

Enid Torregrosa

From: Enid Torregrosa
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 8:35 AM
To: Enid Torregrosa
Subject: FW: HARC Tuesday January 23, 2018

From: Dana Day <danalday@earthlink.net>
Subject: HARC Tuesday January 23, 2018
Date: January 22, 2018 at 6:07:03 PM EST
To: Bryan Green <greenusa@me.com>, Bert Bender <bbender@benderarchitects.com>, Richard McChesney <richard@spottswoodlaw.com>

Happy New Year! Plenty on this month's agenda:

3) 1119 South. Concur with staff.

4) 922 Thomas Court. Concur with staff.

5) & 6) 1109 715 Chapman Lane. Concur with staff. Windows should be repaired and incorporated in the renovation. The solid concrete wall, while not visible from the street, is an eyesore for the adjacent neighbor. It fails to comply with guidelines requiring materials and patterns to be similar to surrounding structures. Massing is inappropriate.

7) & 8) 1109 Fleming. Concur with staff.

9) 306 Peacon Lane. While the revised submission technically complies with HARC's determination that 10% of the front yard be reserved for planting it does not comply with the spirit of HARC's ruling or the myriad guidelines applicable to this proposal. The grass proposed is not sustainable. It will be quickly trampled by feet and tires rendering the entire front yard a wasteland. A requirement for a sustainable, planted buffer between the pavers and the house may be a solution: 18"? 2'? To the best of my knowledge there will be nothing to keep a Peacon Lane resident or visitor from parallel parking in the public ROW in front of 306 even after the installation of pavers. Wondering why this should be approved at all.

10) 916 Washington. It is not clear whether or not the side porch is historic. The 1948 Sanborn map has indistinct marks that appear for the first time and may or may not depict the addition of the side porch. If the porch is historic then it is inappropriate to enclose it. (#1, p.32). The side wall of the house has French doors suggesting an alteration at some point subsequent to original construction. Thus enclosing the porch would not obscure character defining features (#2, p.33) but the blanket prohibition remains if the porch is historic. If the porch is not historic then the enclosure is more appropriately treated as an addition. Enclosing an open porch unequivocally alters the mass (recall Carsten Lane). Additions to historic homes are prohibited on the front of a contributing or historic structure (#7, p.37-d) and if allowed

should be on the rear or set back as far as possible (see staff report for 1421 Catherine Street). The application appears somewhat acceptable because landscaping obscures much of the current porch but it is not appropriate to increase the massing of the first floor of an historic property by a full bay (1/3 of the frontage) or to “enclose a porch” when what is actually sought is an addition.

11) & 12) 815 Whitehead. Concur with staff. Also – remove the inappropriate archway over entry walk: accessory structures are disallowed in front yards (#2, p.40) and “gatehouses” in conjunction with fences are prohibited (#6, p.40). Doubt this structure had HARC approval.

13) & 14) 1317 Grinnell. Postponed.

15) & 16) 1421 Catherine. Compliments to the owner on the restoration of the front porch and reduced height of the carport. Concur with staff: the addition is inappropriate for myriad reasons not least of which is it doubles the mass of the house as seen from the street. The two doors visible from the street are troubling design detail as well. New construction guidelines require patterns of door openings and solid to void ratios of windows/doors be similar to that which is traditional in the neighborhood. The impression of front and rear “front doors” is jarring. No elevations of the proposed accessory structure are provided. Not possible to approve that building with the application as submitted. It does appear large sliding glass doors are incorporated. If the addition is not approved then the accessory structure will be visible from the street rendering the sliding glass doors inappropriate. See discussion of 19 & 20 below. Aside: if they’re planning to attach the pool equipment platform to the accessory structure it will generate hum/vibration in the accessory structure.

17) & 18) 1401 Grinnell. Proposed additions must “be compatible with the . . . surrounding context” (37-a). Surrounding context cannot be determined because the application lacks streetscapes. Dormers are allowed as additions to non-contributing buildings (#1, p.27); however, they must a) be similar in style to dormers normally found on that type of building in Key West (#2, p.27) and in proportion to the building and its roof (#3, p.27). The Guidelines specifically note dormers on bungalow styles typically had a shed roof (#4, p.27). Dormer guidelines are not referenced in the staff report. These particular dormers are problematic. They are set flush with the main wall of the building and the gable overhangs the main wall. They extend almost the full height of the roof. Even without the porch they would be out of proportion to the building and the roof. With the porch there is a strong horizontal orientation to the first floor and an incongruous vertical orientation to the second floor. New porches constructed on noncontributing buildings must be compatible with scale and design with other original porch styles on its streetscape or other nearby buildings (#8, p.33). This guideline is not referenced in the staff report and no context is provided to compare the proposed wraparound porch to other porches in the neighborhood. The new guidelines for additions encourage placement on secondary elevations (#6, 37-d) regardless of whether or not the structure is historic; however, this is obviously problematic for a porch addition. This guideline is not referenced in the staff report. No issues with demolition.

KOTO Opinion: postpone this item to reconsider porch and dormer design in the neighborhood context as well as for compliance with unreferenced guidelines.

19) & 20) 1021 Washington. The subject garage is historical by virtue of its age and ownership history. The main house is contributing. The staff report is silent as to whether the garage structure is listed separately as contributing or should be treated as contributing because of the main house. Relocation is desirable to comply with setbacks. The proposed redesign is inconsistent with HARC guidelines for doors, to wit:

“Sliding glass doors are *not appropriate* for use on any publicly visible façade of a contributing historic structure” (#12, p.33 – not referenced in staff report). The 12 window panels in the sliding doors nicely echo the garage door; nevertheless, the sliders are a problem because they are visible from the street. The new construction guidelines would also prohibit the sliders because “solid to void ratios of walling to windows and doors *shall* be similar to the typology in the immediate area” (emphasis mine).

The proposed dormer is set flush with the main wall of the building and compromises the symmetry of the roof.

The plans show wood decking wrapping around the side and front of the main house. The guidelines prohibit wood decking on the front of any house (#1, p.40). The application references a 6’ fence between the pool and the street but no fence section is provided. A picket fence up to 4’ in height is permitted at the front of a structure. On a corner lot, as here, the height should be consistent on both front and side elevations at least to the rear edge of the structure (#3, p.41 & #4,p.42). A solid 6’ fence is permitted on a side property line only with the consent of the neighbor (#5, p.42). When the property line abuts the street the CoKW is the neighbor. Traditionally the CoKW has not consented to solid fences. A 6’ picket fence would be allowed.

KOTO opinion: need clarification of exactly what approval(s) are being sought. Application exceeds the scope of the staff report discussion. No full proposed site plan is provided. If they are seeking approval of the referenced decking and fence then the application is incomplete. The sliding doors are problematic as is the setback and off-center location of the proposed dormer (see also #9, p.37-e)

Disclaimer: *The views and opinions herein expressed are mine alone. I am not acting on behalf or at the request of any applicant or otherwise interested party nor am I receiving compensation from any applicant or other interested party. I have no financial interest in any agenda item upon which I have made comment and will not incur any private gain or loss due to any determination made by the Historic Architectural Review Commission with respect to said agenda items. I offer my views and opinions on the HARC agenda solely as a member of the community interested in preserving the character and appearance of Key West’s historic districts.*

