



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, May 14, 2024

7:00 P.M. Council Chambers Room 2800

Members Present: Carl Klein, Beth Bodan, Charles Smith, Joshua Bowes-Carlson, Amanda Ziehm, Thomas Ahleman, Matthew Johnson

Members Absent: Stuart Cohen, Lesa Rizzolo

Staff Present: Cade W. Sterling

Presiding Member: Beth Bodan, Vice-Chair

Minutes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

- Vice-Chair Bodan read an introductory statement, provided background on National Historic Preservation Month, and activities and initiatives, and congratulated Carlos D. Ruiz, the City's former Preservation Planner on his retirement after nearly 33 years of service to Evanston.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public are afforded three minutes per person to provide testimony related to items listed under discussion, staff reports, presentations, or to otherwise address the Commission generally. Members of the public wishing to provide testimony on new or unfinished business shall be given the opportunity to do so in a manner and under time limits determined by the Chair.

- Staff read into the record written comment received by Carlos D. Ruiz
- Sarah M. Dreller provided background and additional comments related to the Preservation Consortium and Corps of Volunteers item under discussion, including the value of engaging with and empowering non-profit organizations that play a valuable and different role in heritage conservation.

OLD BUSINESS

Revised Certificate of Appropriateness Application Form

Review and adoption of a single revised Certificate of Appropriateness Application for all scopes of work to replace the existing three applications for minor, major, and window/door replacement scopes of work. Code Section 2-8-3 (G) (9). **This item was continued at the April 9 meeting.**

- Commissioners asked if there were any additional changes to the form outside of those requested at the previous meeting.
- Staff stated that there were some minor additional changes requested by Commissioner Klein which included reordering the links to additional resources, and additional language at the applicant signature line.
- Commissioner Klein also noted that he had created a digital formstack version of the application to streamline its use.
- Commissioner Ziehm asked about inclusion of requested documentation related to protection of trees associated with the Tree Preservation Ordinance
- Staff noted that the requirements were listed for scopes of work involving construction, major alterations, demolition, and relocation.
- Commissioner Klein moved approval, second by Commissioner Ziehm. The matter was approved unanimously by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

24PRES-0046 - 1525 Judson Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District

Anthony Hurtig, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing detached two-car garage and construct a new detached two-story accessory dwelling unit with ground floor parking in the homes rear-yard.

Applicable Standards: Demolition [1-5] & Construction [1-14, & 16].

- Anthony Hurtig, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner provided a brief overview of the proposed scope of work including the intent of the proposal to provide intergenerational housing for the homeowner and their parents, as well as the location of the proposed structure and its design vocabulary in relationship to the existing home at 1525 Judson Avenue.
- Mr. Hurtig briefly addressed demolition of the existing garage which was non-significant and was unable to be reused as it could not support a second story, being construction on a slab on grade with no foundation.

- Commissioners Klein asked if there was consideration given to the existing line of trees between the proposed structure and the home to the south.
 - The applicant stated that the primary consideration was how to provide for an internal program for the structure that met the needs of the family while remaining compatible in its exterior appearance. However, they acknowledge there is considerable growth to the south of the structure and every precaution will be taken to prevent loss of vegetation in those areas.
- Public Comment was given by neighboring residents
 - Mitchell Harrison (1519 Judson) provided background on his time in his home, as well as his families interest in historic preservation including his time as president of the Preservation League of Evanston. Comments further addressed the existing designation of the district in which the homes under consideration are within, as well as the difficulty to receive approval for alterations to homes and an understanding that this type of proposal has not previously been proposed or allowed. Mr. Harrison finished his statement by objecting to the proposal and asking that it be denied due to its inappropriateness.
 - Donna Harrison (1519 Judson) objected to the proposal due to the little space that exists between the proposed structure and her home as well as the space between the existing home at 1525 Judson and the proposed structure. Additional objections included the small size of the lot the proposed structure was being placed on, and the relationship between the scale of the proposed structure and the open space surrounding it. Ms. Harrison further objected to the possibility and fear that although the current proposal is for family to live within the structure, it would become a home for Northwestern students in the near future. Additional comments related to the difficulty in the past to get approval for very modest and appropriate changes as well as the fact that the proposed structure was located on the street, not within the alley and that it would obstruct light to their home since it was extremely close to their home. Finally, Ms. Harrison objected to the lack of communication between neighbors and seeing this for the first time by receiving the postcard which only gave them ~ one week to digest what was proposed and she asked that the matter be continued to allow further discussion between neighbors and for the applicant to better understand the relationship between existing and proposed structures.
 - Ms. Harrison presented copies of photos of her property to the Commission.
 - Tom Breen (1515 Judson) objected to the proposal due to the scale of the structure in relation to its surrounding open space. Additional comments related to the undersized nature of the lot and noting that the home was just purchased recently and suggested that a different [larger] lot would have been more appropriate to accommodate the

families needs and that similar sized coach houses in the District were located at the alley at the rear of properties, not on the street acting like a separate residence. Mr. Breen noted that the distance between the lot line and the home to the south is close to three feet which puts two homes on the smallest lot on the street. Mr. Breen expressed frustration that the proposal had not been discussed with them prior to the meeting due to the significant burden it would place on the Harrisons (1519 Judson).

- Robert Engley (324 Davis) commented on the 300 block of Davis Street, noting that it is part of the historic districts evolution with much of it being constructed in the 1870s and 1880s while others were later built on what was previously a large single lot estate torn down in 1937. The main concern with the proposal was that it does not represent the consistency of design vocabularies on the blocks south side, as well as the setback being reduced to 3', as well as other setbacks between the proposed structure and proximate lot lines east and west.
- Omar Salem, property owner (1525 Judson), expressed a desire to remain neighborly despite the outcome of the proposal. Mr. Salem further provided context on their purchase of the property and their intentions for it as well as their relationship with Evanston which is extensive and multi-generational. The desire was for his parents to move to Evanston and be close to their grandchildren. Mr. Salem was introduced to the Evanston Co-Op, and the idea of accessory dwelling units, and saw this as a perfect solution. Mr. Salem further stated that they were intentional in their desire to propose something that was zoning compliant, and compatible with a historic neighborhood in its design vocabulary. Tony Hurtig was hired due to his expertise with historic properties. Mr. Salem further noted that although they appreciate being within the Lakeshore Historic District, 1525 Judson is non-conforming and was built in the 1950s. They want to propose changes that are compatible and add to the evolutionary character of the District.
- Anthony Hurtig, applicant, was provided the opportunity to rebut any of the comments previously provided by the public. Mr. Hurtig emphasized the comments of the homeowner Mr. Salem, noting that they were intentional in finding a compatible solution that requires no zoning relief. They are intentional in following the rules and also providing new housing typologies and choices which is the intent of the ADU Ordinance.
- Commissioner Deliberation:
 - Commissioners deliberated, with some finding the proposal compliant and compatible as presented, noting the non-contributing status of not only the home in question, but many surrounding homes as well.
 - Additional comments related to the ADU Ordinance that was adopted and was intended to provide for these types of housing solutions

including the possibility of intergenerational and more affordable housing opportunities and that the intent of this needs to be weighed in a wholesome way with the Preservation Ordinance and its requirements.

- Considerable discussion related to the zoning requirements and how zoning and preservation standards relate with each other.
- Mr. Sterling noted that preservation review and zoning compliance are inherently different with zoning treating all properties as a commodity where preservation is process based and treats properties as individual expressions seeking compatible relationships but not dictating specific metrics. Mr. Sterling stated that the zoning requirements in no way supersede the preservation standards, and in fact the opposite appears intentioned in both Ordinances where zoning is in many ways immaterial to whether the preservation standards are met or not.
- Commissioners discussed the importance of preliminary discussions with neighbors to try to avoid confusion and anxiety related to proposals.
- Commissioners discussed the use of the structure as it came up during public comment, and some suggestions were offered as a way to ensure future affordability of the ADU.
- Staff noted that the Commissions purview was not related to how structures are used and that whether the unit is rented or not was immaterial to the discussion but offered to provide additional information to the applicant if they were interested.
- Commissioners discussed the proposed scale of the structure as well as the relationship between existing and proposed structures and open spaces, noting the location of the ADU on the street rather than in the alley required additional sensitivity in approach.
- Commissioners noted that they had no way of knowing what the actual relationship between structures was since no documentation was provided and the photos were obscured by dense vegetation.
- Commissioners noted the importance of changes to environment and open space, and that these were significant considerations in this case.
- Commissioners offered some suggestions that might be explored including moving the ADU further north to create additional separation between the southern neighbor and the proposed structure, minimizing the scale of the structure in either height or width, or even considering an attached or internal ADU as an addition to the existing home rather than a detached accessory structure.
- Commissioners further reiterated that the design, style, and vocabulary of the Coach House was not being questioned and was found to be compatible and although it is on a street in a way that might not be typical for this type of proposal, that doesn't mean it shouldn't happen, and actually interacts with the street in a very

- positive way.
- Staff reminded Commissioners to primarily react to what is proposed and make judgment not on whether it is ideal, but whether the standards are met and it is compatible.
 - Commissioners noted two standards of concern: Standard for Construction 5: Rhythm of spacing and structures on streets; and Standard for Construction 10: Scale of a structure.
 - Staff provided some context on Standard 5 and the type of documentation that might be helpful so that the Commission might determine whether it was met or not
 - The Commission asked the applicant to provide additional documentation that could identify and visually represent the location of the neighboring structures as well as an analysis of the rhythm of the spacing for structures on the street. Since this was not provided and was unable to be determined during the meeting through testimony, the Commission was unable to understand if these standards were met or not. Some additional members expressed concern with the overall scale of the structure and lack of subordination between it and structures to which it was visually related. This standard was also difficult to determine due to a lack of documentation and ineffective photos obscured by dense vegetation.
 - Commissioner Ziehm moved to continue the case to the June 11 meeting, second by Commissioner Johnsen and unanimously approved by voice vote.

24PRES-0047 - 1630 Ashland Avenue - Landmark - Ridge Historic District

Peter Kaeding, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing attached single-car garage, restore the homes first floor north elevation including restoration of the original brackets below the second floor bay, and construct a new tandem two-car attached garage toward the homes west, rear volume. The applicant further requests the following major zoning variations. 1) A north interior side-yard setback of 1’ where 5’ is required and 6” is the existing legally non-conforming condition (Code Section 6-8-2-8 (A)(3), and 2) A rear-yard setback of 3’ where 30’ is required and 28’ is the existing legally non-conforming condition (Code Section 6-8-2-8 (A)(4).

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

The Preservation Commission is the determining body for the Certificate of Appropriateness (Code Section 2-8-8). The Preservation Commission may, at its discretion, make a recommendation to the Land Use Commission, the determining body for the proposed zoning relief (Code Section 2-19-4 (E)).

- Peter Kaeding, architect and applicant provided an overview of the proposal the intent of which was to both restore architectural integrity to the north elevation loggia as well as create a more functional garage space.

- Mr. Kaeding stated that many of the original loggia brackets still exist within the garage other than those cut to accommodate an overhead door on the non-original garage. The loggia is the home's most prominent feature, and is represented in the original perspective drawings for the home.
- The materials for the restoration will match original materials and proportions, the materials for the garage will match existing materials, and although the garage is deep, its horizontality is obscured as seen from the street.
- Commissioners asked the applicant about the roof shape, noting that the west elevation of the garage was not visible.
- The applicant stated that the pitch of the roof as seen from the street matches the pitch of the front porch roof. To accommodate this, the return of the gable that isn't seen from the public way appears truncated.
- Commissioners asked the applicant if he had explored alternatives to the location of the proposed garage that may have been more compliant with the zoning requirements.
- The applicant stated that they had explored both a detached structure in the west side-yard, an attached garage, and also a garage at the rear that was accessed by the current driveway, but all alternatives were either not feasible in terms of vehicular access, or necessitated more substantial alteration to either the home, or its integrity of setting and environment.
- The applicant also noted a side-yard garage either attached or detached would require a new curb cut and removal of healthy street trees and removal of existing on-street parking.
- Commissioners asked about vehicular access along the driveway with the restored loggia brackets – it appears tight.
- The applicant stated they had explored this and were confident a car could access the garage without hitting the brackets. It isn't more unusual than many instances of a driveway running along the side of a home.
- Commissioners asked about increased stormwater and difficulty moving that water without impacting the neighbor.
- Commissioners noted that the location of the garage, pushed further west from the primary structure provided increased subordination and a more appropriate relationship than the existing garage.
- The applicant stated they understood this was a requirement of permitting and would comply without whatever engineering at the City needed.
- Public Comment:
 - The neighbor to the north of the property spoke not in opposition, but encouraged the applicant to verify the location of the garage as it relates to her property line and indicated that a new survey may be

appropriate even though the intent was to move the new garage further south than the existing garage by a matter of inches. There had previously been some dispute about the location of the fence between properties.

- Commissioners asked if the comments Commissioner Cohen provided staff and staff forwarded should be read into the record.
- Staff stated that the comments provided were paraphrased.
- Commissioners deliberated and discussed the north elevation and whether it was visible or not.
- Staff indicated that although obscured by vegetation, the north elevation was visible.
- Commissioners debated the directional expression of the garage, noting how long it was and that adding horizontality to the home. However, the north elevation is not highly visible and is obscured by both vegetation and a fence that will likely exist in some fashion between properties in perpetuity. The actual scale of the garage is less perceptible than it appears on the drawings.
- Commissioners debated the fenestration of the north elevation, and asked the applicant where the proposed pattern of fenestration came from.
- The applicant stated they wanted some relief on that elevation after conversations with staff, but also indicated that the window would not be visible and serves only a minor function. Commissioners debated whether no window was better but decided that there was precedent on the home for a smaller window of similar proportion and that should be reflected in the north elevation.
- A motion to approve with the condition that the applicant work with staff to propose a more compatible pattern of fenestration and window proportions was made by Commissioner Bowes-Carlson and seconded by Commissioner Ahleman. The motion carried 6-0-1 (Commissioner Ziehm abstaining due to a conflict of interest).
- Commissioners deliberated regarding the proposed Major Zoning Variations finding that a recommendation was appropriate since the proposed scope of work that requires the zoning relief has a positive impact on the homes architectural integrity by restoring one of its most significant features without having a detrimental impact on neighboring properties.
- Commissioners liked to clarify for the Land Use Commission that approval of the COA was related only to the compatibility of the north and east elevations that were within the Commissions purview.
- A motion to recommend approval of the Major Zoning Variations due to their positive impact on historic preservation was made by Commissioner Ahleman and seconded by Commissioner Bowes-Carlson. The motion carried 5-1-1 Commissioner Klein dissenting and Commissioner Ziehm

abstaining due to a conflict of interest.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of April 9, 2024

- Approved as presented

STAFF REPORTS

May Historic Preservation Newsletter

Staff will provide an update on the recently published May newsletter

- Staff briefly provided an overview on metrics related to the newsletter and specific columns that residents had provided positive feedback on.

Cultural Heritage Awards Program - Call for Nominations

Staff will provide the Commission with an update on the Cultural Heritage Awards Program and encourage promotion of the open call for nominations.

- Staff briefly provided an overview of promotion of the awards so far, noting the City had provided a press release for it, posted it in newsletters, and that Chair Dreler was planning to present the awards to the Arts Council next week.

DISCUSSION (NO VOTE WILL BE TAKEN)

Preservation Consortium and Corps of Volunteers

Chair Dreler will provide an overview of a National Association of Preservation Commissions webinar she attended entitled, *unlocking the power of nonprofit and historic preservation commission collaboration*. This discussion aligns with Initiative 2.10 within the Preserve 2040 Plan -- organizing a Preservation Consortium or Preservation Advisory Sub-Committee to support and help increase available volunteer capital, expand coordination with partner organizations, and generally reduce demands on Staff and Commissioner capacity.

- Sarah M. Dreler provided additional background on the initiative noting its close relationship with rules and procedures updates currently under consideration by the City.
- Background was provided on the previous attempts at a consortium as well as the initiative within the Preserve 2040 Plan and its importance.

- It was noted that a primary reason for this initiative was to relieve burdens on volunteer and staff capital by broadening the net of preservation to include more voice and allow individuals and organizations to help advance the Commissions work.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Order & Agenda Items are subject to change. Information about the Preservation Commission is available at: Preservation Commission Questions can be directed to Cade W. Sterling at 847-448-8231 or at csterling@cityofevanston.org The city is committed to ensuring accessibility for all citizens; if an accommodation is needed to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning and Zoning Division at (847-448-8687) 48 hours in advance so that arrangements can be made for the accommodation if possible.

Español - La ciudad de Evanston tiene la obligación de hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o a quienes no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor contacte a Carlos D. Ruiz de la Oficina de Planificación y Zonificación llamando al (847/448-8687) o cruiz@cityofevanston.org con 48 horas de anticipación para acomodar su pedido en lo posible