MEETING MINUTES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Friday, February 10, 2017
8:00 A.M.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2404

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

Members Absent: Sally Riessen Hunt and Tim Schmitt.

Staff Present: Carlos D. Ruiz Preservation Coordinator

Others Present: Julie Hacker and Stuart Cohen

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

With a quorum present Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 8:17 a.m.

APPROVAL MINUTES - December 1, 2016

Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve the December 1, 2016 minutes, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Historic Preservation Ordinance Review

1. Recap of Section 2-8-9. - STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (B) Standards for review of construction 1-14.

Chair Williams said the Subcommittee received the responses to questions made to the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA). The IHPA liked the definition for "Walls of Continuity." [Responses attached to the minutes]. The Subcommittee decided to go back to the answers at a later time. The answers are a good point of reference.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Historic Preservation Ordinance Review
1. **Review of Section 2-8-9.** - **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

   (B) Standards for review of construction 15 and 16, (C), (D) and (E), and Section 2-8-10. - **CERTIFICATE OF ECONOMIC HARDSHIP.**

Subcommittee members discussed Section 2-8-9 (B) Standards for review of construction 15 - 17, (C), (D) and (E), and Section 2-8-10. - **CERTIFICATE OF ECONOMIC HARDSHIP,** and made the following **text amendments** (new text) and **deletions** (deleted text):

2-8-9 (B) **Standards for review of construction.**

15. *New additions.* Wherever possible, new additions to structures or objects shall be done in such a manner that if such additions were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the *structure historic property and its environment* would be unimpaired.

16. *New construction.* In considering new construction *(i.e. free standing structures),* the Commission shall not impose a requirement for the use of a single architectural style or period, though it may impose a requirement for compatibility.

17. *Signs.* Any sign that is readily visible from a public street shall not be incongruous to the historic character of the landmark or the district. Recommendations regarding signs are advisory only and may be referred to the **Sign Review and Appeals Board for consideration** DAPR or its successor committee.

(C) **Standards for review of relocation.** In considering an application for a certificate of appropriateness for relocation, the Commission shall consider only the following general standards, specific design guidelines, if any, accompanying the ordinance designating the landmark or district, and the standards included in Subsection 2-8-9(E):

1. Whether the **historic or urbanistic design character and aesthetic interest of the existing site or setting would be negatively impacted by the relocation of the structure or object, contributes to its present setting.**

(D) **Standards for review of demolitions.** In considering an application for a certificate of appropriateness for demolition, the Commission shall consider only the following general standards and the standards included in Subsection 2-8-9(E):

2. Whether the property, structure or object **contributes relates** to the distinctive historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological character of the district as a whole and should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and
5. Whether the property, structure or object is of such physical condition that it represents a dangerous and imminent hazardous condition to persons or property and that retention, remediation or repair are not physically possible or require great difficulty and/or expense.

2-8-10. - CERTIFICATE OF ECONOMIC HARDSHIP.

(B) Standard to be Applied. The Commission shall only approve an application for a certificate of economic hardship upon a determination that the denial of the certificate of appropriateness has resulted in the denial of all reasonable use of and return from the property. STOPPED HERE 2/10/17

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

DISCUSSION

The following discussion points were made during the review of Review of Section 2-8-9. - STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (B) Standards for review of construction 15 - 17, (C), (D) and (E), by paragraph (#).

2-8-9 (B)

15. New additions:
Is every structure in a historic district a contributing structure? Answer, no. The Subcommittee made a decision to not separating non-contributing structures in a historic district from preservation review. The Subcommittee added new text as suggested by Anthony Rubano of the IHPA “historic property and its environment.”

15. New additions and 16. New construction should be used in the context of ‘new construction.’

16. New construction. The Subcommittee added “(i.e. free standing structures)” to differentiate ‘New construction’ from “New additions.”

17. Signs. The Subcommittee added “DAPR or its successor committee.”

(C) Standards for review of relocation.
The Subcommittee discussed the difference between relocating a structure ‘to’ Evanston versus relocating a structure ‘from’ Evanston to a site outside Evanston or within ‘Evanston.’

The Subcommittee made the following text amendment:
1. Whether the historic or urbanistic design character and aesthetic interest of the existing site or setting would be negatively impacted by the relocation of the structure or object.

The Subcommittee discussed 2, 3, and 4. There are structures that originally had a different style and became landmarks after being transformed to their existing style. This would not happen under the current Preservation Ordinance.

(D) Standards for review of demolitions.

The Subcommittee deleted the word ‘contributes’ in (D) 2. Replacing it with the word ‘relates.’

2. Whether the property, structure or object contributes relates to the distinctive…

The Subcommittee made the following text amendment:

5. Whether the property, structure or object is of such physical condition that it represents a dangerous and imminent hazardous condition…

The Subcommittee discussed (D) 6. And concluded that when a stand-alone landmark is demolished, then the site should be removed from landmark status.

2-8-10. - CERTIFICATE OF ECONOMIC HARDSHIP

The Subcommittee discussed whether the cost of restoring windows would be considered an ‘economic hardship’ when the cost is higher than replacement. The Commission would consider other factors.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Iltle made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:33 am, seconded by Commissioner Bady. Motion passed unanimously.

The next Subcommittee meeting is March 2, 2017.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Preservation Coordinator, Community Development Department