EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, November 12, 2019, 7:00 P.M.
Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue
Room 2800 James C. Lytle Council Chambers

MINUTES
Members Present: Elliott Dudnik, Julie Hacker, Sally Riessen Hunt, Ken Itle, Mark Simon, Aleca Sullivan, and Karl Vogel

Members Absent: Robert Bady, Jamie Morris, Suzi Reinhold, and Tim Schmitt

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

Presiding Member: Mark Simon, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Simon called the meeting to order at 7:11 pm with a quorum of seven Commissioners present.

Chair Simon called for two items under ‘Staff Reports’ before ‘Old Business’

A. Preservation and Sustainability Collaboration (Kumar Jensen, Chief Sustainability and Resilience Officer, and Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

Kumar Jensen, Chief Sustainability and Resilience Officer, explained the City staff recommendation for volunteers, two for each, the Utilities Commission, the Environmental Board and the Preservation Commission to join a task force that specifically develop proposed guidelines for how the Preservation Commission and staff will evaluate future solar developments on historic structures and buildings in Evanston. Kumar Jensen and Carlos Ruiz will staff the task force.

Carlos Ruiz said that he attended the Utilities Commission meeting on November 8, 2019 with the same recommendation. He asked for two volunteers from the Preservation Commission. Chair Simon said that Commissioners Hacker and Sullivan have volunteered to the task force. K. Jensen said that the task force will report to the Preservation in the spring of 2020.

B. Alderman Robin Rue Simmons, 5th Ward, referral to EPC to work on the 1995 initiative: “Preserving Integrity Through Culture and History” (PITCH) for cultural
landmarking, honoring some businesses and other historically significant sites in the 5th Ward.

Mark Simon, Chair and City staff will meet with Ald. Robin Rue Simmons and Dino Robinson at a date and time to be determined to discuss the next steps on the PITCH initiative

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 2404 RIDGE AVE. (L) CASE # 19PRES-0094 Advisory review on proposed subdivision - Chris Sweitzer, applicant. The proposed subdivision includes the division of 1 lot into 2 lots. The proposed lot #1 will include the existing principal and secondary structures. The proposed lot #2 is existing vacant land. Thus, the landmark structures are preserved and will remain as a part of their own parcel, and not adversely affected. Applicable standards [2-8-12 (B) 1 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and 2]


Rick Sweitzer, owner, presented the application for the subdivision and described the work on the house and the barn over the last 20 years. He noted that the proposed subdivision of the lot would ensure its historic future.

Public Comments:
Peter Miller of 2354 Ridge Av. said that he speaks for 3 dozen neighbors in opposition of the subdivision; the subdivision does not preserve or adaptively reuse or protect the landmark property. A new structure made possible by the subdivision will block from view the critical features of the landmark site. The proposed 3,800 S.F. house blocks the view of the barn and part the historic house. A building on the subdivided lot will not preserve or protect critical features of the streetscape. The development of the subdivision would alter traffic patterns and adversely affect property values.

Dianne Rucinski of 2354 Ridge Av. said the Commission should not only preserve the structures but also the grounds and the whole pastoral setting. The highest and best use of the property is not the best for preservation. Once the property is subdivided, the Commission will have no purview. D. Rucinski asked to deny the applicant’s request.

Discussion:
Commissioner Itle asked R. Sweitzer about the three different site plans. R. Sweitzer said that site plan (1) gives the appropriate setbacks and it is congruent with all the homes on the street, architecturally and visually. The proposed home will not impact in any way the view of the house. Site plan (2), a setback version, does not impact any view of the barn, and site plan (3) identifies all the trees.

Commissioner Dudnik asked about the 3,800 S.F. house, where does it come from; the application shows a 3,380 S.F. house. R. Sweitzer said he does not know where 3,800 S.F. comes from. The Commission had asked to show the maximum allowable on the lot. He noted that they don’t have interest in building.
Chair Simon said the Commissions’ action on subdivisions is a recommendation. Scott Mangum said that the subdivision requires City Council approval by Resolution. Commissioner Hacker said this is a landmark structure, but is not in a historic district. Was the applicant asked what could be built to meet the zoning requirements and to see the mass of the building? Chair Simon said yes, and because the house is not in a historic district, once the property is subdivided, the landmark no longer would be on the parcel, and so, the adjacent lot will no longer be subject to the Commissions’ jurisdiction.

Commissioner Itle said the key is standard (C) “Not result in blocking or otherwise obstructing, as viewed from a public street or public way, ... the critical features of the landmark or area...” The only view of the historic house is from the south. To meet standard (C), what is needed is more than the 27-foot minimum setback, and establishing a larger setback than required by zoning, to protect that view of the historic house. He suggested a setback of 60-feet. Commissioner Itle said a larger setback would imply less volume of the house; potentially it would be appropriate, because the only view of the house is from the south. Commissioner Dudnik said that the problems are that, what the Commission is seeing is the largest structure that could be built.

Commissioner’s Findings
Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a recommendation to City Council for the subdivision of the lot at 2404 Ridge Avenue, with the stipulation that the typical front yard setback be increased, such as any new construction on lot 2 would not obstruct the south wall of the original historic home as seen from Ridge Avenue, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 nay (Vogel)

B. 2727 LINCOLN STREET (L) - CASE # 19PRES-0199 - DonnaLee Floeter, architect, applies for certificate of appropriateness to construct a one and two-story additions at rear of existing 2 1/2-story brick and stucco single family home, including one story brick extension to existing attached garage on rear of home. The applicant requests a 23.5' rear-yard setback where 30’ is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8). Visible from the alley, a public way. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15] [Zoning A and C] (Continued from 10/1/2019)

DonnaLee Floeter presented the application. The revised elevations show the addition’s first floor as brick and the second floor as stucco, which is consistent with the existing house. Also, the massing of the roof revised. They are asking for zoning variance for the rear setback for the garage addition, which extends into the 30-foot rear yard setback. The hardship is that the house has a very large front yard. It is 10 to 12-feet beyond any other house on the block. They are extending the garage further to the alley, over a portion of the yard that is a driveway. The proposal is at 25% lot coverage and 34.5% in impervious surfaces, which is well below the allowed limits.

Discussion:
Commissioner Dudnik asked why the garage is so large. D. Floeter said because of
storage needs; and the mudroom takes up most of what it was the old garage.

Commissions’ findings
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 2727 Lincoln St. to construct a one and two-story additions at rear of existing 2 1/2-story brick and stucco single family home, including one-story brick extension to existing attached garage at rear of home. Applicable standards of Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15 apply, seconded by Commissioner Riessen Hunt. The motion passed. Vote 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commission's Findings:
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to make a favorable recommendation for 2727 Lincoln St. Section 6-8-2-8, standards A and C for the setback, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 1 nay (Ittle).

C. 1224 OAK AVENUE (RHD) - CASE # 19PRES-0201- Noreen Edwards, owner, applies for certificate of appropriateness for the construction of an attached garage with a rooftop screen porch and open deck, raise the roof height of the house with dormers (attic addition) from 31'10" to 35', replace selected windows, install French doors, build deck at grade and install two A/C condensers on the south side. Visible from Oak Avenue and the public alley at rear. Applicant applies for major zoning relief to construct the attached garage, deck, and attic addition, in the R3 Two-Family Residential District and Ridge Historic District. The applicant requests: The proposed building lot coverage is 51.5% where 45% is the maximum permitted (6-8-4-6. - Building lot coverage); the proposed north interior side yard for the principle structure is 3.2’ where 5’ is required. Although the nonconforming condition is not increased, the addition needs to meet the required setback (6-8-4-7. - Yard requirements. (A) Residential Structure 3. Side Yard); the proposed rear yard is 3’ where 30’ is required (6-8-4-7. - Yard requirements (A) Residential Structures 4. Rear Yard; and the proposed deck is 1’ from the south interior side yard where 5’ is required (6-8-4-7. - Yard requirements. (C) Residential Structures 3. Side Yard. The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15] [Zoning A and C] (Continued from 10/1/2019)

Noreen Edwards presented the application as follow:
- Construct a 3-car attached garage, rooftop deck and screen porch (the double hung windows on the garage match the windows on the house)
- Keeping the existing roof 7:12 pitch, yet raising the roof 3'-2". The rest of the roof would a 10:12 pitch.
- The side dormers are now 3.5’ smaller (13’ wide and setback 27’ to 32’ from the front of the building). The dormers are 4’ back from the edge of the roof. The dormers pitch changed from 2:12 to 4:12
- The new windows are all double hung.
- The new garage will be setback 3’ to 6’.

Zoning variations due to garage:
- Building lot coverage: proposed 51.1%; maximum allowed 45%
• Side yard setback on the north: proposed 3.2'; required 5'
• Rear yard setback, proposed 3'; required 30'
• Side yard setback, proposed 1'; required 5' (for 1st floor deck on south side).

Commissioners’ Comments/Questions:
- Hacker: was concerned with the massing of the house and the reduction of the rear yard from 30’ to 3’, and the material shift from brick to siding
- Ittle: was concerned with the gable roof facing the rear. Floeter said they could change it to a hip roof.
- Hacker: was concerned with the vocabulary of changing materials on the same plane
- Ittle: asked if brick veneer could be used on the addition. Mark Metz, owner, said it is a cost issue for not using brick
- Sullivan: In line with the massing of historic home, one cannot see much of the rear of the house from the primary elevation. With the change of materials, one can still read the historic structure and see where the addition is.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Ittle made a motion to Issue a COA for the project at 1224 Oak Ave. with the friendly suggestion that the roof for the rear roof line be changed to a hip profile, to match the historic configuration, if feasible. Standards for construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15 apply, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 4 ayes, 3 nays (Hacker, Riessen Hunt and Vogel).

Commissioner Ittle made a motion to provide a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for all the zoning variations needed for the project. Standards A and C apply, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 4 yes, 3 Nays (Hacker, Riessen Hunt and Vogel).

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2390 ORRINGTON AVE. CASE # 18PRES-0147 – Joseph Balistreri applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Construction of a single family residence with attached 2-car garage. Visible from Orrington Ave. and Lincoln St. Applicable standards: [Construction: 1-14, and 16] [Previously reviewed 5/14, and continued to 6/11, and 7/9]

Joseph Balistreri presented the application for building a single family house at 2390 Orrington Ave. Based on the previous Commission’s recommendation; they revised the plans accordingly as follows:
• Reduced the size of the Prairie style house
• Reduced the window sizes and window style discrepancies
• Soften the color red of the cedar lap siding
• The footprint was reduced to accommodate de covered front porch
• Materials: brick on the first floor, lap cedar siding on the second floor
• Clad wood Prairie style casement windows
• 30-year architectural fiber glass roof shingles

Joseph Balistreri showed samples of the building materials. He also discussed the tree arborist report and how far back that old Kendall College foundation went into the lot, where the root system dies. The recommendation to save one of the trees is to cut one of them down, installing a tree protection fencing around the saved tree, and protecting the root system. The survey shows where the old foundation of Kendall College is. The 2011 subdivision agreement reads saving certain trees 'if possible.'

Commissioner Itle asked about the proposed setbacks. J Balistreri said 15’ to the north; 24’ front of the porch (east); and 5’ on the south side.

