

Oak Park Historic Preservation Commission
July 13, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Oak Park Village Hall, Council Chambers, 7:30 pm

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chair Christopher Payne, Greg Battoglia, Jennifer Bridge, Darrick Gurski, Rebecca Houze, Laura Jordahl, Aleksandra Tadic, Noel Weidner
ABSENT: Don McLean, David Sokol
STAFF: Douglas Kaarre, AICP, Urban Planner

AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion by Sokol to approve the agenda as submitted. Second by Jordahl. Motion approved 7-0.
AYE: Battoglia, Bridge, Gurski, Jordahl, Tadic, Weidner, Chair Payne
NAY: None

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

MINUTES

None

Commissioner Houze arrived at 7:35 pm.

REGULAR AGENDA

- A. **HPC 2017-16: 1000 Lake Street (Albion Residential, LLC)** – Review the Planned Development application for an 18-story mixed-use building within 250-feet of an Historic Landmark (*Nineteenth Century Club*) and forward comments to the Plan Commission Andrew Yule, Albion Residential, Paul Alessandro, Hartshorne Plunkard Architecture and Donna Pugh, Foley & Lardner, were present.

Chair Payne introduced the application. The historic preservation ordinance outlines three points which the Historic Preservation Commission must take into effect when reviewing a Planned Development application:

- *Evaluate the anticipated effect of the planned development application on the Historic Landmark (Nineteenth Century Club)*
- *Consider the long-term compatibility of the proposed planned development application with the character of the Historic Landmark (Nineteenth Century Club)*
- *Consider the effect of planned development application on the long-range preservation of the Historic Landmark (Nineteenth Century Club)*

The Commission's review is only in relation to the historic landmark within 250 feet of the proposed Planned Development. He provided an overview of the process.

Andrew Yule, Vice President of Development, Albion Residential, presented to the Commission. He stated that historic preservation is important to Albion and to him personally. They agreed that the Nineteenth Century Club is a special building. He provided an overview of the building site. The proposed development is southwest of the landmark.

Paul Alessandro, Partner and Director of Preservation, Hartshorne Plunkard Architecture, stated that they tried to create a pedestrian sense along the street on Forest through the design of the building. The lower portion speaks to the scale of streets. The upper portion is set back 10 feet off Forest. The north façade is brick and metal cladding with plants growing on the wall. The base is illuminated and the tower separated. The mullions mitigate the size. There are porcelain "wood" tiles on the soffits.

He provided a site plan overview. The lobby will include public space and access to the retail spaces. The parking will be on floors 2-4.

Andrew Yule stated that Floyd Anderson of Wight & Company, who provides design review for the Village, supported the proposal, stating it would have a good impact based on its design and materials. The walkway between buildings will have a rotating art wall that will include historic photos of Lyttons and Frank Lloyd Wright homes. They will conduct vibration monitoring on the Nineteenth Century Club.

Commissioner Battoglia asked what the height of the building was in comparison to the Nineteenth Century Club.

Paul Alessandro stated that the mansard of the building was about even with the height of the tower's base.

Andrew Yule stated that the planting wall and the artwork make it so the north wall is not static.

Commissioner Gurski asked if Albion Residential will provide a response to the letter from the Nineteenth Century Charitable Association.

Andrew Yule stated that they will work with them fully and respond to the letter in writing.

Commissioner Gurski asked about the net setback differences from the existing building.

Paul Alessandro stated that they are the same on Forest, and the same as the second and third floors on Lake Street.

Andrew Yule stated that they are going no further west than the existing building.

Chair Payne stated that the Commission did receive the letter from the Nineteenth Century Charitable Association which was addressed to the Plan Commission, as well as the email from Susan Roberts. He asked for the public comment.

Kathryn Jonas, 124 S. East Avenue, stated that in the 2005 Crandall Arambula master plan they did a survey with the idea of creating a historic district. The demolition of more historic buildings could damage the chances of a historic district. Has the Historic Preservation Commission given up on the idea of preservation in downtown Oak Park? What is the Historic Preservation Commission's role in preserving downtown's character?

