



**MEETING MINUTES**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Tuesday, April 13, 2021

7:00 PM

Via Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Beth Bodan, Ken Itle, Mark Simon,  
Stuart Cohen, Suzi Reinhold, Aleca Sullivan, E. Dudnik

Members Absent: Jamie Morris

Staff Present: C. Sterling, City Planner

Presiding Member: M. Simon, Chair

Notes Taken By: C. Sterling

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM**

With a quorum present, Chair Simon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

- 2. SUSPENSION OF THE RULES:** Members participating electronically or by telephone  
A motion by Vice-Chair Reinhold to suspend the rules was seconded by Commissioner Bodan and approved unanimously by roll-call vote.

**3. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. 2410 Lawndale Avenue – Landmark - 21PRES-0023**

Joe & Shiela Keitel, owners of record, apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the Landmark structures north, south, and west elevations with replacement of fifteen (15) original true divided lite six-over-one double-hung wood windows with non-divided lite aluminum clad wood windows with interior grills between the glazing.

Applicable standards: Alteration [1-10]

**Continued from March 9, 2021. At the applicants request this case has been withdrawn from consideration and was not heard.**

**4. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. 1024 Lake Shore Boulevard - Lakeshore Historic District - 21PRES-0033**

Thomas Ahleman, architect, applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the existing non-original addition and construction of a single-story masonry addition with deck and pergola at the rear, alley-facing volume of the residence.

Applicable standards: Construction [1-5, and, 7-15]; and, Demolition [1-5]

The applicant gave a brief introduction on the project

- Replacement addition at the rear. Single-story but twice as large.
- Removal of existing patio and pergola
- Construction of a new deck and pergola to the south and east
- Materials include stained gray brick, with hardie board panels and vertical trim boards

- Hipped roof, main roof is asphalt shingle and a small shed standing seam metal roof over rear entrance
- Explained the north window configuration and intent to install new single pane art glass windows with exterior protective glazing

Questions:

- Commissioners asked about the north elevation windows, understanding why it was a fixed window, but questioned the varying sill height
  - Interior constraints
  - Commissioners stated understanding of the constraints and reasoning for the change from double-hung to casement/fixed windows, but thought aesthetically it is unfortunate
- Commissioners asked about the west elevation fiber cement paneling and recommended the use of stucco or brick here to replicate details from the home
  - Could look into this, but it was done in order to not include a specialized trade
  - Driven by the high sill height and interior furniture plan
- Applicant discussed the balcony, and custom iron railing
- Commissioners discussed the proposed roof form and whether consideration of a form more sympathetic to the existing home and addition
  - A gable roof was considered but is challenged due to the width of the addition, creating a shallow gable
- Commissioners suggested a change to the rear elevations material to continue the brick at the corners to the watertable to create the appearance of brick piers similar to the front facing elevation of the home and have the middle section of the addition be stucco, which would consequently resolve the fiber cement panel issue

Public Comment:

- None

Motion:

- Commissioner Dudnik made a motion for approval. Second by Commissioner Cohen and unanimously approved on roll-call vote.

**B. 1108 Hinman Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District - 21PRES-0034**

John Tomassone, contractor, applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness for alteration to the existing wood front porch decking, railing system, and stairs with use of a composite material and changes to the railing height, picket spacing, top rail, and intermediate posts. Applicable standards: Alteration [1-10]

Applicant provided a brief description of the project

- Existing porch has extensive rot and replacement is needed. Due to the severity of the rot and potential for future water damage, the homeowner desires a composite system.
- Major differences between the existing and proposed porch beyond the materiality are the use of intermediate posts due to material limitations and an inability to replicate the continuous top rail without use of wood
- No changes to the existing columns, base, shaft, or capitals

Questions:

- Commissioners had questions and concerns relating primarily to the use of intermediate posts and the change in appearance relating to the top rail. Additional concerns included not only the picket width but picket spacing as well.

- Chair Simon had concern with the ability to discern a composite material from wood and asked the applicant to explain the material in more detail including its limitations
  - The applicant is proposing the use of an Azek product in a faux grain which will be painted. The limitations are that the product is pre manufactured so it is difficult to do custom work such as the length of the top rail.
  - Commissioner Cohen recommended the use of a smooth azek not the faux wood grain, and noted that when painted, it is difficult to tell the difference between it and wood.
- Commissioners asked if the top rail could be custom fabricated and the interlocking system altered to make the continuous top rail possible, or if the top rail could be wood and attached to a composite newel post
  - Applicant didn't know if this was possible or not
  - Commissioners Cohen and Dudnik suggested the use of alternative products or custom made pieces
- The property owner discussed his concern with cost, the porch not being original already, and the use of similar composites on other front porches in the neighborhood
- Mr. Sterling stated that although non-original, the porch dates from circa 1930 when the home was moved to its current location and that he checked permit records for neighboring properties and if they have composite systems, they did not receive preservation or permit approvals to do so.
- Commissioners asked about the railing height compared to existing
  - Higher to meet code, but they could ask for a code exception if desired.
  - Commissioners determined that either the 36" height or ~30" existing would be fine although the 24-30" is more historically accurate.

Deliberation:

- Commissioners discussed the proposal and testimony provided by the homeowner and applicant. It was accepted that the use of a composite for the railing and decking was not objectionable, but that they should leave it up to the applicant to determine how best to keep a continuous top rail.
- Commissioners further discussed the desire to keep the picket spacing and dimension the same as existing.
- Commissioner Reinhold made a suggestion that the project be approved with conditions related to the concerns the Commission had.

Motion:

- Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal with conditions. Seconded by Commissioner Reinhold and passed 7-0. Conditions include:
  - The existing baluster width and spacing be maintained.
  - The existing use of a continuous top rail uninterrupted by intermediate posts be maintained.

**C. 1048 Forest Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District - 21PRES-0035**

John Eifler, architect, applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of non-original, circa 1940s additions, and construction of a two-story addition at the south west volume of the residence, construction of a single-story addition at the west volume, construction of a raised terrace at the south and west volumes, alteration of the south volumes half-circle bay existing first floor windows with french doors, and construction of additional site features including perimeter fencing, wood trellis, and in-ground pool.

Applicable standards: Alteration [1-10]; Construction [1-5, and, 7-15]; and, Demolition [1-5]

Applicant gave a brief introduction of the project focused on the following:

- The large additions proposed for demolition are non-original, non-sympathetic to the original structure, and create interior challenges and wasted space
- The original structure has a wonderful history and was designed by two influential and prominent architects, the additions were constructed much later (60 years later) and were not designed by anyone influential, nor are they well designed or constructed.
- Applicant described the 1940s additions as unfortunate collisions with the original structure.
- The interior and exterior of the new additions lacks adequate detailing
- The new owners want to remove the non-original additions and add a much smaller and sympathetic/contextual single-story addition in their place
- Believe the proposal will bring back much of the original homes character and proportions.
- Also proposes a large terrace and replacement of windows to French doors at the south half circle addition.
- No composite materials are proposed other than for the perimeter fencing
- Perimeter fencing takes inspiration from period colonial fences elsewhere
- Balustrade atop the new single-story addition matches the balustrade above the front entry portico

#### Questions & Deliberation

- Commissioners applauded the proposal and noted it was unique to have a client who desired a smaller home.
- Commissioners were in agreement that the proposal was an improvement to the many additions added to this beautiful home over the course of its life which significantly altered its form and proportion, predominately from the north
- Commissioners agreed that the 1940s north and west additions were not well designed and non-sympathetic to the existing structure
- Commissioners asked about the balustrade atop the proposed addition and if it would match the dimension of that above the east portico exactly
  - Yes, it is a replication
- Commissioners commended the work Mr. Eifler had done and the attention to detail on the proposed addition.

#### Motion

- Commissioner Cohen made a motion for approval of the project as presented. Second by Commissioner Dudnik and unanimously approved by roll call vote.

#### **5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of March 9, 2021**

- Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Second by Commissioner Cohen and approved 6-0 with 1 abstention (Commissioner Reinhold)

#### **6. DISCUSSION**

- New Commissioners Jacobs and Dreller were introduced to the Commission. Their first meeting will be in May.
- Commissioner Dudnik was acknowledged for this being his last meeting. His service to the Commission and public good was commended.
- Commission retreat was briefly discussed and proposed for a weekend in May. Mr. Sterling will send out some invitation times and finalize the speakers.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 8:30 pm