

**VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Thursday, February 13, 2020 7:00 pm
Riverside Township Hall – Room 4**

MEETING MINUTES

1. Called to Order: 7:00 pm

2. Roll Call

Present: VICE-CHAIRPERSON RICHARD RAY
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL LEARY
COMMISSIONER SANDER KAPLAN
COMMISSIONER KIMBER COOMBES

Absent: CHAIRPERSON CHARLES PIPAL
COMMISSIONER ABERDEEN MARSH OZGA
COMMISSIONER THOMAS WALSH

Also Present: CD Director Abt
Ryan Kelley, DLA Architects
Steven Wright, DLA Architects
James Fitton, D96
Ralph & Jane O'Donnell

3. Approval of the Preservation Meeting Minutes:

3.1. Minutes of the October 10, 2019 Preservation Commission Meeting

COMMISSIONER KAPLAN motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by
COMMISSIONER LEARY.

Voice Vote. 4 Ayes.

Motion Passes.

3.2. Minutes of the November 14, 2019 Special Preservation Commission Meeting

COMMISSIONER KAPLAN motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by
COMMISSIONER LEARY.

Voice Vote. 4 Ayes.

Motion Passes.

3.3. Minutes of the January 14, 2020 Special Preservation Commission Meeting

COMMISSIONER COOMBES motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by
COMMISSIONER KAPLAN.

Voice Vote. 4 Ayes.

Motion Passes.

Preservation Commission Minutes
February 13, 2020

4. Public Comment: None.
5. Demolitions: None.
6. Old Business:
 - 6.1. Remand to Preservation Commission for further input on choice of materials for classroom addition – 735 Leesley (Blythe Park Elementary School)

Director Abt stated that on November 14, 2019 the Preservation Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the classroom and front entry additions to Blythe Park School. She noted that in addition to needing a Certificate of Appropriateness for the classroom and front entry additions, Blythe Park School also required a Special Use Permit to expand the school. The Planning and Zoning Commission conducted a public hearing in December and they recommended approval of the Special Use. At the Village Board meeting on Feb 6, 2020, however some Trustees expressed concern about the chosen building materials and the impact using a wood composite siding rather than brick would have on the neighborhood. One of the findings for a special use is that the proposed use will not cause substantial injury to the value of other property in the neighborhood. They expressed concern about a wood composite as well as the need to have clear direction since this is a civic building and the addition will be a permanent addition to both the historic structure as well as the neighborhood. She stated that the Village Board has requested that the Preservation Commission consider the impact on the neighborhood and provide more detailed feedback on the materials and whether brick or wood siding would be more appropriate and meet the preservation standards.

Director Abt stated that CHAIRMAN PIPAL and COMMISSIONER OZGA had submitted a statement on their vote on the certificate of appropriateness that they would like entered into the record as did COMMISSIONER WALSH. Director Abt stated they all had copies to reference and she would add them to the record as well as provide them to the Village Board (**EXHIBIT A**). COMMISSIONER KAPLAN stated he agreed with CHAIRMAN PIPAL'S comments. He noted they follow the Secretary of the Interior's standards which state "new additions, exterior alteration, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment." He noted an addition shouldn't necessarily match the original structure. He said the siding does that but a different color brick could accomplish that as well. He also noted that it can be difficult to match brick due to age and pollution anyways.

VICE-CHAIR RAY asked what the life expectancy of the proposed wood composite siding was as he was not familiar with the product. Mr. Kelley stated that the warranty is for 10 years; however the life expectancy is the life of the building. He noted that the specific product they have chosen has been around for

**Preservation Commission Minutes
February 13, 2020**

40 plus years. He noted that it does not require any maintenance while a brick does have a maintenance factor with tuckpointing. He also reiterated that they chose the wood siding based on the Department of the Interior's standards that the Commission utilizes. They felt the paneling was sympathetic to the structure as it is the other primary building material of the school with much of the interior having wood paneling. He said that it differentiated the addition from the main building while the new addition location and massing addressed the issues the Commission had identified with their original submittal.

COMMISSIONER KAPLAN noted this type of product had been around for a long time and asked about the brand of product they were proposing. Mr. Kelley stated it was Parklex and that it has been in use for 40 plus years. He also noted that it was different than Trespa which is another well-known product. TRESPA is stamped to look like wood, while the Parklex is an actual wood veneer "laminated" in resin. Mr. Kelley provided the Commission with samples of the siding and the brick as well as a picture of the interior of the school to show the existing paneling.

The Commissioners asked if there was a price difference between the siding and the brick. Mr. Kelley stated that due to the size of the addition the cost is pretty similar.

COMMISSIONER LEARY noted that the addition should be differentiated but masonry would be his preference. VICE-CHAIR RAY also stated he would have chosen brick noting that tuckpointing is not that much of a maintenance investment. He noted there are plenty of brick buildings that haven't been tuckpointed in 50 or more years.

COMMISSIONER COOMBES asked if siding was prohibited for residential structures. Director Abt stated that it was allowed. She stated she did not think the siding would have a negative impact on the neighborhood and with their being no ordinance against its use elsewhere was reluctant to say it should not be allowed in this application. She noted that she stands by her original approval of the certificate; either the siding or the brick meets the standards.

COMMISSIONER KAPLAN stated they historically haven't commented on things like color of historic structures and sees this as a similar situation.

The Commissioners asked Director Abt if they needed to make a recommendation. Director Abt stated that it would be helpful if they came to a consensus and sent an official comment to the Village Board.

COMMISSIONER COOMBES motioned to send the following comment to the Village Board:

**Preservation Commission Minutes
February 13, 2020**

The Commission still supports its original certificate of appropriateness approval. The use of either siding or brick is appropriate as both materials would meet the Department of the Interior's standard of differentiation.

COMMISSIONER KAPLAN seconded the motion.

Voice Vote. 3 Ayes. 1 Abstain. Motion passes.

COMMISSIONER LEARY explained that he was abstaining since he voted against the Certificate of Appropriateness initially and it would not be appropriate of him to opine at this time.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness:
 - 7.1. Report of Certificates of Appropriateness approved by Commission's Designee between October 5, 2019 and February 7, 2020.

The Commission accepted the report.

8. New Business:
 - 8.1. Ralph & Jane O'Donnell, 100 Fairbank – Feedback on landmark designation and potential addition.

Director Abt said that some of the pictures Mr. O'Donnell had sent had ended up in her SPAM folder and not made it into the agenda packet. She stated she printed them out for the meeting for the Commission's consideration. She also noted that the Historical Commission had provided copies of their Historical Structure Surveys for the property for the Commission's reference as well for tonight's discussion.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that they purchased the property in 1992 and the property was not landmarked at that time. He said the structure was over 100 years old and Ms. Miller, the previous owner, had done a wonderful job restoring the structure. He stated they opposed the landmark designation. He noted they moved out 10 years ago and have rented out the property. He said they have been unsuccessfully trying to sell the property and that being under the preservation ordinance is keeping people from buying the property because they want to modernize it. He said they've had two people walk away from the property due to the designation. He said the ordinance was very unclear and obviously written by an attorney. He said he wanted to know from the Commission exactly what it is they were protecting. He said he thought it was just the front of the home.

COMMISSIONER LEARY stated that the ordinance says they are interested in anything visible from the public way or public walk. Mr. O'Donnell specifically asked if an addition on the back would be ok. He showed them the area on a photo where an addition would most likely go.

**Preservation Commission Minutes
February 13, 2020**

COMMISSIONER LEARY stated that an addition wouldn't be an issue, but it still has to go through the process. COMMISSIONER KAPLAN also stated he had no issue with an addition on the house. COMMISSIONER COOMBES asked Mr. O'Donnell what exactly is the issue. She noted that it was obvious he was frustrated and wanted clarification on what issue they needed to address. She noted that several of the Commissioners are historic homeowners including herself and are sympathetic to his situation. Mr. O'Donnell reiterated that he wanted something in writing that an addition on the back is allowed.

The Commissioners said they have worked with homeowners and interested parties in the past and said they would be willing to look at a proposal and give an opinion. Mr. O'Donnell said that neither he nor a buyer would want to invest in plans. COMMISSIONER LEARY stated that he would be willing to review a schematic drawing. He noted that would be sufficient for a preliminary review and would not cost as much as full architectural drawings. COMMISSIONER KAPLAN agreed that would be sufficient for a preliminary review. The other Commissioners agreed. Mr. O'Donnell said he may just hire an architect to create a schematic plan and submit it. He asked when the next meeting was. Director Abt noted that it would be in April. The Commissioners noted that they would be willing to schedule a special meeting for him if he was able to get something submitted quickly. Mr. O'Donnell thanked the Commission.

There was also a question about a fence. The Commission noted that since it would be visible from the street and had potential to impact the view of the structure it would require their review and approval.

9. Informational Items: None.
10. Presentations of Petitions, Communications and Citizen Requests: None.
11. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.