



## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Tuesday March 15, 2022

7:00 P.M.

In Person Meeting

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

Members Absent: Mark Simon, and Aleca Sullivan

Staff Present: Carlos D. Ruiz, Planner  
Brian George, Assistant City Attorney

Presiding Member: Suzi Reinhold, Chair

Notes Taken by: Carlos D. Ruiz

---

## **Agenda**

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

Chair Reinhold called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM with a quorum of seven Commissioners present.

### **2. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **A. 1514 Judson Avenue – Landmark – LSHD – 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; & 10-15]

#### **Continued from the February 8 meeting**

- Mark Schaefer, applicant and architect, provided the location of the site with the Mather west of the alley.
- The foot print of the existing 4-car garage is not changed.
- The existing railing on the rear stairs will be duplicated on the addition. As well as the corner boards, siding, fascia boards and the new windows are the same as the existing.
- Second story: the fire place has been moved inside.

- The roof pitches on the addition are identical to the roof pitches on the house (8/12).
- West elevation: repeating the window muntins, the railing in front of the door on the second floor. The windows are now raised.
- The overhangs are inside the property line.
- East elevation: the existing garage doors will be retained.
- Added corner boards and trim pieces across the bottom to tie in with the existing home.
- South elevation: 2<sup>nd</sup>-story, railing mirroring those on the existing house. The shingles are the same as those on the house. Same windows as in the existing residence.
- Brick and siding will be painted to match the color of the house.
- North elevation: the fireplace has been moved inside, there is a small chimney at the top, and an entry platform.

A motion to approve the project as presented was carried unanimously.

### **3. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. 1229 Judson Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District - 22PRES-0019**

Jeanie Petrick, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the structures primary elevation by opening a previously enclosed front-porch, removing two stucco wing walls above the existing roof line, altering the dimension of the porch stucco pilasters and stucco posts, and installing a new wood window in an existing porch door opening.

**Applicable Standards:** Alteration [1-10]; and Construction [3, 4, and 7]

- Jeanie Petrick, applicant and architect, said the project is to open up the front-porch which is currently closed (with storm windows).
- The project mostly is elimination versus addition and slightly changing some of the proportions.
- The existing storm windows, wing walls and top parapets flanking the porch enclosure and the wall beyond a column (separating the open entry way from the enclosed seating area) will be removed.
- The wing walls that extend above the porch line are very uncommon, or not found on any part of the rest of the house.
- The doorway (now enclosed) will be replaced with a window.
- The proposed wing walls will be wider and will look more like a column.
- The proposed walls by the stairs will be lowered and widen to emphasize the entry into the front porch.
- Commissioner Cohen asked why the parapet walls are being removed.
  - The applicant said, because the parapets are elements that are not seen in the neighborhood at all.
- Commissioner Dreller asked if the porch was open and then enclosed at some point, and now is being re-opened. Also, the wing walls are tapered, and the proposed walls are not.

- The applicant said that, she was not sure if the porch was intended to be closed. Also, the proposed wing walls are straight.
- Commissioner Klein asked if the wall/column next to the stairs was original.
  - The applicant said that there is no historical record. She showed photos of porches in the neighborhood that are similar in design to the proposed alterations to the front porch.
- Commissioners Cohen and Morris concurred that the project is architecturally well designed. They would have some concerns if the building was a landmark. Commissioners Dreller and Klein would have preferred to retain the battered walls, but that would not prevent them from voting for the proposed alterations.

A motion to approve the project as presented was carried unanimously.

**B. 1727 Hinman Avenue – Lakeshore Historic District - 22PRES-0020**

Studio Talo Architecture, applicant, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the west elevation roof face with construction of a gable dormer, replace the homes existing single-pane wood windows on all elevations, add skylights to the rear-facing roof face, demolish an existing circa 1990s single-story addition at the rear-volume of the residence, and construct a new two-story addition and covered porch in its place.

