

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the March 16, 2022 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, March 16, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Maureen Grinnell and Commissioners Jan Gibson, Geoffrey Hanson, and Ron Levitsky.

Commissioners absent: Robin Petit, Two vacant positions

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

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

Chairman Grinnell 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 from the October 28, 2021 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The minutes of the October 28, 2021 meeting were approved as presented.

3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of the bridge located on Lake Road, just north of Woodbine Lane and approving a replacement bridge.

Property Owner: The City of Lake Forest

Project Representatives: City Staff

Meg Kindelin, Johnson Laskey Kindelin Architects

Dave Shannon, P.E. Lochner

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Commissioner Levitsky noted that while visiting the site he and a resident exchanged some brief comments.

Chairman Grinnell invited introductory comments from staff.

Ms. Czerniak noted that the Commission does not typically consider infrastructure projects however, because the Lake-Woodbine Bridge is located in a Local Historic District this project is presented to the Commission for review. She explained that in 2014 and 2015, the Commission was involved in early discussions

about rehabilitation/replacement of the Lake-Woodbine Bridge and at the conclusion of those early discussions, recommended replacement of the bridge, rather than rehabilitation based on the facts presented. She stated that the minutes of the previous Commission meetings at which the bridge was discussed are included in the Commission's packet. She stated that since those early discussions, preliminary design work has proceeded in accordance with the Commission's recommendation. She acknowledged that this project has evolved over a long period of time primarily because of the City's efforts to seek outside funding for the project. She explained that in order to qualify for some types of outside funding, the design process cannot be too far along and as a result, this project was delayed as funding was sought. She noted that in the meantime, the bridge has continued to deteriorate and pointed out that the weight limit of the bridge is currently restricted. She stated that if the bridge is not addressed, ultimately, the State could require closure of the bridge. She stated that the petition is presented to the Commission at this time for review of the design aspects of a replacement bridge and the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. She noted that recently two public forums were held to solicit input on the preliminary designs adding that as a result of public input, the design has evolved significantly. She stated that to the extent possible, the replacement bridge as now proposed evokes the character and elements of the existing bridge acknowledging that current safety requirements must be met. She introduced the project team and noted that the project architect, Ms. Kindelin, is a tremendous asset to the project given her experience with preservation projects.

Ms. Kindelin reviewed her background in architecture and historic preservation and noted that she is a member of Landmarks Illinois and serves on the Easement Committee which conducts peer reviews for projects involving historic homes. She stated that she also is the Chair of the Illinois Historic Sites Advisory Council. She stated that the purpose of the Lake-Woodbine Bridge project is to provide a serviceable bridge and replace a deteriorated structure. She stated that the goal is to achieve the purpose of the project while maintaining the character and experience of the historic bridge. She added that the project also must assure that through the project, attention is paid to preserving and protecting the ravine and surrounding natural area. She stated that in 2013, the State Historic Preservation Office concurred that replacement of the bridge is an appropriate approach and, if the replacement bridge is design in a manner that is compatible with the Historic District, will result in no adverse effect on the District and surrounding historic properties. She reviewed that the bridge was constructed in 1912 and is a three span, closed spandrel arch bridge with two traffic lanes and a sidewalk on the west side. She stated that the bridge was repaired extensively in 1978 with new spans, walls and railings. She stated that the existing bridge has a traditional vocabulary, in the style of Beaux Arts Classicism. She noted that Wacker Drive and many of the promenades in Europe have typical urn shape balustrades like those on the Lake-Woodbine bridge. She reviewed the proposed design of the replacement bridge noting that open balustrades with the urn shape detailing are proposed. She noted that the balustrades are closer together that