Public Comment:
• Leslie Shad of Natural Habitat Evanston asked the Commission to deny the COA. The 55” 330-year old Bur Oak is not in good shape. Cutting the one tree will cause the other tree to die.
• Andrew Yun of lot 13 expressed concerns with the workmanship of the developer, and the impact of the construction on the trees.
• Ada Yun of 708 Lincoln St. said that the arborist’s report noted that the Bur Oak on the north is healthy, as well as the south Bur Oak. The new foundation will have a major impact on the south Bur Oak. Trees on private properties should be preserved in historic districts and the COA should be denied based on the standards. She had concerns about the proposed dark colors of the house and the fencing.
• Michael Wasielewski of 2380 Orrington said that the trees will be impacted and the look of Lincoln Ave. The proposed materials are too similar to the dark brick color. The Commission had asked the diversity with the types and styles in regard of exterior elevations. The other houses on Orrington have a front yard setback of 28.5’
• Camille Blachowicz of 806 Colfax said that Evanston is an important stop in the migratory bird flyway and the Oak trees are important markers for the birds. Also, ornithological tourism brings revenue to Evanston. And non-one of the heritage trees policies of surrounding communities would allow the removal old these trees.
• Ald. Fiske said that she is one of the authors of the Northeast East Evanston historic district nomination, both the National Register and the City of Evanston. Ald. Fiske said this is the prime site for the block, and the Oak trees are a historic part of the property. Historic districts always consider streetscape and landscape masses, and the general context and character of a district, reason why the Oak trees are important. When Kendall College was there, the tree roots stopped at the foundation. The hope was that a building could be built before the roots could migrate.

Ald. Fiske said that this location gives the opportunity to design a really “cool” house, and not quite as large as the other houses on the block. What it is proposed is too big for the site. Because there is a concern throughout the City of
Evanston about of the loss of too many trees on private property, City Council is moving forward to amend the Tree Ordinance to identify heritage trees. As proposed, one of trees would go and the tree that shares the root system will probably go as well. She asked to allow the developer to build something that is consistent with the intent of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, and also with the intent of the community's will. She urged the Commission to work with the developer creatively.

Hugh DuBose, City Attorney, said that as part of the subdivision, the City entered into a tree preservation plan with the developer, an attachment to Resolution13-R-11, contains a site map, coded in red (existing trees to be removed); green (existing tree to remain); and grey (existing tree to remain if possible). City Council added an amendment to the Ordinance, specifying the tree on the ally to be saved. This was adopted on March 28, 2011. Contemporaneously, a Tree Preservation Ordinance was adopted. He noted that this is not part of the Preservation Commission jurisdiction. The Tree Ordinance sets out the rules and regulations for which trees in Evanston, more or less, can be removed in certain situations.

Hugh DuBose said that the Tree Preservation Ordinance is not part of the Preservation Commission jurisdiction. While Ald. Fiske mentioned that there is work going on with the Tree Preservation Ordinance; it has not been discussed whether it is going to be part of the Preservation jurisdiction. H. DuBose said that we cannot rule on legislation that has not been passed. Regarding the standard for review of construction #9, about walls of continuity, there is not a great deal of case law regarding standard #9.

Chair Simon asked if [Resolution 13-R-11] said to save the Oak trees if feasible. H. DuBose said the 3 trees on lot 8 are to be saved if possible, and the one tree on the northeast corner, inside of the sidewalk, is marked to remain if possible. All of the trees in the public right of way are trees that will remain. In regards to the trees at the alley one is to remain and one is to be removed. Chair Simon asked if are there steps to be taken to save a tree if feasible. H. DuBose said, no. Chair Simon said the Tree Preservation Ordinance does not prevent removal of trees on private property, but it might require for certain steps to be taken. H. DuBose said the Preservation Tree Ordinance does not prevent from trees to be removed. Removed trees need to be replaced with a make-up of the same diameter of caliper. There is a process for that and it is with the Public Works Department. This is where our laws sit today.

Chair Simon asked J. Balistreri where were they in the process of protecting the Oak trees. J. Balistreri said:
- They are preserving 3 out of the 4 existing trees with 120% of the caliper
- The City’s arborist provided a list of species of trees the City prefers for planting
- The City arborist has received the action plan for the trees and the Nels Johnson’s (tree expert) letter

Hugh DuBose said that before the developer takes any action, a permit is required under City code 7-8-3.
Commissioner Hacker asked if the design of the house could be modified. J. Balistreri said that if the roots extend too far into the lot, there is nothing really feasible to be built without losing too much money on it. They would have re-platted the subdivision if they had known the trees could not be removed. They platted the subdivision as is so they could have some return on their investment.

Commissioners’ comments/questions:
- Dudnik: if they maintain the 16’ protection radius from the tree, then the kitchen is out of the floor plans
- Sullivan: move back the setback on Lincoln St. to be more in line with the streetscape on Lincoln St.
- Itle: the developer is maximizing the size and footprint of the house, and saving the trees is an afterthought. The trees are an important landscape feature, defining the wall of the street along Lincoln St. He could not see approving the design, given standard #9.
- Dudnik: asked about the health of the existing trees. Leslie Shad said that the tree on the alley is not doing well. The Red Oak tree at the corner is healthy
- Dudnik: suggested switching the front yard to Lincoln St. Carlos Ruiz said that Zoning assigns the narrower width of a lot as the front yard [facing Orrington].
- Chair Simon: the 70% probability to save the trees would only be an option if a house is not built on the property, which is beyond what the Commission could do since the City agreed in 2011 that a house could be built.
- Vogel: could some kind of a variance or incentive be given to the developer if he keeps all the trees.
- Itle: would like to see a version where setbacks around the trees are maximized, even if there is a zoning variance required for building something to the southwest corner of the lot.
- Chair Simon: asked about zoning variations. Scott Mangum said that minor variations are decided by the Zoning Administrator and appealable to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Major variations are decided by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Both will require a notice. Joseph Balistreri said a zoning variance would not be fair to them financially. If they knew this was the issue, they would have re-platted the property and maximized the other lots. They need to build the house unless the City is interested in buying the lot.
- Dudnik: asked if the applicant has any interest in going back and looking at alternatives. J Balistreri said, yes. They came back with a revised design as requested back in May 2019.
- Chair Simon: asked if the house is smaller than before. J. Balistreri said yes, the main floor is 1,736 S.F. and the second floor is 1,918 S.F.
- Sullivan: asked if the house is smaller by making the covered porch part of the house. J. Balistreri said that it was an uncovered porch before. Now the 110 S.F. covered porch counts in the setback. Consequently, the house is 110 S.F. smaller.
- Dudnik: the developer did not explore the alternative to switching the front yard to Lincoln St.
- Chair Simon: by continuing the application by one meeting, and going through the whole Zoning process, is not going to do anything. It would be a different design that will require Zoning approval and several months of work.
- Scott Mangum: under the Commission's rules, the application can be continued twice without a presentation, before re-noticing be required. Under the Preservation Ordinance there is a 45-day requirement that the Commission review the application to approve or deny the application without the applicant asking for a continuance.
- Chair Simon: the Commission will continue the application if the applicant so desires, or the Commission could vote tonight, it is up to the applicant.
- Title: the Commission is looking for a design that protects the 3 large trees on the lot, with a reasonable expectation that the trees will survive the construction process; with whatever setback from those trees would be required to achieve that. Then the house would be designed by the applicant with that in mind. If a Zoning variance is needed to make up for the fact that the setback is larger than required on Lincoln St., then submit the design and the Commission will react to it.
- Carlos Ruiz: at the applicant’s request about the process, said that if the Commission were to deny the COA, the applicant has 30 days from the date of the denial to appeal that decision to City Council.

Joseph Balistreri agreed to continue the item for consultation with their legal counsel. Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to continue the case of 2390 Orrington Av. until the meeting of December 10, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Riessen Hunt. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

At 9:45 pm Chair Simon made a motion for a 5-minute recess, seconded by Commissioner Vogel. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Commissioner Riessen Hunt departed the meeting at this time.

At 9:56 Chair Simon reconvened the meeting with a quorum of six (6) Commissioners.

B. 747 MICHIGAN AVE. (LSHD) APP. # 19PRES-243 - Garry Shumaker submits for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of an existing screen porch (foundations to remain) and construction of new frame and masonry screen porch in the likeness of the existing structure. Installation of new wrought iron railing and front and rear stairs. Installation of widow’s walk railing visible from public way and to utilize materials to match existing structure. New screen porch visible from Kedzie St. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10; Construction 1- 4, 7, 8, and10-15; Demolition 1-6]

Garry Shumaker presented the application for a rear screen porch as follows:

- Demolish the existing back screen porch addition and construction a new screen porch on the same location, changing the entrance of the porch to face the rear yard
- The new screen porch with has a decorative balustrade with brick piers, and fixed screened panels.
- North side elevation: on the new rear porch, adding iron handrail and brick columns, and below the exterior painted wainscot with fixed transom panels above.
- Adding wrought iron handrails to the front entry porch
- West elevation: adding a decorative handrail on the roof over the living room

Commissioners’ comments/questions
- Itle: why the change of materials on the north view of the rear porch. G. Shumaker said that those are transom panels and a solid wall below. The house has very ornate painted wood details on the front gable. They wanted the rear porch in wood to be subordinate to the house, instead of a solid brick wall.
- Hacker: the horizontality and materiality seemed out of keeping with the house. Could it be just screens? G. Shumaker said they could adjust the proportion of the transom windows.
- Dudnik: proposed changing end panels to horizontal siding like the siding on the second story porch. G. Shumaker said they don’t intend to replicate the horizontal siding on the second floor, since it is not of a particular high quality construction.
- Hacker: said that the issue is the proportion of the openings
- Sullivan: asked where is the reference for the pillars and the balustrade? G. Shumaker said that they don’t have any reference to what it was original on the house. The intent is to bring the pillars into the language of the house, a Dutch Colonial detail, but not necessarily existing with the house.

Commissioner’s Findings:
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for the construction of a new frame and masonry screen porch in the likeness of the existing structure. Installation of new wrought iron railing and front and rear stairs. Installation of widow’s walk railing visible from public way and to utilize materials to match existing structure. Applicable standards for alteration 1-7, and 10; construction 1-4, 7, 8 10 and 15; and demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Vogel. The motion failed. Vote: 3 ayes, 3 nays (Hacker, Itle and Sullivan).

Chair Simon asked to those objecting, if there is something that could be modified for the next meeting. Commissioner Itle said that it involves some tweaks of proportion and materiality. Commissioner Sullivan said that there is no precedent for the pillars and balustrades on this house. Commissioner Itle said that he was not convinced with the vertical siding facing the street. It does not seem to fit the vocabulary of the house. If those became a large screen opening that probably will resolve the issue.

Commissioner Hacker said that the issues are: the fenestration, the material and the pillars and balustrade. Standards of construction 3, 7 and [12] are not met.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to continue 747 Michigan Ave. to the meeting of
December 10, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 1111 OAK AVE. (RHD) App. # 19PRES-0221 - Jennifer and David Blikenstaff apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 12 existing aluminum clad double hung wood windows at rear and side of home with Pella aluminum clad double hung wood windows. The replacement will be a "pocket" installation, meaning the exterior trim around the windows will be unchanged. Visible from Oak Avenue. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Hayden McGann presented the application and submitted updated material for the application. 1111 Oak Ave. was built in 2003. They are replacing 12 windows, mainly on the south side of the house, and one on the front facade, a second floor bedroom window above the door.

Current windows are aluminum clad wood windows. The proposed replacement windows are Pella aluminum clad wood windows. These windows are 'pocket' replacement, where the top and bottom sash, and blind stop are removed, then, the replacement windows are inserted in place with an aluminum exterior cap.

There are 3 sizes A, B, and C. Even though the frame size is smaller, the glass dimension is a ¾-inch reduction in width, the height of the top sash is 3/8-inch reduction and the bottom sash is 1/8-inch reduction.

Commissioners' comments/questions
  - Dudnik: are all the windows failing? David Blikenstaff said that the window seals are failing, and the glass is clouded over.
  - Hacker: what are the windows dimensions? H. McGann said that all the widths are the same (35.5") the height changes are 52", 56", and 60"; the sills stay in place.

Commission's Findings:
Commissioner Itle made a motion to issue a COA for 1111 Oak Ave. for 12 window replacement, standard for alteration 1-10 apply, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

D. 1135 Michigan Ave. (LSHD) App. # 19PRES-0244 - Rhonda Stein applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a new 22'x22' detached garage in place of the existing 18'x20' detached garage (to be demolished). The new garage will have a gable roof (similar to the existing garage) with 12" overhangs, asphalt shingle roof (Oakwood—color: Driftwood), 6" Hardie siding (Cobblestone) and wood clad double-hung windows. New garage would be visible from the alley, a public way. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16; Demolition 1-6]

Mike Robins presented the application. The project is for the replacement of an 18'x20' detached garage, which is 4" below grade. The new 22'x22' garage has a 7/12 pitched
gable roof, with 1’ overhangs. The exterior is 16” exposure Hardie board horizontal siding. The 3 windows are aluminum clad wood windows.

Commissioners’ comments/question
- Dudnik: the brackets on the proposed garage are not a feature on the house
- Hacker: there is no relationship between the brackets and freeze board

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 1135 Michigan Ave. to build a new 22’x22’ detached garage in place of the existing 18’x20’ detached garage (to be demolished). The new garage will have a gable roof (similar to the existing garage) with 12” overhangs, asphalt shingle roof, and 6” Hardie siding and wood clad double-hung windows. Applicable standards for construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16; and demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

E. 1204 Sherman Avenue (L) —App. # 19PRES-245 - Mandi Wlock applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing double hung wood windows (other window types include picture, awning and glass block windows) with double hung vinyl windows. The windows are visible from Sherman Avenue, and the alley at rear, both public ways. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Judy Ashworth and Achim Steup, owners, presented the application as follows:
- The house was built in 1885
- The existing wood windows are rotting, and are covered with aluminum storm windows
- Will replace all wood windows, except two vinyl windows in the back on a 2004 addition. Also replace the windows in the basement
- The replacement windows will be the pocket windows. One basement window on the north side will be glass block
- On the south side, a 3-pane window will be replaced with an awning window
- They had three window suppliers to choose from. The replacement windows are costume made vinyl windows from Window Works

Commissioners’ comments/questions
- Dudnik: were all three window options vinyl windows? J. Ashworth said that all three were vinyl windows, one offered wood windows also
- Hacker: on landmark buildings, the Commission has not advocated for vinyl windows. Have the applicants looked at a clad wood window? J. Ashworth said that a landmark house down the street has vinyl windows
- Hacker: the idea is to replace in kind. The Commission has looked at wood clad and wood windows. Restoring wood windows is an option
- Itle: the standards are written so that one would repair/restore original windows. The Commission’s precedent is to replace with like material; that means clad wood window, not vinyl, not other substitute material
Chair Simon: are the windows being replaced with in kind windows? Achim Steup said that all the windows are double hung windows, except for the basement windows.

Hacker: the Commission has asked that applicants examine restoring windows. However, because the windows are single pane double hung windows, she recommended the applicant to look at wood and aluminum clad wood windows.

Dudnik: manufactures now have windows with clad fiber glass on the exterior, the Commission should address whether aluminum clad is the only cladding material.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to continue 1204 Sherman Ave. to the meeting of December 10, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

F. 1926 Central St. (L) —APP. # 19PRES-246 - Fredric Gale applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to change the storefront treatment to a virtually unobstructed wall/curtain of glass that allows the architectural detail of the limestone façade to "pop" and have more visual presence. An excellent example of this effect and inspiration for this proposal is 1245 Chicago Avenue that has similar limestone façade. The previously approved storefront for 1926 Central Street included operable windows that added window frame obstructions and mullions that visually compete and detract from the limestone façade. Front façade is visible from Central Street, a public way. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

The Commission heard this item before 'Old Business'.

Frank Gael, owner, presented the application for a revised storefront at 1926 Central Street. The new storefront has continuing panes of glass instead of the previously approved storefront that had some double hung windows. The revised store front highlights the architecture of the building and its limestone base.

Commissioners' Findings:

Commissioner Vogel made a motion to approve the COA for the proposed storefront as revised, as meeting standards of alteration 1-10, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed 7-0.

G. 320 Greenwood St. (L/LSHD) —App # 19PRES-0242 - John Holbert applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to restore existing windows, install six new windows, replace roof cedar shingles with fiber/glass asphalt shingles, construct a wrap-around porch to the rear of the house, a platform lift, adding a roof overhang from the platform lift to two rear doors, and construct a low 32" wall in the front screen porch and face that with beaded board. Visible from Greenwood St and the side alley to the east. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10; Construction 1, 2, 7, and 9-15]

John Holbert presented the application as follows:

- The house was relocated in 1889 to the existing location as a small cottage. It
was renovated and added in the late 1800s, and again at the rear and side screen porch in the 1940s

- The work includes restoring the exterior, replacing the roof, and adding the rear deck with an overhang and the residential lift onto the rear
- The exterior would be restored, and the windows renovated
- One window will be altered on the west elevation. All new windows will match the dimensions and style of existing windows
- A kitchen window on the rear elevation will be relocated
- On the west elevation, raise the sill 6’ of 2 dormer windows
- Replace the roof cedar shingles with architectural grade asphalt shingles. Also all copper gutters and flashing
- Building the wrap-around porch to unify the back of the house and a residential lift. The material on the porch is all wood
- At the side screened porch, replace the metal screens with wood screens, and a 32” knew wall and replace the wood frame screen panel
- The front stairs will be replaced in kind with additional 42” for the landing

Commissioners’ comments/questions:
- Hacker: was concerned with replacing a cedar shingle roof on a landmark house with asphalt shingles
- Chair Simon: the roof cedar shingles are very integral to the appearance of the house. Adam Klinger, owner, said that the cedar shingles issue is a significant economic issue. J. Holbert said that the highest grade asphalt shingles cost $29,000 and it goes to $53,000 with cedar shingles
- Sullivan: the cedar shingles are a significant historic feature of the landmark house
- Chair Simon: the Commission would consider approving the application, excluding the replacement of the roof cedar shingles. A. Klinger agreed to come back later for the roof replacement. J. Holbert confirmed that the application does not include the roof.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 320 Greenwood St. to restore the existing windows, to install six new windows, to construct the wrap-around porch to the rear of the house, a platform lift, adding an overhang from the platform lift to two rear doors, and to construct the low wall in the front screen porch and face that with beaded board. Alteration standards 1-10, and construction standards 1, 2, 7, and 9-15 apply, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of October 1, 2019.

Commissioner Itle made a motion to approve the minutes of October 1, 2019 meeting as corrected by staff, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.
5. **STAFF REPORTS** (Items A and B were discussed at the beginning of the meeting)

A. **Preservation and Sustainability Collaboration**  
(Kumar Jensen, Chief Sustainability and Resilience Officer, and Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

B. **Alderman Robin Rue Simmons, 5th Ward, referral to EPC to work on the 1995 initiative:** “Preserving Integrity Through Culture and History” (PITCH) for cultural landmarking, honoring some businesses and other historically significant sites in the 5th Ward.

C. **2020 EPC Meeting Dates**

Carlos Ruiz said the 2020 Preservation Commission meetings are scheduled on the first Tuesday of the month. Commissioner Itle made a motion to approve the proposed roster of meeting dates for 2020, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

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

A. **2020 EPC Nomination of EPC Officers**

Carlos Ruiz said that the nomination and election of Preservation Commission Officers for 2020 will be for consideration and vote on the December 10, 2019 meeting agenda.

B. **Design Guidelines Update**

Carlos Ruiz said he will provide an update at the December 10, 2019 meeting.

C. **2020 Preservation Commission Retreat**

Carlos Ruiz said that after a conversation with Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development, the Commission should plan for a retreat in January or February 2020. He included in the packet the Preservation Ordinance. Educational programs such as PITCH, CAMP, and solar installation and sustainability.

Commissioner Hacker said that the Commission needs to discuss the window issue. The Commission needs to discuss things that it has not done as a group. Chair Simon said that he would like the Commission to discuss things that the Commission has a hard time tackling, such as new construction which can be be very subjective. Chair Simon asked all to bring ideas to the December 10, 2019 meeting.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 pm on Tuesday, November 12, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, December 10, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)

Respectfully submitted:

Carlos D. Ruiz  
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator.