

Historic Preservation Meeting
June 18, 2019

Voting Commission Members Present:

Clyde Ensor, Katie Greene, Bill Wilkinson; Connie O'Connell, Dan Fultz, Doug Schmitt, Greta Chessler

Non Voting Commission Members Present:

Bill Wetherton, Chairman; Mary Easterling, Recording Clerk

Visitors:

Pat Wetherton, Eric Ison, Charlie Hawkins, Lennie Fulton, Linn Bayus, Steve Porter, Jill Hall, Ken Hall, Linda Siegrist, Jon Siegrist, Jane Brown, Laura Linkous, Barlow Brooks. Celia Manlove, Robertson Phillips, Cindy Parrish, Debbie Doering, Dave Doering, Nancy and Chuck Webb, Ricardo Pavex, Barb Sweet, Tony Bayus, Hannah Brown, Cara Martin, Ann Ross.

The meeting was called to order at 6:07 and the minutes from the May 21, 2019 meeting were read. Greene motioned to approve and Wilkinson seconded. There was discussion and the minutes were approved unanimously with the following addition add "and videographer" to page two paragraph 4 of the minutes after "there is a court reporter "and videographer" here tonight...

Barb and Rick Sweet 12204 Locust Lane

The Sweets would like to add a 12x12 cedar gazebo with a metal roof. Greene motioned to approve as submitted, Schmitt seconded. Wilkinson questioned the screwed down aluminum roof. He stated that a standing seam aluminum roof is better looking. Sweet says there is no choice in roofing material since this is a kit from Costco. Wilkinson asked if standing seam roof could be added? Sweet says she will ask contractor that assembles the structure. The motion was approved unanimously with the provision they ask about a standing seam roof addition.

Katie and Joe Greene 11804 Woodland Road

The Greens would like to add an outdoor shower enclosure to the left rear side of the house primarily to wash kids and dog after playing in the creek. The enclosure would be made of cedar siding and will match the trim on the side of the house. Wilkinson motioned to approve as presented, Ensor seconded, Greene recused herself from the vote and the remaining board members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

St Lukes Episcopal Church 1204 Maple Lane

Attorney Eric Ison states that St Lukes hopes for a favorable decision He states this addition is important for many church members and Anchorage residents.

Laura Linkous states that the church doesn't want to work with the neighbors. The addition is not appropriate in mass or scale, and the church has not been considerate of neighbors or the appropriateness of the building in a neighborhood.

Dave Doering believes that St. Lukes has been reminded that this project conform on size, scale, mass or proportion. The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) doesn't need to further religious goal of a church, they should be concerned with what is best for the city of Anchorage. St Lukes is landlocked and needs to work within those limitations or find a new campus.

Jane Brown states that Olmstead, who designed a plan for the city of Anchorage, stresses the harmony of the buildings in Anchorage and the plans from St. Lukes do not preserve this harmony.

Attorney Steve Porter represents neighbors opposed to the plans. He handed out highlights of the HPC guidelines. He stated compatibility in size and material is most important - even over architectural detail. Mass, scale and proportion should be the most important to HPC. This addition overpowers the original design of the church. He states that the mass is too large and not compatible with the neighborhood and site. He encourages members to vote against the application in its current form and not be intimidated by the court reporter and videographer.

Attorney Ison states there was no intention to intimidate the Commission. Any good lawyer would bring a court reporter and videographer to establish record. St. Lukes has been responsive to all issues raised. Fr. Delk has met with commission members. The application is in full compliance with rules and regulations. Others say that in prior HPC meetings neighbors have asked to meet and St. Lukes said no.

Committee Discussion

O'Connell likes the new design but will vote no due to the mass and scale of the project. She would be happy to vote for a smaller addition.

Greene is voting yes, but believes HPC needs to change the application process for a future project like St Luke's. HPC members have made a huge time commitment to this process. The way St. Lukes has treated the neighbors has been embarrassing and shocking. They have showed a callousness to the neighbors and to working within the community. St. Luke's new plan is much improved. After completing a list for St. Luke's they tried to soften the materials pay attention to size and scale, but this is not the most appropriate addition. Thank you neighbors; the building has improved because of your involvement.

Chessler is concerned and worried that this process has been a bad experience. We need to learn from these mistakes. John Schnatter used a model of consensus and buy in. He created a team and through town hall meetings, he educated the community. St. Luke's missed this opportunity to build consensus.

Schmitt seconds the comments made by Greta and Katie. The goal needs to be not to detract from the history and character of this community. St. Luke's has not been a good steward of the historic structure. They have no sympathy for the site or the neighbors. The elders have a job to ensure that one hundred years from now we should still be impressed by the structure. He does not want to approve, but as an HPC member he is exhausted. This is a huge missed opportunity. He is disappointed in this process and the proposed structure. Even with the recent additions and changes it still could be better. Neighbors have valid concerns. He feels like his hands are tied.

Fultz stated this has been a painful process and it didn't have to be so hard. Needed to start as a community design process to eliminate some of the opposition. Most likely the result would have been better than what we have here tonight. He strives for perfection though he knows he can't get there. This design is the same as it was one year ago with some small scale changes. There are many other ways to approach this project. It is not HPC's job to design this building. This opportunity was missed a year ago. Technically, they met the conditions we placed upon them, but as an architect, he feels like it can be better. No one wins either way. Seriously considering resigning from the board.

Enzor read a motion to approve. Enzor moves HPC approve the application of St. Luke's and issue a certificate of appropriateness. Schmitt seconded the motion. Bill Wilkinson makes an amendment that all exterior materials must be full depth, natural stone. No Dryvit, stucco or man made materials or thin stone can be used. Schmidt states he hopes St. Luke's asks themselves did we help or hurt the city of Anchorage in this process? Fultz states the animosity

will hang around for a long time. We are all trying to protect Anchorage and the community. A vote is taken on the motion as amended.

Ensor -Yes

Greene -Yes

Fultz- No

Schmitt- Yes

Wilkinson -Yes

O'Connell - No

Chessler-No

Motion passes

Ensor makes a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:05 PM. Greene seconded. Meeting adjourned

Submitted by Mary Easterling-Recording Clerk