



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday May 10, 2022

7:00 P.M.

Via Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Mark Simon, John Jacobs, Sarah M. Dreller
Suzi Reinhold, Carl Klein, Beth Bodan, Stuart Cohen

Members Absent: Aleca Sullivan, Jamie Morris

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

Presiding Member: Suzi Reinhold, Chair

Notes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

Agenda

Old Business

A. **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]

- Continued unanimously to June 14, 2022 to allow the applicant additional time to incorporate comments and provide revisions.

New Business

A. **2330 Orrington Avenue - Northeast Historic District - 22PRES-0051**

Michael Hauser, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a rear volume wooden stoop, alter the fenestration on a single-story circa 1990s rear addition and construct a single-story bay addition at the principle structures rear volume.

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

- Michael Hauser, provided an overview of the proposed project including the intent to provide a mudroom and create more efficient interior circulation. The alterations proposed are on a circa 1990s rear addition and are minimal in scope although visible from the Street.
- Commissioner Jacobs asked about the window manufacturer and type. Michael Hauser noted the windows were Marvin Ultimate, aluminum clad wood with SDL. The existing home has an amalgam of window types and materials currently including some that are original and some replacements. The proposed windows more-closely mimic the original window qualities.
- A motion to approve by Commissioner Bodan was made and seconded by Commissioner Simon. The proposal was approved as presented on a unanimous vote.

B. **1217 Michigan Avenue - Landmark - Lakeshore Historic District - 22PRES-0049**

Garry Shumaker, architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a two-story, detached frame garage in the rear-yard.

Applicable Standards: Construction [1-8; and, 10-16].

- Garry Shumaker provided an overview of the proposed project including the differences between this proposal and a recently approved proposal his client wished to no longer pursue.
- Mr. Shumaker noted the proposals zoning compliance as well as the building to the south being a zero-lot-line building
- Other than the new detached coach house and associated pergola structure, the additional elements of the proposal remain the same as previously reviewed and approved by the Commission including demolition of the existing garage
- The associated wall between principle and accessory structure mimics the stonework on the front of the homes porch piers while providing privacy
- Proportions, massing, fenestration, and materials are all similar and complimentary to the principle structure
- Mr. Shumaker noted one drafting error on the proposed drawing set, a primary elevation second-story window, which is actually a proposed wooden panel to match a similar condition on the principle structure
- Mr. Shumaker noted the subordination of the garage, being detached and located ~100 feet from the street
- Mr. Shumaker noted the relationship between the proposed structure and the north fenestration of the adjacent zero-lot-line building. One window is obscured while the remaining windows remain unobstructed.
- Commissioner Simon asked if the applicant could explain the

discussions that occurred that led to locating the building on the setback rather than supply more room between the proposed structure and its adjacent neighbor. The Commission has received a lot of public comment to this effect and it would help address those concerns and give context.

- Mr. Shumaker explained the rationale being that it was zoning compliant as presented, provided the most efficient use of his clients rear-yard, and provided privacy and security. Pushing the garage further to the rear of the property would negate his clients vision for their property, and would result in the need for a zoning variation which was previously denied.
- Commissioners asked to better understand why the new proposal was being made since a previous proposal was already approved by the Commission.
- Mr. Shumaker stated it was two-fold, that his client preferred this concept after further consideration, and that they had not received approval for their request for minor zoning relief. The alternative to appeal that decision, or move forward with a preferred proposal that was zoning compliant is what led to this decision.

Public Comment:

- Polly Nandiko, neighbor to the south, gave testimony against the proposed project, noting that it would block her light and view through her kitchen window. She believed alternatives existed which would achieve the clients vision while not impacting her quality of life.
- Steve Denenberg, neighbor to the south, gave testimony against the proposed project noting the unnecessary loss of quality of life for the residents in the apartment building, an unnecessary change to the harmonious and symbiotic relationship between that structure and the existing detached garage, fears of inability for maintenance of their north façade, as well as limited access to that elevation for emergency purposes. The loss of light to the kitchen window is avoidable, and the decisions being made are not neighborly.

Deliberation:

- The Commission deliberated, with some questions regarding application of various standards. A Commissioner asked if the standard related to orientation of facades was applicable to which Mr. Sterling stated he did not believe it was. The standard relating to the relationship between structures as seen from the street was ultimately believed to be met as the detached garage was pushed so far from the street, that the existing rhythm of spacing of structures at the street frontage, or perceived from the street

was unchanged.

- Several Commissioners commended the design of the structure itself and the attention to detail while also acknowledging that there may be multiple alternatives which could reduce the impact to the neighbor, but that is not the role of the Commission with powers limited [the role is to review what is presented through the lens of the standards].
- A motion to approve was made by Commissioner Cohen, Seconded by Commissioner Jacobs, and carried unanimously.

C. **2418 Park Place - Landmark - 22PRES-0050**

Patrick Jean-Jacques, owner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a single-story greenhouse addition and two-story circular stair at the rear of the property, alter the principle structures rear volume fenestration, construct a two-story rear-porch addition and stairway, and construct a wrought-iron railing at the existing front stoop.

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

- Patrick Jean-Jacques, owner, gave a detailed overview of the proposed project including some background on the passing of the architect who designed the proposal.
- Mr. Jean-Jacques provided background on the decision to hire a preservation architect for the proposal, and described the attention to detail and decisions that were made which created a composition which he believed complimented the architecture and significance of the home.
- Mr. Jean-Jacques noted proposed areas for infill of existing windows, including two windows on the east elevation enclosed stair addition which were not included in the plans. These are proposed to be filled for use as closet space. The proposed window enclosure on the west elevation would be slightly inset and the sill retained so future owners could reopen or install windows in the original opening if desired.
- Commissioners asked questions related to the proposed railing system at the front of the home, noting what was proposed did not meet current building code requirements.
- Commissioners and the applicant discussed the value and likelihood of approve for asking for a waiver from the railing requirement. It was suggested that the railing proposed for the rear porch could be replicated for the front railing as well, or something which preserved the ornate newel posts, but introduced additional vertical or horizontal rails/pickets in order to meet code.

- Commissioners discussed the proposed bracketing and filigree at the rear porch including its appropriateness, detailing, and proportion. It was asked that it, and it appears that it did, mimic the existing bracketing, and that the filigree helped to reduce the scale of the porch openings.
- Mr. Ruiz stated the Commission should keep in mind that what they are discussing only had to be compatible with the existing structure.
- A motion to approve with conditions was made by Commissioner Dreler, Seconded by Commissioner Cohen, and approved unanimously.
- Conditions included the applicant revising the porch railing in consultation with staff, and providing additional documentation of the bracketing to be used.

D. **548 Judson Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District - 19PRES-0262**

Maria Nanos, owner, seeks approval of substantial modifications to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness, 19PRES-0262, for construction of a new two-story single-family residence and detached two-story coach house and garage. Alterations primarily include changes to the structures roof form, pattern of fenestration including window locations, sizes, and operating style, exterior cladding, and front-porch dimension and detailing.

Applicable Standards: Construction [1-8; and, 10-16]

- Maria Nanos, owner, provided background on the changes made since the project was approved nearly two years previously as well as a detailed explanation of the changes, which predominately related to the roof form, front porch, exterior cladding, and window location and type.
- Commissioners asked questions related to the proposed windows, noting inconsistencies with the drawings provided, the testimony, as well as the window order form that was submitted. For example, the windows in the drawings have no lite divisions, but the order form says they do, the drawings say wood clad windows but the windows in the order form are fiberglass, etc.
- Commissioners stated it was difficult to review what was in front of them if it was not an accurate depiction of what was being proposed and stated it was unfortunate the clients architect was not in attendance to answer questions and clarify
- The applicant noted that the windows do have lite divisions and she believed they were wood clad windows. They changed to casement windows for energy efficiency, and altered locations of windows to align with interior modifications made
- Commissioners stated no preference for either wood clad or fiberglass since they have approved fiberglass windows for new

construction previously. They did however want to ensure the use of a SDL as well as verify the correct lite divisions proposed.

- Commissioners expressed concern with the relationship of materials and textures, particularly for the proposed board and batten cladding. As drawn, the size of the batten strips and the space between, create an imbalance in the weight and proportion of the massing.
- Commissioners noted the improvement and simplification to the roof form.
- Commissioners asked about the front-porch and front door, which seemed out of proportion as well, noting the previous approval was more appropriate.
- The applicant noted that the door as drawn was not accurate and that it was proposed to be larger.
- After some deliberation on the appropriateness of a continuance vs approval with conditions, Commissioner Jacobs moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Klein and carried unanimously.
- Conditions included submission of revised elevation drawings with show the accurate lite division for the windows, additional window details, clarification on the window material and use of a SDL, revising the front door to reflect the correct proportion of that opening, and revising the board and batten cladding to have tighter spacing, particularly in the gable end, but also on the accessory structure (coach house).

Approval of Meeting Minutes

A. Minutes from March 15, 2022

- Approved as presented with one abstention (Commissioner Dreller)

B. Minutes from April 12, 2022

- Approved as presented with one abstention (Commissioner Cohen).

Staff Reports

A. Long-Range Work Plan

- Revisions to the plan are being incorporated and a final draft of the document will be reviewed by the subcommittee prior to review by the Commission.

B. Preservation Month Activities

- Staff provided information on preservation month activities

planned throughout the community including dedication of the first African-American heritage markers which the Commission was heavily involved with.

Discussion

A. Downtown Heritage Resources

Staff recommends discussion around the potential for and value of an intensive survey of the downtown area. Survey and documentation efforts comprise in-field assessment and background research into the historical, cultural, and architectural significance of Evanston's heritage resources. Maintaining an active program in survey and documentation forms the foundation for effective community preservation planning.

- Mr. Sterling provided information on the proposal to survey the downtown, an effort which was intended to help aid in its economic recovery and support more appropriate redevelopment, adaptive use, and rehabilitation efforts.
- Mr. Sterling stated this effort would also supplement the work done by the Commission previously in 2007 as part of creation of the 2008-2009 Downtown Plan
- Mr. Sterling stated various potential and valuable components of the survey which could go beyond the architectural significance and include legacy businesses, incentives, cultural resources, and historical resources and stories.
- Commissioners discussed the significant effort being described and the potential to use CLG funding to hire a consultant. They also described uncertainty about the scope being proposed and the likelihood that it be narrowed.
- Mr. Sterling stated the effort could be narrowed in scope to the existing traditional zones in the downtown, or evaluating the list of supplemental resources prepared by the prior Planning Manager in 2019.
- Commissioners discussed available apps and other resources meant to help facilitate volunteer and Commission survey work
- Chair Reinhold suggested a good first step would be walking tours of the downtown, which could focus on the traditional zones, to orient the Commissioners and get preliminary feedback before moving forward with next steps.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40pm