

The City of Lake Forest
Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the November 18, 2020 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, November 18, 2020, at 6:30 p.m. This meeting was conducted remotely in compliance with Governor's Executive Order 2020-07, issued on March 16, 2020 that suspended certain Open Meetings Act provisions relating to in-person attendance by members of a public body due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present remotely: Chairman Bruce Grieve and Commissioners Carol Gayle, Jan Gibson, Steve Lamontagne, Ron Levitsky, Robin Petit, and Elizabeth Sperry

Commissioners absent: None

City staff present remotely: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development and 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 announced that an in-person meeting is not prudent or feasible due to the Covid-19 pandemic. He asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes of the September 14, 2020 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The minutes of the September 14, 2020 meeting were approved as presented.

3. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing detached garage, construction of a three car detached garage and reconfiguration of the driveway at 1190 Inverlieth Road.

Property Owner: Robert Koe

Representative: Guy Berg, architect

Chairman Grieve asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Commissioners Levitsky and Lamontagne stated that when they visited the site they met the property owner but did not discuss the petition.

Mr. Berg introduced the project on behalf of the property owner. He explained that the massing of the proposed garage is intended to be subservient to the main residence. He stated that the proposed driveway will meander from the street to the northwest corner of the site to access the new garage. He stated that the proposed garage has a simple hip roof with a central gable roof and a cupola to match the

elements of the existing residence. He stated that a small potting shed is proposed on the rear of the garage, the north side. He noted that the garage doors will be carriage style doors. He stated that the existing detached garage and circular asphalt driveway at the front of the property will be removed opening up the front yard to create a meadow-like setting. He added that the existing curb cut in the middle of the property will remain. He provided an overview of the architectural style and detailing of the structures in the Meadowood Dairy Local Historic District if which the property in this petition is part. He stated that the location of the existing garage on the subject property is directly in the sightline of the east and west. He added that the removal of the existing garage and the location of the new garage in the northwest corner of the site will open up the front yard and minimize views of the new garage from the neighbors. He stated that the exterior of the garage will be a combination of board and batten siding and stucco. He presented conceptual images of the proposed garage from different perspectives.

Ms. Baehr stated that the existing garage was constructed in 1966 to replace a garage that was on the property at that time. She explained that the existing garage was not designed in a manner that is compatible with the nearby historic structures and, it is awkwardly sited in the front yard, far from the house. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support of demolition of the garage. She explained that the proposed replacement garage is sited closer to the residence making it more functional for the homeowners. She added that the design of the replacement garage is compatible with the residence and the overall character of the Historic District. She stated that the height of the garage as proposed exceeds the 25 foot maximum allowable height for accessory structures. She stated that the height of the garage as measured to the tallest peak is 22 feet and 8 inches tall and with the proposed cupola, the height is 28 feet and 5 inches tall, exceeding the allowed 25 feet. She noted that the City Code allows exceptions from the height limitation for specific elements, spires and chimneys, however cupolas are not included in the permitted exceptions and therefore, a variance is required. She stated that the proposed height and proportions of the cupola are driven by the design of the cupolas on the residence. She requested input from the Commission on whether the height of the cupola warrants a variance based on the relationship to elements on the historic structure. She noted that prior to the submittal of this petition to the City, significant clearing of vegetation occurred on the property near the existing garage and along the west property line without benefit of a permit. She noted that this clearing raised concerns from a neighboring property owner. She stated that staff recommends a condition requiring that a landscape buffer be re-established along the west side of the property. She noted that the neighbor also expressed concerns about drainage given the grade change in the area. She stated that the City Engineer is aware of the concerns and will require a grading and drainage plan prior to the issuance of a building permit. She stated that a letter in support of the project was received and was provided to the Commission.

Commissioner Gayle asked for more information about drainage on the site. Mr. Berg explained that a civil engineer is engaged and is developing a plan to address the drainage issues. He explained that the drainage plan takes into account the runoff from the roof of the residence as well as any additional runoff that may be generated by the new garage. He stated that an on site drywell system is being considered.

Commissioner Gayle asked whether consideration was given to connecting the replacement garage to the main house.

Mr. Berg stated that there are no plans to connect the replacement garage to the main house. He explained that there is a Façade Easement on the residence held by Landmarks Illinois which protects all four facades. He noted that any modifications to the exterior of the existing residence, including a connection to a garage, could impact the historic integrity of the structure and would require approval from Landmarks Illinois.

Commissioner Sperry asked about the size of the garage and the staking on the site.

Mr. Berg explained that the staking reflects the footprint of the garage and the potting shed on the north side. He noted that the design and details of the garage, including the recessed walls and low rooflines, are intended to reduce the scale and appearance of mass.

Commissioner Sperry asked about the proposed tree removals.

Mr. Berg stated that the driveway is configured to avoid impacting trees specifically a Hickory and an Oak tree. He said that measures will be taken to protect the trees. He stated that some trees near the site of the new garage will be removed and replaced with new trees.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the setback requirements for the replacement garage.

Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the proposed garage meets the 10 foot side yard setback required for accessory structures in the applicable zoning district.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the proposed landscape plan.

Mr. Berg stated that if possible, some of the existing trees that will be impacted will be relocated on the property. He stated that a detailed landscape plan has not yet been developed.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the proposed garage doors.

Mr. Berg explained that overhead doors are proposed because they are the most practical.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the height of the existing residence in comparison to the new garage and cupola.

Mr. Berg explained that as measured from the existing lowest point of adjacent grade to the tallest roof peak, the residence is 31 feet tall and the garage is 20 feet, 2 inches tall above the driveway. He stated that the point of the lowest adjacent grade, the garage is two feet lower than the driveway. He pointed out that based on the City's methodology of calculating the height of the structure, the height of the garage is greater than how the structure will appear from the street. He noted that a mockup of the cupola will be built to allow a review of the size and height before the final details are determined. He stated that City staff is welcome to review the mockup.

Commissioner Gibson asked if the replacement garage will have a second floor and if any flooding occurs in the area of the proposed garage.

Mr. Berg stated that the garage will not have a second floor. He stated that he is not aware of any flooding in the area of the proposed garage. He added that water from the roof, gutters and downspouts on the garage will be directed to a drywell reducing the runoff from that currently comes from the site.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the square footage calculation of the replacement garage and the height of the cupola.

Ms. Baehr stated that for a property of this size, an allowance of 600 square feet is available for a garage. She added that because of the height of the garage as proposed, a portion of the volume space is counted in the square footage of the garage and any excess square footage, over the 600 square feet allowed, is added to the square footage of the house. She stated that in the case, the excess square footage in the garage appears appropriate in the context of the historic residence. She noted that the proportions and height of the proposed cupola relate to the cupolas on the original historic structure.

Commissioner Levitsky asked if the size of the cupola could be reduced.

Mr. Berg explained that he studied the cupolas on the residence and feels strongly that the current design of the cupola on the garage is true to the original architecture of the historic structures in the Meadowood Dairy complex. He stated that a final decision about the proportions of the cupola will be made after the mockup is installed and studied. He explained that a height variance is only needed for a portion of the cupola, an aesthetic element that tapers to a point at the top.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the increase in impervious surface on the site.

Ms. Baehr explained that based on the calculation provided by the petitioner the total existing impervious surface on the site is 27 percent and the proposed impervious surface, 29 percent. She stated that to minimize the potential for drainage issues, staff recommends the use of pervious materials for at least a portion of the driveway. She confirmed that the impervious surface calculation includes the footprint of the replacement garage and the new driveway.

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

Commissioner Levitsky expressed support for the removal of the existing garage and the circular asphalt driveway. He commended the petitioner on the design of the replacement garage.

Commissioner Sperry commended the property owners for the restoration of the existing historic structure. She noted that the replacement garage complements the historic residence.

Commissioner Gayle stated that the proposed garage captures the richness and character of the Meadowood Dairy Historic District. She expressed concern about the drainage issues on the site and asked that pervious materials be incorporated into the site. She stated that the proportions of the cupola appear appropriate.

Commissioner Gibson expressed support for design of the replacement garage and the height variance for the cupola.

Commissioner Lamontagne stated that removal of the existing garage and the circular driveway will be a great improvement to the site and the neighborhood. He expressed support for the petition and the height variance. He stated that the elements and techniques used in the design of the garage help to minimize the appearance of mass of the structure.

Chairman Grieve stated support for the petition. He explained that because the residence is unique its stands out and will not be overshadowed by the garage. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing detached garage, construction of a three car detached garage and reconfiguration of the driveway based on the findings presented in the staff report and subject to following conditions.

1. A detailed drainage plan, subject to approval by the City Engineer, is required prior to the issuance of any permits. In reviewing the drainage plan, consideration shall be given to:
 - a. Reduction in the amount of impervious surface on the site.
 - b. Incorporation of a curb on all or portions of the west side of the driveway.

- c. Installation of storm sewer on the site.
 - d. Restoration of vegetation on the site to mitigate overland stormwater flows.
2. A mock-up of the cupola shall be installed and shall be subject to staff review and approval before the final details and dimensions of are confirmed.
3. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project 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.
4. At the time plans are submitted for permit, a tree survey shall be prepared by a Certified Arborist detailing the trees proposed for removal and, to the extent possible, information summary information on the trees and vegetation removed on the site prior to the issuance of a permit to allow a determination of the total number of replacement inches to be planted on site based on the size, species and condition of the trees removed.
5. A final landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. Replacement plantings as determined to be required shall be reflected on the final landscape plan. The plan shall reflect replacement plantings to provide for a landscape buffer along the west property line.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
7. Prior to final approval of the design and dimensions of the is cupola, a mock-up of the cupola shall be installed at the site, on the framed structure for review by City staff to confirm that the height and proportions are appropriate in relation to the residence.
8. Details of any exterior lighting that is proposed shall be provided with 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 fully shielded from view by the fixture or by sight obscuring glass. All exterior lights, except for motion detector lights for security purposes, shall be set on timers to turn off no later than 11 p.m.

9. 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 Gayle and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for partial demolition of the existing single family residence and construction of additions and an attached two car garage, associated exterior alterations and reconfiguration of the driveway are also proposed.

Property Owner: Wendy Wood-Prince

**Representatives: Edward Deegan and Kevin Leong, Edward Deegan Architects
Tony Quinn, landscape architect**

Chairman Grieve asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest.

Commissioner Gibson stated that during her visit to the site she met the property owner and had a conversation but feels that she can review the petition impartially.

Mr. Deegan stated that the property is located off of a shared private drive on the west side of Green Bay Road. He stated that the residence is located in the northwest corner of the property and has limited visibility from Green Bay Road. He provided some history on the structure noting that originally it was the gardener's cottage for an estate house that has since been demolished. He stated that due to the awkward siting of the residence on the property as a result of the subdivision of the property after the structure existed, the home does not have a backyard. He explained that the petitioner intends to update the structure to make it more suitable for modern day living. He presented the proposed site plan and pointed out that the existing driveway extends across the entire property from east to west and approaches close to the neighboring home. He explained that the plan is to reconfigure the driveway to pull it closer to the front of the residence thereby creating a more usable yard. He stated that the proposed driveway reconfiguration was discussed and agreed upon with the affected neighbor. He explained that the proposed addition to the house is configured as an "L" creating a separation of the yard areas. He stated that the proposed addition incorporates the same architectural detailing found on the existing residence. He stated that the single story mass on the west side of the residence is proposed for demolition. He added that this part of the house was a later addition and is in poor condition. He added that this element is not compatible with the original structure. He stated that a sunroom addition is proposed on the south side of the residence along with a connecting element between the residence and the proposed two-story addition. He explained that the two-story addition is almost identical in massing and form to the original cottage. He stated that a two-car garage addition is proposed on the east side of the proposed two-story addition. He

noted that the proposed garage faces south adding that the garage doors are not visible from Green Bay Road. He stated that a fence is proposed to delineate a front and back yard. He stated that the proposed exterior materials include clapboard siding for the exterior walls and a cedar shingle roof to match the existing residence. He added that the new windows have a cottage style appearance. He stated that the landscape plan was designed in a way that creates an elegant approach to the front of the home and a private back yard. He noted that an in ground pool, terrace, pergola, and seating and dining areas are proposed in the backyard.

Ms. Baehr explained that the project involves several components, including demolition of the west portion of the existing residence, construction of a two-story addition, an attached garage, a single story addition between the existing residence and the proposed two-story addition and other associated exterior alterations. She confirmed that the west portion of the residence that is proposed for removal was a later addition and is not original to the property. She added that this part of the house is not designed in a manner consistent with the original cottage and is not historically or architecturally significant. She added that in discussions with other prospective buyers before the current owner purchased the property, there was interest in complete demolition of the residence. She stated that the petition before the Commission proposes to preserve the original portion of the residence while also making the home and the property more functional. She stated that the design of the proposed additions follow the style and detailing of the original cottage and are consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. She noted that the staff report includes a recommendation that further study be conducted of the window proportions and the muntin patterns in an effort to achieve more consistency across all the elevations of the home. She explained that as reflected in the proposed site plan, most of the existing driveway on the west side of the site will be removed. She noted that the new driveway is separated from the driveway to the home to the south to provide privacy for both homeowners. She noted that staff received a letter from the owner of the property to the south and an email from the Preservation Foundation and both were provided to the petitioner and to the Commission before the meeting.

Commissioner Petit asked about the window muntin patterns, the proposed fence and the driveway material.

Mr. Deegan explained that the intent is to have a consistent muntin pattern. He stated that a split rail fence will separate the yards on either side of the addition. He stated that the driveway will be crushed gravel.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the existing and proposed chimneys and the proposed garage location.

Mr. Deegan explained that the paint will be removed from the existing brick chimney and the proposed chimneys will be built using Chicago common bricks to match the existing chimney. He explained that because the garage encroaches into the

setback along the north side of the property, the garage is sited in a way that is partially obstructing the front facade of the proposed two-story addition in an effort to lessen the amount of encroachment into the setback. He stated that the goal is to balance the design of the proposed additions while also trying to satisfy the criteria for a zoning variance. He explained that locating the garage addition away from the north property line is intentional appropriate to minimize additional encroachment into the setback along the north property line. He pointed out that the residence is located very close to the property line. He acknowledged that if the setback was not an issue, the garage would be shifted to the north to avoid obstructing the front façade of the two-story addition.

Commissioner Sperry asked about the new front entrance to the home. She suggested extending the front porch around the south elevation of the two-story addition.

Mr. Deegan explained that the front entrance is located off of the porch, on the east elevation of the proposed two-story addition. He stated that the new entrance replicates the configuration of the existing porch and entrance on the south elevation of the home. He noted that cottage style homes do have grand or elaborate front entrances. He stated that consideration was given to wrapping the porch around the south elevation. He stated a willingness to explore Commissioner Sperry's suggestion.

Commissioner Sperry explained that the visual charm and character of the additions to the home are obstructed by the proposed garage and she recommended further refinement of the massing and reconsideration of the location of the garage.

Mr. Deegan explained that the location and design of the garage was largely driven by the parameters of the zoning requirements with a goal of minimizing further zoning nonconformities beyond those that already exist on the site. He added that the location of the garage as proposed creates an intimate entry courtyard at the front of the home.

Commissioner Sperry asked about the expanses of windows on the south elevation.

Mr. Deegan explained that the addition on the south elevation is a sunroom which would naturally have large openings. He added that the south elevation of the home faces the area of the yard which is intended to be private adding that significant landscape screening is intended.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the length of the connecting element between the existing residence and the proposed two-story addition.

Mr. Deegan explained that the length of the connecting element was driven by the space needed to locate the two-story addition far enough east to preserve a Heritage Oak tree.

Commissioner Gibson asked about drainage on the site and the proposed plantings on the east side of the property.

Mr. Quinn stated that there is no information to suggest past flooding on the site. He explained that a drainage and grading plan will be prepared for review by the City Engineer to assure that as a result of the additions, water is not being directed to neighboring properties. He stated that the plantings will be selected to provide screening and soften the appearance of the additions. He added species such as White Pine, Oak, Redbud and Witchazel are being considered.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the terrace on the south side of the house.

Mr. Deegan confirmed that the terrace is not covered.

Commissioner Gayle asked about the amount of impervious surface on the site and the porch proposed on the east elevation.

Mr. Leong stated that as proposed, 23% of the site will be impervious surface. He added that the calculation includes the gravel driveway which is somewhat pervious.

Mr. Deegan explained that the porch on the east elevation is open to replicate the existing porch on the south elevation.

Commissioner Gayle commended the petitioner on the landscape plan and the preservation of the trees on the site. She asked about screening the garage from Green Bay Road.

Mr. Deegan stated that the property owner plans substantial plantings along Green Bay Road to provide year round screening from the street.

In response to questions from Mr. Deegan, Ms. Czerniak stated that shifting the garage further into the required setback would require demonstration of a hardship and a lack of alternatives to the further encroachment. She confirmed that a greater variance would require an additional public hearing before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited public testimony.

Ms. Coffin, 1386 N. Green Bay Road, said that she has been in discussions with the property owner about the reconfiguration of the driveway. She stated that she is pleased with the outcome of those discussions expressed support for the plans as proposed. She stated that the plans for the additions and other improvements to the property are very attractive. She explained that her garage faces the residence at 1388 N. Green Bay so she is not concerned about light impacts to her property.

Hearing no additional public testimony, Chairman Grieve invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Lamontagne commended the petitioner for preserving the home and acknowledged that others may have requested approval of a full demolition. He commented that the residence has a lot of charm and noted that the proposed plan incorporates many of those original charming elements. He observed that configuring the footprint of the addition and the driveway in a manner that creates a backyard is a great approach and significantly enhances the property. He commented that he would have preferred that the garage be shifted further north, into the setback, to get the full visual effect of the front façade, but acknowledged that the Zoning Board of Appeals already acted on that aspect.

Commissioner Gibson commended the site plan. She expressed support for the proposed configuration of the driveway. She agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne's comments regarding the siting of the garage in relation to the front façade. She stated that the length of the connecting element appears long but acknowledged the efforts to preserve the Heritage Oak tree by siting the addition away from the tree. She agreed with the staff recommendation that the muntin patterns should be refined to be consistent across all the elevations.

Commissioner Petit commended everyone involved in the petition. She stated that in her opinion, the proposed work will greatly improve the residence and the property.

Commissioner Sperry stated that removing the west portion of the driveway and opening the home up to the yard is a brilliant idea. She suggested that the petitioner consider going back to the Zoning Board of Appeals to request a variance to allow the garage to be shifted further north, toward the north property line, to allow for an unobstructed view of the front façade and to allow the front porch to be extended the full length of the front façade. She explained that because Oak trees are sensitive to construction, the appropriateness of the length of the connecting element should be further studied to assure that it does not appear awkward and if the Oak tree is lost and that it is functional for the homeowner.

Commissioner Gayle commended the petitioner for continuing the motifs of the original cottage structure in the design of the new additions. She agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne she would have liked to see the garage shifted to the north but acknowledged that this particular project requires a lot of balancing. She stated support for the petition.

Commissioner Levitsky commended the petitioner for preserving the original part of the residence noting that many petitions have come forward to request approval of demolitions. He stated that the site plan and landscape plan are very well done. He added that the orientation of the two-story addition is clever and successfully creates both a front and back yard on the property.

Chairman Grieve stated that based on the Commission's comments it appears that the Commission as a whole is supportive of the petition. He commented that he understands the desire for many windows around the home to provide expansive views and natural light however he noted that the original cottage has a much smaller percentage of openings. He asked that the petitioner be mindful of the expanse of openings in an effort to present more of an even balance between what was built originally and the additions. He stated that the petitioner should weigh the option of going back to the Zoning Board of Appeals to request a variance to allow the garage to shift toward the north property line and to the east to create a greater distance between the house and the garage and to allow more visibility of the front façade. He suggested that the petitioner explore Commissioner Sperry's suggestion of continuing the front porch around to the south elevation to further enhance and highlight the front of the home. He stated that the petitioner appears to have given thought to how to address drainage. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Gayle made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition of the existing single family residence, construction of additions and an attached two car garage, associated exterior alterations and reconfiguration of the driveway based on the findings presented in the staff report and subject to following conditions.

1. Consideration shall be given to the following as the final design development is undertaken:
 - a. Study and refine the patterns of solids and voids around the additions to achieve greater consistency with the pattern on the historic cottage.
 - b. Consider the relationship of the porch on the east elevation to the garage, shifting the location of the garage away from the front entrance and extending the porch across the south elevation.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. All modifications proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of design development shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted 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. The final landscape plan shall be subject to review and approval by the City Arborist. The plan shall provide for at least 33 replacement tree inches on site. If full replacement on site is not possible in a manner consistent with good forestry practices, payment in lieu of on site planting will be required prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. If during construction, additional trees on the site are compromised in the opinion of the City's Certified Arborist, additional replacement inches or payment in lieu of on site planting may be required.

4. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
5. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be included with the plans submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view by the fixture or by sight obscuring glass. The dark sky, right to night concept shall be respected. All exterior lights shall be on timers and set to turn off no later than 11 p.m. except for motion sensor security lights.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.

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

OTHER ITEMS

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

Ms. Czerniak stated that this afternoon staff received an email from Rommy Lopat with some general comments about the Historic Districts. She noted that the email was provided to the Commission shortly after staff received it. She stated that in summary, many of Ms. Lopat's comments warrant discussion with other City Departments, and are not solely matters under the purview of the Historic Preservation Commission. She stated that several of the topics raised by Ms. Lopat will be addressed in a future Commission workshop.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the points that Ms. Lopat raised are excellent and worthy of discussion.

6. Additional information from staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner