EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
Tuesday, February 11, 2020, 7:00 P.M.  
Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue  
Room 2800 James C. Lytle Council Chambers  

MINUTES  

Members Present: Beth Bodan, Elliott Dudnik, Julie Hacker, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Mark Simon, Tim Schmitt, and Aleca Sullivan  

Members Absent: Robert Bady, and Jamie Morris  

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Manager  
Carlos Ruiz, Preservation Coordinator  
Bryan George, Assistant City Attorney  

Presiding Member: Mark Simon, Chair  

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM  

Meeting called to order at 7:05 with a quorum present  

2. OLD BUSINESS  

A. 1204 Sherman Avenue (L) — Case # 19PRES-245 – Judy and Achim Ashworth apply 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 PVC clad wood windows. The windows are visible from Sherman Avenue, and the alley at the rear, both public ways. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-6 and 9] [Continued from 11/12/2019, 12/10/2019 and 1/14/2020 without discussion] Applicant has requested to continue the case to March 10, 2020.  

Without discussion, Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to continue 1204 Sherman Ave. to March 10, 2020, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.  

B. 548 Judson Ave. (LSHD) Case # 19PRES-0262 - Chris Turley, architect, submits an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of an existing house located within the R1 Single-Family Residential District and Lakeshore historic district. The applicant proposes construction of a new 2-story wood frame single family residence with a 2-car detached garage and coach  
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house. Additionally, the applicant requests zoning relief for proposed building lot coverage of 38% where a maximum of 30% is permitted (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-7); proposed impervious surface ratio of 58% where 45% is permitted (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-10); and, two off-street parking spaces where three are required (Zoning Code Section 6-16 Table 16-B). Applicable standards: [Construction 1-11, 13, 14, and 16; and Demolition 1-6; Zoning Variations A and C] [Continued from 12/10/2019]

Chris Turley presented the application as follows:

- The 2011 survey of the Lakeshore Historic District lists the house as non-contributing
- The house foundation needs replacement, there is no access to the basement, the exterior walls are rotting. The roof, the hardscape, the garage, and all mechanical need replacement
- The cost of replacing and repairing for a 2 bedroom, 2 bath building is estimated to be 900K, twice the market value of 400K. Plus an addition is estimated at 150K

Chris Turley addressed the standards for demolition as follows:

1. The building is not of historic or architectural significance, there are no rare elements, windows don't indicate a specific style, nor are they rare.
2. There is not a cohesive singular building style in the Lakeshore historic district, the architectural style of the block is eclectic
3. Demolition of the building is not contrary to the purpose and intent of historic preservation
4. This property was originally two lots, then split into three lots (33-foot wide lots, where 50 feet is the standard). Then three low-cost cottages were built
5. The building is out of date; it does not meet any of the code provisions for structural, plumbing or life safety. And it encroaches into the side yards. The wide soffits represent a fire hazard
6. The intent is to build immediately and occupy the new building

Chris Turley said that at the last meeting there were concerns about the height and massing of the building and whether there were strong enough horizontal elements to fit into the context of the neighborhood, and because of the small size of the lot, they are seeking zoning variations (lot coverage and impervious surface.)

Chris Turley described the floor plans from the basement to the second floor, stating that they are not excessive. The house is a modern farmhouse, with horizontal siding. It has a broad plinth base with an 8" horizontal band, 6" siding going up with periodic horizontal bands and gable roofs that step back.

Changes from the first presentation: The building was moved back 8-feet, the first floor was lowered by 6", and the ceiling heights on the second floor have been reduced.
Originally, the front bay had one facade, now there is a front bay and an indented front door. South side: indent on the south side of the building, the neighbors will have more space near their front door, and roofs are stepped back. The front porch lines up with adjoining properties. The front bay was lowered from 34.10-feet to 27.9-feet. The second roof was lowered from 34.1-feet to 31.7-feet. The third roof was lowered from 31.1-feet to 30.8-feet. Originally the front façade had four windows, now there are three smaller windows in a band. Some siding was increased to match that of the neighbors. Also, the trim removed from the corners. The porch has a dark trim on the horizontals of the porch.

Chris Turley addressed the standards for construction as follows:
1. Regarding height: By reducing the total height of the building and pushing it back the building works in context with the properties on either side and within the neighborhood.
2. The height of the building is not maxed out and is not as tall as most of the buildings on the block.
3. 20 out of 23 properties on the block have double-hung windows, 14 out of 23 have all kind of windows. 35% do not have divide lights. 48% have large amounts of glass
4. They are increasing the space between buildings on the side yards (5-feet).
5. They held the façade of the building from the street; the front porch aligns with bays on the adjoining buildings.
6. Only 30% of the properties on the block have front porches as the proposed house.
7. 57% of the properties on the street have horizontal siding as the proposed house.
8. 12 out of 23 properties have one or more gable roofs as the proposed house.
9. The have fencing on either side of the building set back from the façade. The real wall of continuity is the lineup of all the facades.
10. Scale of the structure has been addressed in standards 1 and 2.
11. The building has horizontal emphasis with the horizontal siding.
12. The existing gable roof return, the front bay, and the windows are not reparable, and they do not apply to the proposed design
13. Not applicable
14. The block is eclectic. This design fits into the neighborhood, which is a collection of a variety of architectural styles. The building design is very sympathetic to that, it is elegant and simple.
15. Not applicable.
16. The architectural style is very eclectic.
17. Does not apply.

Chris Turley said they reduced the building’s footprint and lowered its height, set it back from the street even further. The footprint of the building is similar to the footprint of the building to the south. They will help to relocate the neighbor’s garden that encroaches onto the lot. The style is appropriate for the neighborhood.
The accessory dwelling unit will provide affordable housing in this area. Because there is a train station nearby, they are minimizing parking issues in the neighborhood. One family member is considering moving there.

**Commission’s Comments/Questions**

Commissioner Bodan: asked about the steel stair with open treads and horizontal railing. C. Turley said that it is a modern take on a farmhouse.

Commissioner Itle: asked about the roofline and the different gables. C. Turley described the front bay and gable roof, the indented front door and porch behind, the 2nd bay above it, and the back roof as it rises.

**Public Comment**

Ken Marthaler of 530 Judson Ave. expressed concern about boarders and renters that are non-family members, and about the requested zoning variations for the required additional parking space for the coach house, the lot coverage (maximum 30%; requested is 38% and maximum allowed impervious surface is 45%; requested is 58%).

Scott Mangum clarified that off the street parking is no longer applicable to this project. The City has approved a text amendment waiving parking for coach houses when within 1,500-feet of a transit stop. That applies to 548 Judson Ave.

Carlos Ruiz clarified that the zoning variation for the lot coverage and impervious surface are minor variations, not major variations. He also mentioned an email from Geraldine Shapiro of 546 Judson Ave. in opposition to the demolition of the existing house, and that the proposed house is out of context with the two adjacent houses.

**Commission’s Findings**

Without further discussion Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 548 Judson Ave. for the demolition of the existing house, located in the Lakeshore historic district, and the proposed construction of the new 2-story frame single-family residence with a two-car detached garage and coach house. Applicable standards: demolition 1-6, and construction 1-11, 14 and 16. Commissioner Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion for a positive recommendation to the Zoning Administrator for minor variations regarding lot coverage and the impervious surface ratio. Commissioner Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion passed. Vote 8 ayes, 0 nays.

**C. PUBLIC HEARING - 2404 RIDGE AVE. (L) Case # 19PRES-0266** - Chris Sweitzer, applicant, submits for a Certificate of Economic Hardship, following the Preservation Commission’s denial on August 6, 2019, of a Certificate of Appropriateness for post-approval alterations to the barn at 2404 Ridge Av, that
the Commission had approved in 1997 and re-issued by City staff in 2000. The applicant claims that returning the barn back to the 1997/2000 approved alterations would result in economic hardship or the denial of all reasonable use of and return from the property. Applicable standard 2-8-10 (B). [Continued from 12/10/19, and 1/14/2020 both times without discussion] The applicant has requested to continue the case to March 10, 2020.

Commissioner Boden made a motion to open the public hearing for 2404 Ridge Avenue at 7:53 pm. Commissioner Dudnik seconded the motion. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays,

Rick Sweitzer, owner, requested to continue the hearing because of all the moving parts that go together in their efforts to restoring the barn, an Evanston landmark. The Commission previously had denied a COA for some simple elements that had been done 20-years ago. The request for economic hardship is tied up with the City’s additional hardships regarding the barn and elements of it. And until the City advises that the barn may be licensed as an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The City has insisted that the permitted plan which was zoning compliant, specifically the deck, must now be removed to be zoning compliant, although it was approved 20-years ago. Rick Sweitzer said he would like to wait until those issues are resolved.

Scott Mangum said the COA had to do with the skylights and windows. Those are the only elements that apply to the Certificate of Economic Hardship; it does not have to do with the deck or other issues with the property.

Chair Simon had asked what the City would do after the denial of the COA. Scott Mangum said the City is awaiting exhaustion of administrative remedies; economic hardship is one of those remedies being sought. If the Commission were to deny the economic hardship, it can be appealed to City Council, The City Council’s final decision could be appealed to the Court.

Commissioner Dudnik said that the City cannot act until the applicant has exhausted all options in terms of economic hardship. However, the applicant is saying that he cannot resolve that issue until the City responds. Scott Mangum said that the economic hardship issue (2-8-10 (B) has strictly to do with the exterior of the building and the COA. Other issues on the property are not a part of the economic hardship.

Rick Sweitzer said meetings are going on with the City Manager, the City’s Attorney and emails exchanged regarding the existing issues, the ADU, and the legality of challenging something that has existed for 20 years.

Commissioner Sullivan questioned how does re-establishing what was originally approved affects the ADU and the other unrelated issues. R. Sweitzer said is all tied together to make it a rentable ADU, which is in the economic hardship application.
Commissioner Reinhold asked if there is a maximum number of times one could continue an application before it has to be submitted as a new application. S. Mangum said that this is a unique case, being the first of its kind. The Commission’s Rules allow for 2 continuances without an applicant presentation, before re-noticing would be required. The Preservation Ordinance states that the Commission shall hold a public hearing within 35 days following receipt of the completed application. With those two continuances, the Commission is already beyond the 35 days of receiving the application in November 2019. Also, Section 2-8-10 (F) 4 speaks of continuances regarding Certificates of Economic Hardship, stating that the Commission may continue a proceeding for such additional time as it reasonably takes an applicant to comply with the Commission’s request for additional information, documentation, or evidence.

Commissioner Reinhold said that the Commission has not asked for any additional information. Chair Simon said that continuing the hearing does not serve a purpose, and there is no new information. He also noted section 2-8-10 (F) 4 which says that the denial of a COA has resulted in the denial of all reasonable use of and return from the property.

Commissioner Itle said if the Commission were to continue the hearing for another month what additional information, if any, would the applicant be providing that would affect the Commission’s decision. R. Switzer said he was not suggesting for another month, but until such time the City deals with the issues that are related to the ADU.

Commissioner Itle said that the Commission’s action is what the City needs to move this all along. The Commission’s action is the next logical step.

Chair Simon asked R. Sweitzer if he would like to present the application for economic hardship since nobody made a motion to continue the hearing.

Rick Sweitzer proceeded to make his presentation and said unlike the Commission's approval of a house in the historic district, what he is trying to do with the skylights and the windows is the opposite, they are trying to preserve and restore the structure “barn.” The barn was a vanishing landmark until he purchased it 24 years ago to restore it into a viable and beautiful structure, able to live yet another 154 years of useful life. Substantial resources have been required to do so while facing opposition from all sides.

Rick Switzer said that he has worked hard and long and at an ever-increasing cost to preserving and protecting the barn. He requested permission to finish their historical vision. In the packet is the case to leave the exterior improvements made to the barn as they exist. The costs have been enormous; looking into the future of the old and beautiful barn with the intent to, one day, renting out the barn as an ADU with the house for a small return.
Sweitzer argued that changing the items would result in an unreasonably substantial cost. “What good it will do removing the skylights on the east side of the roof at a great cost when they look great and can barely see them.”

“Removing the skylights will reduce the value of the structure. The window changes on the west of the barn are also thoughtful additions, making the first floor more agreeable to the existing floor windows. Changing them is a huge cost with little gain. This work has existed for 20 years and it has been approved by inspectors, with the City being aware of the skylights and windows. Water and sewer for the barn cost $5,000. They face economic hardship from neighbors who are harassing potential and real renters. The neighbors don’t want to see the project completed and rented out.

Chris Sweitzer asked the Commission to allow the enhancements that have been done to the property, and thoughtful restorative work on the barn to remain. Removing any of the work heretofore completed would be shameful, costly and unreasonable mistake.”

Chair Simon asked R. Switzer if he had anything to say concerning the standards for a certificate of economic hardship in the ordinance. R. Sweitzer said they have addressed them one by one in the packet, that he was present to answer questions. The assessed value with improvement went up 100%

**Public Comments**

Diane Rucinski of 2354 Ridge Ave. said the problems R. Sweitzer mentioned are of his own making when he decided to change the plans. He has not demonstrated economic hardship. He could be renting the property for $6,000.

Mary Anne Wexler of 1021 Colfax St. said that R. Sweitzer did not abide by the conditions on the initial permission by the Commission. The windows were never approved. The Commission had said that they will not approve anything visible. R. Sweitzer installed the sewer and water after the COA was denied.

**Commission’s Discussion**

During discussion Commissioners made the following comments:

- Commissioner Dudnik: The application is centered on the notion that going back to what was originally approved, is not cost-effective and is a hardship. However, the unauthorized alterations are the result of the applicant’s own actions. The issue is cost of the revisions that now need to be undertaken to restore the structure to what had originally been approved by the Commission and not anything else. The Commission did not impose the hardship.
- Commissioner Itle: There will be a cost associated with removing the skylights that were installed by the applicant contrary to the approved plan. But what effect does that have on the usefulness of the building? Does it suddenly make that room unusable for any functional purpose? He does not see that as a grave hardship.
Chair Simon: The applicant's arguments went to the Commission's wisdom of the decision to deny the unauthorized work. It was appealed to the City Council and the appeal was denied. The ordinance speaks to denial of all reasonable use and return of the property. The City has not decided what the applicant has to do. Economic hardship does not apply.

Commissioner Sullivan: The cost of making those few alterations, to take them back to what was originally approved, is not economic hardship.

Rick Sweitzer said that he thought that the Commission was going to address the standards of economic hardship, and not address that the hardship is of his own making, or that it has been already adjudicated. It is about the hardship of doing what it has been asked them to do. The standards have specific questions that have been addressed, such as structural engineers, architects, realtors, licensed contractors, to let the Commission know what the cost is; including limiting the possibility to rent the building for a much longer time. That is what the economic hardship standards address.

Rick Sweitzer quoted his architect's letter: ... "the work that was done repositioned the barn for new generation of use and gave new life." Requiring removal of work that has gone unnoticed for 20 years seems incredible and has questionable value to anyone. R. Sweitzer refuted the neighbors' comments as not truthful.

Commission's Findings/Actions
Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to close the hearing (at approximately 8:34 pm on Tuesday, February 11, 2020), seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to approve the Certificate of Economic Hardship for 2404 Ridge Ave. seconded by Commissioner Schmitt. The motion failed. Vote: 0 ayes, 8 nays.

Chair Simon said that standard 2-8-10 (B) was not met: “Standard to be Applied. The Commission shall only approve an application for a certificate of economic hardship upon a determination that the denial of the certificate of appropriateness has resulted in the denial of all reasonable use of and return from the property.”

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1037 Michigan Ave. (LSHD) Case # 20PRES-0019 Joseph Kannookadan applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the (probably non-original) window and door which open to the rear deck (facing east), with a 3-panel sliding door. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1--6 and 9]

Joseph Kannookadan presented the application as follows:
- Rear east elevation: Replace a kitchen door and window with 3-panels panoramic doors with SDLs to fit the rest of the rear of the house
- The doors are recessed under the terrace and onto the deck
• Detail elevation of the doors, 3 panels, 36” x 86” each, which is consistent with the other door in the back
• The SDLs are consistent with the other ones in the house

Commission’s Comments
Commissioner Dudnik said that the door and window are original. He designed the deck and that he is familiar with the home. He noted that on sheet S1, the deck is being replaced. J. Kannookadan clarified it shows that the subflooring was done inside.

Commission’s Findings
Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to issue COA to 1037 Michigan Ave. for the replacement of the window and door on the east elevation, with a 3-panel sliding door. Applicable standards of alteration: 1-6 and 9 apply, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays

B. 318 Hamilton St. (LSHD) Case # 20PRES-0012- Benjamin Harper applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace seven (7) third-floor wood windows with aluminum-clad wood windows: one (1) double-hung facing east, three (3) double-hung windows facing west, and three (3) casement windows facing south with two double hung windows. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-6 and 9]

The applicant was not present at this time. Later in the meeting, Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to continue 318 Hamilton St. to the March 10, 2020 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 1314 Church St. (RHD) Case # 20PRES-0021 - John Fultz applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace thirty-one (31) double-hung wood windows on the front north, sides east and west, and rear south facades with double-hung aluminum clad wood windows Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-6 and 9]

Judy Barren, owner, introduced the application to replace 31 wood windows with Marvin aluminum-clad wood windows. Two back windows have 1” muntins; the proposed muntins are 1 ⅛”. The proposed replacement windows are inserts to keep the inside molding.

Carlos Ruiz noted that the packet indicated that there were 14 windows to be replaced, whereas the owner had now indicated that there are 31 windows to be replaced.

Commission’s Comments/Questions
Commissioner Hacker asked if the replacement windows have a filler or if they are custom made. Velimir Lalusic, contractor, said that the inside and the outside trim will remain. The aluminum-clad windows are custom-sized to fit the exact opening. The storm windows will be removed.

Commission’s Findings
Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to issue a COA to 1314 Church St. for replacement of 31 double-hung wood windows on the north, east, west, and rear south façade with new aluminum-clad wood windows. Applicable standards of alteration 1-6 and 9 apply, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.

D. 903 Michigan Ave. # 6 (LSHD) Case # 20PRES-0020 - Peter Dobson applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fourteen (14) wood windows (to include double-hung, casement and picture wood windows) with Fibrex composite replacement windows on the rear east façade, the front west façade and the south façade. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-6 and 9]

Paul Dobson, contractor, presented the application as follows:
- The replacement windows are full-frame replacements, like for like, except for window units 106 and 107 in the back, are insert windows and not visible from the street
- The building was built in 1920. The windows were replaced in the 1970s
- The storm windows will be removed
- The black color exterior is being maintained
- The meeting rail and bottom sash rail will match the existing design and will look like traditional wood windows
- The proposed Fibrex material is more reliable than aluminum-clad wood windows
- The cross-section drawings show a slight variance in the height of the bottom rail, the meeting rail, and top rail
- The existing picture windows are direct set windows, without a sash frame. The new wider sash frame will be visible from the street
- The picture window on the back step will be replaced with a casement window for better ventilation; there is a variance with the size of the frame. The window is in the back of the building by the alley
- The insert windows will save cost, unlike full-frame replacements
- Fibrex is a strong product with 20 years warranty (a sample window was shown at this time)

Commission’s Comments/Questions
Commissioner Itle: Does the condo association have any kind of standards for how people go about replacing windows to guide other owners and keep a consistent look going forward? P. Dobson said that the condo owners are responsible for their units. Replacement is up to the owners.

Commissioner Dudnik asked about window units 106 and 107, why those windows were not done the same way. P. Dobson said that insert replacement is a less expensive application than doing a full-frame replacement. Also, because they face the alley

Chair Simon asked about the window material on the other condos. P. Dobson said that those windows are wood windows replaced in the 1970s and with storm windows.
Commissioner Dudnik asked if the Commission needed a statement from the condo association for window replacement. Amy Remmert, homeowner, and Board President of the condo association said that as far as the condo association, she could have the rest of the board sign off on a letter to the Commission.

Commissioner Hacker asked about the condo by-laws. A Remmert said that windows are up to each unit owner. There is no law about everybody getting the same windows. But windows would have to be same when looking from the outside.

Carlos Ruiz said that the Commission has encouraged condo associations to have a master plan so that all replacement windows will match. He asked why not using all wood or aluminum-clad wood replacement windows. A. Remmert said because the windows are not the original and because no contractor wants to work on those windows. P. Dobson said that Andersen Windows believes that aluminum-clad wood windows are not the right type for the local climate. Aluminum clad wood windows have the problem of condensation, caused by the cold from the outside and the heat from the inside. Fibrex windows don’t have that problem and they look more like freshly painted windows.

Commissioner Reinhold said that that a wood core with aluminum clad window is more appropriate in a historic district than a Fibrex window.

Commissioner Dudnik was concerned with setting a precedent with the Fibrex windows. Without an understanding from the condo association, potentially there will be different materials for replacement windows.

Carlos Ruiz said that the Commission had recently approved Fibrex windows to replace steel windows on a non-contributing building to its historic district. The Commission made it clear then that it was not setting a precedent.

Commissioner Hacker said that regarding the aesthetic of the windows, the Fibrex windows will look very much like what is there. If it is approved it should be clear that it is specific to this property and this project. In terms of a precedent, it is case by case. It would be important that the condo association sets some standards for the windows, so eventually, they are all the same. For preservation, is not just the aesthetics but it is also the material of the windows. A Fibrex window is not diminishing the historic nature of the building because all the windows were already changed.

Commissioner Itle said that the distinction is that, even though it is an older building in the historic district, the Commission is considering it non-contributing, due to all historic integrity has been lost due to the radical renovation in the past, and therefore is more similar to the building C. Ruiz referred earlier a non-contributing property.

**Commission’s Findings**
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 903 Michigan Ave. Unit 6 for the replacement 14 wood windows (double-hung, casement and picture windows) with
Fibrex composite replacement windows on the rear east façade, the front west façade, and the south façade. Standards for alteration 1-6 and 9 apply, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 1 nay (Reinhold).

Commissioner Reinhold noted that, in this case, the standard of alteration #1 refers to minimal alteration of the structure, which for this particular building, Fibrex does not meet the standard.

E. 1036 Forest Ave. (LSHD) Case # 20PRES-0015 - John Eifler applies for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single-family home in the Lakeshore Historic District. The design of the house is based upon historical massing and materials that are prevalent in the Lakeshore Historic District. The house is set back from the street to align with other homes on the block and is made up of a traditional gabled sloped roof with solar panels facing south and front porch to reflect the design of adjacent homes. Windows are subdivided with mullions and arranged in historically-based bays that are centered on the façade. The exterior materials consist of a stone base or water table, with exterior plaster (stucco) above. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16]

John Eifler presented the application as follows:
- This is a renewal of a COA for the design presented 4 years ago
- The site plan shows the new house aligning with all other properties
- There is a 2-car garage back on the alley,
- The house is now 4,000 s. f. rather than 5,000 s. f.
- On the first floor, rather than having a formal dining room, the entire back of the house is now opened to be family space and a bedroom/study
- The second floor has 4 bedrooms and a laundry area
- The house has five gables
- The exterior materials are stucco with a limestone base, standing seam roof, solar panels, and geothermal
- The height of the building is 32.5 ft. tall, the Oscar Mayer house is 37.5 ft. tall, and the Marsh house on the corner is 40 ft. tall
- A window facing south shown 4 years ago was eliminated
- All stucco finish, aluminum-clad windows, standing seam aluminum roof made from 99% recycled post use aluminum
- The solar panels are solid black

Commission’s Comments/Questions
Commissioner Hacker said regarding the new house with solar panels, the cladding of the roof and the panels are sympathetic to each other. The panels are set back from the front, although they are visible from a public way. And because it is new construction, the design incorporates the solar panels effectively. She would support this project.

Commissioner Bodan asked for a slide with the other houses in the block. John Eifler said the block is eclectic with the big brick Oscar Mayer house, a stucco house at the
end of the block, and a block of houses with a mix of materials and textures.

Public Comment
Joel Hammerman of 1030 Forest Av. said they did not receive a notice for the meeting. They learned about the application the Friday before the meeting via email. Going over the plans online, it was unclear to them the distance between their home and the proposed house. They would like to learn how the construction will fit into the existing space and the materials to be used. They will be looking at the solar panels and the aluminum roof. The orientation of the house seems to be designed specifically for the solar panels. The whole house seems to be oriented towards the south, whereas the houses on either side of the block are oriented towards the street.

They would like to have the opportunity to look at the plans at greater detail and bring the plans to the attention of their neighbors, who he does know if they are aware at all of the plans so that they can have further discussion with the Commission in a month.

Carlos Ruiz said that notices were sent to the neighbors. City staff relies on Cook County’s information to generate the mailing addresses.

Commissioner Hacker said the lot is very narrow, to the north is a large house on a very large piece of property. The former property was subdivided to create this lot. She pointed out that this is a very successful house.

Joel Hammerman said this is new to them. The neighbors’ opinions were made very clearly for different plans. He is asking that the neighbors be allowed to fully digest the plans and ask the questions that may need to be asked.

John Eifler said four years ago, the neighbors did show up. Multiple neighbors applauded the design and approved what was being built.

Commission’s Discussion
Commissioner Bodan said she would like to have information about the house in relation to the neighbor to the south, and how it looks from different points of view. Chair Simon said that it is a block of very large homes, and this is a very small lot. The presentation, last summer, was for a very modern home, set far back, to not match at all with the other homes. Commissioner Bodan said that she was talking about the relationship to its neighbor, how the gables are going to be adjacent to the neighbor to the south.

Commissioner Itle asked how close the building to the north is from the proposed house. J. Eifler said there is another lot to the north. There are more 50-foot wide lots to the south. The code allows for 5-foot setbacks, but because of the overhangs the
setback is 6.75-feet from the north parcel, the same on the south, and 25-feet to the adjacent home. In total 21 to 22 feet between the house and the Oscar Mayer house.

Commissioner Reinhold said she was not familiar with the design submitted previously. She thought that the design fits very nicely on this site and it’s a very thoughtful design.

Commission’s Findings
Commissioner Hacker made a motion to issue a COA for the new home at 1036 Forest Ave. The applicable standards for new construction are 1-11, 13, 14 and 16, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed 7 ayes, 1 nay (Bodan).


Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to approve meeting minutes for the January 14, 2020, meeting, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Preservation and Sustainability Collaboration - Update

Carlos Ruiz said that the working group/committee agreed at their last meeting to develop the guidelines for solar panels with Commissioners Hacker and Sullivan drafting the guidelines. Commissioner Hacker said they drafted the guidelines to be sent to the committee next week. Commissioner Sullivan did most of the writing.

Commissioner Hacker said that the next meeting is February 19, 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 - Update

Chair Simon said that Commissioner Sullivan joined the working group. At the last meeting, it was decided that the working group will write an ordinance to create some kind of cultural district/preservation district, starting in the 5th Ward. It would not be a historic district, and it would not focus on alterations of buildings.

The working group collected some ordinances around the country, to decide on having any kind of procedure before building historic buildings could be demolished. After an ordinance is passed, maybe there will be some kind of funding, exhibits, walking tours and the like.
Carlos Ruiz said that after a visit to the Shorefront Cultural Center, he scanned 1.5 binders out of three binders with the fieldwork of the 5th Ward that Anne Earle (Volunteer) had worked on.

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

A. **2020 Preservation Commission Retreat**

Chair Simon said that he put together a draft agenda for the retreat. He thought about discussion leaders, who will do some preparation for a topic. Commissioner Hacker will lead the discussion on community relations. Commissioner Dudnik will lead the discussion on windows. Commissioner Sullivan will do sustainability. Chair Simon will also do public relations. Commissioner Itle will lead the discussion on the construction of new homes.

Commissioner Hacker said that there should be a discussion on how the Commission can work together better, how to be more effective, and how to deal with setting precedent.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Simon made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 pm on Tuesday, February 11, 2020, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos Ruiz  
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator