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) – Fakruddin 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)