1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

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

Chair Simon referred to New Business item 828 Colfax St. for administrative approval due to the minor nature of the work.

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 2767 Euclid Park Pl. (L) – Jeffrey K. Ross, applicant. Replace existing cedar shake roofing material with synthetic/composite shingles from Enviroshingle, 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 6/11/2019).

Jeff Ross presented the application to replace the existing wood cedar roof with a composite roofing material. He showed pictures of homes with roofs of the synthetic material, with increased exposure of the material over the eaves. A second mock up on the back of the roof was done.

Commission’s findings
Chair Simon asked the cost estimate for the cedar roof. J. Ross said the cost is $244,000. The proposed synthetic material would have 15 courses, adding another $75,000, the special order for the color black is $9,000 and it comes with a 50 year
warrant. The cedar roof is not a cost effective solution. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} mock up has the 15 courses.

Commissioner Itle asked about the warranty for the composite shingle. J Ross said 50 years is the warranty for the material and 10 years for the labor. The manufacturer’s warranty on the cedar shingles is voided if stained. Commissioner Sullivan said that the typical method is dipping the shingles for UV protection.

Commissioner Hacker said that the synthetic material will not look like the cedar shake. Aside from the upkeep cost, this is a landmark where the cedar roof is the main feature of the landmark. Commissioner Sullivan said she was hoping that the synthetic product would replicate the wood shake roof. The synthetic material does not replicate enough the wood cedar to warrant it.

Chair Simon made motion to approve the replacement of the existing cedar shake roofing material with synthetic composite shingles from Enviro Shingle, using the 15 stacking pattern, in accordance with applicable standards for alteration 1-6, 9 and 10, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion failed. Vote: 0 ayes, 5 nays, 2 abstentions (Dudnik and Schmitt).


Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to continue 2390 Orrington Ave. to the August 6, 2019 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

\textbf{C. 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] (Continued from 6/11/2019) \textbf{To be continued to 8/6/2019}; and

\textbf{D. 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] (Continued from 6/11/2019) To be continued to 8/6/2019

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to continue 2404 Ridge Ave. to the August 6, 2019 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 7 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] (Continued from 6/11/2019)

Holly Briggeman presented the application. The house was built in 1873 and put in the National Register in the 1980s. The design goals were to create an informal open kitchen and living space in the back and get an indoor and outdoor feel in the back volume of the house. The home owners are interested in a mix of contemporary and original features.

The ceiling heights in the back volume are lower, and to connect the back with the outdoors, the floor in the entire back volume of the house is being lowered. The front volume remains as is, with the exception of restoring a covered transom at the front door, and replacing a wood deck staircase in the back in stone and a metal rail.

In the rear, the roof volume of the original house is being added with a perpendicular volume, going on the north-south direction, and removing the screened-in porch. At this time H. Briggeman showed the existing and proposed elevations with the rear addition on all sides.

Commission’s findings
Commissioner Ittle asked about the materials and configuration on either side on the south elevation, with the new projecting wing and the glazed wall. H. Briggeman said they are pricing a steel window and aluminum frame window that is meant to look like the steel frame windows. The recessed new construction between the original home and the addition incorporates the new stair that goes from the basement to the second floor, and siding on the addition to match the front. The trellis materials are undetermined, probably metal and painted. There is a steel trellis on the south elevation and a small glass area, the mudroom.

Commissioner Dudnik asked what is the roof material proposed for the mudroom on the west elevation. H. Briggeman said it is a glass roof. Commissioner Dudnik asked what generated the glass curtain wall. H. Briggeman said the addition is a hybrid, a transition between the existing and the new.

Commissioner Reinhold said that the introduction of glass on the roof does not keep with standard 7 regarding relationship of materials and texture to the existing structure.
Commissioner Sullivan thought that the design expressed the Secretary of Interiors Standards, where it complements the front and historic volume. The void and the addition complement the historic structure.

Commissioner Hacker thought that the openings on the back and the glass box are not in keeping with standard 3 regarding the proportion of the openings, which change dramatically. Commissioner Dudnik added concern as to standard 4 regarding the rhythm of solids to voids in front facades and the way openings are handled. The west rear elevation is completely lost in regard to the proportion of openings. The cross volume is not the issue. The rear west addition is no longer respecting the east side of the house. He was not convinced that the glass stair tower is the way of differentiating front and back; it could also be done with a recess.

Chair Simon said that he liked the innovative elements of the addition. However, the south façade, of the new addition is simplified so much that it lost the feeling of being related to the front of the house.

Jeff Cohen, owner, said that the key to make the expansion tasteful, small and modern is the void between the two spaces. The main view of the house is almost unchanged. The void can’t be seen from the front.

Commissioner Reinhold said her concerns were the materials and proportions related to the west, the glass projection, the glass railings and proportions could be refined to reflect the relationship to the other portion of the addition. Carry the relationship of proportions even if the materials change.

Kim Cohen, owner, said she wanted a more modern design and being more innovative. Commissioner Reinhold said that standard 14 allows for innovative design on the back. The design incorporates elements into a volume that is similar to the house. She would like to see a more refined design on the innovative or the traditional approach. As is standards 3, 4, and 7 are not met.

Chair Simon said the project could be approved, it’s really making refinements to better integrate the rear addition with the rest of the home.

Commissioner Sullivan asked the dimensions of the small volume in the back. H. Briggeman said it is 4' x 9', and that the south trellis patio is the back entry.

Commissioner Hacker said one can be innovative, but it is the degree to which is transformed; somehow it is so different from the house. The innovative standard is just one among the 17 standards.

Commissioner Itle said innovative designs can work if there is a clear demarcation between what it is the historic, original and traditional design piece, and what is the innovative piece. Currently, it is a mishmash of both traditional and innovative.
Commissioners Dudnik discussed the addition’s windows size, trim, crowns and style, where they seemed to be inconsistent with the intent of innovation and compatibility.

Commissioner Sullivan moved to continue 1514 Judson Av. to the August 6, 2019 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 7 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 -16] (Continued from 6/11/2019) To be continued to 8/6/2019

At the request of the applicants Commissioner Hacker made a motion to continue 1229 Judson Ave. to August 6, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays seconded 7 ayes

G. 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] (Continued from 6/11/2019)

Lara Biggs presented the application. The existing stairs at the N/S of Ridge and E/W of Greenwood intersections are not ADA compliant. The project is for constructing ADA compliant ramps with retaining wall to match the existing Indiana limestone on the west side of Ridge Ave. The N/W corner slope is steeper than the slope on the S/W corner. To install the proper slopes 2-3 trees will be removed. Three trees of different species will be planted.

At the June meeting the Commission requested a rendering of the retaining wall on the north and south side of Ridge, at the northwest corner along Greenwood and Ridge, and the southwest corner on Greenwood and Ridge. Another concern was how to terminate the wall when it comes into the sidewalk. There is a slight slope down to the sidewalk, at a 90 degree angle in a short vertical wall.

Commissioner Hacker asked about the safety of crossing the street and crosswalks. L. Biggs said the historic district is older in its character. The issue is the stairs, which are impossible to navigate. It is the legal responsibility of the City to make them ADA compliant with minimal improvement and not expanding the scope.

Commissioner Dudnik asked what the overall rise of the ramp is. Chris Venetta, Senior Project Manager said it is 10’ and a two landings every 30’. The ADA guidelines for curb
ramps omit landings, railings and other treatments for ramps; it just has the slope requirements.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion for advisory approval for the project at Ridge and Greenwood for ADA improvements in accordance to standards for alteration 1-10, and 1-6 for demolition, seconded by Commissioner Ittte. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 241 Sheridan Sq. - Garden Park (LSHD) – Advisory Review to City Council - Stephanie Levine, applicant. Garden Park renovation, playground equipment improvements. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Lara Biggs presented the application for the renovation of Garden Park bordering Sheridan Sq. and just north of South Blvd. Beach. The project is the whole park rehabilitation including the playground equipment. The existing old playground is primarily made out of wood and is being replaced with a different playground equipment. They had three public meetings with the neighbors, and the Parks and Recreation Board. The playground equipment is moving to the north. It is a natural style playground (mounds with rubberized surface material in natural and an interactive playground with boulders and tree stumps)

Jeff Rauch, 576 Sheridan Sq. said that most neighbors were not notified. He said the 241 Sheridan Sq. would be the beach address. Carlos Ruiz said that the City staff uses a program to notify neighbors within 250 feet of the closest intersection. J. Rauch asked what is the historic preservation of a park? C. Ruiz said the Commission has advisory review to the City Council. The Commission is not designing the park itself.

Lara Biggs said that Mr. Rauch attended all public meetings. J. Rauch said he could not represent what neighbors would say. Perhaps the Commission could delay its participation to send out a better notification. Chair Simon said the Commission’s role is minimal. What kind of playground equipment is not a Preservation issue. The role of the Commission is to determine if the project would in any way violate the Preservation Ordinance. The project virtually has nothing to do with the Ordinance, so the Commission’s advice would be that the Commission does not have any objection to the playground.

Commissioner Dudnik said the playground happens to fall within a historic district, and that based on the standards of alteration 1-10. Is the construction of the mound and playground disturbing the environment? J. Rauch said the only issue for him would be the grading of the lookout hill.

Carlos Ruiz said he received a call from a resident asking about the playground and wondering if she should attend the meeting. C. Ruiz told the resident that she could attend the meeting.
Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to issue an advisory approval/review to City Council for the project at 241 Sheridan Sq. the Garden Park for the renovation and alteration for the playground equipment improvements and that the alteration standards 1-10 apply, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

B. 1741 Hinman Ave. (LSHD) – Peter Giangreco, applicant. Installation of (12) roof mounted solar panels on rear of detached garage. Only visible from alley to the east. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Peter Giangreco presented the application. He bought of the house in 2007. The big change from the previous owner was in the rear, where there was an underground garage, that was filled in and a porch was built. About 15 years ago the previous owner built a 3-car garage. On top of the garage P. Giangreco proposed to put in 12 Tesla solar panels that only face the alley; they are not visible from the street or the house.

Commission’s findings
Commissioner Dudnik asked if the panels are photovoltaic generating electricity. P. Giangreco said yes. He would charge his Tesla electric car. Commissioner Reinhold asked about the reflectivity of the panels. P. Giangreco said he is not qualified to answer the question.

Commissioner Ittle made a motion to issue a COA for the project at 1741 Hinman Ave. for the installation of 12 solar panels on the roof of the rear of detached garage; applicable standards for alteration are 1-10, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

C. 429 Lee St (LSHD) – Kindon Mills, applicant. Remove existing concrete stoop on the front façade and construct a front entry stair and porch to match the existing rear (original) porch and overhang, matching parapet detail, large scale brackets, siding, and water table. Materials to be matched to the original of the house-cedar siding, wood brackets, tongue and groove decking. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Kindon Mills and John Holbert presented the application. K. Mills said that the front stairs are deteriorated. They took cues from the existing house, such as the deep overhangs and framed parapet walls. Continuing the existing house design the expanded entry has a deep shed roof, matching the double brackets, as well as the 5’ deep porch in reference to the back porch of the house. Also, the side elevations have the same shed roof.

Commission’s Findings
Commissioner Dudnik said that the project has elegant solutions and picks up on how to handle an addition. Commissioner Hacker said the project is innovative, yet meets the standards of alteration.
Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to issue a COA for 429 Lee St. for the removal of the existing concrete stoop on the front façade and construct a front entry stair and porch to match the existing rear porch and match other details of the building, using materials that match the existing siding. Applicable standards 1-10 for alteration apply, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

D. 2401 Lawndale Ave. (L) – Colon S. McLean, applicant. Replace the front porch 1950’s non-original windows (currently broken and drafty) with Marvin clad wood casement windows. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Colon McLean presented the application. He bought the house in 2008 and added a master bedroom in 2010. The application is for the replacement of the east and south facing windows; in what it was originally a screened porch. In the 1950s it was enclosed to a sun room. The windows are cracked; the transoms at the top are fixed and single pane windows. The replacement windows are thermo-pane Marvin wood clad windows that will keep the transoms at the same place at the top, and keep that line that runs across, beneath the transom in the same place across both sides of the windows. The new windows are casement style windows that would be more reminiscent of what one can see in the turret on either side of the leaded glass in the middle and the bay window at the top.

Commissioner's findings
Commissioner Hacker asked if the new casement windows are divided. C. McLean said the Marvin clad windows are not divided, but the casements in the turret are divided. Commissioner Itle said the casement windows without divided lights are fine, it would read the way it is, a screened porch that got enclosed.

Commissioner Dudnik asked if the height of the casements is the same. C. McLean said the heights are the same.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to issue a COA for 2401 Lawndale Ave. for the replacement of the front porch non-original windows with Marvin aluminum clad wood casement windows. Applicable standards of alteration 1-10; seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

E. 1015 Michigan Ave. (LSHD) – William J. McKenna, applicant. Replace 14 wood casement windows from 2nd floor bay facing west (front) south (side) and east (rear), with Fibrex casement windows to match existing casements. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10] To be continued to 8/6/2019

At the request of the applicant Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to continue 1015 Michigan Ave. to August 6, 2019, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

F. 828 Colfax St. (NEHD) – Thomas M. Conroy, applicant. Changes to exterior window openings on the west and south walls. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]
This application was transmitted earlier to City staff for administrative approval.

G. 1206 Hinman Ave. (LSHD) – Paul Lang, applicant. All four elevations affected. 1st floor: Replace kitchen windows, enlarge dining window and replace butler’s pantry window. 2ndFloor: Replace 17 windows, remove 4 smaller windows and add picture window. Window openings created from moving windows will be patched to match stucco and brick mold. Replace door on rear west elevation. Install 8’ H fence along west alley, 6’ H fence along the south side yard property line and a 6’ H fence on the interior north yard. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]

Paul Lang presented the application. P. Lang said the application is for a new set of windows affecting both the first and second floor; as well as a new fence and the replacement of a rear exterior door. The house was moved in the late 19th Century and in the early 20th Century it had an addition. The original house was a Greek Revival with white siding. The enclosed porch was an open porch.

East elevation, 2nd floor, the window on left is moved to be symmetric about its center. The original house entrance was on the left side of the house. The window was centered over the door at that time. Currently, the entrance has been moved towards the north. In keeping the symmetry of the Greek Revival the proposal is to move that window.

On the west elevation or rear of home, replace a door with half simulated light fiber glass door on the rear of the home, remove attic window, patch with stucco in kind.

The windows on the west elevation are moved higher to keep them at a consistent height throughout the house. The windows at the rear of the home drop. The proposal is to moving the windows up the elevation to be leveled across. North elevation, two windows in the top to be moved higher. Expand the window to the furthest right in a dining nook. Also, remove 4 small windows and install a picture window. The existing windows do not have grills. Some windows have a grid pattern.

Commission’s findings
Chair Simon asked how old are the windows being replaced? P. Lang said he was not sure. The wood windows are fragile and don’t have covered headers. Commissioner Reinhold asked about the fence. P. Lang said the fence at the rear is 8’ high adjacent to commercial property, then a 6’ high fence along the south side of the home and a 4’ high fence on the north, in red cedar.

