

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 12, 2018**

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

A Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the Village of Lake Bluff was called to order on September 12, 2018 at 7:03 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room.

The following members were present:

Present: Paul Bergmann
Lois Nicol
Cheri Richardson
Robert Hunter, Vice Chair
Steve Kraus, Chair

Absent: Jane Jerch
Randolph Liebolt

Also Present: Glen Cole, Assistant to the Village Administrator (AVA)
John Scopelliti, Administrative Intern (AI)

2. Consideration of the August 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Member Richardson moved to approve the August 8, 2018 HPC Regular Meeting Minutes as amended. Member Bergmann seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

3. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors

Chair Kraus stated that the Chairperson and Members of the HPC allocate fifteen (15) minutes at this time for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the HPC on any matter not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the HPC.

4. A Public Hearing to Consider a Historic Landmark Nomination for 502 East Prospect Avenue (Wynn Residence)

AVA Cole explained the duties of the HPC and noted the Village Board has the final approval regarding this application. AVA Cole reviewed the HPC actions regarding this application. AVA Cole noted that elevation drawings must be submitted with a Historic Landmark application and a copy has been provided at the dais.

Chair Kraus administered the oath to those in the audience then invited the applicant to the podium.

Edward and Mary Wynn, applicants, thanked the HPC and said the packet contain the details regarding the landmark application request and they are willing to answer any questions from the commission.

Chair Kraus opened the floor for comments from the commissioners.

In response to a question from Member Bergmann, Mr. Wynn said there are still elements from the hotel on the property which includes the stone basin in the rear of the home. He explained the significance of the stone basin which was discovered during the excavation of the family room and have since been incorporated in a landscape element in the rear yard.

Chair Kraus stated the first public municipal water supply service was built at Artesian Lake to service the Hotel Irving (Site). It is his understanding that a portion of the wooden pipe is located in the Lake Bluff History Museum (LBHM). Also, from looking at the actual photographs it appears the applicant's property was situated to the east of the site but he is uncertain about how the property was used.

In response to a question from Member Nicol, Mr. Wynn said they were aware of the homes historical nature before they purchased the property. Also, the LBHM book provided additional history about the site. He said the 1998 survey in the book states the palladian windows were original to the home but after further research it was discovered the palladian windows mirrored an original window on the second floor of the home.

Chair Kraus inquired of the applicant's knowledge regarding Harlan homes and the buildings in that era. Mr. Wynn Ed Wynn stated that based on the information at the LBHM, their home was built for an individual named "Crumb" and also, he read about Mr. Harlan's reputation as a preeminent building. A unique construction method "balloon framing" which refers to a method of construction in which external studs reach all the way from the bottom to the top of the house, was noticed during remodeling and is consistent with the Harlan construction technique.

Chair Kraus said to ensure the information for the record is accurate, he suggested the date of construction listed in the survey document be changed from 1920 to 1939.

Member Bergmann stated that this is a great application and he likes all the details. The Harlan family was certainly an important family in the Lake Bluff community and provided background information regarding the family.

Mr. Wynn commented on the uniqueness on a portion of Prospect Avenue (500 Block) and noted this is a nice streetscape which needs to be protected.

Following a request from Chair Kraus, Member Bergmann proceeded to review the criteria for landmark designation general consideration. A discussion followed and the committee determined the following criteria applies to the application:

- 1a – The structure, building, site, or landscape has significant character, interest, or value as part of the historic, aesthetic, cultural, or architectural characteristics of the Village, the State of Illinois, or the United States;

- 1b – The structure, building, site, or landscape is closely identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the Village, the State of Illinois, or the United States;
- 1c – The structure, building, site, or landscape involves the notable efforts of, or is the only known example of work by, a master builder, designer, architect, architectural firm, or artist whose individual accomplishment has influenced the development of the Village, State of Illinois, or the United States; and
- 1d – The unique location or singular physical characteristics of a structure, building, site, or landscape make it an established of familiar visual feature.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following architectural significance criteria applies to the application:

- 2a – The structure, building, site, or landscape represents certain distinguishing characteristics of architecture inherently valuable for the study of a time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;
- 2b – The structure, building, site, or landscape embodies elements of design, detail, material, or craftsmanship of exceptional quality;
- 2e – The structure, building, site, or landscape is, or is part of, a contiguous grouping that has a sense of cohesiveness expressed through a similarity of style characteristics, time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials and accents the architectural significance of an area; and
- 2f – The detail, material, and workmanship of the structure, building, site, or landscape can be valued in and of themselves as reflective of or similar to those of the majority of the other visual elements in the area.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following historic significance criteria applies to the application:

- 3a – The structure, building, site, or landscape is an exceptional example of an historic or vernacular style, or is one of the few such remaining properties of its kind in the Village; and
- 3d – The structure, building, site, or landscape is associated with a notable historic event.

As there was no further discussion, Member Bergmann made a motion to recommend the Village Board designate 502 East Prospect Avenue as a landmark and specify both the specific historic landmark designations criteria met and the specific elements of the property that merit protection. Member Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous roll call vote.

5. A Public Hearing to Consider a Historic Landmark Nomination for 406 East Prospect Avenue (Ashley Residence)

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and noted his comments thanking the homeowner for voluntarily landmarking the beautiful structure then he requested an update from Staff.

AVA Cole explained the duties of the HPC noting the Village Board has the final approval regarding this application. The applicant submitted addresses, the slots association with the camp meeting area, and noted its status as one of the few 25 foot very narrow lots still remaining in Lake Bluff.

In response to a question from Chair Kraus, AVA Cole confirmed that both applications submitted were complete. Chair Kraus then invited the applicant to the podium.

Kristin Ashley, applicant, read her presentation to the HPC which included background, work related, and current information regarding the applicant such as her involvement with the Lake Bluff History Museum. Ms. Ashley said she has owned one of the last remaining historical camp cottages in Lake Bluff for the past 11 years. Although the home is not designed by a famous architect it is one of the earliest examples of a typical camp cottage on a 25 ft. wide tent lot from the camp meeting association era. The house was built in the 1880s and she thinks is it the biggest antique she has owned. She enjoys living in an historical home as it gives her deep roots in the community and also give her inspiration for her writing. She shared her analogy on why she was applying for landmark designation and commented on revisions made to the home.

In response to a comment from Member Bergmann, Ms. Ashley said the Clancy family might have been the original owners but she is uncertain and she was not able to find any additional information regarding the builder.

Vice Chair Hunter said most of the houses on the 25 ft. lots were 15 ft. wide with gable roofs and this one is 20 ft. wide and asked if there was any indication of this being done. Chair Kraus said this is an amalgam from many separate parcels so it is a 25 ft. parcel plus an additional 10 ft. feet of another parcel so it is actually 35 ft. wide.

Stephanie Bjork (resident) provided information as a result of research done on her property at 414 East Prospect Avenue as it relates to the subject property.

Chair Kraus said this property and that entire street is one of the gems of the Village and expressed his appreciation for the applicant's effort to go through the landmark process.

Following a request from Chair Kraus, Member Bergmann said he has wanted to landmark these houses for a long time then proceeded to review the criteria for landmark designation general consideration. A discussion followed and the committee determined the following criteria applies to the application:

- 1a – The structure, building, site, or landscape has significant character, interest, or value as part of the historic, aesthetic, cultural, or architectural characteristics of the Village, the State of Illinois, or the United States;
- 1b – The structure, building, site, or landscape is closely identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the Village, the State of Illinois, or the United States;
- 1d – The unique location or singular physical characteristics of a structure, building, site, or landscape make it an established or familiar visual feature;
- 1e – The activities associated with a structure, building, site, or landscape make it a current or former focal point of reference in the Village; and
- 1g – The structure, building, site, or landscape is in an area that has yielded or is likely to yield historically significant information, or even prehistoric date.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following architectural significance criteria applies to the application:

- 2a – The structure, building, site, or landscape represents certain distinguishing characteristics of architecture inherently valuable for the study of a time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials; and
- 2e – The structure, building, site, or landscape is, or is part of, a contiguous grouping that has a sense of cohesiveness expressed through a similarity of style characteristics, time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials and accents the architectural significance of an area.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following historic significance criteria applies to the application:

- 3a – The structure, building, site, or landscape is an exceptional example of an historic or vernacular style, or is one of the few such remaining properties of its kind in the Village;
- 3b – The structure, building, site, or landscape has a strong association with the life or activities of a person or persons who significantly contributed to or participated in the historic or cultural events of the United States, the State of Illinois, or the Village;
- 3c – The structure, building, site, or landscape is associated with an organization or group, whether formal or informal, from which persons have significantly contributed to or participated in the historic or cultural events of the United States, the State of Illinois, or the Village; and
- 3d – The structure, building, site, or landscape is associated with a notable historic event.

As there was no further discussion, Member Bergmann made a motion to recommend the Village Board designate 406 East Prospect Avenue as a landmark and specify both the specific historic landmark designations criteria met and the specific elements of the property that merit protection. Member Nicol seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous roll call vote.

6. Significant Demolition Review for 419 East Prospect Avenue

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item noting there is an existing demolition delay in place pursuant to the Village ordinance. Due to a technical reading of the ordinance the delay time lines are now as follows, delay expiration (90 days) was October 17, 2018 is now actually November 22, 2018. The original demolition delay period does not expire unless the HPC recommend such action on November 22nd. This evening the HPC has the unilateral right to extend an additional 30 days which would extend the demolition to a maximum December 22, 2018. Chair Kraus said the reason for the delay is to generate interest in a particular property.

It was the consensus of the HPC not to extend the demolition delay.

Chair Kraus said there was a petition signed by quite a few residents requesting that the HPC hold a public hearing regarding the possible landmark status for the subject property. The historic preservation ordinance identifies four parties (the property owner, Village Board, HPC and Lake Bluff History Museum Board) that have standing to nominate a particular structure for landmark status. He read the letter submitted from the property owner requesting that the property not be landmarked and noting their intent not to proceed with the landmark nomination. The LBHM Board has made a policy decision to be a resource to the community rather than go through the process of

recommending landmarks. Chair Kraus and Member Bergmann disclosed that they are members of the Lake Bluff History Board of Directors. Chair Kraus said the third entity, the Village Board, has deferred to the matter to the HPC to consider if the property should be landmarked.

Chair Kraus said the petition was received at a date that precluded a public hearing from occurring in September 2018. The HPC would make a recommendation to hold a formal public hearing next either in October or November 2018 as the demolition delay continues until December 2018. He said because a full board is not present at tonight's meeting, the HPC could also not take action on the request until the next regular meeting.

Chair Kraus opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Mr. Wynn provided the HPC with additional signatures and expressed his understanding that the HPC is the only party left to nominate this property for a landmark status. According to Staff's memorandum it is not unprecedented for the HPC to make a landmark status.

In response to a request from Chair Kraus, Mr. Wynn explained the distinction between a landmark and a certified landmark. Chair Kraus elaborated on the distinctions noting of the landmark is certified there is a mandatory certificate of appropriateness that must be granted before alternations or demolition can take place. The teeth of the ordinance is regarding certified landmarks. The normal landmark status has a process in place for a property to make changes.

Mr. Wynn commented on the law associated with certified landmarks in regards to federal program which includes the easement program. Mr. Wynn noted for the record that the property owner is not present at tonight's meeting. The property owner did previously note there were roughly four 25 ft. lots on the property and that if the intent was to be historical it should be taken back to that point. Mr. Wynn said the research shows this site consist of four lots. The three lots that immediately adjoin Moffett Avenue were deeded to Edward Jeffries and later the fourth lot was deeded to Abner Scranton. He said because we know or suspect that the house that is on Lots 2 and 3 was there at the time the property was transferred to Mr. Jeffries and the answer is it was the original structure on 419 not the additional immediately to the west. As stated by Mr. Hawley based on his reviewing that he could tell from the stud structure that the "L" portion was not part of the original house. This explains why there would have been a conveyance of three lots but not the fourth. It also suggests that the information in the Lake Bluff History Museum about the house being "L" shaped is probably not correct but the home is more similar to the structure at 666 Maple. He commend whomever placed the ornate lintels on the addition.

Mr. Wynn said there was concern that if we are being historic we should go back to 425 ft. lots and he would take the position that being historic is exactly how the property is today. He said it is obvious the existing house was built before the camp meeting association was established and conveniently facing toward the tabernacle. He suspect that by not selling Lots 1 and 2 that allowed the visual sight line from the house all the way through and when it was conveyed to Mr. Jefferies who was a close associate of the Reverend King, who is very notable in the Lake Bluff camp meeting association that it was done deliberately to keep that property intact. He said even though all the lots in the 1877 plat were done as 25 ft. lots the real history is what predated the plat and the current configuration of the home and he thinks that is one of its unique features.

Chair Kraus said one of the HPC landmark decisions reflect the same thing that even though there is a series of 25 ft. lots that underline the original zoning, that lot is actually 35 ft. wide. All the underline zoning for the east side of Lake Bluff is composed of multiple zoning. A discussion regarding zoning followed.

Mr. Wynn said everything before the 1877 plat was in metes and bounds descriptions and he had to obtain descriptions from the Lake County Office, by the northeast corridor fractional and mapped that out to confirm that the deed was actually for this particular property. Mr. Wynn said we are very passionate about this and there is no will ill against the owner of the property. The plan is to save the structure if possible and potentially negotiate something if that can be done to have a home on there that is fitting with the current style. He thinks it is worth it and the history is now well documented back to the original founder of Lake Bluff and the request is that the commission consider nominating it for landmark status.

Chair Kraus noted that the two objectives are to save the structure and to influence the design of any different structure. Mr. Wynn confirmed both objectives and said it is his understanding that seems to be the consensus of the HPC at it August 2018 meeting.

Member Bergmann said this property came before the HPC months ago with that specific concept in mind of putting an alternate structure on the property but maintaining the original house in most of its form and then building a house extension highly similar to the existing house into the front yard. The concept went away due to economic reasons but it could be a satisfactory resolution to resubmit.

Chair Kraus said the applicant had also requested a subdivision of that particular property which was not recommended by the PCZBA. Mr. Wynn said it is his understanding having reviewed the records is there was an initial request for a subdivision and the applicant sensed that the request would not get approved then there was a second request which received an affirmative “no” vote from the PCZBA.

Vice Chair Hunter asked a procedural question as Chair Kraus and Member Bergmann both serve on the Lake Bluff History Board of Directors do they have to recuse themselves from any kind of voting regarding the matter and Member Bergmann said it is okay to vote on this matter.

Jenny Barthold (resident) asked if not this group, then who is the better group to nominate a building for historical reasons. She understands why the HPC is one of the entities allowed to make the recommendation but does not understand why the LBHM is not interested in doing this sort of work. She asked how the commissioner view themselves as possible nominators. Chair Kraus stated neither he nor Member Bergmann was involved with the decision made by the LBHM that the preferred role of the history museum is to support research into the history of Lake Bluff. Currently, the Board does not feel comfortable making landmark nominations.

Member Richardson said part of the history was former HPC Chair Janet Nelson contribution to perform the research herself to put together a landmark application. Ms. Barthold asked if it was a large task to complete. A discussion followed.

Chair Kraus said the preferred nominator for landmark status has always been the property owner. The preference on the behalf of the Village Board has been for property owners to nominate a property. The Village Board has been consistently troubled with the concept of involuntary landmarking either without the support of or with the active non-support of the property owner. The preferred venue is that property owners on their own behalf nominate their particular structure for landmark status.

Rene Boyle (resident) said some of this is starting to get a little confusing. It seems that the Village Board is recommending the HPC recommend landmark status but the HPC typically recommend landmark status for a home that is not owned by a property owner. Ms. Boyle said her understanding tonight is that the neighbors are more concerned about what is going to replace the home and securing the history of the home which seems to be okay with everyone. It is her understanding that there will be no further action to landmark the home because it has never been done before. She asked will the HPC vote on the matter tonight. Chair Kraus said we can vote on the matter tonight but as long as the demolition delay is in place the HPC can consider the application and it would be his preference to make a decision tonight.

Ms. Boyle thanked the commissioners for their volunteerism and work throughout the years. Chair Kraus said one of the reasons for the demolition delay is to secure the history of the property. He shared a story regarding demolition procedures prior to establishing the historic preservation ordinance. The demolition delay allows individuals and the LBHM to secure the history of the structure and take photographs to secure a montage of Lake Bluff history. Chair Kraus said everyone is concerned about what will replace the structure but that is not the HPC purview. The HPC can have a dialogue with property owners seeking to demolish or restore about what would be appropriate for the particular site. He said neither the Village Board nor HPC have any enforceable rights to determine what will replace a structure. The manner in which the historic preservation ordinance is currently established is that there is not any way, other than talking, to definitively say "yes" or "no" to a particular suggestion for an infrastructure. Chair Kraus briefly explained the importance of landmarking a structure and noted the policy of the Village does not allow any Board to say a structure cannot be demolished.

Ms. Boyle said she believes this home needs the respect and honor being landmarked even if it will eventually be demolished. The history will be categorized even if it is a brass plaque on the sidewalk.

In response to a question from Member Richardson, AVA Cole said it is his understanding that in the past you when you have a signification demolition delay if there is a landmark application pending there will be no permits issued until the application is resolved. If the property is designated a landmark at that time the 120 days delay before the demolition and there is a 30 day extension that can be imposed by the Village Board for a total of 150 days after a landmark is established. A discussion followed.

