

**Oak Park Historic Preservation Commission  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
August 28, 2019 Meeting Minutes  
Oak Park Village Hall, Room 215 – 7:30 pm**

**A. ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Christopher Payne, Committee Members Sandra Carr, Lou Garapolo, Aleksandra Tadic, and Noel Weidner  
ABSENT: None  
STAFF: Susie Trexler, Historic Preservation Urban Planner

**B. MINUTES**

*Motion by Tadic to approve minutes of the July 24, 2019. Second by Carr. Motion approved 3-2.*

*AYE: Carr, Tadic, and Chair Payne*

*ABSTAIN: Garapolo and Weidner (not present for June meeting)*

*NAY: None*

**C. 225 S Humphrey Ave (Sarah Beck and Michael Carney):** Certificate of Appropriateness to alter two windows on the north elevation to accommodate an interior renovation (Ridgeland-Oak Park Historic District).

Drew Nelson, the architect, was present. Mr. Nelson explained the project and clarified that the proposed new windows will be casement rather than double-hung. Committee member Garapolo expressed concern about using a casement window as all the historic windows are double-hung. Mr. Nelson explained that the homeowners would prefer casement windows as they do not want the double-hung mullion at eye-level. The windows will be clad wood. The Committee agreed that they were less concerned about the window type due to its location near the rear of the building.

*Motion by Carr to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for window alterations as proposed. Second by Tadic. Approved 4-1.*

*AYE: Carr, Garapolo, Tadic, Weidner, and Payne*

*NAY: Garapolo*

**D. 630 Gunderson Ave (Sarah Schriber):** Certificate of Appropriateness to remove one window and replace one decorative window (Gunderson Historic District).

Drew Nelson, the architect, was present. Mr. Nelson explained the project. Planner Trexler confirmed to the Committee that the homeowner decided to retain and restore the decorative window in the front-facing dormer. The Committee discussed alternatives to removing the window on the side elevation; Mr. Nelson noted that moving the kitchen appliances to retain the window would mean the window to the backyard would be eliminated. The Committee said they did not have any concerns about removing the window as proposed.

*Motion by Tadic to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for window alterations as proposed. Second by Garapolo. Approved 5-0.*

*AYE: Carr, Garapolo, Tadic, Weidner, and Payne*

*NAY: None*

**E. 1109 Home Ave (Mareen Mellios):** Certificate of Appropriateness for rear porch addition and window alteration to accommodate interior remodel (Gunderson Historic District).

Drew Nelson, the architect, was present. Mr. Nelson explained the project and said the owners would also like to restore the wood siding if it is still extant under the synthetic siding. They want to match the siding on the rear, non-historic addition to the historic siding. Double-hung windows will be added in the kitchen. The Committee discussed whether a separation was needed between the existing house and addition and Mr. Nelson noted that the elevation steps in on one side. The Committee agreed that was sufficient and agreed that due to the bay, the proposed window is barely visible so appropriate. Chair Payne explained the siding process. Planner Trexler said that they must restore any historic materials, for example, if balusters are found under the siding on the porch. If there are any alterations in the project, an additional Certificate of Appropriateness may be needed.

*Motion by Carr to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the window alterations as proposed. Second by Tadic.*

*AYE: Carr, Garapolo, Tadic, Weidner, and Payne*

*NAY: None*

**F. 212 N Harvey Ave (Brett and Sarah Williams):** Certificate of Appropriateness to build an addition on the second floor at the rear of the house (Ridgeland-Oak Park Historic District).

Brett Williams, the homeowner, was present. Mr. Williams explained the project and the alterations since attending the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. He said that the window on the front elevation of the addition has been changed to a double-hung window to match the house and that the rear elevation was altered. He is aware that the rear elevation is not under the purview of the Historic Preservation Commission but these alterations were

preferred by him and his wife. Committee member Weidner said he has no concerns about the gable on the rear.

Committee members Weidner and Carr said that the Commission asked for front and roof views and these have been supplied as requested. Chair Payne said the project will need to go back to the Commission for approval but the addition does not appear to be out of scale and is appropriately differentiated. Committee member Carr agreed and said the roofline doesn't go above the existing roofline, which is appropriate.

The Committee discussed the curve to the front corner of the roof on the addition and agreed it was an appropriate reference to the flared eaves on the house. The Chair said the applicant should label all materials on the drawings prior to submitting them to the Commission.

**G. 532 N Ridgeland Ave (Thor Martin):** Discuss potential project to extend dormers and permanently enclose portion of front porch (Frank Lloyd Wright-Prairie School of Architecture Historic District).

Thor Martin, the homeowner, was present. Mr. Martin asked the Committee about the policy that dormers must be half the roof area and Chair Payne explained that this means half as seen from above. The Committee noted that the existing two dormers already appear to take up more than half the roof area. Mr. Martin explained that they have three options: they can expand the right dormer to match the left, expand both dormers, or expand neither dormer.

The Committee discussed options to more fully enclose a portion of the porch. They said it may be possible but the interior wall should align with the 6-inch post by the door. Mr. Martin said this would bisect the existing door within the porch and the Committee agreed that this would be best resolved with a jog in the wall within the porch.

The Committee discussed the dormers and said they may not be able to approve demolition of the south dormer as it is historic. However, it may be possible to extend the dormers to the rear as they are already there. The Committee agreed that extending the dormers in a linear direction would be appropriate but they should not be extended out to the sides. Chair Payne specified that they can keep the south where it is but match the north dormer to the south at the front. It should be finished similarly. Historic siding should be kept on the historic dormer; the non-historic dormer should look like the historic dormer but can use new materials such as Hardie panel and thin Hardie trim. It was agreed that stucco should be retained on the south dormer.

**H. Other Business**

None

**I. Adjourn**

*Motion by Carr to adjourn. Second by Tadic.*

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Minutes prepared by Susie Trexler, Historic Preservation Urban Planner.