the balustrades on the existing bridge because of current safety requirements. She stated that matching the appearance and texture of the existing concrete is important. She explained that the design of the new bridge will maintain the arch structure of the existing bridge. She noted that the existing bridge has three shallow arches and has an airy and light character adding that maintain the openness of the bridge is important to the pedestrian experience. She stated that multiple design options were studied. She pointed out that the existing bridge has an underlying geometry that guides the spacing of the panels and, as a result, the balustrades are not evenly spaced across the length of the bridge. She stated that the design of the new bridge applied the same geometry. She reviewed some of the restrictions that must be considered account in the design of the new bridge including the requirement for crash rated for the guardrails. She explained that there are multiple ways to meet the IDOT standards and reviewed the various options for the railing that were considered. She noted that some of the options change the open character, change the proportions or limit the pedestrian connection to the ravine. She added that some options create longer term maintenance concerns. She discussed the design options considered for the bridge space noting the goal of allowing light into the ravine. She stated that the constructability of the bridge spans must be considered as part of the design process. She explained that although the existing bridge has three spans, building a three span bridge is not a practical solution because today's materials are stronger and can span further. She added that if a three span replacement bridge was built, all of the existing footings would need to be removed from the ravine to allow new footings to be installed in the same locations. She stated that work would cause require extensive work in the ravine. She explained that with a single span, work in the ravines will be minimized. She stated that the existing footings will be removed down to about two feet below grade leaving a historical legacy. She stated three design options were considered for a single span bridge: a concrete structure with the shape of the arch pulled to edge of the bridge, an option to appear more logical with more of a relationship from top to bottom, and a simple haunched concrete arch structure. She stated that after with a Certificate of Appropriateness, the project will move into full design development and details will be resolved working with the appropriate State and Federal agencies.

Ms. Czerniak clarified that design option one, for both the railing and the bridge structure is the recommended option. She noted that the options reviewed by Ms. Kindelin do not reflect all of the options considered throughout the lengthy process. She noted that the Commission's review is not the final step adding that there is significant engineering work and design refinement that will follow as well as reviews by outside agencies. She stated that whether or not the project receives Federal funding, IDOT requirements apply and IDOT will review the proposed replacement bridge. She stated that the plans will also require review by the State Historic Preservation Office. She noted that unlike other projects, in this case, the Commission is only one piece of the approval process.

Commissioner Gibson asked for clarification on the different design options in the Commission's packet.

Ms. Czerniak clarified that the recommended design as well as some of the other options that were studied by the project team are all included in the Commission's packet.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the safety rating of the bridge and why the bridge has deteriorated to such an extent given that other concrete bridges remain intact. He asked if it possible to treat the new concrete to make it appear aged. He commented that the design of the new bridge appears more modern and lighter than the existing bridge.

Mr. Thomas explained that Wiss, Janney, Elstner and Associates, one of the City's consulting engineers, inspects bridges in the City on an annual basis. He stated that because of its degradation, the Lake-Woodbine bridge has a "D" rating.

Mr. Shannon stated that there is an inherent deficiency in the bridge that has caused the deterioration. He explained that in this case, water gets into a bridge and has nowhere to go. He explained that concrete, contrary to what many think, is not waterproof and as water makes its way through the concrete it pulls different materials turning the concrete into a sand-like material. He pointed out the white staining on the underside of the bridge which means lime is seeping out of the cement leaving behind the sand and gravel. He stated that the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge is due to problems with water seepage that has occurred over the last 110 years, impacting the strength of the bridge. He explained that the new bridge will be constructed of concrete but will not have components that trap water adding that water will run off the bridge or will naturally dissipate.

Ms. Kindelin stated that they are working with the Institute for Masonry and experts in concrete. She stated that tints can be added to concrete to color it. She noted that the texture in concrete comes from the aggregate mix. She stated that the project team will work to find an aggregate mix that is aesthetically correct, but also strong enough to support the bridge. She stated that the existing concrete mix will be analyzed and mock ups of a new concrete mix will be prepared by the contractor. She stated the intent to match the original concrete as close as possible. She stated that transportation projects are always a challenge because modern conditions and requirements have to be addressed and the original conditions cannot be replicated.

Commissioner Hanson asked how the new bridge design will prevent water infiltration.

Ms. Kindelin stated that the fatal flaw of the existing bridge is the nature of its construction which has rubble within it that retains water. She explained that the

new bridge will be sloped appropriately to shed water and will be built with modern materials that are more robust.

Commissioner Gibson asked if the new bridge will experience efflorescence at some point. She asked whether the urn baluster design could change because of input from the State Historic Preservation Office. She asked if the mock ups of the concrete mixture will be available for City staff review.