Karen Brammer, 210 Forest Avenue, stated that she owns the Frank Lloyd Wright Thomas House, built in 1901, and she is not sure why the Commission is limited to only 250 feet. There are many historic buildings within 500 feet. They should think about its proximity to the significant Thomas House. This development will increase traffic that will affect all buildings further north on Forest Avenue. Please think about that and ask the developer to come up with a plan within the permitted zoning that is compatible with the historic character of the area.

Frank Lipo, 535 N. Ridgeland Avenue, stated that he is the executive director of the Historical Society of Oak Park & River Forest, although he is here as an individual. He worked to help create the landmark nomination for the Nineteenth Century Club and he also previously sat on the Historic Preservation Commission for 6 years. This development will have an adverse effect on the landmark. He tries to avoid the "preservation vs. economic development" debate. He personally supports

Transit Oriented Development and downtown density; however, this building is 10 stories taller than what is permitted under the zoning. He would support an 8-story building. The Marshall Field's building height was used to cap the height on the north side of Lake Street to preserve the street wall. The Historic Preservation Commission memo in 2011 to the Plan Commission on the Vantage building stated the following:

- *The height and scale of the building are significantly out of relationship with the Nineteenth Century Club. It doesn't meet the HPC's Architectural Review Guidelines for new buildings based on massing and scale.*

Chris Donovan, 733 S. Elmwood Avenue, relayed a story about how he wants to replace the siding on his house in the Gunderson Historic District with Hardi-board siding so he can paint and insulate and make it "more energy efficient." He was told that he could not because the size of the historic siding is 3-inches and the Hardi-board is 4-inches. If the 4-inch Hardi-board is detrimental to the character of the Gunderson Historic District and the the Historic Preservation Commission can prevent me installing it, why can't you prevent a 187-foot tower that is detrimental to the character of the Frank Lloyd Wright Historic District?

Susan Roberts, President, Nineteenth Century Charitable Association, stated that their organization is taking no position. They haven't been approached by Albion, and she urges the Commission to recommend that Albion monitor their building during construction and pay for any damage that occurs.

Commissioner Houze stated that she appreciates the presentations. She doesn't think the building is in character with the streetscape and with the massing and scale of the homes on Forest Avenue.

Commissioner Jordahl stated that she is also concerned about the massing and height above the allowed zoning. There has been no discussion of the wind tunnel. She is concerned about the impact on historic buildings to the north.

Commissioner Gurski asked if the construction of the Vantage building caused any damage.

Susan Roberts stated no, but the wind has been a problem and blew a door off its hinges.

Commissioner Gurski stated that he agrees with the previous comments. It is a beautiful building in comparison to Vantage.

Commissioner Battoglia asked about the Commission's review of the Vantage building.

Planner Kaarre stated that when the Vantage building went through the Planned Development process originally the Nineteenth Century Club was not yet designated a historic landmark. It was designated in 2010. In 2011 Vantage went through some design changes, which did then require an amendment to the Planned Development and subsequently review by the Historic Preservation Commission, who provided comments to the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Battoglia applauded the design which breaks down the building and the façade. This would be a good opportunity to bread down in scale even more.

Commissioner Weidner echoed the public comments in terms of scale and massing in relation to the Nineteenth Century Club.

Commissioner Engle stated that he had the same comments as the other commissioners, and agreed about the wind tunnel.

Commissioner Tadic stated that she loves the architecture of the building; she just wishes it was somewhere else. It would be preferable to reduce the floors and mass.

Chair Payne reviewed the Commission's purview and reviewed what is in the preservation ordinance. If citizens are unhappy about the Commission's limited purview they should contact their elected officials. There is different purview between historic districts and landmarks. He also doesn't know why downtown Oak Park wasn't created a historic district. There was clearly no will to create one. The character of the corner of Lake and Forest, if there was one, has been significantly altered with two towers, with their backs turned north. The brick wall on the Vantage tower was mentioned in their design review.

The Commission urged the protection of the Nineteenth Century Club during construction. Albion should make an effort to create a monitoring agreement. They also urged Albion to prepare a formal response to the Nineteenth Century Charitable Association.

