



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday April 12, 2022

7:00 P.M.

Via Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Simon, John Jacobs, Stuart Cohen, Jamie Morris,
Suzi Reinhold, Carl Klein, Beth Bodan, Aleca Sullivan

Members Absent: Sarah M. Dreller Stuart Cohen

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

Presiding Member: Suzi Reinhold, Chair

Notes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

Agenda

New Business:

A. 1322 Lake Street – Ridge Hist. Dist. - Landmark - 22PRES-0033

David Roberts, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a front-porch addition at the front elevation of the residence.

Applicable Standards: Construction [1-2; 4-8; and, 10-15]

- David Roberts (the applicant) provided a detailed presentation on the proposed project including the history of the home and its former front-porch, as well as design queues on the existing structure and for the Italianate style more broadly that influenced the proposed design.
- The applicant noted that the rear and side porch additions are more vernacular than the proposed front-porch which would have been more ornate. No historic images could be located for an accurate reproduction, but the proposed design closely follows examples in associated pattern books for the style.
- The homeowners, Kitty and John Culbert, provided an overview of the work they've done to the home since they've inhabited it, including reconstruction and repair of the homes side and rear porches, a new detached garage, and now the proposed front-porch.
- The homeowners described the proposed project as a capstone, returning the home to its former state.

- Commissioners asked the applicant for more information on the proposed porch columns and height of the proposed roof. Specifically if the underside of the porch roof would obstruct the front door transom.
- The applicant explained that although subtle in the provided plans, the roof slopes in order to not obstruct the transom or any mouldings that are extant. As seen from the sidewalk, you would see the front door and transom unobstructed. The placement of the columns allows for a full column rather than a half column or pilaster.
- A motion to approve the project as presented passed unanimously.

B. 1211 Hinman Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District - 22PRES-0034

Paul Janicki, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to enclose an existing roofed side-entry porch for habitable space, alter the principle structures fenestration with new window locations, and install solar panels at the south roof face behind the south gable.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; Construction [3-4; 7-8; 10; 12; and, 13-14]; Solar Design Guidelines

- Paul Janicki (applicant), provided a brief overview of the proposed project including its limited scope (enclosure of small side-porch for use as a mudroom, and new window locations in non-existing openings).
- The applicant provided information on the proposed mudroom addition including the use of cedar clapboard siding of the same exposure as existing, retention of the existing exposed rafter tails, and complimentary fenestration.
- The applicant reviewed the proposed elevations and new window locations.
- Commissioners asked about the new front elevation first floor window and if a transom was being proposed to match the existing first floor fixed window.
- The applicant explained that the transom is not being proposed due to the height limitations under the porch roof. The trim and mouldings would match existing dimensions, and the head and sill heights (excluding the transom) would align.
- The applicant noted that the side elevation proposed art glass window would match its existing counterpart. The applicant further explained how the art glass window would be fabricated.
- The applicant reviewed the proposed solar array noting it was early in the process, but he wanted to propose a simple array on a secondary roof face that is not easily visible from the public way.
- Commissioners asked about the solar component and if the conduit would be visible, as well as how high the panels would

project.

- The applicant explained they were flush mounted with a minimal projection above the roof face, and that not mechanicals or conduit would be visible.
- Commissioners noted that typically more information would be provided to review the proposed windows as well as the solar array. Including proposed section drawings.
- The applicant explained that the window manufacturer had not been selected yet due to variability in lead time and product availability. Although they would be similar from manufacturer to manufacturer, they did not want to show a section that would not be accurate when they came in for permit.
- The staff liaison noted that the majority of the homes window program was replaced in 2005 and suggested that detailed drawings could be provided for administrative review once the permit was applied for.
- A motion to approve the project with the condition that the applicant provide detailed section drawings for the proposed solar array as well as the windows for administrative review, passed unanimously.

C. **1018 Greenwood Street - Ridge Historic District - 22PRES-0032**

David Salzman, owner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a second-story addition atop an existing single-story rear addition, construct a single-story attached garage addition with rooftop deck, and alter the structures front elevation portico.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; Construction [1-5; 7-8; and, 10-15]

- David Salzman, owner and applicant, (the applicant) provided a brief overview of the project and his intent to receive feedback from the Commission so he could begin preparing more detailed drawings with his architect.
- The applicant provided information on the proposed rear addition including its materiality which was primarily hardieboard clapboard siding and salvaged brick. The addition would be a simple cross gable at the rear of the existing home. The front elevation would not be altered.
- The applicant provided information on the proposed windows, which he noted are not accurately represented in the 3D drawing provided. The intent would be to match the existing six-over-six windows with an aluminum clad wood window with SDL.
- The staff liaison provided input on the structures classification as non-contributing noting that this was likely due to its age at the time the National Register District was formed (1980s), and the property being less than 50 years old at the time. Staff encouraged the Commission to review the proposed project as if it were a contributing structure and gave a professional opinion that it would be reclassified under a re-survey.
- The applicant asked for clarification on what it meant to be listed as contributing vs non-contributing. The staff liaison provided a description, but also noted that the code itself does not draw a distinction between these classifications, and the same

standards apply for all proposals.

- Commissioners asked the applicant whether the rear garage was original to the structure and how/if it will be altered.
- The staff liaison interjected saying that all the documentation the City has on file indicates the rear single-story garage and breezeway were original to the home, and they would be a common/evolutionary feature for a late 1950s Colonial Revival
- The applicant stated he was not certain but agreed it was likely original. The intent would be to retain the existing garage and breezeway, but build atop it. The recessed entryway would be modified both in its location and its materiality.
- Commissioners discussed the existing addition and asked the applicant to retain its original qualities to the extent possible, including the recessed entryway and to also explore retention of the metal paneling as these are features that may have gained historic significance over time.
- Commissioners indicated that the level of detail on the drawings provided were not adequate to provide a thorough review. The drawings should be more developed, and provide detailed information on the transition area between the home and the addition, how the brick and clapboard siding will meet, detailed drawings of the proposed windows in comparison to the existing windows, and detailed information on the proposed railing system.
- The applicant stated he could produce these items
- The Chair asked members of the Commission to provide information on the proposal that could guide the applicant and his architect to not only produce more detailed drawings, but address any concerns with the proposal.
- Commissioners provided input on the proposal, particularly concern with the proposed pattern of fenestration, rhythm of solids vs voids, (Standards for Construction 3 and 4), Commissioners also had concerns with the mass of the structure (Standard for Construction 10), retention of the original qualities of the rear addition that may have gained significance over time (Standard for Construction 12).
- Commissioners provided some broad suggestions, such as retaining the existing recessed entryway, pushing the east side elevation façade to the west and potentially wrapping the second-story porch around that elevation, or reversing the location of the porch/deck, and better mimicking the existing homes pattern and rhythm of fenestration in order to also provide a more appropriate relationship of solids vs voids on the façade.
- The staff liaison agreed with the above suggestions and noted that an important feature of the Colonial revival style is symmetry, something lacking in the proposed addition.
- Commissioner Jacobs indicated a willingness to work with the applicant to review proposed changes.
- Members of the Commission asked if there was a way to facilitate an administrative review or review by a subset of Commissioners, or if a continuance was warranted.
- The staff liaison stated that in this instance a continuance seemed more appropriate.
- Members of the Commission asked if a month was long enough to accommodate the revisions.

- The applicant stated it was although the staff liaison noted if more time is needed, it just means it would need to be re-noticed.
- A motion to continue the case to the May 10 meeting was carried unanimously.

Staff Reports:

A. **Long-Range Work Plan Subcommittee**

- Staff provided an update on the long-range plan and has sent subcommittee members a draft document with goal and policy statements as well as a draft list of initiatives for consideration and critique. A meeting with the subcommittee to finalize the draft is being scheduled with an intention to bring a draft to the full Commission for review in May.

B. **Preservation Month Events**

- Staff provided information on events planned in Evanston during the month of May to promote historic preservation.
- Commissioners asked that staff keep them informed of specific dates for events, particularly the installation of heritage markers in the fifth ward – an initiative the Commission worked closely on.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40pm