MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, March 21, 2017
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2404
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Elliott Dudnik, Julie Hacker, Sally Riessen Hunt, Ken Itle, Mark Simon, Tim Schmitt, Diane Williams, and Karl Vogel

Members Absent: Robert Bady and Sally Riessen Hunt (left meeting at 9:00 pm)

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator, Division Manager
Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 pm with a quorum of 8 Commissioners present. Commissioner Riessen Hunt left the meeting at 9 pm.

PUBLIC HEARING


Commissioner Riessen Hunt made a motion to close the regular meeting and open the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed unanimously.

Jim Kollross of 1210 Michigan, applicant, then presented his nomination of the John Augustus Nyden house at 1726 Hinman. John A. Nyden designed and built the house in 1921. Nyden, an accomplished architect, was the designer of notable buildings in the City of Evanston, the City of Chicago, and elsewhere. According to Mr. Kohlross’ application, the nomination meets the designation criteria specified in Evanston’s Preservation Ordinance Section 2-8-4 (A) 2 and (A) 3 and Section 2-8-4 (B).

John A. Nyden immigrated to the Chicago area from Sweden in 1895. Nyden was educated at the Art Institute of Chicago and the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. He started his own architectural firm after interning for other firms and became a very prominent and successful architect. Nyden designed approximately 300 buildings
(multi-family, commercial, retail, hospitals, educational institutions, and residences). Among Nyden’s area works are least eight individual National Register listings, seven Evanston landmarks, and several City of Chicago landmark buildings. Nyden also served as the State Architect for the State of Illinois in 1926-27.

1726 Hinman Avenue is a three-story brick residence located on the west side of Hinman Avenue. The original residence at 1726 Hinman, dating to 1891, was built for a prominent Evanston family. Nyden purchased the property and constructed his residence there in 1921 on a portion of the original home’s foundation. Its distinguishing design features include:

- South façade: 2-story sun porch with side alcoves with windows featuring limestone keystones and decorative brick.
- North façade: 2 chimneys with stone caps.
- East façade: Off-center front porch with 8 Doric columns connected by a unique interlocking wood design. The front door has an open pediment structure with pilasters, a fully divided door, and an arched transom.
- West façade: Arched three-window panel with keystones, and a distinctive dormer with two separate roofs and arched windows. coach house is unique; it has full double doors on the alley and driveway sides; matching details in terms of brick, key stones, copper, etc. The original Colonial tile roof was replaced with asphalt.
- Other distinguishing features on 1726 Hinman include: the bay window in the dining room with an original seam copper roof and copper gutters.
- Original coach house: full double doors on the alley and driveway sides; matching design details with the main house, though the original tile roof was replaced with asphalt.

Mr. Kollross stated that there have been no significant changes to the exterior of the house, based on the original plans located at the Evanston History Center. It remains an extremely well built house with quality materials.

Nyden-designed Evanston landmarks include 17 buildings in Southeast Evanston, representing vintage apartment buildings listed in the National Register of Historic Places and designated as Evanston Landmarks, including: Westminster, 632-640 Hinman Avenue (1912); Stoneleigh Manor, 904-906 Michigan Avenue (1913); Fountain Plaza Apartments, 830-856 Hinman Avenue (1922); and 830-844 Hinman Avenue (1923). Other important Evanston Landmarks by Nyden are: Hahn Building, 1618 Orrington and 1609 Sherman Avenues (1927) a commercial building in downtown Evanston; 2855 Sheridan Place (1911) a residential building; 807-817 Judson (1925) an apartment building; Stoneleigh Castle, 822-828 Judson Avenue (1927) an apartment building.

John Nyden’s Chicago works include the Victory Monument, located at 35th Street and M. L. King Drive, (1927). Listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the Victory Monument honors an African American Regiment that lost 137 lives in World War I. In addition to the Victory Monument, Nyden designed buildings are also City of Chicago
landmarks and listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Examples include Belmont-Sheffield Trust and Savings Building (1928), originally a neighborhood bank building, now apartments and retail; and 257 East Delaware Place (1917); originally an apartment building, now condo. Nyden’s work on behalf of Chicago’s Swedish community included varied building styles and uses, such as Caroline Hall and the President’s Residence at North Park College (1924-1925), now North Park University. Nyden designed North Park’s grounds in 1913 and built the initial gymnasium auditorium.

Nyden designs in Illinois and elsewhere and listed in the National Register of Historic Places include: the Grandstand at Illinois’ State Fairgrounds, Springfield, IL (1927); Goddard Chapel in Rose Hill Cemetery, Marion, IL (1918); and the American Swedish Historical Museum in Philadelphia (1926), the oldest Swedish historical museum in the U.S. This building was jointly modeled after a castle in Sweden and George Washington’s Mount Vernon.

Mr. Kohlross also cited a City of Evanston Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) hearing on November 18, 1975. At that hearing, the then Executive Director of Sigma Chi Foundation, Mr. Bingham, testified that the Sigma Chi Foundation will ‘preserve the exterior appearance of the house as a single family residence’ and ‘maintain it in a fine condition of upkeep and repair.’ A recorded Covenant with the City dated February 26, 1976 states “…2. No changes shall be made that will not preserve the appearance of a single family dwelling…” Although the house currently needs maintenance, repairs such as the roof and the soffits, and painting, the structure still retains its integrity.

Commissioner Simon then asked if this recorded Covenant is still in effect, and Mr. Kollross stated yes, but the Covenant was not sufficient.

After the conclusion of Mr. Kohlross’ presentation, Hal Morris, attorney, representing the Sigma Chi Foundation, the owner of record of 1726 Hinman; Ashley Woods, CEO and President of the Sigma Chi Foundation; and Scott Hezner, a Libertyville-based architect retained by the owner, spoke against the nomination to designate 1726 Hinman as an Evanston Landmark and stated that 1726 Hinman does not meet the criteria for designation.

Hal Morris noted that 1726 Hinman was on the City’s radar for the last 40 years, as stated by Mr. Kollross. During those 40 years, the property was excluded from the Lake Shore Historic District, that district’s original survey, and the 2012 re-survey and never nominated for landmark designation by the Commission or by the City. Moreover, the City of Evanston in the third and fourth quarter of 2016, found it appropriate under the City’s code to issue a demolition permit and a secession of utilities permit for the property.

James Ashley Woods, President of Sigma Chi Foundation, noted that the Foundation has been in the area since the 1950s. They relocated from the Harley Clarke Mansion to 1726 Hinman Avenue, establishing their first international headquarters in the 1960s.
They purchased 1726 Hinman in the 1970s to house the Foundation’s traveling advisors. The Foundation maintained the home until five years ago when their advisors program was decommissioned. The Foundation is the largest charitable organization of its type, raising funds and providing support to undergraduate students across the United States. The Foundation focuses on campus-related social problems and serves and supports 240 campuses, distributing about $4.5 million annually to 17,000 students. Mr. Wood also observed that Sigma Chi Foundation has completed significant work to maintain the 1726 property.

Scott Hezner, architect with the Hezner Corporation, addressed architectural styles and the importance of John Nyden’s work in his presentation. Mr. Helzner noted that Colonial Revival, the property’s described style, represents of many elements, such as Neo-Classical detail with certain common details within the overall building type. Common details in Classical Revival buildings include rectangular footprints, symmetrical facades, porticos and shutters, centered porches, and slate roofs. The structure at 1726 Hinman is asymmetrical and not rectangular, given this building was built on an existing foundation. The elevations have varied stylistic elements and designs. The front porch is not centered, and the terra cotta roof dormer tiles do not reflect the Colonial Revival style. Based upon the site plan, the floor plans, and the design attributes of the building’s elevations, 1726 is not a Colonial Revival structure but a derivative of that style.

Mr. Hezner also noted John Nyden came to the U.S. at 16 years old. He worked as an apprentice for numerous teams of architects working on many projects. Mr. Hezner asserted that John Nyden did not do any design work on his own, except perhaps design his house. He worked with teams of people: draftsmen, architects, engineers, and contractors. Nyden was able to obtain his architectural education through trade schools, the Art Institute of Chicago, and the University of Illinois. The Swedish community helped Nyden with his career. Nyden’s name is not included in architectural histories, and he did not was not create the Colonial Revival style. John Nyden was a working architect, but not a great architect. Nyden’s name does not appear on the list of Notable Early 20th Century Architects.

Mr. Hezner estimated the cost of rehabilitating 1726 Hinman Avenue to a useable condition at $3.2 million. This estimate includes: window, door, details, and walls that need to be stripped; repairs to the building shell and roof; garage door and window replacements in the coach house; restoring and repointing all masonry; stone detail repairs; and fully insulating the structure. Custom features, such as the frieze, gutters, dentils, windows, and columns, would require removal, repair or restoration, and replacement. Mr. Hezner also noted that he house has not had heat or electricity for five months.

