

The City of Lake Forest
Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the April 24, 2019 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, April 24, 2019, at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Bruce Grieve and Commissioners Bob Alfe, Elizabeth Sperry, Jan Gibson, Bill Redfield, Carol Gayle and Wells Wheeler.

Commissioners absent: None

City staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development, Jennifer Baehr, Assistant Planner

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

Chairman Grieve 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 February 27, 2019 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The minutes of the February 27, 2019 meeting were approved as submitted.

**3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Certificate of Appropriateness for restoration of the Barrell Memorial Gateway at Lake Forest Cemetery located at 1525 Lake Road.
Property Owner: City of Lake Forest
Representative: Chuck Myers, Superintendent of Parks & Forestry
Brush Architects**

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

Mr. Myers introduced the petition. He stated that the Barrell Memorial Gateway is 100 years old this year. He explained that the structure has undergone two previous restorations, in 2002 and 2011. He stated that the structure in recent years started to show some of the same problems that the previous restoration projects were meant to correct. He explained that the current restoration aims to identify and correct the issues using a different approach than the previous restoration projects to achieve a longer term solution. He stated that the City hired Brush Architects to perform an analysis of the structure. He stated that the firm brought in a number of professionals and conducted a thorough investigation of the structure's mortar and masonry. He explained that the firm also assisted the City in

preparing the bid documents for the restoration project. He added that the project went out to bid early this year and the City selected Berglund Construction.

Ms. Brush stated that as part of the investigation of the structure, a mortar consultant was engaged to make recommends on the type of mortar that should be used for tuck pointing. She explained that the mortar analysis went beyond the surface mortar to the original setting mortar to allow for a thorough evaluation of the characteristics of the original mortar. She stated that understanding the pattern of the detailing on the stones was very important during their analysis. She explained that the stones were originally tooled in various patterns. She stated that since the stones are large, rather than replacing the damaged stones, some stones will be removed and re-faced. She stated that the stones will be tooled to recreate the pattern found on the original stone. She explained that the large central wrought iron gates are original and were removed for restoration by Corsetti Structural Steel Company. She explained that the restoration of the gates will involve removal of multiple layers of paint and the corrosion. She noted that the east pedestrian gate on the structure does not appear original but will also be restored.

Ms. Baehr stated this project involves restoration of the Barrell Memorial Gateway and includes several components. She stated that overall, the stone of the gate is in good condition noting that only limited replacement is included in the scope of work. She noted that any replacement stone will match the original limestone in color and shape. She added that any damaged or missing elements of the iron gates will be replaced to match the original wrought iron features. She explained that due to a miscommunication between City departments, the restoration work started in advance of presentation of the project to the Commission. She stated that the project appears to using an solid approach to restoration with appropriate methods and materials, consistent with the applicable standards and in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation which speak to using sensitive treatments and maintaining the character of the original structure.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Brush explained that a civil engineer assessed the drainage at the base of the gate and determined that in some areas water is directed toward the base of the gate likely causing some deterioration of the stones at the ground level. She explained that as part of the restoration sub-surface drainage work will be done to redirect water away from the base of the gate. She noted that in the past, mortar was applied to the surface of the joints, without removing the deteriorating mortar. She explained that the current project involves removing the failing mortar and using a lime based mortar to replace it, improving the integrity of the overall structure.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Myers confirmed that previous restoration efforts appear not to have fully corrected the underlying issues that were contributing to the deterioration of the structure. He explained

that in this case, a very thorough investigation was performed in an effort to identify the underlying causes of deterioration and to assure that the restoration lasts for decades. He stated that the project was brought forward by the Lake Forest Cemetery Commission. He added that the project was budgeted over the course of two years and confirmed that the project is fully funded.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Brush explained that Portland cement was likely used in past restorations with the idea that using a stronger material than a true lime mortar was better. She explained that the mortar should be weaker than the adjacent masonry so when deterioration occurs, the mortar is sacrificial to the masonry and the mortar erodes, rather than the masonry.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Ms. Brush explained that the only stones being replaced are those along the base of the structure. She added that the existing stones along the base of the structure are not original and are a different type of limestone than the original Indiana limestone used for the structure. She added that the new stones may appear brighter at first, but will fade in time.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Brush explained that to re-face the stones, they will cut around the stone and pull the stone out of the wall to re-orient them. She added that the foundation of the structure is concrete.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Ms. Brush stated that the drainage work includes installing a perforated drain tile around the structure, so as moisture comes down the building wall, the moisture is captured in the drain tile and directed away from the structure.

Commissioner Redfield expressed support for the project.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Grieve invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Ms. Baehr stated that staff received a letter from a neighbor on Lake Road expressing concerns about increased traffic in the area due to various construction projects in the area.

Ms. Czerniak noted that construction traffic related to the Gateway restoration project is expected to be minimal adding that any vehicles related to the work will be parked on-site at the Cemetery.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Myers said that installation of a stone bumper to prevent vehicles from damaging the gate structure was not considered but could be if that becomes an issue in the future. He added that there was a time that the road at the Gateway was cobblestone. He stated that reestablishing the cobblestone is under consideration and could help to slow

vehicles as they approach the Gateway.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Myers stated that the restoration is expected to be completed at the end of June.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the restoration of the Barrell Memorial Gateway at Lake Forest Cemetery located at 1525 Lake Road. He stated that the motion is based on the findings as detailed in the staff report. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Work must proceed in strict accordance with the plans and specifications presented to the Commission. Prior to any deviations from the approval plans and specifications, further Commission review may be required.
2. Comprehensive photo documentation of the gateway in its current condition must be provided to the Community Development Department and retained in the City's historic files. The purpose of the documentation is to preserve an historic record of the gateway at this point in time, and the restoration activities undertaken.
3. Tree protection fencing must remain in place as directed by the City's Certified Arborist until final inspections are completed and removal of the fencing is authorized by the Community Development Department.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gayle and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage for the History Center Lake Forest – Lake Bluff at 509 E. Deerpath.

Property Owner: History Center Lake Forest – Lake Bluff

Representative: Carol Summerfield, Executive Director

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

Ms. Summerfield introduced the petition. She stated that the goal of the project is to create signage that helps to identify the building for daily visitors and for those attending events at the History Center. She explained that the signage as proposed includes a monument sign on the front lawn along Deerpath, wall signs above the front and rear entrances on the north and south elevations of the building, a sign visible from Washington Road to identify the parking lot, and a sign to identify the Research Center entrance. She explained that the monument sign is proposed on a low brick wall and is setback from Deerpath. She stated that the sign is located so that it is visible to vehicles traveling east and west along the

curving road. She stated that the capstone on the brick wall will be limestone. She stated that the monument sign will be illuminated by lights installed on the underside of the capstone during evening events and open hours during the winter months. She explained that the building sign on the front entrance is proposed to be mounted to the pediment above the front door and will have black lettering. She stated that the rear entrance sign will be mounted to the brick above the recessed entryway and will match the proposed front entrance sign in material and font, but the letters will be white. She noted that the building entrance signs will not be illuminated. She reviewed the size and font of the lettering proposed for the monument and building signage. She added that the lettering will be attached to the surface with small studs. She explained that the sign proposed on Washington Road will replace the existing parking lot sign. She stated that the Research Center currently does not have a sign and it is a challenge for visitors to find the entrance to the building. She stated that the parking lot and Research Center signs are proposed as brick pedestals with attached lettering. She noted that the pedestals will be approximately 2 feet wide and 3.5 feet tall.

Ms. Baehr explained that Commission approval is required for overall campus signage associated with public and not for profit institutions. She explained that the Commission's role is to evaluate the proposed signage for overall compatibility, appropriateness and scale. She stated that the staff report offers a few recommendations, one that speaks to the use of natural materials for the signage and the other recommending that a mock-up of the signs be installed for final review prior to the issuance of a building permit to verify the size of the signs and lettering.

In response to questions from Commissioner Redfield, Ms. Summerfield explained that a mock-up of the proposed signs was installed however the mock-up did not withstand the weather and was damaged and removed.

Commissioner Gayle stated that the signage appears to be thoughtful and well-designed.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Summerfield explained that the monument sign is oriented on a 45 degree angle in an effort to make it visible from Deerpath from both the east and west. She confirmed that funding has been secured to move forward with the preferred option rather than the alternate presented.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Ms. Summerfield confirmed that the capstone overhang will be sufficient to hide the lights. She added that the proposed lighting is intended to be subtle, just enough to draw attention to the sign. She stated that back-lit lettering on the monument sign was considered but down-lighting from under the limestone cap is preferred. She noted that the white metal lettering against the brick wall should pick up enough light.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the proposed signage is more contemporary than the building and have the appearance of for a school building. She added that it may be challenging to find brick for the monument sign to match the original brick use on the building.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Summerfield stated that because the building has the appearance of a church, visitors often have difficulty finding the History Center. She explained that the design of the signage is purposefully different from the signage used by the church.

In response to Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Summerfield explained that the length of the monument sign is intended to attract attention, make the sign visible from the adjacent streets and to create a gathering area where people may stop and sit on the wall before or after visiting the History Center.

Commissioner Gibson questions whether it is necessary to have both the monument sign and the sign above the entrance on the north elevation.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Grieve invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gayle stated that although the building is considered a historic building it has a relatively modern appearance. She explained that the proposed length of the monument sign appears appropriate and not intrusive into the streetscape.

Chairman Grieve stated that the building, as the History Center, effectively operates as an educational building. He stated that in his opinion, there is no conflict with the design of the signage resembling signage that might be found at a school building. He encouraged the petitioner to study the scale and proportions of the proposed monument sign further to achieve a sign that is both appropriate and visible.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Summerfield stated that the pediment above the front entrance is a flat surface.

Chairman Grieve suggested that due to the concerns some of the Commissioners raised, approval of the petition, with the appointment of a subcommittee to resolve the final details of the specific signs in question may be appropriate. He offered that the approvals could be covered in two separate motions. He invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for two freestanding signs on the south side of the History Center identifying the parking and the research center, and the sign above the entrance door on the south elevation of the History Center. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The freestanding signs shall be constructed of natural materials including a limestone capstone.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the signs as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
3. A mock-up of a few letters, or a form core or paper version of the proposed signs, shall be put up in each location to allow verification that the size of the letters as proposed is appropriate in scale and proportion and to allow an understanding of the readability from different points on and off the site. The mock-up shall be subject to review and final approval by City staff prior to the issuance of a permit authorizing installation.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gayle and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

Commissioner Wheeler made a second motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the monument sign on the lawn on the north side of the building and a sign above the entrance on the north elevation the building. He stated that the motion is subject to the following condition.

1. The final placement, size, and design details of the monument sign on the north lawn and the sign above the entrance on the north elevation sign shall be subject to final approval by a subcommittee of the Commission as appointed by the Chairman. If resolution of final details cannot be reached, the Chairman shall be consulted by staff.
2. The monument sign shall be constructed of natural materials including a limestone capstone.
3. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the signs as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sperry and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a single-story rear addition to the residence at 921 E. Westminster. A building scale variance is also requested.

Property Owners: Stephen and Nancy Collins

Representative: Shawn Purnell, architect

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

Mr. Purnell introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. He stated that over the course of a few years, the house has been remodeled on the interior, and the property owners are now hoping to complete an addition to the house. He explained that the proposed addition is located on the rear of the residence and is comprised of a family room, study and screen porch. He reviewed the site plan noting that there are two outbuildings on the south side of the lot. He stated that the size of the addition is small relative to the residence. He noted that the addition is tucked behind the mass of the existing house and is not visible from the street. He explained that the existing residence is an eclectic home, without a strong sense of one particular architectural style. He added that the existing house has aluminum siding and asphalt roof shingles, and the proposed addition will incorporate those materials. He stated that based on staff recommendations, the placement and proportions of the windows around the addition will be refined to more closely match the openings found on the existing residence.

Ms. Baehr explained that as part of this project a building scale variance is requested. She stated that the existing property is comprised of the main house, a coach house and a detached garage. She explained that the existing buildings together, currently exceed the allowable square footage by 161 square feet. She noted that the overage in square footage can be attributed to the large coach house on the property, which contributes approximately 1,000 square feet to the overage. She stated that the proposed addition will add 574 square feet to the total square footage for the property. She noted that the proposed screen porch totals 319 square feet, however this square footage is counted toward the remaining design element square footage and does not add to the overage. She stated that in total, with the proposed addition, the overage will be 734 square feet. She added that overall, the siting and massing of the proposed addition and screen porch are appropriate based on the City's design standards.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Purnell stated that the railing proposed above the screen porch is proposed as a composite material, rather than cedar, to minimize the need for maintenance. He noted that the mechanical equipment located in the footprint of the proposed addition will be relocated to the south side of the addition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Purnell explained that the east wall of the addition will be aligned with the existing east exterior wall of the house. He added that the brick on the addition will be painted white to match the existing painted brick on the residence. He noted that painting the brick will help to mask any differences between the brick on the existing residence and the addition. He explained that the reason for the size and location of the windows as proposed on the east elevation of the addition is to minimize visibility of the driveway and the adjacent neighbor. He noted however that the windows will be refined to be consistent with the larger windows on the existing residence. He noted that shutters are used on some of the windows around the house, however shutters are not proposed on the addition. He stated that as needed, features on the existing residence such as the chimney, will be repaired.

Chairman Grieve suggested that consideration be given to eliminating the center window on the east elevation of the addition and enlarging the remaining two windows to achieve more balance on the elevation.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson explained that the variance appears appropriate based on the unique circumstances of the property; the historic coach house and the depth of the lot. She reiterated that the windows on the east elevation of the addition should be reworked.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Purnell stated that the chimney on the south side of the addition was designed with the intent of keeping the scale of the addition and its elements minimal compared to the residence.

Chairman Grieve summarized the Commission's comments. Hearing no further comments, he invited a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to recommend to the City Council approval of a building scale variance to allow a single story addition. He noted that the motion includes the granting of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition, screen porch and related alterations for the residence at 921 E. Westminster. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. The proportions of the windows on the east elevation of the proposed addition shall be refined to be more consistent with the windows on the existing residence.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with the modifications detailed above. If any additional modifications are proposed, in response to Commission direction or as a

result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
4. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

6. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness or rear additions and exterior alterations at 410 Walnut Road.

Property Owner: Thomas Sweeney

Representatives: Dave Block, architect

Kelley Hoopis, project manager

Mr. Block introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. He explained that the house is located next to the Lake Forest Library. He stated that they are proposing two additions on the rear of the home and a new covered entry on the front façade. He explained that a number of exterior alterations are proposed to update the appearance of the residence. He noted that exterior alterations include painting the exterior brick white, removing all the shutters on the house, painting the existing window sashes and frames black, and replacing the wood windows on the rear with iron sliding doors. He stated that the interior of the house is very dark and replacing the windows on the rear with large openings will allow natural light into the interior. He reviewed the exterior elevations of the proposed additions. He noted that on the north side of the additions there will be "flip-out" windows and counter areas that will be used for entertaining in the backyard. He explained that there is a significant grade change on the rear of the property and the property owners plan to explore grade changes at a later date to make the back yard more functional. He reviewed the plans for the proposed covered entry for the front entrance noting the arched door flanked by two

brick columns supporting a standing seam roof.

Ms. Baehr stated that the proposed additions are on the rear of the house and have minimal impact on the appearance of the house from the street. She explained that the detailing of the additions is minimal and modern while the existing house has more refined details resulting in some inconsistencies. She stated that the proposed exterior alterations including painting the exterior brick white and replacing the window frames, will update the appearance of the residence.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Block explained that the reason for the iron windows and doors on the additions and rear of the existing house as opposed to another material, is for aesthetic purposes. He noted that the proposed iron framed windows and doors are single pane. He stated that although the size of the iron windows and doors are larger, the muntin pattern as proposed is consistent with the muntin pattern on the existing windows around the house.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Block stated that the owners desire a "Modern" architectural style for the additions and alterations. He noted that the manufacturer of the iron windows and doors is "Pinky's Iron Windows". He stated that other concepts were explored for the rear elevation, however, the proposed concept allows for the maximum amount of natural light into the home.

Commissioner Gibson commented that the property is located in the heart of Lake Forest. She noted that the surrounding neighborhood is very traditional.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Hoopis stated that either a solid panel door or an etched glass door will be used for the front entry. She confirmed that the brick on the covered entry will be painted white along with the rest of the house.

Commissioner Sperry suggested that consideration be given to painting the windows white, rather than black, to achieve a softer look with the white painted brick.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Block explained that there are three openings proposed along the rear elevation of the house. He noted that the windows on the north elevation, the rear, of the additions, will not have screens. He explained that there will be a hardscaped surface along the rear of the house and the existing window wells will be removed. He noted that an egress window will be installed in the basement to make up for the loss of the window wells. He stated that the existing grade will not need to be significantly altered to accommodate the proposed additions. He explained that there has been some discussion about a pool in rear yard, however due to the grade change on the lot, significant excavation would be required.

In response to comments from the petitioner, Ms. Czerniak stated that a grading plan was not submitted so the assumption is that no significant grade changes are proposed. She stated that if grading changes are proposed as part of the current project, or as part of a future project, submittal of a comprehensive plan as part of the submittal for building permit will be required to assure no negative drainage impacts for the home or for neighboring properties.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that visually, the elements of the covered entry are not proportional. He suggested that the roof and cornice elements be further studied and refined to appear more substantial and to relate proportionately to the pilasters.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Block stated that the covered entry is three feet deep.

Commissioner Gayle expressed support for the project. She suggested consideration of a glass door on the front entry to achieve the desired modern look on the front elevation.

Commissioner Redfield expressed support for the petition.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Grieve invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson expressed concern about the modern style of the proposed elements in contrast to the more traditional styles of homes in the surrounding area. She explained that the current style of the house is Colonial noting that the home features many traditional elements and detail. She expressed concern that adding modern elements will create a combination of styles. She noted that the proposed alterations do not appear compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the scale and massing of the front entry does not appear to be in alignment with other elements of the home. She suggested that further study be conducted to achieve a design for the covered entry that is in alignment with the scale and massing of the overall house.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Block confirmed that all windows on the rear and west side of the house will be at the same head height.

Chairman Grieve observed that currently, there is only minimal landscaping on the site. He explained that adding landscaping to the property will soften the appearance of the house from the streetscape. He agreed that refining the

covered entry will benefit the overall appearance of the house. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for rear additions and exterior alterations at 410 Walnut Road. He stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report which speak to the applicable Code criteria. He added that the Commission's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. The front covered entry shall be further studied and refined in an effort to achieve a more proportionate and balanced composition.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with the refinement as detailed in condition number one. If any additional modifications are proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of final design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
4. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property. All exterior lights shall turn off no later than 11 p.m. except for security, motion activated lights.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sperry and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

OTHER ITEMS

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

No testimony on non-agenda items was presented to the Commission.

9. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner