

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the April 24, 2024 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, April 24, 2024, 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 Commission members Geoffrey Hanson, Elizabeth Dalieri, Lloyd Culbertson, Leif Soderberg.

Commissioners absent: Commissioners Tina Dann-Fenwick, and Robin Petit.

City staff present: Abigail Vollmers, Senior Planner, and Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

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 of the March 20, 2024 meeting of the Commission.

The minutes of the March 20, 2024 were approved with non-substantive corrections as requested by Chairman Grinnell and Commissioner Culbertson, and with a clarification as requested by Commissioner Dalieri.

3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the use of synthetic roofing for a full roof replacement at 333 East Woodland Road.

Property Owner: Mary Therese and Greg Williams

Presented by: Mary Therese Williams

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

Ms. Williams stated appreciation for the Commission's efforts on the topic of synthetic roof products. She stated that the product she is proposing on her home is the same product she presented to the Commission last summer. She noted that a representative from the manufacturer and her roofing installer are available for questions. She stated that she worked with a color specialist and based on that advice, selected the Black Oak product which offers a diversity in color. She noted that the end caps will be installed to appear similar to the current installation on the home. She stated that the proposed synthetic product will be consistent with the thickness, width and texture of the existing cedar shingles. She presented a sample of

the proposed roofing product noting the randomness and variation of the product. She presented images of her home from the streetscape and from different directions noting how it is softened by existing trees. She stated that over time, various materials were used on her home. She pointed out that the house was originally roofed in asphalt but stated that in her opinion, a quality synthetic product is a better choice than asphalt. She noted that despite changes to the materials on the home over time, her home has remained in the Historic District.

Ms. Vollmers stated that this petition was before the Commission in late summer 2023 and was the impetus for the Commission's due diligence around synthetic roof products. She noted that as a follow up to the last meeting at which synthetic roofs products were discussed, staff recontacted some other communities for updates on how they are responding to requests to use synthetic roof products in historic districts. She noted that both Boston, MA and Evanston, IL allow the use of synthetic roof materials after a complete review and subject to some limitations. She noted that a staff memorandum summarizing the most recent information received by staff was included in the Commission's packet. She spoke to the petition before the Commission noting that the roof proposed for replacement was installed in the early 2000's. She reviewed the applicable standards and noted that when the house was re-roofed with cedar, the appearance of the home was likely softened and may have appeared less monolithic than it did with the original asphalt roof. She noted that the petitioner has selected a synthetic product with the intent of closely replicating the visual characteristics of the existing cedar roof. She noted that over time, some homeowners have preferred cedar over asphalt roofs because of the texture and variation offered. She pointed out that roof materials are a modification that is reversible. She concluded noting that findings are presented in the staff report in support of the petition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Williams stated that she did not provide addresses of homes on which the Black Oak product is installed. She stated that she cannot confirm whether the roof products used on the homes cited by the other petitioner are consistent with the product she is proposing to use.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Gus, representing the DaVinci company, stated that the Black Oak color is available in three different styles and profiles. He confirmed that the installation method proposed by the petitioner will be straight, not staggered. He stated that the product has a UV stabilizer and offers a fade warranty. He noted that testing was conducted in Arizona.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Williams confirmed that the proposed product has multiple widths. She confirmed that various colors were explored and noted that she relied on advice from a color specialist in making the selection. She confirmed that the intent is to replicate the color of the existing cedar to the extent possible.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, the representative from DaVinci stated that beginning in 2017, a UV stabilizer was added to the product. He stated that the UV stabilizer has a ten-year warranty. He stated that the company has been around since 1999 and has not had to replace a roof since 2001. He acknowledged that at times, there have been problems with installers. He stated that the materials are pre-collated by color and size to avoid the same size pieces being installed all in one area. He stated that eight inch and ten-inch shingles are proposed on the Williams' home.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, the DaVinci representative confirmed that shingles with a straight edge is desired by the petitioner with a ten-inch exposure.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, Ms. Williams confirmed that the color was selected to be similar to the existing roof.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hanson, Ms. Vollmers stated that the checklist prepared by staff for use by the petitioners can be included in future Commission packets as petitions come forward.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hanson, Ms. Williams confirmed that the proposed variation in width is intended to replicate the appearance of the cedar roof. She stated that the installation technique is intended to replicate the installation technique for cedar shingles to the extent possible.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, the DaVinci representative stated that snow guards are optional, but highly recommended at the front door and garage. He stated that DaVinci does not provide snow guards. He noted that snow guards are commonly used with slate roofs.

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

Pete O'Malley, 791 Summit Avenue, stated that he is representing the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation and read the written testimony submitted by the Foundation which was provided to the Commission in advance of the meeting. The written testimony is incorporated into the record for this petition.

Jan Gibson, 59 Franklin Place, clarified that neither of the two principal Boston Historic Districts, Back Bay and Beacon Hill, allow synthetic roof products. She noted that the economic welfare of the public thrives because of the protections put in place in historic districts. She stated that the roof material proposed is plastic. She acknowledged that the synthetic product will continue to evolve and suggested that it is too soon to allow use of the product in the City's Historic Districts. She stated that the City deserves better.

Susan Athenson, 901 Summit Avenue, stated that synthetic materials change the character of the Historic Districts. She stated that there is not enough information on how the materials will patina noting the importance of that characteristic in the Historic Districts. She stated that it is important that Lake Forest not start experimenting with synthetic materials in the Historic Districts at this time. She stated that the Commission should feel good about saying no to these types of requests.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Grinnell invited final questions from the Commission.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Williams confirmed that Landmarks Illinois does not hold a Façade Easement on her home.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson Ms. Vollmers confirmed that the architect of the house is unknown.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell offered the petitioner the opportunity to respond to public comment.

Ms. Williams stated that she is trying to make the right decision for her home and has taken good care of the home since purchasing it. She stated that the product presented is in line with the visual characteristics of the existing cedar roofing. She stated that she has done a tremendous amount of research and prefers not to install asphalt shingles on her roof.

Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Soderberg acknowledged that this is a complicated issue. He stated that the role of the Commission is to protect the historic character of the community but also to be responsive to residents and property owners. He stated that it is clear that there are issues with cedar roofs. He stated that in this case, the facts and circumstances warrant consideration of an alternative product. He stated that the fact that the house previously had an asphalt roof is material to the consideration along with the condition of the existing cedar roof. He stated that replacing in kind with a cedar roof that will be impacted by the same factors that caused deterioration of the existing roof is not reasonable. He stated that criteria have been developed after months of due diligence by the Commission. He stated that the facts and the circumstances of this petition do not apply unilaterally to other properties. He stated that the option for snow guards is interesting and acknowledged that safety is important. He acknowledged that there are bad examples of synthetic roofs in the community but noted that the product proposed by the petitioner appears to be of good quality. He stated that the anti-monotony issue is still a concern to him and asked that it be given further consideration as the

frequency of use of synthetic roof products increases. He stated support for the petition as presented.

Commissioner Dalieri acknowledged that the petitioner has done significant research. She stated that the Commission developed criteria for consideration in reviewing synthetic roofs which appear to be met with this petition. She noted that Standard 17 which speaks to reversibility assures that if the roof does not look good, changes can be made. She stated support for the petition.

Commissioner Hanson noted that the Commission has spent a significant amount of time looking at the topic and developed specific criteria to be used in considering synthetic roof products. He stated that this petition appears to satisfy the criteria. He noted that the location of the house a significant distance from the street is an important consideration in this case adding that the tree canopy will help to soften the appearance of the synthetic roof.

Chairman Grinnell acknowledged Ms. Williams patience as the Commission conducted due diligence on synthetic roof products. She stated that the Commission could hold its ground and deny the petition but noted however that based on the work done and information presented, this petition appears to make a reasonable case for the proposed material. She reiterated that the Commission is charged with balancing various interests. She stated that the hard decision is to do the right thing and stressed that the Commission has not entered into this decision without careful thought. She invited a motion.

Commissioner Soderberg made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the installation of a synthetic roof at 333 East Woodland Road subject to the following conditions of approval. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted by the Commission.

1. The approved product is:
 - a. DaVinci Select Shake synthetic tiles
 - b. Select shake profile in two widths, 8" and 10"
 - c. Color: Black Oak
 - d. Installation: straight coursing with a 10" exposure

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Culbertson and approved by the Commission by a 5 to 0 vote.

4. **Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the use of synthetic roofing for a full roof replacement at 250 Majestic Oak Court.**
Property Owner: Jeanette and Dan Hodgkinson
Presented by: Jeanette and Dan Hodgkinson

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

Commissioner Hanson noted that while visiting the site, he spoke with the petitioner and was presented with samples of the proposed roof product for information.

Commissioner Grinnell stated she knew the petitioner from Lake Forest High School as her son was in the same class. She invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Hodgkinson noted that she and her husband bought the property several years ago and have been working to restore the house ever since. She noted that the house was designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw. She stated that the roof is very large and noted that the existing shingles are very thin and may be more of a siding material than a roof material. She stated that the current roof shingles have a very small exposure, about five inches. She noted that Susan Benjamin, an historian, noted the possibility of using a synthetic replacement product. She presented samples of the specific synthetic product proposed as the replacement material. She noted that the dormers on the house are roofed with metal and will be replaced in kind. She noted that the addresses of three other homes she provided reflect the proposed color of the proposed product but are not the same style or thickness proposed for her home. She presented photos of the house and noted that the house is set back from the street a significant distance. She noted that new homes are proposed on either side of the house. She noted that key elements of the house were significantly altered in the 1930's by the architect George Towner Senseney.

Mr. Hodgkinson noted that the existing roof shingle exposure is smaller than typical and pointed out that the proposed replacement product was selected to match the existing exposure.

Ms. Vollmers reviewed the significant changes made to the home in the 1930's noting that the shiplap siding is the most significant element that remains from the Howard Van Doren Shaw design. She noted that the roof overhang, dormers, and windows were all changed. She noted that as a result of the changes made, the home took on a very different character from Shaw's original design. She spoke to the applicable standards noting that the proposed synthetic roof material was selected to match the unusual size of the current roof materials. She noted that the home is sited in an area that is undergoing significant change as a result of a recent subdivision with new homes proposed to the north and south of the Hodgkinson's residence. She noted that the petitioner consulted with Landmarks Illinois about the use of a synthetic roof product because the property benefits from a tax freeze as a result of the restoration work completed on the house, and heard no objection. She stated that findings in support of the petition are detailed in the staff report.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Hodgkinson confirmed that a five-inch exposure is proposed.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Vollmers confirmed that the house is not recognizable as a Howard Van Doren Shaw design today. She confirmed that George Towner Senseney, the architect associated with the later alterations, is not on the Significant Architects list.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Vollmers confirmed that the house is a Locally Designated Landmark but does not have a Façade Easement.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Hodgkinson confirmed that the property has a tax freeze and explained that is why Landmarks Illinois was consulted.

In response to a question from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Vollmers confirmed that the new homes to north and south are subject to the Building Review Board approval.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Hodgkinson stated that new homes in the area will be subject to approval by the Homeowners' Association.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Hodgkinson confirmed that snow guards will be used on the roof.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hanson, Ms. Hodgkinson stated that the product proposed is a specialty shingle. She stated that a landscape plan was prepared as part of the proposed driveway reconfiguration. She stated that plantings will be delayed until the construction nearby is completed. She stated that street trees installed as part of the subdivision development.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell Ms. Hodgkinson stated that the property received Local Landmark status in 2021. She stated that when they purchased the property and applied for a tax freeze, a coordinator from Landmarks Illinois was assigned to review the proposed renovations to the home.

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

Marcy Kerr, Executive Director of the Preservation Foundation, read the testimony submitted by the Foundation and presented to the Commissioner prior to the meeting. The written testimony is incorporated into the record for this petition.

Chairman Grinnell invited final questions from the Commission.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Hodgkinson confirmed that the proposed product attempts to match the thickness of the thin material currently on the house. She stated that shingles will be stacked on top of each other. She noted

that the intent of the color is to be more varied and less brown than reflected in the sample provided.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson Ms. Vollmers confirmed that the petitioners intend to match the thinness of the existing roof material with the replacement material. She stated that staff can continue to work with the petitioners to get clarity on the color and material proposed.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Hanson noted that although the house was designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw, it no longer reflects the original design. He commented that the house is bereft of softening landscaping and suggested that further information be provided on the intended landscaping.

Commissioner Dalieri noted that achieving the variability described by the petitioner may require extra shingles because a single batch of shingles may not provide adequate variety.

Commissioner Soderberg stated that in his opinion, there is sufficient that the house as it exists today does not reflect the original Shaw design. He stated that it is important for the Commission to have clarity on the exact roof product proposed. He stated support for the approach of using thinner shingles with a smaller exposure in an effort to replicate the existing appearance.

Chairman Grinnell noted that her initial thought was that because the home will be surrounded by newer homes the importance of protecting the historic home is important. She noted however that as a result of the changes made to the home over time, the home no longer reflects the original design. She stated support for the petition. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Hanson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for a replacement synthetic roof on the house located at 250 Majestic Oak Court subject to the following conditions of approval. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted by the Commission.

1. The approved product is:
 - a. DaVinci Select Shake synthetic tiles
 - b. Select shake profile in widths ranging from 4" to 10"
 - c. Color: Black Oak
 - d. Installation: straight coursing with a 6" exposure
 - e. Shingle thickness is ½"
 - f. Dormer roofs to be replaced with metal roofing

2. An updated landscape plan shall be included in the submittal for permit to replace the roof and will be subject to review and approval by staff. An estimate of costs to implement the proposed landscape plan, material and labor, shall be provided to allow a bond to be posted as determined to be appropriate to assure plantings in compliance with the approved plan in an appropriate timeframe.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Culbertson and approved by the Commission by a 5 to 0 vote.

5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the landscaping, hardscaping, and fencing at 333 North Green Bay Road.

Property Owner: Joshua and Jayme O'Donnell

Representative: Joel Balentyne and Bruce Everly, Midwest Arbor Corporation

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

Mr. Balentyne presented a survey of the property and noted that a new house which was previously approved by the Commission, is currently under construction on the property. He presented photos of the streetscape noting the landscaped character. He presented an updated hardscape plan noting the changes made since the plan for the house was reviewed and approved by the Commission. He stated that a drainage system will be installed to capture water flowing on to and off of the property. He stated that privacy plantings are planned along the east and south property lines for the benefit of the petitioners and the neighbors. He presented a tree removal plan indicating the trees already approved for removal as part of the approval of the house, and additional trees now proposed for removal. He noted that many of the additional trees proposed for removal are invasive maples and others are impacted by proposed construction or are impacting higher quality trees. He noted that a tree survey with detail was provided in the Commission's packet. He noted that the City Arborist has been out to the site. He noted that replacement inches are provided in the landscape plan.

Mr. Everly reviewed the landscape plan noting that there are minimal foundation plantings to keep the focus on the home. He stated that the east property line is heavily planted to provide screening between the new home and the existing home to the east. He stated that the south property line is also heavily planted. He stated that on the west side of the house, along Green Bay Road, there is a 50-foot Conservancy Easement. He stated that buckthorn will be removed from the Easement area and new vegetation will be planted to maintain the existing density of landscaping along the streetscape. He reviewed the hardscape materials proposed for the site and the extensive fencing plan. He noted that an interior and exterior fence proposed. He noted that a wrought iron fence is proposed along the streetscape, setback into the Conservancy Easement. He noted that the fence on the north side of the property will be similar in design to the fence along Green Bay

Road, but shorter. He noted that an aluminum fence, with a wood grain appearance, is proposed for the east and south property lines. He stated that there is some flexibility on the type of fencing for the interior of the site. He presented a lighting plan as well as current photos of the site.

Ms. Vollmers stated that the Commission continued consideration of the landscape plan when the new home was initially reviewed and approved. She noted that in the earlier presentation, the landscape plan was prepared by a different landscape architect. She noted the importance and limitations of the Conservancy Easement along the west property line on Green Bay Road and the requirement that the streetscape remain heavily wooded. She noted that the fence is intended to match the modern style of the house but noted that as presented, the fence appears industrial in comparison to other fences along the Green Bay Road streetscape. She noted that at the time the house was presented to the Commission, a more typical style fence was proposed along the Green Bay Road streetscape. She noted that with respect to the hardscape plan, documentation is needed to verify that there is sufficient space to allow a delivery truck to pull completely off the shared driveway and stage in front of the proposed gate without blocking the shared driveway. The details for the gate control panel and mail deliveries were also requested for staff review. She noted that a modern styled fence is also proposed internal to the site but is screened by vegetation. She confirmed that the additional trees proposed for removal were reviewed by the City's Certified Arborist and determined to be of lower quality without the likelihood of longevity. She stated that the landscape plan proposes quality and appropriate species including the plantings proposed in the Conservancy Easement. She commented on the lighting plan noting that information on all of the fixtures will be required at the time of submittal for permit.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hanson, Mr. O'Donnell explained that they have two dogs and desire a high fence. He stated that the fence along Green Bay Road must be 80 percent open based on prior approvals, which limits the options when trying to keep nuisance animals off the property. He stated that the interior fence is for privacy. He stated that his preference would be for a single fence however, the openness requirement in the conservancy easement along Green Bay Road makes it difficult to achieve his goals.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hanson, Mr. Everly stated that the fence along Green Bay Road does not meet the requirements for a pool fence. He reviewed the various fencing types proposed. He noted that an aluminum fence will last longer than a cedar fence. He stated that a wrought iron fence is proposed along Green Bay with tighter pickets on the bottom to prevent animals from entering the property.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Mr. Everly stated that the intent is to work with the neighbors to agree on a single fence along the east and south property lines instead of two fences back to back.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Czerniak stated that a fence is allowed in the conservancy easement as long as it meets the openness requirement. She stated that the easement must remain planted at the existing density adding that non-native plantings can be removed but must be replaced with plant materials that will achieve the same density.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Vollmers confirmed that a fence seven feet in height must be setback at least three feet from the property line along Green Bay Road.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Mr. Everly stated that the privacy fence will be lower than the neighbors' fences.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Mr. Everly stated that River Birch trees are placed appropriately in the wet area of the property in order to ensure viability is maximized.

Chairman Grinnell acknowledged that the fence proposed along Green Bay Road aligns with the contemporary design of the house, but not with the Green Bay Road streetscape.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Everly stated a willingness to consider a design more in line with the fence on the property to the north for the fence along Green Bay Road. He explained that steel posts are desired because of the wet conditions on the site. He stated that the steel posts could be wrapped in wood.

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

Justin Foley, 335 N. Green Bay Road, stated that he has had conversations with Mr. O'Donnell and appreciates the careful planning that has gone into the project. He stated general support for the plan and stated confidence that he can work with the new property owner to address any open issues. He stated that if the proposed fence along the shared property line does not exceed the height of his fence and is not visible from his property, he does not object to the fence style as proposed.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Grinnell invited rebuttal to public comment from the petitioner.

Mr. Everly stated a willingness to work with Mr. Foley. He stated confidence that the drainage can be improved.

Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Soderberg stated that along Green Bay Road in the area of the property in this petition, there are stockade fences and iconic fences which have an architected, classical look. He stated that the proposed fence appears stark but acknowledged that may be the result of the requirement to maintain 80 percent openness. He questioned whether the fence along the streetscape needs to reflect the contemporary design of the house or whether the consistency with the modern style is more important for the internal fence on the site. He stated that in his opinion, the fence along Green Bay Road should tie in with the fences in the area. He commented on the aluminum slat fence and stated a preference for a more vertical aesthetic as opposed to the horizontal orientation. He noted that the horizontal cap at the top of the fence creates a modern look as opposed to open slats.

In response to Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Everly stated that the regulations limit the ability to be creative and noted that the fence is recessed into the woods with the intent of minimizing the visibility of the fence. He stated that the design of the internal fence was driven by the architect. He stated the intent to work with the neighbors.

Commissioner Dalieri spoke to Standard 14 and noted that the sharp angles and industrial appearance of the fence proposed along Green Bay Road are not compatible with the streetscape. She stated that as long as the fences along the west and south property lines are lower than the neighbors' fences, in her opinion, the proposed style is acceptable. She noted that with the various fences proposed, it appears that a compound is being created.

Commissioner Hanson acknowledged that the openness requirement limits the options for the fence along Green Bay Road. He questioned whether the Commission could grant an exemption to the openness requirement.

In response to a question from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Everly stated that the internal fence will not be visible from Green Bay Road.

Chairman Grinnell suggested that some further clarification on the fences would be helpful and encouraged discussions with neighbors and consideration of options.

Commissioner Hanson stated that he is comfortable with the interior fence.

Commissioner Dalieri requested that samples of the fences be provided to the Commission.

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

Commissioner Soderberg made a motion to grant a Certification of Appropriateness approving the tree removal, landscape, hardscape, and lighting plans subject to the

following conditions. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted by the Commission as part of the motion.

1. Cut sheets for all of the exterior light fixtures proposed for use on the house and in the yard must be included with the submittal for permit. All fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels if any, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights. All exterior lighting shall be sensitive to the dark sky character of the neighborhood.
2. A dimensioned driveway plan showing the gate fully opened with a delivery truck on the apron, details of the gate controls, and a plan for USPS service shall be included in the submittal for permit.
3. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. Any refinements made in response to the Commission's discussion or as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Commission shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Commission's approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

Commissioner Soderberg made a motion to continue consideration of the fencing with direction to the petitioner and staff to reconsider the fence design in the context of the Commission's comments.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hanson and was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

OTHER ITEMS

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

There were no additional public comments.

6. Additional information from staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Abigail Vollmers
Senior Planner, Community Development