



Agenda Item #: 2

Project Title: 719 Jenifer St - Construction of an addition in the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6th Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 77463

Prepared By: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

Members: Present: Richard Arnesen, Edna Ely-Ledesma, Molly Harris, Katie Kaliszewski, Ald. Amani Latimer Burris, David McLean, and Maurice Taylor
Excused: None

Summary

Ryan Reda, registering in support and available to answer questions

Kaliszewski opened the public hearing.

Bailey provided background information on the project, along with details on previous Landmarks Commission approvals and photos of the evolution of the building over time. She noted that in the staff report recommendation for conditions of approval, she would add, "to include vertical trim beneath side gable" to condition 1.

McLean pointed out that it looked like the applicant got rid of the original trim and sills and then picture framed the windows with composite material. He noted that the previous January 2021 Certificate of Appropriateness specifically called out preserving and repairing all window trim, soffits, and fascia with profiles to match the existing or historic.

Reda said that the only windows with decorative trim were on the front and need to be replaced. They said the windows will be removed and they will probably get solid wood and have them made to match the exact style that was there. They said the side windows had basic trim just as they are now and there were no changes. McLean asked if the side windows had projecting sills prior to recladding. Reda said they were pretty sure it was only the front ones, but they would have to look at photos. Bailey pulled up older photos from the prior application and pointed out the projecting sills on the side windows. McLean said that aside from the loss of historic material, his biggest concern was the way that the house presents itself currently. Older houses had projecting sills, and it is only in contemporary construction that we are losing that. He explained that is why it is important to retain or repair those window details. Reda said that those sills were covered with aluminum cladding because they were rotted. McLean said that he would have preferred to have had the sills replicated as opposed to picture framed. He asked if that could still happen or if it was too late as far as constructability. Reda said that it would be hard to do that because the windows were made to fit the old window openings, so they would have to tear out the bottom sill and move it down, which would destroy the siding.

Harris requested clarification on which windows had already been replaced and which were proposed for repair or replacement. Reda said the first window assessment they received said that all windows were not repairable aside from the front windows. They said the front windows were set up for window weights, but there were no pockets or hardware in the windows for weights; they said the windows were probably not original to the house. McLean asked if staff had gone over the windows with the applicant. Bailey said that she had recommended that the applicant work with a window repair contractor on the best intervention; if the front windows are not original, they are still very old and have unique character that is more in keeping with the decorative elements on the front of the house than the utilitarian elements on the side. McLean agreed that they appeared to be 1800s vintage windows, and would like the applicant to stay the course on having them repaired and functional. Reda said they were figuring out what they can do

while still meeting Building Inspection code. McLean asked if this was a rental or private home, and Reda said it was a private home and they have plans for an ADU on the rear side.

Reda asked if staff had received full plans from the architect. They were wondering if on the rear where the roof goes above the gutter line, it could be brought level to run a single K-style gutter from front to back instead of having two downspouts. Bailey said the application posted on Legistar includes the plans that staff received. McLean asked if there were variations from the submitted plans to what updated drawings will bring because if there were many changes to come, this set may not be up to date enough to approve. Bailey said it was within the commission's purview to refer the item to a future meeting for updated application materials. Harris suggested the commission request specification on windows to reflect what will be repaired or replaced, as well as details on gutters and the porch. Reda said they didn't want to add additional details and instead simply wanted approval in order to fix the roof. They added that the rear windows are like the side windows that were replaced and the new siding would be the same as what was already installed. They said that most of the materials that have already been used on the house will also be used on the rear. McLean said he understood the situation, but they had already lost the window detail the applicant was required to preserve in an approved Certificate of Appropriateness, and now the commission was being asked to approve incomplete drawings with only the applicant's word that they would match everything. Reda said they had a deadline with the City Attorney's office to complete the work by August. McLean asked if the commission would be getting updated plans for review. Bailey suggested that could be a condition of approval. She added that she was particularly interested in the details of the corbels because what exists is very unique, so the applicant will need to replicate the look of the corbels in place on the front of the house. Reda said the front corbels are remaining, and McLean said this emphasized his concerns; Bailey pointed out that the plans say the corbels are being replaced. Kaliszewski said she didn't feel comfortable having this move forward until the applicant submits updated materials that specify the work being proposed under this Certificate of Appropriateness request. McLean asked how quickly the applicant could get updated drawings to staff, and Reda said they weren't sure when their architect could submit them. Bailey said that she needed the updated materials by June 15 in order for this item to be on the June 26 agenda.

Kaliszewski closed the public hearing.

Action

A motion was made by Harris, seconded by McLean, to Refer the item to the June 26, 2023 Landmarks Commission meeting to allow the applicant to submit updated plans. The motion passed by voice vote/other.