



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, July 15, 2025

7:00 P.M. North Conference Room #332A, Floor 3, 909 Davis Street

Members Present: Carl Klein, Thomas Ahleman, Sarah M. Dreller,
John Jacobs, Matthew Johnson, Stuart Cohen, Beth Bodan

Members Absent: Joshua Bowes-Carlson, Lesa Rizzolo, Charles Smith

Staff Present: Erin Baynes

Presiding Member: Carl Klein, Chair

Minutes Taken by: Erin Baynes

CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public are afforded three minutes per person to provide testimony related to items listed under discussion, review and comment, staff reports, or to otherwise address the Commission generally. Members of the public wishing to provide testimony on new or unfinished business shall be given the opportunity to do so following presentation by the applicant in a manner and under time limits determined by the Chair.

NEW BUSINESS

25PRES-0047 - 2819 Colfax Street - Landmark

Charles Neuhaus (Hanson Roofing), applicant on behalf of the property owner, submits for a certificate of appropriateness to alter the structures roofing material from a Hawthorne concrete tile, to asphalt shingle.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-6 and 10]; and Construction [7]

- Applicant presented the case for the replacement tile on the basis of lifecycle and feasible cost for the property owner.
- Maintaining and spot replacing the existing tiles is not feasible as they are deteriorating quickly and are well beyond their initial 75 year lifecycle. Cost of ongoing maintenance exceeds replacement.
- Replacement in-kind is possible but not cost effective for the owners who are on a fixed income. Roof is not considered a character-defining feature of the home. They were a cost-conscious decision over 100 years ago and a similar decision is being made today.
- Commissioner Bodan questioned the longevity of the finish on the replacement concrete tiles and its effect on the tile's ability to dispel water and weather.
- The applicant stated that they have serviced the existing roof multiple times and the process of replacing tiles with new concrete tiles causes significant damage to the roof each time that has to be subsequently repaired.
- Asphalt shingles would cost around \$20k with the replacement tiles at twice the price, with little visual impact on the homes integrity.
- The applicant also suspects that removal of the existing tiles would reveal rot in the roof decking.
- Commissioner Jacobs inquired about the prior patchwork tile replacement on the roof.

Chair Klein closes the hearing.

Motion to deliberate by Commissioner Dreller. Second by Commissioner Cohen

Deliberation:

- Commissioner Cohen stated that the preference is to have roof replacement match the original in visual qualities.
- Chair Klein stated that the textural qualities of the concrete tile and the proposed premium asphalt shingle were likely similar considering the projection of the roof.
- Commissioner Cohen agreed that the roof pitch is fairly shallow. Cooling materials and color will be important on the roof to reflect sunlight and solar gain.
- Commissioner Jacobs asked staff if the home is this in a historic district or is it an individual landmark?
- Staff responded that the structure is a landmark but is not located within a historic district.
- Commissioner Johnson stated that he prefers replacement in-kind but understands that the cost is prohibitive and in terms of the homes architectural integrity, the roof is not as significant of a character-defining feature and it can likely absorb change.
- Commissioner Dreller agreed and stated that the pattern and visual qualities between the two is similar enough in this particular instance.

A motion to approve was made by Commissioner Dreller and seconded by Commissioner Johnson. The motion carried 7-0 on a roll-call vote.

25PRES-0083 - 820 Sheridan Road - Lakeshore Historic District

Garry Shumaker, Shumaker Design Associates, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a non-original single-story masonry addition and deck at the homes rear volume and construct a new two-story brick addition and limestone deck at the homes west, rear elevation.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; and Construction [1-5, 7-13, and 15]

- Representative from Shumaker Design Associates presented the application and the inspiration for the proposed design vocabulary and built form.
- Commissioner Bodan asked about the south-facing windows and doors, and whether a railing was needed outside of the doors?.
- Commissioner Ahleman stated that it wasn't required per code
- Commissioner Jacobs asked what the inspiration was for the second floor balcony?
- The applicant stated that nothing particular informed the design but they wanted a product that takes paint and was sympathetic to the rest of the structures vocabulary and use of materials.
- Commission Cohen acknowledged the use of divided windows as opposed to undivided, but asked why the single panel windows are shorter.
- The applicant stated that the three panel window is not original, bricks were spliced to size and this was difficult to replicate.
- Chair Klein asked about the railing at the south elevation and asked if a rail was added, what would the applicant propose?
- The applicant stated that planter area below the windows is not walkable, they want to provide a transition in style at these doors but will make accommodations for a railing that is complimentary as necessary and if required.
- Commissioner Bodan asked if the french doors swing out?
- The applicant stated they were proposed to swing out.
- Commissioner Cohen stated that exterior doors usually swing inside, the hinges would need to be tamper-proof.

- The applicant stated that they were proposed to swing out as screen doors will be on the inside.
- Commissioner Jacobs asked what doors were being proposed?
- The applicant stated they were using the Marvin Ultimate Series and they would be clad wood.
- Commissioner Ahleman asked that more attention be paid to match the second and first floor windows.
- Chair Klein complimented the design approach.

The hearing was closed. A motion to deliberate was made by Commissioner Bodan and seconded by Commissioner Dreller.

Without further discussion, a motion to approve was made by Commissioner Jacobs and seconded by Commissioner Dreller. The motion carried on a roll call vote of 7-0.

25PRES-0082 - 1001 Ridge Court - Landmark - Ridge Historic District

Dwayne MacEwen, architect and homeowner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the original structures pattern of fenestration and construct a single-story addition to the structures attached garage at the north volume.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; and Construction [1-5, 7-13, and 15]

- Dwayne MacEwen presented an overview of the project. They started with kitchen remodel and added an opening from the kitchen into the attached garage.
- The home has triple-wide brick walls. They will replace the small brick on the outside and can use interior brick from non-visible wythes for the new addition that's proposed. This will ensure the new addition matches the rest of the homes masonry.
- They wanted to keep proportions of windows, intention to do have a true twilight room for line of sight from kitchen and from the room itself into the side yard.
- The addition although in the side-yard, acts and functions as a rear addition facing out into a rear-yard. The home has no real rear yard.

- Commissioner Ahleman asked if the existing opening was done with a permit.
- The applicant stated that they moved all interior walls under an interior remodel permit that was approved and the work got ahead of the timing related to the added scope for the addition. The opening seen now was proposed to be windows and a door facing the exterior, but is now proposed as an opening on the interior between the attached garage and the addition to the garage.
- Chair Klein asked if they kept the brick from the new opening for reuse?
- The applicant stated that they did.
- Chair Klein asked if the railing on top of the addition will match the railing in the yard?
- The applicant stated that it would and that it was proposed to be setback from the parapet being bolted to the interior of the brick wall.
- Commissioner Jacobs asked if the proposed door within the masonry arch is a swinging door?
- The applicant stated it was and would be the same door style and material as the main entrance door on the front of the home.
- Commissioner Ahleman asked how the opening into the garage from the yard was approved and whether it was approved administratively?
- Staff responded that they would follow-up on this question.
- The Commission debated continuing the case to receive clarity on the approvals but determined not to.

The hearing was closed. A motion to deliberate was made by Commissioner Jacobs and seconded by Commissioner Bodan.

- Commissioner Bodan stated that the masonry works and the scale of the addition is sensitive, but the scale of the new windows and doors at the side elevation is a little overwhelming.
- Commissioner Cohen stated that the new opening jumps scale but is proportional.
- Commissioner Jacobs stated that the addition does not face the street and adding two walls and a roof to complete the addition is a minimal alteration. The national standard of wanting a new addition to be both authentic in expression and complimentary, to not look exactly like the older vocabulary of the home is effectively done.

- The second story window is being replaced at the original dormer to act as a door for the new terrace.
- Commissioner Dreler stated that this was a sympathetic approach effectively just extending the window and its profile down to the new terrace.
- Commissioner Cohen agreed that the overall proportions are almost the same.
- Commissioner Ahleman complimented the design. It is visible from the corner and creates a better transition from the home into the yard. The proportions fit the house.

A motion to approve was made by Commissioner Ahleman and seconded by Commissioner Jacobs. The motion carried on a roll call vote of 7-0.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of May 13, 2025

- Approved without amendment.

DISCUSSION

Preservation Commission 2024 Annual Report

The Commission shall review and discuss the draft annual report, making comments or suggestions for edits and additions, with an emphasis on providing a list of key considerations or concerns for the City Council's attention.

- It was requested that the report include that the Cultural Heritage Awards were initiated.
- A request to include an additional column to the table on page 85 with the heading "Working Group and other Meetings Attended"
- Commissioner Dreler asked that the word "organize" be replaced with the word "initiate" and that the word "identified" be replaced with "initiated" on Page 80 #2. Initiative 2.10: Organize a Preservation Consortium or Preservation Advisory Sub-Committee.
- The following are the concerns which the Commission agreed should be brought to the City Council's attention:

- Add preservation staff
- Underscore importance of training for Land Use Commission and elected officials
- Preservation Commission is a resource and not a barrier

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 pm