1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Simon called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm with a quorum of six Commissioners present.

2. OLD BUSINESS


Peter Laundy presented the application with Dorian Breuer, his contractor. Mr. Laundy said the Commission had asked if they would consider an installation that did not have panels visible from the street. The system would not be viable unless they include the south facing panels. The west facing panels are compromised because of shading. Eight of the best harvesting solar panels are on the front façade south facing roof.

He indicated that there is no practical solution to hiding solar collectors on a red roof. They are not willing to replace the roof material for the next 23 years, either to reduce color contrast between the roofing and solar panels, or to replace it completely with solar shingles.
As for the solar shingles, Mr. Laundy indicated that flush solar shingles are less efficient than rack mounted and the models they have seen don’t appear to integrate well into the roofing. Flush panels may violate Alteration Standard #1, because their replacement will require the replacement of the existing building material. Rack mounted panels are removable.

The applicant proposes keeping the visible array to a simple 2-panel by 4-panel rectangle in scale with the portion of the roof, with minimal visible framing. When viewed from oblique angles, panels reflect sky conditions. The contrast between roof and panels varies depending on the weather and the angle.

He indicated that the front garden and façade draw the attention of those who pass by the home. As the seasons change, the details on the façade are accented by the paint colors and this would draw attention away from the roof.

Given the current emphasis upon renewable energy and climate action, Mr. Laundy also argues for a new category for solar panels or collectors within the Preservation Commission Guidelines for Alteration that would consider the following questions that would have impacted both his application and similar cases in the future:

1) Skylights and thermal solar panels used for precedence, especially for rack mounted rectangular solar PV arrays, they may be larger than skylights, but they have the advantage over skylights in that they do not require openings in the historic structure and are removable.
2) Should a property’s perceived charm and beauty be a criterion in denying a COA, uncertainty about likelihood of approval may become a disincentive to plan for roof top solar PV systems. With solar panels would it not be a win for both the streetscape and the environment?
3) Is denying a COA, so all three views, rather than just two, are free of solar panels worth preventing root top clean energy generation. A controversial position to take in a town full of people concerned with climate change. As many houses in Evanston historic districts have south facing side roofs, this may lead to frequent COA applications.
4) Direct mounted solar PV solar panels on sloped roofs conform to all Evanston’s standards for alteration as now written. By being removable with harm to the roof and prolonging the life of the shingles below, they do some good. While solar PV is a new category of alteration for the Commission, is it not innovative design for alteration? It would not seem to qualify, as it is the predominant industry standard design, and if is not innovative designs, standard 9 does not apply.

Mr. Laundy concluded his testimony by saying that his wife and he are both designers. They have tried to integrate the historic and modern in ways respectful of the historic character of their house, and to model how environmental sustainability can be address in these decisions. He asked the Commission to let them extend this project to include harvesting sunshine on their roof. They think it will better express not only their values but those of the City of Evanston as well.
Commissioner Julie Hacker asked about the lower roof and if the Applicant had considered putting the solar panels on that flat roof on the porch south side. Peter Laundy said no, because it is so low and to the left of that roof are maple trees. Commissioner Hacker asked if they had considered putting solar panels at grade somewhere. Peter Laundy said the only place to put them at grade would be on the front lawn. There are street trees that are growing on the west side of the street and there are tall trees across the street. They don’t have control over what they neighbors to the south will plant. Dorian Breuer said that the cost of ground-mounted solar panels is about 50 percent higher.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if there is a garage. Peter Laundy said it has a Siberian Elm tree over it.

Public Comment:
- Jonathan Nieuwsma, past president of and representing Citizen’s Greener Evanston, and current Commissioner of the Utilities Commission said they would like to see solar panels on every roof where it makes sense. The City made a commitment to be 100 percent carbon free by 2050 with the Climate Action and Resilience Plan (CARP) passed by City Council in December 2018.

- Arthur Anderson of 715 Michigan Avenue said the Commission had approved solar panels that are visible from the public way for other historic properties. He noted that the dark color of the proposed solar panels at 1040 Hinman Avenue is not totally out of order with the dark color of the eaves.

Chair Simon acknowledged at this time the comments received via email.

Commissioners made the following comments and asked questions:

Commissioner Ken Itle:
- The solar panels follow the shape of the roof. The array is very similar to other systems the Commission approved on a side facing roofing surface. They are reversible if the technology changes.
- The house will be left essentially unchanged.

Commissioner Julie Hacker:
- The solar panels do not meet the standard of compatibility (Standard #9).
- The application does not comply with the National Park Service standards for the placement of solar panels on historic buildings.
- She was concerned with setting a precedent where one could see solar panels on every front-facing or south-facing gable everywhere.

Commissioner Aleca Sullivan:
- As a Preservation Commissioner, she would have a problem in approving solar panels on primary vistas of the home, even if they are removable. They would negatively impact the historic building.
- She would only approve it on some of the other facades or parts of the roof, because it is removable.
Commissioner Elliott Dudnik:
- Asked about the payback time-frame for the solar panels. Dorian Breuer said 8 to 10 years.
- Asked if not having as many solar panels could resolve the issue of the visible panels, even if it meant a longer payback or a less efficient system, rather than eliminating all of the panels. Dorian Breuer said the other locations (not fewer panels) would be 30 percent less efficient than the proposed array.
- Also noted that the National Park Service examples do not work with this roof configuration.

Commissioner Sullivan:
- Asked if solar panels could be placed on the gable facing west. Peter Laundy said there is no room for relocating panels. The kitchen roof is lower and gets shaded until very late in the morning. The west-facing roof is shaded significantly by a tree. The payback of 8 years could be easily increased to 12 years.

Commissioner Hacker:
- Although it might be ideal to install solar panels on a south facing façade, which may be within the public view, what is the compromise if the array does not have the south facing panels? Dorian Breuer said that Oak Park has adopted a process where because the removability of solar panels, it is not an issue for historic preservation.

Commissioner Jamie Morris:
- The solar panels are not damaging any historic material, she sees it as a passerby interpretation of the house and it is obvious this is an addition, but she did not see damage to actual historic material occurring.

Chair Simon:
- The Commission has approved solar panels based on project-by-project basis.
- The Commission likes to approve this kind of project to encourage solar energy versus the historic preservation issues.
- The Rules and Procedures have been amended in a manner that would provide what is similar to the Oak Park approval process. City staff can approve certain projects that don’t have substantial visibility, but that the Commission still approves those that do have substantial visibility.
- The Preservation Ordinance provides that the Commission would consider the National Park Service standards (but is not bound to them), which provide case-by-case assessment of the preservation issues, and they discourage intrusive installations. The Commission has generally erred on the side of approving solar panels.

Commission’s Decision:
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 1040 Hinman Avenue for the installation of eighteen (18) solar photovoltaic flush-mounted panels visible from the
public way; the applicable standards are: #1, 2, 3, 5, 9 and 10, seconded by Commissioner Morris. The motion failed. Vote: 2 ayes, 3 nays, 1 abstention.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Hacker said that part of Standard #9 was met, referring to “Innovative design for alterations to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations do not destroy significant historic material”. However, referring to “and such design is compatible with the features, size, scale, proportion, massing, color, and material”, that part is not met. Because of that, Standard #9 is not met.

In regard to Standard #5 ‘Distinctive stylistic features, materials, finishes, examples of skilled craftsmanship, or examples of distinctive construction techniques that characterize a property, structure, site or object shall be treated with sensitivity,’ Commissioner Hacker said they are not treated with sensitivity. Standard #5 is not met.

Chair Simon referred to standard 2-9-9 (E) - the Commission shall also consider the Secretary of Interior’s "Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties." He said that applying those standards, the application does not necessarily meet them.

Chair Simon said the Commission was prepared to approve a scaled-down project. He believed Commissioners present at the meeting would have voted to approve a project that was without the visually intrusive elements that seem to go beyond some of other projects that the Commission has viewed.

Commissioner Dudnik said that standard #1 starts with the words ‘Every reasonable effort’. However, while certain efforts had been made, there might have been alternatives that the applicant needed to have or had not explored. A scaled-down version or a modified version might have been acceptable to the Commission.

Chair Simon also emphasized that the Commission would have approved a scaled-down version.

Commissioner Hacker said that if the panels were not on the front façade, and if the panels were on the other two roof locations discussed, she would have supported the Application.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 730 Forest Ave. (LSHD) Case #19PRES-0156 - William Frillman, owner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 12 Marvin wood windows which were installed in 1989-91. These windows have continued to rot despite repairs. Some damage extends into frame and sash. The replacement window will be energy efficient and a close a match as is possible. New windows will match in size and look to the original ones by taking out the frames and putting in the same Marvin aluminum clad wood windows with the same glass size. Exterior trim will be matched. Visible from the public way via Forest Avenue. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]
Maurice Forde presented the application to replace 12 non-original 19 years old double hung and rotted windows with double hung aluminum clad wood Marvin windows in the same size and matching the trim. The windows are labeled 1-12.

Front east elevation: window 3 is an eye brow window to be replaced in kind. South elevation: windows 6 and 7 are combination windows, matching with same configuration. Window 8 is a double hung with SDLs on the upper sash to be matched. North elevation: window 10 is a double hung window. West elevation: window 9 is a bay window to be replaced and the roof will be redone, and window 11 is a double casement window. Photos showed all the deteriorated windows. Dimensions of old and new is virtually the same sizes. Exterior trim is Azak material and the exterior of the house is aluminum siding.

Commissions Findings:
Commissioner Hacker asked if the windows are custom made. M. Forde said yes, they fit within the existing rough opening. Commissioner Dudnik asked about the material of the roof on the bay window. M. Forde said the replacement roof material is aluminum to match the existing.

No public comment.

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to issue a COA for 730 Forest Ave. to replace 12 Marvin wood windows with new SDL aluminum clad wood windows will match in size and look to the original ones. Exterior trim will be matched. Applicable standards: Alteration 1-10, seconded by Commissioner Morris. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

B. 835 Michigan Ave. (LSHD) Case #19PRES-0172 - Franz Allen, contractor, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacements at the east front façade. First floor: remove existing casement clad windows (with transoms) and trim, replace with Marvin double hung aluminum clad windows with simulated divided lights and transoms. Remove picture window and transom above; replace with a Marvin aluminum clad picture window with transom above. Second floor - Remove casement clad windows with simulated divided lights and replace with Marvin double hung aluminum clad windows with simulated divided lights. Simulated divided lights have different configuration and the trim is James Hardie cement. Visible from the public way via Michigan Avenue. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Matt Kerr, owner, presented the application to replace the non- original casement windows on the front elevation with aluminum clad with SDL wood Marvin double hung windows in combination with the existing transoms. M. Kerr showed photos and drawings of the proposed windows on the front elevation, including a picture window on the first floor.

Commissioner Hacker said the double hung windows change the look of the front elevation. She asked why making that modification. M. Kerr said the functionality of the
casement with a screen in the inside is a problem. Also, his daughter’s bedroom is on the second floor, a casement windows wide opened is also a problem.

Commissioner Itle said that the windows are not original and are not in character with the house as originally built. He encouraged the applicant to do more research to know what might have been the in the past. M. Kerr said that in his research at the History Center could not locate any pictures. Commissioner Itle asked what kinds of windows exist on the other sides of the house. M. Kerr said the back of the house seem to have original windows, the sides of the house have Marvin double hung, which would be consistent to the replacement windows the front façade.

Commissioner Hacker asked if M. Kerr could provide a more convincing evidence for the double hung windows. Commissioner Itle said the standard he is focusing is standard 5 that says the application should not create a false sense of history. The Commission asked for photos of the other three exterior facades showing the double hung windows.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to continue 835 Michigan Ave. to the meeting of October 1, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 135 Main St. (LSHD) Case #19PRES-016 - Gregory Jones, applicant, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing steel casement windows with Renewal by Andersen composite casement windows. Visible from the public way via Main Street. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Greg Jones presented the application and said they use a composite material for their windows called ‘Fibrex’ designed to mirror the look and feel of steel, aluminum clad and wood windows. The difference Fibrex versus aluminum-clad windows is that Fibrex uses mortise and tenon joints, which are more structurally sound than mitered joints. They do a full replacement and they are not altering any of the existing openings. The proposed windows are the same as the existing windows, with exception of windows #104 and #205 on the front façade. The building is a duplex and the other owner at 127 Main St. has not made up his mind to replace his windows. The application is for the windows on the rear and alley (to the side) only.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Dudnik said that there are thermally broken steel and aluminum clad windows, which are probably closer to the existing steel windows. G. Jones said the aluminum clad wood windows have the tendency to unhinge at the joints, which are mitered, bringing rot into the wood. Commissioner Dudnik said the aluminum-clad windows are for replacement of wood windows. He could argue that a thermally broken aluminum window is replacing a metal window. The application is not for replacing a metal window with a metal window. Commissioner Hacker said thermally broken steel windows are costly. The problem for her is that she is not familiar with the Fibrex window; which has not been approved. She wanted to know where the Commission stands on Fibrex windows.
Chair Simon said the proposed replacement windows are on the side and rear facades. He would give more leeway for those structures that are not landmarks and the windows are not as visible. Commissioner Itle agreed that the subject building is not of a particular significance or contributing structure in the historic district, which the Commission could give more leeway. In this case, the building is not a contributing structure.

No public comment

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 135 Main St. for replacement of windows for only the west and north facades, with composite casement windows. Applicable standards of alteration: 1-6, 9 and 10, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 5 ayes, 1 nay (Itle).

D. 1100 Hinman Ave. (LSHD) Case #19PRES-0126 - David Thomas, applicant, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing Insulbrick with Hardie board fiber cement wall cladding; windows and doors wraps with Hardie board trim; aluminum soffit, fascia, gutters and downspouts with new aluminum, and front porch wood decking with timber tech decking. Visible from the public way via Hinman Avenue. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Renata Silva presented the application for 1100 Hinman Ave. to replace the Insulbrick and aluminum exterior material with Hardi board fiber cement horizontal smooth siding with 7.5-inch exposure. The 4-inch window trim and corner boards will remain the same size. The aluminum fascia, soffit and gutters will remain in aluminum and in the same size. The wood decking at the rear will be replaced with Trex decking. The front facing gables windows and trim will have the same size aluminum fascia.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Dudnik asked why the Insulbrick is being replaced. Jim Rapsol, owner, said it has holes from woodpeckers. The Insulbrick was installed in the 1950’s, the corners are aluminum to cover the Insulbrick. Commissioner Itle asked if only the deck is being replaced, and not the railing. J. Rapsol said only the deck will be replaced.

No public comment.

Commissioner Sullivan made a motion to issue a COA for 1100 Hinman for alterations as describe above. Applicable standard of alteration 1-10, Commissioner Dudnik seconded the motion. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

E. 2521 Marcy Ave. (L) Case #19PRES-0155 - Kate Newman, owner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of an existing non-original 1-car detached garage and the construction of a new 2-car detached garage visible from the public way via the adjacent public alley and Marcy Avenue. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16; Demolition 1-6]
Kate Newman presented the project to demolish an existing 30-year old aluminum sided one-car detached garage, and construct a two-car detached garage. The existing and proposed garages are not visible from the street. The proposed garage gables exterior materials match that of the gables of the house. The garage roof has a steep pitch, although not as steep as the roof on the house roof. The exterior material is wood lap siding with Marvin clad windows.

No discussion

Commission’s findings:
Commissioner Hacker moved to issue a COA for 2521 Marcy St. for the demolition of an existing non-original 1-car detached garage and the construction of a new 2-car detached garage visible from the public way via the adjacent public alley and Marcy Ave. The applicable standards for construction are 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16; and demolition standards 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

At 9:10 pm the Commission meeting was recessed for 10 minutes for a break.

F. 125 Burnham Pl. (LSHD) Case #19PRES-0171 - Nina Cudecki owner, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness for adding a third bedroom and bath by finishing the attic and adding dormers. Replace existing wood casement windows with new, custom wood clad casement windows. Some window openings will change. Replace existing wood front door with new wood divided light door. Remove nonfunctional chimney and use bricks to patch where needed. On garage replace existing stucco and boards with new stucco and boards, add lannon stone (to match existing) to existing brick base of garage, and replace garage door. Enclose back porch for use as mudroom. Replace painted gutters and downspouts with new painted gutters and downspouts. Visible from the public way via Burnham Place. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

At 9:20 pm Nina Cudecki presented the application for 125 Burnham Pl. The house is a 2-bedroom ranch, while keeping the existing, foot print, building height, and roof line, they are adding a third bedroom and bathroom by finishing the attic and adding dormers. Also, replacing the existing wood casement windows with wood clad casement windows that closely resemble the existing casement windows. Some of the windows will change. Also replacing the front wood door with a new wood door, removing the non-functional chimney, and salvage the bricks. The stucco and boards on the garage will be replaced in kind. Add lannon stone to the base of the garage and replace the garage door. Also enclose the back porch and replacing the gutters and downspouts.

South front elevation: adding one dormer on the front roof. West elevation: Infill a couple of windows openings, installing two new smaller windows, and a new roof dormer. East elevation: Removing chimney, adding windows, replacing garage doors, adding a dormer on garage and a new door window going. North elevation: 3 new dormers, enclosing porch, and changing some windows to doors.
The existing Pella windows are not repairable. The replacement windows look alike the existing casement windows.

Commissioner Hacker asked for photos of the side and rear facades. She found it odd the change to the rear of the house. Diane Wilson, designer, said the dormer on the front is very small. By adding the second dormer, it balances the house. The hip roof larger dormers were added to make the 2nd floor attic a usable space.

Commissioner Itle asked about the demolition of the chimney, and the stone knee wall added to the garage. D. Wilson said the fireplace is non-functional, the owner chose to remove it and add windows that match those on the front elevation. Adding the knee wall to the garage was an aesthetic choice to make the garage feel more a part of the house.

Commissioner Morris asked about to the change to the board and stucco at the garage. D. Wilson said the change was a request by the owner. Carlos Ruiz asked if there is an alley behind the subject property. D. Wilson said no. The dormers on the east and west facades are visible from the public way, but not the rear.

Commissioner Dudnik asked about the large dormer on the east façade and, if the window is an egress window. Michael Venechuck, architect, said the dormers are for adding light, air and egress and to make the attic habitable without adding a second floor. There are French doors on the rear north façade.

Commissioner Hacker said her concerns were about the rear north façade, but it is not visible from the public way. Chair Simon said that to some extent the rear could be visible from Dempster St.

No public comment.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for 125 Burnham Pl. for all the remodeling described in the packet. Standards for alteration 1-10 apply, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

G. 615 Judson Ave. (LSHD) Case #19PRES-0152 - Jeanie Petrick, Architect, submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a two-story addition to the rear volume of the extant residence east elevation visible from the public way via the adjacent public alley and Keeney Street. Alterations-west front façade: first floor, replace front porch pediment shingles with board wood panels and columns with Colonial columns and windows with fixed doors; second floor, replace casement windows with double hung windows and double hung windows with casement windows. East rear façade, first floor, remove wood deck, replace casement windows with wood clad door and add deck and stairs, replace door with new clad wood door and add deck and stairs, remove double hung windows and infill opening with wood siding; second floor, replace double hung windows with casement windows. North façade, first floor, remove double hung windows and reduce opening, remove sliding windows and replace with wood clad windows; second floor, and add new wood clad window; second floor, replace double hung and casement
APPROVED windows with new wood clad double hung windows. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; Alteration 1-10; Demolition 1-6]

Jeanie Petrick, architect, presented the application for a 2-story addition of the back of the house at 615 Judson Ave. They believe that house was remodeled in the late 1980s or early 90s. There are 2 bay windows on the front and the columns with a pitched roof to the main entry.

The two bay windows on each side will be pulled back and bring back the 3 equal windows. On the front elevation, there was a 1-car garage, which is now a livable indoor space. At the back of the house a deck is being added, and a 2-story addition. The addition’s roof is the same scale as the gambrel roof.

Commissioner Dudnik asked about the alterations to the front entry. J. Petrick said the existing columns are 4-inch posts and will be replaced with Tuscan style Colonial columns, slightly larger in diameter. The shingles on the pediment will be replaced with wood siding. The stairs railing will be removed since are not required by the building code. The windows on the second floor on the front façade will be on the same plane.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Hacker made a motion to issue COA to 615 Judson Ave. for the proposed work as described above with applicable standards for construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; alteration 1-10; and demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of August 6, 2019.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to approve the August 6, 2019 meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 5 ayes, 1 abstained (Hacker)

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Amending the Rules and Procedures - Article 5. Certificate of Appropriateness List, adding Line 56 Fountains and Landscape Features for Minor (Staff) or Major Work (Commission) and Line 57 Fountains and landscape features when a part of the statement of significance for a landmark for Major Work (Commission)

Carlos Ruiz said that Article 5, line 56 and 57 of the Rules and Procedures were discussed at the August 6, 2019 meeting. Now the Commission could adopt those text amendments. Commissioner Itle made a motion to adopt the proposed amendment to the Rules and Procedures, related to fountains and landscape features, seconded by Commissioner Morris. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Sustainability – Chair Simon said the Commission would like to meet with Kumar Jensen, Sustainability Coordinator. K. Jensen had suggested that a Preservation expert be invited as well. Commissioner Hacker said she left a message to Bonnie McDonald and asked if someone from Landmarks Illinois could come. Chair Simon said he would
prefer to have an educational session for the Commission rather than policy discussion. Also learn more about the Community Solar initiative.

Commissioner Itle said it would be interesting to hear what other departments are promoting and encouraging other people to do. His take on solar panels is that, yes, they are a contemporary feature, but they are not so radically different than skylights. Commissioners may not have reacted the same way (1040 Hinman Ave.) if the color of the roof shingles was black.

**B. Design Guidelines – Update**

Carlos Ruiz reported that the Design Guidelines are on line. Eighty percent of the links are active. He needs to complete the last portion of the links.

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

No discussion

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Sullivan made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:10 pm on Tuesday, September 10, 2019. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planer/Preservation Coordinator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, October 1, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)