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

- Thomas Ahleman, applicant and architect, and Sean Frisch, property development manager for the owner were present.
- The applicant provided an overview of the project for the stone house with concrete and steel beam first floor, and built in 1940 for Foster McGaw.
- A 1990s addition includes a bay at the south end of the east wall and an enclosure on the upper right corner of the house.
- The addition is about 6-feet and a roofed porch opened on 3 sides leading down to a terrace.
- The basement will be finished with the addition of new mechanicals.
- First floor: the addition opens the kitchen to the family room.
- Second floor: adding a bedroom and a suite bathroom, building up over the existing roof and extending out [about 6 feet].
- Attic: adding a stair, bedrooms on either side and a bathroom (new gable on the front)
- Front elevation: It has Dutch wood siding to be replaced with a matching material.
- The main gable roof lands right on top of the head of the windows. The proposed gable dormer is zoning compliant. The dormer's window has privacy film and matching shutters. The dormer is stepped back from the front façade.
- South elevation: it has wood siding with the Dutch profile bead; limestone and wood shake roof. The main gable vents become windows for egress. Also, the covered porch with standing seam metal roof.
- North elevation: the roof of the addition is cedar shake roof to match the cedar shake roof on the existing house.

- The proposed windows on the addition and the house are insulated glass Marvin wood windows.
- East elevation: existing sunroom with a membrane roof to be replaced with the proposed addition, matching the pitch of the existing gables. Same rhythm of the fenestration with muntins, and standing seam metal roof.
- The detailing of the columns matches the pilasters on the front of the house. Also, metal railing and stone that matches the existing house.
- The attic bedrooms have skylights.
- Commissioner Cohen asked Sean Frisch if he is a developer or the client's representative.
  - Sean Frisch said he works for the owner of the home, handling all their real estate across the country. They plan to use the house as a single family home for their daughter.
- Chair Reinhold asked the applicant how the additions relate to the context around the house.
  - The applicant said the north wall is setback five feet, in the rear is setback 80 feet (zoning compliant). Compared to the other residences in the area it is a bit smaller. The lot is 12,972 square feet, providing 3,891.6 square feet (lot coverage). With the addition is 3,204 square feet, with 600 square feet that could be still developed.
- Commissioner Klein asked how many windows are rotted or with severe deterioration.
  - The applicant said that not all windows are falling apart. Several are not in great shape, not likely to be historically significant and not insulated. To improve the property and not improve the windows, while maintaining the look and the material of the windows, did not seem to make sense. The storm windows will come off.
- Commissioner Cohen commented on the front-facing dormer's width. He said a narrow dormer (to the width of the bathroom) emphasizing the vertical axis of the entry door would be more in scale with the roof.
  - The applicant said they are using the existing roof pitches, not using a steeper pitch or shed roof. The ceiling height is 6.8 feet for the shower, most of the toilet and the back. From the outside, the house has a large gable that lands right above the eave of the window(s). The proposed dormer works well proportionally.
- Commissioner Morris said that the relationship between solid to void of the dormer window and the walls is similar to what it is the existing on the second-story.

**Public Comment:**

- Mary Singh of 1711 Hinman Avenue said that there are three single-family landmarks homes in their block. She asked that Commission to keep in mind protecting the value of these historic homes.
- Peggy Reitz of 1725 Hinman Avenue said that their Cape Cod house will be dwarfed by the proposed addition next door to the north. The addition extends way pass the rear of their house. She encouraged the Commission to look at

standard 9 of alteration and standard 10 of construction. She also expressed concern for 3 air conditioners and a generator outside their master bedroom window. She was also concerned with the proposed gable dormer on the front of the home.

Ms. Reitz was concerned about the discussion she had with the owner that said that his daughter will live in the house and invite 3-5 friends to live with her; despite the Zoning ordinance section 6-4-1-14 limiting to no more than three unrelated person that can live together.