Commissioner Itle said that thinking about how the house evolved historically, so it did start as a Greek Revival house. It was transformed in 1910 by this almost Prairie style wrap around porch. Presumably the windows were replaced with the 1/1 windows. That transformation as indicated in the survey is significant on its own right. This means that the applicant should not necessarily think going back to the Greek Revival style. Instead embrace the kind of hybrid house. Because of that he would not put in divided muntin
grills in the new windows. He would match what exists with the 1/1. He would not like to see changing the position of the windows horizontally. He needs to be persuaded about changing the height of the windows. He would like to see the application come back, be revised and resubmitted. He would not recommend going back to the Greek Revival with the proposed windows.

Chairman Simon said that alterations could acquire their own significance, and that changing the house to the 19th Century appearance seemed contrary to what the Ordinance requires. P. Lang said he struggled with the placement of the window with the design of the Greek Revival Style. Not only the Initial photo, but doing the interior renovation, one can see the old wood siding. Perhaps this is the opportunity to restore the home back to the bones of it, would be a possibility. The original home has 10 foot ceilings, the addition has 8 foot ceilings.

Commissioner Reinhold said that she does not take issue with the application; she thought there is enough information to issue a COA. Commissioner Hacker said the house was transformed not consistently. It is hard to say that the new windows be undivided windows. She did not think that the divided windows should come back. Commissioner Dudnik was not sure about some changes such as relocating the window to make symmetrical, when it wasn’t. He thought the window alterations were extreme.

Paul Lang said he struggled with the front elevation window. The door is out of the way the front of the house. Moving the rear windows is moving up in elevation. Commissioner Sullivan agreed that the alterations acquired their own significance.

Commissioner Reinhold made a motion to issue a COA for 1206 Hinman Ave. for the replacement of the kitchen windows, enlarge dining window and replacement of the pantry window. Replacement of 17 windows, remove 4 smaller windows and adding a picture window. Window openings created from moving windows will be patched to match stucco and brick mold. Replace door on rear west elevation. Install 8’ H fence along west alley, 6’ H fence along the south side yard property line and a 6’ H fence on the interior north yard. Applicable standards include alteration 1-10, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed. Vote: 5 ayes, 2 nays (Itle and Sullivan).


Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to approve the June 11, 2019 meeting minutes subject to any corrections, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan. The motion passed. Vote: 5 ayes, 2 abstentions (Schmitt and Reinhold).

5. **STAFF REPORTS**

   A. **Heritage Tree Ordinance** – Adoption of the Preservation Commission position regarding a Heritage Tree Ordinance.
Chair Simon said that the Commission had approved a statement to the City Council on the Heritage Tree Ordinance. Last time it was circulated he thought the Commission had already approved it. Nobody objected to the exact word. Carlos Ruiz said at the June meeting it was an item for discussion. Chair Simon agreed to write the statement on behalf of the Commission. The Commission did not approve then the statement, because it was only a discussion. Now the Commission has received the Chair’s written statement. He received one comment from Commissioner Jamie Morris.

Scott Mangum said the Commission is not really being asked to make a recommendation on the Heritage Tree Ordinance, only to give the Commission’s thoughts. So those are encapsulated on what we have. This will go on to the Planning and Development Committee of the City Council, it will be discussed further, as far as tree preservation and potential for new ordinance or changes existing ordinance. Tentatively that is scheduled for August 12, 2019. Staff will include those materials.

Commissioner Dudnik said often it is the impact of removing the trees on the neighbor’s properties that is an issue for the Commission. Often the Commission has gotten more objections from that side. He wondered if the Commission should clarify that point (in the middle of the statement’s second paragraph). Chair Simon said he could send with a parenthetical in it.

Public Comment
Leslie Shad of 1110 Judson Ave. said she co-leads Natural Habitat Evanston. He posed the question: imagine a historic district without old trees; it would be a huge loss. Even worst imagine a climate changed world where we lose the tree benefits of cooling our homes and streets, filtering our air, and water and quieting noise. That is what the Climate Action Plan of the City cares about trees. Five Oak and Elm trees were coming down in June, not including the two from 2390 Orrington. In addition four other trees age 70 to 90 years old are slated to come for multi-family rentals, expanding a garage office and splitting a house into townhouses. Some of these were before the Commission. We are losing big trees now.

Trees are an important part of our history. The COA refers to landscape, and trees are landscaping. Major changes include significant changes in landscaping features. Our history includes the oldest things in Evanston. It is the Commission’s mandate to preserve the character and culture of Evanston. The Historic Preservation Ordinance should be modified to explicitly adjust trees and historic landscaping. The idea that the Historic Commission approval would take out the oldest things in Evanston for a new construction or addition is just extremely problematic.

Chair Simon said the City of Evanston has a tree ordinance that the City Council passed. The City Council decided that lots of under 2 acres are not subject to the tree ordinance. The Commission’s recommendation is that the City Council reassesses that, and that there be public comment and discussion on that, because the Commission realizes that it’s not that protective.
B. Amending the Rules and Procedures – Amending Article 5. Certificate of Appropriateness List, Line 54: Solar Panels, Green Roofs, Wind Power Generators, and other technologies from “Major Work (Commission) to Minor Work (Staff) or Major Work (Commission). Also adding text to set the number of times an item could be continued without the need of a new notice.

Chair Simon said that all solar panels projects require Commission’s approval; there is no ability to staff to approve it administratively. We could simply have those solar panels and other green roofs technologies could either be major work (Preservation Commission) or minor work (staff).

Commissioner Dudnik asked who decides a project is minor or major. Carlos Ruiz said that if a project could be decided by staff or the Commission, and when in doubt, he would consult with the Commission’s Chair whether the project could be approved administratively of needs the Commission’s approval. Such would be the case of 1741 Hinman at this meeting. Commissioner Hacker said if the solar panel is not visible from the street, that staff would still take a conservative approach. Commissioner Dudnik said that wind power generators and the like are perhaps more visible as objects. C. Ruiz said he included in tonight’s packet the National Park Service take on solar panels; they have numerous examples on how it can be done.

Chair Simon said the process itself could be burdensome, and in the case of a rear façade that may be well for administrative approval. Commissioner Dudnik said that the citizen who spoke last meeting did not want more obstacles to the process. Chair Simon said solar panels not visible from the street could be approved administratively.

Turbines, wind power generators, and the like should be considered in a separate category from solar panels and green roofs. If solar panels are visible from the main public way, then they should come to the Commission for review. Scott Mangum said that changes to the Rules and Procedures come to the Commission first in a written form and then the Commission takes action on the changes to the rules at the next meeting.

Carlos Ruiz said a second amendment to the Rules is the number of times a project can return to the Commission without notice (Article Four). The idea is when there is an item continued without presentation by the applicant, that that should only occur two times, and after that it should be re-noticed.

Commissioner Dudnik asked about how close to a meeting an applicant could withdraw an application? It is often a hardship to neighbors or those either opposed or in favor of an application when the applicant withdraws five hours before a meeting. C. Ruiz said currently there are no provisions to address the issue.

Commissioner Hacker said line 55 ‘fountains and landscape features’ is only minor work. It should be major work and come to the Commission.
C. Design Guidelines - Update

Carlos Ruiz said he has placed a request with IT to work on the Design Guidelines to be placed on the Preservation Commission.

6. DISCUSSION (No vote will be taken)

Chair Simon asked about the special meeting on July 23, 2019. Carlos Ruiz said that at least seven Commissioners could attend the July 23, 2019 special meeting. The main item is 1215 Church St. the YWCA application to demolish the existing house and a planned development to build a new facility north of where the house currently is. That is not in the historic district. Adding a new entrance for the complex would be in the historic district.

A second item is a City project for improvements on Main St. a portion of which is in a historic district.

A. 2019 Preservation and Design Awards

Carlos Ruiz announced the Preservation and Design Awards reception on Thursday, July 11 at 6:30 pm.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:07 pm on July 9, 2919, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully Submitted:

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, August 6, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)