MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, May 14, 2019
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert Bady, Julie Hacker, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Mark Simon, Diane Williams and Karl Vogel

Members Absent: Elliott Dudnik, Jamie Morris, Sally Riessen Hunt and Tim Schmitt

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Manager

Presiding Member: Mark Simon, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Simon called the meeting to order at: 708 pm with a quorum of seven Commissioners present.

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 2767 Euclid Park Pl. (L) – Jeffrey K. Ross, applicant. Replace existing cedar shake roofing material with synthetic/composite shingles from Enviroshingle, 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] (Continued from 4/9/2019).

Jeffrey Ross, owner, presented the project for the replacement of a cedar shake roof as follows:

- Use of synthetic roofing material rather than the cedar and increase the spacing between the courses on the eaves of the roof.
- The roof has a wave pattern; the eaves are almost a 180 degree half circle.
- Current cedar shingles are stained black. The age of the roof is in some parts 10 years; other parts are 30 or more years. The entire roof needs to be replaced.
- The exposure with the synthetic material on each course on the eave is larger than the stacked eaves in cedar.
- The mock-up on a section of the eave spacing starts small and becomes bigger coming around the curve going up.
- The warranty for cedar is 30 years, if stained the warranty is void. Labor has a 10 year warranty.
• The stacked eaves as existing deteriorate faster; both contractors don't want to do it that way with the synthetic material. It can be done with 8 courses or 15 courses.

**Commission’s findings**
Commissioner Hacker said the landmark has a Dutch wavy roof with wood shingles, exhibiting an unusual distinctive or eccentric design or construction technique, which contributes to its architectural interest. She did not think replacing this roof with the synthetic material meets standards 5 and 6.

Commissioner Itle said the rolled edge stack eave is critical. J. Ross said the Secretary of the Interior has guidelines on roofs. If using the same kind of material is not feasible, then a compatible substitute may be considered.

Chair Simon said the applicant’s argument is that the cost of cedar roofing might be prohibitive. Commissioner Vogel said the synthetic material is more expensive and with additional cost for adding courses to the rolled eave.

Commissioner Hacker asked if Commissioners could see the mock-up to evaluate it. J. Ross said, yes. Commissioner Hacker asked what Commissioners think if it is a wood shingle roof replacement without the staining. Commissioner Williams said the questions come down to whether it’s the color or whether it’s the material.

Commissioner Reinhold said that at the March 2019 meeting, she did not feel that the curved eave design met standards 5 and 6. The mock-up with the 8 courses does not accurately represent the landmark historic look of the roof. She would be interested in seeing a mock-up of 15 courses and re-evaluate it. J. Ross agreed for Commissioners to visit the site to see the mock-up.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to continue 2767 Euclid Park Pl. to the June 19, 2019 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Williams. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

**B. 1032 Forest Ave. (LSHD) – John Eifler, applicant.** Construct a single family home with a detached 2-car garage on existing vacant lot at 1032 Forest Avenue. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16] (Continued from 4/9/2019).

*The applicant requested that this item be continued to the June 11, 2019 meeting.*

Commissioner Itle made a motion to continue the case at 1032 Forest Av. to the June 11, 2019 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

At this time Chair Simon in anticipation to 2390 Orrington Av. that the preservation code does not cover trees. Scott Mangum said the City does recognize the great value of trees and the many associated benefits with trees including air quality, storm water,
reduction of soil erosion, etc. The City has a tree preservation ordinance contained within Title 7 of the City Code 7-8-8, and the Law Department has determined that trees are not within the purview of the Preservation Commission. However, the Preservation Commission will be considering a referral from Ald. Fiske to look at creating some language within the Preservation Ordinance to recognize heritage trees. It is anticipated that it will be on the next Preservation Commission agenda in June 2019.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1629-1631 Hinman Av. (L) – Jean Petrick, applicant. Adding 3rd story open covered front porch Applicable Standards: [Construction 1, 2, 4- 8, 10-12, 14 and 15]

Jean Petrick, architect presented the application for 1629-1631 Hinman Av. for a proposed covered porch to safely access the existing flat roof through the existing historical French doors as follows:

- The units below have the same floor plan with a covered porch.
- Will use similar materials and proportions to accomplish an aesthetically pleasing addition.
- The clients want a covered porch for protection from weather conditions and the sun. It is 30’ high above grade.
- The proposed flat roof covered porch with railings will match existing railings and spindles. The columns, base and capital will also match and the new flat roof will match the existing flat roof detail.

Public Comment
Diane Rasmussen of 1629-1631 Hinman Av. found a newspaper article from 1904 when the building was built, with architectural rendering. The original design had only a railing. Her preference would be to restore it.

Commission’s Findings
Commissioner Williams referred to standard 12: Original qualities should be preserved. The covered porch does not enhance the original quality of the street facing façade. Commissioner Hacker said that the Statement of Significance describes what is significant about this building, such as the heavy cornice below the roof line. The proposed design destroys the massing of the whole building. Commissioner Itle said that the strong horizontal cornice is a key distinctive feature, now it is obscured by the proposed roofed porch. There is something to be said for restoring the original railings. Commissioner Vogel said looking at the first floor height of the porch it gets shorter on the second floor. Identical height over the second floor porch is what it would have been. The building has integrity and the proposal will take it away.

Commissioner Reinhold asked if the applicant would consider revising the application with the railing rather than the roofed porch. J Petrick said, yes. Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to continue 1629-1631 Hinman Av. to the June 11, 2019 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Williams. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.
B. 825 Roslyn Terrace. (L) – Steven Goldstein, applicant. South side porch: remove screens and enclose with wall and windows. Second floor rear north elevation: Remove one window and install 3 new windows. Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-7, 9 and 10; Demolition 1-6]

Steven Goldstein, architect, presented the project as follows:
- On the second floor of the rear elevation an existing non original double hung single window is changed to three wood casement windows matching the casement windows original to the house
- The enclosed porch on the first floor with slider glass doors will be finished with stucco and trim siding and wood casement windows to be in line with the original casement windows.

Commission’s Findings
Commissioner Hacker said the three windows on the front façade, an existing window centered on a balcony, with the proposed patterning, it shifts the whole thing off center. Was the entry way on the front an enclosed porch? S. Goldstein said it was an exterior porch, and at one point it was enclosed. There are no alterations to the front façade.

Commissioner Vogel made a motion to issue a COA for alterations, standards 1-7, 9 and 10; and demolition 1-6 comply for 825 Roslyn Terrace, seconded by Commissioner Williams. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 2865 Sheridan Pl. (L) - Charles S. Cook, applicant. South front elevation: Replacement of original sunroom windows and French door. Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-7, 9 and 10; Demolition 1-6] WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

D. 822 Colfax St. (NEHD) – Thomas Ahleman, applicant. Add a side dormer, a rear dormer, changing a rear elevation bedroom window to French door with a balcony, and constructing a deck off the back of the house. Remove AC from the west dormer window and a new wood casement window matching the adjacent window will be installed in its place. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-8, 10-13, 14 and 15]

Thomas Ahleman, architect presented the project as follows:
- The building has wood shake dormers, one on the north and one on the west. It includes a new larger dormer on the east to accommodate a bed and one on the south for a bathroom.
- The materials match asphalt shingles, painted cedar shake siding, painted wood trim and bead board soffits.
- On the west dormer a new casement and storm window replaces a wood board for an A/C unit, blocking the window opening.
- At the rear elevation the modifications include a dormer and windows, replacing the double hung window, the bedroom French doors to a small balcony, and replacing the first floor double hung window below with patio doors and a deck.
Public Comment
Clare Kelly of 823 Colfax St. spoke in support of the project.

Commission’s findings
With no discussion Commissioner Bady made a motion to issue a COA for 826 Colfax St. for a side dormer, changing of the rear elevation bedroom window with a French door and balcony, constructing a deck off the back of the house, removing the A/C dormer window and installing a new casement window matching the adjacent window, applicable standards of construction 1-8 and 10-15, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote 7 ayes, 0 nays.

E. 1211 & 1217 Ridge Ave. Subdivision (RHD) - Kristen & Pat Coleman, applicants. Proposed subdivision of 120’ x160’ lot into 2 compliant lots. 1217 Ridge lot is to have a frontage of 74.25 and lot area of 11,740 sq. ft. 1211 Ridge lot is to have a frontage of 45.78 and lot area of 7,238 sq. ft. The existing brick drive will remain, no new curb cuts or points of entry from Ridge Ave. are proposed. Applicable standards: [Ord. 29-O-18, Section 2-8-12 (B) 1. (a) - (e) and 2]

Kristen Coleman, owner presented the application as follows:
- The plan is to subdivide the 120’ x 160’ lot into two zoning compliant lots, with an under 75’ frontage for the 1217 Ridge Av. lot, and a 45.78’ for the neighboring lot.
- Currently, the position of the lot line causes an encroachment; the large house extends and crosses the lot line. That lot line would be relocated, so that the house may remain.
- An existing walk way will be removed to comply with Zoning.
- The proposed home on a 72,000 S.F. lot fits the proportions of the block.
- The existing circular drive will remain to be share with the new neighbors.
- Preliminary plans and elevations of a future home on the new lot were inspired on an English or French cottage.

Commission's Findings
Chair Simon said the Commission’s advisory review is on the subdivision only. The preliminary design of a future home is a requirement for the subdivision application. In regard to the existing coach house, any demolition would be subject to future submission.

Chair Simon said the he walked in the neighborhood, where clearly there other lots narrower than the proposed two lots. The subdivision does not seem out of character on the block. Commissioner Hacker asked about the trees to be removed from the new lot. K. Coleman said a mature but deceased elm tree was removed. The plan includes a rough landscape proposal. The remaining trees are not healthy trees. They plan to plant new trees as per the new landscape.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion with a favorable recommendation to City Council for 1211 and 1217 Ridge Av. subdivision, applicable standards Ord. 29-O-18,
Section 2-8-12 (B) 1. (a) - (e) and 2, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.


Joseph Balistreri presented the application as follows:
- Proposed 2-story 5 bedroom single family home with attached garage.
- Proposed materials are cedar siding, brick clad wood windows, brick chimney, Andersen E- Series aluminum clad windows, aluminum gutters, wood soffits and wood trim
- Nels Johnson Arborist proposes saving one oak tree, cut the one oak tree not rooted, installing protection fencing, pruning roots, and add chemicals to strengthen the roots, fertilizing the soil and pruning hazardous limbs.
- Three 7-8" oaks could be planted, also plant more than 125% of the caliper of the trees and make up for that tree to be lost.

Commissioner Williams asked for material samples for a very important corner of this development.

Public Comments
Ald. Judy Fiske, one of the authors of the Northeast Historic District 20 years ago said the following:
- When plan for subdivision of Kendall College property came to the Preservation Commission, one of the standards asked to review in approving of the plat of subdivision was section 2-8-12 d. preserve and protect the critical features of the streetscape associated with the landmark or area, property, structure, site, or object in the district. That includes the trees. So when the Preservation Commission approved that. It came forward to the Council, and Council approved it as well, based on the same standards.
- The trees are entirely relevant to this discussion. When creating a historic district, not only setbacks or the architecture, but the streetscape, the critical features, the landscaping, the whole feeling and character of the district are taken into consideration.
- Asked the Commission to consider these 200-300 years old oak trees. They are important to the streetscape, climate, health, to the joy of living in this area.
- There is no way that one of those trees that’s at the group of two is going to come down and that the other one won’t be affected.
- This corner stands out and it’s incredibly important to the historic district, and asked the Commission to take some time to think about that.

Nancy Bradt, Julie Dorfman, Camille Blachowicz of 806 Colfax St. Michael Wasielewski of 2380 Orrington Av., Allison Sloan, Barbara Janes of 802 Colfax St., Ted Sykes, and Richard Buchanan of 723 Lincoln St. spoke to save the trees and made the following comments:
- Trees that are fenced, failed 3-4 years because construction. 16' radius of protection fence must be strictly enforced.
- City Council committed to the Climate Action and Resilience Plan. 200-300 year old oak trees cannot be replaced.
- The Nels Johnson report says that in order to retain the health of the other trees they would have to retain the stump of the tree torn down.
- Looking at the character of Lincoln St. and the neighborhood, is a showcase of Evanston, and preserving it is important for this and future generations. Looking at all the houses built on Orrington Av., there is a uniform setback.
- Concern was expressed about the setback for the proposed house and its substantial massing.
- Illinois’ ecosystem is called an oak savanna, and Oaks are the backbone of that ecosystem. The oak trees currently are only 17 percent of the oak ecosystem of what originally was.
- If the existing tree is a 32 inch diameter Burr Oak, the National Tree Benefit Calculator says that it’s soaking up approximately 5,248 gallons of storm water runoff every year and it’s absorbing about 1,565 pounds of carbon dioxide, and big shade tree lowers the heat effect index about 10-15 degrees underneath.
- Concern about the mass of the proposed house and the impact it would have on the century old oak trees on the lot.
- The Preservation Ordinance Section 2-8-9 (B) 9. Walls of continuity states: “landscape masses shall form cohesive walls of enclosure along a street, to ensure visual compatibility with the properties, structures, sites, public ways, objects and places to which such elements are visually related.” That says those trees need to be saved.
- The 200-300 year old trees; they are the ambiance of the neighborhood. Replacing them with 7 or 8 inch trees is not going to spruce up the neighborhood. Trees die when they lose 40 percent of their root mass. One should not be a foundation closer than 25 foot to a tree, ideally more than 50 feet away.
- The number of trees lost through storm damage and disease is staggering. The canopy is much less than 13 years ago. It would be a shame to lose two more trees. A development should be done carefully without destroying the healthy trees.

Commissions Findings
Commissioner Ittle made the following comments:
- The project maximizes bulk, volume and mass.
- Street facades have many types of windows at random.
- Treatment of front entrance on Orrington Av. with an open deck and no covered porch is awkward, but on Lincoln St. is a roofed porch that should have been on the Orrington side. The Lincoln street side almost reads more as the front entrance.
- The proposed house design does not fit the character of the rest of the development where they were very traditional about providing a front entrance with a covered porch.
Commissioner Reinhold made the following comments:

- The Commission needs to see more context of what is going on with the adjacent homes. That information is needed to find out how the standards apply with the heights and proportions and the rhythms of the existing houses.
- Applicant should come back with the streetscape on Lincoln St. and Orrington Av., and provide more documentation on what the Commission is comparing the proposed house to, for the compatibility, height, rhythm and scale.
- There are questions regarding standards 9 and 12 (walls of continuity and original qualities) The fact that the neighborhood has made significant efforts to preserve these trees with past development, that does somehow say that this is a characteristic of this specific lot.

Chair Simon said that the Commission should provide the applicant with guidance.

Commissioner Itle referred to the following standards:

- #3 Windows: a broad mixture of windows, and different groups of windows. It’s kind of a little bit of everything without any apparent reason to how things are distributed.
- # 4Rhythm of solids to voids: the corner octagonal piece needs further study. That would be quite an expanse of glass compared to the rest of the neighborhood.
- # 6 Rhythm of entrance porches: not compatible with the neighborhood.
- # 7 Relationship to materials and texture: how this particular brick and cedar siding look relative to the environment.
- # 9 and # 10 Landscaping: Walls of continuity and scale. The house is too big for the lot, and the important historic or mature trees that are on the lot; is it really appropriate to maximize the zoning footprint and build to the maximum (2,393 square feet and the proposed is 2,392 square feet).

Chair Simon noted that the City and the developer negotiated the plat of subdivision, and it does say trees on private property will be preserved to the extent feasible. The City didn’t think or wasn’t able to get any restriction.

Scott Mangum said there is a resolution that approved the subdivision of the property and as part of the resolution there is the tree preservation plan; it had three different denotations for trees: existing trees to be removed, existing trees to remain and existing on-site trees to remain if possible.

Chair Simon said there seems to be questions about what the Commission’s authority is. The arborist seems to say that the tree closer to Lincoln St. will be lost. The applicant in his presentation was speaking as if it would be preserved, which obviously is a goal. To him it is a realistic goal to try to improve the protection of that tree, and do everything possible to protect that tree. The siting of the house is such that, it can’t be moved anywhere. Even if the footprint was shrunk a little and it was moved back, it still
would be 10-12 feet from the house. What clearly the Commission does not have authority to do is to deprive the applicant of the right to build a house on the property.

Chair Simon said he would be in favor of allowing the applicant to further develop the steps to preserve the tree that is closer to the street. The house could be moved and shrunk a little. However, the house is right against the rear setback already.

Commissioner Itle said the two trees in the middle are at grave risk, no matter what gets build on the site. It is a matter of what is the solution architecturally that is compatible with the neighborhood that at least maximizes the odds that the trees can survive.

Joe Balistreri said the 53 inch oak at the end of the alleys, is less than 12 feet from the other house they built, and it is still standing.

Chair Simon said the consensus in the Commission is that consideration should be given to changes to the house itself. He asked if the applicant has enough guidance to go back and reconsider those issues such as the façade of the house, entrance way and windows.

Commissioner Hacker asked for clarification of the drawings (needed to see the house in relation to the houses next to it). In the photo the house appears really massive, if its mass could be minimized and move it away at least from the closest tree. The Commission has seen street facades with the other houses, and the heights, and being able to compare things.

Commissioner Reinhold said that Carlos Ruiz could work with the applicant. It is a matter of information, how pulling the heights across and documenting that. Carlos Ruiz could provide examples of other applicants that have shown that information.

Chair Simon asked the applicant to bring actual samples of the brick and the other materials, better drawings as to the depictions of the placement (vis-a-vis) like the houses on Lincoln. Commissioner Reinhold asked for an elevation comparison with heights, the front façade solids and voids (windows and proportions).

Commissioner Simon said that the presentation did not include what they would do to preserve the trees. J. Balistreri said that the plan that they passed with Evanston calls for a six foot minimum protection with aluminum fence and a silk fence on the inside (copies available).

Chair Simon said he would prefer consulting with the City’s experts rather than making the Commission come up with its own determination as to the trees protection.

Scott Mangum said that there is a tree protection ordinance that was referenced earlier, that requires a tree protection plan for the construction that would be required. If there is tree removal there is calculations for replacement of the caliper of these trees, at least
125% of what would be replaced. These are ordinance restrictions that work outside the preservation authority.

Chair Simon said the Commission lacks the expertise i.e. what would be adequate to save the one tree? Scott Mangum said that it is outside of his expertise. The Public Works Agency arborist regulates that part of the ordinance. The Commission could consult with them and get more information about what type of plan would be submitted to them for review. Chair Simon said the Commission could report to Ald. Fiske at least on the steps being taken.

Commissioner Itle said the applicant should ask Nels Johnson what is the appropriate setback needed from the northern most tree to be highly confident that it survives the construction. Say to Nels Johnson, we want to save this tree, how much can we build.

Chair Simon said there is a gray area about where the Commission's purview to approve things stops. It will be taken into account steps that the applicant took to try to strengthen the preservation of the trees.

Joe Balistreri said they would happy to come back with the suggested changes. The City of Evanston arborist is clear that it is impossible to save both trees. They are trying to find a suitable solution by maintaining one of the trees and keep it if possible.

Ald. Fiske said there is language on the subdivision that indicates that the Commission should be thinking about the trees and she would like that to be really clarified. As the City staff is having this discussion, she would be happy to participate in it. It was the City’s expectation that every step would be taken to preserve the trees, and that’s reflected in the documents that were in the resolution that was finally approved. It did not anticipate in taking something down in order to build as big a house as possible.

Commissioner Williams made a motion to continue the application for 2390 Orrington Av. until the June 11, 2019 Commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of April 9, 2019.**

Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve the April 9, 2019 meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Williams. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

5. **STAFF REPORTS**

Scott Mangum reported about CAMP training on April 26, 2019, with 9 Commissioners present and some other staff and Commissioners around the area. He found it very valuable. If Commissioners have any feedback, he will pass it along to CAMP. The power point presentation would be shared.
Preservation Design awards: the call is out for nominations. Don’t a have date yet for when the award ceremony will be held.

Design guidelines: Carlos Ruiz indicated that he met with Commissioner Hacker. Commissioner Hacker said that Carlos Ruiz will put something together so they could look at it.

Regarding CAM she thought it was great. The presenters were stunned that the Commission could not see floor plans. She would like to understand why it happened, or is there something that would help the Commission understand this. S. Mangum said a middle ground solution is that the applicant can bring the plans and show the plans at the meeting.

6. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

Chair Simon said they are not supposed to take any votes under discussion, but he thought the Commission should vote Diane Williams the best Commissioner ever and make it unanimous.

Commissioner Williams thanked everyone and said it was a pleasure working with all Commissioners and will miss them. She said that it was great working with Scott Mangum, Carlos Ruiz and Johanna Leonard and in the past with Mark Muenzer, Lorrie Pearson and Damir Latinovic.

Chair Simon said that Commissioner Williams set incredibly high standards, analytical ability to have a good critical analysis of projects, she was incredibly even-handed, and if he could strive to be half as even, it will be amazing.

Commissioner Hacker suggested summarizing CAMP for people who were not there. Chair Simon made a list of follow up issues and potential future actions and will bring them next time.

Scott Mangum thanked Commissioner and former Chair Williams for her service.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Williams made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:38 pm, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted:

Carlos D. Ruiz  
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, June 11, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)