



Agenda Item #:	4
Project Title:	112 S Hancock St - Addition and Exterior Alterations in the First Settlement Hist. Dist. - Construct dormer addition, reconstruct damaged rear roof, alter front balconies, create one window opening, modify sill heights of two windows, construct two rear balconies, construct ADA ramp, replace damaged windows, and remove vinyl siding; 6th Ald. Dist.
Legistar File ID #:	76796
Prepared By:	Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner
Members:	Present: Richard Arnesen, Edna Ely-Ledesma, Molly Harris, Katie Kaliszewski, Maurice Taylor, and Ald. Bill Tishler Excused: David McLean

Summary

Douglas Pahl, registering in support and wishing to speak
Meredith Whye, registering in support and wishing to speak
Jason Tham, registering in support and available to answer questions
Brianna Kraft, registering in support and available to answer questions

Kaliszewski opened the public hearing.

Bailey provided background information on the proposed project.

Douglas Pahl, applicant, said that the viability of the third floor living space was improved by adding shed dormers between the gables, noting that they carefully tried to conceal the shed dormers. They said that their overall care in preserving the house and other mitigating factors help offset the slight impact to the historic character of the house that the shed dormers bring. Their goal is to increase the quality of the living space and the viability of the property in the future. They said there are examples of Queen Anne-style homes that show occasional use of shed dormers, so it is not unheard of.

Ely-Ledesma asked if the dormer additions were the only windows on that level. Pahl said that there is light provided from the balcony door, the old dormers, and likely some windows on the back that are now boarded up. They said there were a lot of sloped ceilings, so it was a fairly dark unit.

Arnesen asked how far back the face of the shed dormer is from the gable dormers. Pahl said the shed dormer is set back 3'2". Arnesen asked staff why the shed dormer didn't meet the standards. Bailey said that in looking at properties within 200 feet, there was no precedent in historic resources to have an extensive shed roof dormer that runs along the side of the roof. She said that on this building, there is a combination of roof forms, including a turret, and most of the roof is hipped and already has gable dormers; introduction of a shed roof in between the gable dormers is yet another roof form that is not currently a style found on this building. In thinking about the standards, she said the commission should consider the precedent of this type of change; if they allow a larger dormer with a connector nested in that spans most of the length of the building as long as it is stepped back and minimally visible, it will establish this as something the commission believes meets the standards.

Arnesen asked the applicant to explain the reasoning for the dormers. Pahl said the dormers allow them to take advantage of the areas on each side of the building where the roof pitch is too steep; they can do a lot in terms of

getting bathrooms and windows into the living space. They said that without the dormers, it is below a usable ceiling height and they have to rely on skylights for getting light into the space. Arnesen asked if the bathroom would still work. Pahl said they would guess that it would not work because other options they looked at without the shed dormers did not place the bathrooms there.

Kaliszewski asked the applicant if they had any issues with staff's conditions for approval, aside from the dormers. Pahl said they did not have issues with the other conditions and appreciated the flexibility in terms of administratively approving siding and other materials.

With regard to the standards, Ely-Ledesma asked if the view from the street should be considered here. Bailey said that it should be considered, and that was why the applicant significantly stepped back the shed dormers behind the gable dormers. She said that the original plan was to have shed dormers that spanned the entire side of structure, so they modified the design to have pairs of gable dormers on either side with a stepped-back shed dormer to try to make it minimally visible from the street. Pahl said the views provided are the worst in terms of visibility of the shed dormer from the public right-of-way so the Commission could provide an accurate assessment of the visual impacts.

Arnesen said that it was quite effective the way the dormers are stepped back.

Meredith Whye, a neighbor, raised concerns about the project. They asked what the applicant was envisioning for outside lights. They said that the previous bright white lights were not great for neighbors. They also asked about the estimated duration and noise level of the project. Pahl said they had not discussed proposed outdoor lighting yet, but they intend to make the lighting polite to neighbors. They also noted that City ordinance dictates what light trespass they can have, so they will submit a photometric plan that will be reviewed and approved by the City to meet the ordinance. They predicted 3-6 months maximum for the duration of the project, which is primarily an interior renovation. Jason Tham, property owner, said that most of work is interior and currently slated to wrap up by fall, so they were expecting minimal noise to neighboring properties.

Bailey said that if neighbors had any issues with light trespass, there was a City process for filing a complaint through Building Inspection.

Kaliszewski closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Tishler, to Approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that updated plans be submitted that remove the shed-roof dormers from the design and final siding, trim, window, door, railing, porch, deck, and roofing materials specifications be approved administratively by staff. Siding and trim will need to replicate the appearance of the historic wood siding, not the current nonhistoric vinyl siding. All window components will replicate the appearance of wood windows, with no wrapping of the window opening. Any exterior lighting or mechanicals proposed as part of this project scope will need a Certificate of Appropriateness.

There was discussion on the motion. Arnesen said that he would vote no because the shed dormer was barely visible, so he would like to approve the dormer. He said that by removing the proposed shed dormer, it would turn what could be a four-bedroom space into a one-bedroom at best. Given the current housing crisis and considering the other improvements proposed as part of this project, he would like to approve the dormer. Tishler asked if Arnesen was okay with the shed dormer because it was on the side rather than facing the street. Arnesen confirmed that he thought the shed dormer could be approved because it was on the side of the house and stepped back so that there was limited visibility from the front of the house. Tishler said that he was fine with that reasoning.

Taylor withdrew the motion.

Prior to making a motion, Arnesen explained the reasoning for allowing the shed dormer to move forward, noting the applicant's efforts to limit the visibility of the dormer to the extent possible so that it did not appear to be visible from the street.

Action

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Ely-Ledesma, to Approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that final siding, trim, window, door, railing, porch, deck, and roofing materials specifications be approved administratively by staff. Siding and trim will need to replicate the appearance of the historic wood siding, not the current nonhistoric vinyl siding. All window components will replicate the appearance of wood windows, with no wrapping of the window opening. Any exterior lighting or mechanicals proposed as part of this project scope will need a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion passed by voice vote/other.