

Amelia Brackett Hogstad

From: Andy Johnson <andy@dajdesign.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 12:10 PM
To: Amelia Brackett Hogstad
Subject: 1006 Pine Historic Application Feedback

Hi Amelia,

I am really happy to see improvements being proposed to 1006 Pine St. The building has so much potential, and its an important one to invest historic preservation funds in. I would like to make a recommendation for improvements to be shared with the applicant and HPC.

The siding being suggested for the building is a typical lap siding seen in residential construction - smooth lap siding with a 4" exposure. It is true this would be a more durable product than the existing wood siding with the numerous coats of paint, however the size of the reveal is not consistent with the existing building's historic siding nor is the profile. Covering the building in this material could have a similar affect (probably to a lesser degree) to when older homes' wood siding was covered in the broad exposure asbestos-containing "wavy" siding, pre-painted steel siding, and vinyl siding. All of these options created durability for the buildings' cladding but changed the overall look at feel of the building itself. I like the choice of the smooth version of the suggested siding, but I think a lap siding will cheapen the overall look. I suggest the below siding options be considered, and I do so with recognition that the material cost of the siding will likely double as a result of the product substitution. Both products are extremely durable and hold paint really well in our climate.

- TruExterior, [Cove/Dutch Lap Siding](#), 5.5" exposure (this would be an exact match to the existing siding)
- Hardie Artisan Siding, [Artisan Square Channel Siding](#), 9" exposure

(This is the only Hardie product close to the existing Dutch Cove siding; its not idea but better than the lap siding)

If lap siding is the only option available, please consider the 5" exposure instead of the 4" exposure. I like the 4" exposure, however its just not as compatible with the building, as mentioned above.

This building would be an excellent candidate for local landmarking opening the owner up to grant fund opportunities, which could cover a substantial amount of the cost of the upgraded siding and potentially help make further improvements not being considered. There are numerous considerations that would help this building look and function better. Upon visual inspection, here are the items that stand out (keep in mind, I toured this building in detail years ago with one of the previous owners): the siding is in serious decay, the trim and building decoration has been altered poorly over the years and is in equally poor condition, the building appears to be uninsulated, windows and front door require significant repairs, and the floor structure and foundation require attention.

I strongly suggest that an HSA be conducted that includes the advice of a structural engineer to see what other opportunities may lie ahead for this building's continuation in the future as an important Louisville historic landmark. I would be happy offer my time and share with the applicant's architect about how to conduct an HSA in Louisville, if that would be helpful.

Thanks!

Andy

--

Andy Johnson, AIA

DAJDESIGN

w. 303.527.1100

m. 303.249.1624

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.