



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday July 12, 2022

7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Mark Simon, John Jacobs, Aleca Sullivan, Jamie Morris
Suzi Reinhold, Carl Klein, Sarah M. Dreller, Stuart Cohen, Amanda Ziehm

Members Absent: Beth Bodan

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

Presiding Member: Suzi Reinhold, Chair

Notes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

Agenda

New Business

A. 1210 Maple Avenue - Ridge Historic District - 22PRES-0081

Nathan Kipnis, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new two-story single-family residence and detached single-story two-car garage on a proposed subdivision of the parcel commonly known as 1214 Maple Avenue.

- Nate Kipnis, applicant, provided background on the revised plans which he believes address the primary concerns outlined at the previous meeting. These primarily included:
 - Introduction of a full, covered, front-porch
 - Modifications to the front façade to include a center rectangular bay which protrudes above the front roof face. The bay is clad in wood siding.
- Mr. Kipnis addressed each of the standards that were applicable during the previous meeting, and walked the Commission through a revised 3D proportion study which incorporated greater context and detail.
- Commissioners asked Mr. Kipnis about the front rectangular bay, noting some discomfort with it projecting above the roofline as well as the location of the bay and second story windows which seemed out of character without surrounding vocabularies and positioning (typically located under the eave). The positioning of the windows on the bay and it extending above the roof line create discomfort in relation to the solids and voids in the front façade.
- Mr. Kipnis noted that they had studied the bay and second-story windows extensively and this was the best solution they could offer. The smaller size of

- window related to keeping the building as energy efficient as possible. Reducing the area of solids in the bay would require even larger windows, which would create discomfort with the rest of the second-story windows.
- The Commissioners offered if the bay not extending above the roofline was a better solution which would reduce the solids in the façade and create more balance.
 - Mr. Kipnis disagreed, noting that they explored many options and felt it was important to have the bay extend above the roofline, as it present on a majority of homes on the block. Although more contemporary than other homes, the general form and positioning remains similar.
 - Commissioners asked about the roof form of the front-porch, and whether a sloped roof would be more aligned with surrounding vocabularies.
 - Mr. Kipnis noted that they explored different roof forms for the porch as well as different roof forms for the center bay. However, they all felt inauthentic and contrived.
 - Commissioners questioned the front-porch being canted, noting that columns or pillars were not necessary since it was anchored into the floor joists, but it seems visually unsupported as currently proposed.
 - Mr. Kipnis noted that this feature was important for the authenticity of the contemporary home, and is indicative of the contemporary style. They avoided other typical elements such as ribbon windows etc... but felt it was important to have this feature. The home is a new intervention in the District and its features should relate to its surroundings, ie: having a full front porch which aligns in positioning with its surroundings, but it should be represented in a way reflective of modern design and engineering. Columns and posts were necessary for the porches built in the 1880s, they aren't now.
 - Some members of the Commission expressed frustration with the decisions being made, noting there were other ways to create an authentic expression of contemporary design while being more visually compatible with ones surroundings.
 - **Public Comment**
 - Two members of the public spoke against the proposal, noting that the changes that were made did make the home more contextual than it was previously, but they agreed that changes to the roof form and front-porch were still necessary.
 - Additional members of the public who had previously opposed the project spoke in support, noting that the changes made did make the home more appealing and they believed the architect had done what was necessary to meet the Commissions expectations.
 - **Deliberation**
 - Commissioners debated the proposal as revised and whether it met the applicable standards or not.
 - Commissioners noted that it was important to react to what is being proposed and whether that proposal meets the standards. There are

certainly numerous ways that could make this project better, but they may not be necessary if the standards are met.

- Commissioners further noted that the term compatibility is essential to understanding this project, and that compatibility does not mean replication, but rather that what is being proposed does not detract from the character and integrity of the block and the surrounding homes.
- The proposal was found by a majority of Commissioners to be compatible in its mass and bulk, form, and materials.
- A minority of Commissioners expressed concern with the center bay and front-porch and asked if the case could be continued to allow the applicant to study these. The applicant preferred a vote be taken.
- **After deliberation, a motion to approve by Commissioner Simon was seconded by Commissioner Morris and carried on a vote of 6-3.**
- Following action, the applicant Mr. Kipnis provided some closing remarks and his belief that this project will be an excellent addition to the neighborhood and that he, and his client, were committed to that.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

A. Minutes of June 14, 2022

A motion to approve the June 14 minutes as presented was carried unanimously with one abstention (Dreller).

Discussion

- Mr. Sterling provided updates on the downtown architectural survey, noting that three teams were formed, and in the process of being scheduled to perform the work with an anticipated completion date of the end of September.
- Mr. Sterling provided an update on the long-range work plan. The subcommittee continues to finalize the document and is looking at the implementation section where initiatives will be prioritized. Mr. Sterling anticipated bringing the full document to the Commission at the regularly scheduled September meeting.
- Mr. Sterling noted that the Law Department offered to provide a training for the Commission which would focus on Roberts rules of order, the open meetings act, and interpretation of standards.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10pm