

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS DESIGN COMMISSION

HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS POLICE BUILDING
200 E. SIGWALT ST.
OCTOBER 10, 2023

Chair Kubow called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Jonathan Kubow, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
Scott Seyer
Kirsten Kingsley
John Fitzgerald

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Robert Losselyoung, Tinaglia Architects for *Chestnut Rowhomes*
Christopher Plummer, Owner of the property at *315 W. Rand Rd/2201 N. Chestnut Ave*
Cathleen Deligio, Mastercraft Builders for *716 N. Dunton Ave.*
John Nelson, Architect for *716 N. Dunton Ave.*
Steve Hautzinger, Planning Staff

Chair Kubow acknowledged the large number of people in the audience tonight and said that anyone who wanted to speak during Public Comment, should sign in on the sign-in sheet.

ITEM 2. SINGLE-FAMILY TEARDOWN REVIEWDC#23-051 – 716 N. Dunton Ave.

Cathleen Deligio, representing *Mastercraft Builders*, and Don Nelson, the Architect for the project, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is here tonight seeking approval to demolish an existing two-story home to allow construction of a new two-story home. The subject property is in the Historical Arlington Neighborhood Association (HANA) neighborhood.

Mr. Hautzinger said that in 2004, a community preservation report was prepared for the Village of Arlington Heights by the School of the Art Institute of Chicago. This report was prepared to raise community awareness and promote preservation of historic character in certain neighborhoods in Arlington Heights. Homes in the report are rated in order of importance as Exceptional, Notable, or Contributing. The existing home is 1 of 38 homes in the report that was rated as Exceptional. This property was platted in 1874 and according to the report, the home was built pre-1890. Additionally, the State of Illinois conducted a historic structures survey in the early 1970s. The survey identified architecturally interesting properties throughout Illinois, and this subject house was identified by the State of Illinois as one of 30 significant historic structures in the Village of Arlington Heights.

Chapter 28 of the Village Municipal Code, Section 13.2, states that for demolition in residential zoning districts, design review is required prior to a demolition permit being issued. That review would include verifying that the proposed redevelopment is in character with the neighborhood, that it meets the criteria and the Design Guidelines, and that the proposed redevelopment would not adversely affect the neighborhood. Section 13.7 of Chapter 28 states that the Design Commission will issue a Certificate of Approval if a: the applicant's plans achieve the purpose and intent of the Design Guidelines; b: the proposed design is compatible with the character of neighboring buildings contributing to a favorable environment in the Village; and c: the existing property or structure is determined not to have significant architectural, historical, aesthetic or cultural value. If the Commission denies the issuance of a Certificate of Approval, no building permit or demolition permit will be issued on the application, except by the direction of the Village Board.

Additionally, the Village of Arlington Heights has a Comprehensive Plan, which is a long range plan looking ahead towards goals of the Village. The current Comprehensive Plan discusses historic preservation, with one goal being to preserve physical resources of historic value, which exemplify cultural, political, economic or social heritage of Arlington Heights, with the policy being that whenever specific land areas and/or existing structures come under review, consideration should be given to identify for possible preservation purposes for any buildings that meet certain criteria; one of which is structures that exhibit a high quality of architectural design reminiscent of the past. Another goal of the Comprehensive Plan regarding historic preservation is to preserve and protect existing and future residential neighborhoods in the Village, with the policy being to preserve and renovate housing of historic or aesthetic value.

In regards to **Section 13.2 Design Review**, 'for demolition in residential zoning districts', Staff is opposed to the proposed development plan that includes demolition of this existing historic home due to the home's significant historical quality. Staff evaluated the proposed redevelopment and determined that it is not in character with the neighborhood and it does not meet the criteria in the Design Guidelines because it is not in character with the neighborhood due to the proposal including the demolition of the existing historic home. 'The proposed redevelopment will not adversely affect the neighborhood', Staff feels that demolition and redevelopment of this property would have an adverse effect on the neighborhood due to the loss of the existing historic home.

In regards to **Section 13.7 Issuance of a Certificate of Approval**, a. 'the applicant's plans achieve the purpose and intent of the design guidelines', Staff feels the proposed new house would not fit in with the character of the existing historic neighborhood as well as the existing house does in this location. b. 'the proposed design being compatible with the character of the neighboring buildings contributing to a favorable environment of the Village', Staff feels the new house in this location would not be as compatible as the existing historic house due to the architectural quality of

the existing house which fits with the character of the surrounding historic homes in this location and neighborhood. c. 'the existing property or structure is determined not to have significant architectural, historical, aesthetic, or cultural value', since the existing house is rated Exceptional in the Community preservation report and since this house was included in the State of Illinois Historic Structure Survey, Staff feels the existing property does have significant historical and cultural value. Additionally, the house has a unique and distinctive design with ornate detailing that has architectural and aesthetic value within this historic neighborhood. The house is in a prominent location, it is valued by many of the residents in the neighborhood for its historical quality. The house could be updated and expanded while still maintaining the historic character. For these reasons, Staff recommends the existing house should remain and be preserved.

Staff acknowledged the reports submitted by the petitioner to show the existing conditions of the house and citing numerous repairs and maintenance required for the house. In Staff's evaluation, based on the limited information provided, the issues do not appear to be justification for demolition. Staff recommends that the petitioner seek an alternate lot appropriate for a teardown redevelopment and that the existing home be preserved and updated. **Mr. Hautzinger** explained that during an initial discussion about this project. Staff verbally discouraged the petitioner on 5/23/23 in a phone conversation from planning a teardown/redevelopment of this property, and again in writing on 8/23/23.

In conclusion, Staff recommends the Design Commission deny this proposal tonight, based on that the proposed redevelopment is not in compliance with Chapter 28, Section 13.7 a, b, and c, and that the existing historic house should remain and be preserved based on its significant architectural, historical, aesthetic and cultural value.

Cathleen Deligio, representing Mastercraft Builders and Carpentry spoke on behalf of the project. She said that Mastercraft is a recognized leader in the construction of custom designed residential dwellings throughout the Chicagoland Metropolitan area. Much of its work involves redevelopment projects within older neighborhoods with existing homes that have exceeded their useful life and where intense remodeling or rehabilitation are cost prohibitive. Mastercraft prides itself on striking the right balance in its redevelopment work to ensure new homes fit within the existing neighborhood, and its architectural plans work to ensure the exterior design, size, dimensions, and interior layouts of each new home to blend in with the existing neighborhood.

Ms. Deligio said that the existing home located at 716 N. Dunton is approximately over 140 years old. She submitted to the commission, the following additional reports that speak to the condition of the existing home. Beginning with the report from ALTA Engineering, which includes photos of the exterior and interior of the home, **Ms. Deligio** read the evaluation/recommendation that was given by ALTA Engineering. It read, "In our opinion, the condition of this residence is poor. The lack of maintenance and repair has significant water to infiltrate the building and allowed the structure to deteriorate. The work necessary to correct and restore the integrity of the structure is significant and includes the following: new drain tile and sumps, new waterproofing of the basement walls, remove and replace the basement walls, the basement could be deepened. As an option, the existing basement walls can be reinforced and braced with additional wall structure, the deteriorated or damaged wood beams should be replaced or reinforced to eliminate several of the temporary columns, the chimney should be removed and replaced, the exterior brick should be patched or tuckpointed, the exterior wood porches including the foundations should be removed and replaced, the wood railings, trim, and architectural elements should be replaced, the wood windows and trim should be replaced, the interior wood floors should be shimmed or leveled to reduce unevenness. With the amount of work required to restore the structure of the building, the repair of the building may be cost prohibitive. Demolition may be a necessary option." This report was signed by the president of ALTA Engineering.

Ms. Deligio also presented a letter from the Architect, John Nelson, who was here tonight to speak. She also presented a report from Tropical Environmental, whom she hired to do a mold and asbestos report, which determined that asbestos was found in the home, as well as active mold spores. **Ms. Deligio** read Page 1 of the report into the record as follows:

"Please find this as a letter of explanation of the laboratory results received for the asbestos and mold sampling conducted at the above structure, as requested. Asbestos materials found positive for asbestos are: Flat roof over the

west addition to the house, Grey Mastic located on the chimney and the front buildout, Window glazing located on the windows for the main part of the structure (original windows), Window and door caulk located on the exterior sides of the main structure. Mold in air (taken in basement of structure) counts exceeding the background (baseline) sample taken outside the structure are: Aspergillus/Penicillium. Active mold spores identified by swab sampling (located on basement ceiling) are: Aspergillus/Penicillium". This report was signed by the president of Tropical Environmental.

