Request for City Council Committee Action
From the Department of Community Planning & Economic Development

Date: November 17 2005

To: Council Member Gary Schiff, Chair of Zoning and Planning Committee

Prepared by: Greg Mathis, Senior Planner, CPED-Planning (612) 673-2439

Presenter(s) in Committee: Greg Mathis

Approved by: Barbara Sporlein, Planning Director _____

Subject: Appeal by Robert Levine of a decision of the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

Previous Directives: At a public hearing on October 25, 2005, the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) approved, subject to a number of conditions, a request by the appellant for a Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) to construct an in-ground swimming pool, patio and cabana, for landscape changes, and for several alterations to the house, but denied approval to replace the historic red tile roof on the house with a metal roofing product, for the Charles J. Martin House, an individually designated landmark located at 1300 Mount Curve.

Financial Impact (Check those that apply)
_X_ No financial impact

Community Impact
Ward: 7
Neighborhood Notification: Lowry Hill Residents Inc.
City Goals: Consistent with "Preserve and enhance our natural and historic environment and promote a clean, sustainable Minneapolis."
Comprehensive Plan: Consistent
Zoning Code: Section 599.120 authorizes the Heritage Preservation Commission to hear and decide applications for certificate of appropriateness" and Section 599.350 requires "the commission make findings that the alteration will not materially impair the integrity of the landmark, historic district."

Background/Supporting Information: Robert Levine has filed an appeal of the decision of the HPC. At a public hearing on October 25, 2005, the HPC approved a C of A for an in-ground swimming pool, patio and cabana, for landscaping changes, and for several alterations to the

Charles J. Martin House, an individually designated landmark located at 1300 Mount Curve. house. However, the HPC denied approval to replace the historic red tile roof on the house with a metal roofing product and encouraged Mr. Levine to work with staff to find a more suitable replacement material. Mr. Levine is appealing the following condition of the HPC approval:

- Replacing the clay tile roof on the house with a metal roofing product is not approved.

The attached staff report, application for a C of A and draft minutes from the October 25, 2005, HPC public hearing are respectfully submitted for consideration by your Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: To adopt the HPC findings and deny the appeal.

Attachments

A. Application for an appeal of the decision of the HPC, dated November 7, 2005

B. Letter from staff to Mr. Levine regarding the scope of the appeal, dated November 8, 2005

C. Excerpts from the draft minutes from the October 25, 2005 HPC meeting

D. Staff report for 1300 Mount Curve, dated October 19, 2005

E. Application for a C of A for 1300 Mount Curve, dated September 23, 2005

ATTACHMENT C

EXCERPTS FROM THE DRAFT OCTOBER 25, 2005 HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING

Item for Public Hearing

1. **1300 Mount Curve, Charles J. Martin House, Landmark, by Robert Levine, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the tile roof on the house with a metal roof, construct an in-ground swimming pool and cabana, and landscape changes. (Staff, Greg Mathis)**

   Mr. Mathis presented staff report recommending that the HPC adopt staff findings and approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work subject to the following conditions:

   1. Replacing the clay tile roof on the house with a metal roofing product is not approved.

   2. All of the wood and metal for the project, including the doors, windows and fence, must have a paint finish.

   3. The door and window glazing must be clear, non-tinted, non-reflective glass. One coat of Low-E glazing is permitted on the interior surface of the windows.

   4. The HPC staff must approve the final construction plans.

   The public hearing was then open.

   Kevin Busch, the architect, stated that the area that they want to build the pool on is a decrepit area on the site. There is a retaining wall there that is broken into two or three pieces, it is cracked and has moved off its main foundation. There is a set of steps; there is an old trellis that has been taken down over the years. A part of the project is to clean up and spruce up that side of the house. The roofing material they have searched quite well over the internet and other places to find an appropriate substitution and the best solution they came up with is the Interlok panel. That is what they are proposing to use on the cabana and the roof of the house. They have tried hard to find other substitutions.

   Bob Levine, the property owner, stated that he purchased the house in 1981 and it was about to fall down. That is probably an understatement. He spent a lot of time and effort to maintain this property and he appreciates Mr. Mathis's help in designing this. The one thing that Mr. Mathis was not aware of, he was pretty sure the cost to replace this roof would be substantial, he did not get a bid until last Friday and he has not seen it. The bid for the Interlok roof is $51,000. The price for replacing the clay tile is $276,000. The test

for economic hardship is one that he believes is crossed to replace the clay tile roof, which is called a T-12 roof, it is glazed and they do not make it anymore, it is a special order. He has done substantial work on the roof and has tried to repair it over the years. He has spent $40,000 to take the whole front face off and putting on a new decking beneath it, putting the original tile back on. That cost $40,000 ten years ago. He has four or five substantial leaks and he spent substantial money fixing the roof and the interior that has been damaged. He is hoping to preserve this property for another hundred years. This clay tile is original; the house was built in 1903, so the clay tile is over one hundred years old. Unfortunately, in Minnesota it cracks and expands. He has continually robbed pieces from other portions of the roof to maintain what he has now. He thought he had about 60% of the original tile still left and he is to the point that he cannot do it anymore. Mr. Busch has told the HPC about the retaining wall. One of the reasons for this project is because the retaining wall is crumbling and he is worried about the property down below and the trees in the area. The retaining wall has to be replaced. That is also the reason for trying to open up the west side of the house.

No one else wished to speak for or against this application. The public hearing was then closed.

Commissioner Anderson stated that she appreciates the difference in price but the quality is not competitive with real clay. She is inclined to agree with staff and deny the roof.

Commissioner Koski stated that the applicant should look at a clay tile that is not a special finish or a special color, which seems to have increased the cost and without having that cost information in front of the HPC it is difficult to balance that.

Commissioner Larsen inquired if staff had any comments about the appropriateness of replacing with a clay tile of a different finish. Mr. Mathis stated that he just received the bid before the meeting and had not had a chance to look at it. As far as looking at different materials, if there is something closer that is more cost effective he would be willing to recommend something, but indicted that it would be hard to say without knowing what they have actually looked at and how close it would actually be to what they have currently.

Commissioner Anderson indicated that she wanted to continue this line; since she thought there must be some other kind of product. She asked the architect had checked for other kinds of products and wanted input from the architects on the Commission. Mr. Busch replied that they had looked at different clay products and indicated that there is something called Spanish clay tile that is made out of the same material but it has a different shape. It is much less costly to install and the material is less costly. He thought that for maybe under $100,000 they may be able to do that type of roof on this house. He indicated that would be something that would be possible if they could get approval from the Commission.

Commissioner Herman wanted to know if the $51,000 bid for the metal roof was completely analogous to this bid; if all the under layment work, gutter work and all of

that would be identical between the two bids and that the only difference would be the material on terms of the covering. Mr. Levine stated it is his understanding that both bids anticipate no deterioration of the deck. If there was, both bids anticipate that there would be deck work to be done and that was in addition to the cost. There would be one other proposal that might work, in that, the front face of the house is what is seen and the back two-thirds is really not visible. He was relatively comfortable that the front deck is in pretty good shape because that was done eight years ago. He did not know if the Commission would entertain to leave the front alone and replace the other parts with either the aluminum product or with Spanish tile. The T-12 is causing the major problem, but he could leave the T-12 in front. All of this came to them last week and he did not have the bid. If he can do a hybrid he could work with Mr. Mathis. He does love the tile and does not want to do this, but he needs to have it done right so it stops leaking and wishes there were another product out there. This is the best they have found. This is his pride and joy; he does not want to put something on there that will look bad. Interlok told him that they installed another roof someplace in the city that the Commission approved. Commissioner Koski stated that he did not think that it was relevant to this discussion at this point.

Mr. Levine stated that he would love to find some compromise that works for everybody. Another $200,000 for this job gets a little pricey and they will not give him a guarantee; that is the other problem.

Commissioner Koski stated that this raises a point that maybe there is another solution and something more of a compromise and something more affordable is possible. He thought the procedural thing to do is to deny it and have staff work with the applicant on submitting another roof material.

Commissioner Messenger suggested that they approve it and ask staff to approve the material as an administrative approval. Mr. Mathis stated that this would make him nervous because the Commission is a design review body that looks at changes to buildings and the Commission would be approving something sight unseen. Staff would have no idea if it would be appropriate and one person's interpretation maybe is not. He would recommend that the Commission continue it and have the applicant bring some other material in for review or deny it and have him work with the applicant to find another material that works and bring that forward again.

Commissioner Lee said it was his understanding that the ultimate clay material is just the glaze finish and that the profile was the same. Mr. Mathis stated that the Commission and staff did not know. Commissioner Anderson stated that she would be uncomfortable approving it without knowing what it was.

MOTION by Commissioner Anderson to **adopt** staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an in-ground swimming pool and cabana, and landscape changes and to **deny** the metal roof. **SECOND** by Commissioner Ollendorf. **MOTION APPROVED** with no abstentions.

ATTACHMENT D

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
CPED PLANNING DIVISION
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

FILE NAME: 1300 Mount Curve

DATE OF APPLICATION: September 23, 2005

APPLICANT: Robert Levine

DATE OF HEARING: October 25, 2005

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Charles J. Martin House, Landmark

CATEGORY: Contributing

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Greg Mathis
DATE: October 19, 2005

A. SITE DESCRIPTION:

Constructed in 1903 according to plans designed by noted Minneapolis architect William Channing Whitney, the Charles J. Martin House is an excellent example of an early Twentieth Century city estate. The 2½-story Renaissance Revival style residence is set back on the lot and is accessed by a semi-circular driveway. The residence is 2½-stories in height, with the upper half story being concealed under a low hipped, clay tile roof. The primary construction material is a cream colored brick set with butter joints. Decorative features executed in brick include moulded window surrounds, pediments, dentils, quoins, and banding on the first story. Cornices are executed in wood with prominent modallions. The primary façade, which faces Mount Curve, is symmetrical in arrangement, consisting of a central projecting pavilion flanked by wings of two bays each; the central pavilion is comprised of three bays. The entrance is shielded by a three-bay Doric loggia with a second story balustrade. Windows on the second level are treated in two methods; triangular pediments crown those in the bays while segmental pediments crown those in the central section. Contrary to the front façade, the rear elevation is asymmetrical. Its western bay is semi-circular and is an extension of the living room. The eastern bay, which is rectangular, houses a kitchen and service facilities, and is linked to the basement-level garage. Central to the rear elevation is a two-story, semi-circular, Ionic portico with a coffered ceiling. Within the portico is a small balcony supported by immense scroll-type brackets. Accessed by a Palladian door. The portico opens onto a terrace over the garage, which is enclosed with a wrought-iron fence. Elsewhere on the exterior are low balustrades constructed of brick and stone; the balusters on these are in the shape of urns.

Charles J. Martin was a prominent businessman who is closely associated with the development of the flour milling industry in Minneapolis. For many years, Mr. Martin served as the secretary and treasurer of the Washburn-Crosby Milling Company and its successor, General Mills.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the historic clay tile roof on the house with metal, add a balcony on the west elevation, and construct an in-ground swimming pool and cabana west of the house. A detailed description of the work is as follows: The applicant is proposing to replace the historic red clay tile roof on the house with a metal roofing product by Interlok. The product is stamped to imitate tile and is embossed with a slight texture. The modulation of each unit attempts to simulate a pattern that is two tiles wide and three rows in height. The metal will be prefinished (painted) "tile red". On the first floor of the west elevation, the applicant is proposing to enlarge a five-light ribbon window to create a new French-door entrance with sidelines surrounded by double-hung windows. Directly below, at the basement level, the applicant is proposing to replace the existing multi-light door and windows with a new center door surrounded by paired sidelights. The doors and windows will be metal clad and painted a light cream color. The proposed new entrance on the first floor will open onto a proposed deck that extends out almost 13' from the entry. The deck will rest on brick piers and faced with a buff colored cast stone (concrete) fascia surmounted by a cast stone balustrade. On the south side of the balcony will be a grand staircase of matching materials that leads down to a proposed concrete patio and swimming pool. The proposed patio and pool will necessitate the removal of the remains of a severely deteriorated arbor. The in-ground pool will measure approximately 40' by 23' in size with a varying depth. The north end of the patio will rest on a concrete retaining wall. In addition, the applicant is proposing to build a one-story, brick cabana structure measuring 8' deep and 23' in width just north of the pool. The cabana will have a hip roof with 3' wide eaves and a breezeway through the structure. The cabana will be roofed with the same metal roofing product that is proposed for the house. Around the pool and along the west property line, the applicant is proposing to install an iron fence that is similar to the historic wrought iron fence along the front property line. The fence on the west property line will replace an existing, non-descript fence. Facing the driveway, the fence will have brick piers with concrete caps and an iron gate. In front of the fence, the applicant is proposing to install landscaping that will screen the fence and pool from the stately driveway and façade of the house. The brick for the cabana, fence and balcony piers will be a cream color brick that is similar to the brick on the house.

C. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (1990)

Masonry: *Brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, adobe, stucco, and mortar*
Recommended:

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, brackets, railings, cornices, window architraves, door pediments, steps, and columns; and joint and unit size, tooling and bonding patterns, coatings, and color.

-Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture.

-Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.

Not Recommended:

-Removing or radically changing masonry features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

-Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of masonry features.

-Using electric saws and hammers rather than hand tools to remove deteriorated mortar from joints prior to repointing.

-Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content (unless it is the content of the historic mortar). This can often create a bond that is stronger than the historic material and can cause damage as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar.
-Repointing with a synthetic caulking compound.

-Using a "scrub" coating technique to repoint instead of traditional repointing methods.

-Changing the width or joint profile when repointing.

-Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced masonry feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

-Introducing a new masonry feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Roofs
Recommended:

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.

-Repairing a roof by reinforcing the historic materials which comprise roof features. Repairs will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes such as cupola louvers, dentils, dormer roofing; or slates, tiles, or wood shingles on a main roof.

-Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include a large section of roofing, or a dormer or chimney. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Not Recommended:

-Radically changing, damaging, or destroying roofs which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

-Removing a major portion of the roof or roofing material that is repairable, then reconstructing it with new material in order to create a uniform, or "improved" appearance.

-Stripping the roof of sound historic material such as slate, clay tile, wood, and architectural metal.

-Replacing an entire roof feature such as a cupola or dormer when repair of the historic materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

-Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the roof or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

-Removing a feature of the roof that is unrepairable, such as a chimney or dormer, and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

-Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

-Introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

-Radically changing a character-defining roof shape or damaging or destroying character-defining roofing material as a result of incompatible design or improper installation techniques.

Windows

Recommended:

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

-Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metal which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

-Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.

-Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same

kind of materials is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

-Designing and installing additional windows on rear on other-non character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New windows openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

Not Recommended:

-Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

-Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash which does not fit the historic window opening.

-Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which radically change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

-Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Entrances and Porches
Recommended:

-Designing and installing additional entrances or porches when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations.

Not Recommended:

-Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation.

-Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they appear to be formal entrances by adding paneled doors, fanlights, and sidelights.

-Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

-Installing secondary service entrances and porches that are incompatible in size and scale with the historic building or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Building Site
Recommended:

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. Site features can include driveways,

walkways, lighting, fencing, signs, benches, fountains, wells, terraces, canal systems, plants and trees, berms, and drainage or irrigation ditches; and archeological features that are important in defining the history of the site.

-Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

-Providing continued protection of masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise building and site features through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems; and continued protection and maintenance of landscape features, including plant material.

-Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to building and site features will be necessary.

-Repairing features of buildings and the site by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include replacement in kind - with a compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features where there are surviving prototypes such as fencing and paving.

-Replacing in kind an entire feature of the building or site that is too deteriorated to repair-if the overall form and detailing are still evident-using the physical evidence to guide the new work. This could include an entrance or porch, walkway, or fountain. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

-Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

-Removing nonsignificant buildings, additions, or site features which detract from the historic character of the site.

Not Recommended:

-Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that , as a result, the character is diminished.
-Removing or relocating historic buildings or landscape features, thus destroying the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

-Removing or relocating historic buildings on a site or in a complex of related historic structures - such as a mill complex or farm - thus diminishing the historic character of the site or complex.

-Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of building and site features.

-Replacing an entire feature of the building or site such as a fence, walkway, or driveway when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

-Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the building or site feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

-Removing a feature of the building or site that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

-Introducing a new building or site feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate.

-Introducing a new landscape feature or plant material that is visually incompatible with the site or that destroys site patterns or vistas.

-Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

-Removing a historic building in a complex, a building feature, or a site feature which is important in defining the historic character of the site.

New Additions to Historic Buildings

Recommended:

-Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

-Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

-Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

-Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

-Placing new additions such as balconies and greenhouses on non-character-defining elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Not Recommended:

-Expanding the size of the historic building by constructing a new addition when the new use could be met by altering non-character-defining interior spaces.
-Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

-Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

-Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.

-Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in new additions, especially for contemporary uses such as drive-in banks or garages.

-Designing and constructing new additions that result in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the resource, including its design, materials, workmanship, location, or setting.

-Using the same wall plane, roof line, cornice height, materials, siding lap or window type to make additions appear to be a part of the historic building.

D. FINDINGS:

1. The Charles J. Martin House, located at 1300 Mount Curve, is an individually designated landmark.

2. The clay tile roof on the house is a character defining feature of the house.

3. Replacing the entire clay tile roof on the house with metal does not comply with the *Secretary of the Interiors Standard's* (*Standards*) which recommend retaining, and preserving roofs - their functional and decorative features, including roofing material such as clay tile, as well as its size, color, and patterning.

4. Replacing the entire clay tile roof on the house with metal does not comply with the *Standards* that recommend "repairing a roof by reinforcing the historic materials which comprise roof features" including "the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes such as…tiles…on a main roof" and against "removing a major portion of the roof or roofing material that is repairable, then reconstructing it with new material in order to create a uniform, or "improved" appearance".

5. The *Standards* recommend replacing an entire roof only when that roof "is too deteriorated to repair" and the applicant has not proven that the roof is beyond repair.

6. The *Standards* recommend considering the use of a compatible substitute only "if using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible". The applicant has not proven that the clay tile roof on the house cannot be repaired or replaced with new clay tile that matches the existing tile. In addition, no hardship has been proven for such a deviation from the adopted design guidelines for the property.

7. The proposed metal roofing product is not a compatible substitute material for the historic clay tile on the house. The metal roofing product has a very flat profile compared to the

historic clay tile; a different color, sheen and texture/finish; and a different modulation. Therefore, the proposed metal roofing product does not comply with the *Standards* that recommend against "using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the roof or that is physically or chemically incompatible" and against "introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color."

8. Replacing the historic clay tile roof on the house with the proposed Interlok metal roofing product would materially impair the architectural and historic value of the landmark.

9. The proposed new entry and the reconfigured basement entry and windows comply with the *Standards* that recommend "designing and installing additional entrances or porches when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations" and "designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new."

10. The proposed balcony complies with the *Standards* that the recommend "placing new additions such as balconies…on non-character-defining elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building", "locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building", and "designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new."

11. The proposed balcony, patio, swimming pool, cabana, patio and fence all comply with the *Standards* which recommend that new additions be designed to "reference design motifs from the historic building" while still being "clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color."

12. The proposed swimming pool, cabana, patio and fence all comply with the *Standard* that recommends "designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space."

13. While the proposed metal roofing product is unacceptable for the material to replace the historic clay tile roof on the house, it is an acceptable roofing material for the cabana because the cabana is a new, non-historic structure, that is mostly hidden from the primary elevations of the house and because it will help differentiating the old from the new.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work subject to the following conditions:

1. Replacing the clay tile roof on the house with a metal roofing product is not approved.

2. All of the wood and metal for the project, including the doors, windows and fence, must have a paint finish.

3. The door and window glazing must be clear, non-tinted, non-reflective glass. One coat of Low-E glazing is permitted on the interior surface of the windows.

4. The HPC staff must approve the final construction plans.