- Clare Kelly, Councilmember, 1<sup>st</sup> Ward, asked the Commission to consider the negative impact of the proposed significant alterations and construction and apply the applicable standards (to safeguard and protect the historic districts, to protect the attractiveness for everyone, including nearby homeowners, protect the integrity of the neighborhoods, as well as preventing deterioration of the neighborhoods). She asked that the Commission reject the application for those reasons.
- Brian George, Assistant City Attorney, reminded Councilmember Kelly that it could be considered inappropriate for a Councilmember to use their position on the City Council to influence the Commission's decision, one way or another, on a site-specific project.
- Councilmember Kelly said that Councilmembers are ex-officio members of the Preservation Commission.
  - Brian George said that the City Council Rules do forbid Councilmembers testify before [Commissions] on site-specific projects, the same rule would apply here.
- Councilmember Kelly asked the Commission to consider special uses and verify the intended uses for 1727 Hinman Avenue.
- Betsy Lehman of 1733 Hinman Avenue said the scale and character of the proposed addition and exterior renovation, are not in keeping with the rest of the block. The proposed street-facing changes alter the front façade. The massive two-story addition rear addition, will significantly impact the use and quiet enjoyment of the house on either side. Also, the addition will significantly block light to her home.

Ms. Lehman expressed concern with the use of the house for student housing.

- Connor Shea of 1741 Hinman Avenue said that as a new homeowner, he was concerned with the size of the renovation. Did not see the need for six bedrooms. He had restored his front porch, which was closely vetted to the traditional 1895 structure. Also, the proposed dormer is a significance change to the house and the rear addition will extend way pass the other houses on the block.
  - The applicant said the height is 31 feet 11 inches, where 35 feet is allowed. They are using 600 square feet less than what they could. The addition is 6 feet on the first floor. The elevator is for the grandparents.
- Phil Reitz of 1725 Hinman Avenue said the purview of the Commission is in the Preservation Ordinance section 2-9-3 (G) 15. The Commission can discuss conditional use that relate to the district. There is something missing in the application which is, there should be an application for conditional use, or a declaration that [that use] is not going to be done.

- Carlos Ruiz, Planner, said the application is zoning compliant. The applicant is not asking for a special use. If a special use application is submitted, the Commission can make a recommendation on the special use.
- Brian George said the application is for a certificate of appropriateness.
- Commissioner Cohen asked if the Commission could issue a certificate of appropriateness, with the understanding that this is a single-family use, and the Commission does not endorse the issuing of any special use.
  - Brian George said that the only thing in front of the Commission is the certificate of appropriateness. To talk about things that are not on the agenda would be inappropriate.
- Commissioner Klein asked if preservation review is first or zoning review is first.
  - Carlos Ruiz said that zoning analysis is completed first, and then is the preservation review.
  - Brian George recommended that the Commission confine its deliberations to section 2-8-9 [Preservation Ordinance].
- Betsy Lehman asked if the Commission is confined to review the aesthetics of the project, where to the neighbors go for City assistance for the special use.
- Commissioner Cohen said, as an architect, he thought the project is well designed. If the use of the house is not compliant, he would think that the City perhaps could vacate the house and not allowed it to be used.
- Carlos Ruiz said that if a special use application is submitted, the neighbors within 500 feet of the property will be notified.
- Commissioner Klein suggested continuing the application so that the neighbors and the owner could discuss what is going on.
- Chair Reinhold said continuance should be related to an exterior element, it cannot be related to the use.
- Commissioner Dreller asked what the next step is after preservation review.
  - Carlos Ruiz said the next step is the review of the plans for the building code. The Commission's staff reviews the plans for compliance with preservation. Substantial alterations would not be allowed for permit.
- Sean Frisch, the owner's representative, said he manages all their construction across the country, personal and investment uses. He stated that the house is going to be occupied by the owner. It is not planned for conditional use to become a dormitory.
- The applicant said that it would not be appropriate to continue the application.
- Commissioner Klein was reticent about the proposed dormer on the front façade that allows the expansion of the livable space. Moving forward sets a precedent that property owners can go in front of the Commission, get the certificate of appropriateness for a single-family home, and then later go to other board or Commission, and say this was approved by the Preservation Commission.
  - Chair Reinhold said if Commissioner Klein had an issue with the dormer, that is a valid concern, and he should state the standards that are related to, but unrelated to the use of the home.
- Commissioner Cohen said that revising the attic's floor plan would allow the removal of the dormer and leave the front elevation unchanged.

