

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  
PLAN AND DESIGN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND PARK, ILLINOIS**

**MEETING DATE:** Tuesday, May 5, 2026

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

At 7 p.m., Acting Chair Nanus called the meeting to order. Staff was asked to call the roll.

**ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Acting Chair Nanus; Commissioners Fettner, Henry, Ihnchak, & Mantis

Commissioners Absent: Chairperson Kerch; Commissioner Moore

Councilmember Present: Ross

Student Council Present: Pielet

Staff declared that a quorum was present.

Guests Present: Cal Bernstein, Attorney/Samuels & Bernstein  
Jim Fraerman, Principal/Fraerman Associates Architecture  
Greg Moyer, Founder/Moyer Properties

Staff Present: Fontane, Burhop, Hoffmann, & Markle

Others Present: Marcus Martinez, Corporation Counsel/Elrod Friedman LLP  
Gale Cerabona/Recorder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Regular Meeting of the Plan and Design Commission – April 21, 2026*

Commissioner Fettner advised he reviewed the minutes and watched the video.

Commissioner Mantis moved to approve the April 21, 2026, PDC regular meeting minutes. Commissioner Ihnchak seconded the motion.

On a voice vote

Voting Yea Acting Chair Nanus; Commissioners Fettner, Henry, Ihnchak, & Mantis

Voting Nay: None

Acting Chair Nanus declared that the motion passed unanimously.

**SCHEDULED BUSINESS**

1. PUD-2025-00081 for a Special Use Permit in the Nature of a Preliminary and Final Planned Development

1 with Modifications from City Code; and a Plat of Re-Subdivision, with Variances from City Code (147 Central  
2 Avenue)

3  
4 Planner Markle reviewed the proposal:

- 5 • HPC Consideration Required
- 6 • Historic Resource Standard
- 7 • 147 Central Avenue Landmark Status
  - 8 ○ nominated for National Register in 1982
  - 9 ○ designated a local landmark in 1985
  - 10 ○ Staff determined the entire property was landmarked
- 11 • Prior HPC Consideration
- 12 • HPC Recommendations
  - 13 ○ complete denial
  - 14 ○ Conditions if approved by PDC

15  
16 Senior Planner Burhop reminded the PDC can recommend approval, recommend approval with  
17 Conditions, recommend denial, or move to continue for more information.

- 18  
19 • Site Plan was shown

20  
21 Councilperson Ross said she checked with Corporation Counsel & the City Manager who advised it is okay to  
22 read the following (paraphrased) statement: *City Council greatly values historic and landmarked properties.*  
23 *At a recent Committee of the Whole/COW meeting, a presentation was given on landmark incentives.*

24  
25 Some PDC comments are.....

- 26 • Commissioner Henry asked/said:
  - 27 ○ what the difference is between an owner building on Lot 2 vs. a Certificate of
  - 28 Appropriateness/COA. Planner Hoffmann said this is a single-family district. An additional
  - 29 dwelling would not be allowed.
  - 30 ○ if there is relief for that. Director Fontane said a PUD could be built. There would be a
  - 31 common area and building pads; individual ownership.
  - 32 ○ a COA is needed if subdivided or not. Director Fontane concurred.
- 33 • Commissioner Mantis asked if:
  - 34 ○ there is any other information that could be more compelling regarding the estate setting.
  - 35 Planner Markle said the reason the HPC believes it's a landmark is due to who was on the
  - 36 HPC at that time. Ms. Susan Benjamin was Chair. Planner Markle gave history on the process
  - 37 (nomination, etc.). More than just the main house has historic significance. In 1986, there
  - 38 was a COA for the coach house. In 2011, there was a COA for the Gardener Potter's Cottage.
  - 39 Staff believes the property was intended to be landmarked. The historic estate setting is
  - 40 important to the HPC.
  - 41 ○ this is the HPC's position on data points as mentioned. Planner Markle shared the HPC was
  - 42 also discussing landmark removal on Lot 2.
- 43 • Commissioner Fettner said, if approval is granted, landmark status doesn't go away. Planner Markle
- 44 concurred and expounded.
- 45 • Commissioner Henry asked:
  - 46 ○ if the property owner has to concur with the HPC's designation to landmark. Director
  - 47 Fontane advised there is no involuntary landmarking.

