



## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Tuesday December 07, 2021

7:00 P.M.

Via Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Beth Bodan, Mark Simon, John Jacobs, Stuart Cohen,  
Sarah M. Dreller, Jamie M Suzi Reinhold

Members Absent: Aleca Sullivan

Staff Present: C. Sterling; C. Ruiz

Presiding Member: M. Simon, Chair

Notes Taken by: C. Sterling

---

## **Agenda**

### **1. SUSPENSION OF THE RULES**

City staff recommends suspension of Article 2, Section 4 of the Commissions Rules and Procedures to permit remote participation.

- Motion to suspend the rules was carried on a vote of 7-0

### **2. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. 2514 Harrison Street – Landmark – 21PRES-0169**

Sam Kang, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the existing structures fenestration on the east and south elevations, and replace existing wood panel siding on the rear-volume single-story addition, with cedar clapboard siding to match the existing sidings exposure.

**Applicable Standards:** Alteration [1-10]

- Sam Kang, architect, provided a brief overview of the project and associated alteration to the homes fenestration to accommodate interior renovations including a proposed smaller window at the rear volume bathroom to provide additional privacy, as well as a larger window in the northeast bedroom to be code compliant for egress
- Commissioners discuss the need for additional drawings to compare the proposed window dimensions to the extant original windows
- Commissioners discuss the double casement window at the east elevation rear volume, particularly the double window being out of scale with the existing pattern of fenestration. It is suggested that a larger single casement window with faux meeting rail to simulate a double-hung as seen from the street be incorporated.
  - Applicant agrees to this change
- Commissioners discuss the rear volume bathroom window and concern that the change in window proportion creates asymmetry at the rear elevation where the pattern of fenestration is currently symmetrical and regular. It is suggested that the applicant explore alternate

locations for the bathroom toilet, or to proposed a full size window matching the existing, but with the use of frosted glazing to provide additional privacy.

- The homeowners and applicant indicate that the window shown is a drafting error and that they have discussed the desire to retain the same window size as existing whether through interior layout alterations, or alternate glazing material to provide privacy.
- Mr. Sterling suggests that the larger egress window at the northeast bedroom could be proposed to match the existing condition and suggested the applicant request an exemption from the Building Code for historic purposes.
- A motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved 7-0 with the following conditions for administrative review:
  - the applicant provide detail drawings of the existing and proposed window at the east and south elevation second floors;
  - the applicant modify the proposed south elevation double-hung window to more closely match the existing window in general appearance;
  - the applicant modify the east elevation proposed first floor casement window as a single casement with simulated meeting rail.

#### **B. 1115 Hinman Avenue – Lakeshore Historic District – 21PRES-0167**

Thomas Ahleman, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing aluminum siding with fiber cement siding, replace deteriorated windows in-kind, demolish a non-original addition at the rear-volume of the residence, and construct a single-story addition, covered screened porch, and uncovered deck at the rear-volume of the residence.

**Applicable Standards:** Demolition [1-5]; Alteration [1-10]; and Construction [1-4; 7-8; and 10-15]

- Thomas Ahleman, architect, provided a brief overview of the project and history on the home. The home is described as eclectic with an amalgam of stylistic features and irregular fenestration. The majority of the homes windows are in a state of disrepair that necessitate replacement. The cladding is in poor condition and was previously approved to be replaced with fiber-cement. The original cladding was stucco. The venetian or paladian window at the primary elevation had been covered but will be restored as part of the project.
- The rear volume addition and large screen porch were discussed.
- Commissioners asked about the existing style of the home and uncertainty that Colonial Revival is an accurate description.
  - Mr. Sterling responded that the style designation was what is listed in the survey report, but that other than the front-porch, regular fenestration, and overall symmetry, the home deviates from the Colonial Revival Style with some aspects of Gothic Revival as well.
  - Commissioner Dreller stated that the Palladian window at the primary elevation is a good indication of the Colonial Revival style, as is the homes overall symmetry
- Commissioners agreed that the home was eclectic with a mix of various window types and styles but noted that the rear-volume additions enlarged arch window deviated from any extant design vocabulary on the residence.
  - The applicant noted that it was an homage to the front Palladian window being restored.
  - Commissioners noted that although the two are arched, the proposed window at the rear has such a divergent radius that it is hard to tie the two together and suggested that alternatives be explored.
  - The applicant described alternatives which were looked at, all of which looked more awkward, or resulted in the loss of functionality as the intention is to bring as much light as possible into the interior vaulted ceiling.

- Commissioners discussed the rear additions cladding, and concern that the proposed paneling did not speak to the existing materials and textures of the residence. Alternatives were suggested with the most sensitive solution being to match the clapboard cladding being proposed for the principle structure.
- Commissioners discussed the proposed screen porch, noting that the large screen panels were out of scale with the existing proportion of openings. It was suggested that the applicant look at ways to reduce and break down the size of these openings to better reflect the pattern of fenestration on the home
- The applicant and homeowner provided comment on the design intent as well as previous alternatives that were rejected. Both showed a willingness to continue to work with the Commission to find a more sensitive solution
- Commissioners noted that the addition was very handsome on its own, but needed some changes to meet the standards and be more complimentary to the principle structures existing design and material vocabularies
- A motion for conditional approval was carried 6-1 (SC dissenting) with the following conditions:
  - the applicant work with a subset of the Commission to review revised concepts for the rear additions fenestration and cladding.

### **3. MEETING MINUTES**

#### **A. Approval of November 9, 2021.**

- Meeting minutes were approved as presented

### **4. STAFF REPORTS**

#### **A. Design Guidelines Update**

- Mr. Ruiz provided an update on the design guidelines. The update focused on changes to the previous outline and discussions with the subcommittee on how to best move forward and separation of roles between staff as the authors, and the commissioners as editors

#### **B. Approval of 2022 Meeting Dates**

- The 2022 meeting dates were approved as presented and will be uploaded to the Commissions website

### **5. ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the Preservation Commission is scheduled for **January 11, 2022**.