

Historic Preservation Review Board – November 14, 2007 @ 7:00 PM

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Review Board was called to order by Chair, Mary Jane Anderson, at 7:03 PM at Town Hall.

Chair Anderson called the roll.

Members present: Mary Jane Anderson, Chair; Kevin Peterson, David Waldron and Michael Jean Carpentier

Also Present: Sandy Strehlou, HPRB Coordinator; Lynn Danaher Archipelago Properties developer of Churchill House.

Minutes

Minutes for the HPRB meeting of October 24, 2007 were approved with minor corrections.

Design Review: Churchill Renovations

Lynn Danaher requested that the minutes of the July 25th HPRB meeting be posted.

Ms Danaher provided the HP board with pictures of the doors and signs that she is planning to use in the renovation of the Churchill House. These pictures were entered into the record as exhibit 3.

Chair Anderson read the preliminary Design Review Statement.

At Ms. Danaher's request her objection to the reading of the Design Review Statement was noted in the record, and she declined to sign the statement.

As the legal issues regarding the mandatory review have not yet been resolved between the two parties, the HP board proceeded as if this were a mandatory-incentive based review.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Signage: Ms. Danaher explained that of the two signs currently on the Churchill House on the south and west sides, the sign on the south side will be moved to the blue house (another property of Ms. Danaher's) and the word "suites" will be substituted for the date that is currently on the sign. The other sign will remain on the Churchill House.

Usage: Danaher stated that the seven units (the total of new units available in the Churchill and Carter houses cumulatively,) are intended to be transient or short-term rentals, and that this is required for the lower units as per TFH zoning.

Mechanical/Venting: Chair Anderson asked about bathroom vents. Ms. Danaher explained that they will be small black pipes and that she is trying to keep them on the north (back) of the building (exhibit 1).

Mechanical/Propane: Ms. Danaher explained that each of the four units will be metered separately and the meters will be on the south, (front) of the building however they will be low and will be camouflaged by landscaping. Referring to exhibit 1, south side elevation, Ms. Danaher explained that the vents for propane heating will be 14 x 14 x 6 and can be painted. The propane tank will be buried.

Mechanical/Fire Alarm: There will be a fire alarm, probably on the west side of the building, dependant on the fire code.

Main Façade Doors and Transoms: The two doors on the south side of the building (exhibit 1) will be replaced by mahogany doors as shown in exhibit 3. On the south side the downstairs transom will be replaced with stained glass windows.

New Bathroom Windows: The bathroom windows on the north side (exhibit 1) will be narrow, vertically-oriented, vinyl-clad etched glass.

Railings: Danaher explained that all of the detailing on the railings will be the same.

Deck, Balconies and Porches: Board member Peterson requested further detail regarding the deck and gutters. Board member Waldron requested more detail regarding porch railings. He also noted that there are discrepancies in the drawings and he cannot tell if posts are 4x4s or not. While these drawings are more detailed than those viewed in the preliminary review they still lack the precision of architectural drawings and details are lost due to the size of the drawings. (Exhibit 1).

Gutters: Peterson requested detail on the gutters, as this information was not provided by the applicant (Exhibit 1).

Landscaping: In replying to Chair Anderson's question about landscaping Ms. Danaher described the plan by Greenman Landscape Design of creating a slope from the north side toward the house and parking as shown in exhibit 1.

Parking: The applicants site plan (exhibit 1) shows seven parking spaces located between the Churchill and Carter buildings. The applicant indicated that this was not necessarily the final plan.

BOARD DESIGN REVIEW DISCUSSION

General Guidelines – page 59 HPRB Manual

A. Principals for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures

A1. (Do not destroy or obscure distinguishing original features) Split vote 2 – 2. Removal of porch shed roof was cited as an issue by both no votes.

A2. (Changes should be reversible) Split vote 2 – 2. The Board could not find consensus on whether the proposed changes should or should not be considered reversible.

A3a. (Changes should be consistent with original architectural style) Split vote 2-2. Comments included “back deck is not consistent with original building”; “single door with transom and mahogany doors are not consistent”; “feels the proposed new front balcony is not consistent, but previous decision to allow decks on the side created a precedent”.

A3b. (Changes should be consistent with style of FH’s vernacular architecture) Split Vote 2 -2.

A3c. (Avoid alterations with no historical basis) Split vote 2 – 2. The new windows, entryways and doors were cited as issues.

B. Preservation of Significant Original Qualities. Split vote 2 – 2

C. Replacement or Substitution of Original Features – NA (not applicable)

D. Existing Alterations on Historic Buildings – NA

E. New Additions to Historic Buildings

E1. (Size, scale, material compatibility) Split vote - 1 yes, 1 no, 2 NEI (not enough information). Comments: “not enough detail to assess new balcony railings”; “the envelope is being pushed by removing the original porch roof and replacing it with a balcony”.

E2. (New additions in rear, do not change façade facing street) Split vote 2 – 2. Comments: “Changes are ok because the front façade no longer faces the street”; “Changes ok because they are in character with the era”.

E3. (Height increased) Not applicable – consensus.

E4. (Original architecture should not be obscured by additions that are not consistent.) Split vote 2 no – 1 yes – 1 NEI. Comments: “the new bathroom windows deviate”.

E5. (Make changes reversible so that essential form and integrity are not compromised.) 3 yes – 1 no. Comment; “[reversing the proposed alterations is not viable,] no one would do it.”

Detailed Guidelines – pages 62 – 67

A. Siding – 4 yes

B. Roofs – split vote 2 – 2. Comments: “no, the original porch roof is removed.” “yes, the balcony is historically legitimate.”

C. Porches – 3 NEI – 1 no. Comment: “Historically there would have been a roof over all porches, [balconies deviate from this]”; “The [balconied] porch is a different style.”

D. Entryways and Exterior Doors

D1. (Retain historic entry features) 4 yes. Comments: “South balcony complies, the east balcony does not”; “yes, entries are in same location and use same trim”; yes, because doors can easily be switched out”; “yes, because retains historic wood doors and trim.”

D2. (Original position of entries) 4 yes Comment: “Yes, because locations don’t change.”

D3. (When replacing doors, do so for need and with like) 3 no – 1 yes. Comments: “Yes, because it is difficult to get vernacular doors and the language refers to only the primary façade, making the side doors irrelevant.”; “No, mahogany doors are wrong.” “the doors on the south elevation are ok, the doors on the east elevation are not.”

D4. (Avoid flush, overly ornate or unusual doors) 3 no – 1 yes. Comments: “yes, even though ornate, you won’t be able to tell from a distance”; “No, French doors don’t comply.”

E. Windows. Split Vote 2 – 2. Comments: “Yes, all new windows are vertically oriented”; “No, etched glass does not comply”; “No, should use small square windows for bathroom light, which is more traditional than long skinny windows”.

F. Parking. N/A – consensus.

G. Parking. Yes – consensus.

Ms. Danaher made a formal request that HPRB Coordinator Sandy Strehlou write a letter to the Town of Friday Harbor informing the Town that by coming before the HPRB during this meeting she has fulfilled her obligations under the historic preservation ordinance. Strehlou responded that the design review process is not yet complete and will be continued at the next meeting.

Mary Jane Anderson, Chair

Peggy Sue McRae
9:30: Meeting adjourned