MEETING MINUTES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE
REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Friday, August 11, 2017
8:00 A.M.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2404

Members Present: Robert Bady, Ken Itle, Mark Simon, Karl Vogel and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Sally Riessen Hunt and Tim Schmitt,

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator/Division Manager
Carlos D. Ruiz Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

With a quorum present Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 8:06 a.m.

APPROVAL MINUTES

Before adjournment of the meeting, Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve the July 13, 2017 meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 4 ayes, 0 nays (Commissioner Simon had left already the meeting).

OLD BUSINESS

A. Preservation Commission Rules and Procedures Review (Continuation from July 13, 2017)

The Subcommittee added new text (bold and underlined) and deleted existing text (strikethrough) as follows:

ARTICLE 4. APPLICATION HEARINGS

1. Consideration of Applications.

o) The Commission may allow through its discretion the withdrawal of the applications.
p) The Commission may, at its discretion, conduct additional visits to the premises and obtain additional facts concerning any application before arriving at a decision. All decisions of the Commission shall be supported by appropriate Findings of Fact, and where necessary, shall be accompanied by such conditions and/or recommendations as it may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances.

q) In considering applications, witnesses may be called and factual evidence may be submitted. The Commission shall not be bound by the rules of evidence, but may hear and consider any evidence it considers to have probative value on the issues before it.

NEW BUSINESS

ARTICLE 4. APPLICATION HEARINGS

2. Reconsideration of Applications Approved Subject to Conditions or Denied.

The order of business for reconsideration of applications for Certificates of Appropriateness which previously have been approved subject to conditions or denied shall be as follows:

a) The Chair shall entertain a motion from a member of the Commission that the applicant is allowed to present evidence in support of the request for reconsideration. Such evidence shall be limited to that which is necessary to enable the Commission to determine whether or not there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence, or conditions relating to the application; provided, however, that the applicant shall be given the opportunity to present any other additional supporting evidence, if the Commission reconsider the application.

b) After receiving the evidence, the Commission shall proceed to deliberate whether or not there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence or conditions relating to the application, which would warrant reconsideration. If the Commission finds that there has been such a change, it shall thereupon treat the request as a new application received at that time.

c) The Commission may, at its discretion, appoint three commission members to view additional information submitted and vote on the approval or denial of the application.

3. Modifications to Certificates of Appropriateness.

An approved Certificate of Appropriateness may be modified by a written request from the applicant to the Commission. Such a request shall include a description of the proposed change and shall be accompanied by elevations, plans or sketches, where necessary. If the modification is minor, it may be approved according to the Minor Works procedure as outlined in Article 5. If the modification constitutes a substantial change, the applicant must treat it as a new application and appear before the Commission according to these Rules and Procedures.
ARTICLE 5 – CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS LIST

Historic Districts district reflect pride in the character of a community, and a desire on the part of the community and the city to preserve their assets. Historic districts are an important planning tool for the city, a way to improve the quality of life, sustain neighborhoods, and at the same time, a way to encourage new development that enhances the historic character and scale of an area.

...The following list is provided as a general outline of the level of review that may be expected of various types of projects that are often undertaken. It is not intended to be comprehensive, and it cannot cover every circumstance that will be encountered in a project.

A Certificate of Appropriateness needs a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Commission only has purview over those alterations that can be seen by the public way (City street, alley, or public sidewalk).

Minor Work projects are reviewed by the City of Evanston’s Preservation Coordinator for the City of Evanston. Staff will refer Minor Work projects to the Commission for review, if in staff’s judgment, the change involves alterations, additions, or removals that are substantial, or do not meet the standards, or are of a precedent-setting nature.

Major Work projects, of the types listed below, are reviewed by the Commission. In general, Major work projects involve a change in the appearance of a structure or site, and are more substantial in nature than routine maintenance or minor work projects. Such such changes include includes new construction, expansion of a building footprint or significant changes in landscape features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Routine Maintenance</th>
<th>Minor Work (Staff)</th>
<th>Major Work (Commission)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construction or Additions to primary contributing/significant buildings or landmarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demolition of any primary structures in a district; landmarks, significant or contributing structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demolition of any part of a primary structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relocation of landmark, significant or contributing buildings including accessory structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alteration/Removal of Architecturally or archeologically Significant Features</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alteration/Removal of Contributing Historical, Features Architectural or Archeological structures or objects</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Repair/Replacements in kind of existing Accessory Structures or Buildings when there is no change in design, materials, or general appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alteration of existing Accessory Structures or Buildings and Garages/Coach Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td>X or X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Additions to existing Accessory Structures or Buildings affecting landmarks, significant or contributing structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>New Construction of new Accessory Structures or Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>X or X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Demolition of existing Accessory Structures or Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>X or X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Repair or Replacement of Architectural Details when there is no change in design, materials, or general appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alteration/Addition/Removal of Architectural Features and Details</td>
<td></td>
<td>X or X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

DISCUSSION

The Subcommittee tentatively scheduled the next meeting on Thursday, September 7, 2017 at 8 am.

ADJOURNMENT
Commissioner Bady made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:31 am, seconded by Commissioner Itle. Motion passed unanimously. Vote: 4 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Preservation Coordinator, Community Development Department