1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Vice-Chair Itle called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm with a quorum of seven Commissioners present. Commissioner Dudnik arrived at 7:04 pm.

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 west used as yard and open space. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-14 and 16]. Continued from 1/8/2019 at the request of the applicant.

William James presented the revised application for a single family home with an attached 2-car garage on two combined lots or one zoning lot as follows:

- Brick and stone 2-story building with a metal roof and awnings over the French doors on the west elevation
- The site plan remained virtually the same with a modest change for the new entry on the north elevation
- The first floor plan remains the same as previously submitted, except for the main entry on the north elevation
- The second floor changed with the larger bedroom on the north elevation to accommodate windows that would be in rhythm with the pattern of openings on the rest of the building
• The landscape is the same with the water feature west of the house
• West elevation: changed with the addition of copper collection boxes and downspouts, no eaves, roof windows removed
• South elevation: redesigned, using the same upper lower level windows at both ends and smaller windows in the middle
• North elevation: redesigned, main entry with double door, casement windows, windows above entry, and elliptical window in the attic
• East elevation: redesigned, same first and second floor windows and a double window above the landing on the staircase
• 3D renderings with views from Dempster - the house is essentially the same height as the houses to the east and west
• W. James addressed the following standards for construction as met: 1) Height, 2) Proportion of façades (front), 3) Proportion of the openings, 4) Rhythm of solids to voids in façades (front), 5) Rhythm of spacing and structures on streets, 6) Rhythm of entrance porches, storefront recesses and other projections, 7) Relationship of material and texture, 8) Roof shapes, 9) Walls of continuity, 10) Scale of structure, 11) Directional expression of façades (front), 14) Innovated design (contemporary), and 16) New construction (architectural style: post-modern).
• Standards 12) Original qualities (distinguishing), 13) Archaeological resources, 15) New additions, and 17) Signs, were presented as not applicable.

Public Comment
Randy Smith of 1212 Dryden Pl. said his biggest issue relates to the volume and height of the building. The top of their house 2nd story is 25.5 ft. high (gutter height); the roof line of the proposed is 23 ft. high. Their roof slopes at a 2:1 ratio, and from the ground level looks relatively flat, whereas the proposed roof goes much higher. Their house at the top of the roof is 31 ft. The new house roof is 34 ft. counting the steeple at the end. The roof line is much more visible from the street. The footprint of the proposed house is 13% larger than the average footprint of the existing houses. The lot to the west is still a buildable lot with the removal of the water feature and some of the hardscape. Another house could be put there. Inspiration for the design came from a sizeable chateau; the question is the ability to fit that into the historic district.

William James said he reduced the footprint of the house to fit in one lot, now the concern is the west lot being a buildable lot. Scale: the Dryden mansion towers over 1212 Dryden Pl. The building is within the allowable limits. The roof terrace reduces the bulk to the north. The proposed house is harmonious with the character of the area. It would be difficult to change the roof height. The peak of the roof is lower to the east, than the portion that is to the west. It is lower than the house at 1212 Dryden Pl.

Commission’s Findings
• Commissioner Hacker asked about the height of the datum before the roof at 1212 Dryden Pl. R. Smith said the height of the second floor, the top of gutter is 25.5 ft., the top of the roof is 31 ft. but does not look like 31 ft. high
- Commissioner Hacker said the design is more cohesive on every elevation and, is simplified
- Commissioner Dudnik asked about the zoning analysis, dated March 7, 2019, it keeps mentioning things as being not compliant, and also says to eliminate various elements. Scott Mangum said the description is for one complete lot with the eastern and western lot included, and it notes how it could become compliant, if it were to be analyzed as only the eastern lot separately. So that, the applicant could reduce some impervious surface, the overhangs for the awnings and the water feature accessory structure, to be compliant as only a single home on a single eastern lot
- Commissioner Dudnik asked whether the applicant is consolidating the lots. W. James said he is not consolidating the lots; his submission is for one house on two lots. The City would have to approve the consolidation of the two lots. Regarding the impervious surface, the 1256 and 1244 Dryden Pl. houses, both needed variances for impervious surface, primary because the private drive is part of the building area and is counted as impervious area. That is why the eastern lot would not be compliant on its own.
- Commissioner Dudnik said the Commission is considering one single house on the eastern lot, with a landscaped yard on a separate property
- Vice Chair Itle said the point of the zoning review is that it’s zoning compliant only if considered as one huge lot
- W. James said that he thought leaving a lot as empty space might be desirable
- Commissioner Hacker asked how the application is being evaluated. Vice Chair Itle said the project is being evaluated as proposed, the understanding is that the project, as proposed, requires that the western lot stays vacant to meet zoning that locks in the lot as empty space. If anyone, 50 years for now, wants to build on that western lot, it would have to come back and get approval for changes for both properties
- Commissioner Dudnik said if someone buys the house after its completion, they are free to do whatever they want with that adjoining lot. Vice Chair Itle said they would be in front of the Commission asking for permission. The Commission would have to look at the record
- W. James said the way the house is designed is that all views are oriented to the west, over that open space. If someone were to build a house there, all of these views will be looking at another house that would be 10 ft. away. It is not plausible to be concerned with another house built on the western lot. The Commission has the authority not to approve that
- Commissioner Vogel asked about the distance between 1222 and 1212 Dryden Pl. W. James said the distance is 10 ft. to 10.5 ft.
- Commissioner Vogel asked if one can’t remove the water feature a build a house next door. Vice Chair Itle said that would be a hypothetical project that would have to come to the Commission for review. The Commission would have to relay in good minutes of this meeting to know that it was intended to be the yard for the 1222 Dryden Pl. house, and the that house was approved with the notion that the western lot remains open
• Commissioner Vogel asked what dimensions of the western lot are. W. James said it includes the private drive and the lot area to the north. Destroying the main water feature, with all the windows looking out on the western lot, would be very implausible for someone wanting to build a house 10 ft. away from it.

• Carlos Ruiz said if the lots were subdivided, the Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council. If a new house is proposed on the vacant lot, it has to comply with zoning. If there are conditions under which the current design (at 1222 Dryden Pl.) would have to be compliant by removing certain aspects of it; that is part of the record. Currently is one house in two lots (one zoning lot).

• Randy Smith asked for clarification on the term ‘subdivision’ - if they are two separate lots, would someone have to come to request to be created as two separate lots? S. Mangum said there are two separate lots, unless they are consolidated, there would not be a need to subdivide them.

• Commissioner Vogel asked if the lots could be put together (consolidated). W. James said if the owner would want to build on the open space lot, the value of the 1222 Dryden Pl. house would plummet. He would be willing to put a restrictive covenant on the open space lot, making the City a party to that where the City would have to approve any change being built upon.

• Commissioner Hacker said if the Commission were to approve the application, it would be based in one lot with the current design, because it is not compliant in two lots.

• Vice Chair Itle said any other development would have to be reviewed by the Commission and it would be part of the record.

• Commissioner Dudnik said it is only not compliant based on the size of the lot on the right (1222 Dryden Pl.) if reduced to a 50 ft. (width); it would probably meet all the zoning requirements and never have to touch the house on the east. W. James said if reduced 5 ft. it would be non-compliant due to lot area requirement in the R1 district. S. Mangum said the total two lot area is 14,617 sq. ft.; 7,200 sq. ft. is required for R1.

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to approve a COA for 1222 Dryden Pl. on one zoning lot (1222 and 1232) for new construction: standards 1-14 and 16 are applicable standards. Commissioner Morris seconded the motion. The motion passed 5 ayes, 2 nays (Bady and Dudnik).

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2767 Euclid Park Pl. (L) – Jeffrey K. Ross, applicant. Replace existing cedar shake roofing material with synthetic/composite shingles from Envirosheingle, to match the appearance of the current roof as much as possible, including wave patterns, color and non-eave shingle exposure. Also, lengthen the exposure of the curved eave shingles to improve the longevity of the roof. Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-6, 9 and 10]

Jeffrey Ross presented the application for the use of synthetic roofing material to replace the existing cedar shakes as follows:
• The entire roof is rotting out, it needs to be replaced
• The existing small cedar shakes on the stacked eaves require more nails and deteriorates faster. The contractor would like to lengthen the exposure of the roofing material.
• The synthetic material has 50 year warranty
• J. Ross spent over 100K repairing the cedar shake roof 22 years ago
• Depending what option one uses, cedar vs synthetic, the cost estimate is 275K, more than the average house roof in Evanston. The goal is to replicate the existing roof as much as possible

Commission’s findings
• Commissioner Vogel asked how old is the roof? J. Ross said the roof is approximately 22-30 years old.
• Vice Chair Itle asked were the repairs focused on the curved eave detail, or were random repairs throughout the roof? J. Ross said repairs were done everywhere
• Commissioner Hacker said this is a landmark house; one of its strong characteristics is the roof. The synthetic material looks like plastic. She cited standard for alteration 2 that says ‘distinguishing original qualities or character of a structure shall not be destroyed’
• J. Ross said standard 6 says ‘the new material should match the material being replaced’ – He was told that the synthetic material would do that
• Commissioner Reinhold citing standard 5 about ‘distinctive stylistic features’ expressed concern how the eave is going to look after is changed, and how that would change the actual character of the roof. Commissioner Reinhold asked if the contractor has historic examples of the synthetic material application on eaves, where the stacked cedar shakes make the curve. J. Ross said yes. What will change is the exposure or number of courses
• Commissioner Hacker suggested making a mockup of the eave condition, so that the applicant could make a determination whether the synthetic material is a good match. J. Ross agreed to do that
• Vice-Chair Itle said the roof of the house is so unique and so important to the character of the building that the Commission wants this project done right

Commissioner Reinhold moved to continue 2767 Euclid Park Pl. to 4/9/2019 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

B. 1330 Lake St. (RHD) – Chad Rogers, applicant. West elevation 1st floor: add four double hung windows, remove one casement window and replace it with an existing relocated double hung window; 2nd floor: remove one window and add one double hung window. South elevation 2nd floor: add one double hung window. East
elevation: 1st floor: remove patio entry door, relocate patio entry stairs to center of patio, and add a skylight on east side roof northern section. Replace/add selected basement windows. Applicable Standards: Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-6, 9 and 10]

Chad Rogers presented the application for exterior alterations at 1330 Lake St. as follows:

- Remove existing double hung windows and add some double hung windows on the west and south side of the home, and add an skylight on the north/eastern corner of the roof, and replace the patio stairs on the east elevation
- The north front elevation has five all wood windows with true divided lights
- West elevation: 2nd floor - add one window (above the French windows) in the master bedroom and remove one double hung window. 1st floor – add two windows on either side of the fire place, relocate one double hung window and add two shorter windows over the counter and remove one sliding window. Replace four basement windows
- South elevation: 2nd floor – add one double hung window, 1st floor – remove a door, fill opening and finish exterior with stucco to match existing
- East elevation: 1st floor – relocate stairs to center of open porch. Replace two basement windows

Commission’s findings

- Commissioner Hacker asked who is the manufacturer of the replacement windows? C. Rogers said it is Renewal by Andersen
- Carlos Ruiz said Renewal by Andersen is not an all wood window and is not a true divided light
- Commissioner Hacker said she does not believe the Commission has enough information to decide on the proposal
- Vice Chair Itle said the Commission should give staff direction as to what could be approved administratively
- Commissioner Dudnik said the simulated divided light (SDL) is not a bad option. The muntin size and trim are relevant
- Commissioner Hacker said muntins have certain thickness. A wood window with SDLS should match the profile and trim condition of the existing windows
- Vice Chair Itle said the front façade windows might be original. He wondered if the side elevation windows are vinyl, it needs to be clarified. C. Rogers said the prior owner replaced windows unbeknownst to the Commission. There are a variety of different windows, probably not approved by the Commission
- Carlos Ruiz said it will be helpful to have actual drawings of existing windows with dimensions and to scale next to the proposed windows
• Commissioner Dudnik asked about the stucco. C. Rogers said three contractors were contacted to replace six basement windows, removing a door and apply the stucco finish. The intent is to match the existing stucco

• Commissioner Hacker said drawings need to be clear and accurate. The drawings should show which windows are the historic, which are new, and which ones are being replaced. Then do a detail drawing of the existing historic window next to the proposed new window. Then address the stucco and trim

Commissioner Dudnik moved to continue 1330 Lake St. to the meeting of April 9, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays

C. 321 Lake St. (LSHD) – Corinne Rocca, applicant. Modifications to side entry, including the addition of covered vestibule. Reconstruction and modifications to 2nd floor sleeping porch. Addition of screened-in-porch at rear of first floor. Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-6, 9 and 10; Construction 1-8 and 10-15; Demolition 1-6]

Mike Hauser presented the project for exterior alteration as follows:

• 1. The sleeping porch is a bedroom with windows, not screens. 2. The back porch is visible from the north, west and east sides and 3. West entry to be reworked

• Part 1: The rear porch in plan comes up short on the west side by 18" and on the north side by 6". It is creating waterproofing issues. The plan is to redesign it to cover the entire first floor

• The existing north elevation has a colonnade with 3 sets windows, it will be stretched out with an additional single window

• Part 2: The screen in porch has a wood wrapped colonnade with screen panels. It has a lower spandrel panel and a higher transom. The base is brick, lime stone or blue stone, with a patio finish inside the screen in porch

• Western facade has with 2 bays and fire place in between, and copper standing seam roof

• Part 3: Shifting the entry to the north and a new covered entry with standing seam copper roof. Remove the existing bay. Replacing the existing bay are windows

Commission’s Findings
Vice Chair Itle said it is very clear what is being proposed.

Commissioner Reinhold moved to issue COA to 321 Lake St. for modifications to the side entry, including the covered vestibule addition, and the reconstruction and modifications to the second floor sleeping porch, and the addition of a screen in porch at the first floor. Applicable standards include: Alteration 1-6, 9 and 10; Construction 1-8
and 10-15; and Demolition 1-6. Commissioner Bady seconded the motion. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

D. 1914 Sheridan Rd. (NEHD) – Robert Carlton, Northwestern University, applicant. Remove exterior fire stair, rear entrance and basement cellar entrance at the back of the house for a new 2-story addition with an egress stair and elevator. Add a porch and 2nd floor balcony to the back of the house. Add three air condensers to the north side yard. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-8 and 10-15; Demolition 1-6]

Robert Carlton of Northwestern University, project manager, and Renauld Mitchell, project architect, presented the application for a rear addition as follows:

- The Black House is a community center, a 1920’s Queen Anne in need of total gutting and remodel, the open steel stair attached to the west elevation to be removed, and replace with an enclosed stair with an elevator and porch
- The Black House is being used as a student union. The intent is to: 1. Improve circulation and building performance. 2. Improve the condition of the rear steel stairs, not appropriate to the building, and 3. The building is important to students of color. The goal is to provide students with an improved environment for social and academic activities and study place
- Demolition of curbs and gutters in the parking area
- Combination of paved surfacing, with pavers turning the corner to the house
- Demolition: steel stairs and shed entrances and interior demolition
- First floor demolition: stairs, entrance shed and concrete stair to basement
- Proposed elevator serves all four levels, the stair serves as an exit
- 1st floor ad hoc renovations inside the house, and a back porch addition with platform seating
- 2nd floor stair and elevator, small balcony and covered porch
- 3rd floor – outline of the balcony below, add the stair and elevator
- Existing and proposed elevations: no work proposed on the front of the house
- Rear - steel stair to be removed. The proposed addition is in keeping of the period of the home with the partially covered porch and a balcony above
- Existing and proposed south elevation - old vs. new roofline, geometry and proportions maintained
- North elevation - shed dormer for the elevator
- Photos of steel stairs, north accessible ramp remains, front porch stays as is
- 3D visual of rear addition - same detail as the house, stone datum is continued on the addition
- Windows: Option 1. Restore windows. Option 2. Replace windows. Existing windows are double hung with single pane glazing
• Replacement windows are Marvin windows, more or less match the existing condition
• Restoration – remill the window at ½ inch for additional glazing and argon gas

Commission’s Findings
• Commissioner Reinhold asked if the proposed addition impacts the building to the north. R. Carlton said the addition does not affect the building to the north
• Commissioner Hacker said regarding the massing of the back, that the gable is awkward.

Commissioner Dudnik moved to issue a COA for 1914 Sheridan Rd. for the removal of the exterior fire stair, rear entrance and basement cellar entrance at the back of the house, for a new 2-story addition with an egress stair and elevator. Add a porch and 2nd floor balcony to the back of the house. Add three air condensers to the north side yard. Applicable standards: Construction 1-8 and 10-15; Demolition 1-6. Commissioner Bady seconded the motion. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

E. 1333 Asbury Av. (RHD) – Nathaniel Lielasus-Morrow, applicant. Construction of a single family home with attached 2-car garage at rear on vacant lot. 6-8-2-10. - IMPERVIOUS SURFACE. (A) The maximum impervious surface ratio for the R1 district is forty-five percent (45%). Lot area=7210 SF; Maximum impervious area is 45% = 3244.5 SF; proposed impervious 46.18% = 3330.17 SF. 85.67 SF over – Non compliant. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16]; [Minor Zoning Variance 6-15-11-5: RELATIONSHIP TO SPECIAL USES AND VARIATIONS A and C]

Nate Lielasus presented the project for a new single family home with attached garage as follows:
• New project in the Asbury Ridge subdivision. The lot is 50 ft. wide on Asbury and 150 ft. deep
• The house is composed of a main wing with a south wing and the main entrance on the front
• The private shared alley is in the back of the house
• Unfinished basement space with stairs and mechanical area
• 1st floor: main entry way, main stair, living room, kitchen and family space, mudroom, bathroom, office and access to the garage. Off living room and kitchen there is a patio leading out to a dining patio
• 2nd floor: master suite, 2 bedrooms and a playroom over the garage. The attic is unfinished space
• North elevation: a higher ridge in the front of the house and a lower ridge over the garage, tall and narrow windows, minimized window types
• West elevation - front of the house: stained wood door, recessed entry way with a steel canopy, large composite window system where the main stair is. Street facing main gable and cross gable, and exterior stucco material
• Exterior finishes include Boral Truexterior material, a poly ash material that takes paint well, comes in traditional shapes and profiles
• Stucco chimney with painted steel cap
• Boral use on all eaves fascia boards, window heads, and panels around the recessed front door
• South elevation: end wall is stucco, large bay clad with the boral material, dormer in the attic and a second dormer in the back of the house and play room.
• Limited number of window types, grouped in pairs
• East back of house: lower gable at the garage, higher gable at the main volume of the house and the cross wing
• 3Ds of the house looking northerly and southerly on Asbury Avenue
• North house has stucco finish as well other homes across the street
• The application is also asking for minor variance for impervious surfaces, as part of the Asbury Ridge subdivision, the alleys are counted towards the impervious lot coverage, because they are private alleys. They are asking for 1% variance.

Commission’s Findings
• Commissioner Dudnik asked about the front multi-story window, is the stair behind it? N. Lielasus said yes, it is effectively 2-stories
• Commissioner Hacker complemented the project because it addresses the neighbors in a friendly way. The use of stucco is a nice choice
• Myra Janus of 1222 Greenwood St. said the new house would be 6 ft. away from her property affecting natural light. She said when looking at the design, the Commission should be aware that there is another property to consider too

Commissioner Morris moved to issue a COA for 1333 Asbury Av. for the construction of a single family home with attached 2-car garage at the rear of the vacant lot. Applicable Standards: Construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed, 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Morris moved to make a positive recommendation on the proposed Zoning variation to allow for an impervious surface area ratio of 46.18% as opposed to 45%, seconded by Commissioner. The motion passed, 7 ayes, 0 nays.
4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of February 12, 2019.**

Commissioner Dudnik moved to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 12, 2019 with the changes that have been made. Commissioner Hacker seconded the motion. The motion passed, 6 ayes, 0 nays, 1 abstention (Bady).

5. **STAFF REPORTS**

Carlos Ruiz provided information on the following items:

- **CAMP Workshop** - reminded Commissioners about the CAMP workshop on April 26, 2019.

- **2019 Preservation & Design Awards** – A new category will be added for the awards: Sustainability and Resilience.

- **917 Edgemere Court** – the Law Department is preparing the written findings of fact on the approval of the COA for the construction of the new house. The Commission approved the COA on October 9, 2019. The Commission is being asked to approve its written findings at the April 9, 2019 meeting.

Commissioner Reinhold expressed concern about the length of the discussion that may take place on the written findings at the April 9, 2019 meeting. She asked that the Law Department make the written findings available to the Commission as soon as possible.

Commissioner Dudnik was concerned about abstaining from approving the written findings of fact for those not present at the October 9, 2019 meeting. Vice Chair Itle said that those absent at that meeting can read the minutes and watch the video of the meeting in order to vote on the written findings of fact.

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

No discussion

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Reinhold moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:11 pm on Tuesday, March 12, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed, 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz  
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

The next Preservation Commission meeting is Tuesday, Mary 14, 2019 at 7 p.m.