

Adopted on April 17, 2023

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MARCH 6, 2023 MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present:

Jack Coladarci, Chairman
Chris Enck
Laura Good
Beth Ann Papoutsis
Joseph Stuart
Paul Weaver

Non-Voting Member Absent:

Bob Dearborn

Members Absent:

None

Village Staff:

Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Coladarci called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Marx took roll call of the Commission Members present.

Public Comment:

No public comment was made at this time.

Approval of Minutes:

a. Approval of February 6, 2023 Meeting Minutes.

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the February 6, 2023 meeting minutes or a motion to approve. A motion was made by Mr. Stuart to approve the February 6, 2023 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

Demolition Permit Applications:

a. **Case No. 23-04-LPC - 1304 Asbury Avenue: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the single-family residence at 1304 Asbury Avenue.**

Mr. Marx identified the applicant, the property's location, size and zoning classification with a date of construction of approximately 1913 with subsequent alterations. He stated the property is not listed on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the Historical Society stated the property did not have architectural or historical significance. Mr. Marx then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Weaver asked if the lot to the east is empty. Mr. Marx responded it has existed for a long time with two separate PINs with the new owner developing the property as two separate lots. Chairman Coladarci asked if two homes would be built following demolition. Mr. Marx confirmed that is correct. Mr. Weaver referred to the neighbors' issues which do not relate to preservation and asked if those concerns would be addressed. Mr. Marx stated Community Development has measures in place in terms of the demolition and construction process to ensure the rules are followed which he described. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Christopher Miroslaw, the general contractor, stated a new single family residence would be built adding the cost of renovating the existing home far outweighed the benefit of building a new home. Chairman Coladarci asked if they considered selling the home and Mr. Miroslaw responded they only considered development. Ms. Papoutsis asked what would be the style of the new home and Mr. Miroslaw responded the home at 1304 Asbury would be a traditional stone façade home with hardy board exterior. He stated 1300 Asbury would be a modern, all stucco home noting both would be spec homes. Mr. Miroslaw estimated them to measure 2,800 square feet noting the existing home measured 1,700 square feet. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Coladarci then asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then called the matter in for discussion and asked the Commission Members if they felt an HAIS is necessary. Chairman Coladarci also asked for a motion to grant the demolition permit for 1304 Asbury. A motion to grant the demolition permit for 1304 Asbury was made by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Papoutsis. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

b. Case No. 23-05-LPC - 1205 Sunset Road: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the single-family residence at 1205 Sunset Road.

Mr. Marx identified the property's location and zoning classification noting the property was purchased by the Village and constructed in 1955 with subsequent alterations. He stated the structure is not listed on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the Historical Society stated the property does not have architectural or historical significance. Mr. Marx added no correspondence was received relating to the application and that Emily Grimm, the Assistant Village Engineer, would be speaking to the application on behalf of the Village. He asked if there were any questions. Chairman Coladarci asked why the Village acquired the property.

Emily Grimm informed the Commission as part of the storm water program, she explained how a large pipe would be installed underground after considering obtaining an easement between the two properties. She stated they determined that was not the best option and a grant was obtained from the MWRD to acquire the property. Ms. Grimm stated since it is a flood prone property, they received a grant to purchase the home, demolish it and for it to remain open space in perpetuity. She confirmed this is the only property to be affected by the storm water project. Ms. Grimm explained how the water flowed to the Forest Preserve and the pipe is being installed to increase water flow capacity. Ms. Good asked if there is similar precedent. Ms. Grimm responded the Village may not have done it before and referred to surrounding communities which have acquired properties in the same manner. Ms. Good asked if they would consider moving the home prior to its demolition. Ms. Grimm responded they never considered that and the land had to be deeded open space. Ms. Papoutsis asked if deconstruction would be considered. Ms. Grimm stated once the contractor is hired, it can be discussed with Community Development. Mr. Weaver asked if the home's interior has been maintained. Ms. Grimm responded she does not know the home's interior condition. The Commission Members discussed prior architect, Cynthia Weese. Ms. Grimm noted there are multiple homes in the area in the flood plain. She stated the grant paid for 75% of the home's cost and not the demolition costs. Mr. Weaver stated the home appeared to be in good shape.

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments from the public. Bill Essig, 1200 Sunset Road, stated he is in favor of the demolition permit and provided the home's background to the Commission in terms of the effect on trees on both properties with the original plan to install a reservoir in the middle of the woods. He stated the proposed plan would preserve significant trees and indicated the home may not be able to be relocated. Ms. Grimm further explained how the project would be take place. She added they would work in conjunction with the North Shore Country Day School addition with a timeline of 2024 to demolish the home and start construction.

Susan Benjamin described Cynthia Weese as an important architect and provided her background to the Commission. She stated if moving the home is not an option, it should be documented and acknowledging her significance is important. Mr. Essig added the home needed to be taken down in a certain amount of time in connection with the MWRD grant. Ms. Grimm confirmed they have a year to demolish the home. Mr. Essig asked to be kept apprised of the construction process.

Chairman Coladarci called the matter in for discussion and asked for a motion for an HAIS. Mr. Weaver stated the Commission would not want to hold up demolition and an HAIS should be done. Ms. Good referred to a community which preserved modernist homes and allowed them to be reconstructed. She asked Ms. Benjamin if she thought the home would fit in there in terms of deconstruction and rebuilding it. Chairman Coladarci stated the grant would not cover the deconstruction cost and the Village may not be willing to pay that cost. He then stated Ms. Good's suggestion can be looked into. Mr. Marx informed the Commission if they asked for an HAIS, the

1 applicant is required to cover the cost of the report and the Village is the owner and questioned how it would
2 affect the project's budgeting. He stated the HAIS cost would have to be taken into consideration in connection
3 with the project. The Commission Members discussed whether the Village would be required to pay the cost of an
4 HAIS.

5
6 Ms. Good asked if there are photos of the home's interior. Ms. Grimm stated they can ask the current owners. Mr.
7 Weaver suggested interior photos be taken prior to the determination of whether an HAIS is required. Chairman
8 Coladarci informed the Commission Members of their options and they discussed their position. Ms. Benjamin
9 stated the architect may not have been documented in other HAIS done for other properties and suggested it is
10 important for her work to be documented. Mr. Marx advised the Commission of their options in terms of tabling
11 the matter until the next meeting noting interior photos are not a requirement in connection with demolition. He
12 then outlined code language for a possible determination for the Commission to consider. The Commission
13 members expressed interest in being able to tour the interior of the home at a future date.

14
15 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to continue the application to the April 2023 meeting. A motion to continue
16 the matter to the April 2023 meeting was made by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Good. A vote was taken and
17 the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

18 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

19 NAYS: None

20
21 Ms. Good asked if as part of the Comprehensive Plan update whether interior photos could be included as a
22 requirement in terms of documenting a home. Mr. Marx responded he would speak to the Director although the
23 home's exterior is the main consideration with regard to demolition.

24
25 c. **Case No. 23-06-LPC - 1087 Cherry Street: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the**
26 **single-family residence at 1087 Cherry Street.**

27 Mr. Marx identified the applicant, property's location, zoning classification and size with a construction date of
28 1955 with subsequent additions. He stated the home is not listed on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the
29 Historical Society stated the property does not have architectural or historical significance and asked if there were
30 any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

31
32 Alan McNea introduced himself as the new property owner and stated they initially considered rehabbing the
33 property and decided to construct a new home due to the property's age. Mr. Stuart asked what type of home
34 would be built and Mr. McNea responded it would be a traditional home measuring 3,200 square feet. Mr. Enck
35 asked if it would be a spec home and Mr. McNea confirmed that is correct. Ms. Good questioned the home's
36 materials and Mr. McNea responded it may be stone, hardy board, stucco or plaster. No additional questions were
37 raised at this time.

38
39 Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments from the audience. No comments were made at this time.
40 He then called the matter in for discussion.

41
42 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion for an HAIS or to approve the demolition permit for 1087 Cherry Street. A
43 motion to approve the demolition permit for 1087 Cherry Street was made by Mr. Stuart and seconded by Mr.
44 Weaver. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

45 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

46 NAYS: None

47
48 **Historical Architectural Impact Studies (HAIS):**

49 a. **Case No. 22-23-LPC - 645 Sheridan Road: Review of the Historical Architectural impact Study (HAIS)**
50 **submitted for the single-family residence at 645 Sheridan Road.**

51 Mr. Marx stated an HAIS was done and the Historical Society agreed with the findings reached. He stated Susan
52 Benjamin and Jeanne Sylvester would provide a presentation and asked if there were any questions. No questions
53 were raised at this time.

1
2 Jeanne Sylvester provided a PowerPoint presentation and summary of the HAIS to the Commission including the
3 home's history, its Colonial Revival style and detailing noting the home had minimal changes. She then discussed
4 the history of the home's prior owners. Ms. Benjamin referred to comparisons of Sanborn maps which showed
5 how the home was basically unaltered. Ms. Sylvester identified the changes to the porches done in 1969. Ms.
6 Benjamin referred to the home's interior photos and described its detailing. Ms. Sylvester identified the architect
7 as Edwin Clark and the various buildings he worked on as well as Herman Lackner. Ms. Sylvester and Ms. Benjamin
8 then referred to the property's various elevation views. Ms. Sylvester referred to Ralph Rodney Root, a
9 distinguished landscape architect, along with Louise Hubbard and several photos showing the landscaping on the
10 property as well as interior views. Ms. Benjamin then asked if there were any questions.

11
12 Chairman Coladarci referred to the neglected landscaping and Ms. Sylvester stated they do not know much about
13 the Challengers other than the benign shelving work they did to the property and did not know how the
14 landscaping came to be in such condition. The Commission Members thanked Ms. Sylvester and Ms. Benjamin for
15 providing the thorough report.

16
17 Chairman Coladarci then asked the Commission Members if they found the HAIS to be complete. The Commission
18 Members agreed the HAIS is complete. Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to find the HAIS is complete. A
19 motion to find the HAIS is complete was made by Ms. Papoutsis and seconded by Mr. Weaver. A vote was taken
20 and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

21 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

22 NAYS: None

23
24 Chairman Coladarci then asked if there were any public comments relating to the HAIS.

25
26 Michael Rauchman introduced himself as the property owner. He stated the property was thoroughly discussed
27 when it was first presented and he can provide additional information to the Commission. He stated with regard to
28 considering architectural plans, they engaged Gary Beyerl as the architect and are designing a classical two story
29 home with a stone façade with several features. Mr. Rauchman stated when they first purchased the home, they
30 discussed plans with several architects to assess whether the home could be remodeled and everyone declined
31 and recommended a new home be built. He stated a number of problems with the home were documented and
32 photographed which he identified. Mr. Rauchman stated they intend to keep the coach home.

33
34 Mr. Enck asked if the landscaping would be incorporated in the new design and Mr. Rauchman stated landscape
35 plans have not yet been completed. He noted they planned to keep the fountain noting the home would be sited
36 differently. Mr. Weaver asked if they planned to recycle materials. Mr. Rauchman confirmed that is correct. Mr.
37 Marx provided information with regard to the application submission date and meeting delays as to when the
38 demolition delay would take effect. The Commission Members discussed the impact of a demolition delay on the
39 application. Ms. Good asked Mr. Rauchman if he would consider preserving the façade and Mr. Rauchman
40 responded he would not. No additional questions were raised at this time.

41
42 Chairman Coladarci called the matter in for discussion. Ms. Papoutsis referred to the Historical Society's comments
43 and HAIS presented noting the home has historical significance and stated she would be in favor of a demolition
44 delay. Ms. Good asked Mr. Rauchman if he would consider buying another lot and Mr. Rauchman responded he
45 would not. Chairman Coladarci stated he would not be in favor of a delay and referred to initial marketing
46 attempts and the property's condition noting there would not be a change in the outcome. Mr. Enck described this
47 application as particularly disappointing and a loss to the Village's history. Mr. Stuart agreed with the comments
48 made and appreciated the coach home's preservation. He stated the Commission should set a precedent although
49 they do not have any power. Chairman Coladarci agreed with Mr. Stuart's comments. Ms. Good explained the
50 Commission's position to the applicant with regard to saving historic homes. The Commission Members discussed
51 alternatives.
52

Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to impose a demolition delay for 645 Sheridan Road. A motion to require a demolition delay for 270 days for 645 Sheridan Road was made by Ms. Papoutsis and seconded by Ms. Good. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

Mr. Marx stated he would discuss with Mr. Schoon to confirm the demolition delay date. Chairman Coladarci then read the findings regarding the demolition delay from page 105 into the record. The Commission Members then discussed the applicable findings in connection with the home's architectural and historical significance.

b. Case No. 23-03-LPC - 310 Green Bay Road: Review of the Historical Architectural impact Study (HAIS) submitted for the building known as Leicester Hall on the North Shore Country Day School campus at 310 Green Bay Road.

Mr. Marx stated the HAIS was presented at the February 6, 2023 meeting for the demolition permit application. He identified Siera Erazo as preparing the HAIS included as Attachment A and referred to the Historical Society's conclusions indicating the HAIS is incomplete. Mr. Marx asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

Mr. Weaver stated the Historical Society found the HAIS to be incomplete and the Commission can reach their own conclusion and moved to find the HAIS complete. Mr. Enck seconded the motion. Chairman Coladarci noted the Commission Members found the HAIS to be complete and did not agree with the Historical Society's findings. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

Chairman Coladarci asked if there was any further discussion or for a motion that the Commission found the HAIS prepared by Siero Erazo for 310 Green Bay Road to be complete and the building is considered to be architectural or historically significant and referred to standard nos. 1, 2 and 3 which were met. He then asked if there were any comments from the audience. No comments were made at this time. Chairman Coladarci referred to the demolition impact on the neighborhood. Mr. Enck referred to the loss of another Otis designed structure. The Commission Members agreed the demolition would be a significant loss of an Otis designed building and referred to demolition alternatives.

Chairman Coladarci then read findings into the record relating to the demolition delay for a period of 270 days beginning February 6, 2023 to explore alternatives to demolition with a delay to November 3, 2023 and asked for a motion. A motion was made as stated by Chairman Coladarci by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Mr. Stuart. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

Other Business.

a. Change of Name For Landmark Preservation Commission – Discussion.

Mr. Marx stated Trustee Dearborn previously brought up possibly changing the Commission's name at the Commission's February 2023 meeting. He stated President Rintz asked for written narrative from the Commission regarding what a name change would entail, the reasons, scope, etc. Chairman Coladarci suggested the Commission discuss the matter and present a letter to the Village Council with the suggested new name would be which is the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Marx stated they would compile information collected from neighboring communities which did a similar name change. The Commission Members discussed how the Commission's name was originally designated. Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission's mission related to historic preservation which should be identified in the name and referred to how the previous focus was on landmarking properties which has been a contentious issue in the Village. He asked the Commission Members to consider how the scope of the Commission's duties can be expanded in terms of preserving historic properties and

1 what has been done in other communities. Mr. Marx stated he would provide the Commission Members with
2 additional information relating to the Commission's history.
3

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

5 Mr. Marx stated Trustee Dearborn previously asked for information relating to items discussed monthly at other
6 Village board meetings. He stated after discussions with regard to how information is shared at EFC meetings, it
7 was decided a staff report would be presented to the Commission and explained how information would be
8 distributed to the public including on the Village's website. Chairman Coladarci stated it would allow HAIS reports
9 to be easily accessed to provide information with regard to a property's history. Mr. Marx stated it would be an
10 agenda item on the Commission's next meeting date.
11

12 c. April 3, 2023 Meeting – Quorum Check.

13 Mr. Marx informed the Commission Members the April 2023 meeting would have to be held in a different location
14 or on an alternative date of April 17, 2023. The Commission Members discussed their availability.
15

16 Mr. Marx then informed the Commission that Preservation Award nominations are now being accepted and that
17 prior permit applications can be reviewed for consideration. Mr. Enck asked if work being done at Crow Island
18 would have to come before the Commission since it is a landmark. Mr. Marx responded he would find out.
19

20 Adjournment:

21 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. A vote was taken
22 and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

23 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

24 NAYS: None

25 The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.
26

27 Respectfully submitted,
28

29 Antionette Johnson

30 Recording Secretary