



**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
2	Page 2, second paragraph, second sentence	“The corners...”: I can’t for the life of me figure out what that sentence means or why it is important to the street?	A	This sentence has been omitted to avoid unnecessary confusion.
3	3	Please recheck your records; my memory is the lot size is 40’x60’. (I’m in Montana right now and don’t have my Eliot Lane records available, but I add up in my mind the 3’ side setback, driveway of about 10’, front bedroom about 10’, living room about 14’ and porch about 4’, you are way over 30’.)	A	We have double-checked and revised the measurement to approximately 40x60.
4	3	Drawing, lower right hand...shouldn’t the caption be “attached” garages, not “detached”? If “detached” is the word that is meant, then it probably should say, “Originally the homes....had detached garages.” It is true however that today, many do have attached garages.	A	Caption has been corrected.
5	4	I am completely confused by the meaning of the 1st sentence, particularly the “rectangular openings”.	A	This section has been revised for clarity, including bullet points and additional illustrations. In addition, the text has been revised to specify rectangular <i>door and window</i> openings.

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
6	4	<p>Why even say that garages can be expanded to the rear...that is not possible on Eliot Lane. All garages are within a foot or less of the back lot line already. Expansion to the side is also probably not possible due to building codes which prohibit building so close to an existing structure without attaching the 2 structures. The garages are so close to the back of the original footprint that I believe codes would not allow the expansion without attachment...please check that out. This is why we have 2 attached garages on the 2 Eliot Lane properties that we own. It is unfounded in reality to propose that it is possible to expand the original garages to accommodate a modern vehicle without tearing down the original garage and building a new attached garage.</p>	C	<p>This document focuses on the historic compatibility of changes, rather than zoning codes, parking enforcement, etc., all of which may vary or change over time.</p> <p>As such, it is important to address the compatibility of a wide variety of situations. Other city regulations may be more or less restrictive and will still apply to any changes made to properties in the historic district.</p>

7	4	<p>READ AND THINK ABOUT THIS:</p> <p>This is a very important point of disagreement that I have with these guidelines. Here we have a significant divergence between a desire to keep things original, which I support, and the modern reality of living on Eliot Lane—which the person writing this report most likely does not have to also live it.</p> <p>The City encourages people to use their garages for vehicle parking, laudable. We are the only people on Eliot Lane who use our garages to actually park cars and that is because the original garages really are not big enough for parking anything but a “Smart” car sub compact. All the garages, except ours, have been converted to living space or storage areas, and people park in their driveways (room for one car only), or on the very limited street parking. (There is only one street parking space for every 2 homes due to our narrow alley size and the small lot width.) This is why I do not believe the guidelines should prohibit the removal of the garage and rebuilding of an attached garage. It does not fit with the modern reality if cars are to be parked in a garage and to provide more parking on a very parking impacted street. If the attachment is done tastefully, set back and scaled down below the house roofline, it should be acceptable to make this compromise. This merits more discussion, however, and the city’s preservation office should make a recommendation after research and outreach on balancing this unique garage design and layout of the Lane.</p> <p>The other reason that this is an important point is because the guidelines accept the building onto the rear of the house to make for more living space. Usually, when a homeowner goes to this trouble and expense they want to add a bedroom and a bathroom,</p>	C	<p>Please see response to comment 6; the nature of the guidelines is to be flexible, as each case is different.</p> <p>Outcomes may differ depending on the resource, the goals of the project, and district in which it is located, as well as constraints like the ones you have mentioned here.</p>
---	---	---	---	--

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
		increasing the value of their home as a 2 bedroom, 2 bath house. The problem is that this sort of expansion only promotes more people and more cars per household. If every house has 2 cars then you have 4 cars for every 2 houses and only 3 parking spaces for every 2 homes... 15 extra cars looking for a place to park because they cannot park in the garage or on the street. Not to mention visiting cars looking for parking.		
8	4	<p>UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES:</p> <p>The recommendation to build onto the back of the house into the already small backyard also has another unintended consequence...the homes are then left basically with no backyard. But really... people who live in a house want an enclosed private space, a backyard of some sort. So while they want an extra bedroom and bathroom, they really are not willing to give up their yard, so what to do, what to do....well this is the common solution to that conundrum, which the City has done nothing to stop. They put in a tall solid gate across their driveway, (you will see many as you drive down the street), and that driveway space becomes their "private backyard". So what have you accomplished there? The original garage is hidden behind a tall solid gate and can't really be seen anyway. It completely changes the original look of the ribbon driveway ending at a small garage, and now the driveway has become "yard space".</p>	C	Gates provide a measure of privacy and security for property owners. Allowing a gate at the driveway is acceptable. The zoning code allows gates behind the front setback up to a height of 6 feet - 6 inches. The guidance under these guidelines, are that any driveway gates be constructed of appropriate materials, be stylistically compatible with the architectural style of the building, and be recessed back from the front wall of the house. The rear yard is the only acceptable location for additions because they can be done with little to no effect to the historic building appearance. Additions to the side or front of the house, or additions that attach garage to the house are much more visible and permanently affect the spatial relationship of house and garage. Though a gate may obscure view of the garage, it does not permanently change the historic features or the spatial relationship of historic property.

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
9	5	<p>Why even put this in, unless you are going to refer to it being unacceptable to convert the driveway into patio space by blocking it off with a gate? It is otherwise, due to the lot size, impossible to change the location of the driveway... there is absolutely nowhere else you could possibly put the driveways other than where they are at.</p> <p>Therefore, perhaps the prohibition should not be against moving the driveway, impossible anyway, but against the “re-purposing” of the driveway into patio or yard space, and prohibit putting up a “gate”, which is really the equivalent of a fence, blocking the driveway.</p>	A	<p>The guidelines have been revised to encourage placement of driveway fences/gates set back from the front of the house.</p> <p>We have also reworded the section to de-emphasize the <i>location</i> of the driveway, but rather the width and configuration.</p>
10	5	<p>“Walkways”: The picture used to depict an original walkway shows unoriginal porch steps. Original porch steps were all rounded at the corners. Wouldn’t it be preferable to show an all original set of steps and walkway? See page 11, bottom picture #4...that is an original concrete set of steps and walkway.</p>	A	<p>This section was revised and the images removed.</p>
11	6	<p>I personally take exception with interlocking pavers being a good replacement for the concrete walk. That is a totally modern invention and would not have even been possible in 1920. I do agree with the Spanish pavers as being acceptable as something that was possible during the era, as was brick.</p>	A	<p>This was a common comment, and has been taken into account. The guidelines have been revised to encourage the replacement of walkways in kind with poured concrete.</p>
12	6	<p>“There are no existing...decks on primary elevations”. Inaccurate, see page 2 picture of wood bungalow... .that is an existing but non-original brick elevated deck.</p>	C	<p>For the purposes of these guidelines, the term “deck” was intended to refer to an elevated wooden platform on the exterior of a home. This section has been further revised and the language is no longer included.</p>
13		<p>Tall obscuring gates across driveways to create a private patio space should be prohibited.</p>	B	<p>Please see response to comment 8.</p>

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
14	8	<p>“...most retain their historic clay tile coping along the edge of the parapets”.</p> <p>None of the parapet tile is “historic” tile. The tile that homes have on their copings is all replacement tile because even if the homes had coping tile to begin with, that original tile could not have survived the many times the homes have had to be re-roofed over the years. I defy anyone to point out one bit of coping tile that is old and historic tile from the original building of the homes. The tile that frequently is original is the one-piece “S” tiles that are still found on many of the front porches and small shed roof lines. See page 2, lower left picture, the front shed roof has original “S” tile, and would be a good picture to accompany the “Roof” discussion.</p>	A	The language has been revised the language to read, “Historically appropriate,” rather than “historic” to avoid being unintentionally misleading.
15	8	I’m wondering why on the bungalow homes only composition is recommended. These homes most likely had wood shingles originally, so why would that not also be encouraged and acceptable?	A	The guidelines have been revised to include information about wood shake/shingles and visually compatible substitutes.

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
16	9	<p>While I agree totally that the metal flashing as a roof finish is horrible, not period-appropriate, and should not be allowed, the 3rd picture of a parapet with no coping tile is an authentic and original look for Eliot Lane. I have pictures to prove that.</p> <p>Since these were “modest” tiny homes without a lot of fancy work details, I believe it is entirely possible that no homes on the street ever started with any coping tiles. This could be a detail that well intended preservationists have invented for Eliot Lane without any supporting data because it was a common building element during the time. However, I also believe that while coping tiles are attractive, they are not “necessary” for roof integrity and something that would have added to the cost of building these modest homes. My own guess is that no homes on Eliot Lane started with coping tiles. I can’t say for sure if some had coping tiles and some didn’t, but I can say for sure that at least some did not.</p>	A	<p>The guidelines have been revised to read that the clay tile coping may be retained if desired, or removed if there is sufficient evidence to suggest that it did not exist historically, but that it should not be replaced with visually incompatible materials, such as metal flashing.</p>

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
17	9	Also, your 3 parapet pictures on page 9 depict the characteristic “step up” at the parapet corners, which was so typical on Eliot Lane. While not all roofs had the step up, the majority did. As the pictures show, there was also more than one style of step up. Over the years, through termite damage, or strange additions, stepped up corners have been removed from homes either partially or completely. The guidelines should encourage the replacement of these corner steps... when a house is being re-roofed is the perfect time for the replacements to be made. Damaged parapet step-ups should never be removed; they need to be replaced.	A	An illustration showing the difference between an original parapet and an altered parapet has been added, as well as language encouraging the restoration of the stepped corners.

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
18	10	<p>“The other styles include a flush entrance sheltered underneath a small projecting pent roof...” I’m not clear if the discussion here is about what currently exists, or of what was originally built. The pictures “B&amp;C” are of remodeled and enclosed porches, this is not by any means an “original” design element. Porches “A&amp;C” are originals, I’m not certain about “E”. I suspect “E” is not original but can’t remember what it looked like before the remodeling occurred. No homes had “a flush entry door that leads to an interior vestibule.” There are a couple that I know of that had original flush entry doors, those are both original 2 bedroom houses where, the porch was forgone to give extra floor space on the small lots for the 2nd bedroom—one is on the corner of Eliot &amp; Colorado, and the other is 5 houses from the corner of 3rd St, mid-block. In those cases, the flush entry door led directly into the living room and there was no vestibule.</p> <p>Also, the projection over the “front door” on picture “B” is an added element, not original at all. I remember when it was built and the wooden handrail was added at that time too. The stucco homes never had any wooden handrails. Both “B&amp;C” would have originally been arched openings into a small porch as in picture “A”.</p>	A	<p>This portion of the guidelines was intended to discuss the existing conditions in the district, rather than what is or is not original; however, additional details have been added to this section to inform the reader about what changes have been made to certain porches, as well as to encourage the reversal of non-original enclosures.</p>

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
19	11	All stucco homes with the small 2 or 3-side enclosed front porches originally had arched openings, anything but an arched opening is non-original. This is why we have chosen the Spanish arch to represent our district and is the symbol used on our “historic district” street sign and in our Eliot Lane brochure to depict the “essence” of the district. The front door was always inside of the porch with the door opening to the side of the porch. From the front of the house looking into the porch you would not be looking at the front door, and usually there was a small closet window inside the porch that you would see from the street.	A	Please see response to comment 18.
20	11	It refers to retaining original wood handrails. Page 10, picture “D” is an original tubular metal handrail. I’m not certain about some of the other more decorative metal railings being original, but I believe some are. The wood railing pictured on page 10, “B” definitely is a recent addition. I think there is one bungalow that has a covered porch with a bit of wooden railing that would be original.	A	The language has been revised to say “ <u>Where they exist</u> , original wood railing should be retained...”
21	11	All porch steps had rounded corners. Any porch steps that are squared off are new steps as in the picture #2 at the bottom of the page. I would recommend eliminating that picture or replacing it with a picture of another set of original steps.	A	The images have been revised to depict rounded corners only.

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
22	13	<p>Please reconsider paragraph 6 and the wisdom of a prohibition against attached garages. The ability to tastefully rebuild the garage into something that can actually function as a garage was intended to function is a practical necessity on Eliot Lane and actually makes more sense to me than extra bedrooms and bathrooms.</p> <p>Personally, I would much rather see a garage re-built and attached than I would allowing extra bedrooms which add to the impact of more people, more cars and diminished parking. When you consider the true history of Eliot Lane...tiny little one bedroom homes, adding a second bedroom is more of a transgression and diversion from the original historic intent of the builders than enlarging and attaching the garage. I am not making this argument for myself, as I already have 2 homes with attached garages and do not intend to need more, but from living on the street, I do understand what works for residents and what doesn't work.</p>	A	Please see response to comments 6 and 7.
23	16	<p>Nowhere in the discussion is the term "sand finish" used, although one of the "acceptable" pictures depicts a smooth sand finish. These homes originally all had a smooth but sand finish. A true smooth stucco, non-sand finish, is as inappropriate for the district as are the heavy trowel finishes.</p>	A	The guidelines have been revised to emphasize and illustrate this important point.

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
24	18	I also take exception to discouraging the use of awnings even in the front visible areas. I have a picture of our house dating from the mid 1920's with a great big canvas striped awning above the front living room window. While these houses no doubt did not come with awnings from the builder, it was a very common and practical solution in the 1920's, for shading rooms from hot direct sun at a time when there was no such thing as air conditioning. Even today, awnings can be a practical and attractive addition to a vintage home and are also a very "green" alternative for keeping a home cooler. I can tell you from experience that those little boxes heat up like ovens in the summer. We have awnings that we could not live without on our driveway side windows.	C	<p>Property owners are not necessarily discouraged from using awnings, unless they are in one of the Craftsman-inspired homes within the district. This is because awnings are typically incompatible with the Craftsman style.</p> <p>However, all property owners are encouraged to consider other climate-control options, such as interior shutters or window treatments, before proposing to install an awning on the exterior of their home.</p>

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
25	19	<p>All of the original front doors on Eliot Lane were 15 light doors—3 across and 5 down with a 10-11” bottom rail on the door. At 309 Eliot, we have been in the restoration process for over 4 years. The new front door on that house is an exact replica of the original doors. There is only one house that I am aware of that still has the original 15 light door and that is a greenhouse of bungalow style with a glassed in front porch, about 3 or 4 from the corner of Colorado, east side of the street. It would be a lot better to depict an original door or original style door rather than a replacement door and maybe other compulsive restorers will opt to replace in the future with what was there originally if they knew what an original had looked like.</p> <p>The replacement door depicted might be labeled as an example of an acceptable alternative to the original 15 light doors.</p>	A	<p>The photo has been replaced, and information about evidence to suggest these multi-light doors are the original have been added.</p>

**Response to Comments – Linda Baker Babiak**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Page or Section No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Code</b>	<b>Response</b>
26	21	<p>I totally agree that the homes originally had clay tile attic vents. I disagree with the coping tiles being original elements. I also disagree that awnings, decorative wrought iron, and new decorative or inlaid tiles should not be added. (I confess, I have period correct awnings, decorative wrought iron and decorative exterior tiles installed at both of my homes.) If the City is going to promote the placement of coping tiles as an acceptable decorative element, then I think it should refrain from discouraging other decorative elements common to the 1920's which would include decorative tiles if...and this is the hard part, they are tiles of historic accuracy for the 1920 time period when Catalina and Malibu tiles were so common in Southern California.</p> <p>While it is true that these homes were simply built without a lot of decorative elements, modest homes for a budget price, things like awnings, coping tiles, decorative tiles were commonly added by homeowners during that time period and are not out of place for our neighborhood and not historically inaccurate for homes built in the 1920's. I believe that consideration should be given for adding such decorative elements, if period appropriate.</p>	C	<p>The approach is derived from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which is the set of standards most applicable to the types of changes being made to buildings in historic districts. These standards are the established best-practices for the treatment of historic buildings. Standard 3 reads:</p> <p>Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.</p>