EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, December 11, 2018, 7:00 P.M.
Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue
Room 2800 James C. Lytle Council Chambers

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 1222 Dryden Place. (RHD) – William James, applicant. Construction of a new two-story single family house with attached garage on the vacant lot at 1222 Dryden Place, with adjoining lot to the east used as yard and open space. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-14 and 16)]. [TO BE CONTINUED TO 1/8/2019]

B. 1210 Michigan Av. (L/LSHD) – Michelle Beck, applicant. Construction of a 20'x20' detached garage in the interior south side yard. Requires minor zoning variation. 6-4-6-3: Detached accessory structure not permitted within interior side yards (between the side property line and the principal building); garage proposed to be located within the south interior side yard. 6-4-6-2 Detached accessory structures required to be located 10’ from the principal structure; 5’ separation proposed. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7-13 and 16]; [Minor Zoning variation A and C]. [TO BE CONTINUED TO 1/8/2019]

C. 1239 Asbury Av. (L/RHD) – Valerie Romanov, applicant. Remove existing main roof and raise the second floor exterior walls 2’ to create additional height for attic space, then construct new gable roof to match the existing roof with one dormer on the front west elevation and one or two dormers on the rear east elevation. Restore/replace parts of rotten wood siding as needed, materials to match original wood siding. Replace broken attic windows on the east and west elevations and materials of the existing attic windows on the south and north elevation. Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-10]; [Construction 1-4, 7, 8, 10-12 and 15]. [TO BE CONTINUED TO 1/8/2019]

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 419 Keeney St. (LSHD) – Patti Capouch, applicant. Replace non-original vinyl windows with aluminum clad wood windows. Replace rear porch entry metal doors in kind. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

B. 1208 Florence Av. (L) - Jennifer Cross, applicant. Modify opening at existing single window at front of home with new double window. Replace 2 existing window
openings at side of home with 2 new windows of equal width and height. Add new single window at living room to make double windows. Modify second floor window are side of home with new transom style window. New window to have aluminum clad exterior (Pella Brick red) with mullion patterns to match as close as possible (where necessary). Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

C. Election of Preservation Commission’s 2019 Officers

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of October 23 and November 13, 2018.

5. STAFF REPORTS

6. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

7. ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, January 8, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)

Order & Agenda Items are subject to change. Information about the Preservation Commission is available at: http://www.cityofevanston.org/government/boards-commissions/preservation-commission/index.php. Questions can be directed to Carlos Ruiz at 847-448-8687 or at cruiz@cityofevanston.org The city is committed to ensuring accessibility for all citizens; if an accommodation is needed to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning and Zoning Division at (847-448-8687) 48 hours in advance so that arrangements can be made for the accommodation if possible. Español - La ciudad de Evanston tiene la obligación de hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o a quienes no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor contacte a Carlos D. Ruiz de la Oficina de Planificación y Zonificación llamando al (847/448-8687) o cruiz@cityofevanston.org con 48 horas de anticipación para acomodar su pedido en lo posible.
3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 419 Keeney St. (LSHD) – Patti Capouch, applicant. Replace non-original vinyl windows with aluminum clad wood windows. Replace rear porch entry metal doors in kind. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]
**Application for Preservation Review of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)**

**Binding Review of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) & Window & Door (Storm Window/Door) Replacement**

Thank you for submitting your COA application for Preservation Review. This application is required for exterior work affecting Evanston landmarks and properties within local Evanston historic districts; when a permit is required and when visible from the public street or the public way. To process your application, submit no less than **15 business days** before the next scheduled Preservation Commission meeting the following: one (1) **hard copy** of the fully completed application and attachments including: plat of survey or site plan, floor plans, and elevation drawings of the existing and proposed windows/DOORS (not to exceed 11” x 17” paper size); and one (1) **digital copy in PDF format of the same**.

The Preservation Commission meetings are on the **second Tuesday** of the month. All required materials must be to scale with dimensions, and in context with the principal structure. The submission deadline of the completed COA application is **15 business days** prior to the next scheduled meeting date; this allows the City staff’s review of the application to provide the applicant feedback on the completeness of the COA application. **Incomplete applications will not be accepted.** Refer to the Supplemental Information, pages (i - iv) below.

Refer to Section 2-8-9 Standards for review of alteration (A) 6 to determine if the window(s) or DOOR(s) meet the standards for replacement.

Applications can be submitted in person, by regular mail, electronically via email at cruiz@cityofevanston.org or in a flash drive to the Preservation Coordinator, City of Evanston, Community Development Department, Planning & Zoning Division, Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 3201, Evanston, Illinois 60201.

Completed applications will be scheduled for review at the next available meeting, as long as all the required information is provided before or on the deadline. Preservation Commission meets on the **second Tuesday** of the month [see schedule on page (v) below].

Applicants are asked to present at the scheduled meeting to the Preservation Commission a brief overview of the project.

**For more information call:** Carlos Ruiz at (847) 448-8687 or email: cruiz@cityofevanston.org

---

### Section A. Required Information (Print) * Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance [page i” fifth below].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Property Address: 419 Keeney St., Evanston, IL</th>
<th>FOR STAFF USE ONLY Application Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Owner’s Name: Impact Behavioral Health Partners</td>
<td>Address: 2100 Ridge Avenue, Suite G320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Evanston State: IL Zip: 60201</td>
<td>Phone: 847-866-2977 Email/Fax: <a href="mailto:mweneghan@impactbehavioral.org">mweneghan@impactbehavioral.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Architect’s Name: Worn Jerabek Wiltse Architects, P.C.</td>
<td>Address: 401 W. Superior St., Suite 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Chicago State: IL Zip: 60654</td>
<td>Phone: 312-642-5587 Email/Fax: <a href="mailto:janes@wjwarchitecture.com">janes@wjwarchitecture.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Contractor’s Name: Synergy Construction Group</td>
<td>Address: 2037 West Carroll Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Chicago State: IL Zip: 60612</td>
<td>Phone: 312-243-3700 Email/Fax: <a href="mailto:Tony@syn-grp.com">Tony@syn-grp.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Landmark: [ ] Yes [X] No * Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance on page (i) (fifth page below).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Within Local Historic District: [X] Yes [ ] No; If yes, [X] Lakeshore [ ] Ridge [ ] Northeast Evanston [ ] Apartment Thematic Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted 10/19/04 Updated 12/22/17; 7/27/18
### SECTION B. Checklist for Window/Door (Storm Window/Door) Materials/Style/Components/Features—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><strong>FRONT FACADE</strong></td>
<td><strong>SIDE FAÇADE (L/R)</strong></td>
<td><strong>REAR FACADE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Type</td>
<td>Window Type</td>
<td>Window Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>Awning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Material</td>
<td>Window Material</td>
<td>Window Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clad wood</td>
<td>Clad wood</td>
<td>Clad wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Muntins</td>
<td>Window Muntins</td>
<td>Window Muntins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOOR Type</td>
<td>DOOR Type</td>
<td>DOOR Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding</td>
<td>Sliding</td>
<td>Sliding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOOR Material</td>
<td>DOOR Material</td>
<td>DOOR Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clad</td>
<td>Clad</td>
<td>Clad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOOR Muntins</td>
<td>DOOR Muntins</td>
<td>DOOR Muntins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: 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.

The proposed activity is to replace the existing windows and exterior rear entry door with new windows and new rear entry door. The existing windows and doors, which are proposed to be replaced are not original windows or doors. The existing windows are vinyl windows. The existing rear doors are insulated metal doors and are proposed to be replaced with insulated metal doors. The proposed replacement windows, many of which are visible from the public way, would be replaced with Pella Architect Series Traditional aluminum clad wood windows. This window manufacturer/style has been selected because the profile available would be similar to that of the wood windows assumed to have been original to this home. The manufacturer is able to match the aluminum cladding profile to a specific historic profile, if there is a specific profile, which the windows should match. The doors can not be seen from the public (the street or the alley), see photograph “E,” sheet A4.1. This provides a view of the rear of the building from the alley. The sunroom obscures the view of the replacement doors from the public way.