Hal Morris, the Foundation’s attorney, summarized the three (3) presentations as follows:
• Evanston’s Preservation Ordinance includes a duty to conduct an ongoing survey to identify historically, culturally, and architecturally significant areas, properties, and structures. For forty years, 1726 Hinman was not included. It was not included within the boundaries of the Lake Shore historic district, either originally or when re-inventoried in 2012. It was not identified anywhere for designation until now.

• City staff issued permits for the disconnection of utilities (#16WSRP-0062) and demolition in the third and fourth quarter of 2016. In issuing these permits, the City staff concluded that demolition was appropriate.

• Architecturally, 1726 Hinman is not representative of the Colonial Revival style and is not a new style or standard. Regarding historic significance, it is not an important place. There is no suggestion that either Nyden worked there or met important clients there. It was his residence.

• 1726 Hinman Avenue is not a place associated with someone of actual preeminence or prominence. Nyden was an accomplished architect, but he is not recognized as notable in lists of prominent architects. Nyden may have been prolific, but he was not architecturally or historically noteworthy. Though his work includes designated landmarks, National Register properties, and significant Evanston buildings, it does not mean that 1726 Hinman Avenue is worthy of designation.

• Regarding integrity, 1726 Hinman was never identified for landmark status or inclusion in any historic district, and the building has been known to the City of Evanston for years. The building lacks any stylistic integrity, and the high cost of restoration strongly suggests that it lacks integrity.

• Designating 1726 Hinman as a Landmark would seriously impact the charitable mission of the Sigma Chi Foundation, given the projected $3.2 million rehabilitation cost. The need for repairs would require the Foundation to cease or curtail its charitable work, negatively impacting their ongoing charitable programs. The estimated cost of restoration would represent over 70 percent of their annual budget for their charitable work.

Finally, Mr. Morris stated that the nomination of this particular structure simply does not meet the criteria for landmark designation specified in Evanston’s Ordinance and asked the Commission to find that 1726 Hinman does not meet those Ordinance criteria.

Initial Commission Questions:
Chair Williams reminded the Commission that their role was to determine if this application, based upon the information provided to the Commission, meets the criteria for landmark designation as stated in Evanston’s Ordinance. Chair Williams then asked if a full existing conditions report on the property had been obtained to support the estimated $3.2 million restoration cost? Mr. Morris said no. The Hezner Corporation did not have access to the attic, and they did not look behind the walls in conducting their assessment. Commissioner Itle asked about the 1970s ZBA decision and Covenant, allowing the single-family home to be used for a different purpose, with the understanding that its appearance be maintained. What part of that agreement is pertinent today, and is there something that carries with the title? Mr. Morris said the agreement goes with the property title. It is the City’s decision to issue permits. If landmarked, there will be the $3.2 million cost to bring it back on line.
Commissioner Riessen Hunt asked about the 1976 ZBA/City Covenant’s life span. Mr. Morris said such covenants could run for a substantial amount of time. However, do intervening events cause a covenant to no longer be applicable? The answer is yes. Commissioner Dudnik asked, when did the building’s use as a rooming house stop? Mr. Woods said it stopped about eight years ago. Commissioner Dudnik then asked, was there a responsibility for the Foundation to continue maintaining the building? Mr. Woods said that they invested tens of thousands of dollars in maintaining the property until submitting the 2016 permit applications.

Public Comment
In advance of the public hearing, Chair Williams noted that the Commission had received 18 communications from area residents supporting landmark designation for 1726 Hinman Avenue. Gretchen Fathauer of 1730 Hinman, 4D, submitted pictures to the Commission showing the deterioration of the 1726 Hinman buildings over the years. Ms. Fathauer said that nearby residents believe that a new commercial building or parking lot would change neighborhood character. Kitty Finn of 1730 Hinman, 3B, stated that the home and the trees could be saved.

Mary McWilliams, Associate member of the Preservation Commission, also spoke. She has served the Commission in various roles since 1977. She and Anne Earle, Associate member (in the audience), were members of the original Committee that surveyed Evanston to identify potential landmarks and historic districts. This work took about 10 years, and unfortunately, they missed 1726 Hinman Avenue. This does not indicate that 1726 Hinman is unworthy of designation; it was overlooked. She said the purpose of the Lakeshore Historic District re-survey was to review the historic resources already included and not to expand the boundaries of the District. The current context of 1726 Hinman Avenue is also not necessarily a reason to deny designation. As the author of the nomination of the Woman’s Temperance Christian Union Historic District, Ms. McWilliams noted that this District lacks context, with multi-family buildings surrounding it. But the City felt that this District was worthy of designation. Ms. McWilliams also stated that the building’s composition and style holds together well and is worthy of designation.

Applicant and Owner Responses
Jim Kollross responded to several comments made by Foundation representatives. Regarding Mr. Hezner’s comment about Colonial revival buildings with porches. The Woman’s Club of Evanston (1702 Chicago), a local and national landmark, has a front porch. Regarding context, the parking structure behind 1726 Hinman is directly across the street from the Frances Willard house, probably the most famous building in Evanston and a National Historic Landmark. Regarding permits, the Building staff looks at a list of existing landmark buildings. If a building (by address) is not on the list, it will be cleared for permit issuance. There is no review by the Building Department.

Regarding Nyden’s earlier career, Mr. Kollross noted that Nyden was Chief Draftsman for Arthur Heun, most notably for the Armour Estate in Lake Forest. By 1917 Nyden had
already created 200 structures primarily in the Chicago area. He was an accomplished architect and was published four times in architectural journals for his work. The Nyden designed museum in Philadelphia, PA, includes a plaque displaying his image. Mr. Kollross also observed that 1726 Hinman Avenue is a special house. It is a well-constructed Colonial Revival residence with both significant and unique features of the style. Mr. Kollross respectfully requested that the Preservation Commission recommend designation of 1726 Hinman as an Evanston landmark.

Hal Morris, the owner’s attorney, stated that this is not the 1921 house. Bringing the building back will cost an estimated $3.2 million. The City has had plenty of opportunities over forty years to landmark it, but nothing happened. The property is not proposed to be a high rise or a parking lot but an amenity. Also, suggesting that the City’s Building [Department] readily agreed to demolition, after reviewing pictures of the building during permitting, diminishes staff’s important role.

Mr. Morris noted that John Nyden is architect with some accomplishments, but his house is not a place of a significant event, either in history or specific to Nyden. The building neither exemplifies a particular style nor establishes a new style. This building is neither significant to architectural history nor altered it. This house can be re-used only at substantial cost, seriously affecting the Foundation’s charitable mission. Mr. Morris urged the Commission to look at what exists today, not what was there years ago. This building lacks the necessary integrity and does not meet the Ordinance criteria for landmark designation.

Commission’s Discussion and Findings:
Chair Williams asked, the nomination cites criteria 2-8-4 (A) 2 and (A) 3; why was (A) 4 not included? Mr. Kollross said he could have included (A) 4. However, he believed he covered (A) 4 with the inclusion of (A) 2 and (A) 3 in the interest of keeping a succinct nomination. The Commission agreed that criterion 2-8-4 (A) 4 could be included as part of their decision.

Commissioner Simon noted the conflicting statements made about the actions taken by the City staff and the Covenant. Those seemed to be relevant to what is being discussed. Commissioner Simon said that it seemed that the Covenant was recently discovered. There has not been any kind of determination by the City or the City Attorney as to the effect of it. He wondered if it is advisable to seek that determination. He expressed concern about making a determination without understanding the significance of it.

Commissioner Schmitt said regardless of what the Covenant means, the nomination made the property worthy of landmark designation. Commissioner Itle said while he was curious about the legal status of the previous agreements, he views them as a zoning question for the ZBA. Zoning might have an impact on what they can do with property. It represents a sort of a parallel track to anything the Preservation Commission will do.
Commissioner Simon found the relationship between the Covenant and the Commission’s determination too indistinguishable. He thought the Covenant is like a partial landmarking. Commissioner Simon said the status of the Covenant is integral to his decision. Commissioner Dudnik said the ZBA did not grant a variance; rather they wanted to retain the building. Chair Williams said the ZBA's decision predates any preservation program or any Preservation Ordinance.

Chair Williams said theoretically if the Commission makes a determination and if there were a City issue associated with the property that goes with the title, having clarification about that would be useful.

Hal Morris stated that the owner has asked that the demolition-related permits not be revoked, given City's actions and the landmark nomination submittal. Chair Williams indicated that the Commission considers the nomination data presented to determine if the Ordinance's landmark criteria is met. The issues noted add a level of complexity to the Commission's role determining landmark status.

Mr. Morris, in response to a question about what is planned for the site, indicated that the plan over the next couple of years is to effectively create a campus for the headquarters with additional green space, landscaping and trees and to add to the existing headquarters building in the future.

Chair Williams said the Commission’s options are to proceed and make a motion to consider whether 1726 should be designated, to continue the nomination to the next meeting to obtain more ZBA/Covenant background, or do a combination of both. The Commission discussed the 35-day period after the closing of the public hearing where the Commission is supposed to make its final recommendation. Commissioner Itle suggested the Commission take whatever action it deems appropriate now and use the 35-day period to confirm that there is no legal issue caused by the 1970s agreement that would interfere with whatever action the Commission takes.

Jim Kollross stated he had met with Corporation Council and the City Manager to share the information (Hearing and Covenant) with them. He believed that they are waiting for the Preservation Commission decision. He had discovered the ZBA actions and brought them to the City’s attention because he assumed they were forgotten. The Covenant can be canceled, as a separate protection and has no bearing on his landmark nomination. He wanted to move forward applying the Ordinance’s criteria.

The Commissioners agreed to vote on the nomination. Commissioner Itle noted criterion 4 is the more relevant criterion in this case. Criterion 2 is more broadly written, describing historical development. The Commission discussed Nyden’s work and that 1726 Hinman was his home, concluding that Criterion 4 is more relevant. Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to designate 1726 Hinman Avenue as an Evanston Landmark, and recommend landmark designation to the Evanston City Council. The applicable Ordinance criteria for designation are:
2-8-4 (A) 3. Its exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or overall quality of design, detail, materials or craftsmanship; and

2-8-4 (A) 4. Its identification as the work of an architect, designer, engineer or builder whose individual work is significant in the history or development of the City, the State, the Midwest region or the United States.

Commissioner Itle seconded the motion. Commissioner Dudnik then amended his motion to include criterion 2-8-4 (B) stating “Integrity of Landmarks and Districts. Any area, property, structure, site or object that meets any one or more of the criteria in Subsection 2-8-4(A) shall also have sufficient integrity of location, design, materials and workmanship to make it worthy of preservation or restoration.” Commissioner Itle seconded the amended motion. The motion passed as amended (the recommendation of landmark status for 1726 Hinman was approved). Vote: 5 ayes, 3 nays.

Commissioner Riessen made a motion to close the public hearing and re-open the Commission’s regular meeting at 9:02 pm on Tuesday, March 21, 2017. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Vogel. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS


Chris Coleman, representing applicant North Shore Builders, presented the application. He said that at the January 2017 meeting the Commission had concerns about the design of south façade, and how it related to the homes along Colfax St. In response they added a box bay with an ornamental gable at the top, a window under the main gable roof, eyebrows over the windows, and ornamental brick on the fireplace and chimney.

Commissioners discussed the window under the gable, the south façade being too symmetrical, and the scale of the fireplace.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for the new construction at 2350 Orrington Av. with the suggestion that the proposed attic window on the south gable be deleted, in that standards for construction 1-13 and 16 apply, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 nay.

NEW BUSINESS

A. 2649 Highland Av. (L) - Michele Thoele, applicant. Construction of a 4’ high scalloped picket wood fence. The fence will be located on the south side of the house coming off the SW corner of the front porch and go south about 18 feet to the property line, then head west toward Highland Avenue. There will be a gate and
arbor centrally located. Requested variation is from Section 6-4-6-7-F-2, that states, fences are not permitted within the front yard. Applicable standards: [Construction] [Zoning Variation] A and C.

Michele Thoele and P. Ghogomu presented the application. M. Thoele said the proposed white picket cedar fence is setback approximately 32 ft. from the west property line. The intent is to connect the proposed fence and diagonal arbor with the fence on the adjacent south vacant lot. (This south lot is separate from the landmark lot of record.)

Commissioner Vogel made a motion to approve the fence at 2649 Highland Av. based on standards for construction 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Vogel made a motion to recommend approval of the Zoning fence variance for 2649 Highland Av., fence, in that standards A and C apply, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

B. **115 Dempster St. (L/LSHD)** – Paul Janicki, applicant. Replace four dormers on rear roofs, add to existing garage footprint, add new breakfast bay, remove miscellaneous windows and replace with new windows and expand light wells. Zoning variance: Proposed .5’ rear yard setback for garage/ addition, where 30’ is required. Proposed 0’ west interior side yard setback for garage where 5’ is required. Applicable standards: [Alteration] 1-6, 9 and 10; [Construction] 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-16; [Demolition] 1-5; [Zoning Variation] A and C.

Paul Janicki, architect, presented the application. P. Janicki said, previously, the Commission strongly objected to a proposed addition on top of the garage and the proposed enlargement of the dormers on the primary south elevation. Both are no longer being proposed.

The current project is adding 9’ to the south of the garage; with three double hung wood windows on the south elevation. Also, install two carriage doors and a man door on the garage west elevation. Replacing the existing kitchen vinyl casement windows with two double hung wood windows on the main house west elevation, and remove and existing double hung window and infill the opening with brick to match the existing. On the north elevation, a breakfast bay replaces a wooden deck, a double hung window replaces two small windows above the deck; and four new symmetrical wood dormers on the roof, matching design and details of the original dormers; and the existing bay window is being extended below and a cornice above. On the east elevation, the French door and sidelights on the third floor are being replaced with a single door and two double hung windows on either side. The garage east elevation vinyl siding is being replaced with brick to match the house.

Commissioner Hacker complemented P. Janicki for the proposed plan that addresses the Commission’s previous concerns.
David Abraham, property owner of the vacant lot at 100 Greenwood expressed appreciation of the removal of the addition over the garage. However, he spoke against the 42” of additional height of the expanded garage and the three garage windows facing north and the new dormers facing north. P. Janicki said the 42” additional height is to match the existing entablature height on the west elevation. The glass block window on the north wall is being replaced with three windows. The existing garage is 10.7’ high; the proposed is 14.2’ high.

Diarmaid Collins of 133 Dempster spoke against the proposed 0’ west interior side yard setback where 5’ is required. D. Collins said he would like to have the 5’ side yard setback. P. Janicki said the garage depth then would be 14’.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to approve a COA for 115 Dempster St. to replace dormers on the rear roof(s), add to the existing garage footprint and the breakfast bay, remove some miscellaneous windows and replace with new windows and expand the light wells, with applicable standards for alteration 1-6, 9 and 10, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed unanimously; Vote 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to approve a COA for 115 Dempster St. to for construction [expansion of garage] with standards for construction 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-16, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed unanimously. Vote 7 ayes, 0 nays

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to approve a COA for 115 Dempster St. to remove portions of the west and north sides, and areas of the roof to accommodate dormers and the garage construction, with demolition standards 1-5, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion recommending to the Zoning Board of Appeals for 115 Dempster St. for the proposed work [.5’ rear yard setback for garage addition, where 30’ is required. Proposed 0’ west interior side yard setback for garage, where 5’ is required], with applicable standards for Zoning variation [6-15-11-5] A and C, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 1221 Hinman Av. (L/LSHD) – Janusz Smolla, applicant. West front elevation: replace non-original attic windows with new clad wood windows to match original windows. North elevation: Replace double hung window at stairway with picture window, and replace two non-original windows with new windows to match original. Applicable standards: [Alteration] 1-6, 9 and 10.

Janusz Smolla presented the application. He said the third floor west façade and north façade windows are not original; they are in bad condition and need to be replaced. The proposed windows are wood aluminum clad windows.
On the north façade, windows A and B (as marked in the application) with the grid are not original and will be replaced with double hung windows with no grids. The existing third floor double hung widows on either side of the casement windows (all with grids), will be replaced with double hung windows (with no grids) on either side of casement windows (with no grids), but with a middle grid of the same thickness as the meeting rail the double hung windows.

On the north façade, double hung window C is at the stairway. The stairway will be rebuilt to meet the code and the window opening will be moved 9 inches higher and the sill raised 8 inches, the new window is a fixed widow. Also, next to window B, the former window opening from where an AC unit was removed, will be closed and sided with siding to match the existing. Some of the storm windows have divided lights.

Carlos Ruiz said that if the Commission were to approve the replacement aluminum clad wood windows; it does not mean that the Commission would approve in the future the replacement of the remaining original wood windows.

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to issue a COA for 1221 Hinman Av. to replace the non-original attic windows [double hung and casement] with new wood windows to match the original windows [double hung and casement respectively], and replace a double hung window C with a picture wood window, with applicable standards of alteration 1-6, 9 and 10, seconded by Commissioner Vogel. The motion passed. Vote: 4 ayes, 3 nays.

D. 2145 Orrington Av. (NEHD) – Celeste Robbins, applicant. Construct a 2 ½ car garage and some modifications to existing wood fence, sidewalk and landscaping will be necessary to accommodate proposed garage. Applicable standards: [Construction] 1-5, 7-13, and 16; [Demolition] 1-5.

Ed Witkowski presented the application. He said the project is to build a new 2 ½ car garage on a vacant portion of the lot that is located off the alley to the East of the property. One exterior material option is stone to match the stone, parapet, and walls of the townhomes. The other option is brick to match the new garages to be built next door.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for 2145 Orrington Av. for the construction a new 2 ½ car garage and some associated site work, with the understanding that the stone matching the townhomes will be used, and standards for construction 1-5, 7-13, and 16 apply, seconded by Commissioner Vogel. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for 2145 Orrington Av. for the demolition associated for this project in that meets standards for demolition 1-5, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Jeanie Petrick, the application, said the proposed work is a 450 square feet single story rear addition with an unfinished crawl space below, and a deck behind it. The addition is in the same architectural style as the house (Dutch Colonial or Spanish Colonial). The addition’s parapet wall mimics the curve that is at the front entry porch.

The rear addition includes leaded glass windows above the French doors. The door with the arch mimics the arched window on the front elevation. The exterior finish material is stucco to match the house. The parapet wall has metal flashing. All new doors and windows are wood reflecting of the existing. The original kitchen window on the north wall will be relocated and a new window will be added. The flat roof on the addition allows the retention of all second story rear windows.

Commissioner Simon made a motion to approve a COA for construction of the single story rear addition at 2036 Orrington Av. with the standards for review for construction 1, 3, 5, 7-10, and 12-15, seconded by Commissioner Schmitt. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 nay.

Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to issue a COA for demolition [as necessary to allow the proposed rear addition] in that standards for demolition 1-5 apply, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 nay.


Ann Stockard, the applicant, said the proposed work is on the rear west elevation. A double hung window will be relocated to the south elevation; a new fiberglass door to the kitchen with a transom above and a sidelight will be installed in its place. A new full lite door to the mudroom and two new double hung wood windows are being added. The siding on the square columns at the corner and south elevation will be removed to expose the wood column. Brackets and dentil work will match the existing.

The Commission discussed the style of the railing on the new rear deck and the removal of the siding on the square columns. It was decided to retain the railing as submitted and leaving the siding on the columns as being more appropriate.

Commissioner Ittle made a motion to issue a COA for 1134 Judson Av. for enclosing the rear porch, constructing the deck, relocating and installing new windows and doors. Also, keeping the siding and adding new siding as needed for the columns at the rear,
in that standards for alteration 1-6, 9 and 10 apply, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for 1134 Judson Av. for construction as previously described, and standards for construction 1, 7, 10, and 12-16 apply., seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.


Karl Vogel, applicant, said the one car garage will be demolished and a new 3-car garage will be built. The new garage siding is hardie plank and it has an overhang with bead board finish to match that of the house. The cedar shake under the gable roof match the cedar shake on the house dormers. The 6/1 new aluminum clad wood windows match the windows on the house. The garage requires a zoning variation for the proposed 34% lot coverage, where 30% is allowed.

Commissioner Simon made a motion to approve a COA for 1018 Michigan Av. for the construction of a 3-car garage in accordance with construction standards 1-5, 7-13, and 16, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 abstained (Commissioner Vogel).

Commissioner Simon made a motion to approve a COA for 1018 Michigan Av. for the demolition of the existing garage in that demolition standards 1-5 apply, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 abstained (Commissioner Vogel).

Commissioner Simon then made a motion to recommend a zoning variation to permit the greater 34% lot coverage, necessary to construct the garage at 1018 Michigan, standards A and C apply, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 abstained (Commissioner Vogel).


Commissioner Simon made a motion to approve the January 31, 2017 meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 abstention (Commissioner Schmitt)

COMMITTEE REPORTS (Working Groups)

A. Preservation Ordinance Review Subcommittee - Update.
Chair Williams said the Preservation Ordinance Review Subcommittee next meeting is on April 6, 2017 at 8 am, room 2404, Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

VOLUNTEER REPORTS

A. Design Guidelines Volunteers – Update

No report.

STAFF REPORTS

No report.

DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

No discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Itle made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:59 pm, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted:

Carlos D. Ruiz
Preservation Coordinator.