



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, September 10, 2024
7:00 P.M. Council Chambers Room 2800

Members Present: Carl Klein, Beth Bodan, Thomas Ahleman, Charles Smith, Amanda Ziehm
Matthew Johnson, Stuart Cohen, Lesa Rizzolo, Joshua Bowes-Carlson

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Cade W. Sterling

Presiding Member: Sarah Dreller, Chair

Minutes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public are afforded three minutes per person to provide testimony related to items listed under discussion, 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 during those agenda items in a manner and under time limits determined by the Chair.

OLD BUSINESS

24PRES-0086 - 711 Michigan Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District

DeBaker Design Group, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an attached deck at the homes rear elevation, and alter the homes rear volume by constructing a single-story addition within the existing rear-yard.

Case withdrawn at the applicants request. Pending re-application for the October 8 meeting.

- No action was taken and the case will be re-noticed once a new application has been submitted for review.

NEW BUSINESS

24PRES-0123 - 909 Colfax Street – Northeast Historic District

Jon Proctor, applicant on behalf of the homeowner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the homes rear volume ground floor fenestration, demolish an existing single-story mudroom addition, and construct a single story mudroom and screen porch addition at the homes rear volume.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; and Construction [1-15].

- Jon Proctor presented the application, emphasizing that the home was only within the district and not individually historic or significant, and that the proposed scope of work was not visible from the street. Mr. Proctor noted that the scope of work was limited to removal of a small rear deck, an addition to an existing mudroom, and construction of a new three season room.
- The Chair noted that the home, although not a landmark, was a contributing structure within the district and did have historic significance, and also that proposals visible from the alley also fall under the Commissions purview. The Chair asked the applicant to identify a few standards that were considered as part of the design process and explain how the proposal is compatible with them.
- The applicant noted that the proposed materials would match existing, that the roof form and pattern of fenestration was compatible with the homes rear design vocabulary, and that the scale of the structure, being a single-story below the second-story windows, was compatible with the home as well as surrounding structures.
- Commissioners asked the applicant to further explain the relationship between the proposed additions mass and the neighboring property to the west to which it was most immediately related.
 - The applicant noted that the proposed addition does not impact the adjacent property's closest elevation, and views out of their windows as well as light and air to the property wouldn't be impacted since the addition is behind that homes rear volume. Since it is also only a single-story, and there is a fence and significant vegetation between, the impact is minimal and seems compatible.
- Commissioners asked the applicant to explain apparent discrepancies for the peak of the single-story additions ridge between the elevation drawings and the rendering. In the elevations, it appears the ridge is below the window sills at the second story, but in the rendering, it appears to be higher.
 - The applicant stated that the elevation drawings were accurate and the rendering was slightly distorted.

- Commissioners debated the compatibility of the relationship of solids to voids in the new screen porch addition, ultimately determining that the screen panels which read as voids in the façade, do not read as window openings, and so their scale compared to the pattern and proportion of fenestration at the rear volume of the home wasn't critical and appeared compatible.
- A motion to approve as presented carried on a vote of 10-0.

24PRES-0124 - 829 Michigan Ave. - Lakeshore Historic District

Jeanna DiMaria, applicant and architect on behalf of the homeowner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness, to construct a third story addition above the structures existing footprint, altering the rear volumes massing and roof form, and enlarging a side dormer above the full second story to accommodate new stair access to the third floor addition.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; Construction [1-8, & 10-15]

- Jeanna DiMaria, provided an overview of the application including the desire to construct a third story atop the existing half-story to provide a primary bedroom and suite for the homeowners and their growing family. Alternative locations for the addition were explored, but they did not work with the interior floor plan of the building and would result in a smaller rear-yard.
- The Chair asked the applicant to address some of the critical standards that influenced their design.
- The applicant stated that they studied several alternatives, but felt what was before the Commission was appropriate in its scale and mass, material use, and roof form as seen from the street.
- Commissioners noted the locations unique context, being adjacent to both smaller scale single-family structures and larger multi-family buildings. The location is also zoned for higher density and height, which makes a third story addition possible and the height of the proposal seemed compatible with surrounding design vocabularies.
- Commissioners noted that the change was minimized as seen from the street since the addition was pushed toward the homes rear volume. However, as seen from the sides and the rear, the mass and scale, as well as the directional expression of the home did not appear compatible. This was especially true since the rear addition is in the same plane as the first and second stories, creating a towering composition with little visual relief. The original qualities of the rear façade is completely lost.
- Commissioners asked if 3D renderings had been provided for the view from the alley, noting it would be nice to see a volumetric study from the rear to understand how the new mass and roof forms relate and intersect with existing.
- The applicant noted that she had prepared addition views of the 3D model in an earlier submission but it didn't appear they made it into the packet. Mr. Sterling acknowledged that, and with the help of Secretary Klein, was able to

get those materials on the screen to review.

- Commissioners agreed the 3D renderings from the rear were very helpful, but confirmed concerns with the scale and roof form for the addition as seen from the sides and rear.
- Commissioners asked about the proposed fenestration at the new addition, noting discrepancies between the renderings and the elevations. The renderings show an incompatible relationship of solids to voids in the side volumes of the new addition.
- The applicant noted that the renderings were intended more as volumetric studies, so the elevation drawings were the ones that accurately depicted the pattern of fenestration.
- Commissioners briefly discussed the rear elevations fenestration, identifying opportunities for a more appropriate pattern of windows before the applicant noted that other than the third story double window, the rest of the windows were existing and would remain.
- Commissioners Cohen and Ahleman identified the proposed roof shape as well as the proportion of facades as the standards of concern and provided the applicant with technical assistance to better meet these standards. Specifically, Commissioner Cohen noted that the existing composition has multi-tiered stepped gable roof forms and asked the applicant to consider repeating this influence through a third gable roof form that had increased height and allowed the roof pitch to more closely match the existing pitch of the two stepped gables.
- Commissioner Ahleman asked the applicant to consider a more minor adjustment and described the potential to reposition the third story's mass further west to allow the existing gable roof form at the rear to remain part of the composition by continuing that hipped eave line across the sides and rear and allowing the new addition to rear visually as two large shed dormers. This solution would minimize impact to the proposed floor plan, and would likely not increase cost in any way while allowing the same useable space in the bathroom, closet, and primary bedroom. This would allow the original qualities of the home to remain as seen from the alley and sides, and further break down the mass and scale of the addition so the proportion was compatible.
- The applicant acknowledged that she understood and agreed with this approach, but asked about the timing for review and revision.
- Commissioners Cohen and Ahleman noted that approving with conditions and deferring the change as an administrative review in consultation with up to three Commissioners seemed appropriate and would allow the project to remain on schedule.
- Commissioner Ahleman moved approval with the aforementioned condition. Seconded by Commissioner Cohen.
- Commissioner Ziehm expressed discomfort with this approach due to the complexity of the solutions that were discussed and difficulty understanding what those changes would actually look like.
- The Commission and staff debated the process and merits of approving with

conditions and deferring minor changes as administrative review with some Commissioners expressing concern that this approach, when changes requested are difficult for the entire body to understand, diminishes transparency and puts members who are not trained and practicing architects at a disadvantage.

- Mr. Sterling asked that the discussion about administrative deferrals occur at a subsequent meeting or that he would be happy to discuss the process and past occurrences offline, noting that if Commissioners feel they don't understand the changes being requested, they could disagree with the proposed approach and motion being made.
- The motion carried on a vote of 8-2 with Commissioners Ziehm and Klein dissenting due to concerns with a change that did not seem minor being deferred as an administrative review conducted by staff.

The Commission took a ten minute recess.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of July 16, 2024

- Approved as presented.

DISCUSSION (NO VOTE WILL BE TAKEN)

Associate Membership Program and Corps of Volunteers

Chair Dreller will lead a discussion related to Initiative 2.10 within the Preserve 2040 Plan -- organizing a Preservation Consortium or Preservation Advisory Sub-Committee to support and help increase available volunteer capital, expand coordination with partner organizations, and generally reduce demands on Staff and Commissioner capacity.

- Chair Dreller described the intent of the program as a way to expand volunteer potential and increase volunteer capital on the Commission and decrease workload on staff.
- Commissioners generally agreed with the concept, noting it would be a good way to keep former members engaged as well as create potential for people to contribute who do not have the time or desire to volunteer as a full Commissioner.
- The Commission asked Chair Dreller to come back with a more detailed proposal and noted that a survey of past members may be a good first step.

September Newsletter Call For Content.

The quarterly newsletter is scheduled to be released on September 26. Commissioners interested in providing content should do so by September 19.

- Staff provided an update on the newsletter and asked for

any potential content to be sent to him in the next week or two.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45pm.