



MEETING MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 8, 2021
7:00 PM
Via Virtual Meeting

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

Members Absent: Beth Bodan

Staff Present: C. Ruiz

Presiding Member: M. Simon, Chair

Notes Taken By: C. Sterling

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

- A quorum of 6 members being present (S. Cohen joined later making quorum 7), Chair Simon called the meeting to order at 7:00pm

2. SUSPENSION OF THE RULES: Members participating electronically or by telephone

Action:

- A motion to suspend the rules passed 6-0

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. 1027 Judson Avenue – Lakeshore Historic District – 21PRES-0055

Kevin Panek, architect, applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of a rear addition and rear wood deck and pergola, construction of a two-and-one-half story addition at the east, alley-facing elevation, and alteration of the front porch roofing from asphalt shingles to standing seam-metal, and alteration of the front porch columns.

Applicable standards: Alteration [1-10]; and, Construction [1-15]

- Paul Armstrong, applicant, presented the changes to the proposal since the previous meeting including most prominently simplified and more sympathetic roof forms (gable and hipped with one flat portion), as well as introduction of shed and gable dormers above the full second floor which limited the perceived bulk of the structure from its previous proposal
- Commissioners asked the applicant to review the proposed fenestration for the structure specifically the Juliet balcony at the rear elevation
 - The first floor is above grade level due to internal constraints and the Juliet balcony provides an opportunity to open the kitchen space as much as possible to the back yard. Mimics the front elevation railing as well as the railing on the top floor of the rear elevation.
- Commissioners asked about alteration to the front elevation columns

- Applicant stated they were being altered from their current more ornate state to something more vernacular which they believe more closely matches the aesthetic of the home. The columns are non-original and in poor condition
- The applicant presented some additional alterations from the previous proposal which include mimicking additional front elevation original features and details on the new addition and previous additions of the home
- Proposed windows will match the existing windows
- Commissioners expressed that the new proposal was a significant improvement from what was shown the previous meeting and applauded the effort
- Commissioners questioned the north elevation fenestration, form and scale as compared to the original structure. The two gable extrusions could be simplified to one.
 - The challenge was accommodating internal stair access. This makes the fenestration not align perfectly with the rest of the structure
 - The width of the windows on the stairway will match the existing double windows on the original north elevation gable. This was a drafting error
- Commissioners offered a suggestion that the gable be simplified. If this change is desired, it could be approved administratively as a minor adjustment to the approved COA as well as mimic the general design of the south gable detailing and joinery

Action:

- Commissioner Cohen made a motion for approval with the condition that the changes discussed be incorporated. Second by Commissioner Morris and approved unanimously.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1145 Sheridan Road – Landmark – Lakeshore Historic District - 21PRES-0070

Bridget Montgomery, owner of record, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 16 circa 1913 wood windows as well as 13 circa 1990s non-original windows on the north, south, east, and west elevations of the home with custom manufactured aluminum clad wood, true divided lite windows to match the existing in general appearance.

Applicable standards: Alteration [1-10]

- Bridget Montgomery, the property owner presented the proposal, indicating that the windows proposed were the same previously approved by the commission years previously.
 - The home has many vintages of windows of many materials and profiles. The intent of the project is to have all the windows on the structure be cohesive in style and material
 - During the previous commission meeting they indicated the intent to replace all the windows but until recently did not have the budget to do so and the project was expedited due to safety concerns and inability to open some of the windows
- Ian Dunlap, Marvin representative, presented some detailed information on the proposed windows
 - Existing and proposed profile and component dimensions match near perfectly.
 - The lite pattern is custom and matches the division of the existing windows
 - Proposing a simulated divided lite not a true divided lite window with matching 7/8" muntins
- Commissioner Reinhold noted that when the motion is made, they should reflect that an SDL is being proposed as the agenda notes a true divided lite
- Commissioners asked how the replacement windows will transition into the existing brickmould

- The applicant stated what was previously approved was a full aluminum wrap of the exterior trim and brickmould
- Commissioners agreed it was appropriate to match this condition

Action:

- Commissioner Reinhold made a motion for approval. Second by Commissioner Cohen and approved unanimously.

B. 1050 Hinman Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District - 21PRES-0071

John and Claire Empfield, owners of record, submit for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the existing roofing material from ceramic tile to asphalt architectural shingles.

Applicable standards: Alteration [1-10]

- John and Claire Empfield, owners, presented the project.
 - During inspection before closing on the home, it became apparent that the roof was in a poor state and needed to be replaced.
 - ~80 cracked or broken tiles, water damage in the attic and significant underlayment issues. Due to the vintage of the roof, repair was not recommended since the roof was near the end of its lifecycle and repair would not resolve the underlayment issues of the roof.
 - Replacement in-kind would be ~\$225,000, a significant investment considering the home sold for under \$700,000
 - The proposed roofing material is asphalt in a green color to mimic what is existing in color. Many homes on the block have asphalt shingles.
 - The home has a low pitch roof
- Commissioners asked how much of the \$225k quote was labor and how much was material cost? Alternates to a real clay tile will be significantly less money but the labor may be similar.
 - This was not broken down in the quote
- Commissioners asked if they considered a composite material which would better mimic the texture and edge thickness of the existing roof?
 - Had looked into it but didn't receive any quotes to understand the cost
- Commissioners stated that the strong visual features related to the roof are its low pitch and deep overhanging eaves, not necessarily its materiality. The specific material is not referenced in the survey sheet as a historic feature.
- Commissioners stated that the color of the roof if replaced as asphalt is not necessarily important. Trying to match what is existing is admirable, but the color of the asphalt won't mimic the beauty and vibrancy of the existing roof, so something understated may be more sympathetic.
- Commissioner Morris and Chair Simon stated they would like to see some of the alternative materials explored further
- Commissioner Dreller asked that some of the existing tiles be salvaged and kept on-site so that future homeowners could reconstruct the roof as historically accurate if desired.
- Commissioners asked if they could make a motion to approve the asphalt shingles and a composite material as an administrative approval if the owner determined that was possible to avoid having to make the homeowner return to the committee
 - Chair Simon stated the motion should be for approval or denial of the asphalt shingle roof only since alternative materials were not presented or explored further
- Commissioners deliberated amongst themselves if exploring alternative composite materials was a worthwhile use of time considering the home is not a Landmark and the roof form. Commissioners stated that a composite would be cheaper than the

clay tile, but it would likely still be a six-figure number and the difference in cost would not be worth the minimally more compatible aesthetic.

- Commissioners were in agreement that a recommendation to salvage and keep some of the tiles on-site was worthwhile

Action:

- Commissioner Jacobs made a motion for approval with the recommendation that some tiles be salvaged. Second by Commissioner Dreler and approved 6-1 (Commissioner Morris dissenting)

C. 1629 Judson Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District - 21PRES-0072

Mosaic Construction, contractor, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to 1. alter the fenestration on the rear one-third of the north elevation by replacing three double hung windows with awning windows of smaller size, and installing one awning window on the center of the north elevation bay; and, 2. alter the fenestration on the east and south elevation of the existing rear addition by adding four double hung windows and a new entry door with sidelites. All infill areas to be clad with siding to match existing. Applicable standards: Alteration [1-10]

- Steve Ryniewicz, architect, presented the proposal.
 - The homeowners are renovating the kitchen at the rear volume of the residence and in that process they are proposing to remove some windows to accommodate the interior layout. These occur on the north, and east facades
 - The window alterations to the rear volume bay are minimally visible and partially obscured
 - Fenestration on this elevation is irregular with many varying types
 - Existing and proposed elevations were presented
 - One new window added to the center of the rear volume bay
 - Due to the unusual shape of the kitchen, the most logical work space was where the bay exists, necessitating alteration to the windows
 - The east elevation changes increase the glass area and propose new windows which more closely match the existing design vocabulary of the residence
 - Changes to the south elevation is limited to replacing a sliding glass door with a single swinging door with thin double-hung site-lites.
 - The proposed windows will be Marvin Architectural Grade windows. Window casements and sill treatments will match original conditions
 - Where the existing windows are reduced in size, the infill areas will match the existing 4" exposure wood lap siding
- Commissioners discussed the window alterations at the kitchen and understood that the proposed linear windows were above cabinets and would allow for passive lighting of the ceiling in the kitchen
- Commissioner Cohen stated that the idea of adding windows atop cabinetry is reasonable and not uncommon for historic homes, but the proposed windows are such a proportion that they are not necessarily sympathetic to the overall vocabulary of the homes fenestration. A better solution may be to remove cabinets from the bay altogether so that you had a large bay with windows at a backsplash height. Other alternatives exist in terms of reconfiguring the layout to accommodate the existing windows
- Commissioner Cohen made the recommendation that the windows on the east elevation have a continuous sill height rather than the current alternating height between center and adjacent windows

Comment:

- Milton and Michelle Zimmerman, owners, gave comment on the proposed work.
 - The existing windows, although large, have no view, looking directly at a brick wall across the property line.
 - The primary source of light for the kitchen will be through the new east windows. The materials proposed are appropriate, and the interior renovation will be a tribute to the homes previous beauty. The existing kitchen was poorly designed.
 - The neighbors to the north are supportive.
 - All alternatives to the kitchen layout were not feasible
 - The windows proposed for replacement are non-original and inoperable
- Commissioner Cohen stated that it is logical that there was no original window in the center bay considering the proximity to the adjacent building, but the windows on the side bays do give nice lateral views of the side-yard

Action:

- Commissioner Dreler made a motion for approval. Second by Commissioner Sullivan and approved unanimously

To accommodate the property owners request to provide additional testimony and evidence, the previously closed public hearing for the landmark nomination at 2715 Hurd Avenue 21PRES-0054 was re-opened at 8:35pm

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to re-open the hearing. Second by Commissioner Morris and approved unanimously.

- Chair Simon described the procedure which had been followed to date regarding the public hearing, the applicant and owner giving testimony, public comment, questions by the commission, and deliberation which ultimately decided that the Commission was in agreement that the property met the criteria for designation.
- The public hearing is being reopened to permit the owner the opportunity to provide new testimony at their request. Although out of the typical order of things, since the only remaining business is to pass the report and resolution, the Commission does not want to deny the owner the opportunity to provide new information
- Garry Shumaker, representative to the owner, indicated that the intent was to comment on the agenda item related to the resolution and report and wanted to know why the public hearing needed to be reopened
 - The hearing was reopened to give the owner adequate opportunity to give testimony and evidence which was part of the public record for this case and which could be used by the Commission to make a more informed determination and create a more informed report regarding the designation

Comment:

- Representatives of the church indicated that the church archives contained letters from the 1930s indicating that Dwight Perkins had a role in the design of the building but provided no evidence to that effect. It was suggested that Dwight Perkins took a prominent role and that his son and partners were ancillary to the design of the church. The claim was made that the report and nomination are based on the fact that Larry Perkins designed the church and that was not true.
- Additional concerns were raised with the ability to market the property as well as hesitancy toward the viability of the reports reference to development of the parking lot as a single-family home if the church were adapted to a residential use.
- The owners representative stated that the majority of the uses listed in the report would necessitate demolition of the structure and that adaptive use was not feasible.

- Representatives stated that aspects of previous drafts and commission memos regarding the property were inconsistent including how the structure was stylized
- Owners expressed frustration with the process and particularly with City Staff

Deliberation

- Commissioners asked that evidence be provided by the owner to corroborate the suggestion that Larry Perkins did not design the church and that his father Dwight Perkins had a significant role in its design
 - The owner was receptive to providing the documentation and asked how it could be submitted. Staff stated it could be sent via email or mailed for review by the Commission
- Commissioners reiterated that the Commissions findings and report are based on the evidence provided and the facts which are presented. The goal is to have the most accurate report possible and all available evidence to make accurate decisions. To say the report is flawed without providing evidence that supports that claim is disingenuous.
- Commissioners encouraged the owners to provide the evidence in their care and for staff to attempt to acquire additional information and evidence related to the claims that the designer in the report was misattributed.
- Commissioner Cohen stated that if Dwight Perkins had been involved, which was unlikely, it would make the structure even more significant than it was currently thought to be.
- Commissioners and City Staff discussed the procedure moving forward and necessary dates for compliance with the Ordinance.
- Commissioners stated not taking action on the resolution and report was prudent to give the owners adequate opportunity to provide additional evidence as they indicated would change the outcome of the Commissions decision to recommend Landmark status.
 - This was seen as sensible so that the alleged inaccuracies could be corrected based on new evidence provided by the owner between the June and July meetings and the owner seemed willing to provide such information
- Commissioners discussed the owners allegations of economic hardship
 - Chair Simon stated that there are codified procedures for proving economic hardship and required evidence and documentation that should be presented and can be considered if the structure is Landmarked.
 - The current procedure is to consider a property only for meeting the designation criteria. The City Council has full discretion and could consider additional concerns including the alleged economic hardship, which are beyond the Commissions purview at this point.
- Chair Simon stated the preference to continue the hearing to allow the owner the opportunity to supply any evidence they have and that no stone should be left unturned in an attempt to have the most information and an accurate report. There is no harm in waiting for them to provide the additional information they seem willing to supply.

Action:

- Chair Simon moved to continue the hearing to a date certain -- the July 13 meeting. Second by Commissioner Dreller and unanimously approved.

D. Resolution 21PRES-0073 – Recommendation that City Council Designate 2715 Hurd Avenue as an Evanston Landmark by Ordinance

Requesting the City Manager Transmit the Evanston Preservation Commission's Report and Recommendation that the Evanston City Council Designate the Lot of Record and Church Structure at 2715 Hurd Avenue as an Evanston Landmark by Ordinance.

- No action was taken on the resolution or adoption of the report 21PRES-0073 it will be on the agenda as new business for the July meeting.

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

- The meeting minutes of May 11 were approved as presented

6. DISCUSSION

- Commissioners and City Staff engaged in a discussion regarding in-person meetings

7. ADJOURNMENT

- The Commission adjourned at 9:45pm