

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of the June 4, 2025 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, June 4, 2025, at 6:30 p.m., at the Municipal Services Building, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman John Looby and Board members, Eric Lohmueller, Scott Renken, Sarah Lamphere, Sally Downey, and Chris Collins

Building Review Board members absent: Board member Justin Stamer

Staff present: Luis Prado, Assistant Planner and Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

1. Introduction of Board members and staff, overview of meeting procedures – Chairman Looby

Chairman Looby reviewed the role of the Building Review Board and the meeting procedures followed by the Board. He asked the members of the Board and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes from the May 7, 2025 Building Review Board meeting.

Consideration of the minutes of the May 7, 2025 meeting was postponed.

3. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of demolition of a residence and a replacement residence and the associated hardscape and landscape at 722 Oak Knoll Drive.

Property Owners: Douglas and Karen Close
Representative: Edward Deegan, architect

Chairman Looby asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Close stated after living in the house for many years and considering alterations and additions, demolishing the existing residence and constructing a new residence was determined to be a better approach.

Mr. Deegan noted that the existing residence was constructed in 1957. He stated that the home has significant foundation issues which, in combination with the changes desired by the petitioner, are the basis for the proposed demolition. He presented images of the existing house including photos taken by a structural engineer. He stated that the footprint of the proposed house is staked at the site. He pointed out the large lot and expansive backyard. He reviewed the proposed site plan noting that a one story home generally in the footprint of the existing home is proposed. He

stated that the residence is a ranch with inspiration from the Craftsman style. He pointed out the center entry and front porch, the main mass with wings that extend to the rear, and the private pool and patio area behind the home in between the wings. He stated that the stepped design of the home takes advantage of the views of the rear yard from almost every room and provides natural light. He reviewed the floor plans. He reviewed the proposed elevations noting the water table around the house and the tapered columns that sit on a base on the front porch. He pointed out the height of the central portion of the residence and the lower flanking wings. He reviewed the palette of materials noting that reclaimed brick or stone will be used with a final decision pending. He reviewed the landscape plan and stated that preliminary engineering plans are being prepared to ensure that stormwater is properly handled on the site.

Mr. Prado stated that the existing residence is proposed for demolition and noted that several other homes along this portion of Oak Knoll Drive have been replaced in recent years. He stated that the staff report offers findings in support of the demolition. He noted concern with the driveway as proposed noting that it appears to extend to the property line. He stated that the fence along the north property belongs to the neighbor and based on input from the neighbor, was put up to address impacts to the private areas of their home from the existing house which is further from the property line than the house now proposed. He stated that consideration should be given to pulling the driveway off of the north property line to provide space for plantings to help screen the impact of headlights on the neighboring home and to provide an area for water runoff. He stated that at a minimum, a curb should be required along the north edge of the driveway to ensure that water from the hardscape does not run directly into the neighbor's yard.

Chairman Looby invited comments from the Board.

Board member Lamphere stated support for the demolition and commended the proposed residence. She stated concern about the proximity of the driveway to the property line and the neighboring home. She encouraged the petitioner to shift the home to provide space between the driveway and property line for plantings and drainage.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the lot is beautiful and agreed that it makes sense to construct a new house on the site. He stated that with construction activity, almost all of the trees in the front yard will be lost. He stated that replacement tree inches should be required. He noted that the existing detached garage will remain and suggested that it be re-sided to match the new house.

Board member Downey stated support for the demolition of the existing residence. She noted that based on the site plan, it appears that it will not be possible for a vehicle to enter the first garage bay. She suggested shifting the garage so that vehicles are able to pull into and back out of each of the bays.

Board member Renken stated support for the demolition of the existing residence

and acknowledged the foundation issues despite the fact that the residence appears to be livable. He complimented the proportions of the proposed residence and noted that it appears that the width of the house is determined by the desired size of the interior rooms. He noted concern about the dimension between the garage door and the north property line as proposed and questioned whether the house could be shifted to the south. He commented that if shifting the house is not possible, reducing the size of the kitchen and family room could provide a couple more feet for the driveway apron to improve functionality. He stated that as proposed, the functionality of the garage is compromised. He noted that the existing fence appears to be on the neighboring property to the north and as a result, the subject property does not extend as far to the north as it appears. He commented on the high windows noting that given the desired Craftsman style, a shed dormer with three or four windows could be considered for natural light. He commented that as currently shown, the window appears squatty.

