1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Simon called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm with a quorum of seven Commissioners present. Commissioner Vogel arrived at 7:15

2. OLD BUSINESS


Without discussion Commissioner Bady made a motion to remove 2390 Orrington Avenue from the Commission’s agenda, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion was approved. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

B. 2404 Ridge Ave. (L) – Chris Sweitzer, applicant. Post approval alterations: 1) North Side of Barn: Existing conditions, no changes or alterations. 2) East Side of Barn: far left door replacement was in approved plans but not completed. Approved plans include addition of six skylights. Three skylights were removed from West side of Barn for symmetry and balance and added to East side of barn. Thus, there are three less skylights existing than in original plans. No other changes. 3) South Side of Barn: one less window was installed and is existing than in original plans. Existing window larger than originally approved plans. 4) West Side of Barn: 3 skylights were removed and added to East Side of barn for symmetry and balance. Second floor no change, all windows existing as original plans. First floor minor changes to window positions...
Chair Simon said the current Commission does not have any authority to review modifications approved 20 years ago by the then Commission. However, it has come to light that there are modifications made which were not part of the approval.

Rick Sweitzer, owner, presented the application for post approval of exterior alterations to the barn at 2404 Ridge Avenue. For the last 23 years he restored the historic buildings.

In 2019 they presented to the City a three lot subdivision, when it was determined it would require a zoning variation, they submitted a two lot subdivision, which is zoning compliant with the non-conformities of the barn.

In regard to the alterations to the barn, they have maintained that requiring another COA was unreasonable, based on the statute of limitations, the doctrine of res judicata, double jeopardy and administrative approval. However, they agreed to proceed with the COA application as follows:

- East elevation – 3 skylights on east elevation (approved plans did not include skylights on the east elevation).
- West elevation – 3 skylights (approved plans included 6 skylights); first floor – one window added to north of door (approved plans added window south of door) and two double unit windows added to reflect second floor double windows.
- North elevation – No changes or alterations.
- South elevation – One less window installed on south west side; first floor – existing window larger than original plans, replacing larger window not installed.

**Commission’s Discussion:**

Commissioner Itle talked about the timeline, COA application originally presented to the Commission in 1997; in 2000 the permit was renewed for the same design as 1997, then he asked when the construction went forward, in 2000? R. Sweitzer said the construction had already begun and it was on going. They renewed the COA in 2000, because it had expired. Commissioner Dudnik said the COA had expired, and it had to be renewed in 2000, what happened over the next 19 years? Carlos Ruiz answered that the only time he renewed the COA was in 2000 with the same plans that the Commission had approved in 1997. R. Sweitzer said that the work that is continuing to this date is interior only.

**Public Comment:**
• James DeStefano, architect and resident said the west windows were not added by the previous owner, that the barn no longer looks like a barn. The value of the property is the homestead on top of Ridge with farm/park below.
• Peter Miller, was concerned with the skylights (3 facing east and 3 facing west), which are visible from the public way, and the subsequent changes to the barn should be reverted to what was approved in 1997.

Commission’s Findings:

Commissioners Dudnik and Itle asked what recourse does the City have when somebody did not build what had been approved. Hugh DuBose said that not building to the COA is an ordinance violation in itself. However, the Commission does not have any kinds of adjudicative powers, such as issuing fines. For tonight’s meeting, the basic question is whether to approve the amendment to the COA or not.

Commissioner Itle noted that in the 1997 minutes the skylights were a big point of contention, and the fact that one of the major changes was to shift the skylights around to the opposite side, a critical point, that the skylights be on the one back side. To make that kind of a change, without even asking the question, seems very difficult to accept after the fact.

Commissioner Dudnik said the Commission did not get any explanation for any of the changes. The applicant needed to explain any of these substantive changes, not just the three skylights. R. Sweitzer said that they were working regularly with the Preservation Coordinator (Carlos Ruiz) and with the City inspectors and the zoning staff. Once the permit was issued (with the inspectors), he does not recall what was discussed with C. Ruiz if there was approval given administratively, he could not tell if one happened in 2001 or 2002. He does not recall the discussion he had with the City about each alteration, but it was a matter of discussion regularly.

Chair Simon asked about the skylights being visible from the public way. R. Sweitzer said the skylights are little visible from the public way. Commissioner Sullivan noted that on the west façade, the wider windows, from the original minutes, were not approved. Commissioner Reinhold asked if the Commission does not approve the alterations, what will happen. C. Ruiz said the applicant has the option to appeal such decision to the City Council or modify the changes to the 1997-2000 plans. Commissioner Dudnik asked what was approved in 2000 versus 1997. C. Ruiz said the 1997 documents are the same drawings that he approved in 2000.

Commissioner Elliott Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 2404 Ridge Avenue for the post approval alterations to the original 1997 approved project, including changes to the location of three of the skylights, not relocating one of the doors, changes to windows on the south side, including size of the windows, and some other changes that are all to windows and window positions, in accordance with applicable standards 1-10 for alteration (per Section 2-8-9 (A)(1)-(10)), seconded by Commissioner Ken Itle. The motion failed. Vote: 1 aye (Simon), 6 nays (Bady, Dudnik, Itle, Reinhold, Sullivan and Vogel).
C. 2404 Ridge Ave. (L) - Advisory review on proposed subdivision - Chris Sweitzer, applicant. The proposed subdivision includes the division of 1 lot into 2 lots. The proposed lot #1 will include the existing principal and secondary structures. The proposed lot #2 is existing vacant land. Thus, the landmark structures are preserved and will remain as a part of their own parcel, and not adversely affected. Applicable standards [2-8-12 (B) 1 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and 2] (Continued from 6/11/2019 and 7/9/2019)

Rick Sweitzer, owner, presented the application for the proposed subdivision of 1 lot into 2 lots. The two historic structures remain in lot #1; lot #2 to the south is 50’ wide.

Chair Simon asked what was the width of the frontage of the properties to the south. R. Sweitzer said he did not know.

Public Comment
Chris VanAvermaete of 1013 Colfax St. representing the Ridge and Colfax neighbors spoke against the proposed subdivision stating that the subdivision would altered the historic quality of the property and the neighborhood, the construction of a new house and garage on lot #2 would obstruct the view to the farmhouse and barn, and it will need to cut stairs on Ridge for an entry way. Also, he expressed concerned with the increase of density (up to 9 unrelated individuals) with one ingress and egress on a narrow alleyway.

Clare Kelly of 823 Colfax St. stated that the subdivision would reduce and destroy the value of the historic property and aesthetic value of the house. Asked the Commission to not recommend the subdivision and respect the City’s Comprehensive General Plan that supports the landscape settings that are as integral as the buildings themselves with regard to historic buildings.

William Ward of 2347 Ridge Av. Stated he is a resident for 41 years. If the subdivision is approved the Commission will no longer have influence as to what could happen in the future, and it could affect the farm house and barn. If the subdivision is not approved, that would not prevent the applicant from submitting plans for the Commission’s review. In this case the land is important to the historic character of the property as a farm. He asked the Commission to recommend City Council that the proposed subdivision be denied.

Diane Rucinski of 2354 Ridge Av. since 1996 stated that the Sweitzer Corporation has gotten a separate address for the property (2404 ½ Ridge Av.) because the intention is to develop the south side of the property. The proposed subdivision does not enhance the historic property and destroys the historic nature of the property and asked the Commission to consider not supporting the subdivision.
Commission’s Discussion and Findings
Scott Mangum said the City Council will review the application for subdivision. Chair Simon said the property is not in a historic district, if subdivided, the construction of a new home on lot #2 will not come to the Commission.

Commissioner Reinhold asked about standard 2-8-12 (B) 1. b. for subdivision, about providing the location and design of new structures that are visually compatible with the landmark. She asked how the Commission would determine that that standard is fulfilled, if the Commission is not seeing anything that is being proposed on the new lot. She was not sure how that standard is being met or even if applicable. Chair Simon said the task of whether the Commission is preserving the site is clearly applicable; the subdivision is going to affect the site. Commissioner Sullivan said if the lot is subdivided the Commission is giving away its purview over the proposed lot #2.

Chair Simon asked if the neighbors opposing the subdivision had any pictures that will show any kind of real feeling if the property is subdivided. Peter Miller of 2354 Ridge Av. said he provided to the Commission a memorandum with 3 pictures intended to show the skylights and what would be obstructed if there were a building on that 50’ wide lot #2.

Commissioner Itle asked information on existing trees and how they will be affected by any new development. R. Sweitzer said he has no intentions of building, nor he has any plans or proposed plans. Trees on the lot have been gradually dying and had to come down. There is one mature tree; the Oak trees probably would not need to come down.

Commissioner Dudnik asked is there a reason the Commission should approve the subdivision now and at his point in time. R. Sweitzer said is part of his property rights. He has long wished not to see it developed. It is the highest and best use of the property. Possible use was to have multiple lots. They came to the Preservation Commission and discussed it in 2002 as they recall, it was approved, but they did not take it to the next step to the City Council. They believe they have the right to do so.

Chris VanAvermaete said the applicant is not an Evanston resident, that there are more than 15 residents present who could attend the meeting. The applicant is being disingenuous. James DeStefano said to make an assessment the Commission should look at topography and landscape of the site.

Commissioner Reinhold said the Commission needs more information on the topography and landscape features before a decision could be made. Chair Simon said the issue is to decide whether we would be preserving the site. No evidence has been presented what the site looks like, why the subdivision would damage the site, why the placement of a new home in a central location, on the new site, would not adversely affect the site. He could not see why the Commission could not get adequate evidence from both sides and look at it next month and the Commission should go out and see the site.

Commissioner Dudnik referred to the standards 2-8-12 (B) 1. a (preserving or protecting the landmark), b (provide the location and design of new structures that are visually
compatible with the landmark) – the Commission has nothing to make a judgment on, where and what is going to go there; no zoning envelope or something schematic, and c. (not resulting in blocking or otherwise obstructing as viewed from the public way critical features of the landmark). The Commission does not have that. Commissioner Dudnik would like to see on the plat of subdivision the setback on all sides, what is the largest volume that one can build be there, what could be built there. At this point the Commission is being asked to suspend all judgement and expecting the Commission to trust the applicant that when and if something is built there that it won’t block the view of the landmark. At this point Commissioner Dudnik was not sure why the applicant is proposing the subdivision.

Rick Sweitzer said they don’t have plans to build now, and if they were to develop the property it would raise the ire of the neighbors. They have not commissioned an architect and have no plans to build there. Subdividing gives them the highest and best use, and would allow them to finish restoring the barn, making it habitable and dividing off that lot for someone in the future to use it, if should they choose.

Commissioner Itle said if lot #2 is established the Commission needs to see what the zoning requirements would permit as a volume/envelope/massing, so the Commission could judge what would the effect be on the landmark site, because the Commission would lose the ability to control that once is subdivided. And if there are mature trees, or if needed to be setback 10’ further than the typical zoning ordinance would require to not obstruct the view. This is the chance for the Commission to say that. Lot #2 is 10,000 SF that implies a very large house. The Commission needs to see at least the maximum volume the zoning would permit, so if the Commission would need to say ‘no’, the Commission has to be stricter than the basic zoning requirements, in order to protect the landmark property. The Commission needs to know that now before it approves the subdivision.

Chair Simon said that according to the City’s Assistant Attorney for this section of the ordinance, plans are not required. The Commission has the right to assess the effect of the subdivision on the site and the obstruction of the view, and so the Commission would like to ask everybody to speak to the question of what is there now.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to continue the proposed subdivision of 2404 Ridge Ave. to the meeting of September 10, 2019, with the request to the applicant that he return with a diagram showing the zoning setbacks and restrictions on lot #2, a 3-dimensional depiction of the zoning envelope of permitted to be built on lot #2, topographic and landscape information for the area of lot #2, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

D. 1514 Judson Ave. (L/LSHD) – Holly Briggeman, applicant. Renovate and add on to the existing rear volume of the house in order to enlarge the master suite, and add a family room off the kitchen. The project also includes the addition of a rear stair and a finished walkout basement. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; Demolition 1-6] (Continued from 6/11/2019 and 7/9/2019)
Holly Briggeman presented the application with revisions to the rear addition that complements the simple volume of the house, while separating visually the old and new with a glass transitional space. The addition materials are consistent with that of the house, while keeping the front volume of the original house, and adding a small front porch.

**Commission’s Findings**
Commissioner Reinhold asked if the railing in the rear is metal. H. Briggeman said the railing is painted metal. Commissioner Reinhold said the changes are appropriate.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to issue a COA for 1514 Judson Ave. for the renovation of the existing volume of the house to enlarge the master suite, and add a family room, and also to include the renovation of the rear stair and a finished walkout basement. Applicable standards include Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; and Demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays, 1 abstention (Bady).

**E. 1229 Judson Ave. (LSHD)** – Ben Myszkowski, applicant. Build a new 22′x22′ detached garage in place of existing 20′x21′ garage. The new garage will have a gable roof, with 6′ overhangs, asphalt shingle roof, Hardie Board siding, and 3 single-hung aluminum clad windows. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14 and 16; demolition 1-6] (Continued from 6/11/2019 and 7/9//2019)

Ben and Carolyn Ben Myszkowski presented the application for the demolition of the existing detached garage and revised design for the construction of a new 20′x21′ detached garage. The roof is now steeper than the previously proposed garage roof.

**Commission’s Findings**
The applicants confirmed that the exterior materials are Hardie Board and aluminum clad wood windows.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for the replacement of the existing garage with a new garage at 1229 Judson Ave. with Hardie Board siding as exterior material. Applicable standards: Construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14 and 16; demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

**E. 1015 Michigan Ave. (LSHD)** – William J. McKenna, applicant. Replace 14 wood casement windows from 2nd floor bay facing west (front) south (side) and east (rear), with Fibrex casement windows to match existing casements. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10] (Continued from 7/9/2019)

William McKenna presented the application to replace 14 wood casement windows from a 2nd floor bay facing west (front) south (side) and east (rear), with Fibrex casement windows. The windows are not original to the house and were added with the sleeping porch.
Commission's Findings
Commissioner Dudnik asked if the windows are original to the sleeping porch. W. McKenna stated that the house was built in 1912; the sleeping porch was built in the 1920s and winterized in the 1940s/50s, which is when the windows were installed. Commissioner Dudnik asked if the new windows are being sized to fill the openings. W. McKenna said, yes.

Commissioner Itle asked why using Fibrex instead of clad wood windows? W. McKenna stated that he talked to representatives of Marvin and Andersen, he chose Fibrex because its durability. Commissioner Itle said the replacement of the windows is justified, but questioned the material (Fibrex). Commissioner Reinhold agreed and stated that the Fibrex material is not appropriate for a historic property. Commissioner Dudnik expressed concern about the precedent of the Fibrex material. Commissioner Itle was concerned with the hollow section of the Fibrex windows. W. McKenna said he has a Fibrex door at the rear of the house and a variety of windows on the house.

Following a discussion about alternatives for an appropriate replacement window, W. McKenna agreed to replace the existing sleeping porch windows with aluminum clad wood windows.

Commissioner Vogel made a motion to issue a COA for 1015 Michigan Ave. to replace 14 wood casement windows from the second floor bay facing west, south and east with Andersen wood casement windows with an aluminum cladding outside, applicable standards for alteration 1-10. Commissioner Dudnik amended the motion for aluminum clad wood window replacement (not only Andersen) with staff review. Commissioner Itle seconded the motion as amended. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 818 Colfax St. (NEHD) – William and Laura Pelletier, applicant, submit for Advisory Review of a Minor Zoning Variation for a garage 2'-6" from the property’s east side-yard where 3'-0" is required.

William and Laura Pelletier presented the application for advisory review of a minor zoning variation necessary because the contractor poured the garage foundation 6" closer to the east side yard, with a setback of 2'-6" from the property’s east side-yard where 3'-0" is required. The Commission had previously approved the brick garage to match the primary residence.

Commission's Findings
Without any discussion, Commissioner Itle made a motion recommending approval of the minor variation for the garage with a 2'-6" setback, instead of the required 3'-0" setback, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.
B. 1022 Greenwood St. (L/RHD) – Aria McMillian, applicant, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the extant circa 1980s screen porch to accommodate a greenhouse on the south façade in the same dimension, the addition of four (4) windows on the south façade and two (2) windows and a pair of doors on the east façade as well as three (3) new skylights, renovation of the existing circa 1960s columns, balusters, handrail and newel posts on the existing front porch to more closely match the original aesthetic of the residence, and to remove and replace the front walkway in a different orientation. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Heidi Paul presented the application for the following:

1. The conversion of a 1980s screened-in porch on the south rear elevation to a greenhouse in character with the existing house.
2. Add four windows to the south façade; two windows and a pair of doors on the east façade and three skylights (not visible from the street). The six windows and pair of doors will be made by TMC Windows to replicate the existing wood windows. The new pair of doors is to access an existing roof terrace built on top of a 1970s addition. The oval windows on the east façade will replicate the existing oval windows on the west façade.
3. Renovation of the existing front porch columns, balusters, handrails and newel posts. The existing balusters and handrails were changed in the 1960s in their current form. There is no record of the front porch original design; the oldest photo is from 1954. The intent is to marry the front porch aesthetic with the original 1883 Edbrooke & Burnham house, highlighting the semi-circular brackets original to the house on the west and north facades, and to utilize a handrail and balusters that are found on a historically significant Edbrooke & Burnham house at 1456 Ridge Ave.
4. Remove the existing cement paver front walk and replace it with a field stone walk.

Commission’s Findings

Commissioner Dudnik asked where the architectural clues of the porch columns came from and how is known that the columns are not original. H. Paul said the columns are original to the porch, the handrails, balusters and post are not original. 75 percent of the porch is not original to the house. The front porch is not original to the Edbrooke & Burnham house. The original porch was torn down; a new porch was built in 1898. Subsequently that porch has been torn apart. Holabird & Roche presumably renovated the porch. The columns are in terrible shape, and there is no documentation on the second iteration of the porch.

Commissioner Itle asked if the research included the Sanborn maps showing what the footprint might have been. H. Paul said yes, she is hypothesizing that the existing footprint is the original footprint of the porch; its detailing has been changed in 1898.

Commissioner Dudnik wondered about going back to what it was, or to some extent reflect all the changes that have occurred over the history of the home. What is now, it
reflects that entire history. H. Paul they are trying to bring back the front porch with elements that are found on the east and north facades, such as the brackets.

Commissioner Sullivan said one can make a decision to restore something to a point where there is evidence. One of the beautiful things about the historic home are the columns, that may or may not have been original, but have been there for many decades, and in and of themselves are historic now to the home, and they are called out in the statement of significance. Some of the proposed changes are in keeping and appropriate with the character of the house.

Chair Simon said that the ordinance states that alterations could acquire their own significance. H. Paul asked if the Commission would consider to leave the Ionic columns but to change the handrail, balusters and newel posts (not original). Commissioner Itle said the applicant has a good argument that the existing handrail, balusters and newel posts are newer than 1954, and they are not significant on their own right, and so therefore, some other solution could be considered as long is compatible. The Ionic columns are at least as old as 1954 if not 1898. He said that it would be a mistake to remove those features.

Commissioner Dudnik asked more information about the greenhouse. H. Paul said the greenhouse is manufactured by the Texas Green House Co. it is a glass and steel greenhouse. Commissioner Sullivan asked if the hand rail and balusters are replaced they might have to increase in height to meet the building code. H. Paul said she would ask for an exception from the Building Department and keep it at 29.5" high, stating that the Preservation Commission would prefer to keep the existing height.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for 1022 Greenwood St. for alterations to the screen porch as a green house, changes to windows on the additions of new windows, doors and skylights. For the front porch with the understanding that the design will be changed to include retaining the existing Ionic porch columns, and that the modifications to the railing will maintain the approximate same height as the existing top rail, to be reviewed by staff. Standards for alteration 1-10 apply, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 1040 Hinman Ave. (LSHD) – Peter Laundy, applicant, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of 18 solar photovoltaic flush mounted panels visible from the public way. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Dorian Breuer presented the application to install 18 removable solar panels on the south-facing surfaces of the house. The panels and racking are all black and the panels stay flush with the roof, similar to the other homes included in the packet. The difference is that those panels are not all black. They minimized the number of solar panels on the south facing roof closer to the front of the house by moving solar modules to the middle and the back of the roof.
Commissioner Vogel said the application states that the solar panels are not visible on the front elevation of the house. He asked, aren’t the panels visible from the street? D. Breuer said what it means is by standing in front of the house or the front door, one cannot see the panels. The panels are visible from walking from the south to the north, like the other homes in the packet.

Public Comment
Valeria Piaggio and Jeff Filippelli of 1032 Hinman Ave. said they bought their house a year ago. They had good relations with their neighbors at 1040 Hinman Ave. Unfortunately on this occasion they disagree with the project. The benefits to the homeowner and the City are not commensurate with the impact it has on the views of the house, the neighborhood and the historic value of the property. These are black plastic panels on top of a red roof. The panels are prominent to them, their north facing windows have direct views on this roof; the panels will affect the value of their home.

Valeria Piaggio said there are alternatives to solar panels such as solar shingles, solar tiles and ground panels. The property is 12,000 SF so it could accommodate ground panels. Comed has a ‘Community Solar Plan’ concentrating enough solar panels for a large community, one can sign up and this is happening in the next few months. They are not opposed to generating energy to help Evanston achieve its environmental goals, however, they don’t agree with the materials chosen, some other alternative will have much less impact. Photos show that the roofs are very visible from the street. The roof is bright red and the solar panels are black. Another issue is reflectivity and how much glare is created. Jeff Filippelli said reflectivity increases over time due to degrading of the solar panel material.

Regarding reflectivity Dorian Breuer said the angle of the sun is mostly to the south and hitting a 35 degree angle, reflecting mostly up into space. The panels are tempered glass designed to last 35 years. It is a 25 year product. Also there are many trees between the road and the sidewalk. There is a shingle product from Certainteed and Tesla. The Tesla product costs 80K to 100K dollars and is not in the market yet. It is not a removable product. The decking and the shingles are removed to install the Tesla product. Unlike the solar panels, there are attachment points separated by 5’, it does not affect the house in that way. Ground mounted panels are a more expensive project in the order of 50 to 100 percent.

Commission’s Findings
Commissioner Vogel asked about the cost of the project and the savings in electricity cost to the owner. D Breuer said the project is 20K. The typical bill is $100 to $150 a month. Chair Simon asked if there is a special use of the solar electricity for this house. D. Breuer said it’s the same as the utility, it goes into the grid. First it feeds the house and then back feeds to Comed. The electrons generated by the system go back on the wires and feed the houses of all the neighbors. Commissioner Sullivan asked what would happen if the eight panels on the front of the house are cut out. D. Breuer said those panels are generating the majority of the power. That would remove the economic feasibility of the project. Commissioner Dudnik said the difficulty is the view in the lower
right hand corner, one can see the roof. There are the black glass panels on a red roof. D. Breuer said the glass panel is designed to reflect as little as possible. Commissioner Dudnik said the panels will be really visible in winter including the second group of panels. Commissioner Reinhold said they are not making any alterations to the historic structure, it is really minimal alteration. It is a feature that isn’t changing the historic home. The panels can easily be removed. It is hard to say they are damaging the historic preservation of the home. They can be taking off without destroying that historic roof.

Dorian Breuer said the return of investment in this project is five or six years. Thereafter, the system is paid for itself. Chair Simon said the Commission has the right to approve the addition to any visible physical features; it isn’t a matter of right. It someone was coming with something that is not green energy, he thought the Commission would not hesitate to say that we could approve or disapproved based on appearance. He did not think it’s a matter of having a right. The standards talk about the materials and finishes. The panels affect the historic appearance. The Commission has bent backwards to approve green energy features, that does not mean that the Commission has to approve the 100 percent of the time. Commissioner Reinhold said the Commission needs to be very clear on why or why not is approving these applications. Commissioner Itle said part of his thinking is about other types of roof related changes such as skylights. Although this is more expansive than a skylight, in some ways is analogous, one is changing something that is a roof material into a more reflective piece of glass, and from that point of view, and the Commission has approved all kinds of skylights and all kinds of orientations. He said he was not terribly offended by this proposal.

Valeria Piaggio said the contractor is promoting the materials he can provide, but there are shingles in the market since 2017. She appreciates the spirit behind the project, generating solar energy. Tesla roofs are available at the same cost with the tax incentives as other types of roofing. The Commission made a point about the trees, how they protect the view of these roofs from the street. There is a significant difference in couple of months away of what one could see. They are the ones maintaining those trees and they are aware how foliage changes the views and what it takes to maintain them. They are not against solar, but what would make less impact from a historical preservation point of view.

Commissioner Sullivan said she loves the cause of green energy, there has to be a marriage, when looking at primary facades and primary vistas of the home. If somehow maintaining those and give little more leeway on some of the secondary and tertiary things that the Commission still has purview over, and give more leeway for green energy and things like that when removable. However, the portion that really dramatically affects the perspective from the primary vistas, she had a problem with that. Commissioner Vogel said that he walked by the house, they have native grasses in the front yard, it is beautiful and a charming house. Now the solar glass panels don’t blend in with the roof. Chair Simon said the Commission in the past approved modifications to the front façade as well. However, the Commission should more heavily
scrutinized modifications to the most visible parts of the house, and it needs to be dealt on a case-by-case basis, in terms of whether the modifications adversely affect the appearance too much. He said the Commission should keep trying to approve these projects when the Commission can. Commissioner Sullivan said that one of the historic elements of the home is the red roof, she wished there was not such a dramatic contrast. Commissioner Dudnik said the Commission does not have purview over color, would the Commission have this discussion if it was a black roof or a dark brown roof, chances are everybody would have said it won’t show up.

Carlos Ruiz asked if there is an alternative to remove the panels that are on the front portion and relocate them in areas that would be less visible. D. Breuer thought there maybe two more module locations that were 30 or 40 percent less productive in the very back of the house. There might be a spot on a west facing roof where two panels could be fit. They would be losing two modules. It might jeopardize the project to make it economical. There are locations for four modules on other parts of the house, like further back. They would lose approximately 30 percent of efficiency. By removing the four modules from the front that would be a net loss of 30 percent of the productivity. Chair Simon said it seems that it may not work and asked D. Breuer if his clients could make the decision to continue with the application. D. Breuer agreed to talk to his clients.

Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue 1040 Hinman Ave. until September 10, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Vogel. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of July 9 and July 23, 2019.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 9, 2019 meeting as amended by staff per Commissioner Dudnik’s suggestions, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays, 1 abstention (Bady).

Commissioner Itle made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 23, 2019 meeting as amended per Commissioner Dudnik suggestions, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays, 2 abstentions (Bady and Vogel).

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Amending the Rules and Procedures – Article 4. Application Hearings, adding text to set the number of times an item could be continued without the need of a new notice. Also, amending Article 5. Certificate of Appropriateness List, Line 54: Solar Panels, and Green Roofs from “Major Work (Commission) to Minor Work (Staff) or Major Work (Commission). Changing Line 55 from Fountains and Landscape Features to: Wind Power Generators and other technologies for Minor Work (Staff) or Major Work (Commission).
Carlos Ruiz said that he submitted to the Commission the text that was discussed in Line 54 of the Rules and Procedures, reflecting what the Commission agreed to make the text changes, so now the Commission can approve those changes.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to approve the changed wording in the Rules and Procedures, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

B. Design Guidelines - Update

Carlos Ruiz said he met with IT staff. The guidelines were put in a format to be published on line in the same font as the City’s website. The next thing to do is create the links for things such as the standards for review, links to the National Park Service. By the next meeting the design guidelines should be ready to go on line.

C. 2019 Preservation and Design Awards – Update

No update.

6. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

A. Amending the Rules and Procedures - Article 5. Certificate of Appropriateness List, adding Line 56 Fountains and Landscape Features for Minor (Staff) or Major Work (Commission) and Line 57 Fountains and landscape features when a part of the statement of significance for a landmark for Major Work (Commission)

Regarding Lines 56 and 57 Carlos Ruiz said that it was introduced by Commissioner Julie Hacker dealing with fountains and landscapes. Staff is suggesting to adding some wording that not all landscapes would be decided by the Commission, but the landmarks or with Statements of Significance such as the Shakespeare Garden, the Rose Garden. The Commission agreed with the new text and will vote on it at the September 10, 2019 meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 pm, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully Submitted:

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, September 10, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)