

## **HISTORICAL PRESERVATION**

May 24, 2021  
REGULAR MEETING

### **ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 5:30p.m. Chairman Paul Bremer asked for the roll call to be conducted. Members in attendance and absent are listed below:

#### **Members Present:**

Chairman Paul Bremer, Vice Chairman Jim Kendall, Todd Kabella, Laura Sauerman, Jolene Bolinger, Jim Crisman, Richard Oesterle

**Members Absent:** None

#### **Staff Present:**

Landmarks Advisor Brad Miller, Executive Secretary Anthony Schlueter, Recording Secretary Jenni Pause

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Bremer asked the Board if there were any additions and/or corrections to the meeting minutes for March 22, 2021. Jim Kendall motioned to approve the meeting minutes as presented. Jolene Bolinger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken by a vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstention, the motion passed, and the meeting minutes for March 22, 2021 were approved.

Bremer informed Schlueter that they have never approved the January 25, 2021 meeting minutes. Bremer asked the Board to defer the approval of the January 25th meeting minutes. Rich Oesterle motioned to defer the January 25 meeting minutes to the next meeting. Bolinger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken by a vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstention, the motion passed, and the meeting minutes were deferred to the next meeting.

Bremer informed the Board that Staff has made a request to hear Petition #21-07 first. Bremer asked for a motion to move the Petition. Todd Kabella motioned to hear Petition #21-07 first. Kendall asked why they are asking to be moved. Schlueter stated it is a request by Staff. Bolinger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken by a vote of 6 Ayes, 1 Nays, 0 Abstention, the motion passed.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **18-10 Dave Jancosek, Petitioner/Owner**

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness

**Purpose:** Home Restoration

**Location:** 107 West South Street

Dave Jancosek, 107 W. South St., came before the Commission and provided an overview of the petition. Jancosek detailed the changes he plans to make with the basement. Jancosek requested some egress windows for the house preferably trying to get them all on the back of the house with maybe one on the east side that would be hidden enough that you would only see the top of the window.

Kendall asked Jancosek to describe the egress windows. Jancosek stated it would be a window in the basement that you could walk out, it would be about 27-36". Kendall asked Jancosek to verify that it is an emergency exit. Jancosek confirmed.

Jancosek stated he is also looking to replace the fireplace stack that he removed with a skylight.

State Advisor Brad Miller reported that the home is a structure within the Holley District. Miller reported his understanding is the petition is to install 2 egress windows along the east and south of the foundation along with window wells as well as a skylight to replace the fireplace stack. Miller reported that the petitioner has claimed that they will try to keep the egress windows on the south side but if they have to install one on the east it will be located below grade and not visible. Miller reported installing window wells to grade would not impact historic material. Miller reported that if the petitioner would agree to wood clad windows on the public side painted to match existing windows, he would recommend approval of the new egress windows and window wells. Miller reported that the Commission previously approved the fireplace stack to be deconstructed and rebuilt. Miller reported that approval was subject to the chimney stack being reconstructed due to the chimney being a character defining feature of the house and its preservation is mandated in the guidelines. Miller recommended denying the replacement of the fireplace stack with a skylight. Miller reported the petitioner agreed, prior to approval, to reconstruct the chimney stack using the original bricks if possible. Miller recommended that a skylight may be able to be placed behind the rebuilt chimney so it would not be visible.

Bolinger asked Miller if skylights are appropriate in the district. Miller reported they are allowed if appropriately placed. Miller stated the question goes back to the Commission who voted to allow the removal of the historic chimney because the petitioner said they would rebuild it. Miller reported since the petitioner is choosing not to rebuild the chimney and install a skylight he is going against the original approval. The Commission and the petitioner discussed the chimney and the various work that has been performed at the house.

Kabella asked what type of profile the skylight would be, if it would be more flush to the roof. Jancosek stated it will be like the one on the house across the street, it will be mostly flush. Jancosek stated the skylight will not be noticeable.

Kendall asked what color the skylight will be. Jancosek stated it will match the roof.

Bremer entertained a motion for the Finding of Facts for this petition. Kendall motioned to approve #18-10 which will include 2 egress windows in the basement that will be set below grade with windows wells and in lieu of the rebuilding of the chimney installs a 3 x 6 skylight that will be flush to the roof and match the color of the roof. Bremer included that if an egress window goes on the east side, it will be wood clad and match the existing windows. Kendall amended his motion. Bolinger seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman asked for roll call. With a roll call vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, and 0 Abstentions, Petition #18-10 regarding the Finding of Facts was approved.

