

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the November 19, 2025 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, November 19, 2025, at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Lloyd Culbertson, and Commission members Elizabeth Daliere, Tina Dann-Fenwick, Geoffrey Hanson, Robin Petit and Leif Soderberg,

Commissioners absent: Commission member John Norkus

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

1. Introduction of Commissioners and staff, overview of meeting procedures.

Chairman Culbertson reviewed the meeting procedures followed by the Commission and asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes of the October 15, 2025 meetings of the Commission.

Consideration of the minutes of the October 15, 2025 meeting was postponed.

3. Continued consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving significant demolition of the residence at 10 N. Mayflower Road and a replacement residence including a significant replacement addition and alterations to the remaining portion of the residence. Limited tree removal and changes to the existing hardscape are proposed. A conceptual landscape plan is presented for review.

Property Owner: Charlie Schramer

Presented by: Stan Weisbrod, SJW Architects & Associates, Inc.

Chairman Culbertson asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. hearing none, he stated that he received an email from the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation regarding the petition but did not respond. He stated that the email will not influence his ability to review the petition impartially and based on the applicable standards. He invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Weisbrod stated that the petition was previously considered by the Commission and in response, refinements were made to the plans. He reviewed the applicable standards. He stated that the proposed residence is designed in a modern architectural style and designed to fit in with the context and massing of the other homes in the neighborhood. He presented the elevations as now proposed and reviewed the proposed exterior materials noting that wood siding and a standing seam metal roof are proposed. He stated that since the last meeting, the proportions

of the windows and the pitch of various roof forms were refined. He stated that the residence is intended to read as a quiet contemporary neighbor to the existing homes rather than a competing architectural statement. He presented sketches illustrating the evolution of the design, noting that some elements were refined while others were reduced or removed. He pointed out the patio now proposed in front of the garage intended to soften that massing of that element. He compared the previous elevations to the elevations now proposed and pointed out the significant differences. He stated that in his opinion, the revised elevations satisfy the Commission's standards related to mass, scale, and proportional relationships. He stated that the project is clearly distinguishable as new construction and demonstrates how contemporary work can contribute respectfully within an historic context. He pointed out the fundamental changes made since the last meeting, straightening the footprint and eliminating the angle at the front entrance. He noted that the garage mass is shifted back from the front plane of the house. He stated that the revised design as now presented reflects a comprehensive reworking of the project.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the petition is before the Commission for the third time and after several meetings of a subcommittee of the Commission appointed by the Chairman. She noted that in October, the Commission last offered direction on several elements of the design and the subcommittee, comprised of Commissioners Soderberg and Hanson, worked with the petitioner to offer further guidance. She stated that substantial changes were made to the plans, adding that the most significant revisions made include eliminating the angled footprint of the residence and shifting the garage back from the front of the house. She noted that these changes were possible as a result of the petitioner's successful efforts to vacate the utility easement located in the middle of the property. She stated that the windows are now more uniform in size, shape, and detailing. She stated that the dormers which penetrated the peak of the roof were removed. She noted that the front entry was shifted to the east, shortened, and widened to give it more prominence. She stated that windows in the stairway were shifted to the west, to minimize visual conflict with the front entrance. She stated that as a result of shifting the garage back, a small courtyard is created in front of the garage to soften the overall front elevation. She added that a front facing gable was added to the garage to relate to the front entrance. She stated that the staff report details findings in support of the petition.

In response to a request from Chairman Culbertson, Commissioner Hanson reviewed the subcommittee process noting that three meetings were held with the petitioner in a short timeframe. He said that the process was a good faith effort by all involved. He stated that the discussions focused on achieving better balance between the east and west masses of the house, simplifying the design, reducing the number of competing elements and roof forms, and creating a more cohesive overall composition.

In response to a request from Chairman Culbertson, Commissioner Soderberg agreed that the petitioner proceeded in good faith and in his opinion, responded to the

comments offered by both the Commission and the subcommittee. He stated that the petitioner addressed the key design concerns raised.

Chairman Culbertson commended the Commissioners for their work on the subcommittee.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the Commission routinely requires stone and brick cladding to be a minimum of four inches thick.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Weisbrod clarified that the anthracite siding material is used minimally on the rear of the home and only at the lower level. He confirmed that the roof is proposed as a DaVinci synthetic product that is intended to imitate slate. He confirmed that the dormer to the left of the gabled entry is the only shed dormer on the house and is intended to break up the continuous elevation and add prominence to the front entry.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the building scale calculation includes the proposed garage.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Weisbrod stated that alternate designs for the front entrance were considered. He agreed that the muntin pattern in the windows could be further refined.

In response to questions from Commissioner Daliere about the front entry, Commissioner Hanson stated that wood panels were considered at the front entry. He commented that the proposed design provides an appropriate focal point.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Weisbrod clarified that the window muntins are metal. He stated that an earlier design included tall dormer windows with significantly more glass. He explained that the current design replicates the proportions of glass used elsewhere on the house. He stated a willingness to consider further refinement to the window design but noted that the proposed proportions make sense within the context of the elevation and contribute positively to the appearance of the front façade.

In response to a question from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Weisbrod stated that the intent is to retain the existing historic fence near the property line and install a new fence directly behind it.

In response to questions from Chairman Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that at this stage, the landscape plan is conceptual. She stated that as with most petitions, a complete and detailed landscape plan is required at the time plans are submitted for permit. She stated that plans detailing fencing, hardscape, and all proposed exterior lighting are also required at that time. She stated that if desired by the Commission,

some or all of those plans could be presented to the Commission for review or review could be delegated to staff.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dalieri, Mr. Weisbrod stated that the front door is wood. He stated that the side walls at the entry which are proposed as anthracite, could also be wood. He stated that the front of the entry will be glass and a smooth stone. He stated that a wood decorative element is proposed at the entry to match the front door. He stated that rusticated material is proposed on the side walls to contrast with the slightly recessed smooth stone.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Ms. Czerniak stated that three significant trees are proposed for removal in the rear yard. She noted that as the project develops, detailed plans for the landscaping, fence, and entry pillars will be required and will be subject to City review and approval. She confirmed that no new or relocated curb cuts are proposed.

Chairman Culbertson invited public comment.

Susana Sullivan, 178 Illinois Road, read the statement previously submitted to the Commission by the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation.

Anne Lyon, Lake Forest resident, a former architect, and the listing agent for the property prior to the purchase by the petitioner, noted that the residence at 333 Green Bay Road which was approved by the Commission has multiple shed dormers. She referenced the residence at 61 Sequoia Court noting that it has similar massing including a shed dormer and similar exterior materials as proposed in this petition. She stated that residence at 205 Green Bay Road reflects comparable massing to the proposed residence and is also within the Historic District. She commented that the revised design, with the gabled front element and straightened footprint, is, in her opinion, consistent with the architectural character found in the examples she presented. She stated that she has a long history in Lake Forest and expressed her support for the project.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Culbertson offered the petitioner the opportunity to provide a rebuttal to the public testimony.

Mr. Schramer thanked the Commission and the subcommittee for their work. He stated that the residence at 61 Sequoia Court served as inspiration in the design process. He stated that evaluation of the exterior materials will continue.

Chairman Culbertson asked for staff response to public testimony in particular, the assertion by the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation that Standards 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 are not met by the petition.

Ms. Czerniak summarized the findings detailed in the staff report. She stated that with respect to Standard 1, the height of the residence complies with the maximum allowable 40 feet. She stated that in response to comments from the Commission, the

height of the main entry was reduced, and the height of the garage was increased to provide improved balance across the front elevation. She stated that in response to Standard 3, significant adjustments were made to the openings particularly on the front elevation resulting in improved proportions and relationships of solids and voids. She stated that the window sizes, shapes, and muntin patterns are now more consistent around the home. She stated that with respect to Standard 4, there is a more unified pattern across the elevations with less verticality overall. She stated that with respect to Standard 6, considerable attention was paid to refining the front entry including widening the entry and reducing the height as well as shifting the element to the east, away from the stairway element. She stated that Standard 7 is satisfied with the proposed combination of quality materials including rough and smooth stone, a standing seam metal roof over the large window, and natural wood siding. She noted the variety of textures, and the limited number of materials overall is positive. She stated that Standard 8 is addressed as a result of a significant change to the roof shape, the introduction of a gable roof over the garage, and the straightening of the footprint, which eliminates an awkward condition present in earlier versions of the design.

Chairman Culbertson invited comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick acknowledged that significant modifications were made to the overall design. She stated that the gable roof over the garage serves as an effective counterweight within the overall composition. She stated that while the balance of the fenestration on the front façade has improved, she remains concerned about whether the revisions go far enough. She commented on the importance of rhythm along the street and on the front façade itself and questioned whether the design fully satisfies the applicable Standards. She suggested breaking up the large dormer window to allow the front façade to more fully satisfy the standards. She suggested consideration of detailing the glass surrounding the front door consistent with the window above.

Commissioner Dalieri referenced the residence at 62 Sequoia Court, noting that while it includes a similar shed dormer, it features a smaller and more understated front entrance. She commented that the proposed front entry competes with the overall front façade. She stated that support for the gable roof on the garage and the other improvements made to the design.

Chairman Culbertson reiterated that the petition has appeared before the Commission three times. He acknowledged that while the current design may not be ideal, it incorporates material modifications that significantly improve upon earlier iterations. He stated that the proposed design represents a substantial improvement over the existing structure. He noted that the vacation of the easement was critical and allows the footprint of the residence to be straight, rather than angled. He stated that the massing overall is improved, the roof is simpler, and the windows are reduced and more uniform. He cited the repositioning of the garage and the creation of a courtyard along the front elevation as meaningful improvements. He stated that the

project has progressed significantly and he supports approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness. He then invited additional comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Hanson stated support for the project based on three conditions. He stated that the historic fence should be repaired and retained. He stated that natural wood siding should be used. He stated that a detailed landscape plan should be presented to the Commission for review and approval including fencing and any gates or pillars that may be proposed. He stated that in his opinion, the petition satisfies the applicable criteria.

Commissioner Soderberg concurred with Commissioner Hanson's comments. He stated that the project has progressed significantly and stated support for the petition subject to the conditions outlined by Commissioner Hanson.

Commissioner Dalieri stated that in her opinion, the petition does not yet meet the standards satisfactorily. She stated support for continuing the petition.

Chairman Culbertson stated opposition to continuing the petition noting that the petitioner responded adequately to the direction offered by the Commission.

Commissioner Dalieri stated that in her opinion, the front facing dormer competes too strongly with the front entrance and as a result, the standards relating to the proportion of openings of solids to voids, the rhythm of the entrance, and the proportions of the front façade are not met.

Commissioner Petit stated that in her opinion, the dormer is not successful in breaking up the expanse of roof and is confusing in its current form. She suggested considering a two story window, rather than a dormer.

Ms. Czerniak offered that the petition could be approved with a condition requesting further consideration of refinements to limited and specific elements.

Chairman Culbertson reiterated that in his opinion, the project has progressed significantly and that, given the time and effort invested in refining the design to date, he is supportive of approving the petition with conditions. He invited a motion.

Commissioner Hanson made motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving significant demolition of the existing residence, new construction, alterations to the remaining portion of the home, and the overall site plan including a swimming pool. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion adding that the Commission's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval in addition to the conditions detailed in the staff report.

- The historic fence shall be repaired and retained.

- A detailed landscape plan including any fencing, pillars, and gates proposed, if any shall be presented to the Commission for review and approval.
- The siding shall be natural wood.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Soderberg and failed due to a tie with Chairman Culbertson and Commissioners Hanson and Soderberg voting aye and Commissioners Daliere, Petit, and Dann-Fenwick voting nay.

Commissioner Hanson asked for input from the dissenting Commissioners on what could move the petition forward to a positive vote.

Commissioner Petit stated that in her opinion, Standards 2, 3, and 4 must be satisfied more fully.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated that the house could benefit from greater uniformity overall. She observed that the house as presented has significantly more windows than the surrounding homes which could contribute to off site light impacts. She acknowledged that the residence as now presented is a significant improvement over the plans previously presented to the Commission.

Commissioner Daliere stated that in her opinion, the residence as proposed does not satisfactorily address Standard 2 due to the two competing central masses created by the shed dormer and the entry element.

In response to questions from Chairman Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak summarized the limited refinements suggested by the Commission, aligning the detailing of the windows at the entry with the window above, addressing the front facing shed dormer in some way to mitigate competition with the front entrance, She offered that final approval of those elements could be delegated to staff or the subcommittee.

Commissioner Petit suggested that if approval is delegated to the subcommittee, the petition could be referred back to the full Commission at the subcommittee's discretion.

Commissioner Daliere stated support for delegating final approval to the subcommittee.

Commissioner Handson made a motion to reconsider the motion previously voted on by the Commission.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Soderberg and approved by a 6 to 0 vote.

Chairman Culbertson invited a motion.

Commissioner Petit made motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness approving significant demolition of the existing residence, new construction, alterations to the remaining portion of the home, and the overall site plan including a swimming pool. She stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion adding that the Commission's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. She stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to submitting plans for permit, final review is required by the Commission subcommittee. Consideration shall be given to further refinements, with a focus on opportunities to more fully comply with Standards 2, 3, and 4. In particular, consideration should be given to simplifying or downplaying the large window element to the east of the front entrance to avoid competition between the large window with the associated metal roof, and the front entrance. Consider whether the addition of muntins in the windows immediately adjacent to the front door would be beneficial as a unifying element on the front elevation.
 - a. The historic fence shall be repaired and retained.
 - b. The siding shall be natural wood.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with any final refinements as approved by the Commission subcommittee. Any further refinements made as a result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plan. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Commission subcommittee as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the approvals prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Details of all exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view from off the site. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights. All exterior lighting shall be sensitive to the impacts on neighbors and respect the dark sky character of the neighborhood.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan for contractor parking and material and equipment staging shall be submitted and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.
5. After construction is underway, and prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, a detailed landscape plan shall be presented to the Historic Preservation Commission for review and approval. The plan shall detail areas where existing vegetation is to remain, plantings proposed to replace the tree inches removed, foundation plantings including the courtyard near the garage, and enhanced plantings proposed for other areas of the site, if any. Site plans and

elevations shall also be submitted for entry pillars, fencing, and gates if any are proposed.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dalieri and approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

4. Preliminary information on the proposed demolition of two historic structures and a proposed replacement house and garage at 870 Woodbine Lane

Property Owner: Bianca Timbota

Presented by: Shawn Purnell, architect

Chairman Culbertson asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Purnell reviewed the unique characteristics of the site and the existing structures. He stated that the property includes a utilitarian, single-story garage and a farmhouse which were outbuildings from a large estate. He noted that the structures are unusually sited, located on, near, and over the lot boundaries. He acknowledged that due to the limited buildable area on the property, zoning variances will be requested. He stated that a structural engineer evaluated the existing buildings and found significant deterioration including water damage and mold and noted that the structures do not comply with current building codes. He stated that any modifications to the structures will require compliance with current Codes and stated that in his opinion, renovation would be nearly impossible. He presented a conceptual site plan for a proposed two-story single-family residence. He stated that both existing structures are proposed for removal. He acknowledged that the plans presented are conceptual and asked for Commission input and direction regarding the overall approach suggested. He stated that the intent is to construct a single-family home with a covered porch while mitigating the overall size of the residence. He noted that the massing is reduced from what could be allowed if the full land area of the appendage was factored into the calculation.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the property is challenging and unique. She noted that the property has been under the same ownership for approximately 20 years and has suffered from a lack of maintenance overall. She stated that the petitioners recently purchased the property. She confirmed that the two existing structures are identified as Contributing Structures to the Historic District and were outbuildings for an estate as were several other buildings on Woodbine Lane and Woodbine Place which today are adaptively reused as single family residences. She stated that alterations were made to some of the other outbuildings in the area to allow them to be adaptively reused however, the historic integrity of the structures and overall area was preserved. She reviewed the applicable zoning setbacks noting the limited buildable area and confirmed that it is likely that any proposed redevelopment of the site will require the petitioner to request zoning variances. She stated that at this point in the process, the plans are not sufficiently detailed to allow the square footage of the proposed house to be calculated. She stated that because of the uniqueness of the property, Commission input and direction is being requested very early in the process. She

identified several areas for Commission consideration including input on the existing structures. She stated that if there is support for demolition of the existing structures, Commission input on the siting of a replacement residence on the property will be important. She noted that consideration of whether some or all of the square footage of the appendage of land that extends to the north should be factored into the allowable square footage for a new house will also need to be considered. She noted that the land areas of the appendage will not visually support the mass of the house as viewed from the streetscapes. She stated that while a specific architectural style cannot be mandated by the Commission, guidance may be appropriate given the unique neighborhood context and streetscape and the importance of compatibility. She stated that the selection of exterior materials if a new house is proposed will also be important given the historic character of the area. She stated that several pieces of correspondence were received and were provided to the Commission.

In response to questions from Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Purnell stated that, given the siting and condition of the existing structures, in his opinion, reuse of the buildings is not a viable option. He stated that if the structures were in better condition, reuse may be feasible. He stated that retaining the farmhouse was initially considered but determined to be impractical because the structure extends over the property line. He stated that the structures are a liability.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Ms. Czerniak stated that additions to and modifications of nonconforming structures have occurred previously.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hanson, Mr. Purnell stated that while he cannot speak to the legal aspects of nonconforming structures, in his opinion, the structures are a liability.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that a portion of the farmhouse appears to cross the property line and extend into the City right-of-way.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Purnell stated that the existing structures are very close to the street creating safety concerns and raising significant concerns about the feasibility of reuse.

In response to questions from Chairman Culbertson, Mr. Purnell stated that, according to the structural engineer, the farmhouse could potentially be relocated at great expense. He stated that due to the masonry construction, relocating the garage is not feasible. He stated that there is no conventional buildable area on the lot adding that the initial design approach is intended to maximize the usable front and rear yard areas while complying with the front yard and ravine setbacks.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Purnell stated that reusing some of the brick or other materials may be possible. He stated however that his expectation is that the quantity of salvageable material will be limited. He stated that

creating a wing of a new residence that extends on to the appendage portion of the lot was considered but stated the intention is to retain that area as green space. He stated that the goal of the project is to provide an appropriate residence to meet the client's needs while minimizing the number and extent of variances requested.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Purnell stated that angling the house on the site is an option that could be explored.

Commissioner Soderberg commented on the unique character of the neighborhood and setting, noting the variety of service buildings and architectural forms in the area. He stated that these characteristics are relevant when considering appropriate sizing and responsiveness to context, particularly given the peninsula configuration of the lot.

In response to Commission comments, Mr. Purnell stated that the proposed design is aesthetically consistent with the applicable standards. He confirmed that approximately 90 percent of the land area of the appendage is excluded from calculating the allowable size of the proposed residence. He acknowledged that there is a mismatch between the scale and square footage of a new residence and the proportions of the existing farmhouse. He stated that vernacular elements could be incorporated into the design of a future residence but noted that those elements are not his preference. He stated that the proposed residence is consistent with the broader Historic District, noting other masonry homes in the District with hip and gable roof forms. He stated that the proposed residence is intended to blend into the established context of the area.

Chairman Culbertson invited public comment.

Susana Sullivan, 178 Illinois Road, read the statement submitted by the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation which was distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Andy Wells, 995 Woodbine Place, stated that he renovated the original farmhouse just north of the subject property down to the studs while remaining mindful of the history and character of the neighborhood. He stated that he values both the farmhouse and the street and does not feel that the proposed project is in keeping with the surrounding context.

Mary Ann Wells, 1015 Woodbine Place, stated that three different families live in outbuildings that were originally associated with the Clayton Mark Estate. She described the challenges of her house noting that when her front door is open, it extends on to the City right of way and noted that she was required to preserve a greenhouse structure on her property. She stated that the proposed house does not conform to the neighborhood or the established streetscape. She acknowledged that the buildings on the subject property are in poor condition and acknowledged the unusual configuration of the property. She stated that she does not want to see the existing structures demolished and expressed support for constructing a new residence within the footprint of the farmhouse. She stated disappointment that the new owners

of the property cleared vegetation from the appendage portion of the lot and filled in a portion of the ravine without City approval.

Shawn Roberts, 1020 Lake Road, stated that he has lived in the area for approximately 40 years. He commented that approximately 20 years ago, the Commission rejected a proposal to demolish the farmhouse. He stated that since that time, the farmhouse has been rented off and on. He suggested that the Commission require a similar approach to the work undertaken by the Wells family on the property to the north of the subject property. He stated that he does not support demolition of the house. He stated that the land area near the ravine was cleared without any approval.

Sheila Henretta, 885 Woodbine Lane, commented on the importance of fitting within the neighborhood context. She stated that the size of the proposed home is a key consideration and expressed concern about potential impacts on the mature trees on the south side of the property. She noted that her home office directly overlooks the small white cottage and stated that there is not adequate room on the site for a large residence. She stated that the "L" portion of the property should not be included when calculating square footage. She questioned whether the existing garage could be incorporated into the project. She noted that the main portion of her home is a brick outbuilding dating to 1908 which the previous owner added on to and as a result, received a historic preservation award. She stated that any new construction should fit within the character of the neighborhood.

In response to questions from Chairman Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that unauthorized clearing occurred on the site and was stopped once the City was made aware of the work. She confirmed that clearing of a site that is under consideration by a Board or Commission is not permitted and that any tree removal requires a permit. She stated that the City Engineer will review grading and drainage plans if redevelopment of the site is proposed paying close attention to the ravine on the property.

In response to a question from Chairman Culbertson, Mr. Purnell stated that the appendage portion of the lot that extends to the north is intended to remain as open space or potentially be developed with a pool. He stated that in his opinion, it does not make sense to develop that portion of the property.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Purnell stated that the existing cottage is less than 2,000 square feet and the existing garage approximately 400 square feet. He stated that the proposed residence is approximately 4,000 square feet.

In response to questions from the Chairman, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that a number of structures in the area are historic outbuildings. She noted that many of the homeowners in the area have appeared before the Commission in the past and taken great pains to preserve and protect the character of the area and find ways to adaptively reuse the historic structures. She stated that the Commission has supported

some alterations of the structures in the past to support adaptive reuse. She noted that each structure was evaluated individually with the goal of preserving historic structures and the character of the area to the extent possible while allowing for viable reuse. She confirmed that in some cases, demolition of historic structures within the Historic District has been approved.

Commissioner Hanson acknowledged that the Commission has approved some demolitions in the past but noted that this property is very unique. He commented that the farmhouse evokes a different era and represents a distinctive element of the neighborhood. He stated that he does not support demolition of the farmhouse. He stated that consideration should be given to alterations to the structure to make reuse feasible and stated a willingness to consider relocation on the site if feasible.

Commissioner Petit stated that she cannot support demolition of the farmhouse.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated that adaptive reuse or incorporation of the existing structure into a larger residence should be explored. She stated that a feasibility study should be completed to evaluate reuse options including the relocation of the farmhouse elsewhere on the site. She stated support for retaining the farmhouse over the garage. She commented that the small cottages in the area are a defining feature of the neighborhood and are community treasures.

Commissioner Soderberg stated any changes to the unique character of the neighborhood should be approached with caution. He acknowledged that the existing structures present challenges but stated that any redevelopment should be handled thoughtfully. He stated that reuse of the existing house should be considered. He stated that he does not support fundamentally altering the character of the neighborhood. He added that any new residence should be significantly smaller than what the lot could theoretically accommodate.

Chairman Culbertson commented on the charm of the existing farmhouse. He expressed concern about the removal of vegetation from the property that occurred prior to Commission review or City approval and stated that vegetation on the site should be restored. He stated that he does not support development on the appendage of the property beyond the potential relocation of the existing structure to that area.

In response to the Chairman, Ms. Czerniak stated that since no formal petition is before the Commission, a motion is not required.

OTHER ITEMS

5. Opportunity for the public to address the Historic Preservation Commission on non-agenda items.

There were no requests from the public to speak on non-agenda items.

6. Additional information from staff.

The Commission approved the meeting calendar for 2026.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Czerniak
Director of Community Development