

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
December 18, 2017

The December 18, 2017 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Demsky in the Burnham Board Room of the Village Hall. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Upon roll call, the following were:

Present: Commissioners Ciolek, Jung, Reynolds, Tracy, and Chairman Demsky
Absent: Commissioner McWilliams
Also present: Michelle House, Planner II
David Silver, former HPC Chairman
Bev Dawson, former HPC Commissioner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Demsky asked for comments/corrections to the minutes from the September 27th HPC special meeting. There were no comments/corrections. Commissioner Ciolek, seconded by Commissioner Tracy, moved to adopt the minutes of the September 27, 2017 Historic Preservation Commission meeting as submitted. Upon voice vote, motion carried. Commissioner Reynolds abstained due to his absence at that meeting.

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS

- 1740 Maclean Court Consultation

Ms. House summarized that the residence was a Sears Kit home and have been working with an architect to add a second story to their home prior to staff contacting them. Staff spoke about designating their home as a historic structure, but owner was concerned about construction and wanted to begin as soon as they could. Staff suggested that homeowner save all receipts from construction, etc. If owner wanted to return to discuss designation, staff would be happy to work with them.

Continuing, Ms. House stated that the previous owner had come to the HPC to identify the home as a Sears Kit Home because they felt it added to the marketing value. Current owner was interested in preserving as much of the original architecture and character of the home as possible. Ms. House stated that through research, staff found that many of the ranch homes similar to home under discussion had added two (2) dormers, but current owner was proposing a single, larger dormer over first level, front entrance. Should owner inquiry further after construction, staff would determine if alterations were in keeping with the character of the home.

CONSENT

No consent agenda

OLD BUSINESS

- Review of Draft Single-Family Residence “Birthday” Mailer

Ms. House presented an overview of the draft birthday card mailer for homes greater than 50 years of age. Suggested changes and comments were incorporated, such as bullet points, age of home, etc. Several cards would be used if possible and card would be personalized. For example, “your home is greater than XX (age of home 50, 60, 70) years old”. Cost was being investigated to determine if sending several cards based on age of home was feasible.

Ms. House showed the proposed card as well as photos of the different home options via overhead. Staff worked with Beverly Dawson regarding photos of homes and reached out to Glenview Art League to determine if drawings used in a 1993 calendar by Koenig and Rubloff, former Glenview real estate office, could be used for the birthday mailer. Artist was Shelly Walsh, and staff had attempted contact with her.

Comments made were:

- Commissioner Ciolek suggested the use of three different images for three different cards
- Having three different cards would be nice if cost was not an issue
- Have a blank space on the card to fill in the specific year by hand or with a sticker if printing costs were an issue
- Commissioner Reynolds preferred Option 1 if cost was an issue, but different cards would be nice
- Commissioner Jung commented that all three options were special and acceptable, but Option 1 was inclusive for all years.
- Commissioner Ciolek commented that the photo for Option 1 was a high profile building on Waukegan Rd and recognizable by everyone. If only one card, Option 1 was his preference.
- Ms. Dawson and Mr. Silver both felt it was a good idea and were thrilled that the HPC was moving forward with it.

Consensus was for Option 1 if only one possible card to be used for all home ages. If cost was not an issue, mix and match the three photos for mailings.

Commissioner Reynolds asked if there was information as to how many homes would be age 50 or over. Ms. House responded that the information was not available at this time. Chairman Demsky felt that there were many homes aged 50 or above, but issue was whether they were architecturally significant or not and whether there was interest in designating the home.

Discussion ensued on how to make the card more personal. Comments made were:

- Have all commissioners sign the cards
- Ms. House suggested commissioners sign a paper that can be scanned in and then printed on all cards
- Chairman Demsky felt that signing the card was a good idea.
- There was no set date to mail cards, and they could be mailed in batches.
- Mailing could be an invitation to attend the next HPC meeting for homeowner information gathering and process discussion
- Commissioner Reynolds commented that residents generally do not understand historic preservation and what the benefits would be for the owners.

Commissioner Reynolds stated that this was all about the current inventory. Discussion would be held at the HPC meeting to determine if property met specific criteria, was the architecture of significance, what qualifies a specific property, etc.

Chairman Demsky stated that it might be best to send a blanket mailing and then focus more if individuals were interested.

Comments made regarding the card were:

- Links were useless in the cards – they did not link

- Link information could be included for resident reference
- Ms. House stated that the links were included to draw people's interest and know where to check out on their own
- Could be blanket comment at end of card to contact Ms. House if interested.
- Village of Glenview seal would be centered on page
- Commissioner Reynolds commented that the draft card continued to “feel” like a village pamphlet and not a birthday card. A graphic designer was needed to bring it to life
- Drawing on the front was good, but the information page needed to be revisited
- Commissioner Reynolds felt that it was pared down, but the card was still not engaging
- Chairman Demsky stated that if card was too short or too generic, it was not catching.
- Financial incentives mentioned may catch the owners eye
- Commissioner Ciolek suggested having a celebratory comment on the inside with information on the back of the card
- Card was informative but there was “no call for action”

Ms. House summarized:

First two lines of current draft used on inside of revised card,
'Add your house to our community of historic architecture'
Benefits listed on the back of card
Come to see us for more information

Mr. Silver stated that most of the information was on the village website, and he suggested having only the village website link for added information. There were links that would explain why house/property could be valuable. Commissioner Reynolds stated that the HPC website takes interested owners to links for more information.

Final comments made were:

- Chairman Demsky commented that a “carrot” was needed.
- Say, “bet you didn't know that....”
- Bullet points for benefits: lower taxes, financial incentives, for example
- Invite potential homeowners to a party: have a cake, power point to show, present documentation from homeowner who has designated property
- Would image of a designated home be a better image for the front of the card?
- Do you know if homeowner was still in the home?
- Quote from homeowner if property was sold. Comments are valuable
- Testimonials from owners are valuable

Ms. House would revise card that could be reviewed at the next meeting. Staff would contact artist for approval of drawings to use on card, but would consider photo of designated home. Possible options could be submitted via email for comments.

Commissioner Reynolds felt that there was a need to educate residents to inform them as to what is in Glenview. Ms. House stated that the action plan that was adopted had good ideas in terms of educating residents, but the birthday card was a starting point. Bigger steps could be taken to make historic preservation a well-known issue in Glenview. There were no other comments at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

- Discussion of architectural survey to be completed in 2018

Ms. House stated that Dudley Onderdonk, consultant, identified several survey options in the Action Plan that was adopted in early 2017. Options identified were:

- Kit Homes
- Mid-Century Modern
- East Glenview
- Downtown and South Glenview

Commissioners were welcome to mention other items as potential survey items for consideration.

Comments made were:

- Chairman Demsky commented that there appeared to be a mix of specific types and areas.
- Ms. House stated that the survey could be conducted on one of the options only as deemed appropriate by the HPC. Perhaps do one survey per year.
- Commissioner Reynolds commented that the Kit Homes would be the most interesting survey. He also mentioned that Kit Homes was where we were headed – ‘a manufactured world’ – and would be the more relevant of the options
- Commissioner Reynolds mentioned that East Glenview was probably the more luxury area but was not the most interesting in his opinion.
- Commissioner Ciolek was in agreement but added that he was also interested in the Downtown area since it was changing – in a good way.
- Chairman Demsky commented that there were many items that could be focused on: local stone, slate shingles, masonry type home, for example. He felt that the least interesting would be ‘designating an area’.
- Commissioner Reynolds added that a particular style could be surveyed and questioned if they would be unique to Glenview. He felt that the Kit Home was the most unique to Glenview which went from a tavern town to a suburban community.
- Mid-50s ranches were post war development
- Mid-century modern would be the least interest

Chairman Demsky commented that the HPC was saying it should be special. Ms. House mentioned that the Kit Homes survey was to be done in 2015-2016. Unfortunately, it was not completed at that time due to insurance issues. Staff could contact consultant to follow thru with the Kit Homes survey at this time. Kit homes would be the easier option on the list due to survey started and consultant identified.

In response to Chairman Demsky, Mr. Silver stated that Vicky Granicki conducted the survey and there were approximately 40 homes identified. The results of survey should be in the file with photos and descriptions. Question would be whether or not the homes would still be in existence.

Mr. Silver relayed that Sears Roebuck had a factory in southern Illinois and all of the parts of the home could be purchased from them. There were approximately 30-35 kit homes in Glenview and was potentially the largest number of kit homes around. Kit Homes could be spotted throughout the area. Sears and Wards both had kit homes, but you would have to be inside the home to verify it. HPC was charged with the exterior of the home and not the interior.

Commissioner Reynolds mentioned Susan Benjamin another consultant who did historic work in the area. Commissioner Reynolds stated that a major issue was documenting what Glenview had.

Ms. House stated that a grant had been obtained for the last survey and staff would attempt to get the grant again. In response to Mr. Silver, Ms. House stated that certification had been kept up by the Village of Glenview. Staff would provide the RFP for the survey.

Ms. House stated the next meeting date was not yet set. She would try to schedule a HPC meeting the end of January/early February. There was no other business, and Chairman Demsky adjourned the meeting at 7:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Pomillo
Recording Secretary

DRAFT