Page 1 of 12

### **Call Meeting To Order**

Chairman Rudy Molinet called the Key West Historical Architectural Review Commission (HARC) Meeting of September 13, 2011 to order at **3:00 pm** at Old City Hall, in the antechamber at 510 Greene Street, Key West.

# Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

#### Roll Call

Commissioners present include Vice Chairman Bryan Green, and Chairman Rudy Molinet.

Commissioners Daniel Metzler and Nils Muench were absent with consent.

Also, present from City staff: Assistant City Attorney Ron Ramsingh, Historic Perseveration Planner Enid Torregrosa, IT Director Patti McLauchlin, and Recording Secretary Jo Bennett.

Chairman Rudy Molinet stated there was not a quorum at this time but Commissioner Carlos Rojas was expected to arrive late. We knew this was going to happen on Friday, therefore; we called all the applicants to advise them that actions on the business items would begin late. Once Commissioner Carlos Rojas arrives, we will conduct the agenda business. Chairman Rudy Molinet recessed the meeting to wait on Commissioner Carlos Rojas' arrival.

Commissioner Carlos Rojas arrived at **3:45** pm.

Chairman Rudy Molinet reconvened the Key West Historical Architectural Review Commission (HARC) Meeting of September 13, 2011 at **3:45** pm.

#### Approval of Agenda

Chairman Rudy Molinet inquired as to any changes to the agenda. Enid Torregrosa requested to postpone item #3 until October when we expect to have more Commissioners present. Chairman Rudy Molinet inquired if it would be appropriate with the late start for us to be flexible with the order of the agenda. Assistant City Attorney Ramsingh stated there was no legal issue.

## Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Carlos Rojas, that the flexible Agenda with changes be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous vote.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

# 1 August 09, 2011

#### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the Minutes be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous vote.

## 2 August 23, 2011

#### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the Minutes be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous vote.

# Page **2** of **12**

## Discussion

### **3** Discussion of preventing demolition by neglect.

#### **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Carlos Rojas, that the Agenda item be **Postponed**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous vote.

#### **Old Business**

Removal of rear staircase on the right side of property. No build back – After the Fact
#805 Baptist Lane – Conquering Lion Construction (H11-01-1028)
First reading

Since the applicant was present, it was decided to hear item 6 first.

Adrian Poitier presented the project. Mr. Poitier explained the owner asked him to remove an exterior staircase located on the back of the house, which faces Petronia Street. No build back is proposed. Railings will be installed to secure the second floor back porch. Mr. Poitier acknowledged they failed to get the proper approvals in advance.

## Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

#### Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated the building located on #805 Baptist Lane - #805 Patone Street is not listed in the surveys. The two story apartment structure is depicted in the 1948 and 1962 Sanborn maps. The applicant is proposing the removal of one exterior staircase located on the back of the house, which faces Petronia Street. No build back is proposed. Railings will be installed to secure the second floor back porch. At the moment of this staff report the stair was already removed.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands that the request to remove an exterior staircase constitutes demolition. The criteria when reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness that request demolition in under Sec. 102-218 of the LDR's;

(a) The historic architectural review commission shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for an application for demolition:

(1) If the subject of the application is a contributing or historic building or structure, then it should not be demolished unless its condition is irrevocably compromised by extreme deterioration or it does not meet any of the criteria of section 102-125(1) through (9).

Ms. Torregrosa stated the Code also establishes, under Sec. 102-1, Definitions, that a historic building or structure means;

any building or structure which, in whole or in any structural part, was built 50 or more years prior to the current date, and which is located in the historic zoning districts of the city or has been designated as a historic building and/or structure.

Ms. Torregrosa stated this is an after the fact application. If approved a second reading

Page 3 of 12

is required.

## **Commission Discussion:**

The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

## **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas, Chairman Molinet

4 Remove existing seven front columns and replace- **#1420 White Street – Infinity** Builders (H11-01-929) Second Reading

Commissioner Rojas inquired at if it would be appropriate to discuss the old business items #4 and #5 in the absence of the applicant. Assistant City Attorney Ramsingh stated there was no legal issue unless at some point the discussion necessitated interaction with the applicant.

### **Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

## Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated the house located on #1420 White Street is listed as a contributing resource. The two story frame house is one of the fewer examples of American four square architectural styles in Key West. The house was built circa 1920. This application is for the removal of seven existing round columns due to decay. The plans propose new steel columns and new wood columns to wrap the metal ones. Some of the existing columns have a base, which will be replicate for all columns to protect them from moisture. The existing profile, diameter and dimensions will be replicated in the final columns. On August 23, 2011 the Commission motioned to approve the design and first reading for demolition of seven existing columns. For that meeting the Commission reviewed an engineering report that explained the state of decay of the columns.

Ms. Torregrosa stated Staff understands that, although wood columns are historic, many of them are presenting advanced decay on their bases and in other areas. This decay has compromise the column's structural integrity. Because the proposed solution provides for new wood hollow columns that will have the same profile and diameter as the original ones it is staff's belief that the Commission can consider the proposed plans. This staff report is for the second reading for the demolition request.

# **Commission Discussion:**

The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

# Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Carlos Rojas, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas, Chairman Molinet

Page 4 of 12

## After the Fact Second Reading #727 Windsor Lane – Seatech of the Florida Keys (H11-01-1017)

Chairman Rudy Molinet stated unless someone objected we will continue to discuss the old business items in the absence of the applicant.

# **Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

# Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated the house located on #727 Windsor Lane is not listed in the surveys. This application is an after the fact request to remove a bump out that used to have a shed roof. According to the site plans this structure used to be on the west side of the house. The owner left the front wall of the bump out structure as well as the shed roof. On August 23, 2011 the Commission approved the first reading for the after the fact demolition of the shed.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that the Sanborn maps of 1948 and 1962 depict a structure with a different footprint of what exists today in the lot. It is staff's belief that the existing house, as well as the bump out that was partially demolished is not historic. This is an after the fact application. This report is for the second reading for demolition.

#### **Commission Discussion:**

The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

#### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench

Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas, Chairman Molinet

#### **HARC Planner's Report**

Enid Torregrosa presented her report beginning with a discussion concerning the order that applications should be presented to the Planning Boards and HACR Commissions. Vice Chairman Bryan Green discussed the meeting which was held with Richard Klitenick who is the Chairman of the Planning Board. Don Craig is writing an administrative determination to be presented to the Planning Board and HARC Commission regarding projects that requires variances.

Secondly, Ms. Torregrosa stated she received the official paperwork from The Special Magistrate upholding the Commission's decision on 936 United Street.

#### **Continuation of Old Business with applicant present**

7a Renovate existing two-story structure. Construct new wood deck. Provide new set of stairs with covered landing. Replace existing windows. Repair damaged members #1009 Grinnell Street – Seatech of the Florida Keys (H11-01-1074)

Patrick Wright from Trepanier and Associates and Brandon Ophlin from Seatech of the Florida Keys presented the project. Mr. Wright reviewed the proposed renovation of an existing two story structure. A new exterior staircase is proposed to be built on the south side of the house. The stair includes a covered landing on the

Page **5** of **12** 

second floor. A new wood deck is proposed on the back of the house. The existing jalousie windows will be replaced with two over two true divided lites wood windows and louvered wood shutters will be installed. Repairs to rotted wood and board and batten siding is also proposed. Replacement of the fence is also included.

# Public Comment:

There were no public comments.

### Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated the house located at #1009 Grinnell Street is listed as a contributing resource. The two story frame structure was built circa 1924. The applicant proposes a new exterior staircase to be built on the south side of the house. The stair includes a covered landing on the second floor. A new wood deck is proposed on the back of the house. The existing jalousie windows will be replaced with two over two true divided lites wood windows and louvered wood shutters will be installed. Repairs to rotted wood and board and batten siding is also proposed. The plans also include a new fence; the actual front fence is located outside of the property line on city's sidewalk. Ms. Torregrosa suggested the following Guidelines that should be reviewed for this after the fact request:

For the proposed exterior staircase (Additions, alterations and new construction, pages 36-38a);

(5) Additions should be attached to less publicly visible secondary elevations of a historic structure.

(6) Additions should not alter the balance and symmetry of an historic structure.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards (page 16 of the guidelines);

Standard 1

A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

For the deck (pages 39-40 of the guidelines);

(4) The proportion of decking, patio or pool dimensions shall not exceed fifty percent of the total lot minus the building footprint.

For window replacements, (pages 29-30 of the guidelines);

(3) Replacement windows on contributing structures should be made to fit the original window opening without the use of blocking infil. Such replacement windows, sills muntins, sashes, surrounds and other window features should be of similar and compatible configuration, material, size, design, and placement as those of original windows.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands this house is in need of repairs. The applicant is proposing true divided wood windows, which are an appropriate replacement for jalousie windows in a historic house. Ms. Torregrosa stated Staff understands that the proposed exterior staircase will have an adverse effect on the house; the proposed stair and its covered landing will be visible from the street and will alter the balance of the building. There is no evidence

Page 6 of 12

in the Sanborn maps that this house had an exterior staircase.

Ms. Torregrosa stated it is staff's belief that the proposed design of a new exterior staircase is in conflict with the guidelines. The proposed new replacement windows as the new proposed deck are consistent with the guidelines. The proposed front fence will be 4' height wood picket.

#### **Commission Discussion:**

The Commissioners held a lengthy question and answer session with the applicant concerning the number of legal units at the address, the external stairway and the arches on the front of the house. The Commissioners discussed requiring the staircase to remain inside the structure and not allowing it to be moved to the exterior. The Commissioners had considerable concern of the arches and their condition.

#### **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the item be **Approved** with the understanding the staircase will remain inside the structure. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:

Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas No: 1 – Chairman Molinet

# **7b** Remove rear deteriorated portion of building -

# #1009 Grinnell Street – Seatech of the Florida Keys (H11-01-1074)

Patrick Wright from Trepanier and Associates and Brandon Ophlin from Seatech of the Florida Keys presented the project. Mr. Wright stated this application proposes the demolition of part of the back portion of the house which is attached. A wood deck will be built on part of the area where the proposed structure to be demolished stands.

#### **Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

#### Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated the house located at #1009 Grinnell Street is listed as a contributing resource. The two story frame structure was built circa 1924. The applicant proposes the demolition of part of the back portion of the house which is attached. A wood deck will be built on part of the area where the proposed structure to be demolished stands. Ms. Torregrosa stated the Sanborn maps of 1926, 1948 and 1962 shows a one story sawtooth, wider than the main two story house. When comparing the Survey map with the Sanborn maps it is evident that the footprint of the house, particularly on the northeast (side) and northeast (back) has been altered after 1962. Ms. Torregrosa stated Staff understands that the proposed demolition will be done for an addition that is not historic. Ms. Torregrosa stated Staff understands that the Commission can consider this Ms. Torregrosa stated the back portion of the house request for demolition. that is proposed to be demolished is not historic nor can it be considered as a contributing addition to the historic house in a near future. If approved a second reading is required.

## **Commission Discussion:**

Page **7** of **12** 

The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

## Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench

Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas, Chairman Molinet

#### **New Business**

8 Remove asbestos roof tiles and replace with new synthetic slate roofing. Remove windows and replace with impact resistant mahogany units matching the original ones. Repair spalling stucco and repaint exterior-

**#924 Flagler Avenue- Bender and Associates (H11-01-1140)** 

Bert Bender presented the project. Mr. Bender explained the house dates to the 1930s. This is an on-going effort to restore this structure. The insurance company is requiring the replacement of the roofing since it is approximately seventy-five years old. Much research has been done to be able to find appropriate replacement for the asbestos tiles since they are no longer available. The owner feels the shutters are an important feature to the structure therefor impact resistant windows will be installed. The rest of the work is normal routine restoration work and will be accomplished to meet the appropriate standards and guidelines.

# **Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

## Staff Report:

Ms. Torrgerosa stated her report is for the review of a Certificate of Appropriateness that requests replacement of architectural elements that are in disrepair due to water damage and or termite infestation. The proposed replacements are for a contributing house located outside of the historic district. The historic house is a unique example of Mediterranean Revival architectural style and was built circa 1920. A garage that stands detached from the house is also included in the scope of work.

Ms. Torregrosa stated the house and its garage exhibit a gray diamond pattern asbestos roofing cover. This material has surpassed its life expectancy. Ms. Torregrosa stated the plans propose a new synthetic slate tiles that will be gray in color and will be installed in diamond pattern. Ms. Torregrosa stated the existing metal gutters and downspouts will be removed and replaced with copper ones. Ms. Torregrosa stated the new copper system will match the existing historic profile and will be connected into the historic cistern.

Ms. Torregrosa stated the plans also proposes the replacement of existing windows; existing wood casement and double hung windows will be replaced with similar style mahogany windows with impact glass. Ms. Torregrosa stated there are existing glass jalousie aluminum frame windows located on the east elevation that will be replaced with mahogany casement windows with impact glass. Ms. Torregrosa stated a paint analysis will be conducted to determine the original or older paint color found in the existing windows. Ms. Torregrosa stated the louvered shutters will be replaced with new wooden ones. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the all aluminum channels for hurricane shutters will be removed as well as all existing non historic burglar bars. Ms. Torregrosa stated the existing and transoms on the house will also

Page 8 of 12

be replaced with new mahogany units. Ms. Torregrosa stated the existing doors of the garage will be repaired.

Ms. Torregrosa stated the exterior walls of the main house exhibit spalling problems which will be repaired. Ms. Torregrosa stated the house and the garage will be repainted. Ms. Torregrosa stated no changes to the footprint of the house or any additions are proposed in the plans.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff has the following comments regarding the proposed plans:

- 1. Asbestos construction materials are banned by Federal and State laws. The new proposed material is an appropriate solution for replacement. The material will resemble the existing one in texture, color and pattern design. (Guideline 4-Roofing page 6)
- It is staff's belief that the replacement of the existing metal gutter and downspouts system to a new cooper one will not have an effect in the historic house. Moreover the new system will be made of a superior material and will have the same profile as the existing ones. (First paragraph- Gutters guidelines, page 27)

Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed replacement of windows is necessary due to existing decay conditions. The new proposed windows will be wood with impact resistant glass, which is an appropriate replacement for windows in a contributing building, (Guidelines 3 and 8, Windows pages 29-30).

Ms. Torregrosa stated the plans propose the replacement of existing louver shutters with similar wood ones, which is consistent with the guidelines. (First paragraph and Guidelines 2 and 3, Shutters pages 30-31)

Ms. Torregrosa stated it is staff's belief that the proposed plans include appropriate specifications and building details which are consistent with the guidelines as well as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, particularly Standard #6 (Guidelines page 16);

Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than be replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, when possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical or pictorial evidence.

Ms. Torregrosa stated the removal of non historic elements such as burglar iron bars, metal channels for hurricane panels and piping's that detract from the historic character will bring this house back to its original integrity. Ms. Torregrosa stated the house was built in concrete and deterioration of the exterior walls is showing through cracks and spalling of the stucco finish. The plans include the correction of the stucco and concrete decay. The applicant is proposing to do paint analysis on inconspicuous areas in order to find accurate original colors for windows, shutters and exterior walls.

# **Commission Discussion:**

The Commissioners stated they are very pleased with the project. The only question concerned the fencing. The applicant stated there is no plan, at this time, to do anything with the fencing.

#### Actions/Motions:

Page **9** of **12** 

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Carlos Rojas, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas, Chairman Molinet

9a Renovation of historic structure. Addition of covered porch and pool and addition to the east side of the house. New storage/laundry shed #1126 Washington Street – Bender and Associates (H11-01-1146)

Bert Bender presented the project. This project is rehabilitation of an existing historic home. The project will remove all non-compatible / non historic additions reducing it down to the original structure. Quite a bit of research has been done for this location. The addition to the house to accommodate the master bedroom will have an entrance between the new addition and the historic structure which helps clearly defines the new addition from the historic home. The non-historic concrete veneer in the main house will be removed to expose novelty siding. The garage will be converted into a pool house.

# **Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

### Staff Report:

Ms. Torrgerosa stated her report is for the review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a request to restore a contributing house, built an attached addition to the east side, built a swimming pool, a porch and a deck on the back. Ms. Torregrosa stated the plans also include new storage and laundry shed and renovations to an existing detached garage to be converted into a workshop and pool house.

Ms. Torregrosa stated the house located on #1126 Washington Street is listed as a contributing resource. Although the exterior walls of the house exhibits a non historic precast concrete veneer the frame structure was built circa 1935. By reviewing the Sanborn maps of 1948 and 1962 it is evident that the house footprint has been altered through time. Ms. Torregrosa stated the 1948 Sanborn map shows an almost square structure and water tank elevated 5' on the east side. Ms. Torregrosa stated the main entrance to the house is on its west side.

Ms. Torregrosa stated the plans include the removal of the non historic concrete veneer in the main house to expose novelty siding. Ms. Torregrosa stated some windows and doors will be replaced with wood units. Ms. Torregrosa stated bi-fold solid wood shutters will be installed.

Ms. Torregrosa stated a one story addition to the east side of the house is proposed. This addition will be attached to the main house through a foyer. The addition will be rectangular in footprint and will be lower than the main house. Doors and windows units for the new addition will be wood. Metal v crimp will be the roofing cover material for the new gable roof and novelty siding will be used in the exterior walls. A trellis covered walkway will extend to the front yard. Interesting, according to the Sanborn maps, there used to be a water tank in that same site that was elevated approximately 5'.

Ms. Torregrosa stated a new covered porch will be attached on the back of the house. This new porch will be supported by 6 by 6 posts and will have metal v crimp roofing material over the new gable roof. A new deck on the back of the house is proposed as

Page **10** of **12** 

well as a shed for laundry and storage. Both new structures will be lower in height than the main house. A new swimming pool is proposed on the back.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that the existing garage will be converted into a pool house and work shop. The garage structure will have new novelty siding to match the historic house. Existing doors will be replaced with new solid wood ones. All exterior walls will be painted white.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff has the following comments regarding the proposed plans:

- 1. The proposed removal of non historic concrete veneer will expose the historic fabric. (Guidelines for building exteriors- Wood page 24)
- 2. The proposed side addition is lower than the main house. The design proposes a new structure that will have an appropriate mass and scale that will be compatible with the existing house and surrounding buildings. Although the addition will be seen from the street it will be recessed from the main house façade approximately 8 feet and approximately 31 feet from the front property line. (Guidelines 1,2,3,4 and 5, Additions, alterations)
- 3. The proposed replacement windows and doors will be appropriate replacements for a contributing building, (Guideline 3, Windows pages 29-30)
- 4. The proposed deck and swimming pool will cover less than 50% of the lot minus the footprint of the existing buildings and will be located on the back of the house. (Guidelines 1,3 and 4, Decks, patios, hot tubs and pools, pages 39-40)
- 5. The proposed shed for storage and laundry will be lower than the main house and will be located on the side back yard. (Guidelines 1,2 and 4 and first two paragraphs, Outbuildings, pages 40-41)

Ms. Torregrosa stated it is staff's belief that the proposed plans are consistent with the guidelines as well as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, particularly Standards #9 and 10 (Guidelines page 16-17);

#### Standard 9

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

#### Standard 10

New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that the removal of non historic elements such as burglar iron bars, metal channels for hurricane panels and piping's that detract from the historic character will bring this house back to its original integrity. The house was built in concrete and deterioration of the exterior walls is showing through cracks and spalling of the stucco finish. The plans include the correction of the stucco and concrete decay. The applicant is proposing to do paint analysis on inconspicuous areas in order to find accurate original colors for windows, shutters, and exterior walls.

#### **Commission Discussion:**

Page **11** of **12** 

The Commissioners stated they are very pleased with the project. Vice Chairman Bryan Green complemented the applicant on the quality and completeness of the application package.

## Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Carlos Rojas, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas, Chairman Molinet

# 9b Demolition of non historic additions and non historic dormer 1126 Washington Street- Bender and Associates (H11-01-1146)

Bert Bender presented the project. Mr. Bender stated that as stated during the earlier non-compatible / non historic additions and non-historic dormer from the structure as part of the rehabilitation of an existing historic home.

### **Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

### Staff Report:

Ms. Torregrosa stated this staff report is for the review of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a request for demolition of non historic attached additions on the back , the removal of a non historic attached porch on the east side and the removal of a non historic dormer on the north elevation.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house located on #1126 Washington Street is listed as a contributing resource. Although the exterior walls of the house exhibits a non historic precast concrete veneer the frame structure was built circa 1935. By reviewing the Sanborn maps of 1948 and 1962 it is evident that the house footprint has been altered through time. The Sanborn maps of 1948 and 1962 provide evidence that the actual footprint of the house includes back and side additions that are not depicted in the old maps. The existing dormer on the north façade can be observed in the circa 1965 photo from the Property Appraiser's record; nevertheless its proportions as well as the construction materials observed today are evidence that it can not be considered as a historic architectural element. The plans provide for the installation of matching metal shingles where the dormer is located.

Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands that the request to remove the attached additions as well as the non historic dormer constitutes demolition. The criteria when reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness that request demolition in under Sec. 102-218 of the LDR's;

(a) The historic architectural review commission shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for an application for demolition:

(1) If the subject of the application is a contributing or historic building or structure, then it should not be demolished unless its condition is irrevocably compromised by extreme deterioration or it does not meet any of the criteria of section 102-125(1) through (9).

Ms. Torregrosa stated that the Code also establishes, under Sec. 102-1, Definitions, that a historic building or structure means;

any building or structure which, in whole or in any structural part, was built 50 or more years prior to the current date, and which is located in the historic zoning

Page **12** of **12** 

districts of the city or has been designated as a historic building and/or structure.

Ms. Torregrosa stated it is staff's belief that the proposed request can be considered by the Commission since the proposed structures to be demolish are not historic nor can they be consider as contributing parts to the historic house. This will be the first reading for this demolition request.

### **Commission Discussion:**

The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

#### **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Absent: 2 - Mr. Metzler, Mr. Muench

Yes: 3 - Mr. Green, Mr. Rojas, Chairman Molinet

# Adjournment

#### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Carlos Rojas, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the meeting be **Adjourned**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Submitted by,

sennett

Administrative Coordinator Planning Department