

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND PARK, ILLINOIS**

MEETING DATE: Thursday, January 8, 2025

MEETING LOCATION: Council Chambers, City Hall, 1707 St. Johns Avenue, Highland Park, IL

CALL TO ORDER

At 6:32 p.m., Acting Chair Greenbaum called the meeting to order. This Commission meeting takes place on-site. Staff was asked to call the roll.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, Pines, & Portman

Commissioners Absent: Chairperson Weeder

Councilmember Present: Blumberg

Student Council Absent: Koslow

Staff declared that a quorum was present.

Staff Present: Coleman & Markle

Guests Present: Scott Simpson, Partner/Scott Simpson Design + Build
Cal Bernstein, Attorney/Samuels & Bernstein
Greg Moyer, Founder/Moyer Properties
Julia Jonas, Resident/Historian

Others Present: Gale Cerabona, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission – December 11, 2025

Commissioner Gonka moved to approve the regular meeting minutes of December 11, 2025. Commissioner Pines seconded the motion.

On a voice vote

Voting Yea Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, Pines, & Portman

Voting Nay: None

Staff declared that the motion passed unanimously.

SCHEDULED BUSINESS

1 1. Final Consideration of Landmark Designation Recommendation – 3135 Priscilla Avenue

2 Planner Markle offered a presentation:

- 3 • Landmark Designation Process
- 4 • Summary
 - 5 ○ H.W. Kadell House
 - 6 ○ built in 1941
 - 7 ○ architect is George Fred Keck of Keck and Keck
 - 8 ○ Contemporary style
- 9 • Existing Conditions were shown
- 10 • Previous Consideration
 - 11 ○ criteria 1, 4, 5, & 6
- 12 • Findings of Fact
 - 13 ○ integrity is met
- 14 • Additional Information
 - 15 ○ 30 Keck homes in Highland Park
 - 16 ○ 12 received a Significant rating
- 17 • Landmark Criteria were reviewed
 - 18 ○ passive solar, radiant heat
- 19 • Recommendation

20
21 Commissioner Gonka moved that the property at 3135 Priscilla Avenue satisfies Criteria #1, 4, 5, and 6 with
22 sufficient integrity of design, and a recommendation that City Council adopts a Landmark Designation
23 Ordinance. Commissioner Ehrlich seconded the motion.

24
25 On a roll call vote

26 Voting Yea Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, Pines, &
27 Portman

28 Voting Nay: None

29
30 Staff declared that the motion passed unanimously.

31
32 2. Determination of Historic Significance – 1375 Sheridan Road

33 Planner Markle offered a presentation:

- 34 • Churchill House
- 35 • Significant Rating in Central East survey
- 36 • Colonial Revival style
- 37 • Built c. 1919
- 38 • Architect is Robert Seyfarth
- 39 • Property History was reviewed
- 40 • Architecture
 - 41 ○ alterations – roof replacement in 2022, possible rear addition
- 42 • Elevations were shown
- 43 • Landmark Criteria were illustrated
- 44 • Impact of Historic Findings
- 45 • Recommendation

1 Petitioner, Scott Simpson, Partner at Scott Simpson Design + Build, said the integrity of the structure is a
2 concern as well as making this code compliant (leaky basement, foundation made of terracotta tubes);
3 would be a major project to bring this back.
4

5 Some HPC comments are....

- 6 • Commissioner Hartinger asked if:
 - 7 ○ this is as close to original as possible. Planner Markle said much of the exterior material is
 - 8 original. Mr. Simpson shared that the interior/bathrooms have been altered. Kitchen is from
 - 9 the 1950s.
 - 10 ○ the windows are original. Mr. Simpson said he is unsure. He noted the windows or doors
 - 11 don't operate.
- 12 • Commissioner Ehrlich said it is a classic site for the house. The architect is famous.
- 13 • Commissioner Gonka believes Criteria #3 applies.
- 14 • Commissioner Portman believes Criteria 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 apply. He explained the owner, James Hart,
- 15 is the son of Max Hart of Hart Schaffner Marx. A labor dispute resulted in the first labor union in
- 16 America. Planner Markle stated the obituary of the father, Max Hart, was distributed. They noted
- 17 additional material is available.