Commissioner Gurski suggested they consider a greater setback on Forest Avenue.

Commissioner Jordahl urged Albion to conduct a wind study.

Commissioner Houze stated that the scale of the building was too big in relation to the Nineteenth Century Club. It should be lowered through setbacks or height.

Commissioner Weidner stated that his concern was with the scale and massing in relation to the Nineteenth Century Club.

Chair Payne stated that an alley setback off of the park to mitigate the height in relation to the Nineteenth Century Club should be studied. He also suggested adding more detail to the garage doors.

- B. **HPC 2017-41: 128 N. Oak Park Avenue (Bricks)** – Review proposal to replace two storefront windows with external bi-fold doors (*Ridgeland/Oak Park Historic District*)
Hallie Ervin, Barker Nestor Architects, was present.

Hallie Ervin, Barker Nestor Architects, stated that the Bricks restaurant is looking to add two folding doors in the existing storefront window openings. They fold into three pieces and they are keeping the existing trim. They will replace the glass and are required to have a screen.

Planner Kaarre provided the staff report. The building is a Contributing Resource within the *Ridgeland/Oak Park Historic District*. There is a building permit on file for the 124-128 N. Oak Park storefronts dating to 1929. As there is no demolition involved in the project other than replacing the glass, the project is Advisory in nature. The restaurant Bricks is a new tenant moving into the space. They met with the Architectural Review Committee on June 28, 2017. They are proposing to replace the glass in their two storefront windows with operable bi-fold doors to allow for an indoor/outdoor dining experience. The Committee noted that the decorative aluminum trim should remain in place, and was supportive of the change, which is considered reversible.

Chair Payne noted that the Architectural Review Committee's concerns have been met. The trim is remaining in place and the doors are reversible.

Commissioner Battoglia stated that the project looks great and meets the Architectural Review Committee's recommendations. They should update the plans with the new comments.

Commissioner Weidner asked about the pocket in the window sill.

Hallie Ervin stated that the door system will be set on top of the sill. They will set it back far enough.

Chair Payne state that he is happy with the changes and comments. It will be a nice addition to Oak Park. He is glad they are preserving what's there. They should pay careful attention to the sill.

C. **HPC 2017-42: 303 Linden Avenue (Nohalty)** – Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the clay tile roof with asphalt shingles (*Frank Lloyd Wright-Prairie School of Architecture Historic District*)

Property owner Barry Nohalty was present.

Barry Nohalty stated that there is a leak in the green tile roof and the underlayment needs to be replaced. The repair costs are high. They received two repair/replace quotes for \$88,000 (Renaissance) and \$42,000 (Huebner) and one quote to replace with architectural asphalt shingles at \$17,450 (Blue Sky). He didn't realize the Historic approval process was so formal. The tile contractors prefer to do the work in sections, where they would prefer to do the job all at once. Asphalt shingles is in the Architectural Review Guidelines as an approved replacement materials for clay tiles, though last on the list. They feel it is acceptable. All their surrounding neighbors have asphalt shingle roofs. Tile is also very expensive.

Motion by Battoglia to open the application for discussion. Second by Jordahl.

Commissioner Battoglia applauded the applicant for all of their due diligence. They have demonstrated a hardship. He suggested they maintain the tile entry roof to help maintain some of the historic character of the house. You could use salvaged tiles from the roof to maintain it.

Barry Nohalty stated that they were concerned about uniformity. Their garage is also shingles. It might look odd.

Commissioner Weidner asked if the estimates were for replacing with matching tile.

Barry Nohalty stated yes.

Commissioner Engle asked if there was no opportunity to reuse the tile.

Barry Nohalty stated that there is some. Some are broken and there is not total uniformity. Some could be preserved.

Commissioner Gurski asked the difference between the asphalt and lowest tile estimates.

Barry Nohalty stated about \$25,000. The main issues with the roof is a leak in the master bedroom closet, the front roof slope and the underlayment.

Commissioner Tadic understands the economic hardship, but the roof is a huge architectural feature.

Commissioner Weidner stated that these types of details are what makes Oak Park special, especially the finials. Those types of things can be saved. Consider the life-cycle of the roof, which has lasted 100 years, vs. the life of an asphalt shingle roof.

Chair Payne commented on what they would typically approve and what's been proposed. Under the Roofing section of the Guidelines, a one-to-one replacement would be fantastic. This is a remarkable home and the tile roof is a part of the style. They lose several tile roofs a year under the economic hardship clause, and there is not an abundance of them. So to lose it would be a big deal. But they understand the cost implications. But there are alternatives in terms of materials, but labor is usually the most cost. There are metal tiles that mimic clay that are worth looking at. You can achieve a good matching appearance. The least desirable is the asphalt shingles. The Guidelines call for something similar in size, shape and color. The typical three-tab shingle is not historic and would not get approved. The next step up is roofs that try to mimic wood shingles. What we should be approving are similar size, shape and color. GAF makes shingles that mimic slate and clay tile. It's the most desirable of the low-end options and would meet our Guidelines and not cost what a tile would cost. He would urge you to look at those other options.

Planner Kaarre stated that he emailed one of those options to Mr. Nohalty earlier in the day.

Motion by Battoglia to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the clay tile roof at 303 Linden Avenue with asphalt shingles that replicate the existing clay tile and consider alternative materials such as metal tiles that replicate the clay tile in appearance. Second by Tadic. Motion approved 9-0.

AYE: Battoglia, Bridge, Engle, Gurski, Houze, Jordahl, Tadic, Weidner, Chair Payne

NAY: None

- D. **Oak Park Village Hall: 123 Madison Street (Village of Oak Park)**: Review proposal to install elevators in two locations for CDBG-funded project (*National Register of Historic Places*) – continued from June 8

Planner Kaarre provided an overview of the proposal. Last month the Commission reviewed the two elevator proposals. This month you are focusing on the three options near the Council Chambers. You had requested preliminary sketches. He asked Anthony Rubano at the State Historic Preservation Office for good examples of elevator additions to historic buildings. He stated that generally they should detract from significant interior spaces or exterior elevations, and the best examples are ones where you can't tell that they have been added. Eric Martin from Ross Barney Architects provided some exterior sketches for the three options A, B and C. Options A and B are interior with roof bump-outs designed to be clad in metal to match the roof. Option C is the exterior addition and the shaft is clad in glass.

Commissioner Weidner asked if they are in any particular order?

Planner Kaarre stated that last month it was stated that the Village's preferred option is C based on cost and some interior complications with moving mechanical systems with the other options.

The Commission reviewed photos of the exterior of the building.

Commissioner Jordahl asked about the original intention of the area under the Council Chambers. The exterior elevator, Option C, would impinge on that open space.

Planner Kaarre stated that it was all covered with water – a decorative pool which did not last long.

Chair Payne stated that when you walk around outside the Council Chambers on the ground level, it seems to be a critical part of the design of the building that this remain an open, fluid area underneath this structure. There is something kind of elegant about this connection between the public forum. There's something nice about how that is designed. It would be a shame to enclose that and make it one. When he looks at the two outside options the smaller one is more palatable. He doesn't think that matching the roofing material is a good idea. His concern is that it brings an element that appears historic inside the building. It would meet the Standards if the material was compatible, such as a similar cladding rather than matching. Or find another material to relate to on the structure, such as the concrete columns and the tube enclosure. They relate to the overall composition better. He finds it problematic to clad it in metal and make it look like it's always been there. He prefers Option B because it has the least impact on the overall planning of the structure, even though it might have an big effect on the plan.

Commissioner Weidner stated that he prefers Option C because it tells a story of the building that it was built before the Americans with Disabilities Act. He doesn't like how it would bump up out of the roof. The exterior is the most practical. The glass shaft distinguishes it as not part of the original building that was added later and shows the evolution of the design.

Commissioner Tadic stated that Option B is the least painful to add to the building. She does not like how the glass mass works with the bronze catwalk in Option C. It also impedes the vista that was created by two forms that was the original intent of the architecture between the street and the public space inside. She agrees that the material should be different that the roof material. They should explore concrete or some other elements of the façade.

