

Adopted on December 2, 2024

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 4, 2024 MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

None

Non-Voting Members Absent:

Kim Handler

Junior Commissioner Absent:

Louis Zaranski

Village Staff:

Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Coladarci called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Commission Members present.

Public Comment:

No public comment was made at this time. Mr. Marx noted no additional public comments were received.

Approval of Minutes:

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments or corrections or for a motion to approve the September 16, 2024 meeting minutes. A motion to approve the September 16, 2024 minutes was made by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Mr. Stuart. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

Demolition Permit Applications:

a. Case No. 24-18-HPC - 905 Elm Street: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the single-family residence at 905 Elm Street.

Mr. Marx identified the applicant, the property's location, size and zoning classification with a 1910 construction date and subsequent improvements. He stated the home is not on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the Historical Society stated the property does not have architectural or historical significance. Mr. Marx asked if there were any questions. Ms. Papoutsis arrived at the meeting. No questions were raised at this time.

Cynthia and Timothy Murphy, the applicants, and Cory Todd, the builder, introduced themselves to the Commission. Mr. Murphy stated their main concern related to allergies in dealing with the older home and the need for additional room for their growing family. Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any questions. Ms. Papoutsis asked if they performed mold mitigation. Mr. and Mrs. Murphy described their mold mitigation efforts. Mr. Murphy added the basement is unfinished.

Chairman Coladarci called the matter in for discussion. He asked the Commission Members if an HAIS would be appropriate. The Commission Members did not agree. Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to grant the demolition permit for 905 Elm Street. A motion to grant the demolition permit for 905 Elm Street was made by Ms. Papoutsis and seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

b. Case No. 24-19-HPC - 933 Green Bay Road: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the commercial building at 933 Green Bay Road.

Mr. Marx identified the applicant, the property's location, size and zoning classification with a 1912 construction date and subsequent improvements which he described in detail. He stated the property is not on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the Historical Society determined the property has historical significance. Mr. Marx referred to Attachment C of the Historical Society's findings and asked if there were any questions. He added the property would be redeveloped using part of the existing structure while retaining the front façade and other building portions for commercial development. Mr. Marx also stated the request has been presented to the DRB and will be presented to the ZBA noting the project is not a planned development.

Mr. Weaver referred to the neighboring building and asked if it is being altered. Mr. Marx stated the applicant can elaborate further. Mr. Enck asked if the request is being presented to the Commission since it represented more than 50% in alterations. Mr. Marx confirmed a demolition permit is required although portions of the original structure elements would remain.

Chairman Coladarci asked for the applicant's presentation. Mitch Goltz and Joanne Baker introduced themselves to the Commission. Mr. Goltz clarified they planned to demolish ¾ of the structure and rebuild a new commercial building with the building's rear portion to be renovated for a separate tenant. He described the property as landlocked and explained how they planned to retain the north wall. Mr. Goltz also described the variations being requested and explained in detail how the existing building is not commercially feasible because of its age, layout, and physical state.

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any questions. Ms. Baker informed the Commission the previous plumbing business closed and the owners retired. Mr. Goltz referred to several items they plan to donate to the Historical Society. Mr. Stuart asked for details regarding the building's appearance which Mr. Goltz described for the Commission. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Coladarci called the matter in for discussion. He referred to the property's historical significance and asked the Commission Members if they felt an HAIS should be required. The Commission Members discussed the historically significant florist shop application from several years ago. Chairman Coladarci explained to the applicant the purpose of an HAIS. Mr. Goltz stated the information supplied by Ms. Baker is sufficient enough to document the property.

Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to require an HAIS for 933 Green Bay Road. Mr. Weaver moved to deny an HAIS for 933 Green Bay Road. There was no motion to require an HAIS. Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to allow the demolition permit for 933 Green Bay Road to proceed without delay. A motion was made by Mr. Weaver to allow the demolition for 933 Green Bay Road to proceed with delay. Mr. Enck seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

Historical Architectural Impact Studies (HAIS):

a. Case No. 24-16-HPC - 520 Oak Street: Review of the Historic and Architectural Impact Study (HAIS) attached to the Historically and Architecturally Significant Maximum Building Size Bonus application submitted for the single-family residence at 520 Oak Street.

Mr. Marx explained the application for an HAIS maximum building size bonus and identified the applicant, the property's location, size and zoning classification with a 1921 date of construction and subsequent alterations. He noted the home is not on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the Winnetka Historical Society stated the home has architectural significance. Mr. Marx stated the applicant provided an HAIS to document the home's significance included as Attachment A with the WHS agreeing with the report's assessment. He explained the additional GFA being allowed for the home and noted one written correspondence relating to the application is shown as Attachment E. He stated Ms. Benjamin would present the findings and asked if there were any questions.

1 Mr. Enck asked if an addition would be subject to a storm water review or any other zoning requirements. Mr.
2 Marx confirmed that is correct and stated if an addition is proposed and expanded Roofed Lot Coverage, the
3 Village Engineering Department would still hold the property to the same requirements. Chairman Coladarci asked
4 if the Commission had any jurisdiction over water. Mr. Marx explained the Commission's role and that it did not
5 include allowing deviation from any other zoning requirements. He added that the Village has spoken to the
6 concerned neighbor and noted any change made to the property would be reviewed by the Engineering
7 Department.

8
9 Susan Benjamin and Laura Hershner of Benjamin Historic Certifications presented the HAIS in detail to the
10 Commission in a PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Benjamin identified Edwin Clark as the architect and explained the
11 importance of the home's positioning on the lot. She supplied information relating to the home's prior owners and
12 described the home's architecture in detail as well as the home's exterior and interior features. Ms. Benjamin also
13 referred to the home's photographs and asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

14
15 Sarah and Jason Carano introduced themselves as the property owners. Mrs. Carano described how they worked
16 with Ms. Benjamin and Ms. Hershner in learning the home's history. She also described the proposed work to be
17 done on the home. Mr. Carano provided additional information on the work to be done to the rear and garage
18 which would make the home more functional. Mrs. Carano informed the Commission they planned to be sensitive
19 to water issues and would abide by code requirements.

20
21 The Commission Members commented they are thankful the owners want to save the home. Mr. Stuart asked if
22 the garage doors would be on the side of the home. Mrs. Carano clarified the garage configuration for the
23 Commission. The applicants further explained the proposed addition and garage's configuration in detail. No
24 additional questions were raised at this time.

25
26 Chairman Coladarci asked for public comment.

27
28 Tom Glasgow informed the Commission he wrote the letter regarding the project. He stated his concerns that
29 relate to water and massing directing water on their property are on the record. Mr. Glasgow stated he is glad to
30 have the applicants as neighbors and referred to a nearby renovation. No other comments were made at this time.

31
32 Chairman Coladarci called the matter in for discussion. He asked the Commission Members if they felt the HAIS is
33 complete and asked for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Enck to determine the HAIS is complete for 520 Oak
34 Street and seconded by Mr. Weaver. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

36 NAYS: None

37
38 Mr. Marx informed the Commission that they need to determine if the property has historical or architectural
39 features. He also said that if that is their determination, they need to identify the critical architectural or historical
40 features which warrant preservation. He then referred to the findings on page 77 for the Commission to consider.

41
42 Chairman Coladarci referred to the home's specific features including the shape and material of historic slate
43 roofs, the wood front entrance including door and fan light windows, the red brick envelope of the entire building,
44 the window configuration and shutters on the front of the home and two brick chimneys. Mr. Marx informed the
45 Commission it is important to note that the critical features identified for the record are part of an approved bonus
46 and any future building permit would be measured for compliance with preserving the critical features as
47 identified in the approved bonus. He described a similar submitted GFA bonus application for a historically
48 significant home at 595 Elm Street as an example. Ms. Benjamin described how this application represented a
49 different situation than 595 Elm Street and identified concerns regarding roof repair or replacement in the future.
50 Mr. Marx confirmed roof repair would require a building permit and the proposed scope of work cannot
51 compromise any of the critical features identified.

52
53 Mr. Weaver left the meeting at this time.

1
2 The applicants advised the Commission of the roof's condition. The Commission Members discussed trying to
3 avoid applying a prohibitively expensive condition on the property. Mr. Marx confirmed the GFA bonus would pass
4 on to future homeowners. The Commission Members discussed in significant detail the home's various specific
5 elements and materials.
6

7 Following a thorough discussion, the Commission Members identified the following four critical features of the
8 home as part of the GFA bonus as follows: (i) the window configuration and shutters on the front façade of the
9 main block of the house; (ii) the shape and appearance of the slate roof; (iii) the wood front entrance with classical
10 Georgian features; and (iv) the symmetrical opposite ended chimneys of the main block of the house.
11

12 Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to grant the maximum building size bonus including the four critical
13 features identified. Mr. Enck made a motion to grant the maximum building size bonus including the four critical
14 features identified for 520 Oak Street. Mr. Stuart seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion
15 unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

16 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart

17 NAYS: None
18

19 **Other Business:**

20 a. **Monthly Communications for HPC - Discussion and Content Decision.**

21 Mr. Marx stated an article draft relating to the GFA bonus from Mr. Zaranski has not yet been received and
22 identified the December 15, 2024 as the deadline date for the next quarterly submission with the goal to have a
23 draft ready to review at the December meeting. He suggested a Commission Member provide a brief write-up
24 relating to a home taking advantage of the GFA bonus to assist Mr. Zaranski along with a photograph.
25

26 b. **December 2, 2024 Meeting – Quorum Check.**

27 Mr. Marx described applications submitted for 1099 Fisher and 510 Provident. The Commission Members
28 discussed their availability.
29

30 **Adjournment:**

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

33 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart

34 NAYS: None

35 The meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.
36

37 Respectfully submitted,

38 Antionette Johnson

39 Recording Secretary
40