- Commissioner Dreller referred to standard of alteration 2, the front façade roof form unimpeded is a distinguishing original character defining element of the property, and suggested that some other solution be found, to keep the roof form intact in front of the house. Commissioner Klein concurred with Commissioner Dreller.
  - The applicant said if the dormer is of legitimate concern, they will remove it.
- Commissioner Bodan asked if there are opportunities to relocate the AC units and compressor (for audible and visual compatibility).
  - The applicant agreed to look into that.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to issue a certificate of appropriateness to alter the west elevation roof face with construction of a gable dormer, replace the homes existing single-pane wood windows on all elevations, add skylights to the rear-facing roof face, demolish an existing circa 1990s single-story addition at the rear-volume of the residence, and construct a new two-story addition and covered porch in its place, with the recommendation to remove the dormer on the front façade and to revisit the placement of the air handling units and generator.

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

After discussion, Commissioner Morris amended her motion to reflect that the Commission requires the removal of the dormer on the front façade. Commissioner Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion carried. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 nay.

### **C. 1624 Wesley Avenue – Ridge Historic District - Landmark - 22PRES-0021**

Von Weise Associates, applicant and architect, submit for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a screen porch addition at the second-floor of the structures southeast front elevation, construct a conservatory addition at the ground-floor of the structures northwest rear elevation, alter the homes rear volume fenestration as indicated on plans provided, and replace the cedar shingle roof in-kind.

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

- Chip Von Weise, applicant and architect, and Marcus Confino presented the application for a second-story screened porch (south elevation), a greenhouse addition on the first floor (northwest side of the house).
- First floor/basement to be finished with a second kitchen. South elevation: second floor, they are raising the sill of a window and infilling and existing window opening.
- The house was built in 1868 and significantly altered in 1907 by William Otis.
- North elevation: first floor, removing two windows and replacing with three windows. Adding the greenhouse, and adding new lattice in storage enclosure. Second floor, removing one window and adding two windows.
- The replacement windows are Parrett windows. All of the existing windows will be maintained.
- East front elevation: adding a screened porch (south side) on the second story, not on the same plane as the bedroom on the north side.

- South elevation: first floor, raising sill of a window and infill a window opening. Second floor, adding the screen porch. Replacing the shake roof with a new shake roof.
- West elevation: new greenhouse and the windows to be infilled and a new window above the greenhouse.
- Screen porch roof line is raised for two reasons: first, the top of the window is 7.2'. If dropped down to meet the existing roof, it will be 6' (very low). Second, did not want to look as part of the original structure; it belongs, but is not part of the original structure.
- The greenhouse has a brick foundation.
- The Parrett windows match the configuration and profile of the existing windows.
- Chair Reinhold expressed concern with the front elevation and the screened porch strong horizontal presence.
  - The applicant said that they explored a flat roof and it was even more horizontal. The owner will like to use it as a sleeping porch.
- Commissioner Cohen expressed concern with the intersection of the screened porch roof and the main roof on the house. The screened porch needs more resolution and connection to the central mass of the landmark house. And if the greenhouse could be a shed instead.
- Commissioner Jacob asked if the greenhouse is an aluminum system.
  - The applicant said it is aluminum, and dark square tubing. They could provide the catalog information. The greenhouse is programmatically driven as an office with seating area and for growing herbs.
- Commissioner Bodan asked about the east and west elevations of the sleeping porch. Are the doors operable or stationary screens. Also, the narrow screen units add vertical elements, which do not exist anywhere else. She wondered about striking every other one.
  - The applicant said that the screens are stationary in the east and west, with one operable. The screens cannot be stricken every other one, because the screens would be too big. They had one design with four screens that they could show later.
- Commissioner Cohen asked if the greenhouse could be lowered to eliminate the removal of windows because the pitch of the roof.
  - The applicant said the lower the greenhouse, the bigger it gets.

**Public Comment:**

- Amanda Ziehm of 1632 Wesley Avenue, said their house was built in 1867. She welcomed her new neighbors while emphasizing the important consideration to be given to changing the exterior of historic landmark homes. The screened porch addition would detract from the symmetry and attractiveness of the stately home. Symmetry was a deliberate choice by the architect and it should be preserved. For this reason, she opposed the second floor porch addition. The fifth bedroom on the second floor was a sleeping porch at one time. She suggested converting it back as a sleeping porch.

- Janet Steidl of 1401 Davis Street said she and her neighbors (Mary McWilliams of 1606 Wesley Avenue and Joan Safford of 1618 Wesley Avenue) are concerned with the second floor screened porch addition at the southeast corner. The public facade of the building is on the east. Its face is comprised of a two-story volume, flanked by secondary one-story volumes on the south and north. The primary and secondary masses align across the east elevation and establish a strong symmetry and character of that façade. Other second-story masses are held back far from the front façade. The screened porch and the mass to the north do not align.  
The screen porch sits nearly in alignment with the character defining main façade and throws the symmetry of the building out of whack. It's visually heavy, weighing down the southeast corner of the house and throwing off its balance. The roof plan shows just how far the existing north and second volumes sit back from the face of the building. The secondary volume does not interfere with the character defining symmetry of the east façade.  
Janet Steidl urged the Commission to deny the second story screened porch addition and maintain the historic character of 1624 Wesley Avenue and the 1600 block of Wesley Avenue.
- Joan Safford of 1618 Wesley Avenue said she watched the former sleeping porch change in 1995 to become a bedroom. Also, the glasswork on the north porch, which was a screened porch and became a playroom. She referred to the south façade that directly faces her house. The south façade is barely visible from the street because the trees and bushes. The proposed work gratefully removes those trees to reveal the original south façade. She emphasized how close the screened porch would be from their bathroom windows (about 10 feet closer). She urged the Commission to deny the proposed screened porch.
  - The applicant said they are open to exploring the relationship of the scale and the proportion of that to the roof line. The use of the addition is not under the Commission's purview.
- Chair Reinhold asked how the City would address if a sleeping porch is permitted under a certificate of appropriateness; is there a way to address the possibility that that will get enclosed later and become a bedroom space.
  - Carlos Ruiz said that he would not be surprised that that could occur. There is no way to say that 'one cannot have windows, and it will always be a screened porch'. If enclosing a screened porch were to happen in the future, it will need to come in front of the Commission first.
- Commissioner Cohen asked if the feeling of the Commission about the screened porch is totally detrimental to the symmetry of the house, or could the porch be reduced in size, so the front wall would be pushed, perhaps where the doors coming out the closet are.
- Chair Reinhold said that she would like to see the architect revisit the structure as far as the scale and the rhythm of the openings, as well as the roof line, to see if it could be more compatible with the landmark
  - The applicant said that they will like to proceed with the project without the screened porch, or redesign it if they choose to keep the screened porch.
- After additional discussion with the Commission, the applicant asked the Commission to vote on the COA without the screened porch. If his client chooses to

propose a revised screened porch, it will be done under a new application and with the Commission's review.

Commissioner Dreller made a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness for 1624 Wesley Avenue to construct a screen porch addition at the second-floor of the structures southeast front elevation, construct a conservatory addition at the ground-floor of the structures northwest rear elevation, alter the homes rear volume fenestration as indicated on plans provided, and replace the cedar shingle roof in-kind.

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

Then she added that Commission moves to eliminate the screened porch addition from the project and approve the certificate of appropriateness for the remainder of it. Commissioner Cohen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. MEETING MINUTES**

##### **A. Approval of minutes from February 8, 2022.**

- A motion to approve the meeting minutes as presented was carried. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 abstention (Commissioner Bodan was not present at the February 8, 2022, meeting).

#### **5. DISCUSSION (NO VOTE WILL BE TAKEN)**

##### **A. STAFF REPORTS**

###### Design Guidelines and Long-Range Work Plan

- Carlos Ruiz said that Cade Sterling has transmitted the work to the Long-Range Work Plan [Committee], which will be in front of the Commission when the report is finished.
- Carlos Ruiz said he has continued working with the Design Guidelines subcommittee. They are taking a pause because it has been challenging to agree what the guidelines will entail. He is considering some of their comments and he will address them and work on a draft.

#### **6. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 PM on March 15, 2022.

The next meeting of the Preservation Commission is scheduled for **April 12, 2022**.