- if the property owner changed. Planner Markle said yes. The landmark status is in perpetuity.

Planner Hoffman offered a presentation:

- Recommend
  - Findings of Fact were drafted.
- Project Summary
  - subdivide into 2 lots
- Aerial view was shown
- Proposal
  - slight change
- Planned Development
  - Conditions per the HPC
- Public Benefit
  - \$2,500 donation
- Public Comment
  - 7 were received and distributed
- Recommendation

More PDC comments are.....

- Commissioner Ihnchak asked about Findings of Fact and historic resources. Planner Hoffmann said the standards must be met. This is a Draft the PDC can review. Senior Planner Burhop expounded.
- Commissioner Henry asked, regarding City Council comments, if there is any benefit associated with landmark status. Director Fontane said – a Property Assessment Freeze can occur if requirements are met. He expounded. Planner Markle said there has to be local or national status for eligibility of programs.
- Commissioner Ihnchak asked if modifications have to be approved for new construction. Planner Markle concurred and said – except for basic maintenance and repairs.

Mr. Cal Bernstein, attorney with Samuels & Bernstein, said the report issued by the HPC was a 4-3 vote. Regarding the estate setting and historical structures, he shared Planner Markle noted a new proposed lot occurred in January, 2026. It was stated the current HPC provided its opinion. Mr. Bernstein shared that a former HPC Chair sent a letter of support. He also noted a former HPC Chair will be the architect.

They decided to downzone this property and thought it is the most reasonable request for this property. There is no request to demolish any historical structures. The 2 new lots would be twice the size of any other lot on this block.

In summary, this proposal is consistent with the Master Plan. He noted 2/3 of taxes go to school districts.

Additional PDC comments are.....

- Commissioner Fettner asked:
  - why the existing driveway can't remain. Mr. Bernstein said having a long shared driveway offers complications (maintenance, wear and tear, etc.). Two driveways make the houses more usable. He said the plan is to create a driveway that goes to the porte cochere. They are trying to preserve the existing streetscape.

- 1           ○ where the building line would start, based on the Steep Slope Zone/SSZ. Mr. Bernstein said
- 2           they want to be as far away from the ravine as possible.
- 3           ○ if the HPC cares about where the new house footprint is, if approved. Planner Markle said
- 4           the HPC deals more with design review. Director Fontane reminded the PDC has zoning
- 5           authority. Corporation Counsel Martinez said substantial changes would require review. Mr.
- 6           Bernstein shared the building footprint likely won't exceed 9,600 square feet.
- 7           ● Commissioner Henry asked what this zoning district requires for setbacks. Mr. Bernstein said the
- 8           minimum side yard setback is 12'. He stated a fair amount that offers flexibility is 40' between the
- 9           homes. This is recommended by a former HPC Chair and engaged architect.

10  
11 Director Fontane reminded there is no house proposed on the lot. The buildable area was illustrated. Mr.  
12 Bernstein noted there is a significant front-yard setback similar to other houses on the street.

13  
14 Mr. Jim Fraerman, principal with Fraerman Associates Architecture, said, regarding Lot 2, City zoning rules  
15 apply. The front yard is substantially in excess; preserves the entire front yard. It is not in question that the  
16 Cornelius Field House wouldn't be seen. There is 70% of the property that is regulated. Only 30% is the  
17 buildable area.

18  
19 Discussion took place on the side-yard setback. Planner Hoffmann said, while the SSZ is established, there is  
20 a benefit of land area. Director Fontane discussed the footprint of the existing home.

21  
22 Acting Chair Nanus asked if anyone in the audience wishes to speak. There was no one.

23  
24 Final PDC comments are.....

- 25           ● Commissioner Fettner said he is not against the approval. An 80' setback is unreasonable. A shared
- 26           driveway is also yet to be determined. He is struggling with the setback.
- 27           ● Commissioner Mantis is trying to be understanding of the HPC's denial.
- 28           ● Commissioner Henry said both lots will still be landmarked. He doesn't think he'd want to share a
- 29           driveway. Taxes are a lot of money. He is comfortable with a 20' setback on each side of the
- 30           property line; makes sense; would be in favor.

31  
32 Director Fontane reminded of the HPC standard.

- 33  
34 ● Commissioner Nanus said:
  - 35           ○ the east and west sides look different in the Plat and side-yard setbacks. Planner Hoffmann
  - 36           said Staff will measure that. Mr. Bernstein will verify same with the surveyor. He said the
  - 37           property slopes from west to east. The height will be lower on the new lot. Director Fontane
  - 38           said that is local height vs. average-grade height.
  - 39           ○ he is okay with dividing the lots and would like to see a 30' setback between the properties.
  - 40           Recreating the entryway and driveway is suggested. He is okay with the front setback.
- 41           ● Commissioner Ihnchak said she is concerned with the 7-0 HPC vote. This property has an estate feel.
- 42           A 20' setback leaves a bad taste. Her preference is at least 40' for setbacks.
- 43           ● Commissioner Mantis concurred.
- 44           ● Commissioner Fettner said it may be helpful to see a footprint of a house.
- 45           ● Commissioner Ihnchak would like to see contextual pictures. Mr. Bernstein reminded 2 former Chairs
- 46           of the HPC are in support.

1 Acting Chair Nanus swore in Greg Moyer, founder with Moyer Properties (and partners with the owner),  
2 who advised the house has been on the market. He believes the buyer should have provided a site plan. The  
3 new house will barely be seen. The house can't be maintained. The buyer wants to place a reasonable use  
4 on the property. The driveway wasn't there when the house was built.

5  
6 Mr. Bernsein noted a Senior & Homestead Exemption was taken on this house in 2022. The Applicant is okay  
7 with a 30' setback all the way around.

8  
9 Mr. Fraerman said the intent is to push the house further back. Landscape, trees aren't being taken into  
10 consideration; the house is well protected by vegetation.

11  
12 Mr. Bernstein said they are good with a 30' setback then reducing to a 25' setback on the angle.

13  
14 Mr. Moyer said they are planning to turn the fence in.

15  
16 Commissioner Ihnchak asked, and Corporation Counsel Martinez said 3 out of 5 votes have to be in favor to  
17 approve a motion.

18  
19 Commissioner Henry moved to adopt the Findings of Fact with the Condition that:

- 20 • there is preservation of the gate, fence, and Heritage trees
- 21 • the west side-yard setback of Lot 2 be 30' then past the Field House 25'
- 22 • the structure on Lot 2 would not exceed the alignment of the Cornelius Field House height or the  
23 zoning code height, whichever is more restrictive

24  
25 Commissioner Fettner seconded the motion.

26  
27 On a roll call vote

28 Voting Yea	Acting Chair Nanus (Vice Chair); Commissioners Henry, & Fettner
29 Voting Nay:	Mantis, Ihnchak

30  
31 Director Fontane declared that the motion passed 3-2.

### 32 33 **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### 34 1. Information Item: Administrative Design Review Update

35 Senior Planner Burhop noted an Administrative Design Review approved:

- 36 • an awning at 481 Roger Williams
- 37 • an awning at 59 Skokie Valley Road

#### 38 39 2. Next Regular Meeting – May 19, 2026

40 The next regular meeting is scheduled for May 19, 2026.

#### 41 42 3. Case Briefing

43 There was no Case Briefing.

### 44 45 **BUSINESS FROM THE PUBLIC**

46 There was no Business from the Public.

1 **ADJOURNMENT**  
2 Commissioner Henry moved to adjourn at 9:41 p.m. Commissioner Mantis seconded the motion.  
3  
4 On a voice vote  
5 Voting Yea Acting Chair Nanus; Commissioners Fettner, Henry, Ihnchak, & Mantis  
6 Voting Nay: None  
7  
8 Acting Chair Nanus declared that the motion passed unanimously.  
9  
10 Respectfully Submitted,  
11  
12  
13 Gale Cerabona  
14 Recorder  
15  
16 **MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING ON APRIL 21, 2026, WERE APPROVED WITHOUT CORRECTIONS.**  
17