

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MAY 1, 2023 MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present:

Jack Coladarci, Chairman
Chris Enck
Laura Good
Paul Weaver

Non-Voting Member Present:

Bob Dearborn

Members Absent:

Beth Ann Papoutsis
Joseph Stuart

Village Staff:

Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Coladarci called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. Roll call of the Commission Members present was taken.

Public Comment:

No public comment was made at this time.

Approval of Minutes:

a. Approval of the April 17, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the April 17, 2023 meeting minutes or a motion to approve. A motion to approve the April 17, 2023 meeting minutes was made by Ms. Good and seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Weaver

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Dearborn

Historical Architectural Impact Studies (HAIS):

a. **Case No. 23-01-LPC - 13 Indian Hill Road: (continued from April 17, 2023 meeting) Review of the Historical Architectural Impact Study (HAIS) submitted for the single-family residence at 13 Indian Hill Road.**

Mr. Marx advised the Commission of the status of the demolition application with the result of the application being continued to this meeting. He stated the applicant has since submitted a permit application for site restoration and referred to the staff report as Attachment A-1. Mr. Marx stated the Commission also found the HAIS was complete and the Commission is to make a motion as outlined in the agenda packet. He then stated with regard to the site restoration plan, he outlined the process for any demolition permit with the applicant submitting post demolition construction plans including restoring the site which are to be reviewed by the Village Engineer for compliance or new building plans. Mr. Marx stated the demolition permit would not be issued until both permits are reviewed and found fully compliant with the municipal code.

Chairman Coladarci asked the applicant to comment. Mike Ciaglia referred to the discussion of precedent in connection with the Commission's action and stated he filed for the demolition permit in December 2022. He also stated a demolition permit is not granted until the building permit is approved and vice versa and referred to a comment made at the last meeting relating to the home being torn down and restoring the site with no new home being built which should not be part of the decision process, as well as the statement that the Commission should not let the proposed plans for the site influence their decision. He commented that flew in the face of the Commission and ordinance. Mr. Ciaglia stated his plans are for site restoration and commented any delay imposed

Adopted on June 19, 2023

1 would seem punitive in nature. He then stated the only alternative to maintain two homes would be damaging to
2 him.

3
4 Chairman Coladarci clarified the Commission's charge which entailed considering everything possible to save the
5 property which is deemed architecturally or historically significant. He stated he recognized the applicant's
6 attempts to ameliorate the situation although the Commission is charged with preserving as much of the Village's
7 historic nature as they can. Chairman Coladarci stated they recognize an applicant's costs are increased when
8 demolition delays are imposed.

9
10 Trustee Dearborn asked Mr. Ciaglia if he planned to consolidate the lots. Mr. Ciaglia responded it is not necessary
11 and he planned to maintain them as two separate lots and he has no intention of selling the lot. Ms. Good asked
12 Mr. Ciaglia to explain his purchase process in that it was a private listing that was canceled. Mr. Ciaglia outlined the
13 timeline as how he came to own both parcels. He noted he was unaware the home was an Otis and Clark home at
14 the time of purchase. No additional questions were raised at this time.

15
16 Ms. Good referred to the unfairness to purchasers of historic properties with the Commission having to come up
17 with a method for purchasers to be made aware of significant home purchases in terms of delays. Mr. Enck
18 referred to the consultant's comments relating to a survey of historic homes being needed in the Village which
19 other communities have to identify significant homes. Chairman Coladarci referred to the prior controversy in
20 performing such a survey. He suggested the Historical Society perform such a survey. Mr. Weaver stated the
21 Historical Society has files containing basic information on each home in the Village. Trustee Dearborn stated
22 developers are aware of the process in terms of tearing down significant homes. The Commission Members
23 discussed several homes which were torn down and where new homes were built.

24
25 Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission now has to determine whether to issue a demolition delay. Mr. Enck
26 reiterated his reasoning for not previously voting for a delay. Chairman Coladarci referred to the Commission's
27 options in connection with the ordinance and stated in this case, there is no other alternative other than
28 demolition. He stated a delay in this circumstance would not result in a different outcome and he would vote in
29 favor of demolition without delay. Ms. Good referred to instances where a delay was issued and the applicant
30 decided against demolition. She also described the situation as being proactive instead of punitive and referred to
31 the home's state and local landmark status. Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission cannot make the finding
32 that alternatives are being explored since the applicant stated he would not consider them. He added in previous
33 cases, other applicants had alternatives such as selling the property or not demolishing the home which did not
34 apply in this case. Chairman Coladarci and Ms. Good further disputed their positions at length. The Commission
35 Members discussed requiring the applicant to commit to deconstruction. Chairman Coladarci stated the ordinance
36 did not allow the Commission to require the applicant to perform deconstruction in order to not issue a demolition
37 delay.

38
39 Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to delay demolition 270 days. No motion was made. He then asked for
40 a motion to allow the demolition to proceed without delay. A motion to approve the demolition of 13 Indian Hill
41 Road without delay was made by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion passed,
42 3 to 1:

43 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Weaver

44 NAYS: None

45 NON-VOTING: Dearborn

46
47 **Other Business:**

48 a. Change of Name for Landmark Preservation Commission – Discussion.

49 Mr. Marx stated a copy of Chapter 3.4 from the ordinance was distributed to the Commission and he provided a
50 summary behind the subject of changing the Commission's name. He stated Attachment A contained materials
51 made available for other conversations relating to policy from two years ago in connection with how other
52 communities handled demolition permits and reviews as well as the topic of residential design review which was
53 briefly considered. Mr. Marx then asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Coladarci indicated all of the communities may use the word "historic" in their body title and Mr. Marx agreed. Mr. Marx stated he would provide information as to whether the communities listed on the table focus on historic preservation. Chairman Coladarci then referred to the minutes from 2011 when the Commission was created in its current form. Mr. Marx stated in an attempt to find the original ordinance, it may date back to the mid-1990's and the information is not readily available. He referred to the BRC which was disassembled and demolition permit duties were given to the Commission.

Chairman Coladarci questioned the discussion of calling the Commission the Landmark Preservation Commission and whether it had the purpose of saving historic homes. He also referred to the debate relating to WHO and the result being the Village's ordinance being more limited than others. Chairman Coladarci asked what is included in the package to document a new ordinance. Mr. Marx stated he was not directly involved with that and that it is a process discussed by the various boards and commissions and then sent to the Village Council which involved past staff reports, meeting minutes and ordinances to show what led to that situation. He stated it also involved outside research along with what other communities have done. Mr. Marx also stated such packets exist in terms of the documentation the Commission would have considered although any information prior to 2010 may be harder to obtain since it may not be digital. Chairman Coladarci stated it would be easier for the Commission if they were able to determine the reason for the Commission being named as it is.

Trustee Dearborn stated the impetus behind the name of the Commission is to preserve landmarked properties while the mission is to save historic homes. He indicated some of the prioritizing may have changed over time and commented the education of residents concerning the architectural and historical heritage should be a mission that received greater emphasis. Trustee Dearborn stated a survey which designates homes as potentially historically significant, likely not historically significance or undetermined can be considered as part of the educational process in order to move this forward.

Chairman Coladarci stated they are being asked by President Rintz if there are other things the Commission can do such as providing more information as to what the Commission does and making HAIS reports directly accessible to look up such as their inclusion on the Village's website. Mr. Enck agreed it would be informative if everyone can see the list of significant properties that were torn down and referred to a ¼ of Winnetka homes torn down in the last 25 years. Mr. Marx confirmed demolitions have been tracked since 2000 and estimated the amount to be 700 homes since that time.

Chairman Coladarci suggested prior HAIS reports should be gathered in a single location. Trustee Dearborn stated the name change would put a bigger umbrella around what the mandate can be noting the Commission's powers or duties would not change a lot. He stated they should state they want a more conservative focus on the education and promotion of historic preservation. Chairman Coladarci stated changing the Commission's name and making HAIS reports readily accessible is the first step. Mr. Marx stated the HAIS reports are included in the Historical Society home files and are digitally saved. Chairman Coladarci suggested the Historical Society be asked to help provide digitized HAIS copies. He stated people may then reconsider tearing down historic homes if they see the reports. Mr. Weaver referred to an historic island.

Trustee Dearborn referred to the research done by Ms. Papoutsis and commented that homes are being torn down all over. Chairman Coladarci stated developers have come in with their initial applications addressing concerns the Commission may raise. Trustee Dearborn stated the arguments for preservation in the 1990's have changed with regard to obtaining prior HAIS reports. He suggested a consultant be used to help gather information. The Commission Members discussed whether Nan Greenough and Louise Holland should be contacted. Mr. Enck commented they should stay away from the use of the words "historic preservation" which can be controversial and stated nationwide, the wording preference has been leaning toward "heritage conservation."

Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission Members seemed to agree that the name change would be a good idea. Ms. Good referred to the National Trust for Historic Preservation which uses the word historic in their title

1 and which sees a distinction between historic and architectural significance. She then stated she is concerned with
2 the use of the word historic without the word architectural and suggested the name be the Winnetka Preservation
3 Commission with the ordinance addressing both although she would vote in favor of the proposed name change.
4 Chairman Coladarci explained the reasoning for using the word historic in the title.
5

6 Trustee Dearborn informed the Commission that in 2019, there was a portion of the caucus relating to lowering
7 demolition permit fees for certain homes and to consider other options to preserve homes with 62% of survey
8 respondents who felt historic homes should be preserved. He then suggested the Commission's duties and powers
9 be realigned toward their goals. Chairman Coladarci stated in connection with reordering the Commission's duties,
10 landmarking should fall under item 2 with the next question being how do they do it and referred to whether they
11 should consider what other communities have done. He questioned whether consultants would do it or the
12 Commission. Trustee Dearborn responded it would be a budgeting issue and commented having a third party
13 assist would be helpful. Mr. Enck suggested the Commission consider the recommendations made in the newly
14 adopted Comprehensive Plan. Trustee Dearborn stated the consultant budget can be considered as part of the
15 Village Council budget for the next year.
16

17 Mr. Marx stated the ideas generated by the Commission should be in written form to be shared with the Village
18 Council and suggested it be included as a June 2023 agenda item. Chairman Coladarci agreed with Mr. Marx's
19 suggestion and asked one of the Commission Members to compile a draft letter.
20

21 The Commission Members discussed their availability for the June meeting and Mr. Marx noted a quorum would
22 not be present with the possibility of scheduling an alternative meeting date. Mr. Marx indicated he could
23 summarize the points the Commission Members raised as a draft starting point. Trustee Dearborn suggested the
24 following wording: "The Commission Members believe the more appropriate name for the Commission would be
25 the Historic Preservation Commission with the reason being based on the work that is currently done on a month
26 to month basis that does not prioritize the preservation of landmarked properties but is focused on the
27 preservation on the protection of architecturally and historically significant properties. In addition, the Commission
28 would like to emphasize more education and promoting their work through communities through the Village so
29 that the duties and responsibilities of the Commission are broader than are ascribed by the name Landmark
30 Preservation Commission. Once that name change is completed, the Commission would like to pursue additional
31 avenues of responsibility" with Chairman Coladarci to further review the draft wording. Mr. Weaver confirmed he
32 would compile several paragraphs to be used as a starting point in order to present it to the Village Council sooner
33 than later.
34

35 b. Monthly Communications For Landmark Preservation Commission – Discussion.

36 c. Discussion of Potential Local Preservation Programs.

37 Mr. Marx summarized for the Commission his conversation with Josie Clark from the Village Manager's office in
38 terms of how the EFC meetings are structured and referred to Attachment A which is the EFC's agenda. He also
39 referred to the content which is mostly drafted by EFC members as opposed to Village staff and then described
40 details of those items. Trustee Dearborn stated a difference between the Commission and the EFC is that the
41 Commission has the Historical Society which is used as a resource whereas the EFC forged their own way.
42 Chairman Coladarci suggested links to items the Commission would be considering on their agenda be provided to
43 the public. Trustee Dearborn stated the HAIS reports can be used as a means to get information out to the public.
44 The Commission Members agreed.
45

46 Mr. Marx asked for clarification that the Commission is requesting feedback as to how Commission
47 communications would be inserted as a monthly agenda item in Village correspondence and asked what advance
48 notice would need to be provided due to the voting process and notice requirements. He noted items requiring a
49 discussion need to be posted on the agenda with 48 hours advance notice. Mr. Marx then stated the EFC members
50 collectively decide as to which items are shared at their meetings. Chairman Coladarci suggested the Commission
51 imitate the system the EFC uses. Mr. Weaver described examples of how topics relating to the Commission and
52 historic preservation can be outlined in the content. Trustee Dearborn suggested deconstruction be used as a

1 template for a topic to be included in the newsletter. Mr. Enck agreed to provide a draft and send it to Mr. Marx
2 for discussion at their next meeting.

3
4 d. June 5, 2023 Regular Meeting - Quorum Check.

5 The Commission Members further discussed their availability. Mr. Marx stated due to the lack of quorum, the June
6 meeting would be rescheduled.

7
8 **Adjournment:**

9 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. A vote was taken
10 and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

11 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Weaver

12 NAYS: None

13 NON-VOTING: Dearborn

14 The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

15
16 Respectfully submitted,

17
18 Antionette Johnson

19 Recording Secretary