Ms. Kindelin stated that all concrete will age. She stated that because the bridge is design to not hold water, there should not be experience efflorescence. She explained that as the project moves into full design development, the focus will be on preventing water infiltration. She explained that the existing urn balusters will need to be spaced to meet IDOT standards restrict the openings between the balusters. She stated that the spacing of the urn balusters will be finalized during design development with the goal of maximizing the openings to align, as closely as possible with the existing openings. She agreed to share the mock up concrete samples when they are available.

Chairman Grinnell asked if there is a way to achieve a more graceful urn design and still meet the IDOT standards.

Ms. Kindelin agreed that a more svelte urn shape is desirable but noted that would mean more balusters would be needed to satisfy the spacing limitations established by IDOT.

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

Art Miller, 1100 Pembridge Drive, stated that he participated in discussions with the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation about the bridge and attended the recent community meetings. He stated that the existing bridge reflects Century old standards and classic design choices adding that the architect has done an admirable job both listening to the community and balancing IDOT requirements with retaining the character of the historic balustrade. He stated however that the design is not quite up to the standards of the surrounding residential architecture, notably David Adler's Pike Estate built in 1916, a Nationally recognized Italian Villa. He noted that classic barriers at edges of terrain or on bridges are either open balustrades or solid walls. He noted that books on the landscapes of Italian Villas and English landscape school of Palladian design show mostly balustrade boundaries at major changes in grade, though solid walls are also common. He noted however that they proposed design has neither of these. He explained that since the balusters cannot be made strong enough to withstand a crash of a two ton vehicle, from a Beaux Arts perspective and to adapt the bridge to modern conditions, the new bridge should have solid, classically designed walls. He added that the bridge is a garden element that must be compatible with the nearby Classically designed homes. He stated that the bridge should have more

punctuation, short piers at each end and at intervals to break up the distance of the bridge. He stated that two good examples of punctuation are found at the Bagatelle residence at the corner of Deerpath and Green Bay Road, and at the Clow residence on Ridge Lane. He explained that the new bridge reflects scaled down balusters that are not well-proportioned within the larger setting. He noted that the bridge is surrounded by outstanding, nationally recognized and many times published Classical homes. He stated that the culprit is not the City, the architect, neighbors, or IDOT, but instead, it is the 21st Century two ton vehicles. He stated that Beaux Arts architects faced with such heavy vehicles would employ a solid, artfully designed wall at the top of the bridge. He stated that he supports a continuation of the petition to encourage a classic Beaux Arts approach to the new bridge.

Rommy Lopat, 410 Woodland Road, stated that water caused the deterioration of the existing bridge and agreed that incorporating a drip edge on the new bridge is very important. She asked how the proposed bridge deck will shed water. She stated that an ongoing resurfacing program will be important. She stated her hope that the aggregate on the existing railing will be replicated on the new bridge. She suggested modification of the railing on the proposed bridge to allow pedestrians walking along the bridge to hold the rail. She asked for clarification on what will happen to the footings for the existing bridge. She asked about the purview of the State Historic Preservation Office with respect to the bridge. She asked how Lake Road at the points of connection to the bridge noting that currently, the charm of Lake Road is in part the fact that the bridge is 19 feet at the north end. She noted that at the south end, the bridge is two feet wider at the creating more of a suburban character. She asked if Lake Road will be widened. She asked how the abutment on the northwest end will resolve along the ravine where there is a 10 foot curve in the sidewalk. She stated that she submitted a letter to the Commission which raises questions about whether Standard Five, "Spacing on the Street", is satisfied. She pointed out that the staff report states that the "the bridge will stand separate and apart from the masonry walls on the east side of Lake Road" and questioned how the space between the end of the bridge and the beginning of the walls will be resolved. She suggested that the Commission include a condition that the resolution in this area return to the Commission for review. She noted that there is no indication that any details or drawings will return to the Commission for further review. She stated that there is a tree very close to the bridge that should be removed. She stated that the natural character of the setting must be protected.

Sheila Henrietta, 885 Woodbine Lane, stated that initially, a very different design was proposed and not up to the neighbors' expectations. She stated that the design team responded with a different design that in her opinion, addresses the concerns of the neighbor. She acknowledged that there are many factors that must be balanced, regulatory requirements as well as architectural considerations. She stated that the bridge crosses a beautiful ravine and is surrounded by greenery and stated support for an open design for the railing. She stated that the

design now proposed seems to fit into the idyllic location. She stated that it is important that the project moves forward quickly because school buses drive over the bridge several times a day.

Jim Opsitnik, 971 Verda Lane, noted that concrete partitions with a slight angle at the bottom are sometimes installed to redirect traffic away from walls. He stated that the current design shows a flat wall without a base to redirect vehicles away from the wall. He stated if a base was added to the wall, the focus on the balustrades may be mitigated. He stated that a solution should be explored that addresses safety concerns while at the same time, lightening the appearance of the bridge.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Grinnell invited rebuttal and responses to public testimony.

Ms. Kindelin stated her intent to respond to as many of the questions raised as possible. She stated that the height of the railing must be 42 inches to meet Code requirements. She acknowledged that there is certain grace and charm when walking across a bridge, to run your hand along the railing. She stated that the railing height is based on the average height of a person and the center of gravity. She stated that the existing footings will be cut down to 18 to 24 inches below grade adding that the approach is common practice so that many years from now, there is an historic record of the original bridge. She stated that the State Historic Preservation Office will review the final design for this transportation project and the design will be subject to the agency's approval. She stated that the State Historic Preservation Office understands the challenges between modernity, traditional aesthetics, and Code requirements. She stated that the width of the road is currently 19 feet and 7 inches adding that the road will be increased by 5 inches, to a width of 20 feet. She explained that the expansion is necessary due to the required width of roadways today and also to allow for a five foot wide sidewalk, an ADA requirement. She stated that with respect to the resolution at the ends of the bridge, she added that the bridge will begin and end with regularity and order. She stated that the bridge will end with solid panels.

Mr. Shannon stated that because Federal funding is being sought, the review process is dictated by the Federal Highway Association and overseen by the Illinois Department of Transportation. He noted that public engagement is an important part of the process. He stated that additional design details will be shared at future public meetings. He explained that the design is taken to 30 percent and at that point, an environmental evaluation is completed. He stated that after approval is received from the Illinois Department of Transportation, the final design process will begin which will allow the detailed questions to be answered.

Ms. Czerniak confirmed that Commission action is requested at this time as a critical step in allowing the related processes to move forward. She agreed that

future informational meetings can be held to keep the neighbors informed as the project moves forward.

Commissioner Hanson stated that in his opinion, the existing bridge meets all the applicable criteria for demolition. He stated that the replacement bridge appears to meet the applicable Standards, is consistent with the prior direction of the Commission, and responds to resident input. He stated that unlike some of the earlier design studies, the current proposal is generally consistent with the existing bridge with the exception of the number of spandrels. He added that the single span structure allows for wider views and is more sensitive to the ravine. He stated that the design is graceful.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that the Commission struggles when something especially beautiful and historic is proposed for demolition. He commented that sometimes replacement structures are similar to the original design and sometimes they are not. He stated that the new bridge does not remind him in any way of the old bridge however, a new bridge is certainly needed, and the proposed design is well done. He acknowledged the many constraints the architects and engineers faced in meeting current requirements and coming forward with an appropriate design. He stated that in his opinion, the project team has done a wonderful job. He stated that while he is not enthusiastic about the replacement, the design presented is the best of the alternatives studied. He stated support for the petition.

Commissioner Gibson stated that the three spans of the existing bridge are beautiful. She stated that the new bridge is an appropriate replacement. She stated that it appears that the efforts are being made to replicate the aesthetics of the existing bridge to the extent possible given current requirements. She acknowledged that there are still design details that need to be resolved. She stated support for demolition of the existing bridge and the replacement bridge.

Chairman Grinnell agreed with the comments of the other Commissioners and stated that the demolition criteria appear to be satisfied. She agreed that the design option presented it most appropriate. She agreed that further work is needed to properly resolve some of the design details and expressed confidence in the project team and asked that the Commission's comments be considered as the open items are addressed. She stated that she is comfortable moving the project forward. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited a motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of the bridge and approving a replacement bridge generally consistent with the design presented to the Commission. She stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report and incorporates the comments of the Commission. She stated that the motion is subject to following conditions.

1. As the design development process continues, further study and refinement where possible shall be conducted particularly around the elements discussed by the Commission and taking into account the comments of the public.
2. A mockup of the concrete shall be provided prior to construction of the bridge. The intent is to replicate the color, tone and texture of the existing bridge to the extent possible. A bright, white concrete shall be avoided.
3. As appropriate, existing significant trees and vegetation on the City right-of-way and on adjacent private properties shall be protected.
4. Public notice of construction, construction truck routes and detour routes shall all be included in the pre-construction planning process and communicated to the community.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Levitsky and approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two story addition on the west side of the existing residence at 222 E. Onwentsia Road. Approval of a conceptual landscape plan and overall site plan is also requested. Property Owners: John and Kate Holland Project Representative: Karl Strassburger, designer

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

Mr. Strassburger gave an overview of the location of the property. He stated that the existing home is generally in the northeast corner of the site and the existing driveway extends along the east side of the property. He noted that the siting of the existing home lends itself to an addition on the west side of the property. He stated that the existing sport court and rear patio will be removed and replaced with a new inground swimming pool and patio. He stated that drainage on the site moves from the north to the southwest. He presented images of the existing home. He explained that the proposed addition includes a family room and two car garage on the first floor and a game room on the second floor. He noted that the addition is designed to maintain the layout of the existing home. He reviewed the proposed plan and stated that the roof forms on the addition match the gambrel and gable roof forms on the existing home. He explained that the massing and roof forms on the addition were designed to be subordinate to the existing home. He stated that the proposed exterior materials and design elements on the addition match the existing home. He stated that the property owners added evergreens along the west property line last year and plan additional landscaping in the front and rear yards.

Ms. Baehr stated that the property is located in the Green Bay Road Historic District. She noted that there are many large lots in the area and noted that many of the nearby homes are set back far from the street creating an open, natural character

along the streetscape. She stated that the petition includes: a two-story addition, an extended driveway in the front yard, and hardscape in the rear yard. She noted that the proposed addition will increase the footprint of the house by just over fifty percent. She stated that the addition is designed consistent with the style of the house with matching materials and detailing. She recommended refinement of the openings on the west elevation of the addition noting that as currently proposed, there is a large expanse of windows stacked between the first and second floors on the west elevation which is inconsistent with the elements of the home. She stated that a two car garage is incorporated into the addition and faces west. She stated that the extended driveway crosses the front yard and extends to the west side of the site to access the new garage. She noted that the impervious surface on the site is increased by 12 percent, a significant compared to the amount of impervious surface often considered by the Commission. She stated that the extended driveway increases the amount of impervious surface and disrupts the expansive front yard and open character of the streetscape. She stated that a letter was received from the neighbor to the west expressing concerns about screening of the additional mass, the garage doors and the exterior lights. She stated that an extensive landscape plan will be an important part of the project given the location of the addition and the grade change between the properties.

Chairman Grinnell asked the petitioner to elaborate on the intent of the project.

Mr. Strassburger explained that the rooms at the rear of the existing home are formal living spaces, and the property owners desire a casual family room adjacent to the rear yard. He explained although the family room is the primary reason for the addition, an additional two-car garage is also desired for new drivers in the family. He confirmed that various site plans were studied in an effort to reduce the impervious surface on the site.

Commissioner Gibson asked how stormwater drainage will be handled and requested additional information on the proposed stone material, the hardscape proposed in the rear yard, and the size of the vestibule between the home and the addition.

Mr. Strassburger stated that there is a storm sewer on the property that connects to the storm sewer in the road. He stated that the stone on the addition will match the stone on the home. He stated that there may be an opportunity to reduce the impervious surface around the pool and noted that as proposed, the hardscape does not extend to the home and pointed out some pockets of landscaping within the proposed patio. He acknowledged that there is a significant amount of impervious surface on the site already. He agreed to reconsider the configuration of the driveway extension and to consider the incorporation of gravel or pavers to reduce the amount of impervious surface. He stated that the property owners are considering eliminating the sports court. He stated that the vestibule that connects the addition to the home is approximately 10 feet by 14 feet.

Commissioner Levitsky asked for more information on the exterior lighting and proposed tree removal.

Mr. Strassburger stated that there will be minimal exterior lighting in the rear yard, lighting at the entrances on the addition which will be directed downward, and lighting in the pool. He stated that three trees located near the proposed addition will be removed, a Linden and two Crabapple trees.

Commissioner Levitsky commented that the proposed driveway extension, in his opinion, disrupts the beauty of the site and the approach to the home.

Mr. Strassburger agreed that the driveway extension needs further study. He stated that consideration will be given to shifting the driveway closer to the home to avoid disrupting the front yard and incorporating gravel or pavers to improve the aesthetics.

Commissioner Hanson asked if consideration was given to incorporating pervious materials elsewhere on the site and asked for additional clarification on the drainage and the existing and proposed garage space.

Mr. Strassburger stated that the existing parking court is crushed blue stone over an asphalt base. He stated that consideration is being given to using gravel for the new driveway and pavers at the garage apron. He agreed to consider pervious materials elsewhere on the site. He stated that they are coordinating with the adjacent property owners to the north on drainage issues and a new storm sewer is planned along the west side of the site, to direct stormwater from the two properties to Onwentsia Road. He stated that there are four existing garage bays, three used for vehicles and one for storage. He stated that the detached accessory structure in the northeast corner of the property is a workshop, not a garage. He stated that two additional garage bays are the proposed in the addition.

Chairman Grinnell asked whether the driveway for the proposed garages could come off of the driveway to the neighboring house along the west property line to eliminate the need to extend the driveway across the front yard.

Mr. Strassburger stated that there is a two to three foot grade change and a retaining wall which would make it difficult to take access from the west side of the property.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell asked for public testimony. Hearing none, she invited final questions and comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Hanson noted many positive aspects of the petition but noted that the significant increase in the amount of impervious surface is concerning. He asked that consideration be given to modifying the driveway and incorporating some pervious materials into the plan. He agreed that the windows on the west elevation should be refined to better relate to the windows elsewhere on the home. He stated that year-round landscape is needed to provide some screening of the addition.

Commissioner Levitsky observed that the surrounding properties appear very open, and the homes are set back from the street creating expansive front yards which dominate the streetscape. He suggested consideration of moving the driveway closer to the house to preserve the open front yard in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Strassburger stated that alternate driveway configurations will be considered in an effort to preserve the expansiveness of the front yard.

Commissioner Gibson observed that one of the best views will be from the proposed garage south across the front yard. She stated that in her opinion, the siting of the addition does not embrace the opportunity for views of the front yard. She suggested consideration of using the existing fourth garage bay for vehicles and adding a carport type structure to for an additional parking space eliminating the need for a new garage as part of the addition. She pointed out the need for extension of the driveway would be eliminated in that scenario. She stated that in her opinion, the proposed vestibule seems superfluous. She pointed out that conical roofs are often found on English style homes, on either side of towers. She suggested reducing the size of the pool deck to decrease the overall impervious surface on the site. She suggested Western Cedars as part of the landscaping along the west side of the property. She stated concern about drainage. She stated that several of the standards on which petitions must be evaluated, Standards 4, 5, 11, 13, 14 and 17, do not yet appear to be satisfied. She complimented the residence and stated that the addition needs some addition study and refinement.

Chairman Grinnell commended the architectural detailing on the addition. She expressed concern that as proposed, the plan diminishes the character of the site. She stated that she appreciates the petitioner's willingness to revisit the plans. She invited a motion.

Commissioner Hanson pointed out that one of the standards that must be considered by the Commission has to do with scale. He stated that in his opinion, the addition complies with allowable square footage for the site and the expansiveness of the property appears to support the size of the addition. He made a motion to continue consideration of the petition with the following direction.

1. Explore alternatives for the driveway configuration to reduce the amount of impervious surface and minimize the disruption to the front yard.
2. Consider ways to embrace the view offered by the property.
3. Consider more fully utilizing the existing shed and use of a carport to eliminate the new garage.
4. Consider eliminating the hyphen and conical roof and connecting the family room to the living room.
5. Consider reducing the size of the hardscape around the pool.
6. Consider the use of Western Cedar along the south and west property lines.
7. Refine the west elevation of the addition to present openings that follow the rhythm of the solids and voids on the existing house.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

OTHER ITEMS

5. 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.

6. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner