

**Oak Park Historic Preservation Commission  
Architectural Review Committee  
March 13, 2025 at 7:30PM – Meeting Minutes**

A recording of this meeting is available on the Village of Oak Park Website: <https://www.oak-park.us/Government/Citizen-Boards-and-Commissions/Commission-TV>

**Roll Call**

Present: Chair Lou Garapolo, and Commissioner Amy Peterson  
Absent: Commissioners Scot Mazur, Mark Weiner, and Rachel Michelin  
Staff: Atefa Ghaznawi, Urban Planner

**Agenda Approval**

*Motion by Commissioner Peterson to approve the agenda. Second by Chair Lou Garapolo. Motion approved 2-0.*

**Minutes**

*Motion by Commissioner Peterson to approve the minutes from February 13, 2025. Second by Chair Lou Garapolo. Motion approved 2-0.*

**Non-Agenda Public Comment:** None.

**Regular Agenda**

**ADVISORY REVIEW: 221 S Euclid Ave (Stephen Coorlas, Architect):** Advisory Review to construct a coach house with 3-car garage (*Ridgeland-Oak Park Historic District*).

Chair Garapolo introduced the item. Urban Planner Ghaznawi provided an overview of the application.

The applicant provided an overview of the application. The Committee stated that the coach house has 4/4 windows, whereas the house has 6/6 windows. It is recommended to use 6/6 windows to echo the house. The Committee appreciated all of the attention the applicant made to add all the details to echo the original house, yet still making the coach house modern and distinctive. The Committee requested the applicant to explain various siding materials that was used on the 3D renderings. The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed siding materials. The Committee stated: "if you look at the house from front, it appears to be vertical because of the roof shape. When you look at the garage, it is very flat looking. Can tell us more about your design process?" The applicant stated: "There are a series of offsets in the upper level, and we have played with these dormers to maximize interior space and head height storage space for such a small footprint. This roof geometry was affording us the most space on the interior and most dimension on the façade, while being cost effective structurally, every offset is a dollar added. Staying under 20 feet height requirement, getting the head height and having offset interests, this was the best choice." The Committee asked what is the current elevation height. The applicant stated: "It is at 20 feet which is the max. To cut and make a more dramatic roofline with vertical expression, it would cut significantly into the head height space. The main roofline running north to south

maximize that, coming from ceiling height at level one going up to 20 feet. It was as steep that we could get that pitch.”

The applicant stated that he will incorporate the Committee’s recommendation regarding the 6/6 window.

**DISCUSSION – CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: 332 S East Ave (Tracey J. Brewer, Architect):** To discuss a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a rear corner addition, infill two existing windows, replace/ repair decorative stained-glass windows, and add decorative pilasters to an existing dormer (*Ridgeland-Oak Park Historic District*).

Chair Garapolo introduced the item. Urban Planner Ghaznawi provided an overview of the application.

The applicant provided an overview of the application. The Committee asked: “Is the new infill at the same plane as the south elevation? And is there any reason why the head height of the new window on the addition is not aligned with the other windows on south elevation?” The applicant said: “Yes, the infill is at the same plane. The new window height allows the family to have more storage for coats under the window in the proposed mudroom.” The Committee stated that it was the only window that bumps off the horizontal plane, and it should really align. There is a lot of storage in the mudroom, the homeowner will lose a little of storage by lowering the window but it will make a big difference on the exterior. The Committee strongly recommended aligning the window head height with other windows on the south elevation. Urban Planner Ghaznawi asked the applicant to elaborate on the proposed repair/ replace of the decorative stained-glass windows on south and front elevations. The homeowner stated: “The stained-glass windows on stair tower are falling apart and need repair. We would replace them with new quality upgraded windows with glass pattern that would match the character of the house and existing stained-glass windows on other elevations. The two side lites will be stained-glass. Also, the reason for having a higher window head on the infill addition is because that window will face three dumpsters across the alley, and a higher window will block that view, and will provide more privacy from the apartment building across the alley. Our thought process was the practicality of storage space, and to provide privacy. The misalignment is not perceivable from the alley. We preferred interior practicality to exterior aesthetics.” The Committee stated that the new window can be an opaque or frosted glass that can block the view, and asked if a window is really needed. The homeowner stated that they also thought of not having a window at all. The Committee also pointed out that the annotations on the drawings state *Bid Alternatives*, how the Village would know what will be used, and since all these elements are Bid Alternatives what the applicant will end up with. The applicant stated that they have to get pricing to finalize various elements. There may be a change in the scope of work based on the pricing and the homeowner may omit some parts of the work. When a permit is granted it does not mean that all of the proposed work will be done. The Committee requested the elements that are noted as Bid Alternative to be finalized when the Commission will review the proposal for a formal Certificate of Appropriateness application at the next HPC meeting, as it will be required for getting approval from the Commission. The homeowner stated that they will work with the architect to finalize the priorities and details of the proposal.

The Committee strongly recommended reconsidering the proposed window on the infill addition by either aligning the window height with other windows and using opaque/ frosted glass, or eliminating the window, and provide various priorities and details of the proposal.

**ADVISORY REVIEW: 423 S Humphrey Ave (Scott Doughman, Contractor):** Advisory Review to replace twelve (12) front porch wood windows with vinyl double-hung windows (*Ridgeland-Oak Park Historic District*).

Chair Garapolo introduced the item. Urban Planner Ghaznawi provided an overview of the application.

The applicant provided an overview of the application. The Committee stated that in the existing windows the grid pattern will be up high and asked if the proposed double-hung windows will have a different pattern. The applicant stated that the proposed windows will also have 3/1 pattern on top of the window, and there will be an additional white lite where the two sashes of the double-hung window are separated. The Committee asked if the existing windows can be repaired. The applicant stated that in the contractor's scope of work they don't repair windows and only do windows replacement. The Committee stated that the existing windows are very distinctive and character defining. The Committee asked Urban Planner Ghaznawi why this application is an advisory review rather than a COA. Urban Planner Ghaznawi stated that similar projects in the past have been reviewed as an Advisory Review for example 816 N Oak Park Ave had a similar scope of work. Therefore, this is an advisory review. Urban Planner Ghaznawi stated: "We cannot determine if the front porch was enclosed within the period of significance i.e., 1870-1929 and if it is historic fabric." The Committee stated that there was no consideration to repair the windows. The Committee needs to know if these windows can be repaired. Also, using a double-hung window with a 3/1 pattern on the top and one lite in the middle will change the look of the house. If the windows cannot be repaired, a two-sash window with a fixed upper sash and operable casement at lower sash will be a more appropriate alternative compared to a double-hung.

**ADVISORY REVIEW: 150 N Taylor Ave (Renewal by Andersen, Contractor):** Advisory Review to replace fourteen (14) front porch wood windows with change in grille pattern (*Ridgeland-Oak Park Historic District*).

Chair Garapolo introduced the item. Urban Planner Ghaznawi provided an overview of the application.

The homeowner provided an overview of the application. The Committee asked what the new windows will look like. The homeowner stated that the new windows will be single pane casement with no grille pattern. The contractor is able to fake the upper light. From the inside it will be a simulated divided lite in between of the panels of glass. The homeowner preferred a single pane with clear view instead of a divided light at the eye level. The Committee stated that the horizontal line at upper third is visually important. The Committee recommended a simulated divided lite to match the existing windows.

The homeowner stated that he will consider the Committee's recommendation.

**Other / Old Business:**

- The Committee requested Urban Planner Ghaznawi to prepare a report on the current status of the following past projects that were previously discussed at the HPC meeting on February 27, 2025, at the next HPC meeting on March 27, 2025.
  - 312 N East Ave dormer addition: The COA was denied, however the HPC's decision was appealed to the Village Board and it was reversed. The Commission would like to know if this project is supposed to follow the one-year expiration requirement for a COA.
  - 430 S Taylor Ave: Certificate of Economic Hardship to demolish a historic house, and the current status of the demolition.
  - 216 N Elmwood Ave: Installing a new railing on front porch that does not comply with the HPC Architectural Review Guidelines, and was constructed without a building permit.

Urban Planner Ghaznawi stated that the Village Attorney stated that COA and COEH expires one year after they are issued. She will provide a full report to the Commission at the next HPC meeting. The Village will follow up with the property owners to notify them regarding the expired COA and COEH.

- **Invited Speaker: Frank Heitzman, AIA:** Join us for a presentation on incentives for historic homeowners to remodel or restore rather than tearing down and building new. Heitzman will discuss his participation in a roundtable on the topic hosted by the Glen Ellyn HPC. He will also present two of his projects, the restoration of the building at 111 N. Marion St. in downtown Oak Park and the graceful installation of a residential elevator in the 1889 house at 213 S. Euclid Ave., designed by William J. Van Keuran.

**ADJOURN**

*Motion by Commissioner Peterson to adjourn; Second by Chair Lou Garapolo. Motion approved 2-0.*

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 PM.

Minutes prepared by Atefa Ghaznawi, Urban Planner