MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 12, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Tim Schmitt, Mark Simon, and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Julie Hacker, Jamie Morris, Sally Riessen Hunt, and Karl Vogel

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator
Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM 7:04 pm

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 413 Grove St. (LSHD) – Jeffrey and Janet Clements, applicants. Add a single story six foot addition to rear of home for new kitchen. The six wood windows are in the same style as the existing kitchen windows. The proposed addition requires a minor Zoning variance for lot coverage from 31.6% to 34.5%. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, and 12-15]; [Demolition 1-6]; [Zoning Variance A and C].

Jeff Clements presented the application for a 1-story addition to the rear of the house at 413 Grove St. which requires a minor zoning variance for lot coverage from 31.6% to 34.5%. The rear entrance was moved to the west side along the alley. The door on the west elevation is on the left. There are no windows on the east side. The new Marvin windows will match the kitchen windows. The rear window on the east elevation is for egress, skylights. There are skylights on the roof of the addition.

Commissioner Simon made a motion to approve new construction and demolition, in accordance for applicable standards of Construction 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, and 12-15; and Demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Commissioner Simon made a motion recommending approval of the zoning variance for lot coverage from 31.6% to 34.5% in that meets standards A and C, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.
3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2341 Pioneer Rd (L) – Lawrence & Ann L. Eiben, applicants. Modification to exterior of dwelling, including changes to the existing kitchen main level roof line and door replacement. Also, door and window modifications to existing family room on the east elevation and windows on the south elevation. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10].

Ann Eiben presented the application to remodel the kitchen. The exterior work includes: west elevation, replacing existing door and modifying the roof behind the parapet of the existing 1-story addition. On the east elevation, remove one door and two windows and replace them with three casement windows. South elevation, remove existing casement windows; transoms above to remain.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to issue a COA for the alterations as described above in that the project meets standards for alteration 1-10, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

B. 1625 Judson Av. (LSHD) – Mark Shapiro, applicant. Construction of a wood porch with trellis along the south side yard and east rear yard. Remove rear stairs. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 7, 8, 10, and 12-15]; [Demolition 1-6].

Sergei Safonov and Mark Shapiro presented the application to construct a wood deck and wood trellis at the south side and rear east elevations of the existing house. The door at the back accesses a studio. East elevation: trellis and secondary stair from the studio down to grade. South elevation: wood cedar trellis, and stairs.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 1625 Judson for the work as described above, in that meets standards of Construction 1, 7, 8, 10, and 12-15 and demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Robert Bady. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 1805 Wesley Av. (L/RHD) – Mat Rappaport & Shana Stein, applicants. Construct 2nd story addition on current footprint of existing portion of residence, at north-east corner of structure. Change windows in existing end floor master bedroom, changing double hung windows into French doors in kitchen, new casement window to the north elevation of existing kitchen. Restore cedar siding and trim details. Remove roof and trim over existing one-story kitchen. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]; [Demolition 1-6]

Mat Rappaport, owner, and Kris LaCerda, architect presented the application for the construction of a flat roof 2nd-story addition in the back of the house facing north and east. On the existing 1-story addition screening room, the windows facing north are boarded over. A casement window on 1st floor will replace those windows. On the east elevation first floor, the two double hung windows will be replaced with French casements. On the second floor, the two double hung windows will be replaced with a
picture window flanked by two double hung windows. The proposed windows are Marvin clad wood windows.

Commissioner Reinhold said the flat roof takes away the current profile of the roof line. Kris LaCerda said that studies were made early on, it was challenging to decide which gable to follow; it was decided to keep the roof understated. Chair Williams asked if neighbor were notified. Mat Rappaport said he has letters from neighbors supporting the project. Chair Williams noted that the French doors appear tall and narrow. Kris LaCerda said the first floor has tall ceilings; in order to preserve the trim details, inserting an 8’ high x 32” wide French door in place of the existing double hung, is the quietest insertion they could do. Commissioner Dudnik asked why the proposed windows on north elevation are casement. He also questioned the flat roof on the 2nd-story addition.

Mat Rapoport said the flat roof allows for the minimum head height.

Commissioner Itle said maintaining the trim height on the addition (a residue of the existing roof line of the existing 1-story piece, and expanding it to 2-stories, that trim does not have a meaning anymore. Also he wanted to see a study of the window proportions and divisions, to bring it more in keeping with the rest of the house. He did not think the flat roof is going to be the right solution. Commissioner Reinhold wanted to see how the detail at the roof line would be handled including overhangs.

Chair Williams, said it appears the Commission would like to see the application next month. Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue 1802 Wesley Ave. to July 10, 2018, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

D. 2215 Orrington Av. (NEHD) – Greg Sego & Nick Gehl, applicants. Removing an existing 2-story addition on the east (rear) side of the house and add a new 2-story addition to that same east (rear) side of the house. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15]; [Demolition 1-6]

Greg Sego with Nick Gehl, owners and Paul Janicki, architect, presented the application. The house was moved from where the Orrington hotel currently stands. The stucco house is in the craftsman style. A non-compatible stucco addition was built in the back with casement windows.

The application is to demolish the c. 1910 addition, and replace it another addition on the entire rear elevation. The addition has gable ends roof forms. The first floor is brick and second floor is stucco with half timbering. The north elevation, first floor kitchen windows, second floor double hung windows. South elevation, first floor is brick with tall windows, and new stairs to the basement with a railing. West elevation, removing the double hung windows from the first floor, and return it back to a screen porch.

Commissioner Itle asked what was happening with the middle of the first floor. Paul Janicki said the second floor is pushed back no more than 2’ with a sloping copper roof. Commissioner Reinhold asked if there is a window above the door. The answer is yes.
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 2215 Orrington Ave. for the project as described above, including the second story window above the first floor door, with applicable standards for Construction 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15; and Demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

E. 90 Kedzie St. (LSHD) – Matt Rogers, applicant. 6-foot fence around the entire property, observing the utility easement along the south property line. This would include a fence in the front yard, which is not permitted under City Code 6-4-6-7. The front yard portion would be a 5-foot wrought iron atop a 1-foot masonry wall with 6-foot masonry piers located at all corners on the north property line. There is an elevation shift from the west to east of the front property line, with a portion of the yard along the lake being 28 inches higher. We request that the fence height follow this grade change. Fence Variation: 6-4-6-7 (F) 2 Fences are only permitted in front yard on a Type 1 street; request for construction of a fence in the front yard on a non-Type 1 street; 6-4-6-7 (F) 3 Fences are limited to four (4) feet in a front yard, where they are permitted in a front yard; request for construction of a six (6) foot fence in the front yard. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13]; [Zoning Variation A, B and C].

Matt Rogers, zoning consultant presented the application. There are two lots in common ownership. The applicants are seeking a 6’ fence around the property and landscaping. There are two different plans, because the applicants are seeking a vacation of some of the right of way. The property sits 18’ back from the sidewalk. There is an existing 6’ fence that they hope to tie in with that fence to create more of a front yard. Without that, the front porch sits 9’ from the property line. There is a proposal to purchase that land from the City. They submitted two plans to Zoning, one includes the vacation, and the other does not. The existing fence is on a higher elevation with plantings behind it. The side lot is empty.

Matt Rogers said the east side of the property fronts the Lake with a boat lift. There is 5’ easement that runs across the back of property. The 5’ easement is being observed to grant one of the neighbors access to the Lake. A utility easement for 741 Kedzie could not be found. The fence is proposed on the north side of that easement. The proposed fence along the Lake has masonry piers with a wrought iron fence in between and a 1’ high masonry wall at the base with a 5’ tall wrought iron fence. A 4’ high fence is also being considered. The rest will be a 6’ high wrought iron fence.

A sample of a fence wrought iron fence with a pier system, illustrated what might be the proposed fence. Matt Rogers handed out photos to show that the properties at 741 and 747 Sheridan Road will not have obstructed views to the Lake.

Chair Williams asked why the Commission would approve a fence on land that the applicant does not own. Matt Rogers said the applicants are in negotiations with the City to purchase the land. Commissioner Itle asked where is a 6’ high fence allowed without
a variance? Matt Rogers those fences are allowed on the side, and rear yards and need to be setback 3’ from the front of the house. They are seeking a 6’ high fence on the front yard for security reasons. Commissioner Dudnik questioned how we could be asked to approve the design of the fence if the sample did not reflect the actual proposed fence but rather a “placeholder.” Matt Rogers said what he showed is not exactly the design of the fence, but the style of the fence and that, once they obtained approval by ZBA, they would return for approval of the actual proposed design. Commissioner Williams noted that there are too many unknowns about the design of the fence.

Scott Mangum said the Commission could make a recommendation on the fence variation and ask the applicant to come back for the fence design. Commissioner Schmitt noted that earlier Matt Rogers mentioned a 4’ high fence along the Lake. Matt Rogers said yes. Commissioner Itle referred to some of the letters from the neighbors about the easement that requires the view to the Lake be unobstructed. Matt Rogers said they are doing what they can to not impact their views. Commissioner Itle said the Commission needs to know the wording on the easement and what it really says.

Alexis Ayler of 741 Sheridan Rd. is a type 1 street such Sheridan Road have 4’high fences, nobody has a 6’ high fence. A 6’ high fence will impact views. The utility easement dates 4/14/1950. The only exception was for the boat launch. Alexis Ayler has security concerns, the owners of 90 Kedzie desire for privacy and safety, the implication is that people will be accessing their property by trespassing across her property. She also has children and dogs, she did not put a fence, and she installed electronic fencing for her dogs. She needs to be convinced more about the necessity for a 6’ fence around the property.

Pierre Durand of 747 Sheridan designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw, said he lives in his house since 2000. He was able to expand his backyard in 2009. He wants to preserve the vision of Van Dore Shawn of open space.

Commissioner Reinhold asked about the memorandum on the agenda about Zoning variations, how does that affect this decision. Scott Mangum said it does not affect this decision.

Scott Mangum said is up the Commission to make a recommendation on the Zoning variance. The recommendation to the Zoning Administrator could be to approve or approve with conditions, or deny. The variation is for the location of the fence, the 6’ portion of the fence, the Zoning Ordinance requires a 3’ from the front façade. The portion that is requested for the variation is along the north property line, and anything in front of 3’ behind the front façade.

Commissioner Simon made a motion recommendation to approve the Zoning variation for construction of a fence in the front yard and for the fence to be 6’ instead of 4’ in accordance to standards A, B and C, seconded by Commissioner Itle. Vote: 1 aye (Simon), 5 nays 1 abstention (Bady).
Matt Rogers asked the Commission table the decision on the fence design. Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to table the application for 90 Kedzie St. for COA, specifically for the fence design until 7/10/18, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

**F. 917 Edgemere Ct. (LSHD) – Adam & Sue Sabow, applicants.** Construction on a vacant lot of a new two-story, stone, wood siding, and stucco single-family residence with attached garage. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16].

Fred Wilson, architect, presented the application for the construction of a single family home with an attached garage at 917 Edgemere Court, on a 50’ x 330’ vacant lot. The property is in the Lakeshore historic district, which has multiple home styles within the district.

The house has one and two story elements and can be built as of right without zoning variations. The building is staggered so the driveway and the garage are not as prominent. The interior courtyard is a secured play area and it also breaks up the facade. The south side elevation is staggered stepping down as it goes to the center. On the front west elevation, the area behind the balcony is pushed back. The design creates a series of solids and voids, using the windows and the materials, like the stucco, the wood siding, and the stone; so it is an innovative contemporary design. The building reads as an entire structure, from the front, down the sides, the back and the north side.

Contextually, the building is 33.5’ tall. The main masonry spine is 35’; the building to the south is lower. The buildings to the north range from 36’ to 38’ in height. The floor plans show the garage in the front. The courtyard and the bedrooms are on the first floor. The second floor has living space: kitchen, family room, library, game room and playroom. The roof plan shows where condensers are located. The materials are stone for the lower base, wood siding and stucco panels, the front elements are stucco; an interlocking of materials to break up the facades.

Commission’s findings:
Commissioner Reinhold addressed standard 14: Innovative design. She had concerns on the clarity of the scale and the proportion in relation to the site context around it. Commissioner Reinhold thought it would be desirable to add some color to the renderings; to show how it relates to the adjacent buildings and the materials (the stucco and stone materials). What colors are those elements and how they relate to the adjacent buildings?

Commissioner Reinhold noted that the Commission has reviewed this type of design successfully. The design needs to have some adjustments or modifications to the scale, to reflect a little bit more of the character of the neighborhood.
Garry Shumaker, preservation consultant, regarding the materials said the building is of dolomitic limestone, very common in the neighborhood. Its context is very appropriate with the use of traditional materials. The use of smooth face stucco is common, the cedar siding will create a buff and simple pallet. In terms of colors and tones, this is a neutral house. At the request of the clients, the house is open, airy and light. In terms of scale and proportion; most of the houses in this neighborhood take advantage of nearly full height casement windows, to accent the height of these buildings. This house is the fourth shortest building on the block. It would probably be the only one that does not feature a third floor. The building stays below the average height.

Commissioner Reinhold said the use of glass is a strong statement of the proportions of the glass in relation of the front elevation. Garry Shumaker said is not uncommon to see strips of glass to break up facades.

Commissioner Dudnik addressed how and whether this proposal met the Commission Standards for Review of Construction:

1. Height: The applicants’ elevation drawing illustrating the east side of Edgemere Ct. the building makes it appear as this proposed home is of same height or slightly lower than the other homes. This is misleading, because many of these other roofs a lot these roof slope back and away from their front facades. The notion of being visually compatible is not the case, when one comes across with a flat façade of a height similar to the roof peaks of those homes.

2. Proportion of facades: E. Dudnik did not see that relationship of the proposed house width to its height is the same as others, i.e., the front façade is not visually compatible with the proportions of the adjacent properties to which it is visually related.

3. Proportion of openings: It was said by the applicant about the windows being similar to the windows on adjacent structures. However, the long strip windows on the proposed facade do not show such window proportion.

4. Rhythm of solids to voids in facades: The large openings and the kind of rhythm, from the left and working its way southward does not present a rhythm similar to those of the other homes.

5. Rhythm of spacing and structures on streets: (mentioned, but no comment)

6. Rhythm of entrance porches-relationship of entrances and other projections: There is a different character shown on the proposed front façade from the styles and kinds of entries seen in most of the other nearby houses illustrated on the applicant’s street elevation.

7. Relationship of materials and texture: Most of the adjacent houses seemed to have a predominant material. The proposed use of cedar, stone, stucco, and glass represent and propose many more than is seen on adjacent structures.
8. Roof shapes: Proposed is a flat roof (rather than slopped).

9. Walls of continuity: There is some continuity as shown on the plan; the setback is respected.

10. Scale of structure: This is a very different scale than the other homes on the block in many respects. It comes off as a very different element than on most of the others.

11. Directional expression of facades: It is very horizontal, so is 919 Edgemere Ct. many of the other homes appear to be much more vertical than horizontal.

14. Innovative design: It needs to be respected.

Commissioner Dudnik said looking at the above standards he did not think that they have been met.

Commissioner Simon disagreed with Commissioner Dudnik. He noted that the houses are incredibly different from each other. It would be impossible to build new construction that would be compatible with the majority of the houses. The houses to the south are beautiful ranch style houses, which could be in a subdivision in Northfield.

About half of the houses on both sides of the street are older houses that are little more typical for Evanston, more like each other. The house to the north is far more massive (a Mediterranean house). It literally would be impossible to design a house that is compatible with the features of the surrounding houses. This is new construction; the Commission has approved other new construction projects realizing it is virtually impossible for new construction to match the historic neighborhood. The Commission has certainly not applied the standards to require only new construction that hearkens back to make it look like older homes. The Commission has approved a much more modern home than this one.

The questions about whether particular features could be modified to be more compatible in scale are legitimate. However, to turn down a house that it is in effect different than the surrounding houses that are incredibly different than each other, then every single house would be denied on that basis. New construction inherently looks different than a 100-year old house. The Commission never required otherwise. These houses are so dramatically different from each other in age, style and proportion that would be impossible to apply those standards. This is a block that is about half newer homes. So to say it does not look like the half of the historic homes has no validity in terms of preservation.

Commissioner Itle said the key issues are the materiality, it is too busy compared to the more understated palette of materials that the other houses have. Not to say that it has to match exactly what is there, but perhaps something that is more toned down on the front is appropriate. Commissioner Itle was concerned about the height; the
presentation is somewhat misleading to show how high up the second floor of the new house is set relative to everything else on the block. It fits under the height only because the second floor ceiling is a flat roof, and it is equal to the pitch of all the sloped roofs, which are capturing a third floor. Even though in the line drawing it looks similar in height, it will be perceived as much taller than everything else on the block. The large windows overlooking the Lake are fine, however, something a bit more restrained facing the street is probably appropriate here.

Commissioner Schmitt said this particular lot is very challenging; it is the narrowest lot on the block, something to keep in mind. The reason that it’s shaped the way it is, it maximizes the space they have. But it creates the shipping container looking house, but he likes it and appreciates it.

Commissioner Reinhold said that all appreciate the innovative design. She asked to look at the proportions of the front façade; the rear façade is less of a concern. The commission understands the size and scale and the need to maximize the lot. She requested to look again at the front and the relationship to the adjacent properties in regards to materiality, color and proportion. She was not saying “can’t have an innovative design,” it is welcomed in Evanston in context. It has to have relationship; it needs to be brought a little bit further to show that relationship to the context.

Commissioner Dudnik said he could not tell what is the building an expression of. Fred Wilson said what they wanted to express was that the building is one language in terms of maintaining a consistent style. Commissioner Dudnik said maybe the problem is the combination of different materials. Could it be simplified and make it a much clearer statement? Is all that embellishment needed? Fred Wilson said the issue is composition and materiality. Commissioner Dudnik said a model would help a lot, to make the clearer and allow the Commission to understand the project better. Have a model of the building and the adjacent homes to the north and south.

Chair Williams said the goal was to achieve an airy feel throughout the building, the front façade does not conform to what the design was trying to achieve with the rest of the design around the house. Looking to a modern design on this location is really not an issue. This particular façade does not reflect what else is going on.

Public Comment:
Harry Lowrance of 919 Edgemere Ct. said the Commission had asked before for a 3D model (previous two designs). He had submitted to City staff the neighbors’ position statement then. They need time to examine the plans.

Pauline Sheehan, architect, of 920 Edgemere said it is difficult to get a sense of the massing of the house in relationship to the neighboring properties. A 3D model will go a long way to get a better sense of its scale and its relationship to the neighbors. She is not against contemporary design, but the scale and sensitivity to the other properties is out of line with the unique nature of this street.
Philip Crihfield of 911 Edgemere Ct. and 900 Edgemere Ct. objected as he did two years ago to the rear setback, closer to the lake than the adjacent houses and the height (his house next door is a 1.5 story with the roof angled). This is a 2.5 high story house, up to 35'; his house is 26' high. The height of the house in relation to the back is such for an expansive view of the lake, but at the expense of their privacy. Philip Crihfield said the former developer raised the height of the rear yard. He would like to see what the building height is taken from the back or from the street. He asked the Commission for more time to review the plans by his architect.

Chair Williams said City staff received a letter from Mike Arrington of 929 Edgemere Ct. opposing the application.

Chair Williams said the Commission would like to see the application again given some the concerns, specifically about the front façade, the use of materials, and other issues raised, e.g., models to illustrate the proportions and relationship to other homes.

Garry Shumaker referring to Commissioner Dudnik’s comments said the proposed house terraces back. From the street view, the house will taper back and will appear lower or at least at the same height as the adjacent properties. In terms the issue of floor heights raised by Commissioner Itle, the parapet wall in the low line of the ‘C’ is the floor line. His clients believe they have addressed all the previous concerns and their project meets the standards of construction. He asked the Commission take a vote at this meeting and not to defer the application to a future meeting.

Chair Williams allowed at this time Jackie Crihfield of 911 and 900 Edgemere Ct. to speak. Jackie Crihfield said this is a beautiful house, but it is enormous. The former developer had two other designs that were extremely appropriate for this site.

The Commission discussed at this time options of how to proceed with the new application and whether the ordinance allowed for the applicant to refuse a postponement or deferment and to demand a vote at this time. Garry Shumaker reiterated his clients’ desire for a vote at the meeting.

Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to issue a COA for 917 Edgemere Ct. in that the standards for construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16 have been met, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion failed. Vote: 0 ayes, 8 nays.

4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of May 8, 2018.**

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to approve the May 8, 2018 meeting minutes as corrected, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

5. **COMMITTEE REPORTS (Working Groups)**

I) List of City projects exempt and for Preservation Commission review for comment.

The Commission asked staff to renumber and delete some of the lines (#40 was combined) by City staff or the Commission in the matrix. Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve the Rules and Procedures with modifications as discussed at this meeting, seconded by Commissioner Simon. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

6. VOLUNTEER REPORTS

A. Design Guidelines Volunteers – Update
   No report.

7. STAFF REPORTS


Carlos Ruiz announced that Commissioner Itle has been reappointed for a second 3-year term.

B. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment - Revision of the Review Procedures for Preservation Commission 18PLND-0045

Scott Mangum said this item is a referral from City Council to the Plan Commission, to make changes to the Zoning Ordinance, a text amendment, dealing with the portion in the Zoning Ordinance that deals with referrals to the Preservation Commission for recommendation, as discussed at this meeting on a couple of items. Currently all variations and special uses are referred to the Preservation Commission for recommendation, when they deal with a landmark or within a [historic] district.

The intent of the referral that, there are some items that the Preservation Commission allows or delegates staff to approve COAs, for those items the referral was intended that those items will not come before the Preservation Commission for recommendation of the zoning variance, or the fence variance, because the Commission will not normally see those items as within the Rules and Procedures have delegated staff the ability to issue COAs. For example for a patio or paving area, is something that staff could issue a COA, but that patio would increase the lot coverage from 28% to 31%, it would require a variance. The intent of the referral was that, instead of that coming before preservation, only for recommendation on the variation, where normally will not, just for the work itself, that that instead will not come before preservation.

Staff will have the ability to incorporate staff’s view point, in any kind of variation that will go before, either the Zoning Administrator, or the Zoning Board of Appeals. The way the Zoning Ordinance is worded, fence variation is the only item separate and distinct type of variation within the Zoning Ordinance. Fences are items in the rules that staff has the
ability to issue COAs for. So, the substantive change is to delineate certain types of variations, and not include fences on those types of variations that will be referred to the Preservation Commission for recommendation, and additionally, items that are excluded from the recommendation from the Preservation Commission are items that are approved by staff, as set forth in the Preservation Ordinance and the Commission’s Rules and Procedures.

Chair Williams asked if staff will have the prerogative to refer to the Preservation Commission, if they feel is necessary. Scott Mangum said yes, whatever is covered in the rules. This is a staff report, which will be discussed at the Plan Commission tomorrow evening.

The Commission did not offer any feedback for the Plan Commission.

Miscellaneous:
Chair Williams announced that the Landmarks Illinois annual meeting is on June 25, 2018.

Also, when Governor Rauner signed the State Budget, as part of that, there is now a State Historic Tax Credit. This is great news. Based on the criteria there are some opportunities for Evanston and the State.

8. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

No discussion

9. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Simon made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 pm, seconded by Commissioner Schmitt. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, September 11, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)