Development Activities Meeting Report (Version: 02/20/2026)

This report created by the Neighborhood Planner and included with staff reports to City Boards and/or Commissions.

<table>
<tr><th>Logistics</th><th>Stakeholders</th></tr>
<tr><td>Project Name/Address: 1321 Columbus Ave</td><td rowspan="6">Groups Represented (e.g., specific organizations, residents, employees, etc. where this is evident):
Manchester Chateau Partnership Alliance
Council District 6
Residents</td></tr>
<tr><td>Parcel Number(s):</td></tr>
<tr><td>Building & Development Application (BDA) Number:
BDA-2024-0065</td></tr>
<tr><td>Meeting Location: via Zoom</td></tr>
<tr><td>Date: September 2, 2026</td></tr>
<tr><td>Meeting Start Time: 6:00pm</td></tr>
<tr><td>Applicant: Tetiana Hladii, owner’s representative</td><td>Approx. Number of Attendees: 6</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Boards and/or Commissions Request(s): Historic Review Commission approval for exterior modifications.</td></tr>
</table>

How did the meeting inform the community about the development project?
Ex: Community engagement to-date, location and history of the site, demolition needs, building footprint and overall square footage, uses and activities (particularly on the ground floor), transportation needs and parking proposed, building materials, design, and other aesthetic elements of the project, community uses, amenities and programs.

The project is intended to improve the exterior of the existing house while retaining its historic character and relationship to the surrounding neighborhood. The proposal is primarily focused on replacing and improving the exterior siding and trim. The applicant stated that there are no proposed changes to the overall structure, roofline, or locations and sizes of the existing windows and doors. The existing house is a wood-frame structure approximately 21 feet wide and was previously covered with asphalt siding that gave the appearance of brick.

The proposed exterior would use hardie siding in a blue color, with white trim and existing black windows and exterior doors. The applicant also proposed adding trim around the windows, a small canopy over the front door, and a handrail at the existing front steps. The existing steps and basement window openings would remain unchanged. Existing decorative elements along the roofline, including historic soffit, fascia, and brackets/corbels, would be retained, repaired as needed, and painted white. The applicant also stated that an addition at the rear of the property remains in place and would receive the same siding treatment.

The applicant noted that the project had also been discussed with the Historic Review Commission/Historic Review staff earlier that day. Based on that discussion, the applicant indicated that some of the proposed vertical siding elements on the front would be removed and that the front trim/cap would be adjusted upward, to the extent feasible for the wood-frame structure.

Discussion

Topic / Issue	Recap
Historic character and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood	• *Concern Raised:* The property is located on Columbus Street within the Manchester historic district. The community representative noted that Columbus Street is an important connection through Manchester and emphasized that the project will need to follow the applicable historic guidelines. The proposed colors and overall rendering were viewed positively, but there was discussion about ensuring that the exterior changes remain compatible with the historic character of the house and surrounding properties. In particular, the proposed vertical siding/board treatment was acknowledged as not being traditional to the immediately adjacent house, although it was also noted that the proposed treatment could be acceptable so long as it does not make the house appear out of place within the historic district. • *Who Raised it:* Neighborhood residents familiar with Historic District Guidelines. • *Applicant Response:* The applicant explained that the intent is to renovate the property while respecting and retaining its historic character. The applicant also indicated that, following the earlier Historic Review discussion, the proposed vertical elements on the front would be removed. • *Outcome:* The applicant will revise the proposal to remove the vertical siding elements and retain a simpler framed treatment. The revised drawings will be presented to the Historic Review Commission for consideration.
Window size and appearance	• *Concern Raised:* A question was raised about the window at the lower right side of the front elevation. In one of the presentation images, the window appeared taller than the other windows, raising a concern that the proposal might involve enlarging the existing opening. Because window dimensions and openings are important to maintaining the historic character of the property, clarification was requested. • *Who Raised it:* Neighborhood resident. • *Applicant Response:* The applicant clarified that the window is not being enlarged and that all existing window openings will remain the same size and in the same locations. The applicant explained that the particular window is somewhat wider than others because the house is approximately 21 feet wide rather than the more typical 18-foot width. The applicant also explained that the apparent difference in height in the presentation image was an artifact of the rendering/AI-generated image rather than a proposed change to the window. • *Outcome:* The applicant should ensure that the final drawings accurately depict the existing window dimensions and that no window openings are enlarged or altered.
Historic decorative brackets/corbels	• *Concern Raised:* Discussion focused on the historic decorative woodwork, including corbels/brackets along the roofline. It was noted that the existing property appears to have lost some of the decorative pieces that were historically present. Historic photographs indicate that corbels originally extended across the top of the building, similar to those on the neighboring property. There was discussion about whether the missing decorative elements could be restored. The applicant indicated that she had been

Topic / Issue	Recap
	looking for replacement pieces at Construction Junction but had not yet been able to locate suitable pieces. • *Who Raised it:* Neighborhood resident • *Applicant Response:* The applicant expressed interest in restoring the missing decorative elements if appropriate pieces could be found or reproduced. She indicated that she would continue looking for the historic pieces and would consider having them recreated by a carpenter in the future. • *Outcome:* No follow-up identified.

Link to Video Recording (if available):

Planner completing report: SJE