2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 2010 Dewey Av. (Family Focus) – Nomination for Evanston landmark designation (Continued from July 10, 2018). Consideration of approval of report and resolution asking the City Manager to transmit the Commission’s recommendation to designate 2010 Dewey Avenue as an Evanston Landmark.
City of Evanston
Evanston Preservation Commission

Report to the City Council

Recommendation that the Property at 2010 Dewey Avenue
Be Designated as an Evanston Landmark

September 11, 2018

To the Honorable Mayor and the City Council of the City of Evanston:

COMMISSION’S RECOMMENDATION

The Preservation Commission recommends that the City Council designate the site and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue as an Evanston landmark. The nomination meets the City Code, Section 2-8-4 Criteria for Designation (A) 2, (A) 6 and in accordance with subsection (B) the building does retain sufficient integrity to convey its feeling and association relative to (A) 2 and (A) 6 above.
BACKGROUND

On December 27, 2017 Morris “Dino” Robinson Jr. of Shorefront (the “Applicant”), located at 2214 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, submitted an application, nominating for landmark designation the property at 2010 Dewey Avenue (“Subject Property”), owned by Family Focus. On January 9, 2018, the Commission notified Charles Johnson, Director of Facilities and Technology, Family Focus, Inc. at 310 S. Peoria St., Suite 301, Chicago, IL 60607 (the “Owner”) of the receipt of the nomination, and the Commission notified the Owner of the public hearing scheduled on February 13, 2018.

In accordance to Section 2-8-5 of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended (the "City Code"), the Preservation Commission (the “Commission”) conducted a public hearing on February 13, 2018. At the request of the Owner and with the consent of Applicant, and without a presentation or discussion, the hearing was continued to March 13, 2018. At this hearing, and with the consent of the Applicant, Family Focus requested 120 days to discuss the issue with the neighborhood and the community. The Commission continued the public hearing to July 10, 2018.

APPLICANT’S PRESENTATION

At the hearing held on March 13 and July 10, 2018, Dino Robinson, Jr., the Applicant, presented the landmark nomination.

The original 1905 structure was designed by Ernest Woodyatt, an Evanston resident. A 1926 addition by architects Childs & Smith added more classrooms, a theater and gymnasium. The school stood until a fire gutted the structure in 1958. The 1961 addition by Ganster & Hennighausen replaced the original 1905 structure.

Mr. Robinson, Jr. said that as a community school, Foster School had produced hundreds of successful graduates who have made their place in local, national and global communities. To name a few: Junior Mance- Jazz musician inducted into hall of fame in 1997; Dorothy Bayen – her part in the Ethiopian/Italian war during the 1930s and 40s; Fred Hutcherson – Aviator who trained Tuskegee Airmen; William Logan – Evanston’s first Black Police Chief; Sanders Hicks – Evanston’s first Black Fire Chief (and Olympian speed skater Shani Davis’ first coach); Iva Caruthers – Work in faith based leadership and equity; Joseph Hill – Evanston First Black school superintendent; Tina Lifford – professional actress since 1970s and currently a main character on the TV drama “Queen Sugar.”

By the end of 1930, most Black residents resided in the Fifth Ward of Evanston and Foster School was centrally located in that ward. Although the majority of the students who attended Foster School before World War I were White, by 1928, 85% of the students were Black. By 1945, Foster had a 99% Black student body.

The historical setting of the Family Focus Building, formerly Foster School, illustrates the important cultural, social aspects, and events within the City of Evanston as it interacted with issues of racial equity. The building embodies historic and cultural
themes reflecting Evanston’s early Black history. Shorefront, within its mission as a historical organization, has collected over 100 hours of oral histories of Black residents of Evanston. Within the interviews, not one interviewee failed to mention the important role of Foster School/Family Focus during its many uses.

INTEGRITY, LOCATION and SETTING
Mr. Robinson, Jr. noted the relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. The actual location of a historic property, complemented by its setting, is particularly important in recapturing the sense of historic events and persons.

In the late 19th century White working families, mainly Scandinavian immigrants, began settling in what is now the Fifth Ward. By 1900 a sufficient number of families had moved into the area that the School District saw the need for building a school there.

In the 1860s and 1870s when the Black population was small, Blacks lived in all parts of the original village of Evanston. After 1900, as Black migrants from the South increased Evanston's population, discriminatory housing practices introduced by the White power structure of Evanston directed incoming Blacks to settle in the Fifth Ward. By 1930 many of the Fifth Ward White residents had left, making the population of the Fifth Ward predominantly Black.

From the time the Foster School/Family Focus building was constructed in 1903-05 until the present, the setting of Foster School—an elementary school building adjacent to single family houses on the south, west, and north—has changed little. Facing east, Foster School stands on the west side of Dewey Avenue; the main entrance looks over the large open expanse of Foster Field, which served as the playground for Foster School. Single family houses built in the early 20th century lie immediately to the west, south, and north of Foster School.

Foster School stands where it was built and is surrounded by buildings constructed in the period of significance. The integrity of the location and the setting of the Foster School/Family Focus building is excellent.

DESIGN
Mr. Robinson, Jr. said that beginning in the 1880s Evanston hired architects to design its school buildings. In doing so, Evanston was following a national pattern of building schools that would "define the strength and values of the community." (Bomier, Bruce, Renaissance of the American School Building, Anoka, MN: Environmental Resource Council, 2014). Several of the late 19th- and early 20th-century elementary school buildings in Evanston were placed in residential neighborhoods, often on lots intended for single-family houses. The scale and massing of those single-family houses influenced the scale and massing of the school buildings. In the case of Foster School, the patterned brickwork was the primary ornament on the 1903 building and is the primary ornament on the 1926 and 1931 sections of the building. This brickwork patterning is the most significant design element on those sections of the building.
The 1960 section of the building reflects major changes in school design that had occurred between 1931, when the second addition was made to Foster School, and 1960, when the Ganster & Hennighausen addition was completed. The influence of Modernism on architectural design led to the construction of school buildings with little or no exterior adornment. Significant advances in building construction and materials that included the introduction of fluorescent lighting and improvements in heating and cooling systems were further influences on the design of schools.

The design of all three sections of the Foster School/Family Focus building is as it was in the period of significance. The design integrity of the Foster School/Family Focus building is excellent.

MATERIALS
Mr. Robinson, Jr. said that the 1926 and 1931 additions very closely resemble the design of the 1903 building and used materials common in other Evanston school buildings constructed between 1900 and the 1930s. With the exception of the replacement of the wood-framed, double-hung windows with aluminum windows in the 1926 and 1931 additions, the other materials on those sections are original to the building.

In the 1960 addition, Ganster & Hennighausen used a red brick that is close in color to that of the brick in the earlier portions of the building. The second- and third-floor windows have limestone lintels. The aluminum windows are original to this portion of the building and are evidence of the evolution of the choice of building materials between the 1930s and the 1960s.

Except for the aluminum replacements in the 1926 and 1931 section, the materials are the original building materials and have very good integrity.

WORKMANSHIP
Mr. Robinson, Jr. noted that the two major periods of workmanship evident in the Foster School/Family Focus building represent two distinct views on how a school building should look. Until the 1930s, building ornamentation was a means of showing the importance of the structure. By mid-century the ornate decorations on buildings had given way to the clean lines of Modernism. The brick patterns in the 1926 and 1931 sections show masonry skills beyond simple bricklaying. On all sections the mortar was applied neatly, and the bricks sit in level rows.

The workmanship on all three sections of the Family Focus/Foster School building—1926, 1931, and 1961—are examples of highly competent construction work. The integrity of the workmanship is excellent.

At the end of his presentation, Dino Robinson, Jr. maintained that for the reasons stated above the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue meet criteria for Landmark designation 2-8-4 (A) 2, 6, 10 and possesses integrity under 2-8-4 (B).
FAMILY FOCUS PRESENTATION
At the July 10, 2018 hearing Bridget O'Keefe, attorney, and representing Family Focus Inc., the owner of the Weissbourd-Holmes Family Focus Center located at 2010 Dewey Avenue in Evanston, Illinois (the “Center.”), stated that Family Focus is in opposition to the proposed landmark designation of the Center, because the Center does not comply with the designation criteria outlined in Subsection 2-8-4(B) “Integrity of Landmarks and Districts. Any area, 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.”

In addition, the National Register Bulletin 15(VIII) - How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Historic Property – says: “Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognize seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.” These seven criteria have been used in the past by the Evanston Preservation Commission and provide further clarification on how the issue of integrity is interpreted and applied both nationally and by the City of Evanston.

Ms. O'Keefe stated the following arguments to state Family Focus' position:

DEFINITION OF HISTORIC INTEGRITY
The National Park Service which developed “standards and guidelines that guide preservation work at the national, tribal, state, and local levels, National Register Bulletin 15(VIII) - How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Historic Property – provides useful guidance: “Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognize seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.” These seven criteria have been used in the past by the Evanston Preservation Commission and provide further clarification on how the issue of integrity is interpreted and applied both nationally and by the City of Evanston.

“Historic integrity is the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's prehistoric or historic period.

Historic integrity is the composite of seven qualities:

• location
• design
• setting
• materials
• craftsmanship
• feeling
• association

Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. Not only must a property resemble its historic appearance, but it must also retain physical materials, design features, and aspects of construction dating from the period when it attained significance.”
EVOLUTION OF 2010 DEWEY
The building was constructed in 1903 (with additions being constructed in 1926 and 1931.) On October 30, 1958, a serious fire destroyed most of Foster School. In 1961, a modern addition was added to the portion of the historic building that survived the fire. Since 1989, all windows have been replaced. In 2010, a handicapped accessible entrance was added to the primary façade.

There were corresponding changes to the footprint of the building, which was expanded in both 1961 and 2010. The classroom spaces located on the basement, second and third floors have been demolished to accommodate the office and space needs for current non-profit tenants.

LACK OF HISTORIC INTEGRITY
It is important for a landmark building to be able to convey a sense of the history that it reflects throughout the period of significance and that it has been present throughout that history. The Center has evolved over time and no longer resembles the building originally constructed in the early 20th Century or the mid-century modern building constructed in 1961. The cumulative impact of these changes to the building - particularly since the closure of the school in 1979 - has compromised the historic character of the building and its architectural integrity. Thus, the Center does not meet the integrity criteria mandated by Subsection 2-8-4(B) of the Code.

DESIGN:
The design qualities of “integrity” that are not currently present at the Center.

East Elevation/Main Entry: There have been major changes to the design of the east elevation which has destroyed the historic integrity of its primary façade.

a. The original red brick entrance to the 1905 building was located at the center of the building and consisted of an elegant limestone portico with columns that flanked both sides. The building was expanded in 1926 and 1931. There was a consistent horizontal focus in roof height, evenly spaced window placement and architectural detailing.

b. After the fire in 1958, a significant portion of the building was demolished and replaced with a modern addition. The addition’s primary (east) façade consisted of a flat brick elevation with a non-descript main entry and three rows of windows located on the façade south of the main entrance. The emphasis of the building design continued to be horizontal evidenced by a consistent roof line and window bands.

c. In 2010, the primary elevation was further altered to provide ADA accessibility. The new design destroyed the horizontal focus of the building and interrupted the window pattern.
d. The primary façade has changed dramatically over the years. The altered roof line, interrupted window bands, new entry location and elevator tower destroyed the horizontal focus of the design and no longer convey consistent physical characteristics that existed during its historic period.

Windows: The windows are a primary design element on all facades. The windows throughout the building have been significantly altered since its time of historic significance.

a. The modern windows on the south side of the main entry are different in design and configuration than the original windows on the north side of the main entry.

b. Since 1989, all new windows have been installed in the building. In particular, the windows on the remaining original building were significantly altered by the removal of all mullions. The failure to replace the windows in the original structure with windows maintaining the historic profile and mullions damages the design aesthetic of that wing in particular.

Roof: The original roof appeared to be a hipped roof. After the fire, a flat roof was placed on the current Center. After the 2010 addition, the three-story elevator tower was added destroying the consistent height of the various building wings.

Entries: The historic main entries to the building have been radically altered.

a. The original entry located on site from 1905-1958 was traditional in appearance and constructed of high quality materials.

b. In 1961, after the fire, a non-descript entry was provided.

c. In 2010, a dramatic new handicapped accessible entry was provided on the primary façade.

d. In addition, the historic doors on the remaining original building have been replaced with non-historic materials.

Floor Plans: The interior floor plans have been significantly altered to respond to tenant needs. The classroom spaces located on the basement, second and third floors have been demolished to accommodate the office and space needs for non-profit tenants.

SETTING: The application for landmark designation states that the original building was in the shape of a rectangle. The site plan has been altered and the Center has a larger footprint. Its main entry projects to the east and a building addition projects into the west yard.

WORKMANSHP: The original building contained high quality materials and design elements. A public referendum was required to fund the rebuilding of the school after
the fire. These budgetary constraints led to cost-efficiencies that impacted the level of workmanship that could be provided.

FEELING: The architectural style of the 1905 and 1961 buildings were very different. The “feeling” of the modern post-war school was disrupted by the 2010 addition due to the changed roof lines, interrupted window bands, and the tall elevator tower which damaged the horizontal focus and created a different appearance. Thus, the required “overall sense of past time and place” does not exist due to the very different design aesthetics of the historic building and the modern additions.

ASSOCIATION: The application for landmark designation extensively discusses the 1961 addition designed by Ganster and Hannighausen, referring to them as “prolific school architects in the North Shore.” The 2010 addition to the primary façade significantly impacted the Ganster and Hannighausen design.

INTEGRITY RATING SYSTEM
The following rating system has been used by the City of Evanston to categorize “integrity” in its landmark buildings: Excellent, good and poor.

“Poor” — a poor degree of integrity is exhibited if the building’s materials and details are missing or completely covered, or have unsympathetic, irreversible alterations and additions that greatly compromise the building’s character. Poor integrity may also be measured by missing original siding.”

Applying the definition of “Poor” to the Center, it is obvious that the building’s integrity is poor, because:

a. The majority of the original building was destroyed.

b. The roof shape, entry location, and window type and configuration were significantly altered.

c. The horizontal nature of the primary façade of the 1961 addition was destroyed in 2010.

d. All of the windows have been replaced and the new windows located in the most historic portion of the building do not have a historic profile or mullions.

e. The site plan has been altered with the footprint of the building being enlarged.

The Center contains “unsympathetic, irreversible alterations and additions that greatly compromise the building’s character.” The cumulative impact of all these changes has severely compromised the historic integrity of the original historic structure and the 1960’s post-war school building.

TIMING OF PROPOSED LANDMARK DESIGNATION
Evanston first adopted its Historic Preservation Ordinance in 1978 in order to identify and preserve “areas, properties, structures, sites and objects having a special historical, community, architectural or aesthetic interest or value to the City and its citizens,” and to foster “civic pride” in Evanston’s unique architecture, landmarks and districts.
Over a period of approximately ten years, the Preservation Commission recommended and the City Council passed ordinances designating over 800 individual Evanston landmarks. As of 2015, there were 858 Evanston Landmark buildings. In the mid-1990s, an effort was made to create a Conservation District in the Fifth Ward based on the cultural and historical significance of the West Side (“PITCH”). However, for unknown reasons this process never moved forward. At that time, Foster School was one of several properties specifically identified as a site for historic consideration but no steps were taken to landmark the building.

Thus, the City of Evanston and its Preservation Commission have been aware of this building since the passage of the Historic Preservation Ordinance 40 years ago. It is only being revisited now following Family Focus’s decision to sell the building.

Landmark designation should be reserved for buildings that meet the designation criteria outlined in the Code and should not be used to prevent an owner from exercising its right to sell its property.

IMPACT ON FAMILY FOCUS MISSION
Family Focus is a non-profit organization and the Center is its only asset. Family Focus has provided extensive social services to Evanston residents since 1976 and it is committed to continuing to do so from a to-be-identified leased space within Evanston. It cannot, however, continue to operate from the Center.

Over the past five years, this building has operated at a deficit which has been met by drawing down Family Focus’ endowment. Causing adverse impact on the cost of operating the building and the financial resources of Family Focus. This does not even include the unmet capital needs that will be necessary in the years ahead. Family Focus cannot continue to fund an operating deficit and capital expenditures at the Center at the expense of its core mission – serving children and families in need.

Bridget O'Keefe concluded by saying that Family Focus does not consent to the proposed landmark designation of the Center and does not believe that it meets the criteria of Subsection 2-8-4(B) of the Code which is required to move forward.

Merri Ex, CEO and President of Family Focus concurred with Ms. O'Keefe’s presentation and spoke on the financial difficulties Family Focus is experiencing due to the lack of funding to maintain the building and the inability to market the building with a landmark designation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
The following members of the audience spoke in favor of the nomination:

Bennet Johnson, Lori Keenan, Steven Vick, Mary McWilliams, Ald. Robin Rue Simmons, M. Wetherspoon read letter from Janet Alexander Davis, Delores Holmes and Al Gibbs.
COMMISSION’S REPORT WITH FINDINGS OF FACT

2010 Dewey Avenue
Weissbourd-Holmes Family Focus Building / Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Experimental School / Foster School

Built: 1905 (original three-story building)
1926 and 1931 (North addition of Gymnasium, Theater and classrooms)
1961 (South end new construction replacing original 1905 structure)

Architects: Ernest Woodyatt (Woodyatt), 1905
Childs & Smith, 1926 and 1931
Ganster & Hennighausen, 1961

The City Code Section 2-8-5 (E) requires that the Commission’s recommendation include a report with the following information:

1. **Explanation of the significance or lack of significance of the nominated landmark or district as it relates to the criteria for designation:**

On July 10, 2018, the Preservation Commission found that the nominated property and building(s) for Landmark designation at 2010 Dewey Avenue meets criteria for landmark designation of the City Code, Section 2-8-4 (A) “Criteria for Designation” 2 and 6 as follows:

(A) 2. *Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the historic, cultural, architectural, archaeological or related aspect of the development of the City of Evanston, State of Illinois, Midwest region, or the United States.*

2010 Dewey Avenue meets Criterion (A) 2 because its distinctive identification with, significant individuals, associated with the former Foster School’s and the City of Evanston’s cultural and political history. Consequently, its significance is defined by a period of time between 1905 and 1979, when and where those events took place. The property at 2010 Dewey Avenue along with its building(s) has a strong case for its period of significance from the earliest days of the existence of the former Foster School in 1905 up to 1979, when it stopped being used by the School District.

Throughout Foster School history many individuals who attended the school became prominent Black Evanston citizens that made their positive mark at the local, national and international level, including:

**Junior Mance:** Jazz pianist, released over 40 albums.


Sanders Hicks: First African American Fire Chief. Founder of the Evanston Speed Skating Club. First coach for Olympic medalist in speed skating, Shani Davis.

Iva Caruthers: General Secretary of Samuel DeWitt Proctor Conference, which engages progressive African-American faith leaders in social justice issues.

Joseph Hill: First African American Assistant Superintendent of school district 65 and later Superintendent.


Leon Robinson Jr.: Entrepreneur, Robinson Bus Company and later Robinson Enterprises with real estate holdings across the United States.

(A) 6. Its association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City of Evanston, the State of Illinois, the Midwest region, or the United States.

Foster School provided generations of young Black students education from a few in 1905 when the school opened, to 100% African American student body by 1945. Segregation of the Black community resulted in the majority of Black citizens residing in the City of Evanston’s Fifth Ward by 1930.

Other forms of segregation would not allow a Black teacher be employed in Evanston as a teacher until the 1950s. Foster School was where Black teachers could teach. Most of these teachers achieved successful careers, such as Joseph Hill became the first Black Superintendent of School District 65 in 1960. Eddie Lee Sutton established the Jean-Del Publishing Company in 1969 in order to publish her own educational materials. She later reactivated it under Sutton and Sutton Publisher, Inc. Lorraine H. Morton became Principal of Haven Middle School, later she was elected as an alderman and as Evanston’s first African American Mayor.

In 1966 Foster School became an experimental school or Laboratory School. White children from overcrowded schools were bussed to Foster School. In 1969 the lab school and Foster School became the Dr. Martin Luther King Laboratory School. In 1979 the school was relocated and the Foster building was closed, and subsequently sold to Family Focus in 1985.

The nomination states: “The historical setting of the Family Focus Building, formerly
Foster School, illustrates the important cultural, social aspects, and events within the City of Evanston as it interacted with issues of racial equity. The building is a representation of a specific historically and culturally related theme as a center focus on early Black history. It is an exemplification of a settlement significant to the cultural history and traditions (both positive and negative) of the City of Evanston, and a site worthy of preservation. Shorefront, within its mission as a historical organization, has collected over 100 hours of oral histories of Black residents of Evanston. Within the interviews, not one interviewee failed to mention the important role of Foster School/Family Focus during its many uses.

ABBREVIATED TIMELINE RELATED TO 2010 DEWEY AVENUE

1905  Foster School opens
1924  60% "Colored" student body at Foster School
1926  Addition of an auditorium and gymnasium at a cost of $150,000. A library branch was added in a converted brick garage at the rear of the school
1928  85% "Colored" student body at Foster School
1945  99% "Colored" student body at Foster School
1954  Brown v. Board of Education: Supreme Court overturns legal school segregation at all levels
1954  The new “fire resistant”, $602,000 south wing of Foster School is dedicated
1961  Representatives of Foster School PTA and other groups protest “De Facto Segregation”. “[i]t is a sociological and psychological impediment to personalities of youngsters attending the school”. “Eliminate Foster as a segregated elementary school.”
1969  Foster School renamed to Dr. Martin Luther King Laboratory School
1969  The Supreme Court ruled that racial segregation in schools had to end at once
1976  Family Focus organized
1979  District 65 voted 5 to 2, to move King Lab to the former Skiles School. Foster School closes despite a class action lawsuit to re-open and retain the Lab School at the Foster School building
1986  District 65 considers selling the Foster School building to an “interested buyer”
1999  June 19, Foster School building renamed to the Weissbourd-Holmes Family Focus Center
2001  Evanston’s 60% Attendance guideline for racial integration fulfilled
2005  Foster School building reaches 100 years old
2017  Family Focus announces intent to sell the Evanston property located at 2010 Dewey Avenue

2. Explanation of the integrity or lack of integrity of a nominated landmark or district;

(B) Integrity of Landmarks and Districts. Any district, site, building, structure, or object that meets any one or more of the criteria in Subsection 2-8-4(A) shall also possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials workmanship, feeling, and association to convey its historic significance.
The architectural changes that happened during 1905 and 1979 are all significant and are all part of the property’s history. The fact that the 1905 building burned to the ground in the 1958 and it was replaced in 1961, it does not disqualify the property and building(s) from possessing sufficient integrity of feeling and association with the events that occurred from 1905 to 1979 (the period of significance). The historic events and the people who attended Foster School and their subsequent contributions to society, all are part of the historic property as it evolved.

3. **Identification of critical features of the nominated landmark or areas, properties, sites and objects in a nominated district to provide guidance for review of alteration, construction, demolition or relocation;**

Despite the 1958 catastrophic fire that burned down the 1905 Foster School building and subsequent additions in 1926 and 1931, and the modern addition in 1961, and the alterations from 1989 to 2010, the building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue retains sufficient integrity to convey its feeling and association relative to criteria 2-8-4 (A) 2 and 6,

The photos below taken on September, 2018 are the record for future alteration, construction, demolition, or relocation under Evanston’s ordinance. Also acknowledging that since the building is not being designated for architectural significance that the Preservation Commission in the future would look favorably on a broader interpretation of design standards for modification of the building.
● Modular size red brick
● Horizontal bands of aluminum windows
● Aluminum and glass front entry door
● Flat roof

West Elevation (1926 Addition)

● Modular red brick
● Stone lintels above on second story windows
● Replacement aluminum 1/1 double hung windows
● Flat roof
North/East Elevation (1926 Addition)

- Modular red brick
- Stone band below third story windows
- Double hung aluminum windows
- Decorative modular red brick bans
4. Proposed design guidelines, if any, for review of alteration, construction, demolition or relocation;

If designated as Evanston landmark, the building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue would be subject to review for exterior work requiring a permit and when visible from the public way under the City Code Section 2-8-9 Standards for Review of Alteration, Construction, Relocation and Demolition. Also acknowledging that since the building(s) is not being recommended for its architectural significance, the Commission in the future would look favorably on a broader interpretation of design standards for modification of the building.

If landmarked, and the Commission reviews a future application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Commission will conduct its review based upon the building and site’s form and appearance during its period of significance 1905-1979. The Commission will consider whether the work that is being proposed is compatible with the building as it had evolved, up to 1979; it would not be expected to go back or rebuild a replica of the 1905 building or the like. One may discount the appearance

- Modular size red brick
- Horizontal bands of aluminum windows
- Aluminum and glass front entry door
- Flat roof
of the windows from the 1990's and be more in keeping with the windows that were there in 1979 in the long run.

5. A map showing the location of the nominated landmark

![Map of 2010 Dewey Avenue - Family Focus](image)

**CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The Preservation Commission recommends to City Council the landmark designation of the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue with reference to criteria 2-8-4 (A) 2 “Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the historic, cultural, architectural, archaeological or related aspect of the development of the City, State, Midwest region or the United States” and 2-4-8 (A) 6 “Its association with important cultural, social, political, or economic aspects or events in the history of the City, the State, the Midwest region or the United States,” defining a period of significance dating from 1905 to 1979.

The Commission acknowledges that the building is being designated for its historic and cultural significance to the City of Evanston, not for architectural significance.
Consequently, this designation will require a broader interpretation of the Ordinance’s standards for review in the future, recognizing the distinction between architectural and historic and cultural significance. The Commission concludes that the building and site does retain sufficient integrity per criterion 2-8-4 (B) Integrity of Landmarks and Districts. “Any district, site, building, structure, or object that meets any one or more of the criteria in Subsection 2-8-4(A) shall also possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials workmanship, feeling, and association to convey its historic significance,” to convey its feeling and association relative to 2-4-8 (A) 2 and 6.

LINKS TO:

2010 Dewey Avenue Landmark Nomination

Dino Robinson, Jr. Presentation

Family Focus Presentation
CITY OF EVANSTON
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A RESOLUTION

Requesting the City Manager to Transmit
The Evanston Preservation Commission’s
Recommendation and Report that the
Evanston City Council Designate
As an Evanston Landmark the
Property Located at 2010 Dewey Avenue

WHEREAS, on December 27, 2017 Dino Robinson, Jr. founder of Shorefront (the “Applicant”), located at 2214 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, submitted an application, nominating for landmark designation the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with City Code Section 2-8-5 of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended (the “City Code”), the Preservation Commission conducted a public hearing and review process; and

WHEREAS, on January 9, 2018 the Preservation Commission notified Charles Johnson, Director of Facilities and Technology, Family Focus, Inc. at 310 S. Peoria St., Suite 301, Chicago, IL 60607 (the “Owner”) of the receipt of the application; and

WHEREAS, on January 9, 2017 the Preservation Commission notified the property owner Family Focus, Inc. at 310 S. Peoria St., Suite 301, Chicago, IL 60607 of the February 13, 2018 scheduled public hearing on the nomination; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of February 13, 2018 the Preservation Commission continued the hearing at the request of the Owner and with the consent of the Applicant to March 13, 2018, and on that date at the request of the Owner and with the consent of the Applicant the Commission continued the hearing to July 10, 2010.
WHEREAS, on July 10, 2018, the Commission, accepted testimony from the applicant, the property owner and the public, deliberated and evaluated the application, testimony heard at the public hearing, and other evidence and closed the public hearing also on July 10, 2018; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2018, the Commission approved its Report; recommending that the Evanston City Council (the “City Council”) designate the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS:

Section 1: The Commission determined that the application for landmark designation of the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue is in conformity with City Code Section 2-8-4, “Criteria for Designation.”

Section 2: The Commission recommends that the City Council approves the application for the landmark designation of the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue, as the Subject Property meets the criteria for designation as an Evanston Landmark under City Code Section 2-8-4(A) 2, and 6 and subsection 2-8-4 (B).

Section 3: The report of the Commission’s findings is approved, and attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. The Chair and/or the Preservation Coordinator may make corrections and modifications thereto without change in substance as they shall deem appropriate, consistent with this resolution.

Section 4: The City Manager is hereby requested to transmit the Commission’s Recommendation and Report to the Mayor and the City Council.
**Section 5:** Notice of the recommendation of the Commission, including a copy of the report, shall be transmitted to the City Council or its duly authorized Committee and sent by regular mail to the owner of record of a nominated landmark, and to the nominator within five (5) business days following adoption of the resolution and report.

Adopted: September 11, 2018

Yeas: __

Nays: __

Diane Williams, Chair

Attest:

Mark Simon, Secretary
2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 2010 Dewey Av. (Family Focus) – Nomination for Evanston landmark designation (Continued from July 10, 2018). Consideration of approval of report and resolution asking the City Manager to transmit the Commission’s recommendation to designate 2010 Dewey Avenue as an Evanston Landmark.

FAMILY FOCUS PROPOSED DRAFT LANDMARK DESIGNATION LANGUAGE FOR CONSIDERATION
Dear Carlos,

As you know, the Evanston Preservation Commission recently voted to recommend designation of the Weissbourd-Holmes building located at 2010 Dewey as an Evanston landmark based on the Building meeting the following two criteria for designation:

(2) Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the historic, cultural, architectural, archaeological or related aspect of the development of the City, State, Midwest region or the United States; and

(6) Its association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City, the State, the Midwest region or the United States.

It was clearly stated by the Commission during its deliberations that this designation is based on the “history” of the Building and not its architectural significance. There was also discussion by the Commission that the language to be included in the landmark designation report should expressly provide flexibility with regards to future renovations and/or additions to the Building.

As you know, the Building is the only asset owned by Family Focus. Given its inability to continue to bear increasing operation and maintenance costs, Family Focus was recently forced to put the Building on the market. Feedback has been received that potential purchasers are deterred by the pending landmark designation. Family Focus has a fiduciary duty to preserve the Building’s value in order to maintain a funding source for its core mission – serving children and families in need. Thus, as part of the proposed landmark designation, Family Focus suggests the inclusion of language to maintain options for a future owner to add on to the building or make use of the parking lot to make the Building more financially viable. Hopefully, this will address concerns of potential purchasers who may be seeking to purchase the property for an adaptive re-use project.

Family Focus submits the following designation language for consideration and inclusion in the Landmark Designation Report:

PROPOSED LANDMARK DESIGNATION LANGUAGE

Period of significance: 1905 until 1979 when school closed.

Proposed Landmark Designation shall extend only to the exterior of the Family Focus building. The landmark designation shall expressly not include the interior of the Building or the surrounding vacant land located on lot(s) of record associated with the Building.
The east Building façade shall be considered a primary elevation. Because the north, south and west elevations are secondary, less visible, have been significantly altered, and have minimal architectural design and expression, the north, south and west facades shall be considered secondary elevations. The Commission may approve more significant changes to secondary elevations that are reasonable to meet new needs.

New additions shall be allowed on the roof or to a secondary elevation of the Building so long as such additions are designed to be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the Building and distinguish themselves from the original structure.

Given the absence of historic windows, new or replacement windows on any façade may vary in materials and method of construction from the historic windows, although the arrangement of panes, size, and shape should be consistent with the overall character of the existing Building.

A Certificate of Appropriateness shall not be required for new construction on the vacant land located on lot(s) of record associated with the Building.

Please be aware that Merri Ex will be out of town from August 25th – September 10th with limited access. Thus, it would be best if we can resolve any outstanding issues this week if possible.

We will be able to attend the hearing on September 11th at 7:00 to present testimony on the suggested language. We are available to answer any questions that you may have in the interim. Thank you for your continued assistance with this matter.

Best,

Bridget O’Keefe

Bridget O’Keefe
Daspin & Aument
300 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 2200
Chicago, IL 60606
312-258-3795 – Office
312-213-3406 Mobile
312-258-1995 – Fax
bokeefe@daspinaument.com
www.daspinaument.com
NOTICE TO PERSONS SUBJECT TO UNITED STATES TAXATION:

DISCLOSURE UNDER TREASURY CIRCULAR 230: Any advice contained herein (and any attachments hereto) relating to U.S. federal taxation may not be used or referred to in the promoting, marketing or recommending of any entity, investment plan or arrangement, nor is such advice intended or written to be used, and may not be used, by a taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding Federal tax penalties. Advice that complies with Treasury Circular 230's "covered opinion" requirements (and thus, may be relied on to avoid tax penalties) may be obtained by contacting the author of this document.

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail (or the person responsible for delivering this document to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, printing or copying of this e-mail, and any attachment thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please respond to the individual sending the message, and permanently delete the original and any copy of any e-mail and printout thereof. Thank you.
2. OLD BUSINESS

1505 Ashland Ave.
Front West Elevation
1505 Ashland Ave.

Back East Elevation
1505 Ashland Ave.
Side South Elevation

1505 Ashland Ave.
Side North Elevation
1505 Ashland Ave.

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

---

**Application for Preservation Review of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)**

---

**Section A. Required Information (Print) **

1) **Property Address:** [505 ASHLAND AVE]

2) **Owner’s Name:** SEBASTIAN KOZIURA
   - **Address:** 1701 SIMPSON ST.
   - **City:** EVANSTON
   - **State:** IL
   - **Zip:** 60201
   - **Phone:** 847-757-6171
   - **Email/Fax:** sebastian.kozura@gmail.com

3) **Architect’s Name:** RALPH LAM
   - **Address:** 522 LARKING CT.
   - **City:** OAK PARK
   - **State:** IL
   - **Zip:** 60452
   - **Phone:** 708-712-8343
   - **Email/Fax:**

4) **Contractor’s Name:** SEBASTIAN KOZIURA
   - **Address:** 1701 SIMPSON ST.
   - **City:** EVANSTON
   - **State:** IL
   - **Zip:** 60201
   - **Phone:** 847-757-6171
   - **Email/Fax:**

5) **Landmark:** Yes ☑ No ☐

6) **Within Local Historic District:** Yes ☑ No ☐
   - If yes, select: Lakeshore ☐ Ridge ☐ Northeast Evanston ☐ Apartment Thematic Resources

7) **Refer to the completed Zoning Analysis and check as applicable if project requires:**
   - ☑ Major Zoning Variance
   - ☑ Minor Zoning Variance
   - ☐ Fence Variance
   - ☐ If one or more is checked, then fill out Sections B and C (next 2 pages).
   - If project does not require any Zoning Variance or Fence Variance or Special Use → Complete section B only.

   **Check if your project requires:** Special Use ☐ Planned Development ☑ Refer to Supplemental Information on page (i) below.

---

Adopted October 10, 2004/Updated January 10, 2017
Section B: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

1) In addition to the required site plans, drawings, and photos, briefly describe the proposed activity and reason for obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness. Attach a separate sheet if necessary, and refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance.

ENCLOSED SOUTH FLOOR RAISE ROOF OVER EXISTING ADDITION CHANGE WINDOWS ON EAST ELEVATIONS BUILD A TWO CAR GARAGE.

2) Checklist (Check all that apply and attach any additional information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Exterior Activity</th>
<th>Location / Details</th>
<th>Visible from Public Way (e.g. Streets and Alleys)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Partial Total</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td>Front Side Rear</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Garage: New Replace</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Roof: New Re-roof</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>New Replacement</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Windows</td>
<td>Front Side Rear</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Style/Materials:</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Doors</td>
<td>Fence / Gate: New</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Windows: New</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roof: New Re-roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>New Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>New Address for Relocation:</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Checklist for Exterior Materials—Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Façades/Front Porch &amp; Rear Porch Material</td>
<td>Flashing Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Sheet Metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Stucco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Siding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum Siding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Siding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle, Material: Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roofing Material</th>
<th>Door Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Shakes</td>
<td>Metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Clad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Tile</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Shingles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chimney Material</th>
<th>Window Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Casement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gutters/Downspouts</th>
<th>Window Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvanized Sheet</td>
<td>Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Existing Aluminum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: Storm Window</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muntins</th>
<th>Add Other Materials/Alterations Not Listed Here (Explain and Attach Information As Needed):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Applicant’s Signature: [Signature]

Date: 06/19/18

Print Name: [Name]

Proceed to Section C if you are requesting a zoning or fence variation and/or a special use. Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance [page (i) below]. For Planned Development refer to Supplemental Information [page (i) below].

Adapted October 19, 2004/Updated January 10, 2017
NOTIFICATION CERTIFICATION

FOR CERTAIN EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETINGS

I, ________________________________, the owner/applicant for the property at
(Project Address) ________________________________, certify that I have provided the City of Evanston staff, the complete list of all owners, whose addresses appear on a current tax assessment list, of real property located within a radius of two hundred fifty feet (250') of the subject property. Said distance includes open space, roads, streets, alleys and other rights-of-way.

This action is in fulfillment of the requirement of the mailed notice of certain meetings of the Preservation Commission for any of the following activities: additions to existing structures; construction of new primary structures; relocation of existing primary structures and/or secondary structures; demolition of significant and/or contributing primary structures.

Such notice shall be sent at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting scheduled on

……………………………, 2017, 7:00 p.m. Room 2404 Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, at which time the Evanston Preservation Commission will review my application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the subject property and for the following work:

- Enclose South Porch, Raise Roof on existing Addition
- Change Windows on East Elevation, Build a Two Car Garage

The project requires (check ☑ as needed): ☐ Major Zoning Variation; ☐ Minor Zoning Variation; ☐ Fence Variation; ☐ Special Use; ☐ Planned Development; or

☑ The project does not require any of the above.

Owner/Applicant Address: ________________________________ Phone: ________________________________

Owner/Applicant Signature: ________________________________ Date: 06/19/18

Applicant/owner: You must return this certification signed and dated before the scheduled meeting with the Preservation Commission to: Carlos D. Ruiz, Preservation Coordinator, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201; 847-448-8120 (fax) or email to: cruz@cityofevanston.org

Adopted October 19, 2004/Updated January 10, 2017
DEAR OWNER/NEIGHBOR: You are receiving this meeting notice because an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness has been submitted to the Preservation Commission for one or more of the following activities: addition(s) to existing structure(s); construction of new primary structure(s); relocation of existing primary structure(s) and/or secondary structure(s); demolition of significant and/or contributing primary structure(s). This notice has been sent to all owners, whose addresses appear on a current tax assessment list provided by the applicant, of real property located within a radius of two hundred fifty feet (250') of the subject property. Said distance includes open space, roads, streets, alleys and other rights-of-way. This notice has been sent at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting.

NOTICE OF PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING
TO OWNERS/NEIGHBORS
WITHIN 250 FEET OF THE PROPERTY AT

Address of subject property:

Dear owner/neighbor, this notice is to inform you that the owner/applicant of the property at 1701 Simpson St. Evanston IL 60201 has applied to the Evanston Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work/activity:

- Enclose South Porch
- Close Roof on Existing Addition
- Change Windows on East Elevations
- Build a Two Car Garage

The project requires (check appropriate box):

☐ Major Zoning Variation; ☐ Minor Zoning Variation; ☐ Fence Variation; ☐ Special Use; ☐ Planned Development; ☑ None of the above

The Preservation Commission will review this application on ........................., 2017 at the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, Room 2404 (2100 Ridge Avenue) at 7:00 p.m. The meeting is open to the public.

If you have any questions/comments about the meeting/application contact:
Carlos D. Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator at 847-448-8687 or email at cruiz@cityofevanston.org

Owner/Applicant's Name: SEBASTIAN KORLIJA

Mailing Address: 1701 SIMPSON ST. EVANSTON IL 60201

Date: .................................., 2017
Notice sent on: .................................., 2017
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
COA Application Checklist

Submit one (1) hard copy and a digital copy in PDF format of the same as follows:

☐ APPLICATION FOR PRESERVATION REVIEW - To process your application, submit one (1) completed hard copy of the application and attachments including: plat of survey, site plan, floor plans, elevation drawings, 3D drawing(s) of the proposed alteration/addition/construction (not to exceed 11" x 17" paper size), and one (1) digital copy in PDF format of the same by 5pm on the last Tuesday of the month, or no less than 15 business days prior to the next schedule Preservation Commission meeting (third Tuesday of the month). Completed applications must be collated and the PDF must be correctly oriented for the viewer (vertical or horizontal orientation).

☐ ELEVATIONS/SITE PLANS/DRAWINGS to scale including dimensions (not to exceed 11" x 17" paper size).

☐ CHANGES TO THE EXTERIOR INCLUDING CHANGES TO WINDOWS, DOORS, STORM WINDOWS AND STORM DOORS - SEE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR WINDOW CHANGES (BELOW)

Provide an exterior elevation of each façade involved, showing the existing and proposed appearance (preferably on the same sheet for each façade) with the new items/areas clearly identified.

☐ Site plan with the existing footprint of the primary structure(s) clearly showing the side(s) being altered.

☐ If the changes also include a change in the footprint, provide a site plan clearly showing the location of proposed change, setback dimensions, existing and proposed lot coverage, existing and proposed setbacks, location and height of existing and proposed fences, parking, and landscape design (if any).

☐ Floor Plans – Provide existing and proposed floor plans to scale including dimensions.

☐ ADDITIONS, NEW CONSTRUCTION/DEMOLITION

• If a major alteration, construction or demolition is planned, City staff will notify neighbors within 250 feet of the subject property at least five (5) business days prior to the Preservation Commission hearing to allow neighbors to comment on the proposal at the meeting. The applicant is responsible for providing to City staff the filled out Certification and Notice along with the updated list of names and addresses of current owners/taxpayers in Excel format. City staff will provide the initial list (Excel file) of names and addresses to the applicant with the instructions.

• Exterior elevations, showing building materials, height and width of proposed structure in the context of existing primary structure and/or the immediate surroundings.

• Site Plan clearly showing the location of proposed structure, existing and proposed lot coverage, proposed setbacks and their dimensions, location and height of proposed fences, parking, and landscape design (if any).

• Floor Plans and Roof Plans - Provide floor plans and roof plans to scale including dimensions.

• 3D drawings, models (for new construction and substantial additions)

• Photos of existing building, structure, site, fence or object in context with the immediate structures on the block.

☐ LAND-ALTERING ACTIVITY - Full description and illustrations including berming, re-grading, excavation, walkways, patios, and alteration of seaways, etc.

☐ FENCES - Site plan with fence location(s) clearly identified. Also, illustration(s) of existing and or proposed fence indicating the material, the height, and length (to scale). If zoning variance or fence variance is required, see section immediately below.

☐ ZONING VARIANCE FOR ADDITIONS, NEW CONSTRUCTIONS, FENCE VARIANCE

☐ Fully completed Part C of the COA application

☐ Zoning Analysis Summary as prepared by the Zoning Division

☐ Fully completed Zoning or Fence Variation Application as submitted to the Zoning Division

☐ SPECIAL USE - Special Use Application as submitted to the Zoning Division

☐ PLANNED DEVELOPMENT - Planned Development Application as submitted to the Zoning Division, including:

- Zoning Analysis, General Information Form, Special Use Application, Executive Summary and Aerial Photograph,
Zoning Comparison, Number of Units, Unit Mix and Description, Statement in Support of Proposal Survey, Development Plan, Preliminary Civil Engineering Plan and Preliminary Landscape Plan

☐ **SUPPORTING INFORMATION** - Any information you feel would enhance your application (e.g., photos, letters of support from neighbors, scale models, material samples, etc.). Photos of elevations, proximity to neighbors and any other information must show significant detail and/or context to be replicated. Details must be visible on printouts of digital photos and black and white copies of photos.

☐ **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR CHANGES TO WINDOWS, DOORS, STORM WINDOWS AND STORM DOORS** (Use same example for windows on page (iii) below for doors, storm windows, and storm doors)

• Clear photographs of existing windows. When windows are boarded over, remove boards from typical windows in order to take photographs.

• Drawings showing the elevation and horizontal and vertical sections of existing historic windows. Include muntins, Mullions, transoms, and other window components (see examples below). For historic steel industrial windows that contain operable units, drawings must include this feature.

• Drawings showing the elevation and horizontal and vertical sections of proposed replacement windows. In the case of a hung window, provide section drawings of both the upper and lower sash, including meeting rail. For replacement steel windows, include sections of both operable and fixed units. See note below regarding manufacturers’ standard cut sheets.

• Drawings should be at the same scale and large enough to clearly show construction details. Scale should be provided, measurements noted, and materials indicated for the main components of the window.

• Drawings of the existing historic window should be accurate, based on field measurements. Examples of window drawings are shown below. Add the dimensions of existing windows and proposed windows.

• Replacement windows must accurately replicate the appearance of existing historic windows. Manufacturers’ standard cut sheets usually are not an adequate substitute for detailed drawings since they are not drawn specifically for the proposed window replacement and do not show custom applications or installation details required for the project. In small projects where windows are being replaced and the historic or existing window is simple in design, manufacturers’ standard cut sheets may be substituted for actual section drawings of the proposed window provided there is sufficient detail for review.

• Window sections must show the profiles of muntins, meeting rails, sash, frames, moldings, and other features. Construction details must be apparent, including joinery. For all projects, the window’s relationship to the existing wall plane must also be provided for both the existing historic windows, when present, and the proposed replacement window

**NOTE:** The deadline for submission of Certificate of Appropriateness applications is the last Tuesday of the month or no less than 15 business days before the next scheduled Preservation Commission meeting. The Preservation Commission meets on the **third Tuesday** of each month (except when marked with * on Page v below). However, both dates are subject to change. Be prepared to give a brief overview of your project (10 minutes or less) and present any information that would enhance your application (e.g., photos, letters of support from neighbors, scale models, samples of proposed materials seeking to replicate existing materials, etc.).
# City of Evanston

**ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET**

**APPLICATION STATUS:** Closed/Compliant  
**June 20, 2019**

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS:** Compliant

**Z.A. Number:** 18ZONA-0088  
**Address:** 1505 ASHLAND AVE  
**Applicant:** Sebastian Koziura  
**Purpose:** Zoning Analysis without Bid Permit App

**District:** R1  
**Overlay:**  
**Preservation:** Not Within  
**Reviewer:** Melissa Kotz  
**District:**  

**THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):**
- New Principal Structure
- Change of Use
- New Accessory Structure
- Retention of Use
- Addition to Structure
- Plat of Resubdiv./Consol.
- Alteration to Structure
- Business License
- Retention of Structure
- Home Occupation

**Analyses Based On:**
- Sidewalk Cate
- Other
- Other
- Plans Dated
- Prepared By
- Survey Dated
- Existing
- Improvements

**Proposed Description:**
Construct detached garage, add rear deck

## ZONING ANALYSIS

### RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS

The following sections apply to building lot coverage and impervious surface calculations in Residential Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Porch Exception (Subtract 5%)</th>
<th>Total Eligible</th>
<th>Total Paver Area</th>
<th>Open Parking Debt (Add 200sqft/open space)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavers/Previous Paver Exception (Subtract 20%)</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Paver Regulatory Area</td>
<td># Open Required Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRINCIPAL USE AND STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE:</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - 2F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

**Minimum Lot Width (LF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE:</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 LF</td>
<td>50 LF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

**Minimum Lot Area (SF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE:</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,200 sqft</td>
<td>8300 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

**Dwelling Units:**

| 1 | 2 | 1 | Compliant |

**Rooming Units:**

| Comments: |

**Building Lot Coverage (SF, defined, including subtractions/additions):**

| 2400 | 1817.3 | 21.5% | Compliant |

**Comments:**

<p>| LF: Linear Feet | SF: Square Feet | FT: Feet |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)</td>
<td>3735</td>
<td>2789.6</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Accessory Structure Rear Yard Coverage:
40% of rear yard
<40%
Compliant

Gross Floor Area (SF)
Use:
Comments:

Height (FT)
Comments:

Front Yard(1) (FT)
Direction:
Street:
Comments:

Front Yard(2) (FT)
Direction:
Street:
Comments:

Street Side Yard (FT)
Direction:
Street:
Comments:

Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)
Direction:
Comments:

Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)
Direction:
Comments:

Rear Yard (FT)
Direction:
Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Use [1]

Permitted Districts:
Garage (Det), Coachhouse or Carport
Compliant

Comments:

Permitted Required Yard:
Rear Yard
Compliant

Comments:

Additional Standards:
Comments:

Height (FT)
Flat or mansard roof 14.5, ot
13
Compliant

Comments:

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Feet
Page 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Principal Building:</td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(1A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(1B) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Yard (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(1A) (FT)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(1B) (FT)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (FT)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(2):</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Districts:</td>
<td>Deck or Patio (raised)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Required Yard:</td>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Standards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (FT)</td>
<td>Flat or mansard roof 14.5’, at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Principal Building:</td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(2A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(2B) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Yard (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(2A) (FT)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(2B) (FT)</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(1):</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use(2):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use(3):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUIRED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicap Parking Spaces:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (LF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Feet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angle(1):</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle(2):</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Setback from Alley Access (FT)</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS AND/OR NOTES**

Analysis Comments

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS**

Results of Analysis: This Application is **Compliant**

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is: **Not Required**

See attached comments and/or notes.

**SIGNATURE**

**DATE**
City of Evanston, Illinois

CERTIFICATE OF
ZONING COMPLIANCE

APPROVED

ZONING CERTIFICATE NUMBER: 18ZONA-0088

DATE ISSUED: 

In accordance with Section 6-3-2 of the Zoning Ordinance, the building, structure, and/or use described below complies with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance governing the proposed use.

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1505 ASHLAND AVE

ZONING DISTRICT: R1

OVERLAY DISTRICT: 

USE: Construct detached garage, add rear deck

CONDITIONS OR COMMENTS:

CERTIFICATE BASED ON:

Plans Prepared As: 

Plans Dated: 

Plans Prepared By: 

Plat of Survey Dated: 

Plans Originating As: 

Related Application ID: 

Miscellaneous: 

ISSUED BY: 

Zoning Officer 

Melissa Klotz

THIS ZONING CERTIFICATE IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT.
1505 Ashland Ave.
North West View
1505 Ashland Ave.
North West Elevation
1505 Ashland Ave.
North East Elevation
2. OLD BUSINESS

C. PUBLIC HEARING

- 1225 Asbury Av. (RHD) – Matthew Fleming, owner/applicant. Nomination for landmark designation of the single family residence at 1225 Asbury Av. designed by George Schipporeit and built in 1978 (Continued from July 10, 2018).
Evanston Landmark Nomination Form
Street Address: 1225 Asbury Avenue, Evanston Illinois 60202
Legal description or PIN: 11-19-100-035-0000
Present use: Single family residential
Past Use: Single family residential
Architect: George Schipporeit

1225 Asbury Avenue is eligible for landmark designation on the basis of the following criteria:
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.

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 of Evanston, the State of Illinois, the Midwest region, and the United States.

Written statement describing property:

The modern house located at 1225 Asbury was designed by George Schipporeit in 1973 in solid concrete which was ubiquitous in the modernist era. The house is located three lots south of the northeast corner of Dempster Street and Asbury Avenue. The property is in superb condition and remains virtually identical to the original construction and design.

The residence was built to reflect the Modern movement. The house is sited with its primary façade facing Asbury Avenue and a relatively large expanse of lawn and elegant landscaping in the front that conforms to the standards of the surrounding Victorian houses. In massing, the house is a multi-level configuration (5 levels; 2 below ground level) with the public living space on the main floor, bedrooms on the top floors, and the below grade level rooms reserved for recreational activities. The street view is of rectilinear, asymmetrical concrete form topped with flat roofs and a broad balcony. The house has elegant proportions, with the core elements being the sculptural structure itself. The front facade gives a feeling of regularity, rhythm, horizontality and balance and is devoid of any applied ornamentation or molding. The back of the house, further showcases the modernist architectural pragmatism with extreme sensitivity to light and space. The private back of the house demonstrates a complete dissolution between interior and exterior spaces. Most rooms in the house face the rear of the home and are finished with floor to ceiling sliding doors and horizontal banded second floor windows. Each windowed wall faces the beautifully landscaped yard. There are also 5 exterior horizontal balconies in total, primarily on the front and
south facades, as well as a full roof deck that further bridge the interior and exterior spaces. These qualities are all characteristic of the modernist movement.

In the interior, much of the original modern architectural fabric remains. The house is asymmetrical with a complete rejection of applied ornamentation. To quote Louis Sullivan “form ever follows function.” The skin and bones architectural elements reflect the architecture in its purest form. All interior floors and ceilings are composed of precast concrete while interior walls are poured concrete. Every room above ground level is dominated by natural light, floor to ceiling windows and variable ceiling height to maximize sun exposure and sense of volume. The house is composed of all right angles, simplistic forms and a gridded structure.

The house at 1225 Asbury Avenue is eligible for landmark designation due to its an excellent example of a modern house with a high quality of design and intact original materials and a mostly unaltered appearance. With a design by George Schipporeit, one of the local and prominent Modern architects of the 1950s in Evanston, the house serves an important part of the architectural legacy of the Chicago and Evanston region.

Further details: Exemplification of architectural style (2-8-4-A (3):

According to an overview on Modern architecture as cited here: “The term Modern came to refer to a particular approach by a group of architects who sought to cast off historical precedent and develop something entirely new and different for their time. The carnage of World War I having convinced them that the ways of old Europe were a failure, they rejected ornament as frivolous and outdated. Instead, they sought to create an entirely new, basic aesthetic based on the needs and opportunities of new materials and structural approaches such as reinforced concrete and steel frames.

The development of the steel frame, which became a crucial aspect of Modern architecture, allowed for considerable flexibility of plan, with steel beams and girders allowing for the creation of wide interior spaces. Increasingly, architects began to think about the implications for a new aesthetic. Louis Sullivan, who had a profound effect on Modernist architects, coined the phrase form ever follows function. His idea was that the design of a building should be based on the needs of its function, not on historical ideas or precedent. By the 1930s, form follows function had become a rallying cry of Modernist architects who believed that buildings should be perfectly suited for their intended use, without unnecessary detail or extraneous decoration.

They continue to report that in 1932, the architect Philip Johnson and the architectural historian and critic Henry-Russell Hitchcock co-curated an exhibition at New York’s Museum of Modern Art (MOMA). They identified the new style with three main characteristics:
1. Emphasis on architectural volume over mass. Thin outer walls, often with windows placed flush with or very near the outer surface, could create the impression of a shell stretched taut over the frame very different from the massive appearance of a load-bearing wall pierced with openings.

2. The rejection of symmetry, which had particularly characterized architecture in the classical tradition. Hitchcock and Johnson argued that the Modernists replaced symmetry with a sense of regularity, created by a feeling for rhythm and balance.

3. Finally, the Modernists largely rejected applied decoration, with visual gratification instead being created through the use of intrinsically beautiful materials, elegant proportions, and the elements of structure itself.

Over time, the Modernist era became synonymous with famed architects such as Mies Van der Rohe. As a leader in the Chicago Modernist movement, his work, along with other prominent modernist architects, strongly embodied the use of sculptural form—cubic or rectilinear, volume over mass, flat roofs, the use of reinforced concrete, metal and glass frameworks resulting in large windows and horizontal bands, a tendency for white and cream structures, balconies upon balconies and the ideal that buildings should be embedded fully in their environment.

The house at 1225 Asbury Avenue is representative of the Modern Style and is in the direct lineage of the work of Mies Van der Rohe and his mid-century designs. The house exemplifies the ‘less is more’ motto of Schipper's former teacher and mentor. The entire composition of the house is concrete, steel and glass, or as Mies states ‘skin and bones’. It leverages what were considered structural innovations and functional innovations of the time. The composition allows for almost impossibly large balconies for every bedroom and creates a clean lined rectilinear structure—a contrasting but additive style to the nearby Victorian houses.

With its flat roofs, asymmetry and horizontality, the house is a classic example of the Modernist style—volume, not mass. The simplicity of the front facade gives a feeling of regularity, rhythm, and balance and is devoid of any applied ornamentation, molding or intruding mass. At the back of the house, the dissolution between interior and exterior spaces along with the exterior balconies and endless windows create a sense of rhythm and balance. The house is comprised of elegant proportions and the focus of the house is on the elements of the structure itself. Less is certainly more at 1225 Asbury.

In 2015, Design Evanston, recognized and rewarded 1225 Asbury Avenue with an excellence in design award called the “25 year award”. The below quote was taken from the award brochure highlighting the winners:
In addition, Design Evanston showcased George Schipporeit and the 1225 Asbury Avenue house in a book titled “Evanston: 150 years, 150 places”. Schipporeit and several other local architects from the defined time period are meaningful contributors to the Modernist movement. The house at 1225 Asbury Avenue fits into this architectural context with its use of materials, massing, relationship to the landscape and historical context.

Further details: Exemplification of work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose individual work is significant in the history or development of the City of Evanston, the State of Illinois, the Midwest region, or the United States. (2-8-4-A (4):

George Schipporeit (1933-2013) was born in Huron, South Dakota. Schipporeit spent his childhood in Nebraska, went on to receive an undergraduate degree from Purdue, and later did military service in Manhattan, Kansas. When George got out of the army, he applied to Illinois Institute of Technology where he studied for 2 years. According to the story published by another architect, “He told me once that he had spent his time in Kansas scouring the nearby architecture library, and that he decided to enroll in IIT because “that was where it was all happening.” As George self-reported, “once I got there, I knew it was right for me.”

While Schipporeit never completed graduation, he continued his architectural training working as an apprentice in the office of Mies van der Rohe and Alfred Caldwell. It is reported that Alfred Caldwell was eager to have Schipporeit as an apprentice, sharing that Schipporeit “drew like an angel.” From 1957-1960, Schipporeit worked as their apprentice for 90 cents per hour (equivalent to $8/hour in 2018). During his time under Mies, Schipporeit worked on many high-profile projects such as Lafayette Park urban development complex in Detroit. He also lead the design on three residential towers in Newark, New Jersey.

While based in New York working on the Newark high rises, Schipporeit met and impressed attorney Bill Hartnett, who was working with companies to develop residential projects. During discussions, the Lake Point site in Chicago came up as a potential project and Hartnett offered Schipporeit and another Mies/IIT alum, John Heinrich, the job after rejecting a disappointing proposal by Perkins and Will.
In 1963, at the age of 30, George set out to work for New York developer Harnett-Shaw, Inc and began studies for what would become the famed Lake Point Tower in Chicago in collaboration with his classmate John Heinrich. According to an architects account “Schipporeit remembered that the site was “the best site in the country,” and he and Heinrich poured the next seven years into its design and construction, beginning around Schipporeit’s family dining table. Heinrich thought that the project was the “biggest gamble in the world,” but that the two of them had a chance to do something spectacular. He took the licensing exam while doing the 70-story tower’s working drawings.

The resulting tower was a state-of-the-art flat plate structure, taller and more efficient than any apartment tower in the city and absolutely iconic on the lakefront. The shape bore a resemblance to one of Mies’ 1922 projects for a glass skyscraper, but it’s Y-shaped form came from a programmatic decision to reduce an original cross-shaped plan by 25%, and its curving glass walls were designed to avoid entirely difficult corner details; in the process they provided panoramic views from every major interior space. IIT landscape architecture professor Alfred Caldwell designed a rooftop garden atop the building’s large parking podium.” There are 3 remarkable videos with original footage of the lake point tower construction narrated by Schipporeit himself.

At the age of 37, and after much success with Lake Point Tower, Schipporeit started his own design office and continued practicing in the Modernist style throughout the 1960s and 1970s. While in private practice he was quite prolific leading the design of the following high-rise buildings:

- in Chicago -- Asbury Plaza (750 N Dearborn), 445 E. Ohio, Atrium Village (300 W. Hill Street), IBM Parking Facility.
- in Evanston- State National Bank in Evanston (Chase Bank- 1603 Orrington), Rotary Building (1560 Sherman), 1225 Asbury (personal residence)
- in Skokie- Searle Headquarters in Skokie

In each of these structures, he applied innovative technology, modernist principles- simplicity of form, functionality, geometric form, lack of ornamentation, and rejection of traditional styles.

While working in Evanston, in 1973, Schipporeit purchased the lot at 1225 Asbury and began his vision for his personal residence- what some consider a Bauhaus modern home. According to friends and colleagues, building 1225 was a complicated and expensive process and riddled with some personal challenges. The permit for his personal house was canceled in 1977 and the house sat unfinished for approximately 5 years.

At the age of 47, Schipporeit followed in the footsteps of his mentor, Mies, and in 1980 he became the Chairman of the Department of Architecture at IIT. During that time, he resumed the building of his personal house at 1225 Asbury. After a few starts and stops, the house was eventually completed in 1984. It remained his personal home
for approximately 15 years. While a single-family residence was a departure from his other residential buildings and skyscrapers, the same modernist architectural concepts and technical innovations were applied to his personal home.

Professionally, Schipporeit was considered a very dedicated teacher. He served twice as Dean of the College of Architecture at IIT and online reports say he was “an influential teacher... with a combination of gentle guidance and authoritative knowledge.” Continuing his lifelong interest in urban design and planning, in the early 2000s he established IIT’s Sustainable New Cities Specialization, a masters degree program of which he was Director. George taught, advised, and remained committed to his architectural passion until his death in August 2013, at the age of 80.

Schipporeit’s architecture vision won him many awards, including an American Institute of Architects National Honor Award (1970) for Lake Point Tower, and the American Institute of Architects Chicago Chapter 25-Year Award, also for Lake Point Tower, which honors "design of enduring significance." His work has been widely recognized for his contribution to the modernist movement in Chicago. It is without doubt that Schipporeit’s individual work is significant in the history or development of the City of Evanston and the State of Illinois.

**Integrity of Landmark and Districts.**

1225 Asbury Avenue meets the integrity requirements as set forth in section 2-8-4-B

The National Register traditionally recognizes a property’s integrity through seven aspects or qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It is strongly believed that 1225 Asbury Avenue meets the primary standards as set out by the national park service.

- **Integrity of location** refers to whether the property has been moved or relocated since its construction. The property at 1225 remains in its original location.
- **Integrity of Design** is the consistency and composition of elements that constitute the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. The only design element that has changed since building inception is the addition of a greenhouse which is presently being removed.
- **Integrity of Setting** refers to the physical environment of a historic property that illustrates the character of the place. The integrity of the property surroundings has remained virtually unchanged.
- **Integrity of Materials.** Materials are the physical elements combined in a particular pattern or configuration to form the aid during a period in the past. The integrity of materials has also been fully maintained. The original materials of concrete, steel and glass remain in tact.
- **Integrity of Workmanship.** Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history. The original workmanship and extreme attention to detail in the glass, steal placement and concrete construction is outstanding and remains untouched.
• **Feeling and Association.** While a bit intangible, it is believed that 1225 Asbury evokes a feeling of interest and curiosity. Likewise, the integrity of setting, location, design, workmanship, materials, and feeling combine to convey integrity of association.

**Attachments**
A. Obituary
B. Bibliography
C. Photos (see powerpoint presentation)
OBITUARY: GEORGE SCHIPPOREIT

Architect George D. Schipporeit was born on June 10, 1933 and died on August 29, 2013. He co-designed Chicago’s Lake Point Tower and two downtown Evanston buildings, among others.

George Schipporeit, age 80, of Glenview. Beloved husband of Alice Schipporeit, née Butler; loving father of John Beyer, Heidi (Greg) Peterson, Leslie Beyer, Marta, and the late Gregg Schipporeit; proud grandfather of Elizabeth Cornwell and Emily (Cameron) Jones; uncle of Kevin and George Meyer; brother of the Elaine (Al) Meyer and the late Dale Schipporeit; son of the late George and Ida Schipporeit.

Best-known as co-designer of Chicago’s 70-story Lake Point Tower (completed 1969), he was renowned as both architect and educator. Born in Huron, South Dakota and raised in Norfolk, Nebraska, beginning in 1955 he studied at Illinois Institute of Technology under famed landscape architect Alfred Caldwell. He then moved to the office of Mies van der Rohe, where he worked from 1957 to 1960. In 1963, working for New York developer Hartnett-Shaw, Inc., he began studies for what would become Lake Point Tower in collaboration with John Heinrich, an IIT classmate. In 1970 he formed Schipporeit, Inc., and realized several significant high-rise buildings, including the State Bank and Rotary International Buildings in Evanston, Illinois, and Atrium Village, 445 E. Ohio Street, and Asbury Plaza in Chicago. In 1980 he became Chairman of the Department of Architecture at IIT, and later served twice as Dean of the College of Architecture. After 1990 he continued at IIT as Associate Professor, and taught until his death. Continuing his lifelong interest in urban design and planning, in the early 2000s he established IIT’s Sustainable New Cities Specialization, a masters degree program of which he was Director. He won many awards, including an American Institute of Architects National Honor Award (1970) for Lake Point Tower, and the AIA’s Chicago Chapter 25-Year Award, also for Lake Point Tower, which honors "design of enduring significance."

BIBLIOGRAPHY - SAMPLING

Architect Reference Documents:

Lakepoint tower construction videos with George as narrator:

Interview with fellow architect:
“George Schipporeit.” Architecturefarm, 1 Sept. 2013, architecturefarm.wordpress.com/2013/09/01/george-schipporeit/.

Insight into George’s architecture:

Evanston architects:

1225 Award:

Interview with George; http://www.lakepointtower.org/document/504119034lpt_architect_bio.pdf

Conversations or email exchanges with friends, family, architects:
Marta Schipporeit, George’s daughter
Marty Huertig, former friend
Michael Andersen, previous owner (who met Schipporeit to review house plans)
Jeff Harting, architect

Modern References:
Summary of Modernist Movement
https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/internal_reports/pdfs/modern_architecture_development.pdf


2. OLD BUSINESS

C. PUBLIC HEARING

- 2305 Brown Av. (L) – Carol Lems-Dworkin, owner/applicant. Kristin Lems (Power of Attorney). Application for rescission of landmark designation of the property at 2305 Brown Av. built in 1908, home of Henry Butler a prominent and successful African American businessman. Mr. Butler lived in the home from 1912-1937. The Statement of Significance cites criterion H3 Be associated with a nationally, regionally or locally prominent person or organization; deceased 25 years. (Continued from July 10, 2018). [Applicant has withdrawn the application]
3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 834 Madison St. (L) – Tim Daisy, applicant. Replace selected first and second floor double hung wood windows with double hung Fibrex windows. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-3, 5, 6, 9 and 10]
## Section A. Required Information (Print) *Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance [page 1] fifth below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Property Address:</th>
<th>834 Madison ST</th>
<th>FOR STAFF USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application Number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) Owner's Name:</th>
<th>Timothy Daisy</th>
<th>Address: 834 Madison ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City: Evanston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Architect's Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City:</td>
<td>State:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) Contractor's Name:</th>
<th>Patrick Terri</th>
<th>Address: 2300 Ridge Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City: Glenview</td>
<td>State: IL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5) Landmark: | ☑ Yes | ☐ No | *Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance [page 1] fifth below. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) Within Local Historic District:</th>
<th>☑ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes → Lakeshore</td>
<td>Ridge</td>
<td>Northeast Evanston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section B: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

1) In addition to the required site plan, elevation drawings, and photos, briefly describe the proposed activity and reason for obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness. Attach a separate sheet if necessary, and refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance (page 4). For window/door replacement, state the reason(s) why the existing windows (if original) cannot be restored. Include statement from window/door restoration contractor to substantiate your claim.

We plan to replace exterior windows on the first and second floor of our home. These windows are very old, leaky and non-functional. They need to be replaced and are beyond restoration.

2) Checklist (Check all that apply and attach any additional information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Exterior Activity</th>
<th>Location / Details</th>
<th>Visible from Public Way (e.g. Streets and Alleys)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Construction</td>
<td>☐ Residential ☐ Other:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Demolition</td>
<td>☐ Partial ☐ Total</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Alteration ☐ Restoration</td>
<td>☑ Front ☑ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Addition ☐ Landscaping</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Garage: ☐ Rehabilitation</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Windows ☑ Storm Windows</td>
<td>☑ Restoration ☑ Replacement ☐ New</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Doors ☑ Storm Doors</td>
<td>☑ Restoration ☑ Replacement ☐ New</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Roof: ☐ Restoration ☐ Re-roof ☐ New</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Solar Panels: ☐</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Adhere to Illustrated Guideline (Attached)</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fence/Gate: ☐ Restoration</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Replacement ☐ New</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Siding: ☐ Replacement ☐ New</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sign ☐ Awning ☐ Plaque</td>
<td>☐ Restoration ☐ New ☐ Replacement</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>☐ Replacement ☐ New</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Relocation: ☐ Principal Structure</td>
<td>☐ New Address for Relocation:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Secondary Structure</td>
<td>☐ New Address for Relocation:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Checklist for Exterior Materials—Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Façades/Front Porch &amp; Rear Porch Material</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Stucco</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Siding</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum Siding</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Siding</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle, Material:</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Material</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Shakes</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Tile</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Sheet</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clad</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Material</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Type</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutters/Downspouts</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvanized Sheet</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashing Material</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascias, Soffits, Rakeboards, Trim</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Material, Type:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Iron</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraces, Patios, Decks</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Pavers</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pavers</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poured Concrete</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Material</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poured Concrete</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Pavers</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pavers</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed Stone</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Other Materials/Alterations/Fixtures/Not Listed Here (Explain and Attach Information As Needed):</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Applicant's Signature: [Signature]

Date: 8/19/18

Print-Name: [Signature]

Proceed to Section C if you are requesting a zoning or fence variation and/or a special use. Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance [page (i) below]. For Planned Development refer to Supplemental Information [page (i) below].
Front - North
Faces Madison

No Change 2nd Fl.

No Change 1st Fl.

Replace 2 2nd Fl. windows
Side - Faces Elimwood, West side

1 second floor window

6 Bay windows to replace
1st floor - existing - Faces Elmwood, West side

Trim 15/8" x 15/8"

27 3/4" x 36"
visible glass

35 1/2 x 36" visible glass

35 1/2 x 50" visible glass

Trim 1/4" X 1/4"

(C)x2

(B)

Scale 1:20

(Identical window on R side of bay.)
1st Floor - Proposed replacement - Facing West

C x 2
B x 1

Scale 1:20
2nd Floor - existing - Faces Elmwood, West Side

Scale 1:20

(references to window measurements and dimensions)
2nd Floor - Proposed replacement, E & D

(E) x2

(D)
2nd floor - existing

Faces Madison - Front, North
Fauc Elmwood - Side, West

2 identical windows Facing north
1 identical window Facing west

Scale: 1:20
West facing, 1st fl
Damage to window C
West facing, 1st fl
Damage to window C
West facing, 1st fl
Damage to window C
West facing, 2nd floor damage to window D
west facing, 2nd floor
damage to window E
West facing, 2nd floor
damage to window E
West facing, 2nd floor
Damage to window E
North facing
2nd fl
A
west facing, 1st floor
B
Re: Application for 834 Madison St/iWindow Replacement

1 message

Emma Daisy <emma@waldo.net>  Fri, Aug 24, 2018 at 3:38 PM
To: Carlos Ruiz <cruiz@cityofevanston.org>
Cc: timothy daisy <timothydaisy@warpmail.net>

apex window "restoration" quote:
http://apexwoodwindowsanddoors.com/my/invoice/776cc1fd-6ca4-4b82-b303-923d5881169f

On Fri, Aug 24, 2018 at 3:31 PM, Emma Daisy <emma@waldo.net> wrote:
HI, Carlos,
Attached is the corrected application.

As for the restoration quote, we have had a very difficult time getting one. Tim contacted at least 6 different window restoration companies. Only one got back to us and did an assessment. He said that the windows could not be repaired to fix air leaks and wood damage. We asked him to put that in writing, but instead he put together a quote for replacing the windows in question, which I attached, and said they needed to be replaced.

The Apex quote also includes restoration for the first floor north facing windows, which we are not proposing at this time. That will be phase 2 of window restoration. The 1st floor north facing windows are from a more recent vintage and in much better condition than what we are proposing to replace.

Additionally, we are replacing some of the windows that are not street facing, which is included in this quote and the quote from Andersen, but from our understanding does not require landmark review.

I am sending the files in 3 emails since it is a lot of files. This is the first, which includes photos of interior window damage.
Emma Daisy

On Thu, Aug 23, 2018 at 3:13 PM, Carlos Ruiz <cruiz@cityofevanston.org> wrote:

Hi,

Yes you can draw the proposed windows on separate pages, just make sure that are properly identify and place each sheet following the corresponding existing window.

Thank you,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
Community Development Department/Planning and Zoning Division
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Avenue | Evanston, IL 60201
847-448-8687
cruiz@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

On Thu, Aug 23, 2018 at 2:36 PM, Emma Daisy <emma@waldo.net> wrote:

HI, Carlos.
I am working on getting all these things updated for the application.

One question:
Is it going to be OK if the proposed window elevation drawings are on a separate page than the existing window elevation drawings? I am doing this by hand and had already drawn the existing windows (5 different window
drawings), and I don't have room to draw the proposed windows on the same paper to scale. Hopefully that will be OK and once we have the higher quality scans, you can print them out for the side by side comparison?

Emma Daisy

On Tue, Aug 21, 2018 at 11:25 AM, Carlos Ruiz <cruiz@cityofevanston.org> wrote:

Dear Mr. Mrs. Daisy,

Thank you for submitting your COA application for window replacement at 834 Madison St. I have some observations about the application that I think will make your application complete:

1. Section 2 include the number of windows and indicate their location on the respective elevation (6 double hung windows at bay on west elevation, 3 on first floor, 3 on second floor)
2. On Page 3, check the existing and proposed Window Material and Muntins (Not existing)
3. The lines on the elevation drawings are very faint (almost not visible on the screen). You need to darken the lines and the written information, or scan the drawings at a higher resolution as PDFs. If necessary you can bring your drawings to my office and scan them at a higher resolution.
4. Also, assign a code to each window (number, letter). For instance, at the bay, there are 6 windows. Four of these window are the same size and style, those four windows could be identified as 'A'. The two windows in the middle could be identified as 'B'.
5. Provide the elevation drawings of the existing typical window(s) with dimensions and to scale, side by side with the replacement windows with dimensions and to scale. This is the best way to show that the replacement windows are compatiable with the existing windows.
6. On the photos, write on each photo the location by elevation and floor (1st or 2nd) and its identification (i.e. 'A')
7. Provide the cost estimate from a window restoration contractor.

If you can provide the above information by this Friday, August 24, 2018 I could include your project for the special Preservation Commission meeting on Wednesday, September 5 (room G300) or the regular meeting on Tuesday, September 11, 2018 at 7 pm 2nd floor Council Chamber, room 2800).

Thank you,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
Community Development Department/Planning and Zoning Division
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Avenue | Evanston, IL 60201
847-448-8687
cruiz@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

On Tue, Aug 21, 2018 at 2:53 AM, timothy daisy <timothydaisy@warpmail.net> wrote:

Dear Carlos,

Attached, you will find the application for preservation review, along with drawings and photos of the existing windows. We hope to make it on to the agenda for the September 11th meeting.

I am out of the country but will be checking my email regularly. Please let me know if you need any more info from me.

I look forward to hearing back from you!

All the best,

Tim

--
timothy daisy
timothydaisy@warpmail.net