

Adopted on February 2, 2026

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
JANUARY 5, 2026 MEETING MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Jack Coladarci, Chairman  
Chris Enck  
Beth Ann Papoutsis  
Joseph Stuart  
Patti Van Cleave  
Paul Weaver

**Members Absent:** Anna Wisniewski

**Non-Voting Member Present:** Scott Myers

**Junior Commissioner Absent:** Louis Zaransky

**Village Staff:** 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:**

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

**Approval of Minutes:**

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any comments or corrections in addition to those made by Mr. Enck or for a motion to approve the December 1, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the December 1, 2025, minutes, as amended, was made by Mr. Enck and seconded by Ms. Van Cleave. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Weaver

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Myers

**Alterations to Locally Designated Landmarks:**

**a. Case No. 26-01-HPC - 419 Sheridan Road: Advisory review of proposed alterations to 419 Sheridan Road, a locally designated landmark.**

Mr. Marx stated the application is for the locally designated landmark and summarized the previously approved alterations. He also summarized in detail the proposed exterior alterations for the window replacements and asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Coladarci and Ms. Papoutsis referred to the redacted information in the proposed plans. Mr. Marx clarified the reasoning which related to FOIA. He also identified the window on the second floor which would be blocked out.

Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any questions. Ms. Papoutsis asked if there were any restrictions with regard to window safety in terms of the fire code. Mr. Marx responded there are requirements for two means of egress and an application would be reviewed if a building permit is being requested. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Coladarci asked for the applicant's presentation. Jayden Nettesheim of Dirk Denison Architects summarized the project under construction and stated that they were advised of 14 windows which required

1 immediate attention. He stated the windows would be replaced in kind and they are working with the  
2 manufacturer. Mr. Nettesheim then described the window aesthetic for the Commission.  
3

4 Chairman Coladarci questioned the age of the current windows. Mr. Nettesheim responded that the windows they  
5 would replace are not original to the home's construction. He stated that the contractor initially advised the  
6 windows needed to be replaced and that they did not consider storm window replacements noting the existing  
7 windows being beyond repair. Mr. Enck suggested the steel casement windows may be original to the home and  
8 commented on the difficulty in replacing them with casement windows. Mr. Nettesheim described the process  
9 they are going through with regard to the window estimates and manufacturing as well as their discussion with the  
10 Hopes manufacturer.

11  
12 Chairman Coladarci asked if there were any other questions. No additional questions were raised at this time. He  
13 then called the matter in for discussion.  
14

15 Mr. Enck asked if the applicant needed to come back due to the changes from the previous approval. Mr. Marx  
16 responded they may have to if they have undertaken that entire scope of work and he would have to discuss the  
17 matter with the Director. No additional comments were made at this time.  
18

19 Chairman Coladarci referred to the general criteria the Commission is to consider on page 4. Mr. Enck stated the  
20 Commission is considering shop drawings which do not accurately reflect the proposal and described windows as  
21 being a significant portion of a building's exterior. He suggested the Commission strongly encourage the applicant  
22 to go forward with a final version of what they are proposing. The Commission Members discussed how the  
23 windows shown in the shop drawings compared to the window proposal previously approved. Mr. Enck stated the  
24 Commission should recommend the existing framework be removed so that the windows are not downsized  
25 further and commented the SDL shown on the drawings are a good thing. He also suggested the perimeter sight  
26 lines of the window frames to be as narrow as possible. Mr. Nettesheim provided further information relating to  
27 the window to be filled in.  
28

29 Chairman Coladarci stated the Commission has discussed the remaining items under the General Criteria category  
30 and asked if there was any further discussion with regard to Section 2 – Design Guidelines. No comments were  
31 made at this time. He then stated the Commission would now review the findings which he read into the record.  
32 Mr. Marx informed the Commission if they determine that the proposed alteration is inappropriate, it should be  
33 verbalized in a finding which would require the applicant to confer with the Commission to reconcile the finding as  
34 being inappropriate within 35 days and read the relevant language into the record.  
35

36 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to find the proposed alterations as inappropriate and if so, to move the  
37 matter to the Director. Mr. Myers asked why this matter being considered at this time since a building permit is  
38 not necessary for this portion of the project. Mr. Marx responded the prior review did require a building permit  
39 with a permit being issued. He stated since the applicant mentioned these windows also needed replacing, they  
40 are attempting to rectify the matter in a timely fashion and are working with the manufacturer which is the reason  
41 the request is being presented at the January meeting. Mr. Nettesheim informed the Commission they estimated  
42 they should have a more definitive proposal within the next 1.5 months. Mr. Myers then suggested the matter be  
43 paused until some of the Commission's concerns have been mitigated by the manufacturer. Mr. Marx clarified as  
44 long as an updated submission is provided prior to the February agenda packet being posted, the matter can be  
45 placed on the February meeting agenda. Mr. Nettesheim stated the concerns the Commission raised are similar to  
46 those they are discussing with the manufacturer. He added the most concerning windows are being addressed  
47 now and the remaining windows would need to be replaced within the next 10 years. Mr. Marx stated the  
48 Commission can take a vote to continue the matter since it is not tethered to a building permit which he described  
49 as a unique circumstance.  
50

51 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to continue the matter to the February 2, 2026 meeting. A motion to  
52 continue the item to the next meeting was made by Mr. Weaver. Mr. Stuart seconded the motion. A vote was  
53 taken and the motion passed, 5 to 1:

1 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Weaver  
 2 NAYS: Van Cleave  
 3 NON-VOTING: Myers  
 4

5 Ms. Van Cleave explained her position to the Commission in that they are asking the applicant to modify what they  
 6 have already found and agreed the shop drawings do need to be updated. Mr. Enck further clarified his position  
 7 stated earlier. He also asked Mr. Nettesheim to provide a comparison of the shop drawings against the measured  
 8 profiles when they are available. Chairman Coladarci asked the Commission Members if they would like to change  
 9 their vote based on the discussion. Ms. Papoutsis asked if it is possible to hold a special meeting in the event the  
 10 updated drawings are finished prior to the next meeting date. Mr. Marx stated he would have to discuss it with the  
 11 Director or Jack. Chairman Coladarci indicated a special meeting would not speed up the process and would not  
 12 change the outcome. He confirmed there was no change in the Commission Members' vote.  
 13

14 **Other Business:**

15 a. February 2, 2026 Regular Meeting – Quorum Check.

16 The Commission Members discussed their availability. Mr. Marx advised the Commission Members of the items on  
 17 the February meeting agenda.  
 18

19 b. 2025 Preservation Awards - Award Plaque Update.

20 Ms. Van Cleave identified a sample of the original plaque and provided an update on the plaques to be made along  
 21 with 3-D renderings. The Commission Members were in support of the proposal. Ms. Van Cleave and Mr. Enck also  
 22 provided an update with regard to the Crow Island renovation addition. Ms. Van Cleave stated she is working with  
 23 Laurie Peterson to draft an article to include in the next quarterly update. Mr. Marx advised the Commission  
 24 Members of the deadline.  
 25

26 c. Monthly Communications For Historic Preservation Commission - Discussion and Content Decision.

27 Mr. Marx stated in an addition to the Crow Island article, if anyone had a draft of an article for the Commission to  
 28 review for the next meeting, to provide it to him a week before the next meeting. Mr. Weaver referred to an  
 29 article written in connection with landmarked homes' historical status and the architects and homeowners who  
 30 won awards. He stated the Historical Society also has *The Winnetka Talk* digital archives and he would speak with  
 31 them again. Mr. Marx advised the Commission Members they are in the process of attempting to digitize  
 32 information for the Village's home files. Ms. Van Cleave stated she would suggest to Mary and Megan and the  
 33 Historical Society with regard to holding a workshop for homeowners to find out more information regarding their  
 34 homes' history.  
 35

36 **Adjournment:**

37 Chairman Coladarci asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Stuart and seconded by  
 38 Ms. Van Cleave. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

39 AYES: Coladarci, Enck, Papoutsis, Stuart, Van Cleave, Weaver  
 40 NAYS: None  
 41 NON-VOTING: Myers

42 The meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.  
 43

44 Respectfully submitted,

45  
 46 Antionette Johnson  
 47 Recording Secretary  
 48