MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, July 10, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Julie Hacker, Sally Riessen Hunt, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Mark Simon, Karl Vogel and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Jamie Morris, and Tim Schmitt,

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

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 7:09 pm with a quorum present.

OLD BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARING

- 2010 Dewey Av. (Family Focus) – Nomination for Evanston landmark designation (Continued from March 13, 2018).

Morris "Dino" Robinson, Jr. of Shorefront presented the nomination for landmark designation on the basis of four designation criteria, as defined in the preservation ordinance: Sections 2-8-4 (A) 2, (A) 6, (A) 10, and 2-8-4 (B).

Ernest Woodyatt designed Foster School, now the Family Focus Center, in 1903—a two-story, red brick school building, with an English basement and a hipped roof. In 1926 and 1931, the firm of Childs & Smith designed additions to Foster School, reflecting key elements of the Woodyatt design. A fire destroyed much of the original 1903 building in 1958. The 1961 (post-fire) Ganster & Hennighausen addition was a marked contrast to the Childs & Smith additions, and subsequent alterations occurred to the building in 2010.
Mr. Robinson said the structure at 2010 Dewey Avenue embodies a sense of community that has stood for over a century in Evanston. The structure has served Evanston’s west side community as a school, a symbol of social change, and currently, a place for social services.

At 2010 Dewey, or the former Foster School, generations of neighborhood residents were educated. Many have made significant local, national and global contributions to society. 2010 Dewey later became the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Experimental School, serving as a model for innovative teaching and as a response to desegregation efforts nationally and locally. Mr. Robinson also referred to a 1996 study, supported by an Evanston Community Development Block Grant, to create a West Evanston Conservation District, and the formation of the work group, Preserving Integrity Through Culture and History (PITCH). This work group sought to develop a West Evanston conservation district and increase neighborhood engagement with historic preservation, local history and culture.

Mr. Robinson then cited the criteria for landmark designation for 2010 Dewey Avenue as follows:

CRITERION (A) 2.: Many notable people were educated at Foster School prior to the school’s closing in 1979. Their work contributed to the history and culture of Evanston, and nationally and internationally. Examples include: Junior Mance; Dorothy Hadley Bayen; Fred Hutcherson; William Logan; Alice Tregay; Sanders Hicks; Iva Caruthers; Joseph Hill; and Tina Lifford. (Their many accomplishments are detailed in the application for landmark designation.)

CRITERIA (A) 6 and (A) 10: Foster School was originally constructed in 1903. Between 1905 and 1967, multiple generations of Black students were educated there. By the 1930s, it was the dominant school for Evanston’s Black students, reflecting the local impact of ‘Jim Crow’ and segregation. After protests from the Black community in the 1940s, Black teachers were hired to teach in Foster School. These teachers included Grace Boyd, Willa Brown, Mary Lou Sullivan, Wendell Lanton, Dorothy Brown, Patsy Sloan, Jean Hunter, Alice Robinson, Vera Brownlee, Eddie Lee Sutton, Carolyn White Hunter, and Lorraine Morton, later elected Alderman of the Fifth Ward and Evanston’s first African American Mayor.

SECTION (B) INTEGRITY OF LANDMARKS AND DISTRICTS: According to the National Park Service (NPS), “Integrity is evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s historic or prehistoric period. The National Register of Historic Places has established criteria that specify the qualities of
historic integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.” The Evanston Preservation Ordinance requires that a local landmark meet four of those qualities: location, design, materials, and workmanship. Mr. Robinson then described how 2010 Dewey meets these four (4) qualities:

Integrity of Location: Location is important in relating the property’s location and setting to the historic events and the story of the people associated with that historic property. Evanston's schools had and have a commanding presence in their neighborhoods. Foster School is no different. Because of that presence, both the location and the setting are important.

Integrity of Design: As defined by NPS, design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. Foster School’s designs and additions reflect changes in 20th century school design. The use of traditional red brick and window styles are continued throughout each addition. In Later new additions utilize aluminum and brick.

Integrity of Materials: The NPS definition states that “Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.” Except for the aluminum window replacements in the 1926 and 1931 additions, the materials are the original building materials and have very good integrity. The 1960’s additions to 2010 Dewey were constructed with red brick, the second and limestone lintels above the second- and third-floor windows. 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.

Integrity of Workmanship: Specific to Foster School, workmanship illustrates the aesthetic principles of 20th century school design. 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. The workmanship on all three sections of the building—1926, 1931, and 1961—are examples of highly competent construction and workmanship.

Representatives of the property owner then presented their arguments in opposition to the nomination of 2010 Dewey Avenue for landmark designation. These representatives included: Bridget O'Keefe, attorney, Marie Ax, Executive Director and Julie Hamos, Vice Chair of the Board of directors of property owner, Family Focus,
Ms. O'Keefe emphasized that Family Focus respects and shares the community’s passion towards this building. However, Family Focus’ position is that the 2010 Dewey Avenue building is ineligible for designation because it does not meet the integrity standard Section 2-8-4 (B) of the Ordinance. Ms. O'Keefe also cited the National Register criteria regarding integrity and its seven (7) aspects or qualities: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association. She asserted that 2010 Dewey does not meet all seven qualities.”

The original building was constructed in 1903 with subsequent additions in 1926 and 1931. On October 30, 1958 a fire destroyed most of Foster School, and in 1961, a modern addition was added to the portion of the historic building that survived the fire. Family Focus took ownership of the property in 1983. In the late 1990s Family Focus replaced all windows in the building. A handicapped accessible entrance was added to the primary façade in 2010, which included a 3-story elevator. This new entrance represented a major change to the primary elevation. There were also corresponding changes to the footprint of the building, which it was expanded in 1961 and again in 2010.

2010 Dewey has evolved over time, and no longer resembles the building it was originally constructed in early 20th Century, nor the mid-century modern building that was constructed in 1961. The cumulative impact of these recent changes, particularly since the closure of the school in 1979, has compromised the historic character of the building and its architectural integrity. Thus, the Foster School building does not meet the integrity criteria mandated by Subsection 2-8-4(B) of the Code.

Based on the rating system used by the City of Evanston to categorize “integrity” in its landmark buildings, the 2010 Dewey Avenue building is rated as “ 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. The cumulative impact of the above changes has severely compromised the historic integrity of the original historic structure and the 1960’s post-war school building.

Ms. O'Keefe also noted the “PITCH” effort of the mid-1990s. 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. The City of Evanston and its Preservation Commission have also been aware of this building since the passage of the Historic Preservation Ordinance in 1978, or 40 years ago. There have been numerous opportunities for the City and Preservation Commission to determine that this building was appropriate to landmark.
There is a significant burden that must be met to approve a landmark designation of 2010 Dewey given the adverse impact on the financial viability of Family Focus. The cost of operating the building is having a negative impact, and Family Focus cannot continue to fund the building at the expense of its core mission – serving children and families in need.

Ms. O'Keefe stated that Family Focus neither consents to the proposed landmark designation of 2010 Dewey nor believes that it meets the criterion 2-8-4(B) which is required for designation. Merri Ex, CEO and President of Family Focus then spoke about Family Focus’ financial difficulties due to the lack of funding to maintain the building and their inability to market the building with a landmark designation.

The following members of the audience spoke in support of the nomination: Bennet Johnson, Lori Keenan, Steven Vick, Mary McWilliams, Ald. Robin Rue Simmons, M. Wetherspoon read a letter from Janet Alexander Davis, Delores Holmes, and Al Gibbs.

After audience comment, Commissioner Hacker asked if the property is landmarked, how the Commission would review changes to the building, such as windows or roof, and how to evaluate those kinds of changes.

Commissioner Dudnik said that ‘Preservation’ is being used here as if the Commission is speaking of the word ‘demolition’ and alternative scenarios. Chair Williams said that criteria 2-8-4 (A) 2, (A) 6, (A) 10, and 2-8-4 (B) “Integrity” are the issues the Commission is considering, and whether or not this nomination meets those criteria. That is the basis for the Commission’s decision.

Commissioner Dudnik then noted that 2010 Dewey Avenue would only have to meet one or more of the section (A) criteria. He had a problem with (A) 10, the neighborhood development and (B) was partially met. Commissioner Simon said it is clear that the nomination has to meet both--at least one criterion of (A) and criterion (B).

Chair Williams said that Commissioner Hacker’s question refers for future reviews of the physical aspects of the building and identifying the character defining features of this property. Commissioner Itle observed that this nomination is not about architectural design but cultural and political history. Therefore, a period of significance must be identified which is probably from original construction to 1979 when the school closed. To Commissioner Hacker’s point, reviewing whether some renovation or application is appropriate or not would be based on 2010 Dewey’s appearance in 1979.
Commissioner Simon stated that the section (A) criteria being presented are not just about the people that were there, but also about a strong feeling and association with the building. Criterion (B) is harder, because it does say that it must have sufficient integrity of design, materials, feeling and association. Realistically, 2010 has some of those and not others. The Commission can recommend approval based upon the historical, cultural, feeling and association. In the future, it would not be approving projects based on the architectural features and can be flexible in reviewing plans to modify the exterior or the windows. All of this says that a future owner would have to come back for exterior alteration of the building, and nothing else whatsoever.

Chair Williams noted that the National Register references about integrity gets to the question—does the site retain its identity? The basis of the identity question is if someone from the period of significance returns to the site, they would recognize this place. This assures flexibility over the landmark’s story and the building.

Commissioner Dudnik said the way (B) is written says…a feeling and association to convey its historic significance; it does not say… a feeling and association to convey its “architectural significance.” Commissioner Riessen Hunt said just because it does not resemble the original does not mean it does not mean that it lacks integrity. A case could be made for the stabilization if the community and the beginning of the entire community. Commissioner Bady said he appreciated both sides and learning about the history of 2010 Dewey Avenue. Also he appreciated the people who came in support of the nomination. He had no doubt that the historical and cultural relevance is there.

In summary, Commissioners agreed that criterion (A) 10 was written primarily for districts and inapplicable here. Commissioner Hacker asked if that would mean that there would be more latitude on exterior alterations. Commissioner Simon said the critical features are historical. It would neither preclude exterior alterations nor discourage exterior alterations. Scott Mangum noted that the Commission has 70 days after the closing of the public hearing to approve its report on the nomination and send it via a resolution to City Council.

Commissioner Itle then moved to direct City staff to prepare a report recommending designation of 2010 Dewey Avenue (the former Foster School) as a City of Evanston landmark, with reference to criteria (A) 2 and (A) 6, and defining a period of significance dating from 1905 to 1979: acknowledging that the building is not being designated for architectural significance and that future Commission decisions should look favorably on a broader interpretation of design standards for modification to the building; and criterion (B) that the building retains sufficient integrity to convey its feeling and
association specific to those two criteria. Commissioner Dudnik seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Commissioner Itle then moved to close the public hearing for 2010 Dewey Avenue, seconded by Commissioner Riessen Hunt. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

**B. 1805 Wesley Av. (L/RHD) – Mat Rappaport & Shana Stein, applicants.**
(Continued from June 12, 2018). Construct 2nd story addition on current footprint of existing portion of residence, at northeast corner of structure. Change windows in existing end floor master bedroom, changing double hung windows into French doors in kitchen, new casement window to the north elevation of existing kitchen. Restore cedar siding and trim details. Remove roof and trim over existing one-story kitchen. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]; [Demolition 1-6]

Mat Rappaport and Shana Stein presented revisions to a second story addition over an existing one-story kitchen at the rear of the house. The revised plans showed a flat roof over the second story addition, modifications on the east elevation 2nd story double hung windows, and replacement the following: on the first floor, two double windows with French doors with a transom; a small bathroom window on the second floor; and on the north elevation, a double hung window on the second floor and a casement window over a kitchen sink with a 2 inch SDL. After subsequent roof studies, the proposed addition has a flat roof.

Commissioners expressed additional concerns about the flat roof. The owner of 1811 Wesley also spoke in support of the application.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for 1805 Wesley Avenue with the understanding that the applicant will consider a shed or similar roof configuration for the new addition, and that this final roof detailing be reviewed with City staff; Commissioner Simon seconded it. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

**C. 90 Kedzie St. (LSHD) – Matt Rogers, applicant.** 6-foot fence around the entire property, observing the utility easement along the south property line. This would include a fence in the front yard, which is not permitted under City Code 6-4-6-7. The front yard portion would be a 5-foot wrought iron atop a 1-foot masonry wall with 6-foot masonry piers located at all corners on the north property line. There is an elevation shift from the west to east of the front property line, with a portion of the yard along the lake being 28 inches higher. The fence height follows this grade change. Fence Variation: 6-4-6-7 (F) 2 Fences are only permitted in front yard on a Type 1 street; request for construction of a fence in the front yard on a non-Type 1 street; 6-4-6-7 (F) 3
Fences are limited to four (4) feet in a front yard, where they are permitted in a front yard; request for construction of a six (6) foot fence in the front yard. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13]; [Zoning Variation A, B and C]. (Continued from June 12, 2018). To be continued until resolution of fence variation with the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Commissioner Itie moved to continue 90 Kedzie St. until the September 11, 2018 meeting. This continuance assumes that the Zoning Board of Appeals resolves the fence issue and that the proposed fence design is available for Commission review. Commissioner Bady seconded the motion. The motion then passed unanimously 9-0.

NEW BUSINESS

A. 1427 Chicago Av. (L) – Jim Moore, applicant. Installation of an illuminated message board behind glass in a masonry opening at the NW corner of the property. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-7, 9 and 10]; [Construction 17]. The Commission’s review is advisory to the Design and Appearance Review Committee (DAPR).

Jim Moore, Facilities Manager for First Presbyterian Church, presented the application for an exterior, illuminated message board on the first floor of the east elevation of building’s bell tower. According to Mr. Moore, when the church was built in 1895, one of the original features was the masonry opening at the bell tower, where the message board is located. The old message board had a black background with white letters (changed manually). The new message board has already been installed in the opening. The board is a high definition TV screen and is located in the bell tower at the corner of Lake St. and Chicago Av.

The measurements of the glass opening are 47” H x 71” W. The message board is 28’ away from the sidewalk facing Chicago Av. The messages change about every 30 seconds. At night the screen shows white letters with a black background. The illumination levels are less now than with the old message board.

With respect to 1427 Chicago Av., Commissioner Simon made a motion that the Preservation Commission recommend approval to DAPR of the new illuminated message board. The applicable standards for alteration 1-7, 9 and 10 and standard for construction 17 apply. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.
B. 1505 Ashland Av. (L) – Sebastian Koziura, applicant. Increase height of existing rear addition, construction of rear deck, and construction of detached 2-car garage. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-7, 9 and 10]; [Construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10 and 12-15]

Sebastian Koziura presented the application to raise the roof of the existing rear addition at 1505 Ashland. The new addition is lower than the main house roof. A new rear deck and the construction of a 2-car detached garage are also proposed.

Commissioner Hacker asked for new drawings of the rear elevation to correct the location of the windows. Commissioner Reinhold asked about the location of new windows on the north side elevation. Commissioner Itle noted that the drawings do not reflect the description of the project. The Commission asked for floor plans to understand the location of windows, and what windows are being replaced. The Commission also requested more detailed information about the proposed alterations to the existing house.

Sebastian Koziura said all the windows, except those on the front elevation, are being replaced. Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue 1505 Ashland Av. to September 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

C. 2865 Sheridan Pl. (L) – Charles Cook, applicant. Restore house to its pre-fire condition, including rebuilding the roof, replacing and restoring windows. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]; [Demolition 1-6]

Chuck Cook presented the application for the restoration and alterations at 2865 Sheridan Place, a Prairie style home built in 1911. The house had a fire at the beginning of 2018. The fire destroyed much of the second floor and 2/3 of the roof. The main roof is clay tile, and the one story porch is red asphalt shingles. The original tiles will be reused.

The first story windows will remain. The second story windows are gone or significantly damaged. All the second story windows will be replaced. The new windows are Marvin aluminum clad wood windows (insulated double glazed windows). The profile of the muntins is very similar to the original windows. The damaged brick will be repaired and reused.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 2865 Sheridan Pl. to restore the home to its pre-fire condition including rebuilding of the roof and replacing and restoring the windows and that applicable standards for alteration 1-10 and demolition
1-6 are met. Commissioner Ile seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 9-0

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 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.

Commissioner Riessen Hunt made a motion to open the public hearing for 1225 Asbury Avenue, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed 9-0.

Matt and Jolie Fleming presented the nomination for 1225 Asbury Av. for landmark designation. Matt Fleming said they were surprised to learn that the house was not a landmark. It is listed as non-contributing to the Ridge Historic District because it was built after the District’s period of significance. Evanston landmark designation is the first step for the National Register. Mr. Fleming indicated that the house meets following criteria for landmark designation:

Criterion 2-8-4 (A) 2: Architect George Schipporeit designed the house as his home. He also designed notable buildings in Evanston, including the Chase Bank Tower (1603 Orrington) and the Rotary International Building.

Criterion 2-8-4 (A) 3: George Schipporeit was a student of Mies van der Rohe, and his practice applied Mies’ “less is more” design ethic. The house’s exterior is stucco, and the interior walls are poured in place concrete. The house stands out in the neighborhood among the 19th Century homes, and its rarity and location contribute to its unique character.

Criterion 2-8-4 (A) 4: George Schipporeit was also an architecture professor and department chair at IIT. His most recognized work is Chicago’s Lake Point Tower, which he co-designed. Schipporeit also won awards for his architectural designs of other major building projects, including Asbury Plaza and Atrium Village, both located in Chicago.

Criterion 2-8-4 (B) Schipporeit started building the house in 1973, and construction stopped in 1977. He lost and then reacquired the property in 1982. The house was completed in 1984. The integrity of the house is the same as it was designed and built. The existing non-original green house is being removed as part of ongoing interior improvements.
Chair Williams said the Commission is enthusiastic about this nomination but would like to have additional information to satisfy the ordinance criteria under section (A) and have the nomination specifically address the house’s integrity as required in section (B). Chair Williams suggested Mary McWilliams as a good resource for additional information to support the nomination. Commissioner Hacker agreed and also suggested Susan Benjamin, a preservation consultant, who could help with architectural language. Commissioner Dudnik agreed that more information about the house should be included in the nomination.

The Commission asked the applicants to return with a more detailed nomination. Commissioner Dudnik moved to continue the hearing for landmark nomination of 1225 Asbury Avenue to the Commission’s September 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

- **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, it was the home of Henry Butler a prominent and successful African American businessman. Mr. Butler lived in the home from 1912-1937. The original Statement of Significance for 2305 Brown cites criterion H3, an association with a nationally, regionally or locally prominent person or organization deceased 25 years.

  Commissioner Williams recused herself from the hearing, citing that Martha Rosenberg, one of the owner’s daughters, used to work for her. Commissioner Itle then presided during Commission review of this agenda item. Commissioner Bady made a motion to open the public hearing for 2305 Brown Av. seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed 8-1 abstention. (Chair Williams abstained).

  Kristin Lems, daughter of Carol Lems-Dworkin, presented the application for the rescission of the individual landmark designation of 2305 Brown Av. Martha Rosenberg, another daughter, and Karima Modawdi, Carol Lems-Dworkin’s granddaughter, also spoke on behalf of the application.

  The applicants stated that the home does not meet the criteria for continued landmark status and addressed each landmark criteria individually. The house has been associated with Henry Butler, a prominent African-American, Evanston resident and local builder. According to Ms. Lems, no association has been made between the house and Henry Butler for more than 80 years, and no parties have expressed any interest in the house as a landmark, except for her mother’s personal interest. It was also noted
that Ms. Lems-Dworkin, the owner, submitted an application to add the architectural features of the home to its landmark status in 1983, and the Preservation Commission turned it down. Ms. Lems also questioned Henry Butler’s association with the property. The building permit lists the owner as Margaret Fuller, and the builder listed as Henry Butler. He was not an architect, and no architect is listed.

2305 Brown was described as a very small, utilitarian, one-story brick house. It cannot be called “important” in innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design or detail. The property was also not associated with important events or movements in the history of Evanston or beyond. The desire for a landmark house was a personal project of owner, Carol Lems-Dworkin. Over time, due to the owner’s limited financial resources, she has been unable to improve the property. Rescinding the status may inspire improvements by a new owner, based on the City’s general zoning requirements.

Kristin Lems indicated the house is been in the market for two months and the asking price has been lowered twice to $350,000 and to $325,000. Ms. Carol Lems health has declined considerably since 2017, and she resides at an assisted living/care facility. Her home is her only asset, and the sale is necessary to support her care. By March 2019, Carol Lems-Dworkin will run out of money.

Mary McWilliams then spoke about 2305 Brown, stating that Henry Butler is closely associated to this house. What is important is Mr. Butler lived in the house. Ms. McWilliams said she respects Ms. Carol Lems-Dworkin’s situation. The applicants added that there is support for the application to rescind landmark status.

Commissioner Vogel asked whether the landmark status or the current asking price was the real issue. Real estate data indicates that the house is overpriced. It should also be appraised which has not been done. From a market perspective, there are no available entry-level houses in northwest Evanston. So, price may be the issue. Commissioner Vogel identified a similar property that sold at the right and lower price.

Commissioner Itle asked if the landmark design is to be rescinded, what new information has been uncovered about Henry Butler or the house to support rescission? Carlos Ruiz then suggested marketing the property more positively noting potential financial incentives. Commissioner Simon said the Commission does not reassess what the Commission did in the past. Two months on the market seems a short time. It may ultimately be sold at the right price.
Commissioner Dudnik moved to continue the hearing for 2305 Brown Avenue until September 11, 2018, and Commissioner Bady seconded the motion. The motion passed 8-0 with one abstention (Commissioner Williams).

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of June 12, 2018.

Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve the June 12, 2018 meeting minutes as corrected, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed 6-0 with two abstentions (Commissioner Simon was absent at the time of the vote; Commissioners Riessen and Hacker were absent at the June 12, 2018 meeting).

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS (Working Groups)

No report.

6. VOLUNTEER REPORTS

A. Design Guidelines Volunteers – Update

The project review matrix was discussed, as part of the web update, and this matrix could be inserted online.

7. STAFF REPORTS

Last night, City Council tabled the appeal from the owners of 917 Edgemere Court of the Commission’s decision denying the COA for construction of a new home until their July 23, 2018 City Council meeting.

8. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

No discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 pm on July 10, 2018, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, September 5, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room G300
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Sally Riessen, Hunt, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Jamie Morris, Tim Schmitt, Mark Simon, Karl Vogel, and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Julie Hacker

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator; Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM 7:05 pm

Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 7:11 pm with a quorum present.

743 Michigan Av. (LSHD) – Fakhruddin Adamji, applicant. Install 12 solar photo-voltaic (PV) panels on the south roof of the home. Modules are flush to the roof surface. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-3, 5, 9 and 10]

Eric Thomas, contractor, described proposed solar panel installation:
- Black panels and supporting materials
- Panels approximately 4” thick

Commissioner Itle motioned to issue a COA for solar panels at 743 Michigan Av. with applicable standards of alteration 1-3, 5, 9 and 10 apply, seconded by Commissioner Morris. Motion approved unanimously 9-0.

2338 Bryant Av. (L) – Jeff Herberholz, applicant. Rear west elevation: remove existing 1-story covered porch and construct 1-story sun room; remove 2nd story west wall at
office and add a 23'-2 1/4" x 6'-6" area for new 2 bedrooms. Applicable standards: [Construction 1- 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11- 15]; [Demolition 1-6]

Jeff Herberholz, architect, described proposed addition:
- Designed as glass room for views to golf course
- More contemporary to distinguish from existing house
- Flat roof to preserve bedroom light above
- Materials on addition match existing house materials
- Trim colored to match existing trim

Richard Miller, property owner described addition:
- Meant to stand out from original
- Want to have four season room

[Commissioner Vogel arrived, 7:31 pm]

Commissioner Itle motioned to issue COA for 2338 Bryant Av. as described above in that standards of construction 1- 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11- 15; and demolition 1-6 apply, seconded by Commissioner Bady. Motion approved unanimously 10-0.

**2610 Lincoln St. (L)** - Stuart Cohen, applicant. Demolish 1990’s south rear addition. Construct new 1-story south rear addition for kitchen and family room and a small mudroom entry to be added on the east side. Remove the 1990’s terrace and stucco walls and replace with new stone landing and new stuccoed walls. Applicable standards: [1- 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11- 15]; [Demolition 1-6]

Stuart Cohen, architect, described project:
- Described previous additions and proposed new addition
- Described project’s relationship to applicable standards

Jim Young of 2607 Colfax expressed concern over drainage onto his property.

Mr. Cohen noted that landscape design is not part of project, but the project should result in less impact.

Mr. Ruiz noted city engineering would review before permit issuance.

Joe Caprile of 2615 Colfax was concerned about impervious patio and new exterior lighting.
Commissioner Simon recused from vote.

Commissioner Schmitt motioned to approve a COA for the project at 2610 Lincoln St. as described, in that the standards for construction 1- 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11- 15; and demolition 1-6 have been met, seconded by Commissioner Riessen Hunt. Motion approved 9-0-1 (Commissioner Simon abstained).

917 Edgemere Ct. (LSHD) – Elliot Flaws, applicant. Construction on a vacant lot of a new two-story, stucco and stone single-family residence with a 2-car attached garage. The application is Zoning compliant. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16].

Chair Williams described the process for the item.

Fred Wilson, architect, described proposal:
- Narrowest lot on block
- Vacant for a number of years after demolition of flat roofed home
- Setbacks of east side of block
- Zoning compliant
- Wood siding eliminated from previous submittal; stucco and stone “spine”, metal clad bronze windows
- Height 31’-6” to roof, 33’ to parapet
- Horizontality of windows to stretch facade
- Lines of proposed building in comparison to neighboring structures
- Etched glass garage door on front
- First and second floor plans

Gary Shumaker, consultant, reviewed standards:
- Height comparison of block. Average height in the block is 33’-4”; the proposed house is at 33’. The tallest house on the block is 38’
- Proportion of facade; smooth stucco and stone used as on other properties on block and in district including: horizontal banding of windows, large spans of glass
- Proportion of openings; highlight the proportions of glass as other houses on the block and historic district
- Rhythm of solids to voids; house is behind average setback lines on the block
- Rhythm of spacing and structures on streets; the front porch engages the average setback line on the east side of the block, the second story is setback as the wall of continuity
- Rhythm of entrances porches and other projections; C shape modest overhang identifying the front entry and door, the garage mimics the windows and doors, the garage is pulled back from the front yard
- Relationship of materials and texture; portions of the façade are glass, stone, and stucco, as in many houses on the block and district
- Roof shapes and roof mounted equipment; flat roofs on block; some houses on the block have 2-story flat roof additions, all roof mounted equipment is no visible from any direction, the historic district has a diversity of architectural styles including flat roof homes
- Walls of continuity; the houses to the north are tall structures with predominantly flat facades with sloping roofs, the proposed house recedes from those facades
- Scale of structure; compared height and side setbacks on block the house falls within the average
- Directional Expression of Facades; it is a horizontal structure with a band of glass, the spine is the vertical element, the rain screen on the front aligns with the window sill and head of the adjacent house
- Original qualities; this is a non-contributing site
- Innovative Design; it is a modest home using innovative design strategies to make use of a very narrow site
- New Construction; the house is of its own period and time

[Commissioner Reinhold left the room temporarily at this time]

PUBLIC COMMENT
Harry and Lowrance, 919 Edgemere Ct:
- Presented 3D model of the block
- Discussed scale of proposed house in comparison to adjacent landmark structures
- Should be compared to visually related structures on block as opposed to elsewhere in district

Andrea and David Rappaport, 930 Edgemere Ct
- Clarified their house is not directly across street but two houses to north

Mary Ann McGrath, 943 Edgemere Ct
- Mean height and setback numbers skewed by 925 Edgemere
- Referencing Standard No. 10 – the side elevation is monolithic on North side
- Noise concern from equipment

Pauline Kurtides Sheehan, 920 Edgemere Ct
- Concern with floor to floor height; second floor at 18’ above grade
- Concern with overall height with building raised above grade
- Concern with window well location

Phillip Crihfield, 911 Edgemere Ct
- 911 Edgemere Ct is a landmark house
- ADA ramp at house is not relevant because of lack of visibility
- May not be in agreement with zoning analysis
- Contest that Lake Michigan is not considered a public way

Doug Gilbert, preservation architect and consultant
- Reviewed proposed building in comparison to standards:
  - Height - more than just number, but context
  - Proportion of facades - flat roof vs. sloped
  - Proportion of openings - large expanses of glass different than examples presented
  - Scale - related to standards 1 and 2; out of context with surrounding houses
  - Innovation – contemporary architecture can be appropriate if compatible in height, massing, and window design

[Commissioner Simon left the room temporarily at this time]

Chair Williams noted that communications received from Commissioner Hacker, neighbors at 907 Edgemere, Michael Arrington from 929 Edgemere Ct, and other letters in support addressed to Ald. and City Council were part of the record.

Mr. Shumaker noted that they were not in agreement with the accuracy of the model presented.

In response to Commissioner Vogel, Mr. Wilson noted that street level renderings were used in place of a model.

Commissioner Dudnik compared the proposal to standards for:
- Scale of Structure – Comparing the building height compared to other structures on the block. The massing of the structure is more important than gaps. The model demonstrates that the building is larger
- Openings – Larger opening not consistent and proportion greater than many others.
- Rhythms to solids and voids in facades of building not covered by the presentation slide
- Roof shapes analysis only covers half of buildings on block

Commissioner Riessen Hunt commented that innovative design should be compatible in scale.

Commissioner Itle doesn’t believe that you can take peak of roof as height and then raise ceiling heights and be compatible. As proposed the building is not in the character of the block.

Commissioner Vogel stated that he wants to support, but the mass doesn’t fit.

Commissioner Simon inquired whether it was feasible to build less high.

Commissioner Reinhold suggested tapering the height to be lower at front, and raising the height at middle to reduce proportions of facades on street. The height of the first floor could be raised in interior of building instead of at front. The material changes are appreciated. A massing model with voids would be beneficial.

Chair Williams noted the height concerns could be looked at in a future revision.

Commissioner Simon stated that he liked design and wants to get to point to be approved, but the mass is an issue.

Mr. Shumaker stated the client is not willing to reduce 5’ in height.

Following a 5 minute break for the applicants to confer, Johanna Leonard suggested the Commission continue the item to the October 9th meeting and refine the outstanding issues.

Chair Williams summarized that the standards of height, proportion of facades, rhythm of solids and voids, and scale are the key standards that the Commission would like to see addressed.

Commissioner Itle suggested looking at the first floor above grade height and the eve/gutter line height instead of at the peak as the point of analysis, and suggested revisiting the floor to floor ceiling heights.

In response to Commissioner Reinhold, Mr. Shumaker stated that equipment was located below the 5’ raised areas.
Commissioner Dudnik suggested a model and to start the building height lower and work up helps with rhythm and wouldn’t read as 2 rectangles.

Commissioner Reinhold requested a physical model to show how facades work together.

Commissioner Riessen Hunt supported stepping the building height back.

Mr. Shumaker clarified his thought that the full block should be the context.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to continue consideration of the Certificate of Appropriateness to the October 9, 2018 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed 9 ayes, 0 nays. (Commissioner Morris had departed)

Commissioner Riessen Hunt made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:09 pm, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 9 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
and Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, November 13, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)
MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, September 11, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Julie Hacker, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Jamie Morris, Mark Simon, and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Tim Schmitt, Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Sally Riessen Hunt, and Karl Vogel

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM 7:05 pm

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.

At the invitation of Chair Williams, Bridget O'Keefe, attorney for the property owner presented:

- There has been less interest in purchase of property since landmark consideration.
- The property is being designated for history, not architectural reasons.
- Seeking flexibility in design guideline language.
- Agree with period of significance.
- Propose additional language: only exterior changes to be reviewed, exempt surrounding land for purposes of possibility to develop residential use on property to north.
- Detailed proposed language excluding interior review, designate east elevation as primary, allow for new additions on roof or secondary elevations if compatible, allow for flexibility for window replacements.
- Concerned with vagueness of report language.
- East façade primary because is most visible and as entrance.
- Do not see potential of developing land to the east.
At the invitation of Chair Williams, Dino Robinson Jr., applicant stated:

- Also interested in flexibility within building and zoning compliance and to allow for additions that would fit in.
- Believes that development of the lot north of building acceptable to community.
- Does not see potential for development on lot to the east of the building.

Chair Williams expressed concern with proposed language regarding exceptions to Preservation Ordinance provisions, such as excluding the site from Commission review.

Ms. O’Keefe clarified that they are asking for flexibility due to nonprofit status of owner.

Commissioner Simon noted that he was only interested in providing additional flexibility for development of the land to the north.

Commissioner Itle stated that he was also open to future subdivision for development to the north.

Commissioners Simon and Hacker discussed adding general language about what the Commission might consider, but cautioned against being too specific as that could limit creative reuse.

Ms. O’Keefe added that the additional language would useful for real estate broker and developers to know limits and opportunities.

Staff and the Commission clarified that subdivisions of landmarks are required to come before the Commission, unless the landmark designation excludes the land. Commissioners were not comfortable excluding land, but instead favored adding language to the report that would not discourage a future subdivision.

In response to concerns about the report listing the critical features, the Commission agreed to remove the bulleted list of features, from item number 3 in the report, while retaining the photos.

In response to concerns about the design guidelines, the Commission suggested additional language to item number 4 in the report:

Modifications necessary for adaptive reuse of the property shall not be discouraged. Such modifications shall include, but not be limited to, the subdivision of north parking lot for residential development, additions to the roof and building, and modifications to windows. Changes to interior of the building are not within the purview of the Preservation Commission.

Commissioner Simon made a motion recommending approval of the report as modified by the Commission, and resolution for the City Manager to transmit the Commission’s recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Sebastian Koziura, applicant presented revisions to the plans:
- Revised plans provided as requested by the Commission.
- No modifications to front elevation.
- Windows being refurbished in main portion of house per the Commission’s recommendation.
- Detailed proposed modifications to elevations.

Commissioner Hacker noted that the window trim on the north elevation may not appear how it is shown on the elevation and is concerned with lowering roof line instead of continuing the existing roof line across. Commissioner Hacker also suggested looking at the thickness of window muntins.

Commissioner Itle noted that the applicant could move the second floor window at edge of north elevation.

Commissioner Itle motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness in accordance with applicable standards of Alteration 1-7, 9 and 10 and Construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10 and 12-15, subject to the second floor north elevation window shifted to avoid conflict with the roof, seconded by Commissioner Simon.
The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

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).

Commissioner Hacker motioned to reopen public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold.
The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Jolie and Matt Fleming, applicants presented the documents submitted for landmark nomination:
- Overview of experts consulted and materials submitted.
- Described significance of architect, George Schipporeit (2-8-4.A.4).
- Described significance of the home (2-8-4.A.3).
- Described integrity of the home (2-8-4.B).

Chair Williams stated that they are excited about the nomination and for bringing it back to the Commission with the additional information.
Commissioner Reinhold motioned to recommend landmark designation for the property at 1225 Asbury Avenue and to direct staff to prepare a report and resolution to transmit the report and resolution, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Hacker motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

- **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]

Chair Williams noted that the applicant has withdrawn the application.

Commissioner Reinhold motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

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]

Jim McNamara, installation manager for Andersen Windows presented the project:
- Addressed difference in measurements between existing storm windows, proposed windows including the amount of visible glass.
- Black exterior proposed versus current red.
- Look is consistent.
- Interior damage to existing windows.
- Fibrex composite material that has been used for about 23 years, including on another landmark home.
- Payne sizes
- Homeowner not available to attend, but chose window based on durability and look.
- Top end of manufacturer’s product line.

Commissioner Hacker expressed concerns with proposed material instead of wood or wood and clad. /replacement/infill
In response to Commissioner Reinhold, the applicant stated that some of the windows will be retained and repainted black to match.

Commissioners Reinhold, Hacker, and Itle were not comfortable with the proposed material on a landmark house.

The applicant stated that they can discuss options with the homeowner, including gutting out the windows to retain the amount of glass.

Commissioner Hacker and Chair Williams requested an accurate section diagram and true elevations for cross-comparison purposes and to indicate which windows will be removed and which will be retained.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to continue consideration of the Certificate of Appropriateness to the October 9, 2018 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of July 10, 2018.**

Chair Williams noted that the minutes can be consolidated because much of the information is contained within the Landmark Report. Approval of the July 10, 2018 meeting will be considered at a future meeting.

5. **STAFF REPORTS**
   
   No items.

6. **DISCUSSION** (No vote will be taken)

   No discussion.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 pm, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Mangum
Planning and Zoning Administrator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, October 9, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)