



Meeting Minutes for January 10, 2023

The Burlington Historic Preservation Commission met on Tuesday, January, 10 2023, 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://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLX2Do5DiQXize1mDyBLhHd_eJ4ov89fPU

Members Present:

Kristina Meinking, Acting Chair
Vernon Hess
Wendy Geise
Michael Williams

Members Absent:

Brian Pennington, Chair
Russ Vandermass-Peeler, Vice-Chair
Christina Benson

Staff Present:

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

I. Call Meeting to Order

Ms. Kristina Meinking, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

Mr. Brian Pennington, Chair, Ms. Christina Benson, Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler, Vice-Chair, requested excused absences.

Ms. Wendy Geise, Member, made the motion to excuse Mr. Pennington, Ms. Benson, and Mr. Vandermass-Peeler.

All were in favor.

II. Approval of Minutes of the December 13, 2022 Meeting

Mr. Vernon Hess, Member, made a motion to approve the December 13, 2022 minutes. Mr. Michael Williams, Member, seconded the motion.

All were in favor.

III. Applications for Major Certificates of Appropriateness

ITEM 1: HD-22-051: A request by Ms. Carol Lehman to remove awnings at 419 Fountain Place, PID 126035. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and in the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) District.

Ms. Jamie Lawson, Planning Director, gave a brief overview of the item and information included in the packet to the commission. Ms. Lawson stated that the item was included on

the agenda due to not being able to find evidence if the awnings were original to the home. Ms. Lawson said that the guidelines state if the awnings are not original, this type of work is labeled as general maintenance. If the awnings are original, the applicant would have to come before the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Lawson stated that staff is bringing this to the commission to be cautious.

Ms. Lawson swore to tell the truth to the best of her ability.

Ms. Meinking called for any conflicts of interest. There were none.

Ms. Carol Lehman swore to tell the truth to the best of her ability.

Ms. Lehman stated that she felt that the awnings are inappropriate to the home and neighborhood, as well as moldy, and would like to completely remove them.

Ms. Lawson requested Ms. Lehman to elaborate on how the awnings are affixed to the home and who would be doing the work in taking them down. Ms. Lehman responded that the awnings are attached to the windows and her family and friends would be doing the work. Ms. Lawson inquired if there would any impact to the brick on the home. Ms. Lehman stated that there would not be.

Mr. Williams inquired about how the awnings are attached to the windows. Ms. Lehman confirmed.

Ms. Lehman stated that her home is the only home in the area with the awnings in the area. Mr. Hess stated that after driving through the neighborhood that he also felt that the awnings were inappropriate for the area.

Ms. Meinking inquired if there was any way to tell from the hardware the age of the awnings or when they were installed. Ms. Lehman responded that she had been shown photos of the awnings on the house that were quite old. There was a discussion of the photos of an awning that had been removed previously.

Mr. Hess stated that he reviewed the supplemental materials and believed the hardware on the awnings to be aluminum and could not believe that they were that old.

Ms. Geise stated that she believed the awnings to be from the 60's, definitely not original to the 20's when the home was built.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Findings of Fact:

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

Design Standards applicable for removal of awnings:

- A1. Retain any existing historic hardware used for roll-up awnings so that it can be utilized with a new fabric component.

Staff also suggests the Historic Preservation Commission consider the additional findings of fact (while specific to canopies) could be applied to awnings:

- A1. Retain and maintain historic canopies. Non-historic features are not required to be retained. However, if an applicant seeks to alter or replace such a feature, it must be replaced by a historically appropriate feature.
- B1. Only fabric awnings supported by a metal internal frame are permitted unless there is historical precedent for another design. Plastic, vinyl, leatherette, and metal awnings are prohibited.

Motion:

Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the findings of facts as found in the agenda.

Mr. Hess seconded the motion.

All were in favor.

Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the removal of awnings from 419 Fountain Place.

Mr. Hess seconded the motion.

All were in favor.

Ms. Lehman had a brief discussion about future projects she would like to complete on the home and Ms. Lawson advised her to discuss her projects with staff and they would help advise her on what she would need to do.

ITEM 2: HD-22-053: A request by Mr. and Ms. Wilson to install new trim siding and new wood clad windows on the exterior of the home at 801 & 803 West Davis St, PID 125581. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and in the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) District.

Ms. Meinking inquired if there were any conflicts of interest. There were none.

Ms. Lawson gave a brief overview of the application and staff report. Ms. Lawson stated that when staff reviewed the National Register Report for the property, it was identified that the home was built in the 1980s, therefore, the home is defined as intrusive and has a negative impact on the Historic District.

Ms. Lawson swore to tell the truth to the best of her ability.

Mr. Joshua Wilson swore to tell the truth to the best of his ability.

Mr. Wilson stated that the property is tenant occupied. Mr. Wilson stated that the property has taken a lot of exterior damage due to weather. Mr. Wilson stated that nothing on the property is historic and is wanting to repair the home and match the other homes in the area. Mr. Wilson stated that the house currently had a type of hardboard siding and would like to replace with LP Smart Side as it is most similar to the original. Mr. Wilson brought a sample of the siding for the commission to view. Mr. Wilson stated that he would like to replace the windows with an clad interior to protect and have easier maintenance. Mr. Wilson stated that the current windows are not true SDL's plastic windows and most are broken. Mr. Wilson would like to replace the windows with true SDL's or GBG windows.

Mr. Williams inquired if the SDL windows added to the cost. Mr. Wilson stated that it depended on what is available and a few of the different options he could go with. Mr. Wilson stated that the double hung shutters also need replacement and isn't sure if he needs to come back or if he can add them to this application.

Ms. Lawson inquired what color he was planning to go with. Mr. Wilson stated he would be going with a similar color.

Ms. Geise inquired if the shutters were wood. Mr. Wilson confirmed and stated they were most likely pine.

Ms. Meinking inquired about what the design standard for replacing the shutters was. Ms. Lawson responded that to replace them would be a Minor COA and can be completed through staff review. Ms. Wilson inquired if the shutters would need to remain wood. Ms. Lawson confirmed.

Ms. Lawson inquired if the siding used would be cementitious siding. Mr. Wilson responded that it would be Engineered Wood siding. Ms. Lawson inquired if it was a composite material. Mr. Wilson responded that it would be engineered wood with 90% of it being wood particles. Ms. Lawson inquired if the intent was to match the original wood. Mr. Wilson confirmed and stated that the wood would be smooth and not grained.

Ms. Meinking inquired if there was any discussion on this type of material for siding. Ms. Lawson responded that it had not been with the new design standards and that Hardy Board had become more common. Mr. Williams stated that Hardy Board is also an engineered material.

Ms. Lawson stated that there had been similar cases with the same questions and issues and were in the same category.

Ms. Geise inquired about the railings. Mr. Wilson stated that the railings had become unstable since the initial application was submitted and would like to replace the railings with a powder coated aluminum product.

Mr. Williams inquired if replacing the railings would be a Minor COA. Ms. Lawson inquired if the railings were currently there. Mr. Wilson responded that they were there but unstable and unsafe. Ms. Lawson stated an addition of rails where they weren't previously is a Major COA but if Mr. Wilson is maintaining and replacing them with something similar it is a Minor COA.

Ms. Lawson inquired about the material Ms. Wilson plans to replace the railings with. Mr. Wilson stated they are currently wood, and he would like to replace them with powder coated aluminum. Mr. Williams inquired if the railings would look like wood. Mr. Wilson confirmed. Ms. Lawson stated they could defer the railings and that Mr. Wilson could send in photos to let it be a staff decision.

There was a brief discussion about a deck that is on the back of the home. It was discussed that Mr. Wilson would apply for a Minor COA including the replacement of the railings.

Mr. Wilson inquired if there were standards associated with sheeting and other replacements. Ms. Lawson stated for him to communicate with inspections.

Ms. Geise inquired if the material of the window mattered if the home was non-conforming. Ms. Lawson stated that it always helpful for HPC to weigh in even with the home being intrusive. Mr. Wilson stated that it would be helpful for him to know what materials he can use. Ms. Lawson stated that it is helpful for applicants to come in with what the planned install material is for HPC to give feedback.

Mr. Williams inquired what material the current windows are made out of. Mr. Wilson responded plastic. Mr. Williams inquired if the windows are similar to those on Fountain Place and the surrounding Historic District. Mr. Wilson stated no but he would like to go to a Vinyl window without an SDL or to a Vinyl window with an exterior SDL. Mr. Wilson brought the proposed window and SDL to the commission.

Ms. Meinking inquired about the material of the current windows. Mr. Wilson responded that they were wood and need lots of maintenance to fix. Mr. Wilson stated he felt the SDL would look best for the home in this area. Ms. Geise inquired if the windows were going to be painted. Mr. Wilson responded they would come the color chosen.

Public Comments:

Ms. Carol Lehman, 419 Fountain Place, expressed interest in the window replacement and the process to do it.

Discussion:

Ms. Meinking inquired if there is a specific type of window he planned to install. Mr. Wilson responded that the window he brought is similar to what he wants to install, just white and a different brand. Mr. Hess spoke in support of the Vinyl windows after installing vinyl windows in his own home that year.

Ms. Meinking inquired about what Design Standards had to say about the windows. Ms. Lawson stated that there was discussion on page D-20 about replacing windows. Mr. Wilson stated that the size of windows would not change.

Findings of Fact:

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

Design Standards for preservation of windows:

- A1. Preserve and maintain historic doors and windows, as well as historic materials, details, and features of the doors and windows that contribute to the character of the historic building.
- A2. Glazing surrounding doors and windows shall not be covered, painted or otherwise altered. Examples of such character-defining features to be preserved include transoms and sidelights.
- A3. Historic door and window materials shall only be removed when an accurate restoration necessitates its removal. Examples of such materials include conventional glass, stained glass, textured glass, leaded glass, beveled glass, glass block, and tracery.
- A4. Infill material shall be recessed to maintain the outline of the original opening if a historic door or window opening on a secondary or rear elevation of a masonry building is to be enclosed.

Design Standards for repair of windows:

- B1. Repair historic doors, windows and their details and features using accepted preservation methods.
- B2. Double-pane glass may be used as a repair or replacement material in an existing sash if it is generally compatible with the reflective quality of the existing glazing elsewhere on the building and if the muntin is deep enough to accommodate insulated glazing. However, because insulated glazing will fail at some point as the sealer (gasket) deteriorates, the installation of a single-glazed window with a storm sash is preferable. The dead air space with a storm sash is much deeper than the space between the two glazing units and the storm will eliminate air infiltration around the blind stop.

Design Standards for replacement of windows:

- C1. Replace only the damaged feature or portion of a feature of a door or window if it is damaged beyond repair. Use materials identical to that of the historic feature.
- C2. Substitute materials may only be considered when the material cannot be repaired or when the material is no longer available.
- C3. Encourage the replacement of later non-historic windows and doors, and those that are missing, with new windows and doors that are based on historic doors from the building or documentary evidence. Replacement material shall match the historic material in size, shape, design, texture, scale, color, and (where possible) material.

- C4. Do not alter the opening size and shape of historic windows and doors to accommodate new doors or windows. Likewise, the historic framing and detailing surrounding the opening shall be preserved.
- C5. Replacement windows should be the same material as the original windows. Aluminum-clad wood, vinyl-clad wood, cellular PVC, composite, fiberglass, or steel (if original to the structure) may be approved provided the windows are solid in composition and closely match the original windows in dimensions, profile, and general overall appearance.
- C6. The replacement of clear glass can only be done with clear glass. Tinted, frosted, reflective or opaque glass is inappropriate.
- C7. Only 9-over-6 or 6-over-6 double-hung sash windows shall be used for houses in the Glencoe Mill Village district.
- C8. Jalousie windows and sliding windows are prohibited in the historic districts.

Design Standards for preservation of walls:

- A1. Maintain and preserve walls and their details that contribute to the significance of the building. These features include wall materials such as wood, brick, masonry, stucco, metal, glass, shingles, and their architectural details.
- A2. Retain trim work such as brackets under eaves, spindle work, and vergeboard, specialty siding and accent finishes.
- A3. Do not obscure original facades with replacement materials such as metal “slipcovers” hiding historic commercial buildings or vinyl siding on a house’s exterior.

Design Standards for repair of walls:

- B1. Repair historic walls using recognized and accepted preservation methods.
- B2. Historic walls and their features shall not be visually obscured by the installation of modern substitute materials.
- B3. Remove obsolete building elements such as unused mounting brackets and anchors, junction boxes, cables and conduits, and other such features.

Design Standards for replacement of walls:

- C1. Replace only the damaged portion of a historic wall if it is deteriorated beyond repair and such deterioration is clearly documented. Materials identical to the original shall be used.
- C2. Wall components that must be replaced shall be identical to the original in size, scale, texture, detail, craftsmanship, material, and color. For instance, if a new design is necessary, the design shall be compatible with the historic building based on documented evidence.
- C3. New wall features that compromise the building’s integrity shall be avoided. Examples of such features and materials include windows, vents, balconies, chimneys, and doors, as well as installing artificial siding atop historic siding. Compromising a building’s historic integrity includes creating a false sense of history.
- C4. Substitute materials may be considered when the material cannot be repaired or when the material is no longer available.

- C5. Plywood is a prohibited material for wall cladding. Also, wood shakes or shingles which are incongruous with the design of the building should not be used.
- C6. The careful removal of artificial siding material and the restoration of the original siding is encouraged. Caution should be observed when removing any asbestos material, particularly that which is in a friable state.

Design Standards for Artificial Materials:

- 2. Artificial siding may be considered when the historic siding is missing or too deteriorated to be repaired and when like material is not available or cost prohibitive. Applicants must document the extent of deterioration that necessitates replacement, and they must also prove that a like material is unavailable. The longevity and appearance of artificial materials over time must be considered. For example, as noted elsewhere, oil-based copper naphthenate shall be used on all exposed wood surfaces prior to priming to extend the life of the replacement material.
- 3. Do not cover historic wooden siding with artificial materials such as vinyl or aluminum, as doing so can trap condensation and cause long-term damage to historic materials, conceal damage that needs to be repaired, and accelerate deterioration of the historic materials.
- 4. Synthetic stucco or exterior insulation and finish systems (EIFS) can be an acceptable replacement material if the replacement material matches the historic material in size, texture, appearance, design, and other visual qualities. However, EIFS is more susceptible to damage, so it should be avoided when possible near doors and lower parts of facades. It is also more appropriate in locations not visible from a street.
- 6. Cementitious (fiber cement) siding may be used in some situations. It shall not be used on a facade visible from a street that already features wood siding. In some cases, it might be used on a full facade that is not very visible from a street. It can also be used on rear additions and non-historic outbuildings. When permitted, the exposure width of clapboards must match that of the original structure and grain patterns shall be avoided.

Ms. Geise requested clarification on D-20 C3. Ms. Lawson confirmed Ms. Geise's understanding of the definition. Mr. Williams stated that he felt the windows matched the windows that are encouraged in the area. Ms. Geise stated her concern was replacing a wood window with a vinyl window. Ms. Lawson stated there was a similar issue with an apartment building in the area. Mr. Wilson inquired if historic home owners would have to have a wood window made in order to be able to replace it. Ms. Geise confirmed.

Mr. Hess stated that what Mr. Wilson presented looked similar enough to the historic windows in the area.

Ms. Lawson stated that a similar application of an intrusive property from wood to vinyl windows was approved by the HPC. There was a brief discussion of the project and what the applicant had done.

Motion:

Ms. Geise made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact as found in the agenda. Mr. Hess seconded the motion.

All were in favor.

Ms. Meinking suggested a motion to approve the application with the nature of the property being built in the 1980's and design being intrusive and non-conforming to the Historic District noted.

Ms. Geise made a motion to approve the application with replacement of siding and windows with alternative materials due to fact that they will appear historically appropriate and due to the building being circa 1980 and being intrusive and non-conforming to the Historic District per the National Historic Registry. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

All were in favor.

IV. New Business – None

V. Other Business

a. Minor Certificates of Appropriateness

Ms. Lawson gave brief overviews of each minor COAs that had been recently approved that were included in the Historic Preservation Commission's packet.

b. Certified Local Government Training

Ms. Lawson reminded the commission members of the ongoing requirement to complete trainings. There was discussion about how often training was needed. Ms. Lawson reminded the commission of available online trainings.

c. Local Historic Overlay Design Standards Discussion

Ms. Lawson notified the commission that a training session with the Local Historic Overlay Design Standards Creators was coming in the future. Ms. Lawson also updated the commission that the Post Cards for this update had been sent out.

VI. Adjournment

Mr. Hess made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

All were in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm