

Adopted on August 4, 2025

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
JULY 7, 2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present:

Jack Coladarci, Chairman
Beth Ann Papoutsis
Joseph Stuart
Patti Van Cleave
Ann Wisniewski

Members Absent:

Chris Enck
Paul Weaver

Non-Voting Members Absent:

Scott Meyers

Student Representative Present:

Louis Zaransky

Village Staff:

Bob Dearborn, Village President
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Coladarci called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Commission Members present.

Public Comment:

Bob Dearborn, Village President, thanked the Commission for their service to the community. No public comments were made at this time.

Approval of Minutes:

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any additional comments or corrections or for a motion to approve the May 5, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the May 5, 2025, minutes as amended, was made by Mr. Stuart and seconded by Ms. Van Cleave. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Zaransky

Demolition Permit Applications:

a. Case No. 25-09-HPC - 1385 Trapp Lane: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the single-family residence at 1385 Trapp Lane.

Mr. Marx identified the property owners, location, size and zoning classification with a construction date of 1960 and a 1998 roof replacement. He stated the property does not appear on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and the Winnetka Historical Society indicated that the property has architectural significance as identified on Attachment C with no public comments having been received. Mr. Marx noted a building permit was received for a new single family home and asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

Scott Simpson introduced himself to the Commission as the owner of the design/build firm that is representing the property owner. He stated the new owner is the son of the prior owner. Mr. Simpson stated the basement is located in the flood plain and noted the home has not been occupied for two years. Mr. Stuart asked what is the style for the new home. Mr. Simpson described the new home's style which would be built to FEMA and flood plain standards. He informed the Commission they performed limited research on the home's history. Chairman Coladarci asked if the home could be remodeled to fit the owner's needs. Mr. Simpson responded it could not since the home is located in the flood plain.

1 Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments from the audience. No comments were made at this time.
2 He then called the matter in for discussion.
3

4 Chairman Coladarci referred to the Historical Society's findings relating to the home's historical significance. Mr.
5 Zaransky agreed with the findings and summarized a similar situation for a Glencoe home. Ms. Papoutsis provided
6 information on the home's architect. Chairman Coladarci asked the Commission Members if they felt an HAIS is
7 necessary. Ms. Papoutsis asked if there are interior photos available. Mr. Simpson provided additional information
8 on the home to the Commission. He added they planned to deconstruct the home.
9

10 Ms. Van Cleave stated she could not determine from the photos that the home warranted an HAIS. Mr. Simpson
11 provided details in terms of their plans to deconstruct the home. Chairman Coladarci stated he would also not be
12 in favor of an HAIS although it is an interesting home. He then asked for a motion to request an HAIS. Ms.
13 Papoutsis moved to request an HAIS. Mr. Stuart seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 3
14 to 2:

15 AYES: Papoutsis, Stuart, Wisniewski

16 NAYS: Coladarci, Van Cleave

17 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
18

19 **b. Case No. 25-10-HPC - 770 Cherry Street: Review of the demolition permit application submitted for the**
20 **single-family residence at 770 Cherry Street.**

21 Mr. Marx identified the property owners, location, size and zoning classification with a construction date of 1959
22 with subsequent alterations. He stated the property does not appear on the Illinois Historic Structures Listing and
23 the Historical Society indicated the property has architectural significance with one public comment having been
24 received and included as Attachment E. Mr. Marx then asked if there were any questions. No questions were
25 raised at this time.
26

27 Chairman Coladarci asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then asked for the
28 applicant's presentation.
29

30 Doug Reynolds, Reynolds Architecture, was representing the property owner and described the condition of the
31 ranch home as vacant and unmaintained. He stated the interior is in ok and modest condition and had been
32 changed quite a bit. Chairman Coladarci asked if the home was listed on the MLS. Doug responded he did not
33 believe so. Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any additional questions. No questions were raised at this time.
34

35 Chairman Coladarci called the matter in for discussion and referred to the Historical Society's findings. He asked for
36 the Commission Members' opinion on recommending an HAIS and for a motion. No motion to recommend an HAIS
37 was made. Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to allow the demolition permit to proceed without delay. A
38 motion to approve the demolition permit for 770 Cherry Street without delay was made by Ms. Van Cleave and
39 seconded by Mr. Stuart. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

40 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski

41 NAYS: None

42 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
43

44 **Landmark Nomination:**

45 **a. Case No. 25-08-HPC - 615 Elm Street: Review of local landmark designation application for the property**
46 **at 615 Elm Street.**

47 Mr. Marx identified the property owners, location, size and zoning classification with a construction date of
48 approximately 1895 which was built by Frank Windes and had subsequent alterations. He noted the property
49 received the maximum GFA bonus with the critical features being identified as the wrap around porch and front
50 facing gable. Mr. Marx stated Susan Benjamin and Jeanne Sylvester would provide a presentation to the
51 Commission and asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.
52

1 Jeanne Sylvester stated the property owners, Taylor and Jennifer Katzman, are also present and provided a
2 presentation of the landmark designation application to the Commission in a PowerPoint presentation. She
3 identified the architect, property photos, the prior owners' history, the home's features and limited alterations.
4 Ms. Sylvester noted there were no significant changes to the exterior and identified the home's various facades as
5 well as descriptions of the home's interior. She then referred to the criteria to be evaluated for the Commission's
6 consideration of landmark status and stated their findings include that they found the home to be an excellent
7 example of a simplified Queen Anne with distinguishing characteristics of the shingle style. She also described the
8 windows on the third floor as representing the best shingle wrap around style. Ms. Sylvester then identified the
9 home as being associated with several significant owners who contributed to the Village or state of Illinois. She
10 also stated that the unique location or singular physical characteristics of the structure make it an established and
11 important visual feature in the Village. She then restated the home's architectural significance with reference to
12 the previous findings as well as the window detailing. Ms. Sylvester concluded the building more than satisfied the
13 criteria to have architectural and historical significance under the code and asked if there were any questions.
14

15 Chairman Coladarci referred to the history with regard to the back of the home and asked when an area was boxed
16 in. Ms. Sylvester responded it may have been done in 1920. She concluded that since it is located in the rear of the
17 home, that change did not present an architecturally significant change and would not present an impediment to
18 landmarking. Ms. Van Cleave questioned the condition of the basement. Mr. Katzma described the updated
19 basement which included adding brick. The Commission Members and applicants discussed the basement's
20 details. Ms. Sylvester added the lattice may not be original. Additional comments were made to support the
21 applicants' efforts to save the historic home. Mr. Katzman provided additional information regarding the interior
22 improvements which were done in an effort to maintain the home's historic elements.
23

24 Chairman Coladarci thanked the applicants for restoring and requesting landmark designation. Ms. Van Cleave
25 reiterated Frank Windes' importance to the Village. Ms. Papoutsis agreed with Ms. Van Cleave's comments and
26 commented on the home's importance to the Village. Several Commission Members agreed with the comments
27 made.
28

29 Chairman Coladarci then read the criteria for the Commission to consider into the record. He referred to the first
30 category, General Considerations, items (a)-(f) with which the Commission members agreed. He referred to the
31 second category, Architectural Significance, items (a)-(e), with which the Commission members agreed. Chairman
32 Coladarci referred to the third category, Historical Significance, items (a)-(c) with which the Commission members
33 agreed. The Commission members determined the Rarity category to merit a score of 4, Rarity-Method of
34 Construction or its Application to merit a score of 5, Association with an Historical Event, Person or Cultural Activity
35 to merit a score of 5, Association with an Architect or Master Builder to merit a score of 5 and for Local,
36 Established or Familial Visual Features to merit a score of 5. The total Tier 1 score was determined to be 69.
37

38 Chairman Coladarci referred to Tier 2 and the Commission Members discussed the following categories: Alteration
39 of Original Design Integrity and the Commission Members determined it merited a score of 50, Age of Structure
40 merited a score of 20, Alteration of Surrounding Properties (View from Property) merited a score of 12, Alteration
41 of Original Structure (View of Property) merited a score of 15 and Structural Condition merited a score of 15. The
42 total Tier 2 resulted in a score of 112. The total score resulted in 91.4 which fell into the Unique category.
43

44 The Commission Members identified for the record the following individual criteria for preservation and protection
45 to include: (i) the structure of the house maintains a high historical integrity of the structure; (ii) the property is a
46 historic house in one of the Village's oldest neighborhoods around Village Green Park; (iii) the structure of the
47 house is in excellent physical condition; (iv) the house has been home to numerous prominent residents of
48 Winnetka throughout its history and (v) it is one of the most prominent homes of the Village Green Park
49 neighborhood.
50

51 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to adopt the previously identified findings. A motion as stated by Chairman
52 Coladarci was made by Ms. Papoutsis and seconded by Ms. Van Cleave. A vote was taken and the motion
53 unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

1 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski
2 NAYS: None
3 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
4

5 **Alterations to Locally Designated Landmarks:**

6 **a. Case No. 25-11-HPC - 419 Sheridan Road: Advisory review of proposed alterations to 419 Sheridan**
7 **Road, a locally designated landmark.**

8 Mr. Marx identified the property owners and referred to the narrative provided by the applicant which described
9 the proposed alterations which included a converting a terrace a small greenhouse, adding limestone veneer
10 hardscaping, cast iron railing installations, and a small window replacement on a family room addition. He referred
11 to the existing photos and the proposed greenhouse and window replacement and identified the proposed colors
12 and materials. Mr. Marx noted the window would be slightly enlarged to allow for more natural light and asked if
13 there were any questions.
14

15 Chairman Coladarci asked how much larger would the window be. Mr. Marx stated the applicant can respond and
16 referred to Figure nos. 1 and 3. He noted the changes would be compliant with zoning code requirements.
17

18 Chairman Coladarci identified the Commission's role in the process. Mr. Marx informed the Commission that
19 certified landmarks are subject to a binding review by the Commission and a designated landmark required an
20 advisory review by the Commission with permit approval to follow, noting that the subject property is a designated
21 landmark.
22

23 Jacob Dodds, with Dirk Dennison Architects, stated it was their intent to keep the modifications within the style of
24 the 1929 home and identified previous additions done on the home. He stated the alterations would provide
25 modern updates. Mr. Dodds stated the window sill would be lowered 9 inches. Mr. Stuart asked if the bay is
26 original to the home. Mr. Dodds identified the portion of the home which is not original to the structure and stated
27 the glass footprint addition would be built on the existing terrace. He then stated the home received the landmark
28 designation in 2004 or 2005.
29

30 Chairman Coladarci asked if the Commission at that time would have reviewed the additions. Mr. Marx stated the
31 Commission would have reviewed the context of the existing property although it had recent modifications. He
32 noted the alterations would not be visible from the street. Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission should
33 determine that the proposed modifications would not violate the previous landmark designation. He asked if there
34 were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.
35

36 Chairman Coladarci then asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then called the
37 matter in for discussion.
38

39 Chairman Coladarci asked the Commission if they felt the proposed modifications are not appropriate. The
40 Commission Members did not feel the modifications would be inappropriate. Chairman Coladarci then referred to
41 the general standards on page 105 for the record. Ms. Papoutsis commented on how the proposed renovations
42 would keep in with the home's character. Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to find the proposed alterations
43 appropriate to the subject property. He also asked for a motion to find the proposed alterations are appropriate to
44 the preservation to the subject property. A motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was made by Ms. Van Cleave
45 and seconded by Mr. Stuart. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

46 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski
47 NAYS: None
48 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
49

50 Chairman Coladarci then asked for a motion to find that the property continued to meet the criteria for the
51 designation as a locally designated landmark. A motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was made by Ms.
52 Papoutsis and seconded by Ms. Van Cleave. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

53 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski

1 NAYS: None
2 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
3

4 **Other Business:**

5 a. 2025 Preservation Awards - Review of Nomination.

6 Mr. Marx stated three nominations were received and he referred to the previous concern relating to having
7 negative comments on a property on the record. He suggested the Commission not state concerns in a negative or
8 detracting way for properties which are not nominated.
9

10 The Commission Members discussed 507 Cedar Street which fell under the rehabilitation category. Mr. Marx
11 reminded the Commission Members the home is a landmark which had window replacements. The Commission
12 Members then discussed 140 Sheridan Road. Mr. Marx identified the property owners and noted the home fell
13 into the restoration category. Ms. Van Cleave described the amount of renovations done to the home. The
14 Commission Members discussed 870 Locust Road. Mr. Marx explained in detail the amount of work done on the
15 home and that the home fell in the new construction category. The Commission Members discussed this home at
16 length including the lack of information available and decided to defer the decision on the home to the next
17 meeting or until they had the availability of more photos.
18

19 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to continue the determination of 870 Locust Road to the next meeting to
20 provide the owner an opportunity to submit additional evidence in support of their application. A motion as stated
21 by Chairman Coladarci was made by Ms. Van Cleave and seconded by Mr. Stuart. A vote was taken and the motion
22 unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

23 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski
24 NAYS: None
25 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
26

27 Mr. Marx informed the Commission he would find out who the architect is by the next meeting.
28

29 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to approve the nomination of a preservation award for 507 Cedar Street. A
30 motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was made by Ms. Van Cleave and seconded by Ms. Wisniewski. A vote was
31 taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

32 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski
33 NAYS: None
34 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
35

36 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to approve the nomination of a preservation award for 140 Sheridan Road.
37 Mr. Zaransky stated he would not be in favor of nominating the home and identified his reasoning. Mr. Marx
38 stated nominations are considered based on the home's exterior. A motion as stated by Chairman Coladarci was
39 made by Ms. Van Cleave and seconded by Ms. Papoutsis. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5
40 to 0:

41 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski
42 NAYS: None
43 NON-VOTING: Zaransky
44

45 The Commission Members discussed the preservation award being presented for the home at 1180 Oakley Street
46 at the next Village Council meeting.
47

48 b. August 4, 2025 Regular Meeting - Quorum Check.

49 The Commission Members discussed their availability. Mr. Marx stated there may not be an August 2025 meeting
50 due to the lack of agenda items.
51

52 c. Monthly Communications For HPC - Discussion and Content Decision.

1 Mr. Marx asked the Commission Members if they had anything to be drafted for a future publication in the
2 quarterly report. Ms. Papoutsis suggested 615 Elm Street, the landmarked property discussed at tonight's meeting,
3 be included. Mr. Marx also suggested the home which received the GFA bonus be mentioned. Ms. Van Cleave
4 stated she would look into seeing if someone could write up a report on the historical significance of Crow Island.
5 Ms. Papoutsis asked for her comments to be clarified relating to combining children's activities along with
6 architecture in the May 2025 meeting minutes. Mr. Marx referred to the Commission's previous discussion relating
7 to a home being put on the market and the issue of whether the Commission Members could take the position in
8 an unofficial capacity of sharing the knowledge of the listing with a preservation-minded purchaser.
9

10 **Adjournment:**

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

13 AYES: Coladarci, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Wisniewski

14 NAYS: None

15 NON-VOTING: Zaransky

16 The meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

17
18 Respectfully submitted,

19
20 Antionette Johnson

21 Recording Secretary

22