MEETING MINUTES
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, June 11, 2019
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Jamie Morris, Julie Hacker, Mark Simon, and Aleca Sullivan

Members Absent: Ken Itle, Sally Riessen Hunt, Suzi Reinhold, Tim Schmitt, and Karl Vogel

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

Presiding Member: Mark Simon, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Simon called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm with a quorum of six Commissioners present.

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 2767 Euclid Park Pl. (L) – Jeffrey K. Ross, applicant. Replace existing cedar shake roofing material with synthetic/composite shingles from Enviroshtingle, to match the appearance of the current roof as much as possible, including wave patterns, color and non-eave shingle exposure. Also, lengthen the exposure of the curved eave shingles to improve the longevity of the roof. Applicable Standards: [Alteration 1-6, 9 and 10] (Continued from 5/14/2019).

Jeffrey Ross had requested to continue his application to July 9, 2019. Carlos Ruiz said that Mr. Ross informed him that Commissioners could visit the site to see the mockup of the synthetic roof. Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to continue 2767 Euclid Park Pl. to the July 9, 2019 Preservation Commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

B. 1032 Forest Ave. (LSHD) – John Eifler, applicant. Construct a single family home with a detached 2-car garage on existing vacant lot at 1032 Forest Avenue. Applicable Standards: [Construction 1-11, 13, 14 and 16] (Continued from 5/14/2019)
Chair Simon said that the applicant for 1032 Forest Ave. withdrew the application.

C. 1629-1631 Hinman Av. (L) – Jean Petrick, applicant. Adding 3rd story open covered front porch Applicable Standards: [Construction 1, 2, 4- 8, 10-12, 14 and 15] (Continued from 5/14/2019)

Mr. Sang-Yu-Lee, owner, presented the application. Mr. Lee said the revised proposal is an open balcony with balusters to match the existing and large square posts that are lined above the existing two-story columns, and a new railing and new flooring.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Hacker asked for a section drawing showing that the cornice will remain, that the rail will match that of the newspaper picture and that the roof below will support the new balcony. Mr. Lee said the architect wrote that the view of the cornice would not be obstructed. The post and rail will match the original intention in the newspaper sketch (handed out at the meeting) - all the materials will match the existing scale and the proportions. The existing structure is sufficient to hold the flooring and a railing.

Commissioner Bady made a motion to issue a COA for 1629-1631 Hinman Av., adding a 3-story open porch (balcony), provided that there is a detail drawing of the profile of the cornice and the railing on the top (staff to review), applicable standards for construction 1, 2, 4- 8, 10-12, 14 and 15 are met, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.


Per the applicant’s request, Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to continue 2390 Orrington Ave. to the July 9, 2019 Preservation Commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2404 Ridge Ave. (L) – Chris Sweitzer, applicant. Post approval alterations: 1) North Side of Barn: Existing conditions, no changes or alterations. 2) East Side of Barn: far left door replacement was in approved plans but not completed. Approved plans include addition of six skylights. Three skylights were removed from West side of Barn for symmetry and balance and added to East side of barn. Thus, there are three less skylights existing than in original plans. No other changes. 3) South Side of Barn: one less window was installed and is existing than in original plans. Existing window larger than originally approved plans. 4) West Side of Barn: 3 skylights were removed and added to East Side of barn for symmetry and balance. Second floor no change, all windows existing as original plans. First floor minor changes to window positions and added window to left of exit door. Applicable standards [Alteration: 1-10]; and
B. 2404 Ridge Ave. (L) - Advisory review on proposed subdivision - Chris Sweitzer, applicant. The proposed subdivision includes the division of 1 lot into 2 lots. The proposed lot #1 will include the existing principal and secondary structures. The proposed lot #2 is existing vacant land. Thus, the landmark structures are preserved and will remain as a part of their own parcel, and not adversely affected. Applicable standards [2-8-12 (B) 1 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and 2]

At the request of the applicant Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue 2404 Ridge Ave. (both proposals) until next (EPC) meeting, July 9, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Morris. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

C. Ridge Ave and Greenwood St. ADA Improvements (RHD) – Advisory Review to City Council - Lara Biggs, applicant. Removing the sidewalk stairs on the west side of the Ridge and Greenwood intersection in order to make the intersection fully ADA compliant. This will require removing the existing retaining walls north and south of the intersection and construct new retaining walls. Also removing 2 trees on the north side of Greenwood in order to lower the sidewalk to meet the ADA slope requirements. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10; Demolition 1-6]

Lara Biggs, Bureau Chief - Capital Planning/City Engineer presented the application as follows:

- The work is on the west side of the intersection of Ridge Ave. and Greenwood St. (northwest and southwest corner of the intersection). Both corners have stairs onto Ridge Ave. and Greenwood St.
- Removing the stairs and replace them with appropriate ADA ramps. Then matching the sidewalks back into the existing slopes as they go away from the intersection.
- The sidewalk on Greenwood St. back from Ridge Ave. on the north side will be replaced approximately 90 feet back from the intersection.
- The parkway and sidewalk will be lowered in a gradual slope.
- Along Ridge Ave. and Greenwood St. retaining walls will be constructed, lowering the sidewalks and putting in the ramps. The new walls will match the existing Indiana limestone wall.
- Two trees will be removed (hybrid Elm trees) along Greenwood St. and replaced with hybrid Elm trees in approximately the same location.
- At the end of the ramps, the keystone landing will be lower than the current sidewalk.

Commission's Findings
Chair Simon asked if there is another forum to discuss citizens' concerns about safety. L. Biggs said she received comments from two citizens. She responded to one citizen who asked to flatten the slope. The second person was concerned about the design, that the proposal is not as safe as the existing stairs, and also about the removal of the trees. Regarding safety, L. Biggs said the City of Evanston has made over the years a
substantial effort to be ADA compliant in sidewalk projects. There will be more opportunities for citizens to express their concerns or they can contact her.

Commissioner Dudnik said the 1:12 slope will need railings, that the City no longer was planting the hybrid Elm trees. L. Biggs said that Paul D’Agostino, the City’s forester recommended the hybrid Elm tree. Regarding ADA on public sidewalks, the ADA is not clear; they are relying in IDOT standards for sidewalks.

Commissioner Sullivan asked how the limestone wall will be finished. L. Biggs said the wall will have truncated edge with some slope.

Public Comments:
Janet Gayes of 1207 Greenwood St. said she has a family member who uses a wheelchair. Her concerns are about ADA accessibility and safety.

Garry Shumaker wondered about the continuity of the limestone wall and what happens to the curb on the outside. He also said that there is no crosswalk at the intersection. L. Biggs said the corner retaining wall will be removed. That area will be at street height and with a new sidewalk. There is no plan to install a crosswalk.

Commissioner Hacker asked for the design of the retaining wall. L. Gibbs said Indiana limestone is readily available, the design detail (sketch/rendering) of the retaining wall will be provided. Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue the Ridge Ave. and Greenwood St. ADA improvements to the July 9, 2019 Preservation commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Morris seconded the motion. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

D. 1418 Judson Ave. (LSHD) – Susan Bedard, applicant. Removal of existing 2-story rear portion of house and construction of a new 2-story addition in its place. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; Demolition 1-6]

Susan Bedard, architect presented the project as follows:

- The 1888 house was added on at least four times. The 2-story 1950s add-ons will be demolished.
- The house is home to the City’s largest Oak tree (18 feet in circumference at the base). The tree will remain.
- The new addition uses the existing foundation to stay away from the Oak tree.
- The addition has vertical form, consistent with the Victorian houses.
- Windows are wood and double hung, comparable to the existing windows.
- The overall height is below the highest peak of the existing roof. The roof pitch is 12 and 12, same as the two gables at the front of the house. The side facing gables are 8 and 12.
- The existing siding is aluminum siding. The new siding is hardie board lap siding and a matching exposure on the aluminum. The original details such as the crown moldings over the windows and the crowns at the eaves are being reproduced.
- The side elevations are not visible from the street or the alley.
- The rear deck on the elevations is not part of the project. The landscapers will apply for the COA for the rear deck.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Hacker asked about the Oak tree roots. S. Bedard said the arborist is confident that with hand digging and careful root pruning, they can do a small amount of new foundation. Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 1418 Judson Ave. for the removal of portions of the rear of house and construction of a new 2-story addition, and the extension of the home. The applicable standards of construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15 and demolition 1-6 apply, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

E. 1514 Judson Ave. (L/LSHD) – Holly Briggeman, applicant. Renovate and add on to the existing rear volume of the house in order to enlarge the master suite, and add a family room off the kitchen. The project also includes the addition of a rear stair and a finished walkout basement. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; Demolition 1-6]

At the request of the applicant Commissioner Bady made a motion to continue 1514 Judson Ave. until the July 9, 2019 Preservation Commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Morris. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

F. 1229 Judson Ave. (LSHD) – Ben Myszkowski, applicant. Build a new 22'x22' detached garage in place of existing 20'x21' garage. The new garage will have a gable roof, with 6” overhangs, asphalt shingle roof, 4” Georgia Pacific vinyl siding, and 3 single-hung windows. Applicable standards: [Construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14 and 16; demolition 1-6]

Ben and Carolyn Myszkowski, owners, presented the application as follows:
- The existing garage is structurally unsound.
- The proposed 2-car garage exterior is vinyl siding to match the color of the house.
- Lighting fixtures will be placed on either side of the new garage door.
- The north side has two windows and the west side has one window and a man door. The windows are vinyl.
- The house exterior is stucco.
- The height and the massing of the new garage are similar to the existing garage.

Commission’s Findings:
Commissioner Hacker asked if the applicants thought about matching the stucco of the existing house and using material in keeping with the existing house. C. Myszkowski said the existing garage is not stucco, it’s siding. Commissioner Dudnik wondered if there was any detailing from the house on the new garage., C. Myszkowski said this is their third major project on the house; they don’t take lightly vinyl siding and vinyl windows. They have restored several of the wood windows on the house.
Ben Myszkowski said in the application that the windows are checked as wood. Commissioner Dudnik said that he would have preferred wood windows and hardie board, rather than vinyl. B. Myszkowski said the hardie board was an additional 34% more than the overall project.

Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve a COA for 1229 Judson Ave. to build a new detached garage as described above. Applicable standards for construction 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14 and 16; demolition 1-6 apply, seconded by Chair Simon. The motion failed. Vote: 1 aye (Bady), 4 nays (Dudnik, Hacker, Morris, and Sullivan), 1 abstention (Simon).

Commissioner Hacker suggested making an effort to have the designer look at the materials and any of the detailing. Commissioner Dudnik said the garage company has built garages that took some clues from the house. He thought that is more than the material. Chair Simon said that on the whole, the proposed garage does not look consistent with the house.

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to continue the project for a new detached garage at 1229 Judson Ave to be heard on July 9, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

G. 715 Sheridan Rd. (L/LSHD) – Garry Shumaker, applicant. Construct a 2-story addition along the north end of the structure with matching masonry, ceramic roof tiles, limestone caps and cornices and Marvin Ultimate casement and DH units to match the main structure. The 2nd level of the east facing portion of the north addition is constructed with Marvin Ultimate French doors and fixed units, wood trim, brackets, outriggers, and rafter tails. Also, replacement of non-original double hung “inserts” with Marvin Ultimate DH and casement windows. Restoration of leaded glass panels. Also, minor resizing of existing openings on the 1st level to the north on the main West elevation. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10; Construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; Demolition 1-6]

Garry Shumaker presented the application as follows:
- A 2-story addition at the north end of the existing 1910 structure.
- The existing sleeping porch will be demolished. The addition extends that porch about 2-feet to meet the property line.
- The house to the north is built on the property line, obscuring the north elevation of the house.
- The 2-story addition with a gable roof replicates the masonry, cornice work and chimney from the main house. The existing brick will be salvaged and used for the street and visible sides. Newer brick will be at the back of the addition.
- Replace all the existing windows on the main body of the house; including the Marvin windows on past additions with aluminum clad Marvin landmark Ultimate series in a bone white color.
The original stained glass windows frame sashes have failed; the plan is to church glaze those windows, fully restore and installed behind thermo-pane glass.

- No change to the south end of the house.
- All the addition’s flying rafter tails, copper gutters, and ceramic tile roof will be replicated in kind.

**Commission’s findings**
Commissioner Dudnik asked about the east elevation 3rd story half-timber on the center bay. G. Shumaker said it is a glass conservatory. However, the east elevation is not visible from the public way.

Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve a COA for 715 Sheridan Rd. as described above. Applicable standards for alteration 1-10; construction 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-15; and demolition 1-6, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

**H. 730 Sheridan Rd. (LSHD) - Garry Shumaker, applicant.** Partial enclosure of existing covered porch visible from the public way including new entry door, (2) new windows, and a new wood siding. Replacement of rear entry door, and sliding patio door visible from the public way. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Garry Shumaker presented the application as follows:

- Enclosing 2/3 of the existing open porch on the front elevation and create a new front entry door. The new door is solid and stained with a glass sidelight
- The side of the existing porch will be painted shiplap siding with a 3/8-inch reveal that comes along the side and returns around the front. There is a small overhang with half round gutters providing a weather break.
- On the rear of the house the existing full glass door and sliding doors will be replaced in kind.
- The same window and door Pella Architect series will be used on the back of the house. An inside window is being replaced to match the sidelight with a full height casement window.
- The two double hung windows on the house will remain.

**Commission's Findings**
No discussion or public comment. Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 730 Sheridan Rd. for the project as described above. The applicable standards are for alteration 1-10, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of May 14, 2019.**

Commissioner Bady made a motion to approve the May 14, 2019 meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Hacker. The motion passed. Vote: 3 ayes, 0 nays, 3 abstentions (Bady, Dudnik and Sullivan).
5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Design Guidelines – Update (discussed later in the meeting)

6. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

The Commission discussed Solar Panels first.


Andy Anderson of 715 Michigan Av. (landmark in the lakeshore HD) addressed the Commission as follows:

- He attended a session explaining the use of solar panels on homes. He asked then if the program was available for landmarks and historic district homes.
- Carlos Ruiz had informed him that solar panels on landmarks or historic district homes require a presentation to the Commission.
- Changing the roofing material could be reviewed by staff or the Commission depending on the impact, such as change of material.
- 420 Keeney St. (with a flat roof where the roofing material can’t be seen) is the situation where solar panels could be approved by staff.
- The City of Evanston has a goal for citizens to get all electricity from renewable sources. The City adopted a plan to be 100% reliable on renewable energy by 2030.
- As a landmark owner he would like to know how the Commission is going to integrate the preservation of history with the need to have sustainable energy delivery.
- He recommended that authority be given to staff in appropriate circumstances for the installation of solar panels. He recognized that certain situations where solar panels would be inappropriate.
- People should have guidelines on what they can do. Solar panels should be compatible for preservation.

Chair Simon said the Commission could look at if there is some kind of guidelines or distinction to be made for solar panels to be reviewed by staff. A. Anderson said that he is asking that the Commission amend line 55 (of the Rules and Procedures) for staff or Commission review. Preparing a presentation for solar panels could increase the cost $1000. The City is trying to get people to join in a group purchase of solar panels by September 30th. The tax credit of 30% for the cost of the solar panels is going to be reduced from 30% to 28% on January 1, 2020. This requires quick action from the Commission.

Commissioner Hacker encouraged A. Anderson to submit an application sooner than later. Solar panels are not a simple issue as one may think. She has already met Kumar
Jensen and agreed that the Commission and his office should have a workshop for people who want to learn about the application of solar panels and how overlaps with preservation. Commissioner Dudnik said that the issue is with solar panels that affect adversely roofs and when visible (from the public way).

Carol McCullough of 1120 Elmwood Ave. said her neighbor at 1101 Greenleaf St. was turned down for solar panels. As the owner of a landmark she had to differentiate from the old part of the house to the new part of the house. Solar panels on a historic house are distinguishing from the house. Chair Simon said the Commission has tried hard to approve solar panels because the Commission’s support for sustainable energy.

A. Heritage Tree Ordinances – Discussion on Heritage Tree Programs and Ordinances such as Pasadena, CA; Austin, TX; Menlo Park, CA; Portland, OR.

Chair Simon asked if Commissioners had an opinion regarding a heritage tree ordinance where the Preservation Commission would make determinations with respect to individual trees.

Commissioners Comments:

- Commissioner Hacker: Regarding landscaping, that there may be certain issues that fall under the Commission’s purview; something the Commission would like to protect if it is a landmark. But, she did not know how the Commission would deal with the tree issue or how it would fall within the Commission’s purview.
- Chair Simon: The City arborist and other people with expertise should be making those determinations.
- Commissioner Hacker: Unless there is some historic grove that is going to be cut down, not sure about individual trees.
- Commissioner Dudnik: Regarding a tree ordinance, how does it affect the tree and the community? The issue is trees that affect someone’s house, even if it is not specifically on that someone’s property. The question is when is it a heritage tree?
- Chair Simon: Evanston has a tree ordinance now, as an attempt not to restrict individual homeowners, it does not cover trees on private residential lots (under 2 acres). The City may decide that the existing tree ordinance isn’t strict enough.
- Chair Simon: There is consideration of the possibility that the Preservation Commission will be the party to decide what steps should be taken in respect to individual trees. However, the Commission does not feel that they are the right people to be making decisions on trees. The Commission does not have the expertise to make these decisions.
- Commissioner Hacker: Could not conceive prohibiting additions while attempts are being made to save a tree. There might be areas that should be protected that come up under landscape for preservation. Not sure about protection for individual trees.
- Chair Simon: Alderman Fiske referred this issue to the Preservation Commission because the tree ordinance does not cover private trees on private residential
lots. The Commission as a whole thinks that trees are integral to the character of historic districts. In terms of what restrictions should be placed on residential lots, seems a very political decision affecting homeowners. He thought it is not the Commission’s decision in any way.

Public Comment:
Carol McCullough of 1120 Elmwood Ave, (a landmark) said that two trees over 100 years old were cut to build two townhouses and a 1.5 garage. One of the trees was jointly owned with her property and the lot for development. There are no rules to protect trees.

Additional Comments from Commissioners:
Commissioner Sullivan, said hypothetically, if there was a nomination of a house as a landmark and one of the features of that home was a tree as a significant landscape feature, she did not know how that would come into play.

Commissioner Hacker: How a tree ordinance for residential properties move forward? Scott Mangum said there is a referral from Ald. Fiske to look at a heritage tree ordinance. Staff provided information about several municipalities, the type of ordinances they have, and their definition of heritage trees. The City of Evanston tree ordinance in Title 7 was also included. There is a threshold for when it’s included; right now it’s for subdivisions over two acres or a planned development. One option would be to change that threshold. Tonight, this is a discussion item to take any kind of input from the Preservation Commission. Following tonight’s meeting it will be discussed at the Planning and Development Committee of the City Council. There, they can flush it out further and take the input of this Commission and either make changes to the existing preservation ordinance, for example changing that threshold and making it applicable to more properties, or they could provide direction to come up with another ordinance that would be more specific to designating or landmarking individual trees.

Commissioner Hacker: Could the Commission make a recommendation if agreeable that the Commission is interested in changing the tree ordinance and having them look at properties that were less than two acres?

Chair Simon: Since individual trees are not covered by the preservation ordinance, the Commission would be supportive of the idea that the City assesses: whether the existing tree ordinance should be amended, so as to potentially cover some of these difficult issues. He thought that the Commission could not make specific recommendations beyond a general look at this.

Commissioner Hacker: The Commission then would be looking at, for example, a grove of trees and it is a landscape feature. The Commission would like to protect those as an important landscape feature.

Chair Simon: Regarding who makes decisions as to individual trees, the Commission does not feel that it is a historic preservation matter.
Commissioner Dudnik: It may only be for demolition. For new construction, then a tree may not be applicable, unless the process of putting in the addition or construction wipes out some trees. Currently, that is not one of the criteria for a COA.

Chair Simon: The Commission would not want to decide which trees are heritage trees, because the Commission is not well equipped to have any decision-making authority with respect to specific trees. Designation of heritage trees works like designating a building with a hearing, even against the wishes of the owner. The tree heritage ordinance would remove the exemption for residential lots.

Carol McCullough said the tree heritage ordinance could say that 100 year old trees or older could not be cut in historic districts. Commissioner Hacker thought that would be too general of a statement.

Chair Simon said he would write a statement and ask for comments from all Commissioners.

Leslie Sevcik of 1418 Judson Ave. said that there are construction practices that can help preserve trees such in her situation. Guidelines to preserve trees would be very helpful for people that are choosing whether to take a tree out, or not. There aren’t too many trees that are over 3-stories high and over 300 years old. Any efforts the Commission could do to help people not to take trees out that are significant to the neighbors and historic districts would be great.

Garry Shumaker said it would be a disservice for property owners under two acres to pursue a heritage tree ordinance. The Commission would be over stepping by getting involved in this. Landmarking trees would further debilitating owners the ability to do anything. If the Commission’s recommendation is for, against, or for improvements, it needs to be looked at very carefully. There should be a voice for the best interest of property ownership, economic development, and property owners’ rights.

Arthur Anderson of 715 Michigan said the jurisdiction of the Commission ought to relate to the geographic areas where the Commission has purview. If there is going to be some approach taken to trees it should be something that affects the entire City.

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Design Guidelines - Update

At this time Chair Simon introduced Commissioner Aleca Sullivan. Commissioner Sullivan worked in the past for the National Park Service in their Technical Preservation Services Division, which oversees the federal historic tax credit. She has a master’s degree in historic preservation from Boston University.
Commissioner Hacker reported that Carlos Ruiz has entered the guidelines in the Commission’s web page (work in progress). The guidelines would be accessible online soon. Carlos Ruiz said he needs to make sure that links work. Also will work with IT staff to use the same font and look on the new pages.

Commissioner Hacker regarding the ruling that Lake Michigan or body of water is not a public way said that the Commission can't look at those facades (facing Lake Michigan). It may also happen if there is not an alley and it’s the back façade of a landmark. She spoke to the City’s Assistant Attorney (Hugh DuBose) that a landmark house is more than the front façade, but is the whole house. Hugh DuBose suggested to her that the Commission put language together to address the issue.

Chair Simon suggested studying how other ordinances work, how the national standards apply to this situation. Step back and see what the intent is and how it should work.

Garry Shumaker said if there is not any public right of way and if it is not visible; then it is not the purview of this Commission. The Northwestern University parking garage might have been the case for that decision (Lake Michigan not being a public right of way).

Commissioner Hacker said there are some easements (Landmarks Illinois) which are very restrictive. The Commission would not know if Landmarks Illinois is reviewing a case. Carlos Ruiz said Landmarks Illinois looks at the Commission’s agendas to find out if there are projects under a façade easement.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 pm, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, July 9, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator