



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, November 14, 2023
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Carl Klein, Sarah M. Dreller, Beth Bodan Amanda Ziehm, John Jacobs, Joshua Bowes-Carlson, Charles Smith, Thomas Ahleman

Members Absent: Samantha Steele, Stuart Cohen, Aleca Sullivan

Staff Present: Cade W. Sterling

Presiding Member: Sarah M. Dreller, Chair

Minutes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public are afforded three (3) minutes per person to provide testimony related to items listed under discussion and staff reports, or to otherwise address the Commission generally. Members of the public wishing to provide testimony on new or unfinished business shall be given the opportunity to do so following presentation by the applicant in a manner and under time limits determined by the Chair.

- No comment received.

NEW BUSINESS

A. **23PRES-0208 - 1021 Forest Avenue - Landmark - LHD**

Shumaker Design Associates, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter an existing single-story three car detached garage, constructing a second-story addition atop the existing ground floor footprint for use as an accessory dwelling unit, and constructing a new two-story addition to the

structures north volume. The Preservation Commission is the determining body for the Certificate of Appropriateness per Code Section 2-8-8.

- Garry Shumaker provided an overview of the proposed project including that all materials will match those existing on the home, which includes a larger addition to its rear volume completed within the last decade or two.
- The proposed windows will match the new windows on the rear addition of the home.
- The Commission asked about the existing garage, what year it was built, and suggested that it has a slightly divergent design vocabulary from the rest of the home, particularly the roof form.
- Mr. Shumaker indicated that the garage was completely rebuilt at the same time as the addition was constructed to the homes rear volume. It has new windows that can be salvaged as they are serviceable.
- The Commission asked if the applicant considered replicating a roof form for the proposed structure that complimented the garage's existing roof form
- The applicant responded that it had been considered but the new construction presented an opportunity to create a roof form more compatible and sympathetic to the home.
- The Commission asked the applicant about the necessary minor zoning relief, having concerns that the lot, particularly the rear-yard was too built out and not compatible with surrounding character.
- The applicant stated that minor variations are not the purview of the Commission to review.
- Mr. Sterling stated that the City Code conflicts in this instance where the zoning ordinance directs minor variations to the Commission for review and recommendation, but the Preservation Ordinance does not give the Commission that authority and controls in this instance. The Commission may review minor variations but does not make recommendations on them.
- Mr. Sterling noted that if the concerns raised could be tied to the applicable standards, it would be in order to discuss them further.
- Commissioners expressed concern with the bulk of the structure, particularly under standard for alteration #1 as well as standard for construction 5 and 10. It was suggested that an addition in only the vertical direction would meet the standards but the two-story addition to the existing footprint did not seem compatible.
- Additional Commissioners disagreed, stating they felt it was compatible, particularly in regard to the properties surroundings and the general character of the Lakeshore Historic District which contains many large coach houses.

- Mr. Shumaker expressed that they were required to retain the existing three off-street parking spaces which precluded stair access from the existing garage space, and necessitated the new two-story addition.
- A motion to approve as presented was made by Commissioner Bodan, seconded by Commissioner Jacobs and carried on a vote of 7-1. Commissioner Ziehm dissented under Standard for Alteration #1 and Construction #10.

B. **23PRES-0193 - 927 Ridge Avenue - Ridge Historic District**

Tom Lemberis, contractor and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the structures roofing material, replacing original slate tiles with asphalt shingles. The Preservation Commission is the determining body per Code Section 2-8-8.

- Todd Archermen, homeowner, presented the proposal, with emphasis on an insurance dispute that resulted in payment significantly below the cost necessary to replace the slate in-kind. The cost of the new slate roof would be disproportionate to the overall value of the home.
- Commissioners asked the applicant to provide more detail on the adjusters report that was included, and why repair was not considered.
- Mr. Archermen stated that repair was considered, and was preferred. However, he was told by both the adjuster as well as multiple contractors that repair was not feasible or financially viable due to the number of damaged tiles, need to walk on the tiles for repair, resulting in more damage and replacement, and insufficient underlayment that is the result of active leaks. To repair the underlayment, a majority of the tiles would need to be removed and replaced at a cost similar to full replacement in slate. Additionally, the tile roof is over 100 years old and at the end of its lifecycle.
- Commissioners agreed that repair was likely not feasible in this situation and that the cost associated with both in-kind replacement or replacement with a composite slate tile would be prohibitive.
- Commissioners discussed the proposed asphalt shingle, noting that the structure is listed as non-contributing, and that the proposed shingle does a decent job at creating differentiation in the general appearance of the roof and is a more sympathetic choice to a typical 3-tab shingle or asphalt shingle that replicates wood.
- Commissioners asked about the existing gutters and whether they would be removed or not, as well as the copper on the barrel dormer and roof ridge and valleys.

- The applicant stated that these would be removed and replaced with aluminum.
- Commissioners asked about the barrel dormer roofing material.
- The applicant responded that it would be shingles or a modified bitumen material.
- Commissioners noted that it was a character defining feature of the home that should be treated with sensitivity and asked if it could be replaced in copper
- The applicant said he would explore that but noted the other material, gutters, ridge, valleys, flashing etc, would not be copper.
- Commissioners agreed that copper in this location may conflict with the new design vocabulary and material pallet, and suggest the use of a standing seam roofing material.
- The applicant agreed to this.
- Commissioners asked about the sides of the dormer which are currently clad in slate.
- The owner stated the intention was to clad the side walls in asphalt shingle.
- Commissioners asked if the applicant would use a wood panel or siding instead to compliment the existing condition of the home and retain the dormers visual quality as a unique feature.
- The applicant agreed to this.
- A motion to approve with conditions was made by Commissioner Jacobs and seconded by Commission Ahleman. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

A. Minutes of October 10

- The meeting minutes of October 10 were approved without amendment.

STAFF REPORTS

A. October Newsletter Engagement Summary

Staff will provide data related to distribution of the October newsletter, the number of recipients, total opens, and number of unique clicks by content area.

- Mr. Sterling provided an overview of the engagement summary, noting an increase in viewership over the past newsletter, as well as an increase in those whom subscribe to the Commissions newsletter.
- Mr. Sterling noted that although the speaker series and presentations have been very impactful in person, the number of

views as a result of the newsletter seems very low and the Commission may consider an alternative or supplemental way to present that information moving forward.

DISCUSSION (NO VOTE WILL BE TAKEN)

A. Preservation Ordinance Overview

Staff will provide an overview of the Preservation Ordinance with a focus on what types of projects come before the Commission, what powers and duties the Commission has that fall outside of design review, procedure if members feel the Ordinance is not being followed, procedure for making changes to the ordinance or to make recommendations for amendments to the City Code, and aspects of the ordinance that deviate from best practice or nationwide innovative trends and approaches to preservation. Examples include demolition delay and demolition by neglect procedures, conservation districts, and registration and celebration of culturally significant resources that may lack architectural integrity.

The slides for the presentation will be made available at the time of the meeting on November 14 and subsequently posted on the Commissions website.

- Mr. Sterling provided the Commission with an overview of the ordinance and the responsibilities of the Commission followed by questions and answers related to the slides.
- Mr. Sterling noted that the presentation was intended to be used as a training tool for future Commissioners.

B. Nomination period for 2024 Officers and 2024 Annual Housekeeping Items

Nominations for 2024 officers, including Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary will be open through December with a vote on new officers held at the regularly scheduled January meeting.

- Mr. Sterling reminded Commissioners that the nomination period for 2024 Officers would be open through the December meeting with elections held in January.
- Mr. Sterling also reminded the Commission about other annual responsibilities including adoption of a 2024 meeting schedule at the December meeting, and work on the annual report to be reviewed by the Planning and Development Committee.
- Additional items for consideration include reviewing the Commissions Rules and Procedures, Eligibility Study List, and Rules of Circumstance.

ADJOURNMENT

The Commission adjourned at 9:45pm