



## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Tuesday February 08, 2022

7:00 P.M.

Via Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Simon, John Jacobs, Stuart Cohen, Jamie Morris,  
Suzi Reinhold, Carl Klein, Sarah M. Dreller

Members Absent: Aleca Sullivan, Beth Bodan

Staff Present: Cade W. Sterling; Carlos D. Ruiz

Presiding Member: Suzi Reinhold, Chair

Notes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

---

## **Agenda**

### **1. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. 2118 Orrington Avenue – Northeast Historic District – 22PRES-0011**

Garry Shumaker, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish two existing detached garages and an existing single-story addition at the homes rear-volume; construct a new two-story detached garage; construct a single-story rear-volume addition in the same footprint as existing; construct an open deck in the rear yard; alter the structures south elevation first floor fenestration at the proposed kitchen, and; alter the structures north elevation first floor fenestration to accommodate a larger side-entry.

**Applicable Standards:** Alteration [1-10]; Construction [1-5; 7-8; and 10-15]; and Demolition [1-5]

- Mr. Shumaker, applicant and architect provided a thorough summary of the proposed project noting the addition being constructed in the same footprint as the existing single-story rear addition, and construction of the rear-yard detached accessory structure replacing two detached accessory structures.
- Mr. Shumaker noted the details of the proposed addition more-closely mimicking the existing conditions of the principle structure and its original character
- Commissioner Klein applauded the proposal and noted the likely need to accommodate existing overhead utility lines.
  - Mr. Shumaker noted this would be addressed during permitting
- A motion to approve the project as presented was carried unanimously.
- Many Commissioners applauded the proposal and presentation.

#### **B. 736 Forest Avenue – Landmark - Lakeshore Historic District – 22PRES-0012**

Susan Bedard, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an addition to, and alter the fenestration, height, and roof form of, an existing detached three-car garage.

**Applicable Standards:** Alteration [1-10]; Construction [1-5; 7-8; and, 10-13]

- Stephen Knudson, consulting architect for the applicant, provided a brief summary of the proposed project.
- Mr. Knudson noted the intent of the proposal is to accommodate a recreational vehicle. The structure will be vernacular in nature, with simple massing and form sympathetic to the existing prominent gable of the principle structure as well as complimentary detailing.
- Commissioners asked for clarification on the proposed cross gable roof pitch, and if it matched the pitch of the existing home.
  - Applicant stated it would match the pitch of the existing home
- Commissioners asked for clarification on the proposed height of the structure
  - Applicant stated the height was 28'H, the max allowed for an accessory structure
- Mr. Knudson stated one clarification from the plans is that the proposed new windows on the south elevation will be wood to match the materiality of the principle structure, not vinyl clad as noted on the plans.
- Mr. Knudson noted the vernacular nature of this alley, with predominately single to one-and-one-half story garages of recent construction.
- A motion to approve the project as presented was carried unanimously.

**C. 1514 Judson Avenue – Landmark – Lakeshore Historic District – 22PRES-0013**

MRSA Architects & Planners, applicant, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a second-story accessory dwelling addition to an existing single-story four-car detached garage.

**Applicable Standards:** Alteration [1-10]; and Construction [1-5; 7-8; and 10-15]

- Mark Schaefer, applicant and architect, provided a brief summary of the proposed project.
- Commissioners discussed the proposed internal space of the proposed structure created with the intersecting gables. Specifically, Commissioners noted the intersecting gables did not relate to the principle structure, and create awkward internal space, primarily in the bathroom.
  - The applicant acknowledged the comments noting they were aware of the tight internal space. The plan was proposed in order to maximize interior space which is limited by the footprint of the existing single-story structure planned for re-use.
  - The applicant noted there is little context other than the rear addition of the home that provides a good starting place for the design. The block has limited integrity, and many large, non-contributing structures or vacant lots are in close proximity. In that way, the proposed structure has similar materiality and detailing, but is meant to be authentic in its own expression.
  - The applicant further noted the significant distance between this proposal and the existing rear addition.
- Commissioners discussed alternatives to the exposed, canted, fire-box which conflicted with Standard for Construction #6. Suggestions were made to internalize the fire box and chimney, or to extend the chimney to the base of the structure.
- Commissioners discussed the proposed minor zoning variation and asked for staff to clarify.
  - Mr. Sterling noted that the proposal triggered a minor variation request for rear-yard setback of 0'. The variation is minor because it is an addition in the vertical dimension for a structure which is already legally non-conforming with a 0' rear-yard setback. The issue is triggered due to an increase in the intensity of the use and need for additions to comply with the underlying zoning requirements.
  - Mr. Sterling noted that the neighbor to the south has written in support of the project and the zoning relief.
- Commissioners discussed concern with the proposed canted intersecting gables, specifically in relation to Standard for Construction #2, 4, and 6. Suggestions were made as

to better incorporate these features into a harmonious design vocabulary as they currently do not speak toward anything either existing or proposed.

- Commissioners briefly discussed the plan to paint the brick on the single-story existing garage portion while providing some guidance to the applicant.
- The applicant reviewed the recently constructed addition to the rear of the principle structure, noting that the addition above the garage intended to mimic many of these details including the trim work, windows, and exterior cladding.
  - The applicant noted the proposed windows were Steel casements.
- Commissioners noted that the drawings provided seemed to conflict with some of the testimony that was being provided. For example, the windows were proposed as wood on the application, but are now proposed as steel, and the proposed detailing of the garage addition do not appear similar to what exists on the rear addition.
- The applicant and Mr. Ruiz commented on the level of detail necessary for review and the need for the drawings to accurately reflect what will be submitted for permit as to not require re-review by the Commission.
- Commissioners asked for input on whether it was prudent to continue the case to allow for additional detail, noting that many details and annotations were not included and it was difficult to understand what the project would accurately look like.
  - The owners of the property asked that a continuance not be made noting significant challenges related to their construction timeline.
  - Mr. Sterling noted that the minor zoning relief was still pending review and determination, and advised the commission that a continuance was in the best interest of the body and would not deviate significantly from the projects current review time.
- The Commission provided specific direction on the information needed for the next meeting including adding annotations, providing accurate detailing of the project, and additional photos of the rear addition for context.
- A motion to continue the case to the next available meeting of the Commission was carried unanimously.

## **2. MEETING MINUTES**

### **A. Approval of January 11, 2022.**

- A motion to approve the meeting minutes as presented was carried unanimously.

## **3. STAFF REPORTS / DISCUSSION**

### **A. Design Guidelines**

- Mr. Ruiz provided a summary of the project timeline and next steps including development of a template for how the proposed guidelines would look.

### **B. Long-Range Work Plan**

- Mr. Sterling provided a summary of the project timeline and next steps noting the incredible work of the subcommittee and members of the outside preservation community to finalize the plans vision and value statements.

### **C. Pre-Review Subcommittee**

- Mr. Sterling asked the Commission for guidance on how to best proceed with the subcommittee, noting its success in providing more complete applications.
  - Commissioners stated a preference to continue the program, to ask former members of the Commission to participate, and have a rotating member from the current commission.

## **4. ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the Preservation Commission is scheduled for **March 8, 2022.**

**APPROVED**