



MEETING MINUTES

PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, October 8, 2024

7:00 P.M. Council Chambers Room 2800

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

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Cade W. Sterling

Presiding Member: Sarah Dreller, Chair

Minutes Taken by: Cade W. Sterling

CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public are afforded three minutes per person to provide testimony related to items listed under discussion, 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 during those agenda items in a manner and under time limits determined by the Chair.

NEW BUSINESS

24PRES-0134 - 711 Michigan Avenue - Lakeshore Historic District

DeBaker Design Group, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an attached deck at the homes rear elevation, and alter the homes rear volume by constructing a single-story addition within the existing rear-yard. **This case was originally heard on July 16 and continued to allow the applicant time to propose an alternative composition.**

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

- Beth Debaker, provided an overview of the revisions made since the subsequent review by the Commission including:
 - Changes to the proposed roof plan, changing from a hipped roof with intersecting gable to a more dominant gable addition with smaller connecting addition between it and the rear volume of the home.
 - Changes to material planes to ensure material transitions don't occur in the same plane
 - Changes to the pattern of fenestration and proportion of openings including changing the rear entrance location of the addition
- Commissioners applauded the change in design, noting that it addressed the previously identified standards of concern that were raised due to the previous roof plane sloping back toward the home, as well as material transitions occurring in the same plane.
- The applicant further suggested that, in part due to conversations with the neighboring property owner, they change the material on the north elevation to be brick to match the principal structures materiality, while retaining lap siding at the intermediate connecting piece or bussle which speaks to the vocabulary of part of the rear elevation and second-story sunroom.
- Commissioners noted that this change, or the plans as presented, were compatible
- Commissioners asked about the proposed fenestration at the south elevation, particularly what aspects of the homes existing vocabulary were referenced with proposing five windows ganged together.
 - The applicant noted that the ability to gang the windows together reflects modern window design, where weight pockets aren't necessary and the mouldings between become superfluous. As a south facing elevation, the thought was to gain as much natural light as possible. This elevation is also the least visible from the street and that lended itself to some flexibility in approach and creative license.
- Commissioners agreed noting that the side elevations of the home already have a much more irregular pattern of fenestration.
- Commissioner Cohen moved approval, second by Commissioner Ahleman.
- Chair Dreler asks for additional debate on the motion.
- Commissioners asked about the request to modify the wall material on the north elevation from siding to brick.
- Chair Dreler stated this could be done through an amendment to the original motion
- Commissioner Rizzolo made a motion to amend the original motion, allowing the north elevation to be either brick or lap siding as previously proposed. The motion was approved 10-0 and the underlying motion was amended.
- A vote on the amended motion carried on a vote of 10-0.

24PRES-0137 - 318 Greenleaf Street - Lakeshore Historic District

John Gonzalez, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, submits for a

Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the structures existing pattern of fenestration, construct an overhead entry portico at the homes street facing primary elevation, and construct a gable dormer above the full second-story at the homes west volume. Additionally, the applicant seeks major zoning relief from the maximum permitted building lot coverage of 30.7% where 30% is the maximum permitted (Code Section 6-8-2-7) and open off-street parking in the required street side-yard where open off-street parking is only permitted within the rearmost 30' of the rear-yard (Code Section 6-8-2-12).

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)).

Applicable Standards: Alteration [1-10]; and Construction [1-8, and 10-14]

- John Gonzalez, presented an overview of the proposal, including the desire to rehabilitate a former coach house turned single-family home. The alterations proposed were sought to increase efficiency of the interior layout as well as give the structure more of a unique identity, reflecting its historic evolution.
- Commissioners, noting that the structure was originally part of the Myron Hunt landmark designated home to the west, asked what inspiration from that structure or its design vocabulary shaped the changes to the former coach house.
 - The applicant stated that the changes made were complimentary to the Myron Hunt home, but there was also a desire to create a new identity and unique character to the former coach house. That was done primarily through the front portico and centered front entryway which does mimic both structures roof forms with flared hipped roof.
- Commissioners acknowledged the improvement to the structures overall visual appearance and were not disturbed by the changes to the front elevation along Greenleaf even though that certainly makes the home appear more independent from its original principal structure.
- Commissioners noted significant areas of brick that would need to be infilled, both in the current glass block areas, as well as the front elevation and other secondary elevations. The Commissioners asked how they would match the existing brick.
- The applicant stated that there were many areas where infill would be needed, but also areas where original brick was being removed, most notable the large area at the alley facing elevation to accommodate the new garage opening. The intention would be to use the original salvaged brick on the front elevation to have an exact match, but knowing that other areas would require sourcing complimentary brick.
- Commissioners agreed with the approach but also noted it could be difficult to locate a matching brick for the other areas and offered some technical assistance and resources.

- Staff noted that most commonly, brick matching existing is the requirement, and that brick is reviewed and approved on-site through mock-ups.
- Commissioners asked about the proposed pattern of fenestration, specifically why some windows were proposed to be ganged together while others have mouldings and trim pieces, and that many of the proposed windows weren't proportional to one another.
- The applicant acknowledged this could be studied further and that the drawings could be clearer. As presented there is not consistency in approach without a good reason why.
- Commissioners noted several discrepancies on the drawings that make it difficult to understand exactly what is being proposed.
- Commissioners asked about the existing glass block areas and why some were being infilled and others were remaining.
- The applicant stated the majority of glass block would be removed and infilled with matching brick, but some locations are between floor joists and difficult to access.
- Commissioners asked that this be reviewed and noted it was ideal to infill all the glass block areas, especially since three of the four elevations were highly visible.
- Commissioners asked if the changes, which were important but seemingly minor, could be handled administratively rather than require the applicant to come back to the full Commission.
- The majority of Commissioners asked to review the proposed changes at the subsequent meeting, noting how the changes may result in a different visual appearance and composition that is difficult to visualize without drawings.
- A motion to continue the case to the November 12 meeting was seconded and carried on a vote of 9-1 with Commissioner Ahleman dissenting, feeling the proposal met the standards as presented.
- Commissioners reviewed the proposed zoning relief, noting the minimal request for lot coverage above the maximum permitted, and a request for off-street parking location that in more ways than not, exists currently (the ability to park on the driveway), its just that its triggered since the garage door is moving from the driveway side to the alley side.
- Staff noted that the request was only major due to the parking variation otherwise the lot coverage would be a minor variation request.
- Commissioners noted that the increase in lot coverage is appropriate and in the interest of historic preservation as it allows for the creation of the entry portico which enhances the structures visual appearance and how it engages with the street, highlighting its evolution from a secondary structure to a primary structure.
- A motion to provide a positive recommendation on the zoning relief carried on a vote of 10-0.

24PRES-0138 - 2945 Central Street - Landmark

Ken Hazlett, architect and applicant on behalf of the homeowner, submits for a

Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate and adapt a former Pure Oil service station. The applicant proposes replacement windows, overhead doors, and a new main entry door in the existing openings, masonry repairs, replacing the existing asphalt shingle roof with a blue clay tile roof, new copper bay and entry awning, and a wood pergola/arbor and fence at the property's south and east lot lines.

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

- Ken Hazlett provided an overview of the proposal, including rehabilitation of the pure oil station based on similar rehabilitations across the country. The primary scope of work includes window replacement and restoration of the original steel windows, recreation of the structures blue glazed tile roof and copper detailing, re-painting or staining the brick, and embellishing the front façade to mimic design vocabularies of more ornate pure oil stations. In addition to this, as the space will be used as a restaurant, the existing paved areas will be used as outdoor seating with a large pergola or arbor and fence surrounding the outdoor space to create a sense of enclosure.
- Commissioners applauded the changes to the primary structure, noting the condition of the existing structure as well as the unique nature of the landmark designation. Whats proposed speaks to the structure uniqueness and honors its past while giving it new life for the future.
- The sample images of other restored or rehabilitated stations were very helpful.
- Mr. Hazlett noted that there is a fraternity of these restored stations, and hopefully this one becomes part of that group.
- Commissioners debated stain vs paint for use on the structures masonry. Although stain is more commonly accepted as the sensitive approach, it was noted that many masonry paints exist now that allow the brick and mortar to breathe and not trap moisture.
- Commissioners asked about the interior layout of the new structure and how access would occur.
- The applicant stated that the interior floor plans were not developed yet and really only provided at this time for concept purposes. The owner is still working on what type of restaurant would go into the space, and that would dictate some interior decisions.
- Commissioners spent considerable time reviewing the proposed arbor and pergola as well as the outdoor space.
 - There was concern with the scale of the structure compared to the modest scale of the principal structure and that the arbor overwhelmed the building, nearly completely obscuring it.
 - Concerns with access points and proximity to the street were identified, noting the sidewalk in that location was very narrow and perhaps a better entrance or secondary entrance location could be on the Hurd Street side which was wider and had a parkway between the street and the outdoor space.
 - Commissioners asked about the proposed paving material, noting something that was permeable and provided more texture than

- concrete would better compliment the structure, such as a brick with open joints.
- Commissioners asked if the opening for the arbor could be repositioned and become wider to frame and provide additional visibility of the dominant front gable and main entryway.
 - The applicant noted this was an excellent suggestion that would be explored.
 - Commissioners debated painting vs leaving the arbor natural, as well as growing ivy or other material on the arbor to soften it and provide additional visual screening.
 - Commissioners noted that there was significant opportunity for the outdoor space and the arbor to compliment rather than stand apart from the building, it is a space and concept that just needs to be studied further, including additional trees and plant material either in the ground or in planters or large tree containers in order to make the space more comfortable and pleasing.
 - Mr. Hazlett noted that they could study it further, but wanted to acknowledge that currently the outdoor space floats with no connection to the building nor the street and surrounding built vocabularies. It is intended to create enclosure and a defined sense of space that also carries and compliments the existing street wall created through building set much closer to the street.
 - Mr. Hazlett noted that his client was the contract purchaser, who was contingent on the property with a closing dependent on the Commission's approval. He asked if there was a way to address concerns with the outdoor space outside of a return to the Commission.
 - Commissioners and staff discussed approaches that would allow the scope of work for the building to be approved while having the arbor and outdoor space return in November.
 - Commissioners also discussed whether the work could be approved administratively, noting that the arbor as well as the paving material were minor work that would most commonly be approved by staff, as well as the discussion around landscaping being outside the purview of the Commission since it doesn't require a permit.
 - Commissioners agreed that the suggestions related to the landscape were forms of technical assistance that could be followed or not since that portion doesn't require the COA, but that they would like the pergola/arbor to come back to the Commission since it's of a unique and precedent setting scale compared to most arbors and pergolas that they may not see. It really dominates the space and requires additional sensitivity in approach.
 - Staff noted that even though the scopes of work are listed as minor, the Commission controls those rules and if they ask it to come back before them, staff would certainly do so.
 - A motion to approve the project without the arbor and pergola (only

the rehabilitation of the structure itself and the associated alterations), on a vote of 10-0.

- Staff noted that a separate motion to continue the other portion of the scope was not necessary as the case was approved with that removed. As such, the applicant would reapply under a new case only for the arbor and pergola which would be reviewed in November.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of September 10, 2024

- Approved without amendment

STAFF REPORTS AND UPDATES

2024 Cultural Heritage Awards

Staff will provide the Commission with an update on the Cultural Heritage Awards and next steps.

- Staff provided a brief update on the 12 nominations, the Jury, and the proposed awards ceremony at the October 28 City Council Meeting where the five selected winners would be acknowledged and celebrated.

Envision Evanston 2045 Review Timeline and Process

Staff will provide an update on the anticipated review of Envision Evanston 2045 by the Commission and the expected process for providing feedback.

- Staff provided an update on timing, with the release expected in mid October allowing the Commission time to review before a discussion at the November 12 meeting.
- The zoning code portion is planned to lag behind release of the comprehensive plan with a date unknown.
- Chair Dreler asked for as much time as possible to review both documents before a discussion noting past versions were sent to them with very little time to digest.
- Staff noted that the current process was for the Commission to present their findings to the Land Use Commission at their December meeting either through a formal comment letter or in-person testimony by the Chair or subset of the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 10pm.