

Adopted on May 6, 2024

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 1, 2024 MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Joseph Stuart

Non-Voting Members Present:

Kim Handler

Village Staff:

Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Coladarci called the meeting to order at 7:05 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:

Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to approve the March 4, 2024 meeting minutes. Ms. Good asked for her comments on page 3, line 38 to be stricken. A motion to approve the March 4, 2024 minutes, as amended, was made by Mr. Enck and seconded by Mr. Weaver. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Weaver

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler

Landmark Nomination:

a. **Case No. 24-07-LPC – 1207 Whitebridge Hill Road: Review of local landmark designation application for the property at 1207 Whitebridge Hill Road.**

Rehan Aslam introduced himself as the property owner since 2015 and thanked the Commission and Mr. Marx for their guidance through the application process. He provided the Commission with a history of the home's previous owner who asked that the home not be altered or torn down. Ms. Aslam stated the home is apparently is a midcentury modern home designed by William F. Deknatel and provided a summary of the home's architect and the home which stood out as a Winnetka landmark. He stated the landscaping was improved and confirmed little has been changed of the home from it's original design.

Mr. Marx informed the Commission the home was constructed in 1957 with details included on Attachment A and three written comments included as Attachment C. He then asked if there were any questions or the Commission can discuss the matrix to determine the score with final approval by the Village Council. Mr. Marx then noted pertinent information was highlighted for the Commission to assist in their discussion.

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any questions. Susan Benjamin provided public comments relating to the architect and described the home as extraordinary. She also offered to provide the Commission with additional research she performed.

Mr. Weaver thanked the applicant for the work performed on the home and recognizing it as a home to be saved. Ms. Good also thanked the applicant for submitting the landmark application and informed the applicant that promising the previous owner that the home would not be torn down is not a guarantee and asked for interior photos. Ms. Aslam responded he would provide additional interior photos. He added the eave was repainted to be

red which matched the original accent color of the home. Ms. Papoutsis agreed with the comments made and asked Ms. Aslam if he would agree to have an article written regarding the home and Ms. Aslam agreed. No additional comments were made at this time.

Mr. Marx referred to Attachment B on page 28 for the Commission to consider. The Commission Members discussed the various categories to be scored. They first determined the home to be Extremely Rare with a score of 5. With regard to Method of Construction and Application, the Commission discussed this item at length and determined the home to be Rare with a score of 4. Mr. Marx provided the Commission Members with a summary of how each category is calculated and weighed. With regard to Association with Historical Event, Personal or Cultural Activity, the Commission Members discussed this item at length and determined the home to have a score of 5 for Local. With regard to Association with an Architect or Master Builder, the Commission Members determined the home to have a score of 5. Chairman Coladarci referred to the Established or Familiar Visual Features, Symbol of the Village as a whole, Symbol of a Neighborhood or Conspicuous Structure in the Context of the entire Village, the Neighborhood or not particularly Conspicuous category and the Commission Members determined the home to have a score a 4. The Commission Members concluded the home had a Tier 1 score of 68.

The Commission then referred to Tier 2 and with regard to the first category of Alteration and Design Integrity, the Commission Members determined home scored a 5 of Excellent. With regard to the Age of Structure category, the home resulted in a score of 1 and the Commission Members discussed whether the age of the structure should have anything to do with the home's historical significance. With regard to the Alteration of Surrounding Properties, View from Property, the Commission Members determined the home merited a score of 5. With regard to Alteration of Original Site, View of Property, the Commission Members determined the home to have a score of 5 of Original. With regard to Structural Condition, the Commission Members determined the home to have a score 5 of Exceptional. The Tier 2 score was determined to be 20.8 with a total score of 88.8 resulting in the home being in the Unique category.

Chairman Coladarci referred to the Commission's findings and recommendations to be made to the Village Council and asked for a motion that the home met the criteria for landmark designation. Mr. Enck read the findings into the record. A motion was made by Ms. Papoutsis to approve the home as a landmark designation with the following findings: " (1)The house is a distinctive example of a midcentury modern design from noted 20th century architect William Deknatel; and (2) the house is a rare example of a well-preserved midcentury home for the Village of Winnetka and its lakefront; and (3) the current and past owners have maintained a high level of architectural integrity to the home's original design. Mr. Weaver seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Weaver

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler

Historical Architectural Impact Studies (HAIS):

a. Review of the Historic and Architectural Impact Study (HAIS) attached to the demolition permit for the single-family residence at 1155 Chatfield Road.

Mr. Marx stated the HAIS submitted for 1155 Chatfield Road was done by Benjamin Historic Certifications. He noted the Village staff received additional comments which were reviewed at the January 2024 meeting with no additional comments were received. Mr. Marx informed the Commission the Historical Society found the HAIS to be complete and agreed with its findings and asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Coladarci asked how long has the home been empty. Dmitri Livshis, the property owner, responded it has been vacant for 5-6 months. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Susan Benjamin and Jeanne Silvester provided a summary of the HAIS to the Commission. Ms. Sylvester referred to photographs and the difficulty of seeing the home from the street. She estimated the date of construction to be 1914 and described the home's materials and referred to an historic image. Ms. Benjamin commented it was difficult to see what has happened to the home over the years in terms of the home's alterations which had Arts

1 and Crafts elements. Ms. Sylvester informed the Commission they were unable to find out the home's architect or
2 for the home next door. Ms. Benjamin and Ms. Sylvester further described several of the home's detailing and
3 elements. Ms. Benjamin then stated the home has been maltreated over the years. Ms. Sylvester provided the
4 Commission with information relating to the home's original owner as well as summaries of the surrounding
5 homes.

6
7 Chairman Coladarci described the HAIS as outstanding and asked if there were any questions. Mr. Enck asked if the
8 vacant lot is part of this property. Mr. Marx provided the Commission with a summary of the vacant lot which
9 belongs to a different property owner and stated that it is not part of this application.

10
11 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to find the HAIS is complete. A motion to find the HAIS complete was made
12 by Mr. Enck and seconded by Mr. Weaver. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

14 NAYS: None

15 NON-VOTING: Handler

16
17 Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to delay demolition and read the findings into the record. Mr. Enck
18 commented the home is interesting with the home's significant elements having been modified and lost. He stated
19 the demolition would have significant impact on the neighborhood. Mr. Weaver added the home is in severe
20 neglect and is a hazard to the neighborhood. Chairman Coladarci referred to the neighbors' letters in support of
21 tearing the home down and asked for a motion to issue the demolition permit without delay. A motion to approve
22 demolition without delay was made by Mr. Enck and seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion
23 unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

25 NAYS: None

26 NON-VOTING: Handler

27
28 **Other Business.**

29 a. May 6, 2024 Meeting – Quorum Check.

30 The Commission Members discussed their availability. Mr. Marx provided the Commission with an update on the
31 demolition delay for 518 Elder Lane with the Village Council deciding to uphold the delay.

32
33 b. Monthly Communications for Landmark Preservation Commission – Discussion and Content Decision.

34 Chairman Coladarci informed the Commission he provided Mr. Marx with a written sample and specifically
35 referred to the Green Bay Trail. He suggested items of interest from the Commission be included. Mr. Marx stated
36 he would confirm with Josie how much space is available for the Commission's submission in the newsletter. Mr.
37 Weaver suggested information from Ms. Benjamin's reports be included once a year. Ms. Papoutsis referred to the
38 Friends of Green Bay Trail and the work they do which she commented would be good to include in the newsletter.
39 She also referred to the summary she provided of the Historical Preservation Awards winners which Mr. Marx
40 identified in the materials. He provided the Commission with an estimate of the timetable that it would take for
41 the Village Council to finalize the latest landmark application. Mr. Enck commented the format is easily
42 manageable and could be done once monthly and indicated it can be done at the Commission's discretion if they
43 determine it did not need to be done monthly.

44
45 Mr. Marx then explained the protocol in terms of how items can be brought up and discussed at meetings and
46 which can be included in the agenda packet. He also suggested the Commission choose the preservation awards
47 for the first publication with the Green Bay Trail communication added later as well as with Mr. Enck's summary of
48 the stone home. Mr. Marx stated the items list can be a working list which carried over month to month.

49
50 Chairman Coladarci suggested Ms. Papoutsis's preservation awards summary be included in the newsletter first
51 along with a photo. Mr. Marx indicated links can be eventually included in the newsletter or on the website. Ms.
52 Papoutsis suggested information to clarify the entire preservation awards process be included in order to clear up
53 misinformation.

Chairman Coladarci referred to Section 6.4 *"Powers and Duties"* of the code with regard to the duties the Commission is charged with to be included as part of the discussion of what they want to advance. He referred to surveys of the Village being an explosive issue in the past and which would be very helpful to have now. Chairman Coladarci then commented on the difficulty the Commission experienced in changing an applicant's mind in terms of the demolished property's outcome. Mr. Enck referred to the Chicago Historic Resource Survey which contained information and identified buildings in terms of significance by being colored coded. Chairman Coladarci suggested the Commission Members consider ways in which to expand and redirect their efforts. Mr. Marx suggested the Commission begin with identifying what the Commission would like to see themselves as doing and examine the Comprehensive Plan goals compared to what they are currently doing. The Commission Members and Mr. Marx discussed the survey work previously done by student volunteers and Commission Members and to consider how they can get the process of creating such a survey done.

Adjournment:

Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Papoutsis and seconded by Mr. Weaver. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis, Weaver

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

Recording Secretary