Mr. Nelson spoke to the letter he submitted. He visited the home with his engineer/inspector to look at what could be seen at the surface, and they cited code violations against the 2018 International Residential Code and the 2017 National Electrical Code. They are not saying that the home should be torn down or anything like that, but they do cite code violations that were found, to note what has to happen to this house if it remains. A dollar amount is not used in their report because he is not capable of doing that; however, he is just citing code violations, which are numerous, with 65 items cited just in the National Electric Code that need to be addressed. He also pointed out that the pictures submitted do not show what is happening to the houses on either side of this home, with one house recently built and the other home currently under construction. Both homes were approved by this commission. So with that, the suggestion is that it is hard to put this house in a position to be saved, but that is not to say that it is impossible, it is just to say that it is hard and technically infeasible. That's essentially it.

Ms. Deligio said that the structure of this home, as John has mentioned, both internally and externally, is in very poor condition, and its internal floor plan does not address the needs of a modern family. The home was reconfigured many years ago through the construction of a poorly designed addition at the rear of the home. The addition did not respect or even consider any of the architectural features of the original home. She did not have a date on when the addition was done. The home has been utilized as a two-flat dwelling for many years, and it contained a poorly designed makeshift kitchen area that is non-code compliant to support the two-flat concept, which was removed when purchased in 2019. It still has two separate electrical meters. All of the home's current systems and structural components, including but not limited to: its electrical service, plumbing, heating service and structural supports, are obsolete and not code compliant. The home was built on a crumbling brick foundation system that is damaged beyond repair. The basement area floods during heavy rainstorms. It has no drain tiles or other drainage systems. When the home was purchased in 2019, the seller specifically remarked that the home needed to be torn down, as it is beyond repair. None of the home's prior owners have invested any money in the upkeep of the property, nor made any necessary capital repairs and/or improvements. It is not financially or physically feasible to rehabilitate this home. The costs associated with such work, even if undertaken, cannot provide for any reasonable return. Some of the structural deterioration within the home, including its foundation, is simply beyond repair, which is stated in the ALTA Engineering report that the foundation is buckling in and how it has been patched.

Ms. Deligio continued her comments. She said that per Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code, Section 13.7, the Design Commission is charged by the Village Board to review plans for demolition and redevelopment of residential properties throughout this community. The issuance of a Certificate of Approval is conditioned upon findings by the Commission that the following conditions have been met: The applicant's plans achieve the purpose and intent of the Design Guidelines, and the proposed design is compatible with the character of the neighboring buildings contributing to a favorable environment in the village, and the existing property is determined not to have a significant architectural, historical, aesthetic, or cultural value.

Ms. Deligio said that they built the new home at 710 N. Dunton and they are currently building the new home at 720 N. Dunton, so there will be 3 new homes on that section of the property, which is right across the street and a few doors down from another new home. Mastercraft believes in earnest that its redevelopment plan meets or exceeds all of the design guidelines, its plans are compatible with the character of the neighborhood in which the construction will take place, the proposed new home will contribute to the vitality of Arlington Heights as a premier residential designation in the Northwest suburbs. The property to be redeveloped does not possess any significant architectural, historical aesthetic for cultural values. Mastercraft asserts that no significant community value exists that would preclude the demolition of this dilapidated structure. It is important to note that the Village Board inserted the word 'Significant' as a limiting measure to the Design Commission in determining whether one or more of the four elements is present to deny the issuance of the Certificate of Approval for a demolition permit. The dictionary defines the term 'Significant'

as part of importance or of consequence. It recognized synonyms are consequential, momentous, or weighing. The use of the limiting term 'significant' is important because it does not represent the conscious decision by the Village Board to respect property rights and petitioners who are otherwise entitled to a fair return on the redevelopment of their properties. Though many properties may have some architectural, historical, aesthetic, or cultural value, few have the significant value required by the ordinance. As to whether the subject property has any architectural value, Mastercraft has found none. The original home was not constructed by a well-known architect, the architectural plans for the original dwelling, both interior and exterior, are not unique and merely reflect the period of time in which the construction took place. Though the original facade of the home is interesting, its style in and of itself is not a significant architectural feature. Architecture by its very nature, involves unique elements of design, form, and function. There is nothing of consequence associated with the architecture of this residence. Any special architectural province associated with the home was otherwise destroyed years ago through the poorly designed and constructed home addition. Mastercraft has found no evidence of any historical significance either associated with this property, no historical events have taken place on the property, the home played no critical role in the development of Arlington Heights as a place of worship, a government center, or mercantile center, a school, or a place for some other consequential activity of note. No famous people have resided in this home. The property and home have merely served as a single-family home from its inception and ultimately a non-code conforming two-flat that was out of character with the original building and neighborhood. The existing building has no significant aesthetic value, as noted above, the building both interior and exterior is in very poor condition. The home has no meaningful aesthetic character from which any form of preservation can be justified. Mastercraft has found no cultural value associated with this property, the lack of any historical events or historical uses associated with this home indicate that the property has served no meaningful role in the development of Arlington Heights, parks, letters and related scholarly pursuits, which are the principle elements associated with a community's culture.

Ms. Deligio said that based on the pictures provided from the reports, both of the porches would need to be removed and one side porch only has 7-feet, so there is only 2-feet to get off of the side porch because it abuts the new neighboring home. When she developed the home next door at 710 N. Dunton, most of the pavers had to be removed, leaving only one row going to the back of the home. They have no foundation structure, as the architect has indicated in his report, so those have to be removed and redone. The windows are original in the front, and a few new windows throughout the house would have to be redone. The basement is the main concern because it does not support, it has intense spalling. **Mr. Nelson** explained that an attempt to shore up the existing foundation wall with some concrete was made, but it did not work. On the northwest portion of the house there is some failing coming through, there is spalling on the inside throughout the basement. In a penetration test, beams and the joists are soft, probably owing to the moisture that is there. The adjustable columns that are about 4 to 6-feet on center are supported by 4 x 4, which is certainly very temporary and not acceptable as a design requirement found in Section 311 of the 2018 International Residential code.

Ms. Deligio asked if anyone had any questions at this time. **Chair Kubow** appreciated the presentation and said that there will now be a discussion by the commissioners and then public comments. After that, any questions or discussion from the commissioners for the petitioner would occur.

The commissioners summarized their comments. **Commissioner Seyer** thanked everyone for coming tonight and he appreciated this project being brought before the commission because it has enlightened him a lot about the area and the existing home. He felt the existing home shows some historic character in the surrounding neighborhood, which is important, but he could certainly appreciate that there is a lot to do with maintaining or bringing it up to a current state, these are very historic homes. Speaking from his own experience, his firm renovated the Tribune Tower, taking it from an unused office building of historic importance to condominiums, which is extremely unique. Therefore, he felt this home could be something amazing, but he understood the financial constraints of doing that. He wanted to limit his comments tonight to what is being presented with respect to the design of the new home. Because of the importance of the site and the existing home, he could not make a decision without seeing an actual 3D rendering of the proposed home. Only a 2-dimensional elevation has been presented, while this commission has seen much more than that on a much less sensitive site. All he could go by when looking at this project and whether he votes for or against it, is what is going to replace the home that will get demolished. Looking at the context elevation submitted, he felt the

homes on either side of this property are quite nice and fit in to the context, at the very least with respect to the heights; however, when he looks at the design of the new home at 716 N. Dunton, there is nothing that relates to the new homes on either side of it, and it was quite massive in scale. Looking at the proposed new home and everything presented, which again is nothing rendered or shown, he felt it was kind of a generic home that might actually be more like a modern farmhouse, which this commission has seen so many times for so many other projects. The design does not fit here, in his opinion. **Commissioner Seyer** went back to some of the comments expressed about quality architecture, which should be unique; however, he saw nothing unique about what is being presented on the design of the new home. If the petitioner is proposing something that is a respectful nod towards the historic significance of the existing home, then he would be more sympathetic, but his decision is based almost entirely on the proposed design, which he felt just did not fit; therefore, he was against it. He acknowledged the large amount of people here tonight who are against this project, and if this project went forward, it would put the homeowner in a really difficult position where the entire neighborhood did not want that new home there. The new homeowners will not be appreciated or be able to have anything to do with their neighborhood, and the best part of the neighborhood are the people there. In conclusion, **Commissioner Seyer** said that he could not support this project, on those topics and those items, because in the end, the petitioner is going to want that approval, otherwise the home buyer is going to be in a terrible position; please don't do that to them.

Commissioner Kingsley concurred with the comments from Commissioner Seyer. She felt the existing home has a lot of value and it is hard to put a label on a home to say that it has exceeded its life. Many people in this neighborhood live in older homes, many people have bought homes that have mold, many people have bought homes that have had asbestos, whether you tear down a home or keep it, you have to deal with the asbestos. Many people in this room and many people around the Village and elsewhere have original windows in their home, and they can be made efficient. Therefore, she did not think that is a reason to say that the home cannot be preserved. It may cost quite a bit, but tearing it down, doing the abatement, and then building a new home is also going to cost quite a bit. Most people who buy an older home deal with that, they do some structural intervention, they redo all the electrical, it is what they do because they love the home.

Commissioner Kingsley said that a Design Commission application requires existing floor plans and elevations be submitted, and that information was not included in the packet tonight, which would have been quite helpful. The existing home is probably a smaller home with 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms, but without floor plans she was unsure. The proposed new home has 3 bedrooms and 3 baths, with new millwork that will not be patterned like the existing oak millwork in the home. Many people want new homes because it is easier to not have to deal with shoring up and replacing things, and fewer people want to do the hard work of preservation; however, those people are out there. She did not think this can be a reason that the existing home has to be torn down. She said the existing home has been there a really long time, it was indicated in the 1970's report and then again in 2004, which is significant and adds value to the neighborhood. She felt it was better when there were 2 vacant properties on each side of this home because that is how it was meant to be on the site, but that did not mean that the home should be demolished now. **Commissioner Kingsley** said that is where she is at right now; the design of the proposed new home is not of higher value, while the existing home has a lot of value to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the sideyard setbacks for the new home, and **Mr. Hautzinger** replied that one side is at 5-1/2-feet and the other side is at 11.9-feet, which **Mr. Nelson** confirmed. **Commissioner Eckhardt** also asked about the comments that were made regarding the pavers being removed for construction of the new home next door, and **Mr. Nelson** explained that the plat of survey for 716 N. Dunton shows an encroachment into the side yard setback on the 50-foot wide lot. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that some of these issues were self-created by the petitioner for wanting to build 3 homes on 3 lots that previously only had one home on all 3 lots; however, these are all buildable lots and he understood why the petitioner chose to build 3 homes here. **Commissioner Eckhardt** said that he could not sleep at night if he allowed the existing home to be torn down. He had no further comments.

Commissioner Fitzgerald agreed with the comments from the other commissioners. He said the existing home has architectural value and it is a beautiful home that is not built anywhere anymore. The existing home looks wonderful

even in bad shape, and for him, it would be great if someone would come in and fix it. He said the existing home is exceptional, unique, and significant to the neighborhood; therefore, he is against demolishing it.

Chair Kubow said there were a lot of comments tonight and he appreciated the commissioners' passion and thoughts towards the Village and renovations. This commission sees houses every other week that are allowed to be demolished, it happens constantly, but never in his 10 or 11 years on this commission has a home that is considered exceptional and part of the historic survey that was done been brought in front of them. Therefore, he agreed with the commissioners; he was not comfortable in allowing this home that is deemed exceptional, 1 of only 38 in the Village, to be torn down. He appreciated all the reports submitted and he understood the hardship of what the petitioner bought; the home is in rough shape and there is a lot of work to do, but that is not this commission's problem, the petitioner bought it. This is a home that was built in the late 1800's and he just could not in his good conscious allow a home like that to be torn down.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mary Ann Crosby-Anderson, presented a slide presentation that she and some other members of the audience will speak to. She lives at 728 N. Dunton Avenue, which is 3 houses away from the subject home. She and her husband moved to Arlington Heights 36 years ago, they moved from the city and they chose to move to a more historic area of the suburbs, and in particular Arlington Heights. She thanked the Design Commission for all their hard work and for listening to all the details and seeing their faces at many meetings. She knows that this is an appointed volunteer position and the commissioners do it well. She also thanked Steve Hautzinger for his work for the Village. She is here tonight to ask the Design Commission to deny approval of the demolition of the Italianate home at 716 N. Dunton, and to deny the subsequent new construction. Her argument is based on what has already been mentioned; Sections 13.2 and 13.7 of the Municipal Code. She gave a bit of background: their neighborhood has been in a state of flux for awhile, with a lot of teardowns in the two blocks of 700, 800, and 900 N. Dunton, as well as new construction. In addition to that, this house is now being proposed to be torn down, and they are also aware that another house located 2 houses away could potentially come up for demolition/new construction. That home is also an 'Exceptional' house in the same report. Because they are concerned about this, a group of neighbors including herself and her husband, have begun to meet for the past couple months and decided to research the current Village approval process for the demolition and new construction of single-family homes. For the sake of the audience, in case they are not aware, this is what their group found: To demolish an existing single-family home, this commission has to approve it before a demolition permit and a building permit for new construction is issued, and if the commission approves it, then the petitioner can apply for demolition and building permits. If the Design Commission does not approve it, the petitioner can appeal to the Village Board. If this house at 716 N. Dunton is demolished, there is no recourse, it is never going to come back. These sections of the Municipal Code allow the Design Commission to deny a demolition, it is in this commission's purview and in your opinions. They first found these sections in the code in 2003, and it was most recently revised in 2018. So based on the content of the Municipal Code, they again are asking the commissioners to deny this demolition. She said there are several other people who want to talk about the architectural, historical, aesthetic and cultural significance of the home, to plead to you that it does indeed have architectural, historical, aesthetic, and cultural significance. They believe that if this home is demolished, it will adversely affect their neighborhood. She lives 3 houses away and she does not want to see the home gone. She lives in an old house and she knows the work that goes into it. This denial is in the commission's power, authority, and responsibility, based on the Village code. Again, she respectfully requests that this commission use their authority to please protect this home and to protect our neighborhood and our community. She thanked the commission for what they do.

Kurt Skrudland continued with the slide presentation. He lives at 735 N. Vail Avenue. He and his wife are longtime residents of Arlington Heights and live on the same block as the house at 716 N. Dunton. He is an architect and has been designing single-family houses almost exclusively for over 30 years. Over that time, he has designed a fair number of new houses and many renovations in Arlington Heights; however, the vast majority of his work for many years has been on the North Shore of Chicago and in the historic districts of those communities. When working in those communities, he often works with preservation or Design Commissions similar to this one. When there is a request for a teardown, it is determined on a case-by-case basis and it depends on the character of the existing

residence. Sometimes the question of whether a house should be preserved or torn down is unclear; however, with this house on Dunton, it is not complicated because it compares in character and quality with some of the better houses in those communities. There is no possibility that this house would be allowed to be demolished if it were located there. His license allows him to do structural work for single-family residences and he regularly surveys and documents the conditions of older historic homes. Unless there is something unusual, he does all the structural engineering necessary for renovation himself, so he has significant experience with this. Given this experience, he is qualified to comment on the condition of this home at 716 N. Dunton. The developer submitted a report from an Engineering commissioned environmental survey to assess the condition of the residence. In his experience, the issues cited are nothing unusual or surprising, they are very common and they are what he would expect to deal with in the renovations he works on. Therefore, he did not think the report actually makes a case for demolition; instead, it is a positive report in support of renovation. During the estate sale at 716 N Dunton when the house was opened to the public, he took the opportunity to informally survey the interior and exterior the house. Overall, he found the house to be in amazingly good shape, and he believes its longevity is partly due to its exceptional design. As you can see, the roofs are simple, the whole structure with the intersecting roofs and walls essentially interlock and buttress themselves; it is essentially like a church would be built with a cruciform shape. The exterior wood details, the majority of which are protected by the roofs and overhangs, are highly detailed and especially well preserved. As one would expect some of the unprotected wood details have been replaced or repaired overtime, but that work was done respectfully and can be replicated where necessary. The roofs are straight and the masonry craftsmanship and material itself is of high quality and is in excellent condition. The interior of most houses of this vintage would have been renovated beyond recognition by now, but as you can see, the house has retained much of its original character. The code violations that the architect cited are not relevant. The home is grandfathered in and you are not required to update those existing non-complaint conditions. The current code only applies to whatever addition might be built and the elements being replaced. Stylistically, the house at 716 N Dunton is an excellent example of Italianate architecture. He is not aware of another historic home in Arlington Heights that has a higher quality design or detail than this one. He felt it was safe to say that nothing like it will be built again, it is irreplaceable. He believes that Arlington Heights is on the verge of losing all of the historic fabric that remains in this community, unique and beautiful residences like this contribute greatly to the character of Arlington Heights, and for many of us they are a major part of the reason why we live here. The people that have turned up tonight are evidence of this. If this house does not qualify as having significant architectural, historical, aesthetic, or cultural value, honestly, he did not know what does. Thank you for your attention.

Tom Gaynor continued with the presentation. He lives at 208 W. Fremont Street, and he has been there for 41 years. He is currently serving as the HANA Board president. As you know, HANA is 625 households north of the Downtown Central Business District. It is an all-volunteer organization and as president, he is one of the residents there. He does not represent HANA in any way, but what HANA does is communicate issues of neighborhood importance. There is a terrific network as you can see, and when information comes up that affects their neighborhood, that information is provided, such as information for this meeting, to their neighbors who would like to participate in this community effort. The HANA Board will never come out with a position statement, because that is not what they do; they do not speak on behalf of their neighbors. He just wanted to be clear on that. Mr. Gaynor explained that they recently had down-zoning approved by the Village Board this summer, which is a terrific way to shore up the southern border of HANA, and they really appreciate the Design Commission's full support of that effort. The teardown issue has been on HANA's radar for decades, so they decided to understand the process of teardowns in the Village. What they found was everything that was talked about earlier; the School of Art Institute of Chicago study, the Village Ordinance that talks about the criteria by which teardowns are evaluated, and this commission of experts that have the responsibility to review the merit of homes based on the ordinance. Arlington Heights already has this framework in place by which we can do a great job of historic preservation, which is really great to see because they were not aware of that. He referred to the slide presentation that shows, through a Freedom of Information Request to the Village, they found that there were 43 homes in HANA that have been torn down in the last 19 years, with 2 homes being Exceptional, and 6 homes being Notable. The residents of HANA now know how this process works and that there are opportunities for them to weigh in and help get to the right decision on teardowns in their neighborhood. So going forward, anytime there is a proposed teardown of any nature in their neighborhood, they will be more engaged in the process. From a historic preservation standpoint, HANA does have the majority of the older homes in town, but there are a lot of older homes in other parts of the Village that are of historic nature, and we really should figure out how to do something at the Village

level to do the right thing. Of the 517 homes in the School of Art Institute of Chicago study that were noted, 52 of those homes were torn down. We have to be aware as a Village that our character could slowly be diminished by these one-at-a-time teardowns.

Tina Kanter said that her family lived in the Scarsdale neighborhood for 30 years and they raised their two daughters there. They had the opportunity to move and after they sold their home and were in transition, they decided to find a home to rent in the Village, and had always admired the home at 716 N. Dunton. She and her family had the privilege of renting and living in this home for four years, from May 2019 to June 2023. They were amazed at the beauty and intricate details of the woodwork both inside and outside, the two beautiful porches, the charm and warmth of the home with the 10' ceilings, beautiful built-in cabinets, a built-in bookcase in the dining room, the grand and beautiful staircase that she loved decorating, and the gorgeous floor boards, wood trim and doors, and wood floors. The quality and workmanship cannot be replicated today, and it reminds her of the old adage 'they don't make them like they use to', which is certainly true in this case. Along with everyone else, she felt there was no reason for the home to be destroyed, perhaps only to continue to try to bring in other homes that really don't fit in the area and to continue to build new homes in a historical district instead of preserving the neighborhood's rich character will only help erase a key part of the history here. She said that they loved living in this home, it is very livable, and she was sad to leave.

Laurie Turpin-Soderholm, 717 N. Dunton Avenue, lives directly across the street from this home. She wanted to briefly address 716 N. Dunton Ave. in terms of its importance to our history and culture. She referred to the slide presentation and said that in the 1870s, Arlington Heights at that time known as Dunton, was small but bustling. It had a burgeoning downtown and a train that went to Chicago. Residents watched the Great Chicago Fire from Asa Dunton's roof on what is now Arlington Heights Road. Approximately 2 years later, noted portrait photographer C. H. Hanchett built the house at 716 N. Dunton. Hanchett must have done well for himself, besides having 3 working studios in Illinois, he had this large ornate house built in brick, when everyone else was building wooden farmhouses. It included a closet lined in zinc and designed for a shower, which must have been a luxury since complete water systems did not come to town until 1903. Eventually, Mr. Hanchett sold the house and moved closer to one of his other studios, and the house was sold to Carl & Sarah Bellindor, who purchased it in the early 1890s, leaving their farm in Mount Prospect to move into town. In 1923 their daughter Martha and her young family moved in with them. In fact, one of their daughters, Iona, was just three years old when she moved into her grandparent's big home, and she lived there until 2018 when she passed way at the age of 98. The Bellindor family were known for their generosity. During the Great Depression they often provided hot meals to the so-called hobos who came to their back door, and to help neighbors through hard times, they gave away parcels of their own remaining farmland, so others could provide for their families. Over the years, they provided a safe and warm home to widowed or otherwise needy women in the separate apartment built into the house. They were not people who were famous, they did not hold office, they were not influential business people or industrialists. But they were the kind of people who built this town with their generosity, their love of family, and service to others in the community. 716 N. Dunton for many years was known as a place of great safety, warmth and generosity. Since the 1870s, our country has been through multiple wars, including two world wars, the Cold War, two global pandemics, the Great Depression, as well as the invention of electricity, the automobile, the telephone, the airplane, the space shuttle, the Internet. It has seen 28 presidents, the turn of two centuries, one millennial, and Y2K. 716 N. Dunton Avenue has survived it all. In some ways it is like comfort food, providing a sense of stability and strength to our community in times of turmoil and uncertainty. Perhaps it is the brick used to build the home that helps this solid structure ground us. To lose a piece of local culture and history of this magnitude would be like cutting the very heart and soul out of our community. Some people may say it's just an old building; those people are wrong. Buildings tell stories, they are a testament to those who came before us, what was important to them and what they have passed on to us. They live and breathe and connect us to our past and all that made us what we are today. The fact that we are all here tonight, makes it clear that 716 N. Dunton reminds us and even teaches us that we are a community made up of neighbors who value our past and work together for our future. There are many lovely bedroom communities in our area, but we have all chosen to live in this beautiful community, with its history and diverse neighborhoods and our beautiful old homes with the character that cannot be built into new homes. Visitors love our downtown, they love visiting our historical museum, strolling through our historic neighborhoods that we all cherish. We are in fact a Norman Rockwell painting. But this cannot happen in a community made-up entirely of subdivisions, and this is why Arlington Heights is such a desirable place to live, work and shop. The home at 716 N. Dunton Avenue, with its firm standing in

our collective cultural history, its documented architectural significance and importance to the stability of the neighborhood, is an icon and a local landmark. We ask the Design Commission to consider carefully the neighborhood and the community of large. The loss of this home would not just negatively impact the look and feel of our neighborhood, irreparably changing it, but it would also affect the desirability of living here, which would impact our entire community. We ask you to put first the interests of the people who live here, go to school here, pay taxes here, and are committed to Arlington Heights. Development is important, and especially in other neighborhoods where the development actually contributes to that neighborhood. Not all teardowns are bad, and just because a house is old does not mean necessarily it needs to be saved. As I hope you have heard tonight, this is not the case here. Development at the expense of our history will permanently and irreversibly harm this neighborhood and this community. Please don't let Dunton Avenue, the jewel and the historic crown of Arlington Heights, become a subdivision of million dollar cookie-cutter new builds. Please help us to ensure that our history, culture, and community, remains at the heart of who we are in Arlington Heights, and not outside developers who make permanent changes and drive away as soon as the check clears. Our collective neighbors ask our Design Commission to use the authority given to them to deny this demolition and save this home. Because we care about this place that we've chosen to live, we care that 716 N. Dunton continues to speak to us, continues to share our history, and in fact shares our future. For all the people who have written to share their concern, have signed their petition, and have forgone an otherwise pleasant evening at home to be here, we ask you to hear us and deny this demolition. Thank you.

Chair Kubow asked if there was any further comment from the public and there was no response.

Ms. Deligio commented that the photos submitted by Ms. Kanter of the staircase decorated for the holidays do not show how the stairs were in fact broken, the bathrooms are undersized, the basement floods, there is no central air conditioning; there are many items in the home that have not been shown. Ms. Kanter said that while she and her family lived there, they never had an instance of flooding from rain and they did not see any broken stairs when they left.

Ms. Deligio said that she has been told to possibly put the home back up for sale. If HANA wants to buy it at the value that we believe we need to because of the loss of income, then HANA can approach and we will look at it carefully. But for us to be able to do what everyone thinks should be done, is not feasible. She could not sell the house because basically we would have to cut off the back room to put up a garage, which would be establishing the house at a very nominal amount of square footage, besides the porches have to be taken out and reconstructed. So really, there is nothing that is of value except for maybe the front windows that are original, and the couple of corbels underneath, but the top rake is deteriorating and has to be replaced. She submitted all the reports because she wanted to come informed because she is not a person to demolish, she has renovated homes in Chicago and other areas, but the life expectancy at some point has to end, and this one has not been taken care of and in fact the original owner said that the home that was very similar to this one was demolished, 2 houses were demolished at the corner of Dunton to do a library, and she said that was a sin.

Chair Kubow asked if Staff had any comments at this time and there were none.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO DENY THE PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 716 N. DUNTON AVENUE, BASED ON ITS HISTORICAL VALUE, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW HOME.

**FITZGERALD, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; SEYER, AYE; KUBOW, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**