

Adopted on July 7, 2025

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MAY 5, 2025 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 comments were made at this time. Mr. Marx noted no additional public comment was received.

Approval of April 7, 2025 Meeting Minutes.

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments or corrections or for a motion to approve the April 7, 2025 meeting minutes. A motion to approve the April 7, 2025 meeting minutes 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, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver

NAYS: None

Demolition Permit Applications:

a. **Case No. 25-07-HPC - 829 Foxdale Avenue: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the single-family residence at 829 Foxdale Avenue.**

Mr. Marx identified the property owners, its location, size and zoning classification with a construction date of 1921 with subsequent alterations and additions. He stated the property does not appear on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing. Mr. Marx stated the Historical Society indicated that the property did not have architectural and historical significance and asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

Chip Hackley, Hackley & Associates, described the request as straightforward identified the property owners who would like to remove the current home and expand their own home. He stated the home is in its original condition and has not had any interior improvements although the home is not in good condition.

Chairman Coladarci asked if the home expansion would result in the home being much larger than others on the street. Mr. Hackley explained the applicant's plans to expand their home and garage. Mr. Weaver asked if the lots would be later consolidated. Mr. Hackley confirmed that is correct. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Coladarci asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then called the matter in for discussion.

1 Chairman Coladarci asked the Commission Members if they felt the home merited an HAIS. Mr. Enck responded it
 2 did not based on the Historical Society’s findings. Ms. Papoutsis agreed with Mr. Enck’s comment. Mr. Weaver
 3 referred to the neighbor’s drainage and flooding issues which were raised. Mr. Marx informed the Commission
 4 that neighbor provided correspondence as part of the application and noted drainage and grading issues are
 5 subject to the Village permit process. Mr. Hackley provided additional information with regard to their application
 6 process to the Commission.

7
 8 Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to approve the demolition request for 829 Foxdale without delay. A
 9 motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was made by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken
 10 and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

11 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver
 12 NAYS: None

13
 14 **Historical Architectural Impact Studies (HAIS):**

15 **a. Case No. 25-03-HPC - 326 Ridge Avenue: Review of the Historic Architectural Impact Study (HAIS)**
 16 **attached to the demolition permit for the single-family residence and coach house at 326 Ridge Avenue.**

17 Mr. Marx provided a summary of the application to the Commission. He stated the HAIS author, Jean Guarino, is
 18 available to answer questions although there has been no PowerPoint to be presented. Mr. Marx asked if there
 19 were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

20
 21 Jean Guarino began by stating that the home has exceptional local and architectural significance and described it
 22 as a rare and well-preserved example of an Italianate style home. She identified 11 other homes from the 1850-
 23 1880 time period, only two of which were built in this Italian style. Ms. Guarino then described the home’s unique
 24 features and stated it is one of the oldest homes in the Village and one of only three remaining homes in the
 25 Village built by John Dale, a prominent Village resident. She then asked if there were any questions.

26
 27 Chairman Coladarci referred to the comments made that the home has outlived its usefulness and asked for Ms.
 28 Guarino’s comment. Ms. Guarino responded it is rare to find a home from this time period in Chicago overall and
 29 that it has been a visual landmark in the neighborhood for 150 years. She then described some of the home’s
 30 significant features noting the home has not been significantly altered. Mr. Weaver described the HAIS as very
 31 thorough and the Commission Members agreed.

32
 33 Chairman Coladarci asked for public comment. No public comments were made at this time.

34
 35 The applicant, Jackie Magner, informed the Commission they considered renovating the home but found it
 36 functionally obsolete and that it would be cost prohibitive. She noted no public comment was received. Chairman
 37 Coladarci explained the Commission’s position to the applicant. Edward Deegan, the architect, explained the
 38 reasons in detail as to why the home could not be renovated which included foundation issues.

39
 40 Ms. Papoutsis asked the applicants if they were aware of the home’s history. Mr. Deegan responded they realized
 41 it would be a challenge and identified other rehabbed homes they have worked on. The Commission Members and
 42 the applicants discussed the reasons why renovation would not work. No additional comments were made at this
 43 time.

44
 45 Chairman Coladarci asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then called the matter in
 46 for discussion.

47
 48 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to find the HAIS complete. A motion to find the HAIS complete was made
 49 by Mr. Enck and seconded by Mr. Weaver. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

50 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver
 51 NAYS: None

52
 53

1 Chairman Coladarci asked the Commission Members if a demolition delay should be imposed. Mr. Weaver advised
2 the applicants that a demolition delay would hopefully allow them to reach a different outcome. Ms. Papoutsis
3 referred to the fact it is one of the oldest homes in the Village which is in decent shape and a great example of
4 Italianate architecture. She agreed with Mr. Weaver’s comments and referred to the Historical Society’s comments
5 and that it would be difficult to not impose a demolition delay. Mr. Enck agreed with the comments made and
6 added it is difficult to see this type of request. He also stated there is a lack of buildable lots in the Village with
7 teardowns being wasteful from an environmental and historical standpoint. Mr. Enck also stated the Village’s
8 history is being wiped away and added the home is in good shape compared to other historical homes that were
9 torn down. Mr. Stuart agreed with the comments made and described the home as charming and unique and it
10 would be difficult to recreate that. He also described the home as a great example of a home that has been part of
11 the Village that would go away.

12
13 Chairman Coladarci described the request as an unbelievably difficult case with the applicants’ original intent being
14 to keep the home. He explained the difficulty of maintaining an older home. Chairman Coladarci then stated while
15 the home met all the requirements of imposing a demolition delay, he questioned what a delay would accomplish
16 in terms of changing the outcome. Chairman Coladarci referred to their ordinance and that the Commission is the
17 last part of the demolition review process. He concluded that while he agreed with the Commission Members’
18 comments, a demolition delay would not accomplish anything other than being punitive to the applicants. The
19 Commission Members continued to discuss their positions in detail.

20
21 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to not issue a demolition delay and approve the demolition permit
22 immediately. No motion was made. He then asked for a motion to impose a 270-day demolition delay. A motion as
23 stated by Chairman Coladarci was made by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Papoutsis. A vote was taken and the
24 motion passed, 4 to 1:

25 AYES: Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver
26 NAYS: Coladarci

27
28 Mr. Marx asked the Commission Members for the standards to be identified. The Commission Members then
29 identified the standards in connection with the demolition delay. The building or structure is considered to be
30 historically or architecturally significant as it meets the following standards: (1) the structure exhibits a high quality
31 of architectural design without regard to the time built or historic associations, (2) the structure exhibits a high
32 quality of architectural design that is not the result of a change or a series of changes in the original structure, (3)
33 the structure exemplifies an architectural style, construction technique or building type once common in the
34 Village and (4) the structure exhibits an unusual, distinctive or eccentric design or construction technique that
35 contributes to the architectural interest of its environs as an accent or counterpart.

36
37 The Commission Members then discussed the applicable standards. The Commission Members found that the
38 proposed demolition will have a significant negative architectural or historical impact on either the Village as a
39 whole or on the immediate neighborhood due to the following architecturally or historically significant aspects of
40 the structure: (1) the Italianate architectural style of the house, (2) the well-preserved condition of the property,
41 (3) the age of the home and rarity of other homes from that era, (4) the integrity and intactness of the home’s
42 original design and (5) lack of significant alterations to the interior and exterior of the structure. It was also
43 determined that preservation alternatives to the demolition of the structure include: (1) selling the property to a
44 preservation-minded buyer with knowledge of the difficulty and expense of saving the home and (2) remodel or
45 adaddition to the existing home with use of the GFA bonus option.

46
47 Chairman Coladarci then stated based upon these findings, demolition must be delayed for a period of up to 270
48 days from March 3, 2025, in order to explore alternatives to total demolition and demolition of the structure may
49 not occur prior to November 28, 2025. He then asked for a motion. A motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was
50 made and the motion was seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 4 to 1:

51 AYES: Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver
52 NAYS: Coladarci

53

1 **Other Business:**

2 a. June 2, 2025 Regular Meeting - Quorum Check

3 Mr. Marx indicated there may not be a June meeting due items although the landmark preservation awards are
4 normally reviewed in June. The Commission Members decided to review nominations at the July meeting.

5
6 b. Monthly Communications For Historic Preservation Commission - Discussion and Content Decision

7 Mr. Weaver advised the Commission Members he is still working on the proposed submission for the quarterly
8 report. Ms. Papoutsis suggested combining the children’s architectural activities with the submission which she
9 would draft. Mr. Marx confirmed these two items would be addressed at their next meeting. Mr. Enck identified an
10 architecturally and historical home which would be listed on the market soon with the goal to find a preservation
11 buyer and questioned whether this would be the appropriate forum to get the word out. The Commission
12 Members discussed options in terms of getting the word out. Trustee Bob Myers was in public attendance and
13 provided information to the Commission on where sellers’ information can be provided in connection with older
14 homes. The Commission Members discussed options in detail as well as past discussions regarding surveying and
15 documenting homes.

16
17 Chairman Coladarci referred to Laura Good’s service recognition and Commission tenure being acknowledged. Mr.
18 Marx confirmed he would discuss it with the Village Director.

19
20 c. IDOT Improvements to Willow Road - Schmidt-Burnham Log House and Crow Island School

21 Mr. Marx provided an update to the Commission and identified the request from IDOT for a form of public
22 comment to provide feedback with regard to proposed improvements along Willow Road. Trustee Myers provided
23 additional information to the Commission. Mr. Marx confirmed the Commission’s comment would be that the
24 Commission did not believe that the project would have an adverse effect on either property.

25
26 No additional business was discussed at this time.

27
28 **Adjournment:**

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

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

32 NAYS: None

33
34 The meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

35
36 Respectfully submitted,

37
38 Antionette Johnson

39 Recording Secretary

40