



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE
1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2017
7:00 P.M.

VILLAGE BOARD CONFERENCE ROOM
1200 WILMETTE AVENUE, WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091

Members Present: Bob Furniss
Melanie Glass
Charles Hutchinson
Michael St. Peter
Joseph Vitu

Staff Present: Erika Block, Planner I
Rachael B. Randolph, Zoning Review Planner

Guest: Dan and Tiffany Neely
Erich Wefing, Wefing Design Studios

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Block called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MAY 3, 2017

The meeting minutes from May 3, 2017 were approved. Motion by Chairman Hutchinson, seconded by Commissioner Furniss and approved unanimously.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT

No Chair Report was discussed.

IV. STAFF REPORT

Ms. Block reported that a map with local landmarks will be going up on the website. There will be a story map and if you hover over the addresses a picture of the home will appear and that should go up on the site this summer. There will also be a link to this map from the HPC page.

V. LOCAL LANDMARK UPDATE

Ms. Block reported that the sale of 1134 Elmwood, the Gage House was finalized. There has been no contact with the new owners.

The John Stut House, 1136 Sheridan Road, is also for sale and has a contract pending.

VI. SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURES REPORT

802 Lake is for sale. The owner had previously contacted Ms. Block about landmarking the home, but the children of the homeowners did not support this. It is now for sale and is being marketed as a teardown.

930 Lake, a home designed by Marion Gutnayer, has applied for a permit for an addition off of the rear of the home.

1635 Lake is also in for a permit for a two-story addition.

VII. REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS 2017-HPC-02, 301 SHERIDAN ROAD, THE ALEXANDER McDANIEL HOUSE

Ms. Block introduced Mr. and Ms. Neely the homeowners of 301 Sheridan Road. Mr. Neely stated that he wanted to discuss three things in regards to their project: how they got where they are today, how they came up with what they want to do with the house and then the specifics. They previous lived in Madison, WI. They did a major restoration/renovation of their home there. As part of the project they wanted to restore the house, but also make it into a house that they wanted to live in. They had also gone through a review process in Madison as part of that work and after it was completed they won a preservation award for their restoration.

When they found 301 Sheridan they fell in love with it and hope to live there the rest of their lives. They have lived there for a number of years and then they began to think of how they will continue to live there. They have three adopted children and ageing parents who like to spend time with them. Getting into the house is a challenge for their parents and so that is something that they had to think about

They had first considered building ramps around the house. Then they started to think about alternatives and also started working with Erich Wefing on some ideas for restoration work around the house and the idea of an attached garage that would allow them to drive their parents into the house. That is one of the major changes presented here. This new garage would be largely non-visible from the street. The current garage is seen by everyone on Maple as is a two-story porch that was added on the back of the house. Both of these added features will be removed. They plan to add a wraparound porch to the back of the house in addition to the new garage.

They will be making some changes to the inside of the house as well. It is very much still set up as if there were servants in the house. The kitchen is small and in the back of the house. They plan to move the kitchen to where the dining room is and the dining room to where one of the living rooms is to accommodate the spaces they need. They now think that we have a plan that solves the livability problems of the house: how to make the house more easily accessible for their parents and how to make the space more livable for the whole family. Additionally, they wanted to ensure that any changes made could be reversed by someone living there next if so desired.

Ms. Neely spoke about how they tried to make the garage look as if it were detached from the house if you were just walking by. The garage will be largely hidden by vegetation from the front of the house and will not be visible from Maple.

Mr. Neely spoke about some of the interior changes and also the eventual restoration of some of the original exterior features that they hoped to make.

Commissioner St. Peter brought up the fact that the Commission had received some negative feedback about the attached garage. He asked them to describe how the design of the garage would be consistent with the original structure.

Mr. Neely described the high pitched roofs that are seen on Victorian homes and that the roof of the proposed garage will match that of the house. Similar windows will also be used. If you are in the front of the house there is another part of the house that projects out in front of the garage that will cover the addition partially. From the side of the house on Maple you will not see the garage at all. One of the goals was to construct it so that it could also be removed in the future.

Commissioner Furniss spoke about the original garage and what a loss it was but that the current garage has no historic value and its removal is not a loss. The other issue is the porch. He was not concerned about the removal of the rear porch. The garage being attached was concerning. Both letters that the Commission received brought up concerns with the garage being visible from the front. Mr. Neely explained that the existing foliage will completely hide the new garage. Also there is an existing projection that will partially cover the addition.

Ms. Block did speak to a neighbor who did write in an objection to the garage addition. The neighbor felt that an attached garage denotes a new construction – this will indicate to a passerby that this is a new home and not a historic home.

Chairman Hutchinson did not agree with that assessment as one could hardly see the garage. He agreed with what she was saying about attached garages usually meaning new construction, but it does not apply in this case. This garage will be on the side. Chairman Hutchinson then asked some of the future restoration – in regards to front porch and the roof detailing. Mr. Neely is still working on how to replicate these details and this work is certainly a goal. It is not part of the plan at this time, however.

Chairman Hutchinson then asked about the “barn door” on the garage and why have doors on both sides of the garage? Mr. Neely replied that this would allow them access to both sides of the house. Both doors could be opened and they would be able to access through. This is more for utility than anything else. The front is a regular garage door and on the back would be more of a “barn door”.

Chairman Hutchinson then asked about the kitchen remodel, specifically about the moving of the side porch door and window. Mr. Neely explained that in that room that there are

three windows and a door. Their plan is to reuse the existing window and the existing door – just the order of the doors and windows will be changed.

Commissioner Glass then asked about seeing a proposed elevation of the front of the house with the addition. Ms. Block pointed out that this was in the supplemental packet.

Commissioner St. Peter stated that as a response to the concerns from the public that the Secretary of Interiors Standards of the Review should be applied. He felt that the Standards have been met – nothing historically significant is being altered and the responses from the homeowners have shown how nothing original is being altered. He then moved for a vote on this project. Chairman Hutchinson seconded and Ms. Block restated the request: The granting of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a detached garage and construction of a new attached garage, a dormer addition, the demolition of a side and rear porch for the new construction of a wraparound open porch and selective window and door replacement. All voted in favor of the motion. There were no nays or abstentions.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Block then introduced Ms. Randolph who will be taking over as staff liaison to the commission as she is leaving the Village to stay at home with her new daughter. Ms. Randolph explained that she had previously been the staff liaison to the HPC and is looking forward to doing so again.

Ms. Block brought up the deteriorated condition of the Wilmette North District signs as a potential project as well as restarting the preservation awards.

Chairman Hutchinson would like to recognize our older homes and thank the owners for being stewards. He would specifically like to look at doing something for the midcentury modern homes.

Commissioner Furniss recognized Ms. Block for all of her hard work and dedication. All of the commissioners agreed and stated how much she will be missed. The best of luck was wished for her future.

IX. UPCOMING PRESERVATION MEETINGS/OTHER BUSINESS

The Landmarks Illinois annual meeting will be held on Thursday, June 29, 2017 in Ravenswood. The National Trust for Historic Preservation Conference will be held in Chicago in November 14-17, 2017 at the Palmer House Hotel.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 8:13 p.m. by Commissioner Furniss and seconded by Commissioner St. Peter and approved unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rachael B. Randolph