

**Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission
Regular Meeting
October 17, 2023**

Members Present: Dan Grimm, Bill Fowler, Emily Paprocki, Clyde Ensor

Members Absent: Bill Wilkinson

Non-Voting Members Present: Bill Wetheron, Chairman; Emilie Delehanty, Recording Secretary

Visitors Present: Laura Hammer, Laura Popovich, Lee Lorch, Jr., Paul Reber, Vic Topper, Ryan Burke, Brian Elder, Charles Cash, Maria Galvin

The September 2023 Minutes were read, and Fowler motioned to approve, Paprocki seconded, and the minutes passed with no changes.

Lee and Cris Lorch

1502 Hobbs Park Road

Lee Lorch, Jr. presented to the Commission representing his parents. The Lorches would like to replace old windows and have received an estimate for Marvin and Anderson replacements. He brought in samples and told the group that they prefer the Marvin replacements over the Anderson. Ensor explained that the Commission needs to have SDL or true divided light and dividers on the exterior of the glass. Grimm would like for the windows to be full replacement new construction windows and the trim needs to replicate the original versus the replacement inserts that were presented. Grimm made a motion to approve the replacement using new construction window as an SDL or true divided light with a grill pattern matching the existing. Paprocki seconded. Motion passed. Paprocki clarified that this will need to be a new quote as these will have to be a new construction window versus a replacement insert.

Rosanna Gabriele and Ryan Burke

1111 Bellewood Road

The owners and their architect, Charles Cash, presented schematic drawings of a new garage, a connecting walkway with pergola and a new pool house which would replace an existing carriage house.

1. Demolition of existing carriage house/garage. The existing carriage house (which was used as a garage) is in the location of the proposed new pool house. Owners intended to use the existing structure. However, after consulting with a structural engineer and their builder, they learned that the existing structure has no foundation, has had at least four additions, and that all the joist work has been poorly replaced, repaired, and is now in disrepair. In short, all of the structural components are shot. The cost of repairing all of the damage from various additions and inattention would be astronomical. Therefore, they would like to demolish the building and start over. In the new structure, they would use original components from the original buildings, including the windows and a large hayloft door. The exterior would mirror the siding design and style of the existing original main house. Ensor commented that the Commission can only approve a demolition once there is a full construction plan of the new building.
2. Cash presented the drawing of the pergola and a new garage. The garage would be next to the main house, but it would be detached. The pergola would be on the other side of the garage and would lead to the proposed pool house. The pergola might be stone and wood columns, but it also might be a modular metal design. Paprocki asked if they had considered placing the new structures at a 90-degree angle to the house, but due to the previous plantings of many trees as part of a tree canopy, it makes most sense for the

layout of the garage, pergola, and pool house to be in a line. Paprocki asked about the low roof level of the garage. Cash explained that they are toying with the idea of creating a green roof on the garage and the owner also mentioned that they wanted to keep the roof level low in order to avoid impeding neighbors' sight lines. Grimm questioned why so many materials are on the garage when the main house has less materials involved. Cash said that the other materials are all found on the main house. Grimm questioned the detachment from the house. Cash described it to be similar to a plaza or garden court. Paprocki asked about the proposed roof of the pool house and asked about any trussing. The architect is undecided on that detail, at this point.

Emily made a motion to demolish the pool house using the conceptual drawings for the proposed new building. Grimm seconded. Motion passed. Grimm made a motion to approve the concept of the garage addition, the pergola, and the pool house addition, but will need to see further design development. They will need to present these flushed out designs in a future meeting. Ensor seconded. Motion passed.

Vic and Nicole Topper
2106 Homewood Drive

The Toppers presented revised plans for their tennis pavilion. The revised tennis pavilion has a crawl space, not on a slab, and concrete viewing pads flanking the front covered porch. They proposed using split face concrete blocks on the side of the crawl space. This would be painted and will give texture to the skirt board of the pavilion. The owner also presented the plans of using painted brick in case the Commission would not approve the split face concrete blocks. Grimm and Paprocki stated that the material must be painted brick instead of the split face concrete block. Paprocki recommended wrapping the brick around the entire structure, to create continuity amongst the sides of the pavilion. Grimm made a motion to approve this amended pavilion with painted brick to match the chimney. In addition, the skirt board of painted brick will be wrapped around the entire structure. Fowler seconded. Motion approved.

Laura Hammer
12500 Ridge Road

The Owner presented revised plans for a second-story addition and front porch renovation, including revised details for the front porch and revised eave details. Grimm mentioned that the revised roof line of the addition and the proposed removal of the second-floor deck look great. He recommended bringing the rear wall of the addition back in contact with the existing chimney chase, which would alter the rear roofline slightly, but would be better building practice. Paprocki asked about the level of the proposed front porch addition, and owner explained that it will match the existing porch level - same construction details. Paprocki recommended making the porch steps be constructed of (simulated) wood to match the wood for the front porch. Grimm expressed concerns that the front porch gable did not have a clear termination point at its base. It needs to sit on a solid piece and not just have skirt board run into the ground. The owner explained that the cedar shingles will extend to the porch deck level, and that the decking and skirt board will interrupt and form a 'base' for the shingled gable face. Below the skirt board will be just a few inches to grade. Whatever gap is exposed here should be covered with composite boards as 'lattice'. Grimm agreed with that plan. For the arched eave, Grimm would like a casing trim board to be added at the head of the shingled arched main opening to create a more pleasing and feasible termination of the cedar shakes. Paprocki emphasized that it is hard for shakes to end in an arch shape along a bottom edge and there should be some sort of transition. It was agreed that the casing could be eliminated as long as the jamb material extended out to the face of the shakes and established a clean arched edge.

Grimm made a motion to approve as submitted with the following revisions. The decking has mitered returns on edges, the skirt board must match the overhang, the skirt board and decking is continuous underneath the shingle columns, the head of the arch on the main porch resolve the outside corner detail, and wood steps for new steps to match the materials. Fowler seconded. Motion passed.

Ensor motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:18 pm, Grimm seconded it, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.