Board member Collins agreed with the comments of the other Board members.

Chairman Looby agreed that as proposed, it will be difficult to maneuver into and out of the garage. He invited a response to Board questions from the petitioner.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Deegan stated that initially, the driveway was proposed straight along the north property line to the street but noted that the required zoning setbacks were not met. He stated that the configuration of the driveway is limited by the side yard setback and the desire to preserve some trees in the front yard. He stated that the driveway apron, in front of the garage doors is 23'. He stated that the house may be able to be shifted south slightly, and it may be possible to take a few inches out of the house.

Ms. Close stated that all the stormwater flows north to south in this area. She stated that the driveway as proposed will not create drainage problems. She stated that the neighbor previously installed the fence to screen impacts from her headlights. She stated that the trees on the property are not in the prime of life and only live for 70 to 80 years. She stated the intention to plant replacement trees to the extent possible.

Chairman Looby noted that the driveway will be pitched away from the garage and as a result, will direct water to the neighboring property. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited public comments, hearing none, he invited final questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Downey asked that further consideration be given to how the north property line will be treated.

Board member Looby stated that the responsibility for screening headlight impacts is on the owner of the property creating the impact. He invited final comments from the petitioner.

Mr. Deegan agreed to explore options for the north property line in an effort to

mitigate impacts on the neighboring property to the north.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Downey made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the house at 722 Oak Knoll Drive. She stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report.

The motion was seconded by Board member Lamphere and approved by the Board in a 6 to 0 vote.

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of a replacement residence and attached garage and the preliminary concepts for the hardscape and landscape subject to further modification along the north property line. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporates the comments of the Board as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to Submitting Plans for Permit address the following through refinements to the plans:
 - a. Shift the siting of the residence or reduce the width of the residence to provide space between the driveway and the north property line for planting and drainage.
 - a. If determined to be appropriate at the discretion of the City, install a curb along the north edge of the portion of the driveway closest to the property line to mitigate water run off on to the neighboring property.
 - b. Install a site obscuring fence along a portion of the north property line to mitigate views of vehicles and the impact of headlights on the neighboring property to the north.
 - c. Provide an auto turn study prepared by an engineer demonstrating that vehicles of the sizes commonly owned by families are able to maneuver into and out of the garage without encroaching into the landscape buffer.
 - d. Note on the plans that the stone on the elevations of the residence shall be a minimum of four inches thick.
 - e. Consider replacing the high windows with a shed dormer to provide the natural light desired.
2. All modifications to the plans, including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit the following materials must be submitted and will be subject to City review and approval.

Tree Removal and Landscaping

- a. A tree removal plan. The plan shall identify trees proposed for removal, and trees identified for protection and preservation and shall be based on the drainage and grading plan.
- b. A tree protection plan identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing pre and post construction treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees intended for preservation which are located close to construction activity.
- c. A detailed landscape plan. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and incorporate all required replacement tree inches to account for trees being removed. The landscape plan shall include plantings along the north property line to screen the driveway, lights from vehicles maneuvering into and out of the garage, and parked vehicles. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

Drainage and Grading

- d. Detailed drainage and grading plans. Grading or filling is limited to the minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices. The property must continue to accept water that is tributary to the site and runoff from new construction must be addressed to avoid increasing stormwater runoff on to neighboring properties.
- e. If the driveway is located close to the north property line, a curb shall be installed along the north edge of the driveway to contain water runoff and debris if determined to be appropriate by the City.

Exterior Lighting

- f. An exterior lighting plan. Details of all proposed exterior lighting, on the residence and on the property shall be provided. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.

Contractor Parking and Staging of Materials and Equipment

- g. A plan for contractor parking and material and equipment staging.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and was approved by a vote of

to 6 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of a first and second floor addition and alterations to a single family home at 1030 Oak Grove Lane.

Property Owner: Jenna Paulson

Representative: Shawn Purnell, architect

Chairman Looby asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Paulson stated that it is her intention to maintain the appearance of the home and use the same exterior materials on the addition.

Mr. Purnell presented an image of the front of the home and stated that the proposed addition and alterations will honor the simple massing and detailing of the home. He stated that the addition will allow the primary suite to remain on the first floor. He presented images of the neighboring homes and noted the significant amount of landscape screening in the neighborhood and screening from Waukegan Road. He stated that a relatively small addition is proposed to add bedrooms, increase the size of the kitchen, and add a garage bay. He reviewed the existing and proposed floor plans noting that the existing mudroom space is reclaimed for a garage bay and a sunroom and landscaped patio are added to the rear of the home. He noted that the second floor addition is intentionally small. He reviewed the existing and proposed elevations noting that the existing front elevation is symmetrical, but the rear elevation is not. He noted the intent to highlight the massing of the main entrance on the front elevation. He stated that the addition projects from the rear of the house and does not impact the front elevation. He stated that a hipped roof is proposed on the second floor addition to minimize the appearance of mass. He stated that with the addition, the house remains well under the allowable square footage. He presented alternative roof forms that were studied for the rear elevation.

Mr. Prado reviewed that a first and second floor addition is proposed along with related alterations. He stated that no variances are requested. He reviewed the homes in the area noting the distance from the subject home and the vegetation that provides substantial screening. He asked the Board for comments and direction on the form of the dormer on the rear elevation. He stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the petition.

Chairman Looby invited comments from the Board.

Board member Lohmueller complimented the addition noting that it blends in well with the existing home and site. He questioned whether windows are available to match the existing first floor windows that are proposed to remain. He stated concern about the use of vinyl windows. He commented that the garage door appears crowded with the arch and commented that in his opinion, gable dormers on the rear of the home could present a better solution.

Board member Downey complimented the addition. She stated that the arch on the garage door appears forced and, in her opinion, detracts from the house. She commented that the proportions of the dormer appear off. She noted that overall, the details are well done.

Board member Renken commented that the house is understated and elegant from the front. He suggested adding a detail above the front door. He observed that the garage doors have different radii and suggested using a straight top for the garage doors rather than an arch. He stated support for the alternate dormer design. He asked for clarification on the siding material.

Board member Collins stated support for the alternate roof form on the rear addition.

Board member Lamphere commented that arched garage doors can be difficult to maintain.

In response to a question from Board member Lamphere, Mr. Purnell stated that the brick will be painted white.

Chairman Looby agreed that the arch at the top of the garage doors should be eliminated.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Paulson agreed to eliminate the arch from the top of the garage doors. She stated that the existing windows were replaced within the last five years. She stated that the windows on the addition will match the existing windows.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Purnell stated that he is inclined to move forward with the first alternate presented for the roof form on the rear addition. He commented that he would like to consider a way to bring stucco in as an accent material.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final questions and comments from the Board. Hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of a first and second floor addition and alterations to the residence at 1030 Oak Grove Lane. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporates the comments of the Board as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to submitting plans for permit conduct further study and refine the plans consistent with the following direction.

- a. Revise the dormer on the rear elevation with consideration of a gable dormer instead of an arched dormer and improving the proportions.
 - b. Add detail above the front door.
 - c. Eliminate the arched garage doors and replace with standard, straight doors.
2. All modifications to the plans, including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit the following must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by staff.

Landscaping

- a. A detailed landscape plan for foundation plantings around the expanded footprint of the home shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards in the Code. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

Drainage and Grading

- b. A drainage and grading plan or a grading waiver application.

Exterior Lighting

- c. Details of exterior lighting, both existing and proposed lighting must be reflected on a plan. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.

Contractor Parking, Materials and Equipment Staging, and Tree Protection

- d. A plan reflecting areas for contractor parking, material and equipment staging, and tree protection fencing.

The motion was seconded by Board member Lamphere and approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

5. Continued consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of partial demolition and significant alterations to the residence at 663 Circle Lane. A building scale variance is requested.

Property Owner: Margaret Antonik

Representative: Christopher Derrick, architect

Chairman Looby asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest.

Board member Downey stated that she knows a neighbor of the property but stated that she will be able to review the petition objectively.

Hearing no further declarations from the Board, Chairman Looby invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Antonik stated that her family has lived in Bannockburn since 2004 and recently acquired the property.

Mr. Derrick stated that the residence is an expansive mansion that was constructed in 1983 on three acres of property. He stated that the residence does not reflect a single architectural style or have any historical significance. He stated that the property was originally part of the Villa Turicum Estate prior to subdivision of the area and noted that the Tea House from the Estate is located on the property. He stated that no changes are proposed to the Tea House. He noted that the property is sited at the end of a cul-de-sac, adjacent to the McCormick Nature Preserve, on a bluff above Lake Michigan and as a result, there are few neighboring homes. He stated that the house is behind a gated entry and significant landscaping which provides privacy. He stated that the proposed changes will have limited, if any visibility from the street or from neighboring properties. He reviewed the changes proposed on all elevations of the house which are intended to create more architectural character. He reviewed the changes proposed to the windows noting that all of the windows and doors will be replaced. He stated that the goals are to improve the interior layout, remove the awkward porticos which reduces the footprint of the home, and change the roof to a mansard form to reflect the French Provincial style. He stated that the existing landscaping will remain. He stated that based on the City's square footage calculation method, raising the roof by four feet increases the overall square footage of the house. He stated that six decorative dormers are proposed as an architectural feature but noted that there is no living space in the attic. He stated that the house is below the allowable building height. He described the exterior materials noting that a limestone veneer is proposed to be applied over the existing brick. He stated that a synthetic roof product is proposed. He spoke to the variance noting that the bluff reduces the amount of land area that is permitted to be factored into the calculation for allowable square footage. He stated that a consultant was engaged by the property owner to develop a plan for stabilizing the slope of the bluff. He stated the owners' intention to make sure that the project proceeds in a respectful and orderly way.

Mr. Prado stated that the proposed work constitutes a partial demolition based on the petitioner's calculations which show that less than 50 percent of the house will be removed. He confirmed that the property little relationship to surrounding homes given the nature preserve to the south, the Lake to the east, and the extensive

landscaping on the property. He stated that the existing house is eight percent over the allowable square footage. He stated that with the proposed changes, primarily the change to the roof structure, as proposed, the house will be 19 percent over the allowable square footage. He noted that the footprint of the house will be reduced as a result of the proposed alterations. He noted that in some areas on the proposed elevations, there is an imbalance in the relationship between the windows and solid walls. He commented that the dormers on the rear of the house could benefit from some refinement. He stated that findings in support of the petition including the building scale variance are detailed in the staff report.

Chairman Looby invited comments from the Board.

Board member Downey stated that the proposed alterations will improve the home. She stated support for the building scale variance. She commented on the windows on the north elevation noting that they are larger than the existing windows but do not change the appearance significantly. She stated that the octagonal windows on the rear elevation appear to be squeezed into a tight area. She encouraged further study of that element. She stated that the stone should be a minimum of four inches thick consistent with past Board approvals. She encouraged the petitioners to be sensitive to the impact of construction noise and congestion on the street noting that this area has been impacted by ongoing construction in the past.

Board member Renken complimented the proposed design. He acknowledged that the additional square footage overage is caused by the changes to the roof form. He stated that in his opinion, lowering the roof would be inappropriate for the selected architectural style. He agreed that there will be little visibility of the house from off of the site. He asked for further clarification on the proposed stone material. He complimented the front elevation. He stated that the north elevation could benefit from refinement and offered comments about window and door placement. He suggested aligning the windows on the south elevation. He commented on the rear elevation, acknowledging the owner's desire for expansive windows to take advantage of the views. He suggested refining the dormers and suggested consideration of shallow pitch shed dormers which could disappear into the roof. He agreed that the octagonal window appears awkward in the tight space.

Board member Coffin commended the project. He agreed that the window placement and spacing could benefit from further study and refinement.

Board member Lamphere stated that the proposed changes will elevate the house. She stated that parking for construction related vehicles should occur on the site and not in the cul de sac. She commented on the north elevation noting that the windows next to the service door could be reduced in size. She agreed that the octagonal window appears out of place. She commented that the plan is ambitious and expressed interest in understanding how the limestone veneer will be installed over the brick.

Board member Lohmueller agreed that the project is ambitious. He stated that removing the portico will be a great improvement. He noted that with the major transformation that is planned, a change to the siding, and changes to the window openings, consideration should be given to the adequacy of the insulation and the vapor barrier. He stated that the plans reflect massive renovations to the interior. He stated that the proposed roof form will enhance the home over the current roof. He suggested paying careful attention to the window divisions adding that more rectangular shapes as opposed to square, may enhance the appearance. He stated that the windows on the rear elevation appear crowded and suggested flattening the shed dormers and eliminating the octagonal window. He stated that the north elevation has expansive areas of stone and suggested breaking the expanse up with ivy, a trellis, or an additional window.

Chairman Looby suggested that adding a window in the garage would improve the appearance of the north elevation. He stated that in his opinion, the number and size of the windows on the rear elevation seems reasonable given the desire to take advantage of views. He stated however that some simplification should be considered such as reducing the trim. He stated that the proposed roof form appears appropriate for the home. He asked for further details on the windows and the proposed limestone veneer material.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Derrick stated that black or dark brown aluminum clad Pella wood windows are proposed. He stated the intent to stay with standard windows sizes rather than use custom windows. He pointed out that currently, the brick butts up to the windows. He stated that a cast stone casing will be added around the windows to make the windows appear larger. He stated that over 300 square feet of glazing will be added to the home mostly on the rear elevation. Agree with shallower pitch on the shed dormers. He stated that the pitch on the dormers on the rear elevation can be reduced. He stated that the octagonal window is in an existing opening. He stated that to the extent possible, the existing window openings will be retained to minimize impacts to the interior. He presented a sample of the proposed limestone cladding material stating that it will be attached to the existing brick as was done at the petitioner's house in Bannockburn. He stated that the existing four inch thick brick veneer will remain, and the cladding material will be placed over the brick. He stated that the cladding product is about four and a half inches in total. He stated that wire mesh is fastened to the brick and the cladding is mortared on to the brick. He stated that the product is from Turkey.

Chairman Looby invited additional questions or comments from the Board.

Board member Downey suggested that on the north elevation, the window proposed for removal could remain.

In response to a question from Board member Lamphere, Mr. Derrick stated that he has not installed the proposed cladding material over brick in the past.

Board member Renken stated that the brick appears to be in good shape. He encouraged the petitioner to have a mason assess the brick before applying the cladding.

In response to a request from Chairman Looby, Mr. Derrick agreed to install a mockup of the cladding material at a corner of the house for the Board to inspect.

Ms. Antonik stated that the veneer product is on her home in Bannockburn and there have been no issues.

In response to questions from Board member Lohmueller, Mr. Derrick acknowledged that to enlarge the windows, some of the masonry will need to be removed. He stated that cast stone will be inserted around the windows.

Board member Renken pointed out that if the front portico is removed, the front entrance will be flat. He suggested some articulation to create a shadow line.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final questions and comments from the Board. Hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of a partial demolition of the residence at 663 Circle Lane, significant exterior alterations including modification of the roof form and changes to windows and doors, and a building scale variance. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporates the comments of the Board as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to the submittal of plans for permit:
 - a. Install a mockup of the cladding material to demonstrate how the stone will be configured at the corners of the residence and at the windows AND prepare detailed drawings of the installation method to be included with the plans submitted for permit.
 - b. Refine the north elevation for consistency in window placement, size and style.
 - c. Refine the east elevation including, but not limited to, modification of the octagonal window, lowering the pitch of the shed dormer roofs, and refining the window placement, size, and style to achieve a balance of openings to solid wall.
 - d. Add a note on the plans stating that the cladding shall be a minimum of 4" thick unless otherwise approved by the Board after viewing the on site mockup.
 - e. Refine the front entrance to achieve a deeper projection or recess.
2. All modifications to the plans, including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to

determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit the following materials shall be submitted and will be subject to staff review and approval.

Tree Protection

- a. A tree protection plan identifying the location of fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing pre and post construction treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees intended for preservation which are located close to construction activity.

Exterior Lighting

- b. An exterior lighting plan detailing existing and proposed exterior lighting on the residence and elsewhere on the site. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.

Contractor Parking and Material and Equipment Staging

- c. The cul-de-sac must remain unobstructed and free from debris. No contractor parking is permitted on the street. If vehicles cannot be accommodated on site, off site contractor parking may be required at the City's discretion.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and approved by a 6 to 0 vote.

7. Opportunity for the public to address the Building Review Board on non-agenda items.

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

7. Additional information from staff.

Mr. Prado reminded the Board that due to the July 4th holiday, the next meeting of the Board is on July 10th.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak
Director of Community Development