

**CITY OF SAINT PAUL
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

FILE NAME: 1621 Summit Avenue

DATE OF APPLICATION: July 2, 2014

APPLICANT: Rich Laffin, Richard Laffin Architects, Inc.

OWNERS: George and Wendy Caucutt

DATE OF HEARING: July 24, 2014

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Summit Avenue West Heritage Preservation District

CATEGORY: Contributing

CLASSIFICATION: Building Permit

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Christine Boulware

DATE: July 17, 2014

A. SITE DESCRIPTION:

The two-story house at 1621 Summit Avenue has a wood frame covered with stucco and a cross-gabled asphalt shingle roof. It has Tudor Revival details, such as vertical false-timbering in the front and side gables, and the shallow jetty with brackets in the front gable. The side gables have open eave pent roofs matching the rest of the eaves and closing the tympanums. The windows are flat-headed, six-over-ones, with a ribbon of five on the second story façade and paired elsewhere. The hipped front porch rests on stucco piers, has open eaves and it flairs slightly toward the top at the sill line of the second story windows. In-swing casement windows topped by four-light transoms open the porch to the exterior and a brick knee-wall rises up to the first story window sill level and continues around the building as the brick foundation. The house and garage are categorized as contributing.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant proposes to replace nine pairs of original in-swing casement windows and non-original storm windows with Marvin aluminum-clad, out-swing casement windows on the south/ primary elevation.

The new windows would be not be installed in the same location as the original, but framed in the plane where the current storm windows are located. No changes are proposed to the transom windows and existing wood trim would be filled, sanded, and repainted, and all stucco would be re-dashed.

C. BACKGROUND:

The applicant met with HPC staff on June 5, 2014 to discuss the proposal. Staff informed the applicant the application as proposed did not comply with the district guidelines and would need to be reviewed by the Commission. The applicant submitted the application as is on July 2, 2014.

D. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than 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, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
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.
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.

Summit Avenue West Heritage Preservation District Guidelines for Design Review:

Sec. 74.36 – Restoration and rehabilitation

(a) General Principles:

1. All work should be of a character and quality that maintains the distinguishing features of the building and the environment. The removal or alteration of distinctive architectural features should be avoided.
2. Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible. In the event of replacement, new materials should match the original in composition, design, color, texture and appearance. Duplication of original design based on physical or pictorial evidence is preferable to using conjectural or "period" designs or using parts of other buildings.
3. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship characteristic of structures or a period should be treated with sensitivity.
4. Buildings should be used for their originally intended purpose or compatible uses which require minimum alteration of the building and its site.
5. In general, buildings should be restored to their original appearance. However, alterations to buildings since their construction are sometimes significant because they reflect the history of the building and neighborhood. This significance should be respected, and restoration to an "original" appearance may not be desirable in some cases. All buildings should be recognized as products of their own time and not be altered to resemble buildings from an earlier era.
6. Whenever possible, new additions or alterations to structures should be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

(d) Windows and Doors:

(1) Existing window and door openings should be retained. New window and door openings should not be introduced into principal elevations. Enlarging or reducing window or door openings to fit stock window sash or new stock door sizes should not be done. The size of window panes or sash should not be altered. Such changes destroy the scale and proportion of the building.

(2) Window sash, glass, lintels, sills, architraves, doors, pediments, hoods, steps and all hardware should be retained. Discarding original doors and door hardware, when they can be repaired and reused in place, should be avoided.

(3) The stylistic period(s) a building represents should be respected. If replacement of window sash or doors is necessary, the replacement should duplicate the material, design and hardware of the older window sash or door. Inappropriate new window and door features such as aluminum storm and screen window combinations, plastic or metal strip awnings, or fake shutters that disturb the character and appearance of the building should not be used. Combination storm windows should have wood frames or be painted to match trim colors.

E. FINDINGS:

1. On March 1, 1990, the Summit Avenue West Heritage Preservation District was established under Ordinance Number 17716, § 1. The Heritage Preservation Commission shall protect the architectural character of heritage preservation sites through review and approval or denial of applications for city permits for exterior work within designated heritage preservation sites §73.04.(4).
2. The house and garage are categorized as contributing to the Summit Avenue West Heritage Preservation District.
3. The window replacement is proposed on the primary elevation of the house.
4. **Sec. 74.36 (a)(1)** General principle No. 1 states that "*the removal or alteration of distinctive architectural features should be avoided.*" The original in-swing casement windows are considered a distinctive architectural feature of the property. The removal of the windows does not comply with the principle.
5. The non-original storm/screen windows are not distinctive features and their removal and replacement with appropriately detailed storm/screen windows with historic profiles would not have an adverse impact.
6. **Sec. 74.36 (a)(2)** General principle 2 states "*deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible*" and **Sec. 74.36 (d)(2)** guideline states that "Window sash, glass, lintels, sills, architraves, doors, pediments, hoods, steps and all hardware should be retained. Discarding original doors and door hardware, when they can be repaired and reused in place, should be avoided." The interior and exterior photographs do not show significant deterioration of the sash and do not justify the removal and replacement of the original in-swing casement windows. The photographs do not show deterioration of the sash that would warrant replacement. The proposal does not comply with this principle and guideline. An estimate for repair was not provided.
7. **Sec. 74.36 (d)(1)** The guideline states that "Existing window and door openings should be retained. ...Enlarging or reducing window or door openings to fit stock window sash or new stock door sizes should not be done...Such changes destroy the scale and proportion of the building. The proposal to install the new out-swing casement windows in the front part of the frame, where the storm windows are currently installed, would alter the historic relationship between the window

- openings and the windows. The operation of the proposed window (out-swing vs. in-swing) is a departure from the original design intent. The proposal does not comply with this guideline.
8. **Sec. 74.36 (d)(3)** The guideline states that “The stylistic period(s) a building represents should be respected. *If replacement of window sash ... is necessary, the replacement should duplicate the material, design and hardware of the older window sash*”. The proposed out-swing casement does not duplicate the design, hardware and operation of the original in-swing casement window; it would adversely impact the design of the façade. The in-swing casement windows are original to the property and important to the Tudor Revival style design. The proposal does not comply with this guideline.
 9. **Sec. 74.36 (d)(3)** The guidelines for storms/screens states “*Inappropriate new window...features such as aluminum storm and screen window combinations...that disturb the character and appearance of the building should not be used*” and “*Combination storm windows should have wood frames or be painted to match trim colors.*” The existing storm windows are non-original to the property and their removal would not have a negative impact, however, new storm window would not be installed on the exterior, but the interior, as the out-swing casement window would be installed in the opening where the storms/screen are traditionally sited.
 10. The proposal to replace nine pairs of original in-swing casement windows at the south (primary) elevation of the residence will have an adverse impact on the Program for the Preservation and architectural control of the Summit Avenue West Heritage Preservation District (Leg. Code §73.06 (e)).

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the findings above, staff recommends denial of the proposal. Staff encourages the applicant to explore window repair and installation of full-frame, flush-mount storm/screen windows that would not conflict with the division of the sash and would match the historic profile present on the storm in the transom openings.

G. ATTACHMENTS:

Application
Photos
Plans