

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE ST. CLOUD HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A meeting of the St. Cloud Heritage Preservation Commission was held on April 26, 2011, at 3:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers. Members present were Bartlow, Berg, Fischer, Morgan, and SCSU representative Ludwig. Chirhart and Lenaghan were absent.

**Approval of Minutes:** Fischer moved to approve the minutes of February 22, 2011. The motion was seconded by Berg and carried unanimously.

**Open Forum:** No one was present to speak at the open public forum.

**HAP-2011-03/417 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. So.:** Carla Chapman, Senior Planner, stated that the applicant is requesting to construct a new house at 417 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. So. which is a vacant lot. A fire seriously damaged the two-story Colonial Revival house that was previously on that lot, and an alteration permit was approved to demolish the house on February 15, 2011. The HPC approved an alteration permit shortly thereafter for demolition of the detached garage. Applicant's submittal was for a single story patio house. The Alteration Permit Subcommittee recommended the following: That the applicant include an additional half or full story with a projecting front roofline. The second story apex is to include architectural features and be in a different but complementary color than the rest of the house. Additional windows are to be installed on the side elevations. Shutters are not encouraged on the windows, and exterior colors are to be kept in a warm color palette. Landscaping is to be installed along the front elevation in varied species. Also, a detached garage matching the enhanced design of the house is encouraged. Ryan Mulliner, applicant, stated that he received Chairperson Bartlow's drawings today. Chairperson Bartlow stated that the A, B, C exterior drawings are options that she drew up. She asked the applicant if he is open to making changes to his plan. Mulliner answered that he is willing to make changes as necessary to move ahead with his project. Bartlow stated that the Commission has several options: 1) to approve the request as submitted; 2) approve the request with

changes; or 3) deny the request. Bartlow outlined her recommended changes. Option A - Move the roofline down to make it more of a one and a half story house. The Subcommittee wanted to see a porch or an illusion of a porch and agreed that it may be acceptable to have the bedrooms in the front of the house be offset from the rest of the house to make it look more porchlike. Option B – The same as Option A, but remove the siding on the lower level and replace it with a panel product. Option C – The same as Option B but add a peak above the door. Bartlow commented that she does not think the peak above the door adds anything, and, in fact, detracts from the design. Mulliner stated that he prefers the peak because it keeps the water off the sidewalk. Fischer asked for applicant's opinion. Mulliner stated that he does not want the exterior of the house to look like a non-typical property in the neighborhood. He is more concerned about the inside and what his renters want. He is open to changes to the outside as long as it looks nice and doesn't boost the costs over budget. Mulliner said all of the options are attractive although he is not certain how they affect the interior of the house. He said he likes Option C with the peak over the door because it keeps the water from dripping on the sidewalk and creating an ice hazard in the winter.

Bartlow summarized the changes to applicant's submission that are included in the options which she submitted. 1) Reduce the height of the house to one and a half stories for better proportion; 2) add a dormer with window on the side elevations with plumbing vents, etc. behind the dormers; 3) overhangs and gable ends shall be the same depth as overhangs on the sides; 4) slightly decrease the slope of the sides of the lower roof so that there is a longer line where the roof meets the wall below the upper windows; 5) increase the width of the recess of the front door as applicant's drawing makes it appear to be too tight both visually and functionally. The corridor or hallway inside does not have to change; 6) Slightly increase the height of the center window on the upper level to emphasize the size difference; 7) The main floor double hung windows and the upper floor windows shall have the same mullion pattern; 8) The windows on the front elevation shall remain centered; 9) Additional windows must be installed on the side elevations. 10) Doors shall remain as one panel doors. 11) Bartlow asked applicant what type of window materials he intends to use. Mulliner

answered that he intends to use white vinyl double hung windows. It will be difficult to add more windows on the south side because there is a bathroom and cabinets on the entire wall. 12) Increase width of the trim between the two colors of the siding; 13) Add trimboard to the face of the wall under the overhang at the gable ends; 14) Exterior light fixtures, if included, should be historical in nature; 15) Tan and green siding with white trim with warm gray singles are acceptable; 16) The front and back doors should be painted in a historic red color from the Sherwin Williams exterior preservation palette (standard maroon is not acceptable); 17) The Subcommittee discussed and encouraged a garage with detailing consistent with the house, but agreed that may not be practical in this situation; 18) The Subcommittee recommended that surface parking be screened from street view by hedges. Bartlow asked if staff or the applicant had a site plan indicating the proposed location of the parking. Chapman stated that applicant submitted a site plan with the original elevation drawings. Staff reviewed the site plan, and the lot only allows three parking spaces in the rear. Staff has not heard from applicant whether there will be any site revisions or screening added. That will be considered by Zoning at the time of the building permit application. Bartlow's concern was that if the surface parking extends beyond the width of the house, the parking should be screened from the street view. Mulliner responded that the house extends to the setback limits, and the parking will be in line with the house. Bartlow continued with the recommended changes: 19) There be a raised edge on the parking surface to prevent people from parking on landscaped surfaces; 20) All disturbed soil shall be seeded, sodded, or landscaped within one year of the start of construction. Chapman stated that is a requirement of the Land Development Code. Bartlow noted that the picture shows that there is a chain link fence on the property. Mulliner responded that the portion in the front of the property was removed yesterday afternoon. Bartlow added the following: 21) The chain link fence should be removed. Mulliner commented that the neighbor has three dogs that are quite active in his back yard. Therefore, Mulliner said he left the portion of his chain link fence that extends from the neighbor's two short wood fences. He has talked to the neighbor to the south about extending his 6' tall wood fence. Bartlow continued with the following recommendations: 22) The small tree on the property and the

boulevard trees shall remain; 23) Sidewalk shall extend from the front door to the street; 24) The shrubs as shown on the front elevation drawing be the minimum landscaping required at the foundation; 25) Bartlow asked how site maintenance will be handled, and Mulliner said it will be done by his crew. 26) If significant changes are made to the plan, applicant shall submit scaled, dimension exterior elevations, floor plan, and site plan drawings for administrative approval prior to start of construction; 27) applicant shall submit product cut sheets with colors noted for exterior finishes, windows and doors for administrative approval prior to the start of construction. Bartlow explained that the Commission doesn't want to be put in a situation where applicant uses, for example, a type of siding which the Commission does not approve of and has to ask the applicant to remove it and replace it with a different kind of siding. Ludwig commented that the dormers need to be much larger in order to make the upper space usable. He also noted that usually the side and front of the porches are the same pitch which is set by the sill of the window coming down to the head of the door. The adjustment made by Bartlow would make a different pitch on the sides compared to the front. Since applicant would like to have the small dormer to protect the entrance from ice, they should all be the same pitch. Morgan asked Bartlow if she had a reason for joining the three upper windows rather than separating them as applicant did on his proposal. Mulliner explained that he intended to have the trim between the windows to join them. Morgan stated that he likes the peak above the door because he thinks it dresses up the porch. Mulliner concurred. Fischer asked if making the front door wider causes a problem. Mulliner answered that it does because he already made the bedrooms on each side of the door one foot smaller. He proposed a 4 5/8" piece of trim around the door; therefore, losing another 5" or 6" on each side of the door would make the front part of the bedroom smaller than he would like. Bartlow said it may be better not to make it wider. Fischer asked if it would be necessary to have the door set back to achieve the porch look or if it could be flush with the front of the house. Mulliner responded that he had it recessed, but it can be flush. Morgan commented that recessing the door gives the front a more porch like appearance. Morgan noted that the house in Option A has siding on the front, but the siding has been replaced with flat panels in Options B and C.

Morgan said his preference is the siding, and Bartlow agreed. Morgan commented that he also likes the two tones of green. Fischer asked applicant his opinion on dropping the roof down. Mulliner stated that on his original submission he planned on using the upper story as living space, and that plan would have allowed more green space in the rear yard. Shrinking the house down to a one and a half story will make the house longer and reduce the green space. Bartlow asked how many bedrooms were in the house on his original submission. Mulliner answered that there were two on the main floor and two upstairs as well as a small bathroom upstairs. Bartlow asked applicant if he would need the full second story to accommodate those bedrooms and bathroom with rafters on top of that or if the height could be brought down somewhere between his plan and her suggested plan. Mulliner said the sidewalls from the first floor to the bottom of the rafters is probably 3' on Bartlow's plan. He said he could probably get the usable space upstairs if he could go with a 5' sidewall. Morgan noted that having usable space upstairs will include installation of functioning windows as opposed to false windows in the one and a half story house. Fischer asked Mulliner his house style preference. Mulliner said if he could make the sidewalls a little higher than in Bartlow's drawings, the upstairs space could be utilized. Bartlow asked staff's opinion on the Commission approving the request with these numerous changes. Chapman stated that the Commission could approve the request subject to the Chair and staff approval of revised elevation drawings that would be resubmitted by the applicant. Morgan moved to approve the alteration permit based on revised drawings submitted by applicant with conditions recommended by the Commission subject to approval by staff and the HPC Chair. Fischer seconded the motion. Glaesman noted that references to the site itself such as landscaping and a new garage will be considered advisory comments rather than conditions of approval. Fischer offered a friendly amendment to give some flexibility to the width of the recess at the front door so that it doesn't interfere with the width of the bedrooms. Morgan agreed to the amendment. The motion with the amendment carried unanimously.

**Other Business:** Chapman thanked Tom Fischer for his six years of service on the Commission.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

---

Bill Morgan, Secretary