

Adopted on August 5, 2024

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
JUNE 3, 2024, MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present:

Jack Coladarci, Chairman
Chris Enck
Laura Good
Beth Ann Papoutsis

Members Absent:

Joseph Stuart
Paul Weaver

Non-Voting Members Present:

Kim Handler

Junior Commissioner Present:

Louis Zaranski

Village Staff:

David Schoon, Director of Community Development
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Coladarci called the meeting to order at 7:12 p.m.

Public Comment

No public comment was made at this time. Mr. Marx noted no additional public comment was received other than that on the agenda.

Approval of Minutes:

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments or corrections or for a motion to approve the May 6, 2024, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the May 6, 2024, minutes was made by Ms. Papoutsis and seconded by Ms. Good. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

Demolition Permit Applications:

a. Case No. 24-09-LPC - 338 Linden Street: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the single-family residence at 338 Linden Street.

Mr. Marx identified the applicant, the property's location, zoning classification, size and 1959 construction date. He stated the property is not on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the Historical Society stated the home does not have architectural or historical significance. Mr. Marx noted no written comment was received and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Enck referred to page nos. 8 and 11 of the plat and aerial illustrations and questioned if there are three different lots. Mr. Marx responded it is not clear as to why the lots are split in this manner. He confirmed there is no planned consolidation, and the applicant can speak further to the status. Mr. Marx added the Sanborn map dated to 1938 and provided further information as to the existing home's construction date which may have been a previous structure. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Doug Reynolds introduced himself as the architect and builder and explained the reasoning why the home could not be rehabbed. He stated the home was neglected, had water damage and had not been maintained for many years. Mr. Reynolds indicated the home may have been occupied within the last year and informed the Commission the home was listed on the MLS. He confirmed a new home would be built and there would not be a lot consolidation. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Coladarci asked the Commission if they felt the home warranted an HAIS or for a motion to grant the demolition permit application for 338 Linden Street. A motion to approve the demolition permit was made by Mr. Enck based on the Historical Society's recommendations. Ms. Good seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

Historical Architectural Impact Studies (HAIS):

a. Case No. 23-21-LPC - 445 Sheridan Road: Review of the Historic and Architectural Impact Study (HAIS) attached to the demolition permit for the single-family residence at 445 Sheridan Road.

Mr. Marx provided an update on the Commission's recommendation to require an HAIS which was provided by McGuire Igleski & Associates on behalf of the applicant. He stated the Historical Society found the HAIS to be complete and agreed with the assessment that the home has architectural and historical significance. Mr. Marx noted two written comments relating to the demolition permit application were received following the February 5, 2024, meeting and the applicant is present to answer any questions. He identified the written comments as the staff report's last attachment.

Chairman Coladarci referred to the social media commentary relating to the application and asked if there were any questions. Mr. Enck asked if there were other approval steps being taken by the Village concurrently with the application which would affect the Commission's review. Mr. Marx responded there are not.

Vijay Kotte introduced himself as the property owner on behalf of 445 Sheridan LLC and as a current Winnetka resident. Chairman Coladarci asked Mr. Kotte to explain his knowledge of the property's historical and architectural significance. Mr. Kotte provided a summary of their admiration of the property and the previous owner's history. He indicated certain sections had been remodeled and described the amount of updates done to the home. Mr. Kotte confirmed they initially considered remodeling the home to live in it and described the bluff's condition and confirmed they had not considered the historical or architectural community impact until the HAIS was requested. He also confirmed they met with lakefront neighbors regarding their intentions with not a lot of resulting commentary. Mr. Kotte stated they agreed with the HAIS' conclusions.

Ms. Good asked Mr. Kotte if they considered other lakefront property. Mr. Kotte responded he had previously informed the Commission they looked in Winnetka since they wanted to remain in the Village as well as in Kenilworth and Glencoe. He stated their primary reason for the lot selection was their desire to remain in Winnetka and reiterated their initial intention to rehab the home. Mr. Kotte stated they realized following the inspection it would not be feasible to rehab the home. He added they are committed to the property and confirmed they have not spoken to the press. Mr. Kotte stated they learned a lot about the home's prior owners after reviewing the HAIS and they are willing to help salvage any significant items for the Village. He described in detail the amount of work required to repair and update the home.

Chairman Coladarci described the home as the most iconic home in the Village and stated the Commission's job is to save iconic historic homes. He questioned whether something can be done to at least save the home's exterior. Mr. Enck asked Mr. Kotte what made the home not possible to work for his family. Mr. Kotte described the narrow footprint, inadequate floor plan and subsequent additions as well as the difficulties to add on to the home due to the steep slope ordinance. Ms. Good asked Mr. Kotte if he would consider selling to someone else due to the bluff regulation limitations. Mr. Kotte responded they are committed to the home and are not considering other alternatives.

Trustee Handler referred to a previous instance where a demolition application was withdrawn, and the home was restored after a sale to a new owner. She also stated the applicant should have realized the property's difficulties prior to its purchase. Mr. Kotte reiterated their commitment to the home. Mr. Enck stated there is always a solution as opposed to demolition and commented on the demolition's historical effect on the community and referred to several successful rehabilitation examples. Mr. Kotte described in detail several areas where the leaks

1 occurred as well as his prior comments relating to lake views from the home. He then referred to the amount of
2 time the home was listed on the MLS with no interest and the amount of money they have spent maintaining the
3 home in its current condition.

4
5 Chairman Coladarci explained the Commission's role and position in detail in terms of saving historic homes.

6
7 Michael Herschenson introduced himself as the applicant's architect. Ms. Good asked Mr. Hirschensen if he agreed
8 with the HAIS' findings relating to the home's style. Mr. Herschenson referred to the home's photos and agreed
9 with the characterization of its arts and crafts style. Trustee Handler commented that the HAIS did not appear
10 complete. Ms. Good agreed with Trustee Handler's comment and did not agree with the HAIS findings. Mr.
11 Hirschensen described the home as having a mixture of styles. Ms. Papoutsis stated she is very disappointed that
12 the HAIS author is not present to make the presentation on such an iconic home. Mr. Marx stated communication
13 was made with the consultant. Mr. Hirschensen stated he was not aware the HAIS author was required to be
14 present. Mr. Marx confirmed he communicated multiple times of the importance for the HAIS consultant to be
15 present at the meeting. Mr. Kotte stated it was not clear to them that it was a requirement for the HAIS author to
16 be present.

17
18 Chairman Coladarci explained to Mr. Kotte the importance of having a complete HAIS report on file and asked if it
19 is possible to get the HAIS author here now. He questioned the Commission Members' next steps since they want
20 to question the HAIS author. Mr. Schoon informed the Commission if they felt there was not sufficient information
21 on which to draw a conclusion in that they believe the report is incomplete, the item can be continued to a future
22 meeting with the particular information in question to be addressed. The Commission Members and applicant
23 discussed the opportunity to bring the HAIS author to the meeting. Mr. Kotte informed the Commission they
24 provided the HAIS author with a lot of the information contained in the report.

25
26 Mr. Kotte referred to the Historical Society's agreement with the HAIS findings and questioned their next steps.
27 Chairman Coladarci stated the applicant can ask for a continuance or for the Commission to take a vote on the
28 HAIS' completeness. Mr. Kotte stated they are going to have to ask for another continuance and described the
29 process as very painful. Chairman Coladarci confirmed the item would be continued to the next meeting with the
30 HAIS author to be present and for them to have the ability to ask questions. Mr. Marx confirmed the next meeting
31 date would be early July together with two other agenda items. Mr. Schoon confirmed the Commission can set a
32 special meeting. The Commission Members discussed scheduling a single meeting date for this agenda item
33 together with the July agenda items as well as scheduling a special meeting for this agenda item only.

34
35 The Commission Members confirmed the item would be continued to June 17, 2024, subject to having a quorum.
36 Mr. Schoon informed the Commission that they should advise the applicant as to the specific items to be
37 addressed in order for the applicant to be prepared. Ms. Good asked for findings relating to the home's particular
38 architectural style to be addressed. Chairman Coladarci asked for the home's interior photos. Mr. Enck asked for
39 the Winnetka Historical Society property file materials to be included. Mr. Marx confirmed the historical society
40 information is included in the preliminary review materials and was shared with the applicant. Mr. Enck also asked
41 for the real estate listing photos. Ms. Papoutsis asked for any additional information relating to the stained-glass
42 windows or artists' names who worked on the details of the home. Ms. Good asked for prior landscaping photos to
43 be included.

44
45 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to continue the hearing for 445 Sheridan Road to June 17, 2024, at 7:00 pm
46 as a special meeting. A motion was made by Ms. Good to continue the matter to June 17, 2024. The motion was
47 seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

48 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis

49 NAYS: None

50 NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

51
52 **Alterations to Locally Designated Landmarks:**

1 a. **Case No. 24-10-LPC – 790 Bryant Avenue: Advisory review of proposed alterations to 790 Bryant**
2 **Avenue, a locally designated landmark.**

3 Mr. Marx stated a staff report was put together at the request of the contractor representing the applicant. He
4 stated the changes were represented as being for maintenance and repair. Mr. Marx identified the locally
5 designated landmark's location and stated that the material replacements would be one-for-one with the
6 structure's trim, stucco and brickwork along the driveway. He referred to the 2015 submission with the colors to
7 match what was presented at that time and which he identified as Attachment B. Chairman Coladarci stated the
8 color would be the same and the material would be different.

9
10 Mr. Enck and Ms. Good questioned the stucco replacement which has different variations. Mr. Marx stated the
11 applicant is not available to answer the Commission's specific questions noting the architect has already done a lot
12 of work on the home. Mr. Marx informed the Commission the application did not require a building permit for
13 stucco installation. Mr. Schoon informed the Commission their recommendation is non-binding for the applicant
14 and for example they can suggest certain materials be used. Ms. Papoutsis questioned the durability of boral
15 material for which Mr. Marx provided more information.

16
17 Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission can either provide advice to the applicant or continue the item to the
18 July meeting for the applicant to provide additional information and answer questions. Mr. Enck commented he is
19 fine with the application as presented and referred to their ordinance's limitations. Ms. Good questioned whether
20 the stucco was original to the home. Mr. Marx referred to Attachment B and the Commission can assess as to how
21 it is dated. Mr. Enck stated the Commission should suggest the applicant match in appearance as close as possible
22 to what is historically appropriate and to refer to the Secretary of the Interior rehabilitation standards. Ms.
23 Papoutsis commented the proposal appears that the applicant is doing what is best for the home.

24
25 Mr. Marx asked the Commission Members for their findings. Chairman Coladarci suggested the Commission advise
26 the applicant to match the original stucco pattern. Ms. Good stated there are questions to be asked of the
27 applicant for this type of renovation and the applicant is not present. Mr. Marx stated the Commission has the
28 option of finding the proposed changes are appropriate or not or make a statement on recommending changes the
29 Commission would like to see. Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission cannot vote whether the proposed
30 renovations are appropriate or not since they do not have sufficient information. Mr. Enck suggested the
31 Commission Members provide the applicant with general comments at the next meeting when the applicant is
32 present.

33
34 Chairman Coladarci suggested the Commission Members continue the matter to the next meeting since
35 information is lacking on the specific areas to be articulated. Ms. Good suggested the Commission Members ask
36 the applicant if they have any knowledge as to whether the stucco is original and its original color. Mr. Enck
37 suggested the applicant be asked if the dimensions would match and what prompted the project. Ms. Good
38 suggested positive comments relating to the applicant restoring the property be relayed. Mr. Schoon added
39 confirmation should be made as to whether the applicant planned to use stucco or synthetic stucco. Ms. Good also
40 asked for historic home photos.

41
42 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to continue the item to the July 1, 2024, meeting since the Commission
43 cannot make a recommendation due to questions for the applicant. A motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was
44 made by Mr. Enck and seconded by Ms. Good. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

45 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis

46 NAYS: None

47 NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

48
49 **Other Business.**

50 a. **July 1, 2024, Meeting – Quorum Check.**

51 The Commission Members discussed their availability.

52
53 b. **Monthly Communications for LPC – Discussion and Content Decision.**

Mr. Marx referred to the item provided by Mr. Weaver based on last month's conversation of 483 Sheridan Road and the property's subdivision anniversary and the mansion was removed on July 21, 1959. Mr. Enck asked if a property photo can be included. Mr. Marx responded that he could ask the Winnetka Historical Society.

Chairman Coladarci provided date clarifications to add to the submission. He then asked for a motion to approve the proposed language written by Mr. Weaver as amended. A motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was made by Mr. Enck and seconded by Ms. Papoutsis. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

2024 Preservation Awards – Review of Nominations.

Mr. Marx informed the Commission there are two nominations, one of which he described as a prominent nomination submitted by the 1180 Oakley property owner. He stated the two submissions are in the categories of new construction and restoration with the submission deadline having been May 26th.

Trustee Handler provided the Commission Members with an update for the Farmer's Market table relating to educating the public as to the different Boards and Commissions and asked for the Commission Members to participate.

The Commission Members discussed a topic for next month's article. Mr. Enck agreed to provide a summary for next month's article.

Ms. Papoutsis questioned whether a requirement should be made for the HAIS author to be present for historically significant properties' demolition applications. Mr. Marx referred to the language in the materials and suggested the recommendation can be more strongly emphasized in the future.

The Commission Members discussed the two preservation award submissions and the difficulties in giving an award for new construction.

Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to recommend a preservation award for 1180 Oakley for rehabilitation. The Commission Members voted to recommend a preservation award for 1180 Oakley. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to recommend a preservation award for 870 Locust Road for new construction. A motion was made to nominate 870 Locust Road for a preservation award for new construction. A vote was taken, and the motion failed, 1 to 3:

AYES: Coladarci

NAYS: Enck, Good, Papoutsis

NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

Mr. Enck stated the applicant should be thanked for applying.

Adjournment:

Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Enck and seconded by Ms. Papoutsis. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Good, Papoutsis

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Handler, Zaranski

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

1
2 Respectfully submitted,
3
4 Antionette Johnson
5 Recording Secretary