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>Windows</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Windows Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Windows</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOORS</td>
<td>x Rear</td>
<td>x No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm DOORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Hung Aluminum Clad Wood Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Panel Insulated Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Storm Window Style</td>
<td>3/4 Light Panel Aluminum Clad Wood Ventilating Storm with Screen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Applicant’s Signature: [Signature]

Print Name: Patti Capouch

Date: 11.20.18

NOTE: The deadline for submission of Certificate of Appropriateness applications is no less than 15 business days before the next scheduled Preservation Commission meeting. The Preservation Commission meets on the second Tuesday of each month (except when marked with *). 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.).
KEY NOTES:

1. REMOVE EXISTING PORCH CEILING. INSTALL NEW STAINED FACE BRICK.

2. WHERE ANY MORTAR JOINTS NEED TO BE REPAIRED, THE EXISTING BRICK IS TO BE CUT BACK A MINIMUM OF 3/4" BEFORE INSTALLED IN 1/4" LIFTS, COMPACTED, AND TO HAVE A CONCAVE PROFILE. MORTAR IS TO BE PRIMED BEFORE REPLACING.

3. REMOVE AND REPLACE ALL EXISTING WINDOWS.

4. PATCH AND REPAIR ANY DAMAGED OR DEFECTIVE DRYWALL/PLASTER IN ALL AREAS OF WORK, INCLUDING AREAS DAMAGED DURING DEMOLITION. NEW DRYWALL/HARDWARE AND TRIM. SEE DOOR AND HARDWARE SCHEDULE, A3.2.

5. CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY TO DETERMINE PROPER EXISTING BUILDING ELEMENTS VARY FROM THE INTENT OF THE DRAWINGS, INDICATED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS SHALL BE FIELD-VERIFIED BY THE CONSULTANT.

6. CONTRACTOR TO USE APPROPRIATELY SIZED BACKER SEALANT MATERIAL AND PRIMED BEFORE REPLACING.

7. EXPANSION JOINT IS TO BE CLEANED OF ALL EXISTING SEALANT & BACKER ROD (OR REMOLDED FOAM PAD, OR Neoprene Pad) TO BE CAREFULLY REMOVED AND REPLACED.

8. INSTALL NEW VANTY CABINET AND SINK AT 2ND FLOOR UNIT ONLY.

9. REMOVE EXISTING TUB SURROUND AND INSTALL NEW CULTURED MARBLE VANITY TOP W/BACKSPLASH & NEW CULTURED MARBLE VANITY TOP W/BASHPLASH.

10. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING WALL AND TILE AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

11. REMOVE EXISTING TOILET AND INSTALL NEW TOILET AT 2ND FLOOR UNIT ONLY.

12. REMOVE EXISTING RADIATOR AT 2ND FLOOR DINING ROOM.

13. INSTALL NEW EXTERIOR DOOR AND FRAME. PROVIDE NEW MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.

14. REINSTALL LIGHT FIXTURES AND OTHER CEILING COAT, APPLY (2) LAYERS OF POLYURETHANE FINISH PER MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.

15. REFINISH DINING ROOM HARDWOOD FLOORS, AT SECOND FLOOR UNIT ONLY.

16. REMOVE EXISTING REAR UNIT ENTRY DOOR AND FRAME, REPLACE WITH NEW FACE BRICK, THE BRICKS AND/OR STUDS TO BE REPLACED WITH NEW FACE BRICK. CONTRACTOR TO BE CONTACTED BEFORE PROCEEDING. THIS MAY REQUIRE PENETRATION, ARCHITECT AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEER TO CONFORM TO THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO.

17. REMOVEL小說 AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

18. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING WALL AND TILE AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

19. REMOVE EXISTING MICROWAVE TO REMAIN.

20. SCREEN DOOR TO MATCH EXISTING. TYPICAL AT ALL UNITS.

21. INSTALL NEW EXTERIOR DOOR AND FRAME. PROVIDE NEW MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.

22. CONTRACTOR TO USE APPROPRIATELY SIZED BACKER SEALANT MATERIAL AND PRIMED BEFORE REPLACING.

23. EXPANSION JOINT IS TO BE CLEANED OF ALL EXISTING SEALANT & BACKER ROD (OR REMOLDED FOAM PAD, OR Neoprene Pad) TO BE CAREFULLY REMOVED AND REPLACED.

24. INSTALL NEW VANTY CABINET AND SINK AT 2ND FLOOR UNIT ONLY.

25. REMOVE EXISTING TUB SURROUND AND INSTALL NEW CULTURED MARBLE VANITY TOP W/BACKSPLASH & NEW CULTURED MARBLE VANITY TOP W/BASHPLASH.

26. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING WALL AND TILE AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

27. REMOVE EXISTING TOILET AND INSTALL NEW TOILET AT 2ND FLOOR UNIT ONLY.

28. REMOVE EXISTING RADIATOR AT 2ND FLOOR DINING ROOM.

29. INSTALL NEW EXTERIOR DOOR AND FRAME. PROVIDE NEW MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.

30. REINSTALL LIGHT FIXTURES AND OTHER CEILING COAT, APPLY (2) LAYERS OF POLYURETHANE FINISH PER MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.

31. REFINISH DINING ROOM HARDWOOD FLOORS, AT SECOND FLOOR UNIT ONLY.

32. REMOVE EXISTING REAR UNIT ENTRY DOOR AND FRAME, REPLACE WITH NEW FACE BRICK, THE BRICKS AND/OR STUDS TO BE REPLACED WITH NEW FACE BRICK. CONTRACTOR TO BE CONTACTED BEFORE PROCEEDING. THIS MAY REQUIRE PENETRATION, ARCHITECT AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEER TO CONFORM TO THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO.

33. REMOVEL書き換え AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

34. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING WALL AND TILE AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

35. REMOVE EXISTING MICROWAVE TO REMAIN.

36. SCREEN DOOR TO MATCH EXISTING. TYPICAL AT ALL UNITS.

37. INSTALL NEW EXTERIOR DOOR AND FRAME. PROVIDE NEW MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.

38. CONFORM TO THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO.

39. REMOVE EXISTING REAR UNIT ENTRY DOOR AND FRAME, REPLACE WITH NEW FACE BRICK, THE BRICKS AND/OR STUDS TO BE REPLACED WITH NEW FACE BRICK. CONTRACTOR TO BE CONTACTED BEFORE PROCEEDING. THIS MAY REQUIRE PENETRATION, ARCHITECT AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEER TO CONFORM TO THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO.

40. REMOVEL書き換え AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

41. REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING WALL AND TILE AS NECESSITATED BY NEW WORK.

42. REMOVE EXISTING MICROWAVE TO REMAIN.

43. SCREEN DOOR TO MATCH EXISTING. TYPICAL AT ALL UNITS.

44. INSTALL NEW EXTERIOR DOOR AND FRAME. PROVIDE NEW MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.

45. CONFORM TO THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO.
1. INTERIOR TRIM AT DOORS TO BE FLAT-STOCK. FINISH TO MATCH DOOR.

(2) COATS SHERWIN-WILLIAMS BUILDERS CRAFT

NOTE: SIZES ARE APPROXIMATE. G.C. TO VERIFY ROUGH AND MASONRY OPENING SIZES, PRIOR TO ORDERING WINDOWS.

2. INTERIOR LATEX PRIMER/FINISH - B30WF6000 SERIES - FLAT, COLOR: TBD.

UNIT REAR ENTRY WALL BUMPER

THRESHOLD

LOCKSET

SWEEP

HINGE

2'-10"

2'-10"

2'-0"

1'-8"

3'-0"

TYPE

NATIONAL GUARD 200A

PEMKO - ADA COMPLIANT, EXT. ALUM. FINISH, WIDTH TO MATCH DOOR WIDTH

IVES 5BB1HW, HEAVY WEIGHT, 4.5" X 4.5", 3/DOOR - STAINLESS STEEL - 630 FINISH

SCHLAGE SATURN S251PD, INTERCONNECTED LOCK - 626 FINISH

VENTILATING WITH PANEL VENTILATING SCREEN DOOR

PELLA ARCHITECT SERIES TRADITIONAL, SINGLE-

ANDERSON 400 SERIES 3/4 LIGHT

3. ALL INTERIOR WINDOW SILLS SHALL BE 3/4" THICK CULTURED MARBLE WITH MATTE FINISH, U.N.O.

2. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO SUBMIT ANY PROPOSED FINISH SUBSTITUTIONS TO ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW.

11. NON-FLATS: 150 G/L

DO NOT EXCEED THE VOC CONTENT LIMIT OF 250 G/L ESTABLISHED IN GREEN SEAL STANDARD GS-11, PAINTS, FIRST EDITION, MAY 20, 1993.

- A) ARCHITECTURAL PAINTS, COATINGS AND PRIMERS APPLIED TO INTERIOR WALLS & CEILINGS:

3. ALL INTERIOR WINDOW SILLS SHALL BE 3/4" THICK CULTURED MARBLE WITH MATTE FINISH, U.N.O.

2. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO SUBMIT ANY PROPOSED FINISH SUBSTITUTIONS TO ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW.

11. NON-FLATS: 150 G/L

DO NOT EXCEED THE VOC CONTENT LIMIT OF 250 G/L ESTABLISHED IN GREEN SEAL STANDARD GS-11, PAINTS, FIRST EDITION, MAY 20, 1993.

- A) ARCHITECTURAL PAINTS, COATINGS AND PRIMERS APPLIED TO INTERIOR WALLS & CEILINGS:

3. ALL INTERIOR WINDOW SILLS SHALL BE 3/4" THICK CULTURED MARBLE WITH MATTE FINISH, U.N.O.

2. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO SUBMIT ANY PROPOSED FINISH SUBSTITUTIONS TO ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW.

11. NON-FLATS: 150 G/L

DO NOT EXCEED THE VOC CONTENT LIMIT OF 250 G/L ESTABLISHED IN GREEN SEAL STANDARD GS-11, PAINTS, FIRST EDITION, MAY 20, 1993.

- A) ARCHITECTURAL PAINTS, COATINGS AND PRIMERS APPLIED TO INTERIOR WALLS & CEILINGS:

3. ALL INTERIOR WINDOW SILLS SHALL BE 3/4" THICK CULTURED MARBLE WITH MATTE FINISH, U.N.O.

2. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO SUBMIT ANY PROPOSED FINISH SUBSTITUTIONS TO ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW.

11. NON-FLATS: 150 G/L

DO NOT EXCEED THE VOC CONTENT LIMIT OF 250 G/L ESTABLISHED IN GREEN SEAL STANDARD GS-11, PAINTS, FIRST EDITION, MAY 20, 1993.

- A) ARCHITECTURAL PAINTS, COATINGS AND PRIMERS APPLIED TO INTERIOR WALLS & CEILINGS:

3. ALL INTERIOR WINDOW SILLS SHALL BE 3/4" THICK CULTURED MARBLE WITH MATTE FINISH, U.N.O.

2. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO SUBMIT ANY PROPOSED FINISH SUBSTITUTIONS TO ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW.
GENERAL NOTES:

I hereby certify that these plans have been prepared under my responsible control and that, to the best of my knowledge, they conform to the Building Code of the City of Evanston, Illinois.

Todd E. Wiltse, AIA
PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM REGISTRATION #184.002955

WINDOW ELEVATIONS

A. South Elevation
B. View from Southeast
C. East Elevation
D. East Elevation
E. View from Northeast
F. North Elevation
G. North Elevation Detail

SCALE: 1:8.57
3. NEW BUSINESS

B. 1208 Florence Av. (L) - Jennifer Cross, applicant. Modify opening at existing single window at front of home with new double window. Replace 2 existing window openings at side of home with 2 new windows of equal width and height. Add new single window at living room to make double windows. Modify second floor window area side of home with new transom style window. New window to have aluminum clad exterior (Pella Brick red) with mullion patterns to match as close as possible (where necessary). Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]
Application for Preservation Review of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)

Thank you for submitting your COA application for Preservation Review. This application is required for exterior work affecting Evanston landmarks and properties within local Evanston historic districts when a permit is required and when visible from the public way. To process your application, submit one (1) hard copy of the fully completed application and attachments including: plan of survey, site plan, floor plans, elevation drawings of the existing and proposed, 3D drawings 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 no less than 15 business days before the next scheduled Preservation Commission meeting.

The Preservation Commission meetings are on the second Tuesday of the month. All required materials must be to scale with dimensions, and in context with the principal structure and immediate/adjacent structures on the same street block. The submission of the completed COA 18 business days prior to the next scheduled meeting date allows the City staff's review of the application and to provide the applicant feedback on the completeness of the COA application. Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Refer to the Supplemental Information, pages 9 - 14 below.

Applications can be submitted in person, by regular mail, electronically via email at cruiz@city.ofevanston.org or in a flash drive to the Preservation Coordinator, City of Evanston, Community Development Department, Planning & Zoning Division, Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 3021, Evanston, Illinois 60201.

For new construction, additions, major alterations, and demolition, applicants must submit this office electronically via email, or a flash drive with the current and updated list of all names and mailing addresses of property owners within 250 feet of the subject property (in Excel format). The updated list must be submitted before or no later than the submission of the COA deadline. Contact City staff to obtain a preliminary list of mailing addresses. Zoning Analysis must be completed by the City of Evanston's Zoning Staff before or by no later than the submission deadline of the completed COA application. Zoning staff requires typically 10 business days to complete a zoning analysis, depending on the case load. Applicants must give themselves enough time to request a zoning analysis to meet deadlines.

Completed applications will be scheduled for review at the next available meeting, as long as all the required information is provided on the deadline. Preservation Commission meets on the second Tuesday of the month (see schedule on page 14 below).

Section A. Required Information (Print) * Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance [page 1, fifth page below].

1) Property Address: 1208 Florence Avenue
   FOR STAFF USE ONLY
   Application Number:

2) Owner's Name: George Paul & Maria Romero-Yuste
   Address: 1208 Florence Avenue
   City: Evanston
   State: IL
   Zip: 60202
   Phone: 847-867-3910
   Email/Fax:

3) Architect's Name: Norandy Remodeling
   Address: 440 E. Ogden Avenue
   City: Hinsdale
   State: IL
   Zip: 60521
   Phone: 630-455-5600
   Email/Fax:

4) Contractor's Name: Norandy Remodeling
   Address: 440 E. Ogden Avenue
   City: Hinsdale
   State: IL
   Zip: 60521
   Phone: 630-455-5600
   Email/Fax:

5) Landmark: Yes ☒ No ☐ * Refer to the Supplemental Information for guidance on page 1 (fifth page below)

6) Within Local Historic District: ☑ Yes ☐ No;
   If yes, ☑ 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 1 (fifth page below).

Adopted October 19, 2004; Updated December 22, 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.

Modify opening at existing single window at front of home with new double window. Replace 2 existing window openings at side of home with 2 new windows of equal width and height. Add new single window at living room to make double window. Modify second floor window at side of home with new transom style window – new windows to have aluminum clad exterior (Pella Brick Red) with mullion patterns to match as close as possible (where necessary).

---

**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: ☐ New ☐ Replacement ☐ Rehabilitation</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Windows ☐ Storm Windows</td>
<td>☑ New ☑ Replacement ☑ Restoration Style/Materials:</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Doors ☐ Storm Doors</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Roof: ☐ New ☐ Re-roof</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fence / Gate: ☐ New ☐ Replacement</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Siding: ☐ New ☐ Replacement</td>
<td>☐ Front ☐ Side ☐ Rear</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sign ☐ Awning</td>
<td>☐ New ☐ Replacement ☐ Restoration Material:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Air Conditioning Unit</td>
<td>☐ New ☐ Replacement</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Façades/Front Porch &amp; Rear Porch Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Stucco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Siding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum Siding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Siding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle, Material: [ ] Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Shakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Tile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Shingles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutters/Downspouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvanized Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashing Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascias, Soffits, Rakeboards, Trim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Material, Type: [ ] Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True divided lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated divided lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height: [ ] Length: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraces, Patios, Decks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poured Pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poured Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Add Other Materials/Alterations Not Listed Here (Explain and Attach Information As Needed):**

**Air Conditioning Unit**

---

4) Applicant’s Signature: [Signature]

Print Name: [Print Name]

Date: [Date]

---

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 (j) below].
City of EVANSTON

1208 FLORENCE AVENUE

BEGINNING STREET NUMBER 1206
END STREET NUMBER
STREET #
SUFFIX
STREET NAME Florence Avenue
PIN 10-24-202-034-0000

LOCAL
WITHIN LOCAL DISTRICT? No
LOCAL DIST CONTRIB/NON-CONTRIB?
LOCAL LANDMARK? Yes
YEAR 1908
LOCAL LANDMARK ELIGIBLE? No
CRITERIA
A1: Exemplify an architectural style, construction technique or building type once common in the City.

PHOTO ID: 10-24-202-034-0000-01.jpg

NATIONAL REGISTER
NR DISTRICT CONTRIB/NON-CONTRIB
WITHIN DISTRICT? No
NR LANDMARK? No
NR ELIGIBLE? No
CRITERIA
ALTERNATE ADDRESS?

GENERAL INFORMATION
CATEGORY Single Family Residential
CONDITION Excellent
INTEGRITY Excellent
CURRENT USE Single Family Residential
SECONDARY STRUCTURE Two Car Garage
NR SECOND

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION
DETAILS Stick work in gable area, window trim, wood siding pattern.
CONSTRUCTION YEAR c. 1906
DATE SOURCE
WALL MATERIAL (CURRENT) Wood Siding
WALL MATERIAL 2 (CURRENT) Wood Siding
NO OF STOREYS 2
ROOF MATERIAL Asphalt
FOUNDATION Brick
PORCH Entry Porch

WINDOW MATERIAL Wood
WINDOW MATERIAL 2 Storm Windows
WINDOW TYPE Double Hung
WINDOW CONFIGURATION Multi Light
HISTORIC FEATURES
ALTERNATIONS Portions of the porch have been repaired/renovated, new storm windows.

260
ADDITIONAL PHOTOGRAPHS

PHOTO ID: 10-24-202-034-0000-02.jpg

HISTORIC INFORMATION

OLD ADDRESS (CITY, OR. YEAR) [ ] BUILDING MOVED [ ]
MOVED FROM [ ] ORIGINAL OWNER [ ]
ORIGINAL ARCHITECT [ ] ARCHITECT SOURCE [ ]
SURVEY DATE [ ] SURVEY AREA [ ]

PERMIT/HISTORIC INFORMATION

CURRENT ADDRESS [ ] OLD ADDRESS [ ] DATE OF CONSTRUCTION [ ]

PERMIT MOVING INFORMATION

MOVING PERMIT # [ ] DATE MOVED [ ]

ORIGINAL PERMIT INFORMATION

BUILDING PERMIT # [ ] DATE [ ]
BUILDING PERMIT DESCRIPTION [ ] COST [ ]
ORIGINAL OWNER OCCUPIED [ ]
EXTERIOR ALTERATION PERMITS [ ]
HISTORIC INFO OTHER SOURCES [ ]
OTHER PERMIT INFORMATION [ ]
HISTORIC INFO COMPILER [ ] VOLUNTEER [ ]
PLAT OF SURVEY
OF THE SOUTH 33 FEET OF LOT 5 IN BLOCK 6 IN CHASE AND FITZGERALD'S ADDITION TO
Evanston in Section 24, Township 41 North, Range 13, East of the Third
Principal Meridian, in Cook County, Illinois.
ADDRESS: 1208 Florence Ave., Evanston, Illinois

SCALE: 1"=20'

TO: HEIDI WITTMANN COLEMAN
ATTORNEYS NATIONAL TITLE NETWORK

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT WE, PREFERRED SURVEY, INC., ILLINOIS
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR CORPORATION NO. 116 HAVE SURVEYED
THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREON AND THAT THE PLAT SHOWN
HEREON IS A CORRECT REPRESENTATION OF THAT SURVEY. ALL
DIMENSIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.

GIVEN UNDER OUR HAND AND SEAL AT GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS, THIS
13TH DAY OF MARCH, AD 2009.
EAST ELEVATION

3/16" x 1'-0"

WEST ELEVATION

3/16" x 1'-0"
EXISTING WINDOW ON EAST ELEV.

EXISTING WINDOW SECTION

EXISTING WINDOW DETAILS
4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of October 23 and November 13, 2018.
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, October 23, 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 Ittle, Jamie Morris, Mark Simon, Tim Schmitt, Karl Vogel and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Suzi Reinhold,

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

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Williams called the special meeting to order at 7:15 pm with a quorum present.

Chair Williams proceeded with the explanation of meeting ground rules and standards for review of demolition. (The meeting ground rules were published online with the meeting materials on October 12, 2018.)

2. NEW BUSINESS

2603 Sheridan Rd. Harley Clarke Mansion (L) – Wally Bobkiewicz, City Manager, applicant. Demolition of the Harley Clarke mansion and coach house (mansion).
Applicable Standards: [Demolition 1-6].

City Manager Bobkiewicz provided a brief history of the property:

- 1927 - House built. Harley Clarke family members lived there until 1949.
- 1965-2015 – City purchased the property and leased the mansion to the Evanston Arts Center (EAC).
- 2011 – City Council directed City Staff to identify other uses for the mansion.
● 2012-2013 – The City issued an RFP for the use of the property. The City received one response from Tawani Enterprises to purchase and renovate the property. In 2013, the City Council rejected Tawani’s proposal.

● 2013-2015 – The Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) approached the City about relocating state programs to Harley Clarke. A change in governorship resulted in IDNR’s request being withdrawn.

● 2015 - Citizens Committee was formed to study uses for the mansion. The Committee’s Report was made to City Council. City Council discontinued any further discussions.

● 2016 - City Council approves the City’s proposal to keep the mansion and allocate $250,000 for improvements. Those funds were used to improve the two Fog Houses adjacent to the mansion. Harley Clarke Planning Committee was formed to discuss next steps.

● 2017 – RFP was issued seeking Qualified Non-Profit Entity to lease the mansion. One response was received from Evanston Lakehouse and Gardens (ELHG).

● 2018 – City Council rejected the proposed lease to ELHG.

● June – August 2018 - Evanston Lighthouse Dunes (ELD) proposes to fund demolition of the Harley Clarke Mansion and Coach House. City Council approves an MOU with ELD and the files an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application to demolish the mansion (and coach house).

City Manager Bobkiewicz then presented Section (B) 1 of the application, addressing the standards for review of demolition in the City Code Title 2, Section 2-8-9 (D):

● 1. The Harley Clarke mansion and coach house are not prime examples of one particular architectural style or design.

● 4. The mansion’s design can be reproduced, which is a standard that permits demolition.

● 5. The buildings require a significant amount of financial expenditures to resolve current property code violations. Financial hardship must be considered as reason for demolition.

City Manager Bobkiewicz indicated that the building was in a deteriorating condition, noting that: "Further, the buildings in their current state present a danger to persons inhabiting or visiting the property. There are multiple property code violations that require a significant amount of financial expenditure to resolve. This financial burden and hardship must be considered with the demolition proposal as set forth in City Code 2-8-9 (D) 5. For your review, this application also submits correspondence which highlights a series of property issues, although the items listed are not exhaustive of all building code issues. To reiterate, remediating or repairing these requires great difficulty and expense."

The City Manager then listed the following examples of deteriorating condition and building code deficiencies:
DETERIORATING CONDITION
• Evanston Arts Center did not perform the necessary maintenance, repair, or renovation work needed to keep the mansion in proper working condition.
• The mansion house remains vacant; the coach house is in extremely deteriorated condition.
• Current state of both structures presents a danger to persons inhabiting or visiting the property.
• A 2012 & 2015 building inspection identified multiple mechanical and plumbing code violations resulting in estimated repair costs of $430,000 to $600,000. Repairs would only make the house code-compliant as a single family home. Achieving building code compliance for a new stated use would trigger additional repairs/remodeling based on that specified use (ex. bathroom count per floor, accessibility, etc.)

MECHANICAL AND PLUMBING CODE VIOLATIONS
A walk through inspection was conducted to assess plumbing and mechanical systems on November 6, 2015. The following violations were identified:
• RPZ backflow preventer is leaking.
• Boiler replacement and new radiator is likely required on the third floor.
• Second and third floor bathrooms require remodeling to meet ADA requirements.
• The basement boiler mains have suspected asbestos.

ELECTRICAL CODE VIOLATIONS
A walk through inspection was conducted to assess electrical on November 11, 2015. The following violations were identified:
• All painted and worn lighting switches and receptacle devices must be replaced.
• Open wiring found on all levels of the property, including missing junction box covers, lighting outlets, and Wiremold raceway fittings.
• Ground Fault Circuit Interrupters are needed for all receptacles within 6’ of water.
• Incandescent track lighting and fluorescent fixtures with high efficacy luminaires must be replaced.
• Ungrounded receptacles on first and second floors need repair, and issues associated with a missing ground must be fixed or risk an electrical fire.

The City Manager concluded his presentation citing City Code Section 2-8-9(D) 6:
• The demolition of the buildings will result in open lakefront land which will restore the original condition of the property to its natural state.
• Demolition will present the lakeshore as it existed in the early days when no buildings were present.

PUBLIC COMMENT
The Commission heard public comments from 38 individuals. -- 37 people spoke against the demolition of the mansion and the coach house, and one representative from ELD spoke in favor of the demolition.
Chair Williams also acknowledged receipt of written communications in favor of retaining the mansion and/or denial of the certificate of appropriateness for demolition from: Aaron Packman (Professor of Civil Engineering at Northwestern); Beth Lange; Allison Toonen-Talamo and Sebastian Koprowski; Paul Janicki; Sara Schastok; Bonnie McDonald (Landmarks Illinois); Allen Letter, Former Executive Director of the Evanston Arts Center; Anne Sullivan, Program Chair in Historic Preservation of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago; Preservation League of Evanston (Mary Brugliera, Paul Janicki, Emily Guthrie and Sheryl Connelly); Neal Vogel from Restoric; Brad White; Charles Birnbaum (Cultural Landscape Foundation); Jack Weiss (Design Evanston); Jennifer Sandy (National Trust for Historic Preservation); Mario Machnicki (US Heritage Group); Mark Sloan (Central Street Neighbors Association); Peter DeMuth (Southeast Evanston Association); Michelangelo Sabatino (Dean of IIT’s College of Architecture); and Peter Babaian (Simpson Gumpertz & Heger).

The public comments included presentations by representatives of Landmarks Illinois detailing the significance of the Harley Clarke mansion and the physical conditions of the building. Additional comments were provided by architects, engineers, landscape architects, and preservation historians with familiar with the building as consultants to the City or as representatives of groups other than Landmarks Illinois. These professionals and Evanston residents, either neighbors from the Harley Clarke area or from other parts of Evanston, highlighted the history and architectural features of the buildings and the surrounding gardens, and notable aspects of Mr. Harley Clarke’s career and importance. A summary of these comments follows:

- Bonnie McDonald, President and CEO of Landmarks Illinois. Her organization has assisted Evanston residents for four years to save the Harley Clarke mansion and develop a re-use plan. They urge the Commission to deny the City’s request the COA to demolish the mansion. The Mansion is an Evanston designated landmark for which the City is charged with protecting. It is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The City’s application is flawed and erroneously presenting that the buildings are a danger to persons and repairing it requires great difficulty or expense. There is no evidence to support this. The application describes the building in good working order and needing minor inexpensive repairs. An updated examination by appropriate experts is necessitated. A request to access the building with experts, architects, engineers, and contractors to examine the mansion’s interior and exterior condition was denied by City Council. Many experts will demonstrate this evening that the mansion continues to meet the Evanston landmark criteria and there is no cause to award a certificate of appropriateness (COA) for its demolition. Asked the Commission to vote to deny the demolition application

- Anthony Borich, Partner at Jenner & Block and an attorney representing Landmarks Illinois stated that access to the mansion and coach house should be provided to Landmarks Illinois experts, as had been noted by Bonnie McDonald and as denied by the City Council. He objected to the proceeding and requested findings of the EPC, in writing, resulting from the site inspections conducted by
the Commissioners on October 20, 2018. He concluded that he does not believe assertions by City Manager’s Office were supported.

- Lisa DiChiera, Director of Advocacy for Landmarks Illinois, citing Standards #1 and #2, indicated that demolition of Harley Clarke will result in a loss of heritage, architecture, and landscape and would set a poor precedent for historic preservation. Preservation of the mansion relates to jobs, economic investment and the environment.

- Anne McGuire, AIA, Evanston architect with McGuire Igleski & Associates concurred with the other comments opposing the proposed demolition. She testified that her firm had been hired in 2012 by the City of Evanston to assess the Harley Clarke property and evaluate code compliance. No major deficiencies were found and, in conclusion, she felt that the mansion is safe and repairable.

- Stuart Cohen, FAIA, Evanston architect with Cohen & Hacker Architects LLC, architectural historian and Professor Emeritus of Architecture at UIC, read a statement from Susan Benjamin, noted North Shore architectural historian, in opposition to the proposed demolition. Harley Clarke is one of 42 properties included in the book “North Shore Chicago: Houses of the Lake Front Suburbs”, which include an essay devoted to the Harley Clarke mansion.

- Julia Bachrach, historian and preservation planner, stated that demolition should be denied based on 4 standards. Furthermore, she observed that the Jens Jensen’s landscape is among one the most important historic landscapes resources that remain today.

- Audrey Niffenegger, former student and instructor at the Evanston Art Center, stated that Harley Clarke is an important cultural and historic place for artists.

- Tom Hodgman, Board President of Evanston Lake House and Gardens (ELHG) spoke of the cultural significance and future of the mansion. He noted that his group had 1500 supporters, over 140 donations to re-use the mansion, and that 2000 individuals signed a petition asking the City Council to not demolished the building.

- Michelangelo Sabatino, Dean of the College of Architecture, Illinois Institute of Technology, testified that demolition will attract negative attention and that standards 1, 2, 3 are relevant when arguing against demolition. Furthermore, that demolition deprives City residents of an important part of their collective memory; that the Harley Clarke mansion is part of the shoreline; and that demolition undermines Evanston’s preservation ordinance.

- Neil Vogel, historic preservation expert with Restoric, LLC, indicated that the cost estimate to repair the steel windows has been overstated and that the detailing on the Harley Clarke structures is special and better than any other landmark.

- Paul Janicki, Evanston architect with Paul Janicki Architects, discussed Standard #1 and the architectural significance of the mansion as the entry to Evanston from North and, in relation to Standard #4, that there are few examples left in region of this unique architectural style and construction and that it cannot be easily reproduced.

- Edward Gerns, Principal and Preservation Architect at Wiss Janney Elstner stated that the building is in good condition.
- Peter Babaian, restoration structural engineer and Partner at Simpson Gumpertz & Heger, indicated that he had inspected the exterior of the buildings. He found no structural damage, and there was no evidence of imminent danger.
- Brad White, Evanston resident and author of the City’s 1994 Preservation Ordinance testified that he was embarrassed by the City’s presentation and that it shows a lack of respect for the Preservation Commission and for this process. Furthermore, the City has not addressed Standard #6 regarding any plan for future.
- Emily Barton of City of Chicago’s Historic Preservation Division stated that she had written her SAIC master’s thesis in historic preservation on the Harley Clarke mansion. Having been in the building previously, she found the required repairs and restoration is no different from what is typically needed. She cited adaptive reuse for the mansion, as it has been done with similar historic buildings in Chicago.
- Mary McWilliams, former member of Evanston’s Preservation Commission, reiterated that, in 1981, the Harley Clarke mansion was designated a landmark under three criteria: high quality of design; exemplifying the work of a prominent architect; and distinctive design. Furthermore, she indicated that demolishing the building will be detrimental to the public interest; and that Susan Benjamin, Architectural historian and author, had declared the Harley Clarke house to be the grandest French eclectic style house in the Northeast Evanston historic district.
- Virginia Beatty, local historian and radio personality, indicated that the Harley Clarke structure sits on five acres that were part of 1,280 acres given to a local native-American woman in 1829. Beatty stated: Think about history, what's been there and what would this history be if the Harley Clarke is torn down? Could it be a monument to women who have built Evanston?
- Carl Klein, Evanston resident, referred to the City’s 2000 Comprehensive Plan, cited and relied on by the Illinois Appellate Court in 2015 as a codified plan, wherein “...Evanston should seek to preserve the structures and environments which have given the community much of its physical appeal and special visual character…”
- Lori Keenan, with Save Harley Clarke (SHC), stated as a representative of those in support of saving building, that citizens have volunteered to pay the $15,000 annual maintenance and are working with state officials on potential plans to re-use Harley Clarke.
- Sarah Schastok, PhD, art historian and Evanston resident, fundraising consultant to ELHG, and former President & CEO of the Evanston Community Foundation, spoke of the distinctive features of house. She noted that fine architecture provides spaces that go beyond mere shelter. They house our spirits while encouraging them to roam and to soar, and this is what happens at Harley Clarke as a public building, offering unique experiences to our community.
- Allison Toonen-Talamo, architect with the restoration structural engineering firm of Klein Hoffman, assessed the structural foundation and landscape. She indicated that, with a community facing the same situation, they developed a history and support system for a property that is now is thriving and generating...
more business than anticipated. Harley Clarke should be treated as a gem and rarity.

- Gregory Dowell, architect with Wiss Janney Elstner and co-author of WJE Harley Clarke report prepared for Landmarks Illinois, stated that the condition of Harley Clarke does not meet standard 5, i.e., that it is unsafe or imminently hazardous, and that the building can be restored. It should mothballed if can’t be reused now.
- Nicole Kustok, representing the Evanston Lighthouse Dunes (ELD) testified that, by removing both structures at 2603 Sheridan Road, we would be preserving the lakefront and spotlighting the Grosse Pointe lighthouse, a National Historic Landmark that she believes is obstructed from the public view by the Harley Clarke home and coach house. There are three options to fund operation costs: taxes, philanthropy, or commercialization. No one wants to increase taxes to support the mansion. Removing Harley Clarke results in parkland, freely accessible and equitable for all of Evanston
- Evy Russell, local resident of the area, maintained that views of the Lighthouse are not obstructed by Harley Clarke. She indicated that taxes are not affected because of funds to maintain it; maintenance cost are $150,000 and $200,000 has been raised. The house is not a danger (I don’t understand this one…)
- Mario Machnicki, President of US Heritage Group and Restorations by Marion, (stonemasons), stated that he has travelled the world and found unusual details in this building not seen elsewhere. His work today is training masons. Unfortunately, there are no masons that could build such a beautiful building. The materials used at Harley Clarke ranging from mortar to the brick and stone use, as well as the style or technique of setting these materials are very unusual. The building is a sanctuary to learn about the traits of the past and craftsmanship.
- Tom Riley, Evanston resident, stated that he and his wife chose to live in Evanston because its reputation as “preservation city”. He believes are better alternatives exist than tearing down the building.
- Barb Riley, Evanston resident, had attended Open House Chicago and viewed other repurposed buildings. She and her husband own a building older than Harley Clarke and feel that they are held to higher standards than the City is regarding preservation.
- Allie Harned, with SHC, formed in July 2018, stated that her organization gathered over 3,300 signatures of support in just 10 days. They have received donations from as far as Oregon, New York, and Pennsylvania. The building is not a teardown. Harley Clarke could became an economic engine for a thriving community
- Jen Shadur, with SHC, testified that Harley Clarke was a self-made man, philanthropist for the arts, and educational pioneer for film in education. In 1918, Mr. Clarke started the Society for Visual Education and funded a study in Evanston schools, including Foster School. This study proved the worth of motion pictures in education and its curriculum influenced educational methodologies nationwide.
• Ray Friedman, Evanston resident, agreed with all other speakers except for Ms. Kustok. The residents want to save and use the mansion. It would not cost anything extra to the City because it is privately funded.

• Betty Ester, Evanston resident, first learned about the mansion when she moved to Evanston 26 years ago. The photo of Harley Clarke was used promoting affordable house as a ‘dream house,’ but then the message would say, ‘but this is the house one could afford with the program.’

• Madeline Gelis, Emeritus Board Member of Landmarks Illinois, quoted Albert Einstein… *In the middle of difficulty lies opportunity.* She asked whether Einstein would have been in favor of demolishing a mansion for the opportunity of more lawn given that Einstein stated: *It’s not that I am so smart, it’s just that I stay with problem longer.* She appealed to Evanston elected officials to allow citizens of Evanston stay with this problem longer and help them solve it.

• Patrick Donnelly, ELHG and film producer, asked what the Preservation Commission do when overruled. He also stated that the building is not unsafe, that money is available for other projects, and that money could have been raised during the last three years for the building

• Jeff Smith, Evanston attorney, speaking to Standard 5, indicated the building is not only usable, but it has been used for many events from 2009-2015. Furthermore, it is not unsafe. The building was in good condition when the IDNR made an offer to buy the property building. IDNR believes in conservation. The building is sound and original.

• Bennett Johnson, past President of the Evanston NAACP chapter, spoke to ELD’s intent to return the property to its natural state. He recalled having lived on Milburn St. as child. In a photograph with his sisters and cousins facing the water, there was no beach. He believes the idea to returning to its natural state is a fallacy. Regarding demolition, there was a cost limit on City expenditure (for demolition, cleanup, site remediation, construction, and restoration) suggested and passed by City Council, demanding that the ELD pay for all the cost. However, this limit was not included in the memorandum of understanding and, as a result, there is no limit. The cost may eventually be borne by the City for the demolition. Restoring the building will create an economic engine, not only jobs but income and activity, that will bring money into the City and people. If the building is saved, it will provide public access to all the people

• Ben Gasbarra indicated that demolition should not be considered when adaptive reuse is a possibility. It is a unique building for small group programming. He read a letter from One Community Museum, a group interested in the property. Their mission is to build a national network of community-based facilities museums which offer the public equitable opportunities for experiential learning

City Manager Bobkiewicz clarified that the City Council had allocated $250,000 for repairs to the Harley Clarke building and that those funds were used for restoration of the adjoining Fog Houses.
COMMISSION’S FINDINGS

In response to Commissioner Bady’s question, Alex Ruggie, Assistant City Attorney, said the Commission is approving or denying the certificate of appropriateness, a final administrative decision, or the applicant can revise their application and bring it back. Chair Williams said the applicant could also apply for economic hardship, or special merit, or appeal to the City Council as stated in the City’s Preservation Ordinance.

Commissioner Dudnik asked what maintenance work the City had performed under the terms of their lease with Evanston Art Center to maintain the mansion’s exterior. City Manager Bobkiewicz said the maintenance was mostly on window issues and moisture entering the building. No evidence of such maintenance was presented in the City’s application. Commissioner Dudnik stated he had not observed any hazardous conditions, that many of the items listed in the City’s application were recommendations and not code violations, were trivial, and do not represent dangerous or hazardous conditions. City Manager Bobkiewicz said the City stands by the 2012 and 2015 reports.

Chair Williams said after her visit to the building on October 20, 2018 and reading the City’s report, she did not find any issues associated with the physical condition that would necessitate its demolition. The features in the interior of the building are quite extraordinary as is the exterior. Looking at it as a historic resource, it does not meet Standards of Demolition #1, 2, 4 and 5 at all. The application did not address those factors.

Commissioner Schmitt referred to the 2012 McGuire Igleski report (pages 5-9), and Demolition Standard #5, i.e., repairs and the presence of hazardous conditions. He did not find anything in the Report to support that City’s position in their application. Specifically, on page 8 of the McGuire Igleski Report, it starts with “No major structural deficiencies were observed in the EAC. The conditions observed are generally a result of deferred maintenance and material degradation.” Furthermore, the report adds that the interior of the house appears to be in good structural condition. There is no mention, in the report, of anything that speaks of public hazard.

Commissioner Schmitt also indicated that the price estimate of $430,000 on page 331 of the meeting packet, represented a preliminary budget for code compliance based upon the Evanston Art Center (EAC) remaining in the building, i.e., it is a cost for “minimum code upgrades if there is no change in use.” Other costs cited include improving the kiln room and the basement for extra ventilation and fire compliance if the EAC stays in the mansion. The report also cited what budget would be required for providing other potential business uses or occupancies, and it is $265,000. Therefore, it seems to be some discrepancies in the application and what is referenced in terms of economic hardship.

Chair Williams said standard #1 gets to the issue of what the Commission does and its statement of purpose in the ordinance—preserving, protecting, enhancing, and encouraging the rehabilitation of buildings.
Commissioner Dudnik said the Wiss, Janney report also indicates that the condition of the mansion is good or better than described in the 2012 McGuire Igleski report. He also cited Mary McWilliams’ written statement that was included in the meeting packet since it very effectively addresses each applicable standard.

Commissioner Morris said her interpretation of Standard 3 is that tearing down something that is designated locally as a local landmark is contrary to the objectives of historic preservation.

Commissioner Vogel said that it is critical that people see the inside of the house. He said the interior of the house is incredible. He said the City’s proposal does not meet any of the standards.

Commissioner Bady said that upon visiting the Harley Clarke mansion last Saturday (October 20, 2018) for the first time, he found it breath taking. He was struck by the building. Regarding Standard #5, he did not see where the building was structurally unsound.

Commissioner Riessen Hunt said that she evaluates buildings for site, structure, and interiors, while doing property condition assessments as a professional architect. She was in the building on Saturday October 20th and saw very little, if any, structural damage.

Commissioner Hacker said that she was very concerned that the building is not being maintained in any way. Ongoing delays on just its maintenance will continue the building’s deterioration.

Commissioner Itle said that he saw nothing that was presented to justify the demolition under any of these five standards. The first four standards all relate to its significance, architectural character, and uniqueness. It is very clear that the mansion is a significant building and piece of architecture and a unique design. It would be great loss to the City if it were demolished. Under standard #5, he agreed with many of the other experts and that it is in surprisingly sound condition and could very easily be protected and mothballed for five or even ten years, while figuring out what the right permanent use and the right permanent organization to use the building would be, and come up with that renovation plan. It is unfortunate over the past 50 years the City has not done what they should have done to properly maintain the mansion as well as it could have easily been, but it still is very salvageable and very repairable.

Chair Williams agreed with Commissioner Itle on the issue of mothballing the building. She did not see where there is a real imperative or need to demolish the structure at this point. Examples of mothballing buildings for years have been mentioned, and these landmarks have ultimately found their use, as long as that use is not dictated. Any use needs to fundamentally be market based. She said in terms of the findings of fact, the Commission finds that the City’s application does not meet any of the standards for demolition.
Chair Williams then stated that any Commission motion should include a request to staff to prepare a report summarizing the Commission’s findings of fact, based on tonight’s discussion, and that this report will be reviewed at the Commission’s regularly scheduled November meeting, and subsequently submitted to the City Manager’s office and to the Council.

Commissioner Dudnik asked about the request made by Mr. Borich representing Landmarks Illinois, during the Public Comments session regarding obtaining Commissioners’ notes resulting from their October 20, 2018 visit to Harley Clarke. Chair Williams said the site visits were not conducted as a meeting nor did they constitute a Commission meeting. Chair Williams noted that the City’s legal counsel should respond to that point, and Mr. Borish’s statement will be shared with the City Legal Counsel.

Commissioner Itle then made a motion to deny the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of the Harley Clarke mansion and coach house, applying Demolition Standards 1-5 (standard 6 does not apply, since there is no proposal to build a new building) with none of the applicable standards having been met by the application, and to direct staff to prepare a report of the Commission’s findings of fact. The draft of the report to be reviewed at the November 13th Preservation Commission’s meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Simon.


The motion to deny the application passed 10-0.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Itle made a motion to adjourn the special meeting at 9:25 pm on Tuesday, October 23, 2018, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 10-0.

Respectfully Submitted

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

The next Preservation Commission meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, November 13, 2018.
MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, November 13, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.


Members Absent: Jamie Morris, Sally Riessen Hunt, Ken Itle, and Diane Williams,

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

Presiding Member: Mark Simon, Acting Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM 7:07 pm

Secretary Simon called the meeting to order at 7:07 pm, with a quorum of seven Commissioners present. In the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to appoint the Secretary as Chair of the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote 7ayes, 0 nays.

2. CITY PROJECT – City of Evanston Street Light Master Plan presentation.

Rajeev Dahal, Senior Project Manager of the City of Evanston said they have been working on the Streetlight Master Plan for over a year, including two public meetings and steering committee meetings. Tonight they will present their findings and recommendations. Mike Kerr, Executive Vice President of Christopher Burke Engineering made the presentation on the following topics including:

**Timeline:** Five Steering Committee meetings held between July 2017 and October 2018, conducted Existing Conditions Light Level Readings, held Public Meeting # 1, Union Metal Goes Out of Business on December 2017, provided Alternate Technology Exploration, and Additional Existing Conditions Light Level Readings. Conducted a Northwest Municipal Conference Survey, and Community Lighting Level Survey. Ending with Public Meeting #2 on November 2018. Seven hundred people responded to the community survey. In every case all the streets were rated too dark, except their own streets were not as dark...
**Existing conditions**: COE lighting standards are less than IESNA lighting standards, lighting levels generally do not meet IESNA or COE recommended lighting levels (18 of 31), tree canopies impede lighting levels, and existing lighting is a significant source of light pollution

**Existing Conditions Recommendations**: LED luminaires should be used in future developments/construction, a replica Tallmadge full cutoff LED luminaire that is dark sky compliant should be used for future applications, recommended spacing between trees and poles should be 25\(^\pm\), and metering should be explored by COE

**Alternative Technology Exploration**: Luminaires, color temperature (recommended 3,000K or less), optic (Type III for 0 footcandle at the base), lens types (frosted acrylic type, shoots light down), the retrofit Tallmadge luminaires are LED, and engineered Tallmadge luminaire is recommended (LED mounted on the top cover of the luminaire)

**Lighting Levels Recommendations**: Mid-range lighting levels compared to the National Standards and the Evanston standards for roadways, intersections, parks and others.

**Davit Arm Roadway Lighting Unit (1,600)**: The Davit Arm pole with luminaire would be located on all major roadways, select collector roadways and critical intersections where pedestrian traffic and/or vehicle traffic is high.

**Tallmadge Lighting Unit (4,200)**: RFPs will be issue for identical Tallmadge poles, the luminaire will be a full cut off with LEDs in the top; < 3,000K, Stemburg luminaire fixture or similar, Located on local streets or in combination with roadway poles on collector or major roadways. No Tallmadge pole will be replaced without Council approval

**Other Type of Lighting Units**: Park Pathway (2,000); Shoe Box (parking lot); and Wall Pack, Same range of wattage and color temperature

**Prioritization**: The budget for lighting in the city is about 150,000, The goal would be adopt these standards; use them on new projects moving forward, Prioritize locations that are high accident locations, uncontrolled crossings around schools, churches, transit facilities, or any areas identified by the police that could use extra light

Commissioner Dudnik said that he and other Commissioner (Itle) were part of the Steering Committee. They were very thorough in the entire process. He was surprised that not too many people saw the mockups. Those who saw the mockups noticed clearly the difference between the new and old.

3. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. **1225 Asbury Av. (RHD)** – Matthew & Jolie Fleming, applicants. Consideration and approval of the Commission’s report recommending City Council approval of landmark
designation and adoption of resolution asking the City Manager to transmit the Commission’s report to City Council (Continued from the 9/11/2018 meeting).

With no further discussion on the Commission’s report regarding 1225 Asbury Avenue for landmark designation, Commissioner Reinhold moved to approve the Commission’s report and recommend the report to City Council for approval of the landmark designation for 1225 Asbury Avenue, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 7-0.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to approve the Commission’s resolution and to send it for recommendation to the City Council, for 1225 Asbury Avenue, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 7-0.

B. 1222 Dryden Place. (RHD) – William James, applicant. Construction of a new two-story single family house with attached garage on the vacant lot at 1222 Dryden Place, with adjoining lot to the east used as yard and open space. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-14 and 16] (Continued from the 10/9/2018 meeting).

At the request of the applicant, Commissioner Dudnik made a motion the application for 1222 Dryden Place to the meeting of December 11, 2018, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 2603 Sheridan Rd. (L) – City of Evanston, applicant. Consideration and approval of the Preservation Commission’s findings on the denial of the certificate of appropriateness for demolition of the mansion and coach house (Continued from the 10/23/2018 meeting).

The Commission reviewed a draft of its findings regarding the denial of the certificate of appropriateness for demolition of the mansion and coach house at 2603 Sheridan Rd. and made the following revisions:

From PUBLIC COMMENT section, fourth paragraph, delete first four bullet points, beginning at ‘The Harley Clark Mansion… and ending at Evanston landmark criteria’

From COMMISSION’S FINDINGS section, third paragraph, after ‘…visit to the site,’ insert ‘testimony form thirty-seven (37) people was heard.’

Fourth paragraph: correct ‘2-8-9’ to ‘2-8-4’

Fourteenth paragraph (delete and insert):

FINDING: The City application relied on City inspections that showed minor existing or potential documentation of code violations such as plumbing, mechanical, and electrical. The lack of proper maintenance over the years did not reach a point where rehabilitation and restoration are not physically or financially possible.
Fifteenth paragraph: The City’s application did not present evidence of demonstrate that the Harley Clarke mansion and coach house are a danger and in imminent hazard condition to persons or property either.

From SUMMARY section, insert third new paragraph:
The report summarized in City’s presentation concluded that no major structural concerns exist in the Harley Clarke mansion and coach house.

Move the following nine paragraphs starting in ‘Per City’s application Section B (1):’ and ending in …’both exterior and internal elements of the mansion.’ to page 3, after bullet point ‘Represents the lakeshore in the early days when no buildings were present.’

From CONCLUSIONS section, second paragraph (delete and insert):
The City’s application did not demonstrate that Section 2-8-9 (D) 1-5 standards for demolition have been met (standard 6 does not apply). On the contrary, the Harley Clarke mansion and coach house are a cultural, architectural asset to the City of Evanston and citizens. Their current physical condition is safe to the public and they could be restored for the benefit of the City and citizens. does not constitute a danger or imminent hazard condition as required by the Ordinance.

Public Comment:
Jennifer Shadur, representing Friends of Harley Clarke, requested full documents and materials with the Commission’s findings to City Council. Also suggested that City Council watch the full video of the October 23, 2018 Preservation Commission special meeting.

Lori Keenan said the findings should recognize experts in the field, evidence by reference. The findings could be a local document, and should be accurate and comprehensive.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to approve the ‘findings’ on the application for certificate of appropriateness for demolition of Harley Clarke mansion and coach house at 2603 Sheridan Road, as a result of the meeting of October 23, 2018 and as disapproved by the Commission at that meeting, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed 5-0. Commissioners Reinhold and Bady abstained.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1210 Michigan Av. (L/LSHD) – Michelle Beck, applicant. Construction of a 20’x20’ detached garage in the interior south side yard. Requires minor zoning variation. 6-4-6-3: Detached accessory structure not permitted within interior side yards (between the side property line and the principal building); garage proposed to be located within the south interior side yard. 6-4-6-2 Detached accessory structures required to be located 10’ from the principal structure; 5’ separation proposed. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7- 13 and 16]; [Minor Zoning variation A and C].
Michelle Beck, owner, presented the application as follows:
The previous owners received approval for a garage at the very back of the yard. The new forward location on the side yard will create a larger garden, and have less paved space and more green space. The neighbor most affected by the projects supports it. It would remove a large portion of the driveway to have a better garden. They will not build the garage on the approved location, instead the will move forward the existing fence. The garage design is simple but would be decorated and painted in the same way as the house with stained glass in the octagonal window facing the street. It requires two zoning variations: the side yard location, and the distance between the garage and the house is five feet instead of ten feet. The exterior is wood siding to match the house.

Commissioners were concerned with: setting a precedent pushing the garage forward, the octagonal window, whether the proposed garage is consistent with other garage in the neighborhood.

Mary McWilliams (Commission’s Volunteer) said several years ago the Commission approved a garage to be moved forward at the northeast corner of Church St. and Wesley Ave. The house to the east looks out onto that garage. She suggested going to see that particular house to assess how that affects the whole setting.

Commissioner Vogel was concerned with the quality of the proposed garage. Commissioner Dudnik said the issue is what the impact is going to be like next to the house, regardless of who built it. It seems the applicant is underestimating what the impact is going to be even from her house, with the 5’ setback, and the impact on the neighbors as well.

Commissioner Hacker said she would like to see a site plan of the other homes, and where the garages are.

Michelle Beck agreed to come back next meeting with contextual photos, showing whether there are similar garages in close proximity and then also potentially meeting some of the more stylistic objections as some members had voiced.

Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue 1210 Michigan Av. to the December 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes; 0 nays.

B. 1308 Elmwood Av. (L) – Matthew Kerouac, applicant. Construction of 1-story frame addition at rear of existing family residence with roof top deck. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1- 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, and 15].

Matthew Kerouac presented the application. Previous owners received approval for updating the front porch and adding new windows a year ago. The new owners would like to add a one-story enclosed mudroom connected to the house and a one-story screened porch at the rear of the property, with stairs off to the back. Above the one-story addition is a rooftop deck that is accessed from the master bedroom.
Commissioner Dudnik asked about the band at the porch that seems to be an excessively thick band above the screened porch. M. Kerouac said the roof pitches, and because building on top of that, the deck at the end has to be at a nominal thickness and it tapers back, creating a heavier band. But the fascia is a layered.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to approve a COA for the project at 1308 Elmwood Av. for the construction of one-story frame addition at the rear of the existing single-family residence that includes a rooftop deck above the addition; the applicable standards for construction 1-5, 7,8,10,12, 13 and 15 apply, seconded by Commissioner Vogel. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 1239 Asbury Av. (L/RHD) – Valerie Romanov, applicant. Remove existing main roof and raise the second floor exterior walls 2' to create additional height for attic space, then construct new gable roof to match the existing roof with one dormer on the front west elevation and one or two dormers on the rear east elevation. Restore/replace parts of rotten wood siding as needed, materials to match original wood siding. Replace broken attic windows on the east and west elevations and materials of the existing attic windows on the south and north elevation. Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-10]; [Construction 1- 4, 7, 8, 10- 12 and 15].

Sergei Abushevitz, owner and Victor Melnikov, architect presented the project.

The roof structure is deteriorated and needs replacement; there is an existing habitable space in the attic level with a bathroom. They proposed to lift roof structure 2 feet for proper insulation and create more livable space in the attic level. Also, replace damaged exterior materials and elements with materials to match the existing. There are no changes to the footprint of the house, and all elements of the front façade remain, including materials.

Also, they proposed to enlarge the existing dormer on the front elevation. And because the existing roof structure is made of 2x6 (rafters) it needs to be replaced with additional insulation. The existing livable space in the attic, including the existing bathroom is low. They also proposed one or two dormers on the rear elevation, while removing the existing dormer addition.

Commission comments:
The dormers at the rear don’t match the dormer on the front, they are smaller and the pitch is different. The eaves of the small dormers are much higher. The proposed front dormer is much bigger than the existing dormer (from 6’ to 11’ in width) and it is taller too.

Commissioners were concerned with the front elevation with the proposed raising the roof; it substantially changes the appearance of the landmark home, and it takes away its horizontality (with additional siding above windows). Revised plans should respect the design of the front elevation, including the proportions on the front façade of the landmark house, and enlarging the front dormer would be problematic.

The applicants agreed to come back with revised plans maintaining the original front elevation. Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue 1239 Asbury Avenue to the
December 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of October 9, and October 23, 2018.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to approve the October 9, 2018 meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner. Craig Eyler of 741 Sheridan objected to the motion on the October 9, 2018 meeting, approving a 6’ high wood fence all the way around at 90 Kedzie, that is in violation of his visual easement. A letter with the objection was sent to City Carlos Ruiz. Commissioner Vogel seconded the motion to approve the October 9, 2018 meeting minutes. The motion passed. Vote: 4 ayes, 0 nays, 3 abstentions (Commissioners Hacker, Dudnik and Simon).

The October 23 meeting minutes were deferred to the December 11, 2018 meeting.

6. STAFF REPORTS

- Nomination of Preservation Commission’s 2019 Officers
  Nominees: Mark Simon, Chair; Ken Itle, Vice-Chair; and Elliott Dudnik, Secretary.

- Approval of meeting dates for 2019
  The Commission meetings in 2019 will be on the 2nd Tuesday of the month, except August and October, which will be on the first Tuesday of the month.

7. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

No discussion

8. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 pm, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Preservation Coordinator