18
19 Commissioner Gonka moved that this house meets Criteria #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and has sufficient integrity and
20 design. Commissioner Ehrlich seconded the motion.
21

22 On a roll call vote

23 Voting Yea Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, & Portman

24 Voting Nay: Commissioner Pines
25

26 Staff declared that the motion passed 5-1.
27

28 3. Recommendation to the Plan and Design Commission/PDC Regarding a Planned Unit Development/PUD –
29 147 Central Avenue

30 Planner Markle gave a presentation:

- 31 • Commission Consideration Required
- 32 • Review of Historic Record
- 33 • Summary
 - 34 ○ Field property
 - 35 ○ Significant rating in the Central East Survey from 2020
 - 36 ○ Gothic Revival/Italianate style
 - 37 ○ built c. 1875
 - 38 ○ architect is Highland Park Building Company
 - 39 ○ proposing to subdivide into two parcels
- 40 • Site Context
- 41 • Site Plan (Lot 1 & Lot 2)
- 42 • Prior PDC Consideration – January 6, 2026
 - 43 ○ removing driveway on Lot 2, creating driveway on Lot 1
- 44 • Photos were shown
 - 45 ○ 123+ square-foot setback from street

46
47 Staff asked if anyone from the public wishes to speak. The following came forward:

- 1 • Kelsey Gonzalez stated she lives across the street and noted it is part of the National Historic District.
2 Planner Markle said this is a local landmark. Ms. Gonzalez said this is not typical. This is the oldest
3 house in Highland Park and lived in by the second Mayor. The estate is proposed to be destroyed to
4 preserve the home. This should be highly considered. This house is on a tour route. She doesn't
5 want a precedent set and hopes this is not delandmarked.
6

7 Senior Planner Coleman advised this case is not regarding delandmarking.
8

9 Commissioner Ehrlich disclosed that he lives within 400' of this house. He consulted Corporation Counsel
10 and was advised he could participate in this matter.
11

12 Staff asked if anyone in the audience wishes to speak. The following came forward:

- 13 • Tom Corning:
14 ○ asked if one lot would not be landmarked if these parcels are subdivided. Planner Markle
15 said Lot 2 would not be landmarked any longer.
16 ○ asked how many dwellings could be built. Senior Planner Coleman stated one, as it is a
17 single-building lot.
18 ○ appreciates the owner retaining the structures. He would like an Italianate structure to keep
19 the historic character. Mr. Corning noted the driveway is problematic.
20 • Jim Fraerman stated he is a former Chair of the HPC and won awards for preservation. He advised the
21 subdivision retains the historic structures on Lot 1. Lot 2 only has the gate that is historic. Mr.
22 Fraerman has no objection. Regarding two driveways, that would impede onto a Heritage tree.
23 Another tree is huge. The porte cochere is on the west side of the house. He hopes the view is not
24 compromised for neighbors. Both parcels have significant restrictions (ravine, significant buffers).
25

26 Commissioner Ehrlich said the fence along the front of the house is also historic. Mr. Fraerman
27 stated he doesn't know the relative integrity of the Field House.
28

29 Some HPC comments are.....

- 30 • Commissioner Ehrlich has an issue with the second driveway, as it will compromise the slope. He
31 noted the ravine is behind the house on a sloping angle; there may be more restrictions; There is a
32 vacant house. The landmarking could be removed later; could destroy the value of the house. It's a
33 unique National Historic area.
34
35 Councilmember Blumberg said there are significant restrictions that are in no Commissions'
36 purview. There is a Steep Slope Zone/SSZ. The structures are landmarked. He explained
37 delandmarking. The HPC cannot consider what may be built on Lot 2. The matter before the HPC is a
38 nonbinding recommendation to the PDC.
39
40 • Commissioner Gonka asked when this property was landmarked. Senior Planner Coleman said 1985.
41
42 Councilmember Blumberg said there was a similar circumstance. He provided background on
43 subdividing from the other case.
44
45 • Commissioner Ehrlich asked if the HPC should be considering anything regarding this being a National
46 Historic District. He said the other case had a second street and alley access. Councilmember
47 Blumberg expounded on that farm house. He noted, in the end, the lot was subdivided.

- 1 • Commissioner Portman asked if that was a Historic property or in a Historic District. Councilmember
2 Blumberg stated it was a regulated structure. Planner Markle expound on 326 Central Avenue. They
3 noted thorough documentation was found regarding the buildings of Lot 1 on this project.
- 4 • Acting Chair Greenbaum:
 - 5 ○ said it is a stately house. The property attached to it enhances it. If the subdivision is
6 allowed, it will lose the charm.
 - 7 ○ asked if there are a lot of trees. Planner Markle said this has nothing to do with landmarked
8 design.

9
10 Mr. Bernstein noted this is such a large lot, it triggered a PUD. The property at 326 Central Avenue did not
11 go through this process. This is a unique situation. The COA should have come before the HPC to add a
12 regulated fence. Planner Markle referenced a footnote and explained same. The fence and gate were added
13 after the property was landmarked.

14
15 Commissioner Ehrlich advised the new fence was installed as a result of the bridge for safety reasons.