Bremer entertained a motion for the Certificate of Appropriateness for this petition. Bolinger motioned to approve #18-10. Sauerman seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman asked for roll call. With a roll call vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, and 0 Abstentions, Petition #18-10 regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness for Petition #18-10 was approved.

Kendall asked the petitioner how close they are to picking out a color theme. Jancosek stated he likes the white and stated he may come back for approval of some accent colors.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **21-05 Rebecca & Robert Alm, Petitioner/Owner**

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness

**Purpose:** Exterior Painting

**Location:** 113 West South Street

Rebecca & Robert Alm, came before the Board and provided an overview of the petition.

Miller reported that house is a notable structure in the Holley Historic District. Miller reported the siding will be the HC163 ducksberry gray, cedar shakes will be a solid stain, bricks steps and lattice will be 1559 Arctic shadows and the trim, columns, rails, crown, windows, soffit and fascia will be PM 4 Brilliant white. Miller recommended approval as submitted.

Oesterle complimented the petitioners on the cedar shakes and stated they look great.

Bremer entertained a motion for the Finding of Facts for this petition. Kendall motioned to approve #21-05 with the exterior of the structure being painted HC163 ducksberry gray, cedar shakes will be a solid stain, bricks steps and lattice will be 1559 Arctic shadows and the trim, columns, rails, crown, windows, soffit and fascia will be PM 4 Brilliant white. Bolinger seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman asked for roll call. With a roll call vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, and 0 Abstentions, Petition #21-05 regarding the Finding of Facts was approved.

Bremer entertained a motion for the Certificate of Appropriateness for this petition. Bolinger motioned to approve #21-05. Crisman seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman asked for roll call. With a roll call vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, and 0 Abstentions, Petition #21-05 regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness for Petition #21-05 was approved.

**21-06 Andrzej (Andy) Gurzak, Petitioner/Owner**

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness

**Purpose:** Free Standing Sign

**Location:** 127 North Main Street

Andy Gurzak, 127 N. Main Street, came before the Commission and provided an overview of the petition.

Kendall asked the petitioner to verify that the signs would be off the front porch. Gurzak confirmed.

Miller reported on the appropriate location which would be on the front porch and on the proposed sign design, materials, and colors. Miller reported any future signage would need to come before the Commission.

Kendall asked if the shingle signs will be the same size as Fleming's. Gurzak confirmed.

Bremer entertained a motion for the Finding of Facts for this petition. Bolinger motioned to approve #21-06 for 2 perpendicular signs on the front porch as presented. Oesterle seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman asked for roll call. With a roll call vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, and 0 Abstentions, Petition #21-06 regarding the Finding of Facts was approved.

Bremer entertained a motion for the Certificate of Appropriateness for this petition. Kendall motioned to approve #21-06. Sauerman seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman asked for roll call. With a roll call vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, and 0 Abstentions, Petition #21-05 regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

**21-07 Duckit, LLC, Petitioner/Owner**

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness

**Purpose:** Façade Restoration

**Location:** 208 South Main Street

Kyle Ropac, 208 S. Main St., came before the Board and provided an overview of the petition. Ropac stated he is before the Board more as a workshop, he is not looking for approvals just yet. Ropac handed out rendering options for proposed remodel. Ropac stated he is trying to keep the original limestone look but due to previous work on the limestone restoring it is not an option. Ropac stated they had a structural engineer inspect the limestone and they are afraid if they start peeling away the limestone it will affect the integrity of the structure. Ropac stated it is only the front 20' of the building that is

structurally questionable. Ropac stated he is open for discussions on how to correct the stucco over masonry look there.

Laura Sauerman stated 20' back is a better structural situation, she asked if that was because the original building was added to. Brad Miller stated the entire building was constructed in 1936. Sauerman asked why just the front 20' would have structural issues. Miller stated he cannot answer that. Kendall stated the back portion of the building was built like a vault to store records.

Kendall asked if there is a code issue with the number of entrances, since option 1 & 2 show two entrances and 3 only shows one entrance. Ropac stated the entrances have no bearing on code.

Alex (no last name) came before the Board as the architect for Ropac. Alex provided details on the current state of the front structure of the building. Alex claimed the front of the building is currently not fully supported. Alex stated the front of the building and the current stairs going to the basement are currently not up to code. Alex stated this building will have a side exit, so they have an extra exit. Sam

Jim Crisman asked if the building was originally limestone, and someone recently painted over it. Ropac stated that is what they are thinking but are not completely sure. Vickers stated the building was originally limestone and granite and at some point, someone did a refacing of the building and cut into the limestone to install a façade. Vickers stated when that façade was removed it left holes in the granite which someone tried to patch with a stucco type of paint that was painted over all the limestone. Vickers stated you can clearly see where the patch work is cracking and crumbling.

Rich Oesterle stated his concern is the structural soundness of the building. Oesterle stated he feels the Board should be comfortable that a structural engineer has inspected the building. Oesterle stated he does not believe that is an uncommon method of construction and has a building that is only 4 years older than this one and has a solid brick wall behind the limestone façade. Vickers detailed on how everything was constructed on the inside.

Ropac stated he heard Kabella speaking about the overhang and stated he tried to make it flat with the same look up top but structurally he couldn't. Kabella asked the petitioner to verify that he is saying the façade cannot be flush from top to bottom. Alex stated it can but it loses square footage. Kabella stated he likes the building for downtown Chicago, but the design does not fit the Crown Point downtown Square. Bolinger agreed. Ropac stated he had brick on it was suggested he needed to use similar material to the original. Ropac stated his wish is not to use limestone and to use a whitewashed brick. Kabella stated he understands trying to get some more square footage, but this design is setting a whole new precedence for the downtown area.

State Advisor Brad Miller reported this is the first time he is seeing the 3 different renderings. Miller reported in his opinion what is currently there is the 1936 design. Miller reported he understands that some materials might be jeopardized but was not in those conversations. Miller reported that anything that radically changes the façade dissolves the integrity of the building counter to the spirit of

preservation and the guidelines of the downtown square. Miller reported he is not even going to discuss perspectives on this because it is changing the original design.

Ropac asked if he spends the money to have a structural engineer come out and won't sign off on what is there, what does he do then if it is not structurally sound. Kendall asked what the city procedure is if the building is not structurally sound. Schlueter reported it probably wouldn't pass code and wouldn't be permanent at that point. Kabella asked Schlueter to clarify that he is just speaking about the façade. Ropac stated the only part of the building in question is L shape of the building on the front off the alley, the first 20' of the building, the shared wall with the old Harvest Bread company is ok. Kendall stated if the petitioner has a structural engineer come in and report to the Board where the building is a problem and the petitioner has to fix it then those changes will need to be approved. Kendall stated they will need to see how much needs to be altered to save the structure.

Kabella stated what he is getting out is when they first started speaking about this and when they met at out at the site the fascia is what was questionable structurally. Alex explained the 3 courses on the inside that are the issue. Alex stated they found this when they started prying around and doing a little bit of demo. Alex stated there is no way it will hold a steel beam. Kendall asked if he means it won't hold the steel beam for the second floor. Kabella stated he just wanted to understand and asked the petitioner to clarify that it is not structurally sound to hold the second level. Ropac confirmed. Alex stated they need to install a new staircase that will be up to date with current code due to the fact the current stairs are not up to code and will need access to bring in the machines to do that.

Kendall asked the petitioner asked about option 3, he stated if remembers correctly there are currently smaller square windows on the top level. Kendall asked if inside if the building is open to the ceiling or is there a second floor. Ropac stated there is a second floor all the way across. Kendall asked why the limestone cannot be kept at the top to keep the same kind of pattern for the windows that is there now. Petitioner and Board discussed the windows. Miller reported that if the structural repairs have to happen, they have the original building design, and it can be rebuilt as such to preserve the architectural integrity of the building. Miller reported the current building design is the original building design and if structural repairs must happen the building could be recreated to preserve the original elements. Kabella stated with another petitioner it came up with what year do they go back to for restoration. Miller reported this is the original design. Kabella asked Miller to verify that if they must tear off the front façade and want to keep the integrity of the structure, they need to keep with the 1936 design. Miller reported in 1936 that building existed as it does today there is no different façade. Miller reported there was a fo-façade was added in the 60's but removed in the early 2000's so as it sits now is how it was in 1936 when originally constructed with original facade. Kabella stated what he is getting from the petitioner is that when this façade went on, they just put bump out metal with chicken wire. Miller stated that is on the inside. Ropac stated it carries over to the outside. Miller stated the limestone is fastened to the brick. Ropac asked who policed the application of the façade. Kendall went over the process he believed they did when applying and removing the fo-façade which left the granite and limestone damaged. Kendall stated all of that was done without the Boards approval and by the time they got involved the best thing they could do was get as much information about what was done as

possible. Kabella asked Ropac to verify that he wants to go beyond that. Ropac stated he does not like to own things and only go halfway with corrections. Ropac stated he does not want to change the integrity of the square; he just needs to tear the front of the building off because of structural issues. Ropac stated the cost of taking the building back to the 1936 design is astronomical. Miller asked Ropac to verify that the 3<sup>rd</sup> option requires the least amount of work and going back to the original design would be even less window space which would be less work. Ropac confirmed. Kendall explained how they made the windows and granite work once they removed the fo-façade and how they tried to get everything to match. Schlueter asked if the windows have a functional use for business type of use. Kendall stated that was used as office space. Schlueter reported that the petitioner is looking for some guidance from some of the designs he submitted including the original that can be worked with. Schlueter reported his understanding from the ad hoc committee is if the exterior can have some sort of nod to the 1936 appearance that is the goal they want to get to.

Kendall asked if the limestone is being worked on will the Lake County Title wording be removed from the building. Ropac stated his wishes are to have the wording removed.

Alex Kutanovski state he understands that the Board is trying to preserve the buildings but with some buildings, there look or the way they are set up, are just not economically viable for any business to go in. Kutanovski stated maybe the Board should be looking at what the buildings will look like 100 years from now because the square has to progress forward to some extent. Kabella stated that conversation came up when they approved New Town West and what was stated was it may not be historical now, but it will be years from now. Kabella stated they must be very careful about the precedence they set.

Oesterle stated one of the things they were worried about when they created the Historic Preservation Commission was people purchasing homes after the district was created and understanding that the home they purchased is located in the historic district and the guidelines would need to be followed. Oesterle asked Ropac to verify that the building was located within the historic district when he purchased it. Ropac confirmed he just purchased it in the last couple weeks. Oesterle stated his concern is that the integrity that has been on the Commission, that is there by appointment, is to follow the guidelines. Oesterle stated if there are structural issues or some other reasons, they could waiver from the guidelines, then they could but it does fall a bit on the integrity of the Board members. Ropac asked with that being said if he should engage the structural engineer to then bring back the information of what he discovers so they have a starting point. Kendall agreed and stated the argument about the stairs is going to happen on the inside and will not have an effect on the Board's decision. Vickers disagreed, stating the building was built like a fortress and in order to get in there they will need to get a excavator in the building. Alex stated they will not be able to prop up the façade. Kendall asked the petitioner to verify what they are saying is they are going to have to cut a hole in the building to get equipment in there. Vickers confirmed one way or another they will need to get equipment in. Ropac stated they can do that from the side of the building if need be. Kendall stated he likes on option 3 that they kept the doors in their current location, the windows on the first floor are fine and understands the need to add some larger windows to the second floor to make it useable for the use they intend. Kendall stated he is good if there is a limestone divider between the first and the second floor that gives that

break. Kendall stated he would like to see the Lake County Title wording stay because it is part of the history.

Miller recommended engaging a structural engineer if that is prerogative of the petitioner, it would be useful and important for the Commission and the petitioner to present a finalized rendering of what would happen after that. Miller reported it would be better for everyone if the petitioner does get an Engineer, it would be better for everyone to understand what will come after that before that money is spent. Ropac asked if there is a clause in the guidelines that states that if it is not economically viable to sustain a business in that facility, the Board must consider. Miller confirmed for demolition. Ropac stated if the front is not structurally sound it would need to be demolished. Miller reported it would come down to the definition of demolition, typically that means the whole structure. Miller reported that would trigger a new process. Ropac asked what that process would be. Miller stated it would need to be discussed. Ropac asked Miller if he was saying he does not know. Miller stated he could send Ropac the ordinance the language is there, it is a couple pages.

Mayor David Uran asked the Board to verify that if the integrity of the outside of the building is not able to be preserved/restored, is there an opportunity for accommodation for the front to be demoed and put back some of the periods they are requesting along with accommodations of some of the other things that take place on the square to compliment the building, so it does not become a completely new façade. Uran stated it could match some of the current structure and would then be economically feasible as well as energy efficient. Uran asked if he is hearing from the Board that there is an opportunity to work with the petitioner to look at the ideas going forward with the architect so that there can be accommodation of both. Bremer stated the board can work with the petitioner.

Kabella asked the Board if they have any objections or preference towards the 3 rendering options that the petitioner provided. Miller reported as Staff he would recommend against that until they get the engineer's report, and a full slate of materials is provided. Miller stated they could put it as an "unofficial" opinion. Ropac stated he does not want to do the design 30 times, if he could get some options to work with it would be helpful. Ropac stated mini windows at the top will not work for any business. Petitioner and Board discussed the possible options and differences with the rendering options. Ropac asked could he take option #1 (without the cantilever) and blend it with the top of option #2. Sauerman asked wouldn't that make it #2. Ropac asked if he could do #2 with all glass going across if it is recessed in. The Board agreed that was not a good option. Kabella stated the proportions of the building look different from option 1-3. Petitioner stated they are all to the scale they are just at different angles.

Kendall discussed the different options that could be done with the double entrance and the windows. Kendall asked if there is a way of keeping the entryway that is recessed and getting rid of the glass that is full sheets which would kind of keep some of the integrity of the design.

Bremer asked the petitioner if they would like to be placed on the agenda for next month or would they like to have a special meeting. Ropac stated he would prefer a special meeting at an earlier date. Ropac stated if they have one more ad hoc meeting before next month that would help speed things up.

Sauerman stated her preference would be 3. Sauerman stated if there are issues with the structural integrity and there has to be demolition, she is going to throw a wrench in the plan and state she likes the original whitewash brick. Sauerman stated she feels a lot of things are going to depend on the structural integrity of the building.

Ropac asked what kind of documentation the Board needs from him and at what level do they want him to do the inspections. Kendall stated if they could have the engineer point out the issues that would be good. Ropac stated he wants the engineer to be able to do his job. Bremer stated have the Engineer do a report and submit it to Miller. Miller recommended to the petitioner to do flat elevations of the west and south sides instead of 3D renderings so that the board can see the proportions accurately. Miller stated they will also need to provide what types of materials they are proposing including windows and doors. Ropac asked what type of LED's they allow and what don't they allow. Miller stated it is more about the visual appearance and placement of the lights. Miller stated the ordinance details the lighting as well. Ropac stated the guidelines are vague. Ropac stated he would rather have the type of light the Board would approve. Kabella stated they are not opposed to LED lighting if replicates the time era. Kendall stated the goose neck lights they are showing are used all around the square. Miller reported that type of light is not appropriate for an art deco building. Kabella recommended again that the Board provide the petitioner with some options and preferences.

Bolinger asked Miller if option #3 would be adaptive. Miller stated he would prefer not to comment because anything short of preserving what is there or recreating what is there with new materials that match the existing will jeopardize the integrity of the building. Miller reminded the Commission that this building was added to the National Registry Historic District after it was unveiled. Miller reported any changes in this light would tipping it back to what it was before which puts a dent in the whole Historical District. Miller reminded the Commission that the National Registry Historic District is a separate from the local district, has to maintain it's integrity, if too many changes happen to the district, it could be delisted which has dramatic impact on all property owners in the downtown district. Miller reported that is why the local commission is set up to maintain the integrity of the district which is where his concern is with this petition.

Kendall asked Miller if the petitioner has any access to any resources from Landmarks with the structural stuff that might help expedite. Miller stated not really, their funds are mostly for non-profit organizations or government. Miller stated they would turn to a structural engineer as well. Miller reported that a contributing building like this has the ability to pursue Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits but they would be having to do best practices which is what he is promoting, preserving what is there or recreating with new materials that match the existing.

Kendall asked if they know how thick the limestone is. Alex stated it is about 1-2" and they are not sure if it is a limestone face or full limestone. Kendall and the petitioner discussed the options for the limestone repair or replacement. Alex stated there are some issues with the structural integrity of the brick.

Crisman asked the petitioner if they are looking for an answer from the Commission on what the structural engineer should be addressing. Alex stated if the engineer states the building is unsound what are the options after that. Bremer stated they will need to get the report from the Engineer and provide a copy to Schlueter and Miller and they will review it. Oesterle stated he would like their discovery to determine how thick the limestone is.

Bremer stated they will carry this over to the next meeting and if the petitioner gets some answers before the next meeting, they will need to take the info to Schlueter and Miller and see what they can do to get the petitioner into a special meeting for a workshop so that maybe at their next scheduled meeting they will be able to vote on the final rendering.

Bremer entertained a motion for the Finding of Facts for this petition. Bolinger motioned to defer #21-07 to the next meeting. Kendall seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman asked for roll call. With a roll call vote of 7 Ayes, 0 Nay, and 0 Abstentions, Petition #21-07 was deferred.

### **Misc. and Public Comment**

Debbie Thill, 321 E. Clark St., came and voiced her opinion about the Lake County Building, Thill stated the building is an iconic building and deserves to be preserved as is. Thill stated she is tired of people coming into the city, buying a historic structure that does not work for them and then destroy it to make it what they want it to be. Thill stated people know they are buying in a historic district so if they don't like it as is they should not buy it.

No Misc.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 6:57 p.m., Chairman entertained a motion to adjourn. Sauerman motioned to adjourn, seconded by Kendall.

### **ATTESTMENTS OF MEETING MINUTES**

The above minutes were approved and adopted by majority on the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Bremer, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Anthony Schlueter, Executive Secretary