Mr. Wynn responded to a question regarding the brick structure. There was an investigation of two structures known to be constructed of Cloe's brick and he has pictures that shows that the color of the brick can vary depending on the materials used and how long the brick remains in the kiln. This was an issue but he does not think it was determinative of the HPC decision it is probably additive

so he wanted to address the issue. Mr. Wynn commented on the importance of landmarking a home and said a delay may cause people to reconsider reluctance to this point. Also, he thinks there are other issues involving this property that will be addressed at the appropriate time to the right bodies. Staff's memorandum states for the 120 day delay to trigger it requires that the application be complete and the clock will not start until the application is complete. A discussion regarding demolition application completeness followed.

Chair Kraus opened the floor for comments from the commissioners. He questioned if the HPC was comfortable holding its own hearing with respect to landmark status or if the committee is not in favor of an involuntary landmark process.

Member Bergmann commented on previous landmark presentations and successfully replacement structures. He said the HPC has previously looked at homes with significant architectural and background history and is again presented with a home that has a great deal of social history. He is rather fond of the architectural style and that the Italianate style is very unique and pleasing in town. He thinks when the HPC receive a petition with this many Village residents asking the HPC to take a much deeper look, he thinks the committee has to respond and hold a public hearing.

Vice Chair Hunter said he think the HPC should hold a public hearing because he thinks at this point no one really knows what the petitioner has in mind. He expressed his belief that no one but a property owner should nominate their own residence. It becomes almost punitive when you keep extending the delay and this is not how the process should work. He said the HPC should go through the process and give the petitioner a little more time to consider another alternative. Vice Chair Hunter said the HPC should move ahead without being punitive. He used the Blair House which was an architectural gem as an example of an extended demolition process and excessive punitive cost.

Member Richardson said she does understand the challenge with property rights versus what the HPC is trying to do which is to maintain the Village character. She does not have an issue with the HPC landmarking the property because there is a really good reason to do and hopefully this will allow additional time to speak with the property owner and perhaps have a different outcome.

Member Nicol agreed that the home is probably not an architectural gem but she believes there is so much social significance to the building and placement of the home. She appreciate the research done on the home and said she thinks it is an extremely significant home and the HPC mandate is to preserve/protect these architectural significant homes and properties. Member Nicol said she want to respect individual property rights but yet she thinks this is a share community. Property owners do own their individual homes and parcels of lands but yet we all collectively have some ownership in the Village and she appreciate everyone that took a voice to that ownership. Member Nicol said she supports holding a public hearing to further consider landmark status.

Chair Kraus said this is difficult for him because he loves the house then explained why. He would support a petition for landmark status based on the conditions discussed in the aforementioned applications and for what the structure represents in the history of Lake Bluff. He needs to balance that with the taking of property, the involuntary nature of a landmark, and with the reality that no

matter what the property owner can do what they desire to do, so he is not in favor of involuntary landmarking, but it appears the HPC consensus is to move ahead with the public hearing.

Vice Chair Hunter made a motion to nominate 419 East Prospect Avenue as a landmark and hold a public hearing concerning the nomination at its October regular meeting. Member Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Nicol, Bergmann, Richardson and Vice Chair Hunter
Nays: Chair Kraus
Absent: Jerch and Liebelt

7. Continued Strategic Planning and Visioning for the Historic Preservation Commission

Chair Kraus explained to the commission that he met with Village President Kathleen O'Hara and Village Administrator Drew Irvin about his vision moving forward with the HPC Strategic Planning and Visioning. Chair Kraus stated that this plan would be talked about in a special public hearing.

Member Bergmann asked about whether there will be a workshop or special hearing for this item.

Chair Kraus talked about sitting down with AVA Cole and members to talk about this topic later. A brief discussion commenced.

8. Chairperson's Report

Chair Kraus expressed to the commission his visioning moving forward along with an upcoming workshop on a Saturday early in 2019. He stated that he will be participating in a real estate group forum.

Chair Kraus talked about the potential of a special meeting moving forward to talk about the Strategic Planning and Visioning for the HPC and encouraged any members interested to contact AVA Cole.

Vice Chair Hunter asked if the PCZBA would be invited to this special meeting. A brief discussion commenced.

Chair Kraus asked if the ABR would also be present for this special meeting. A brief discussion commenced.

Member Bergmann asked about the funding opportunities that are present for this commission to complete this strategic plan.

AVA Cole stated that the biggest resource we have is staff time. He stated that the Village has the GIS software but again it is the necessity of the data and the amount of time that needs to be dedicated to completing this project.

Member Bergmann mentioned that it needs to be determined the amount of time and money that needs to be dedicated to this plan. A brief discussion commenced.

9. Staff Report

There was no staff report.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider, Member Bergmann motioned to adjourn. Member Richardson seconded the motion. Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 9:12p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Scopelliti
Administrative Intern