Commissioner Battoglia stated that he likes Option B as well. He's not sure he can see concrete, which is a heavy, foundational material, on a roof, which might seem awkward. Maybe metal, but in a different scale, or a larger panel. He understands why Option C is proposed to be glass, but when it's going to abut this mass it will seem awkward.

Chair Payne stated that with concrete it goes all the way through the building, which is why he mentioned it. His comment was more about not matching the roofing material.

Commissioner Gurski stated that he likes Option B as well. His concerns are with the functionality of Option C. Trying to navigate the catwalk from the elevator in a wheelchair could be difficult. Option B flows straight out.

Commissioner Houze stated she also prefers Option B. The large glass shaft doesn't fit very well between the two buildings. She also agrees that the material should be different.

Commissioner Jordahl stated that it is difficult to recommend any of the options without seeing the plans. If she recalls there were problems programmatically on the inside with the interior options. However, from a preservation perspective, something as unobtrusive as possible and with compatible materials would make the most sense.

The Commission reviewed the preliminary plans for Options A and B that were provided to them in June.

Commissioner Bridge stated that she can see Commissioner Weidner's point about the evolution of the design of the building, but also Commissioner Tadic's point about blocking the vista of the

courtyard. Her opinion is leaning toward Option B. The material needs to be compatible, but doesn't look like it was part of the original design.

Commissioner Weidner stated that he would like to hear what Anthony Rubano at the State Historic Preservation Office thinks about these options, and also if Harry Weese wrote anything about ADA and how he may have approached it.

Planner Kaarre stated that they will hear from the SHPO because the project will have to go through Section 106 review.

Motion by Battoglia to recommend Option B to the Village Board. Second by Tadic. Motion approved 9-0.

AYE: Battoglia, Bridge, Engle, Gurski, Houze, Jordahl, Tadic, Weidner, Chair Payne

NAY: None

- E. **Historic Preservation Ordinance** – Discuss a proposal to amend the ordinance to add procedures to “*amend or rescind historic landmarks*” and forward a recommendation to the Village Board

Planner Kaarre provided a staff report. The historic preservation ordinance includes procedures for designating Historic Landmarks, but does not include procedures for amending or rescinding them. This has come up because there was a request to rescind a landmark nomination. Evanston has a section in their ordinance that is reasonable and clear. The language used in the Evanston ordinance is clear and precise. It requires a landmark to be designated for at least two years, and it calls for the same public hearing process that required the designation. It also requires that the building no longer meet the criteria for designation. The Village Manager has requested that the Historic Preservation Commission review proposed process and make a recommendation to the Village Board on whether it feels that the historic preservation ordinance should be amended to include this process to allow property owners to request amendments or rescission of landmark designation. Staff recommends amending the preservation ordinance to add the language that allows property owners, the Commission, or members of the public the opportunity to request an amendment or rescission to a historic landmark. The proposed language is appropriate and the process is reasonable. Applicants should be able to make their case before the Village, and currently there is no process whatsoever. Assuming you make this recommendation, then the recommendation for Item F (1515 N. Harlem) would be for that building to go through the new process once the ordinance has been amended.

2-8-6. - AMENDMENT AND RESCISSION OF DESIGNATION.

- (A) *Designation may be amended or rescinded, only after a period of two (2) years following the designation, upon petition to the Commission and compliance with the same procedures and according to the same criteria set forth herein for designation as follows:*
- 1. Petitions for amendment or rescission of a designation may be submitted by the same persons authorized to submit nominations pursuant to Subsection 2-8-5(A).*
 - 2. Properly submitted petitions are referred to the Commission for public hearing as provided in Subsection 2-8-5(C).*
 - 3. In the case of a rescission of a landmark designation or part or all of a district designation, the Commission shall consider whether the landmark or district no longer meets the criteria for designation, and make a recommendation to the Council or its duly authorized committee as provided in Subsection 2-8-5(E), including a report concerning whether the landmark or district does or does not continue to retain significance and integrity.*

(B) *The Council shall rescind or amend a designation only after all of the above procedures have been followed. The Council shall rescind a designation only upon a finding that the designated landmark or district no longer meets the criteria for designation in Section 2-8-4.*

Motion by Weidner to open the item for discussion. Second by Engle.

Commissioners Battaglia and Bridge asked how an application could be rescinded under this criteria if it was requesting economic hardship, since that is not a criteria for designation.

Chair Payne stated that if you look at this outside of the current application, say there was a fire that irreparably damaged a fire or something happens.

Commissioner Bridge stated that rescission would be more likely for destruction of the building than the history of the building changing.

Commissioner Engle asked if this was common language in other ordinances.

Planner Kaarre stated that not a lot of ordinances have this language, in those that he reviewed.

Commissioner Gurski stated that some owners could take the viewpoint that if they neglect their building long enough and it deteriorates to the point that they could rescind it.

Commissioner Bridge stated that the current ordinance has language about demolition by neglect.

Commissioner Gurski asked if they could include it in the language. It plays into this situation.

Commissioner Bridge stated that it could be Point 4, that demolition by neglect is not a criteria for rescission of landmark status.

Planner Kaarre stated that rescission can only be granted if the building no longer meets the criteria for designation. The condition of the building is not part of the criteria for designation but its significance, architecture, etc. Deterioration is a separate issue.

Commissioner Bridge asked if two years was long enough. It seems arbitrary.

Planner Kaarre stated that Evanston did go through a rescission process recently.

The Commission discussed the process. They felt that only two years is not long enough before requesting rescission. They discussed who can nominate a property for landmark designation. Under the current ordinance any person can nominate a property. Therefore, under this process, anyone can apply for rescission. However, this does not mean they will get approved unless the building no longer meets the criteria for designation.

Commissioner Engle noted that this process seems like a much harder process to get approved.

Planner Kaarre stated that in addition to the criteria for designation, a building also has to be 50 years old and have integrity of design, materials, location and setting. So demolition by neglect could have a minor impact on designation.

Commissioner Gurski stated that materials is a big issue with the Harlem building.

Chair Payne stated that they have told them they are very willing to work with them on finding alternative materials. He noted that the Commission should all read section 7-9-17 regarding prevention of demolition by neglect for future reference. Regarding this addition to the ordinance, the revisions should be made so it fits in our ordinance and chapters.

*Motion by Weidner to recommend to the Village Board that Article 7-9-13 of the Village Code (Historic Preservation) be amended to add the proposed language from the Evanston ordinance 2-8-6, to be amended as necessary, to provide a process to request an amendment or rescission of historic landmarks, changing the period to three years. Second by Gurski. Motion approved 9-0. AYE: Battoglia, Bridge, Engle, Gurski, Houze, Jordahl, Tadic, Weidner, Chair Payne
NAY: None*

- F. **1515 N. Harlem Avenue (Harlem Associates/Girgis)** – Consider the request by the property owners of 1515 N. Harlem Avenue to rescind the historic landmark designation, subject to a recommendation to amend the historic preservation ordinance in Item E (*Historic Landmark*)
The property owners were not present.

The item was tabled to a future date, if necessary

- G. **Architectural Review Guidelines** – Review and discuss the final draft of the revised guidelines and forward a recommendation to the Village Board

*Motion by Engle to forward the revised Architectural Review Guidelines to the Village Board for adoption, upon completion of the revisions proposed at the June 20, 2017 meeting. Second by Tadic. Motion approved 9-0.
AYE: Battoglia, Bridge, Engle, Gurski, Houze, Jordahl, Tadic, Weidner, Chair Payne
NAY: None*

Planner Kaarre stated that submitted by July 31 could go to the Board by August 7.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

*Motion by Jordahl to adjourn. Second by Houze. Motion approved 9-0.
AYE: Battoglia, Bridge, Engle, Gurski, Houze, Jordahl, Tadic, Weidner, Chair Payne
NAY: None*

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Douglas Kaarre, AICP, Urban Planner.