Historic Landmarks and Preservation Districts Commission

Report of the Committee—DENIAL

To: Joe Hohman
From: Bradley Fister, Historic Preservation Specialist
Date: March 2, 2022

Case No: 21-COA-0230
Classification: Committee Review

GENERAL INFORMATION

Property Address: 2214 Patterson Avenue

Applicant: Joe Hohman
2214 Patterson Avenue
Louisville, KY 40204
502-931-9851
jhohman@umhomeloan.com

Owner: same as applicant

Estimated Project Cost: TBD

Description of proposed exterior alteration:
The applicant requests approval to replace all windows on the first and second floor front façade with new clad wood windows. This is three total windows.

Communications with Applicant, Completion of Application
The application was received on September 29, 2021. Staff conducted a site visit on October 7, 2021 to assess the interior and exterior condition of the historic windows. Staff worked with applicant extensively to explore alternatives to replacement windows prior to coming to the committee. It was then determined that this application would need a Committee-level review and is scheduled to be heard by the Cherokee Triangle ARC on Wednesday November 10, 2021 at 4:30pm, online via WebEx.

The Cherokee Triangle ARC met on November 10, 2021 at 4:30 pm via WebEx online video conference to discuss the case. Members present were Gail Morris, Jennifer Shultz, Pete Kirven, Tamika Jackson, David Morgan, and Committee Chair Dave Marchal. Joe Haberman, Cynthia Elmore, and Brad Fister, Landmarks Staff; and Mr. Hohman, the property owner were in attendance.

Mr. Marchal opened the meeting. Mr. Fister then presented the case for the proposed windows to be replaced. He recommended denial of the project based on the Window Design Guidelines. Mr. Marchal then asked the applicant if they wished to present any further information to the committee. Mr. Hohman discussed his intention to replace the windows. He also said that he had spoken to a window repair person but did not have documentation to share. Mr. Morgan asked if the applicant knew the sizes of the existing windows and if the proposed new windows had the same profile. The applicant stated that the windows would generally look as they do now but was not sure of actual dimensions.

Mr. Marchal asked if there had been any comments from the public regarding the proposed window replacement. Mr. Fister stated that he had no received any public comment and that no one was in attendance to speak. With no further comment, Mr. Marchal closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Mr. Morgan made a motion to defer the case until there was more information on the dimensions of the existing windows and proposed replacement windows. The motion was seconded by Ms. Schultz. Ms. Elmore took a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously (6 yes and 0 no).

The applicant's computer disconnected prior to the completion of the motion, so staff contacted him on November 11, 2021 to explain the outcome of the hearing. Staff also explained that the applicant would need to bring detailed dimensioned drawings of the existing windows as well as the detailed and dimensioned cut sheets for each individual window that is proposed to be replaced for the future meeting. The applicant's architect, Nathan Smith, reapplied for the window replacement with a new COA application on January 6, 2022. The applicant told Staff on February 18, 2022 that he wanted to go back before to the ARC for replacement of the front windows. Staff worked with the applicant to separate the side and rear window replacement from the front window replacement. The side and rear window replacement was approved at staff level (22-COA-0002) on March 2, 2022. The Cherokee Triangle ARC was scheduled to hear the continued case on Wednesday March 2, 2022 at 4:30pm, online via WebEx.

The Cherokee Triangle ARC met on Wednesday March 2, 2022 at 4:30 pm via WebEx online video conference to discuss the case. Members present were Gail Morris, Pete Kirven, Tamika Jackson, and Committee Chair Dave Marchal. Joe Haberman and Brad Fister, Landmarks Staff; and Joe Hohman, the property owner were in attendance.

Mr. Marchal opened the meeting. Mr. Fister then presented the case for the proposed window replacement. He recommended denial of the project based on the Window Design Guidelines. Mr. Hohman verified that the committee had received cutsheets, elevations, and specifications for Quaker clad wood replacement windows. He then asked for his architect to speak about the proposal for the front windows.

Nathan Smith (3210 Dublin Ln.) stated that the windows were proposed to be replaced because the homeowner wanted to update the look and performance of

the house. He stated that Mr. Hohman did not want storm windows and that historic windows deteriorate too fast without them. Mr. Smith stated that the proposed replacement windows will match the existing window in size, style, color, and configuration. Mr. Marchal asked if the sizes of the rails and styles were the same as the existing historic windows. Mr. Smith said they were; however, he also said that he had not measured the historic windows.

Mr. Marchal asked if there were any comments from the public regarding the proposed window replacement. Joseph Segal, 2216 Patterson Ave., spoke in favor of the case. With no further comment, Mr. Marchal closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

The ARC members then deliberated the case. They acknowledged that the proposed replacement windows generally met the guidelines but also expressed concerns about the condition of the windows not meeting W1. They discussed how guidelines call for repair over replacement. They also discussed how they had requested estimates on repair versus replacement for these windows as an indication of the condition of the historic windows. Since the applicant did not provide further evidence on the condition of the windows to refute staff's assessment, the ARC felt they lacked any new information to find that the windows were deteriorated enough to meet W1. Furthermore, there was not sufficient evidence to show that the proposed replacement windows matched the historic windows in their dimensions.

Mr. Kirven made a motion to deny the application because there was not sufficient evidence to prove that the windows met the threshold for full replacement (W1), rather than repair. Ms. Morris seconded the motion. Ms. Jackson said she would have liked to have known more of the state of the existing windows because the proposed replacement windows do meet the Design Guidelines. Mr. Haberman took a roll call vote. Committee members Kirven, Marchal, and Morris voted yes while Committee member Jackson voted no. The motion to deny the replacement of the front three historic wood windows passed (3 yes and 1 no). Thus, the application for a COA was denied. The committee moved to the next case on the agenda at approximately 5:30 pm.

Findings

The following additional findings are incorporated in this report:

The following design review guidelines, approved for the Cherokee Triangle Preservation District, are applicable to the proposed exterior alteration: **Window**. The report of the Commission staff's findings of fact and conclusions with respect to these guidelines is included in this report.

Site Context/ Background

The R5B zoned property in the Traditional Neighborhood Form District is located on the east side of Patterson Avenue, seven lots south of its intersection with Willow Ave. The home is a circa 1905, 2 ½ story, lap sided, American Foursquare with a limestone foundation. The front façade features a ½ width porch on the north side

with dentil and other decorative molding as well as Tuscan columns. There is a ¾ lite entry door flanked by decorative sidelights. The façade also features three large one-over-one, double-hung, historic wood windows. These large windows, the porch details, and the entry door with sidelights are character defining features to the home. The surrounding homes are a mix of American Foursquare, bungalow, and Arts and Crafts style from a similar construction period.

Conclusions
The existing front historic wood windows do not meet Window Design Guideline **W1** as they are not severely deteriorated. While the proposed clad wood windows appear to match the exiting in size and appearance, replacement of them is not warranted if the existing historic wood windows are not severely deteriorated. Furthermore, the applicant did not provide further evidence on the condition of the windows to refute staff's assessment. He also did not provide information on repair versus replacement as the applicant simply wanted to replace his windows. Thus, the ARC lacked any new information to find that the windows were deteriorated enough to meet Window Design Guideline **W1**. Furthermore, the was not sufficient evidence to show that the proposed replacement windows matched the historic windows in their dimensions.

DECISION
On the basis of the information furnished by the applicant, the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is **denied**.

David Marchal
David Marchal
Cherokee Triangle ARC Chair

03-02-22
Date

WINDOW

Design Guideline Checklist

+	Meets Guidelines
-	Does Not Meet Guidelines
+/-	Meets Guidelines with Conditions as Noted
NA	Not Applicable
NSI	Not Sufficient Information

	Guideline	Finding	Comment
W1	Replace severely deteriorated historic windows with new windows that convey the same visual appearance. Replacement windows may either be accurate reproductions using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building and the district. Use of vinyl- and aluminum-clad wood window systems on primary elevations may be permissible if the proportion and detail closely match the original.	-	The historic wood windows are not severely deteriorated, per the standards for replacement in the Design Guidelines (-). The windows need repair and weatherization.
W2	Select windows that match the historic sash dimension, muntin configuration, reveal depths, glass-to-frame ratios, glazing patterns, frame dimensions, trim profiles, and decorative features when repair of original windows is impossible.	NSI	Applicant stated the proposed replacement windows will fit existing window openings and match the muntin configuration; however, no proof was given that they matched the historic windows in actual dimensions.

W3	Evaluate the option of using appropriate salvage materials when replacing windows that are deteriorated beyond repair.	NA	
W4	Do not use replacement sash that does not fit historic window openings. Original openings should never be blocked-in to accommodate stock windows	+	Proposed windows will fit existing window openings.
W5	Do not install contemporary picture, glass block, or jalousie windows in exterior window openings.	NA	
W6	Do not install synthetic replacement windows (vinyl, etc.) on primary facades.	NA	
W7	Install replacement windows that operate in the same way as the original windows - double-hung windows are replaced with double-hung, and casement windows are replaced with casements.	+	The proposed replacement windows will operate the same as the original historic windows would have.
W8	Do not replace multi-pane windows that have true divided lights with thermal glazing windows that have false "snap-in" or applied muntins on primary façade elevations.	NA	
W9	Do not apply reflective or insulating film to window glass.	+	
W10	Do not use smoked, tinted, low-E, or reflective glass on building facades that can be seen from a public way.	+	
W11	Use large sheets of clear glass when replacement of storefront display windows is required.	NA	
W12	Do not block-in or back-paint transoms or sidelights.	NA	
W13	Use surviving prototypes to reconstruct missing window elements, such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds. The reconstructed element should be constructed of materials for which there is a historic precedent or a compatible substitute material if that is not possible.	NA	
W14	Do not alter the number, size, location, or shape of original windows seen from a public way by making new window openings or permanently blocking existing openings. If windows are no longer needed, they should be shuttered if original shutters exist. If shutters do not exist, a temporary closure should be prepared, leaving the window frame intact.	+	
W15	Locate any new windows openings that may be required for a new use on a façade that cannot be seen from a public way. Newly-installed windows should be compatible with the overall design of the building.	NA	
W16	Do not obscure historic window trim with metal or siding material.	NA	
W17	Do not install new floors or dropped ceilings that block the glazed area of historic windows. If such an approach is required, the design should incorporate setbacks that allow the full height of the window to be seen unobstructed.	NA	
W18	Install exterior storm windows that duplicate the shape of the original window. Storm windows should be painted to match the color of the window frame.	NA	
W19	Do not install exterior storm windows or screens that damage or obscure historic windows or frames. Mount storm windows on the blind stop within the window frame. Storm window or screen rails should always match the rails of the windows behind. They should have either wood or narrow, metal frames that are painted to match the color of the building trim.	NA	
W20	Do not install window air conditioning units on a primary façade if installation on a secondary façade can address the same need. If this is not an option, do not alter the window sash to accommodate the air-conditioning unit.	NA	

W21	Install any security bars in such a way that they do not obscure the architectural character of original windows or damage historic fabric. Commercial security grills should retract out of sight during business hours.	NA	
W22	Design awnings to complement existing architectural features. They should not overwhelm the façade.	NA	
W23	Install awnings made of weather-proofed canvas of a traditional form. Fiberglass, metal, plastic, and back-lit awnings that have contemporary shapes are inappropriate and visually intrusive.	NA	
W24	Select an awning color that complements the building, with solid colors and narrow or wide stripes running perpendicular to the building being the preferred patterns.	NA	
W25	Install awnings in a way that does not harm the building. Hardware installation should be limited to that which is required for structural stability and should be driven into mortar joints rather than into masonry.	NA	
W26	Attach awnings between the window display area and the signboard or second-floor window sills. Awnings should be attached below the transom line where historic prism glass is present and building scale allows.	NA	
W27	Install awnings so that the valance is no lower than 7' above the sidewalk.	NA	
W28	Repair shutters with in-kind materials. If damage is so extensive that they cannot be repaired, replacement shutters should match the visual appearance of the originals.	NA	
W29	Install shutters only where there is historic evidence for them. Replacement shutters should be or appear to be operable, measure the full height and width of the windows, and be constructed of a historically-appropriate material. Solid shutters are appropriate for the ground floor, and solid or louvered shutters are appropriate for upper floors.	NA	
W30	Mount replacement shutters so that they partially cover the vertical trim of the window frame. This gives shutters the appearance that they are indeed operable, even if in truth they are not. Shutters should not be applied to the masonry or cladding on either side of the window.	NA	
W31	Do not install aluminum or vinyl shutters.	NA	
W32	Photographically document architectural features that are slated for reconstruction prior to the removal of any historic fabric.	+	Photos submitted with application