Mr. Buhlig said that the addition was built in the mid 50's to the mid 60's so it didn't seem to him that the proposed batt and board siding was in conflict with the original home and it is not in conflict with his budget. Vice Chairman Carr said the lap siding had 2 3/4" reveal originally. He agrees with staff that the lap siding should go back and that the missing window should match. Vice Chairman Carr said he would like more specifics on the proposed window. He added that the existing railing is inappropriate and he does not have a problem with the short wall with lap siding. He agrees with staff that horizontal cement board siding would be appropriate. He is not in favor of the batt and board siding. Vice Chairman Carr asked if the applicant has any plans to install garage doors. Mr. Buhlig said that it all comes down to the budget. He asked if there is assistance for poor people. Staff said the 353 Tax Abatement is an opportunity. The code doesn't take economics into account. Staff can provide information on the staff person that manages the tax abatement.

Mr. Buhlig said there is a 3 inch reveal on the existing siding. He asked what kind of latitude he would have and how strict will the City be on the reveal? He said Smart Siding is another option. Vice Chairman Carr said the smooth smart siding might be more economical than a fiber cement board. He could use the Smart board and rip it. It is not beveled. He is not sure of the thickness. The cement board is only 5 16th inches thick. Commissioner Drottz said the Smart

Siding is a consistent thickness and it is a little thicker than Hardie siding. If there is a starter strip that is ripped in half to have two pieces. Commissioner Drottz said he may have a sample. Mr. Buhlig said he may need to go with 5/4 for casings and corner boards. The simulated wood grain on the smart siding may be acceptable if it matched the existing profile. That would allow him to use the 5/4 Smart trim and cap it, Commissioner Drottz said.

Vice Chairman Carr asked Commissioner Wilson if he is aware of the thickness he is using on his new garage. Commissioner Wilson said it is 3/8th's inch. He rented a truck and got it from Columbia. He added that he priced 5/4 corner boards and they are \$50 per corner. Commissioner Wilson asked if Mr. Buhlig could use the existing siding to cover at least one side of the addition. Mr. Buhlig said that he might have enough to only do one side.

We can let the nuisance officer know this may need time before the changes are made as there are still several issues to consider. The Commission suggested that the Design sub-committee meet on site with the applicant.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Carr to table the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hobbs. The motion passed 9-0-0.

Other Business

Administrative Approvals since the March 16, 2021 meeting:

- Renewal of COA for a Picket Fence at 526 W. Franklin
- 253 W. Kansas Like in-kind repairs to the foundation
- 327 Harrison Like in-kind replacement of front porch post
- 450 E. Franklin Like in-kind repairs to front porch
- 124 N. Gallatin Sign

Miscellaneous matters from the Commission:

Vice Chairman Carr said the house at the corner of Fairview & W. Kansas is for sale.

Miscellaneous matters from Staff:

Staff asked the Commission to take the time to read the recently approved Preservation Plan & to think about priorities for implementation.

Training- Staff reminded the Commission that annual training is required by every member of this commission to be in good standing with the state and our CLG status.

IX. Adjournment

Other Business: None

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.