16
17 Mr. Bernstein shared what was landmarked. The Resolution approved that the house was landmarked in
18 1985. The house and other certain area/properties (Stupey Cabin) on the land were landmarked.
19 Subsequent to 1985, two COAs were sought for a Coach House and a Guest House. He stated there is no
20 evidence, since 1985, that the HPC or City Council extended landmarking to Lot 2. The house and landscape
21 design at 405 Sheridan is landmarked.

22
23 More HPC comments are.....

- 24 • Commissioner Ehrlich said there are 3-4 structures on one side. When a house is landmarked,
25 typically a lot is as well.

26
27 Councilmember Blumberg stated, regarding the determination at Linden & Central Avenues, the
28 landmark was specific to the structure. It only applies typically to the structure.

- 29
30 • Commissioner Gonka said some people come forward themselves to landmark a house (without an
31 attorney). The repositioning of the driveway changes the curb appeal of the land. He wondered if a
32 permit was issued for the fence. Senior Planner Coleman said it was part of the bridge repair, so a
33 permit was issued.
- 34 • Commissioner Ehrlich said the other case may not have set a precedent for future matters.

35
36 Mr. Bernstein noted this is in the R4 district which has strict zoning. He expounded on the overlay
37 zone, etc. The two lots are almost 90,000 square feet; no lot is similar, so it won't create a
38 precedent. They are complying, and this is consistent with the Master Plan. Mr. Bernstein stated a
39 shared driveway is problematic. The site plan was illustrated, and the setback was discussed. He
40 noted they considered having 3 lots on this property. The existing home has an \$80,000 tax bill. This
41 limits the home sale. Subdividing will create interest in marketing the home for sale; more
42 attainable. They want to see it maintained.

- 43
44 • Commissioner Gonka said that would give a current concession to the owner.
- 45 • Commissioner Ehrlich said an argument could be made that the lot, as is, could be more saleable. Mr.
46 Bernstein shared they are trying to make Highland Park better.

- Commissioner Portman commented the driveway is not the only thing that's important. He read the Ordinance in 1985 (4 houses, Stupey Cabin; subject properties). Mr. Bernstein reminded the PDC is seeking the HPC's advisory opinion. He noted code language in 1985 may have been used interchangeably.
- Acting Chair Greenbaum asked, and Planner Markle said the PDC should discuss the driveway.
- Commissioner Portman asked if the driveway could be shared. Mr. Bernstein said the existing driveway will serve Lot 1, and a new driveway will be built on Lot 2.

Councilmember Blumberg remarked his function as a Liaison is to bring policy to the HPC.

- Commissioner Ehrlich believes they need to review the entire estate.

Mr. Greg Moyer, Founder with Moyer Properties, stated the owner doesn't live in the home. It's been on the market for a year. People love the property. It's not saleable. This is a reasonable way to market a house that is historic. One can barely see the other lot. It could sit there for another year.

Additional HPC comments are.....

- Commissioner Portman said this is a Historic Preservation Commission (created in 1985). When he walks east on Central Avenue, the house has unbelievable characteristics. What strikes him is the estate; preserving the entirety of the lot. He would vote no to subdivide based on the merits before the HPC.
- Commissioner Gonka said the entire property/PIN # was landmarked. Subdividing and moving the driveway changes that. The shape of the driveway and fence is historic.
- Commissioner Portman concurred and would like to preserve the property. He would like to see a shared driveway that splits off to both houses.
- Commissioner Pines is not bothered by the relocation of the driveway. If being more affordable makes it saleable, he is for it. An architectural effort needs to occur on the new house. He would like to see the lot line move further to the east.
- Commissioner Ehrlich thought initially the house would be too close to the lot line. He is unsure what would enhance this. It is more valuable as one large estate. A singular driveway is not as saleable. Commissioner Ehrlich is opposed to disturbing the driveway, etc. The other aspects need to be considered.
- Commissioner Hartinger believes there are good things and bad things on both sides.

Commissioner Gonka asked if a motion should be crafted that a subdivision would have a significant impact on the historic nature of the site. Mr. Bernstein read the Staff Report, and noted a Planning Report is the next step. Councilmember Blumberg asked that anyone who speaks gets recognized by the Chair. Senior Planner Coleman clarified what the motion should be.

Commissioner Gonka moved that the subdivision of the lot would significantly impact the historical significance of the property at 147 Central Avenue based on the historic fence, columns that make-up the gate, relocation of the new driveway and its impact of the curb appeal, and the growing density of the lot. Commissioner Ehrlich seconded the motion.

On a roll call vote

Voting Yea Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, Pines, & Portman

1 Voting Nay: None

2
3 Staff declared that the motion passed unanimously.

4
5 4. Preliminary Consideration of Partial Landmark Designation Removal – 147 Central Avenue

6 Planner Markle offered a brief presentation:

- 7
- 8 • Partial Landmark Removal of Lot 2
 - 9 • Summary of Application
 - 10 • Site Plan, Photos were shown (no structures; driveway/gate)
 - 11 • Prior Designation
 - 12 • Recommendation

13 Ms. Julia Jonas, Historian, noted she was a docent at this house in 2016. She provided history (pineapple on
14 gate post, owner was a gentleman farmer, had two bedrooms, circular driveway so horses could go
15 forward). This Field House and 4-acre property was placed on the Chicago Watch List. The property slopes
16 down with a view of the ravine. The house may have been built in 1870.

17
18 Mr. Bernstein explained this should be considered as if the subdivision occurred. Historic features are
19 located on Lot 1, not on Lot 2. Criteria wouldn't apply to Lot 2; vacant lot.

20
21 Some HPC comments are.....

- 22 • Commissioner Ehrlich said the HPC could wait until it is known if the lots will be subdivided; it's a
23 hypothetical. Planner Markle said Staff was advised by Corporation Counsel that it is appropriate to
24 discuss both issues together. Mr. Bernstein said they were directed by Staff & Corporation Counsel
25 to bring this forth as the process.
- 26 • Acting Chair Greenbaum said, due to keeping the lot as one estate, this is not worth the discussion.
27 Senior Planner Coleman said an Application was submitted and must be reviewed for Lot 2.

28
29 Councilmember Blumberg said, procedurally, decisions could occur. He noted the options are to
30 delandmark Lot 2, not to delandmark Lot 2, or if there is no motion at all, the matter would fail.
31 Planner Markle said this action ends with the HPC (and does not go to City Council) if the
32 Commission does not recommend landmark removal.

33
34 Staff asked if there is anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on this matter. The following came
35 forward:

- 36 • Kelsey Gonzalez asked why there are two motions. She doesn't understand the logic. If it was
37 deemed this should not be subdivided, how can delandmarking occur? Ms. Gonzalez noted the
38 Lakefront landmark would be destroyed.

39
40 Commissioner Pines moved to continue this matter to the next HPC meeting. Commissioner Portman
41 seconded the motion.

42
43 On a roll call vote

44 Voting Yea Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, Pines, &
45 Portman

46 Voting Nay: None

1 Staff declared that the motion passed unanimously. A report will be drafted and the HPC's
2 recommendation would be submitted to the PDC. The potential delandmarking issue will be discussed at
3 the next HPC meeting.
4

5 Commissioner Gonka shared this is a back-door attempt to get a lot subdivided. It is grossly unfair to put
6 these issues together.
7

8 Acting Chair Greenbaum said making a decision on a hypothetical is a slippery slope; back-door approach.
9 She is having a hard time wrapping her head around this.
10

11 Councilmember Blumberg advised Corporation Counsel could attend the next HPC meeting.
12

13 5. Resolution Recommending Ways to Encourage Historic Preservation

14 Planner Markle asked for feedback on the report. Commissioner Portman likes the memo and asked what
15 next steps are. Planner Markle replied if City Council asks for actions, this will come back to the HPC for
16 embellishments.
17

18 Commissioner Hartinger moved to adopt Resolution #2026-001. Commissioner Gonka seconded the motion.
19

20 On a roll call vote

21 Voting Yea Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, Pines, &
22 Portman

23 Voting Nay: None
24

25 Staff declared that the motion passed unanimously.
26

27 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

28 There were no Discussion Items.
29

30 **BUSINESS FROM THE PUBLIC**

31 There was no Business from the Public.
32

33 **OTHER BUSINESS**

34 1. Administrative Determination of Historic Significance – 1770 Heather Lane

35 Planner Markle advised there was a fire and demolition was requested.
36

37 2. Next Regular Meeting is Scheduled for February 12, 2026

38 It was noted the next regular HPC Meeting is scheduled for February 12, 2026.
39

40 **STAFF REPORT**

41 Planner Markle asked that the Organizational Disclosure Form be completed and submitted by January
42 16, 2026.
43

44 They noted a Code Amendment would be presented at the next HPC meeting due to an error.
45

46 **ADJOURNMENT**

47 Commissioner Pines moved to adjourn at 9:29 p.m. Commissioner Gonka seconded the motion.
48

1 On a voice vote
2 Voting Yea Acting Chair Greenbaum; Commissioners Ehrlich, Gonka, Hartinger, Pines, &
3 Portman
4 Voting Nay: None

5
6 Staff declared that the motion passed unanimously.

7
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9
10
11
12 Gale Cerabona
13 Recorder

14
15 **MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2025, WERE APPROVED WITHOUT CORRECTIONS.**