



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday October 11, 2022

7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Mark Simon, John Jacobs, Beth Bodan, Amanda Ziehm
Suzi Reinhold, Carl Klein, Jamie Morris, Stuart Cohen

Members Absent: Sarah Dreller, Aleca Sullivan

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

Presiding Member: Suzi Reinhold, Chair

Notes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

Agenda

1. CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

2. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1334 Asbury Avenue – Landmark - Ridge Historic District – 22PRES-0189

Paul Dovydaitis, owner and applicant, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the homes fenestration at the north and west elevations; remove an ancillary chimney to the roofline; infill the partially enclosed recessed porch at the homes west elevation, and construct a wood-frame deck at the homes rear-volume.

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; Construction [1-5; 7, 10, and 12-13]

- Douglas Hammen, architect for the owner, presented a brief overview of the proposal which was intended to accommodate interior alterations as well as alter aspects of the circa 1990 rear addition to be more sympathetic to the homes original design vocabulary.
- Commissioners asked the architect about the decision to propose divided lite windows rather than simple one-over-one windows which would better mimic the predominant condition on the rest of the home.
- Mr. Hammen explained that the windows being replaced, at the kitchen as well as the new enclosed porch area replicated the windows that existed originally, and that were divided lite. These exist elsewhere on the home as well.
- Commissioners asked if they were also replacing the glass block in the 1990 addition and what type of window those would be.
- Mr. Hammen stated that they were replacing them. They will either be

fixed windows, or casement windows. Due to their interior location there is no need for them to be operational but they feel this alteration is more sympathetic than the existing glass block.

- A motion to approve the project as presented was seconded and carried on a unanimous voice vote.

B. 1215 Judson Avenue – Lakeshore Historic District – 22PRES-0187

Studio Talo Architects, applicant, submit for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a single-story addition and open deck at the rear-volume of the residence.

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

- Thomas Ahleman, architect for the owner, submitted a brief overview of the proposed rear addition as well as the alternations to the spare rear volume of the home. The addition is simple in form and modest in size and mass with intentional divergence from the remaining homes materiality while remaining complimentary. The addition was revised many times from a previous more contemporary solution and best meets the needs and desires of the client.
- Mr. Ruiz asked the architect to address the standards for construction and alteration and how the design meets these.
- Mr. Ahleman reviewed the standards which applied.
- Mr. Sterling asked the architect to address why the addition does not align with the rear volume of the home and extends beyond its existing side-wall position.
- Commissioners were split on whether this condition bothered them or not with some noting that many additions are out of plane with the principle structure while others noted the best practice and guidelines are to inset an addition to help it read as non-original.
- Mr. Ahleman explained it was driven by the clients desires for interior layout. The indentation to the north was not driven by the standards for review but rather the setback requirements.
- Commissioners expressed concern with Standards for construction 3, 4, and 7. Specifically, the operating style of the windows, being casement with no lite division, the material of the roof being standing seam metal where no precedent for that material exists elsewhere, and the proportion of the openings at the rear elevation as well as the orientation and material of the decks railing system.
- Mr. Ahleman explained that the decisions were meant to contrast the home in a modest way while fulfilling the wants of his client. The openings at the rear of the home are intended to maximize light and views of the rear-yard.
- Mr. Ahleman expressed dissatisfaction with the commissions comments noting a similar design was approved with revisions at a previous meeting. He wondered where the consistency was.
- Commissioners stated that this was part of the problem. A solution for one home and one design vocabulary does not necessarily translate to a different home and design vocabulary. The homes are inherently different as should be the approach.
- Commissioners offered some suggestions including revising the railing system to better mimic the front elevation, revising the operating style

of the windows, and reducing the scale of openings at the rear elevation which reads as a mid-century intervention as drafted while the remaining home is a circa 1890s Colonial Revival with a drastically divergent rhythm of solids to voids in its facades.

- Commissioners made clear that their job was to react to what was proposed, not to re-design the addition for the applicant. They encouraged studying alternatives to what was proposed.
- Mr. Ahleman consulted with his client and offered to make the changes to the roof material as well as include faux meeting rails on the casement windows.
- Commissioners stated there were many issues and concerns that could not be addressed without seeing how they relate to each other holistically.
- A motion to continue the case to the November 8 meeting was seconded and carried unanimously.

C. **1453 Maple Avenue – Landmark – 22PRES-0173**

Myefski Architects, applicant, submit for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the structures south, north, and east elevations fenestration, construct a single-story trash enclosure at the east elevation, construct an accessible lift at the west elevation, and install rooftop mechanicals on the northeast corners rear-most 30'.

The applicant requests the following Major Zoning Variations to complete adaptive use to multi-family residential: 24 dwelling units where 14 are permitted (Zoning Code Section 6-8-8-4); a rear-yard setback of 0' where 25' is required and 7.5' is the existing legally non-conforming condition (Zoning Code Section 6-8-8-7); and, 10 leased off-street parking spaces or a parking ratio of .275 per bed where 19 spaces or a parking ratio of .55 per bed is required (Zoning Code Section 6-16-3-5, Table 16-B).

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

- Commissioner Jacobs recused himself from the case due to a conflict of interest (prior employment).
- Adam Breaux and Mike Karkowski, architects for the owner, presented a detailed overview of the proposed alterations to the exterior of the building as well as the interior alterations to accommodate adaptation to multi-family residential.
- Mr. Sterling noted one correction in the presentation – that the north elevation was not only visible but highly visible from Maple Avenue.
- Mr. Sterling asked the architects to also address the necessary zoning relief since the Commission was empowered to make a recommendation on their appropriateness if desired.
- The architects reviewed the proposed variations including the internal density, off-street parking, and rear-yard setback.
- Commissioners asked the architect about the north elevations fenestration, specifically with concern regarding standard for construction 3 and 4. This elevation does not seem to relate to the other three.
- The architects explained the positioning of windows as well as operating style was dictated primarily by a desire to provide as much

- light and vent into the units as possible. They are limited with the significance and higher visibility of the remaining elevations and it was an opportunity to be more sensitive elsewhere while being more functional here. The majority of the units are fixed due to the fire setback and zero lot line condition. The recessed balconies meet the fire setback and allow for fresh air.
- Commissioner acknowledged that was a clever solution. Commissioners debated the elevation with some wanting to see a more compatible solution while others noted that often buildings have a more functional and vernacular elevation and that it did provide an opportunity to speak independently and focus on utility.
 - Commissioners agreed that the treatment to the south and east elevations were highly sensitive, and applauded the architect for retaining the classical positioning of openings – although some noted that it does limit the potential light and vent for the southern units as well as not provide points of egress for the mezzanine levels and lofted spaces, although they also noted that wasn't technically required.
 - Commissioners expressed concern with the size of the interior units as well as the limited light and vent for the southern units.
 - The architects stated the spaces would have natural light and vent although they acknowledged it was a challenge when converting to multi-family. Commissioners acknowledged this as well, noting it was a difficult task to convert spaces of assembly to individual dwelling units.
 - The architects stated the units are intentionally small to fill a market need which is supported by the structures location and proximity to mass and alternative transit options. This further allows for lower rent structures and providing on-site affordable units. If the units get larger, it doesn't equate to an alternative approach to the interior spaces, but it would increase the overall unit rent structures and create more luxury apartments.
 - Commissioners discussed the proposed accessible lift including its positioning, viable alternatives that were explored such as a ramp, the ability to maintain it in the winter, and options to better screen it from view. They did acknowledge the alternative at the rear of the building would not be acceptable or dignified.
 - The architects explained that they studied it many times and many ways and this was the most sensitive solution which allowed those with accessible needs to use the same entrance as everyone else. A ramp would have to be placed at the south elevation and would be ~80' long and would be harder to maintain and result in those with accessible needs entering the building through the basement which was not deemed equal.
 - Commissioners asked if there were options to better screen the lift or restore balance and symmetry to the front façade by incorporating a similar screen on both sides.
 - The architects stated they would continue to explore this
 - The Commissioners deliberated on their power to provide a recommendation on the proposed zoning relief if desired. Some members preferred to make a recommendation since they could do so while others did not see a connection between the alterations under their purview and the requested relief.

- Specifically, the parking and density questions were outside their purview and limited powers. The rear setback to facilitate the garbage enclosure could fall within their purview, but the enclosure was likely not necessary in the interest of historic conservation or adaptation of the building, rather it was simply a nice amenity to have although alternatives exist.
- Mr. Sterling stated that the discussion about internal units or parking should relate to some aspects of the standards that are within their purview. For example, if the number of units was concerning or inappropriate, that could relate to the necessary changes in fenestration which may be deemed non sympathetic or adverse to the structures integrity.
- Mr. Sterling stated they could perhaps make a recommendation on the unit density if they felt it was necessary for the adaptive uses pro-forma.
- Commissioners stated they had no way to know if that was the case or not.
- Mr. Sterling stated they could request that information.
- The Commissioners did not feel comfortable with that and would prefer those discussions to occur at the Land Use Commission who is well versed at those types of conversations and decisions.
- The Commissioners did not see a material connection between the window openings and the internal unit mix except at the north elevation, which most agreed met the standards and was already appropriate.
- Commissioners asked if they were obligated to provide a recommendation.
- Mr. Sterling stated that they were not, just that they had the power to do so.
- Commissioners asked if a formal motion was necessary to decline to make a recommendation. Or if this would be preferred.
- Mr. Sterling stated they did not and there was no preference as the decision would be adequately reflected in the report to the Land Use Commission and recorded in the minutes.
- The Commission declined to make a recommendation on the proposed zoning relief, determining that the Land Use Commission.

Public Comment

- Two members of the public, Jack Weiss and Len Koroski spoke in opposition to the proposed project noting that the use was not compatible with retention of the structures interior architectural integrity. They acknowledged agreement with the Commission that the exterior alterations were appropriate and sensitive and that they should be applauded. They further agreed with the treatment of the north elevations fenestration, but encouraged the applicant to find a more compatible use that would preserve the interior spaces which are highly significant and rare in their integrity.
- The architects noted that many alternative uses were marketed and explored but were not viable in current conditions. They noted that although some of the interior integrity would be lost, that was common for adaptive use projects which have to balance the ability to finance the necessary and appropriate exterior alterations that allow the building to retain its exterior integrity and ability to tell its story, while

adapting and giving new life to the interior. The outcome is a balancing act that results in the continued life of a significant building that would otherwise be very threatened and could face demolition in the future. This building has been vacant for some time and left in a state of disrepair internally due to diminishing membership. At its peak the lodge had over 2,000 members. When it was sold they had close to 20 +/-.

Deliberation

- Commissioners deliberated the proposed scope of work and how to best move forward.
- Commissioners noted the loss of interior integrity was unfortunate and akin to saving a patient's life while leaving them handicapped. Unfortunately the interior was outside the Commissions purview, and the proposed use was permitted in the District. Even if the number of units was lower or the use was changed altogether, there would still be no way to control how the interior was handled.
- The Commissioners agreed that the proposal met the standards for review and applauded the architects on their presentation and approach to the building's exterior.
- A motion to approve as presented with two conditions was seconded and carried unanimously with one abstention (Jacobs). Conditions included: continue to study the accessible lift and alternative which screen it from view and restore balance to the façade; and, to remove, salvage, and repurpose or donate the stone wreath in frieze details at the south elevation.

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

A. Minutes of September 13, 2022

- The minutes were approved as presented on a 7-0 vote with 1 abstention (Morris).

4. STAFF REPORTS

A. Legacy Business Program

Staff shall provide an update on the City's Legacy Business Pilot Program.

- Staff provided an update on progress to date with the goal of program launch in early spring 2023. Current next steps are finalizing the financial incentive framework as well as program administration.
- The RFP for web and design services closes November 1.

B. Downtown Heritage Resource Survey

Staff shall provide an update on the Downtown Heritage Resource Survey and outline next steps.

- Staff noted the intent to provide a document for review at the Commissions December meeting.

5. DISCUSSION

A. **Preserve 2040 - Preservation Commission Long-Range Work Plan**

Staff proposes additional review and discussion of the Preserve 2040 Work Plan.

- Staff provided information on additional individuals and organizations that have provided comment including close to 20 former Commissioners, Landmarks Illinois, and the State Historic Preservation Agency. Staff stated an intent to bring a revised version to the November meeting.
- Commissioners asked to review the draft a week prior to the packet being released to give more time to review and provide critical feedback.
- Staff agreed.

B. **Heritage Resource Design Manual**

Staff shall provide a presentation and overview of the draft Heritage Resource Design Manual.

- Mr. Ruiz provided information on the design manuals new direction based on feedback given by the subcommittee many months prior. The new document is intended as a resource for homeowners, not the Commission. Staff will revise and provide a document for the subcommittee to review in November and bring it back to the full body when the subcommittee was comfortable with its approach and content.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05pm