



MINUTES
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS
REGULAR MEETING
BLOOMINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT, OSBORN ROOM
305 S EAST STREET, BLOOMINGTON, IL 61701
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2022 5:00 P.M.

The Historic Preservation Commission convened in regular session in-person in the 4th Floor Council Chambers of the Government Center at 5:00 p.m., Thursday, December 15, 2022.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Scharnett.

ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Mr. Paul Scharnett	Chair	Present
Mr. Greg Koos	Vice Chair	Present
Ms. Georgene Chissell	Commissioner	Absent
Ms. Sherry Graehling	Commissioner	Present
Ms. Dawn Peters	Commissioner	Present
Mr. John Elterich	Commissioner	Present
Ms. Kim Miller	Commissioner	Present
Mr. Jon Branham	City Planner	Present
Ms. Alissa Pemberton	Assistant City Planner	Present

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ellen Schroeder Conklin spoke, as the owner of 907 N. McLean, about her interest in installing a wrought iron fence in the Spring, between her property at the neighboring property at 905 N. McLean. She would like an opportunity to work with a subcommittee to prepare the project in advance, so her application review goes smoothly.

MINUTES

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the November 17, 2022, Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Commissioner Graehling noted scrivener’s errors on pages three and four. Commissioner Elterich made a motion to accept the minutes, as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Graehling. All were in favor (5-0).

REGULAR AGENDA

- A. BHP-29-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by David R. Dow & James A. Neeley Trust for an S-4 (Historic Preservation Overlay) District (Local Historic Preservation Designation) for property at 33 Sunset Road. PIN:14-34-402-016. CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER MEETING.**

Mr. Branham presented the Staff Report with recommendation to adopt the Resolution and attached Nomination Report. He thanked Mr. Koos for leading the subcommittee and drafting the Nomination Report.

The Petitioner provided additional information on the property, indicating that evidence from the Ewing Manor archives shows documentation of over 1,000 bluebell bulbs purchased in 1928 for planting along Sunset Road, so the bluebells onsite are from that collection.

Mr. Koos made a motion to adopt the proposed Resolution. Ms. Graehling seconded.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

Mr. Branham noted that the case will proceed to the Planning Commission on the first Wednesday in February, 2023.

Chair Scharnett noted that the next three items (BHP-30-22, BHP-31-22, and BHP-32-22) have been tabled, at the request of the applicant.

- B. BHP-30-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Franklin Park Foundation an S-4 (Historic Preservation Overlay) District (Local Historic Preservation Designation) for property at 809 N. McLean Street. PIN:21-04-210-001. CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER MEETING; REQUESTED BY APPLICANT TO TABLE TO JANUARY.**
- C. BHP-31-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Franklin Park Foundation for an S-4 (Historic Preservation Overlay) District (Local Historic Preservation Designation) for property at 901 N. McLean Street. PIN:21-04-207-005. CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER MEETING; REQUESTED BY APPLICANT TO TABLE TO JANUARY.**
- D. BHP-32-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Franklin Park Foundation for an S-4 (Historic Preservation Overlay) District (Local Historic Preservation Designation) for property at 310 E. Walnut Street. PIN:21-04-202-016. CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER MEETING; REQUESTED BY APPLICANT TO TABLE TO JANUARY.**

Chair Scharnett noted that he believes the public should have a chance to comment on both of the following cases, as they are architecturally unique and may be historically significant. He also recognized that the building at 407 W. Market Street is burnt out and that Holiday Drive is vacant and has been for a long time.

E. BHP-34-22 Consideration of the historical or architectural significance for the structure located at 407 W. Market Street, in accordance with the demolition review procedures. PIN 21-04-158-006.

Mr. Branham presented the staff report with a recommendation for approval of the Demolition Permit. He stated that, due to the severity of the damage and unsafe condition of the building it is no longer suitable for Landmark designation, which is the criteria for review. He acknowledged Mr. Koos' contribution to researching the history of the property and noted key characteristics of the history and architecture.

Chair Scharnett opened the hearing. No public testimony was received.

The Chair stated that he disagrees that Landmark nomination criteria takes into account the condition of a property after a fire, and that it is primarily related to history, significance, and characteristics. He noted that brick does not burn easily.

The Chair inquired whether the building had been evaluated by a structural engineer. Mr. Branham replied that he was not aware of what work had been completed to evaluate the structural condition of the building. The Chair stated that, until a full evaluation of the property has been completed and shows evidence that there is no potential of reuse, he is not supportive of demolition.

Ms. Peters stated she concurs with the Chair, but is unsure that the Commission has the ability to require a structural review. The Chair clarified that they have the ability to find that it is a historic structure, delay the demolition process, and ask for further discussion.

Mr. Branham explained that Staff would speak with the Building Official and see what structural information is available.

Mr. Koos inquired whether the person at the City who would review the results of any report would have the credentials to appropriately analyze such. He concurred that a professional opinion is needed regarding the structural condition of the building before proceeding with demolition.

Mr. Elterich inquired whether Staff is aware of what the owner has planned for after demo. Mr. Branham stated he did not. Mr. Koos stated the landowner is absentee, and he believes that whatever new building is placed there will not meet the same density due to current Code and so will not provide the same tax base.

Chair Scharnett stated that the Commission's purview is about finding whether the structure is significant or not, then they are permitted to delay the demolition.

Ms. Peters stated that she believes it is significant.

The Chair reviewed the nomination criteria:

1. The building does have some value as part of the landscape of the City.
2. The building does not possess this characteristic.

- 3-5. The building was designed by George Miller.
6. The kind of brick that is used in the subject building is very hard to make and very hard to get in that same quality today.
7. The building is not innovative; it recalls its period.
8. The building has been a visual fixture at that location for a long time, and he noted concerns about the condition and longevity of the adjacent house if this building is demolished.
9. This criterion is unknown; additional information is needed for this item to be properly evaluated.

He noted that only one of the criteria must be met to be considered architecturally significant, and this building meets multiple criteria. He stated his belief that the building is architecturally significant.

Ms. Peters made a motion to find that the property is architecturally significant. Seconded by Mr. Elterich.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

The Chair asked that Staff return with a completed structural analysis to allow review of the last criterion.

F. BHP-35-22 Consideration of the historical or architectural significance for the structure located at 1225 Holiday Drive, in accordance with the demolition review procedures. PIN 14-35-451-021.

Mr. Branham presented the staff report with a recommendation for approval of the Demolition Permit. He acknowledged Mr. Koos' contribution to researching the history of the property and noted key characteristics of the building's history and architecture.

Chair Scharnett opened the public hearing.

Aaron Freeman (1032 Adlai Stevenson Drive, Springfield, IL), representing U-Haul, spoke on behalf of the project. He stated they have visited the neighbors in the area and they are in support of the proposed development. He provided information on adaptive reuse projects and historic dedications in their other locations. He noted the roof has significant damage and much of the interior has been destroyed, but they are interested in salvaging and using items that are not damaged to set up a mini-museum in the showroom.

Mr. Elterich asked to clarify whether the other buildings were demolition or reuse. Mr. Freeman stated the others were reuse but the subject building is not in a condition to reuse.

Mr. Koos inquired about the square footage of the current and proposed buildings. Mr. Freeman responded that the current building is about 30,000 square feet and the proposed project will result in about 90,000 square feet. Ms. Peters clarified that the project includes the adjacent lot as well and asked Staff to show the Planning Commission information on the project. Mr. Branham provided additional information

on the project, as approved through the Legislative Site Plan Review process. Mr. Freeman provided additional details.

Ms. Peters stated that she believes the building is architecturally significant, but that the demolition request should be approved. She stated it does meet criteria “f.”

Mr. Elterich noted that Gene Asbury was well-known local architect as well.

The Chair stated that the building is innovative; Googie style was focused on innovation. Mr. Koos agreed; clear span for that period is significant.

Ms. Peters stated she is interested in how the historic information and homage could be communicated, including incorporation of some of the design elements in the new buildings. Chair Scharnett stated that he disagrees on the finer points but understands the intent.

Mr. Koos suggested that, as a level of mitigation, they could ask that a measured drawing be made of the principal façade and photographic documentation of all four sides of the building be prepared for archival preservation of Asbury’s work in Bloomington. The Chair concurred. Ms. Graehling inquired whether the original blueprints might be available somewhere. U-Haul agreed to the terms and requested to consult the Commission in the future as they develop the interpretive presentation.

Mr. Elterich noted procedural concerns; an approved site plan and vacant property is irrelevant from the perspective of applying the criteria for landmark nomination. Ms. Peters concurred. The Chair stated that the HPC is the final decision maker on whether a property is determined to be significant.

Ms. Pemberton noted some procedural items.

Chair Scharnett noted the differences between this and the previously reviewed property; one has architectural features still intact from the exterior, the one currently under review has exterior architectural features that are in disrepair and not enduring. He noted that this is precedent as a review of mid-century architecture which will become more common. The materials are more questionable, expect discussions surrounding adaptive reuse and retaining feature styles (e.g. proportion and scale) rather than specific elements, with goal of retaining the spirit and ideology, despite materials being more subject to deterioration.

Mr. Koos concurred that the two buildings hold substantially different types of challenges, while appearing to be similar cases on the surface.

Ms. Peters noted that discussions about materials is important and should be kept in mind while working on the Preservation Plan, as materials affect preservation ability.

Ms. Peters made a motion to find the building at 1225 Holiday Drive is historically significant based on criteria a, d, e, f, g, and h. Mr. Elterich seconded.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

Ms. Peters made a motion to approve the demolition permit, with the condition that an exterior survey with measurements and photographs be performed. Ms. Graehling seconded.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - No, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (5-1). The motion passed.

G. BHP-37-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Sarah Lindenbaum for a Certificate of Appropriateness for front porch repair on the property located at 1001 N. Evans Street. PIN: 21-04-226-008.

Staff requested permission to review case BHP-37-22 and case BHP-40-22 together, as they are related to the same property. There were no objections. Mr. Branham presented the staff report with recommendation for approval of both requests.

Chair Scharnett opened the public hearing.

Sara Lindenbaum (1001 N. Evans) spoke on behalf of the project. She indicated the porch is deteriorating but was once beautiful when constructed with the original home. She noted the shape was changed decades ago, but much of the detail work is still present and the plan is to repair what can be repaired, replace what can not, but goal is to keep visual consistent with the original style and character of the home.

Mr. Koos and Mr. Elterich thanked the Petitioner for their dedication to property.

Ms. Peters inquired whether they planned to keep the current shape of the porch. Ms. Lindenbaum replied in the affirmative.

No additional testimony was provided. The Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Peters made a motion to accept the findings of fact as presented by the Staff and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for front porch repair. Mr. Elterich seconded.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

J. BHP-40-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Sarah Lindenbaum for a Funk Grant in the amount of \$4,600.00 for front porch repair on the property located at 1001 N. Evans Street. PIN: 21-04-226-008.

Ms. Peters made a motion to award a Funk Grant in the amount of up to \$4,600.00 for front porch repair at 1001 N. Evans Street. Mr. Elterich seconded.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

H. BHP-38-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Linda Gerard for Certificate of Appropriateness for slate roof repair on the property located at 402 E. Walnut Street. PIN: 21-04-203-012.

Staff requested permission to review case BHP-38-22 and case BHP-39-22 together, as they are related to the same property. There were no objections. Ms. Pemberton presented the staff report with a recommendation for approval of both requests.

Chair Scharnett inquired about the additional estimate from 2020 on a different property. Staff identified the document as a quote for a similar scope of work on the adjacent property (which is a mirror image) that was available in older files. While the quoting agency is no longer in business, it provides perspective on costs and appropriateness of the

scope. The Funk Grant request uses the sole source justification for providing a single estimate.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Paul Stauffer (1920 Dunraven Road) spoke on behalf of the project. He discussed slate roofs and stated he believes in repair and protecting the historic aspects of the materials. He stated he has completed other similar projects and listed past projects and qualifications. The owner has a fair amount of slate and he has access to more, if necessary.

Chair inquired about the longevity of this kind of repair. Mr. Stauffer explained that this is gray slate, likely from Pennsylvania. He discussed the longevity of different kinds of slate. He plans to replace any significantly degraded slates identified during work, he may need to replace some pieces of metal with newer materials since the kind of metal used on this roof is no longer available.

The Chair asked for clarification on whether he believes the proposed budget is reasonable. Mr. Stauffer explained that the project is a partial repair, not a complete replacement, the proposed budget should accomplish the scope of work. \$10,000.00 is a good ballpark based on the size of the job and other similar projects he has completed.

Rick Gerard (404 E. Walnut Street) spoke on behalf of the project. He thinks they have selected the right contractor for the job. He stated they have been trying to find someone to complete the work for a long time; the roof has been leaking, and the need has become urgent. He noted that the unit is a rental and the current residents have moved out due to water damage. He provided additional details about building.

No additional testimony was provided. The Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Graehling made a motion to accept the findings of fact as presented by the Staff and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for slate roof repair. Mr. Elterich seconded.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

I. BHP-39-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Linda Gerard for a Funk Grant in the amount of \$5,000.00 for slate roof repair on the property located at 402 E. Walnut Street. PIN: 21-04-203-012.

Ms. Peters made a motion to award a Funk Grant in the amount of up to \$5,000.00 for slate roof repair at 402 E. Walnut Street. Ms. Graehling seconded.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

Consideration, review and possible action on changes to the Rust Grant Guidelines and application timeline.

Mr. Branham explained the changes made to the Guidelines, at the request of the Commission.

Mr. Koos stated his concern that 30 days may not be enough time for applicants, particularly due to the limited availability of tradespeople qualified to do this kind of work. Ms. Peters clarified that the dates noted in the documentation are for the application window. The Chair noted that project preparation and estimates can (and should) be done before the grant application, and that a mid-year review may result in an additional application window. Mr. Koos stated that his concerns are addressed.

Chair Scharnett asked to clarify that advertisement will occur initially and for the mid-point application window. Staff replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Koos stated his concern regarding confusion between this grant and COVID-related money allocated in the same district, particularly as related to Prevailing Wage. Ms. Pemberton explained that Federal funding has specific guidelines that may include Prevailing Wage. She clarified that the subject (ARPA) funds target area overlap the Rust Grant area, but is not identical.

Mr. Koos inquired whether the projects funded by the ARPA funds will be brought before the HPC for review. Ms. Pemberton explained that Federally-funded City projects (CDBG, etc.) are reviewed for nomination criteria before the grants are awarded. As a Certified Local Government (CLG), Staff completes those reviews, but does have the ability to seek the HPC's assistance in cases where there are questions or concerns about potential significance. She cited a recent example where Staff went the extra mile to investigate a property to ensure that potentially architecturally significant features would not be negatively impacted by the project proposed for funding. Ms. Pemberton noted that the City's Building Official is a licensed Architect. She clarified that non-designated (S-4) properties do get review prior to funding, they are just reviewed through a different process than S-4 properties.

Ms. Graehling made a motion to accept and adopt the changes to the Rust Grant Guidelines, as proposed by Staff. Ms. Peters seconded.

Ms. Miller inquired whether marketing has already started. Ms. Pemberton replied that the lead time to begin is short, materials have already been discussed at the Staff level. Mr. Branham explained that there is some flexibility of timeline. Ms. Pemberton noted that marketing can overlap with application review process. Mr. Branham stated that the target audience would be properties within the Rust area only.

Chair Scharnett stated appreciation for Mr. Wetterow's work on improving the accuracy of the City's GIS data. He called the question.

Ms. Pemberton clarified that the motion on the table is to accept and adopt the Rust Grant Guideline updates as presented by Staff.

Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Mr. Elterich - Yes, Ms. Miller - Yes, and Chair Scharnett - Yes. (6-0). The motion passed.

Chair Scharnett called a five-minute recess.

The meeting resumed at 6:21 p.m. with the same Commissioners and Staff present.

Updates regarding the Community Preservation Plan (CPP).

Ms. Pemberton presented a proposal from Staff on how to proceed with accomplishing some of the priority work set out in the Community Preservation Plan (CPP). She noted that many of the designated and non-designated properties of the same age seem to be experiencing similar issues related to maintenance and owner turnover, and that more than anecdotal evidence is needed to identify the root causes and to justify any changes needed to improve the condition of historic properties in the City. Staff proposes a structured research and data-gathering project, with outcomes related to all five themes in the CPP.

In summary, the steps are to select a Pilot Project area and:

1. Gather in-office data and populate the chosen platform (mobile app likely)
 - a. Designating Ordinances, when applicable
 - b. Historic photos and relevant property information
2. Work with volunteers or consultants to gather in-field data
 - a. Blight indicators
 - b. Current photos
 - c. Condition of designated or architecturally significant features
3. Review and validate field data, develop condition and preservation scores, fill in missing information, identify trends and conclusions
4. Present tailored results of in-office and in-field data in a public format such as “walking tour” or “virtual visit,” as part of cultural tourism and history education.
5. Propose new or adjusted programs, policies, or ordinances to address gaps and issues identified during the project.
6. Repeat for next area, to help achieve survey goals of Theme 1 while improving data about HP Ordinance and the City, in general.

Mr. Koos asked about self-analysis of the data on whether the Ordinance is working. Ms. Pemberton replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Pemberton emphasized the importance of gathering Ordinances and historic images prior to onsite review of properties, to allow comparison. She noted that data gathering can result in difficult conversations about what that data means and asked the Commission to start thinking about how to have those productively.

Ms. Pemberton proposed that the Franklin Square Historic District serve as the Pilot Project due to the limited geographic scope, duration of designation, and variety in use and condition.

Ms. Pemberton outlined the next steps and draft timeline for the Commission. She noted that some of the duties that will fall on the Commission are related to communicating with

other Stakeholders in the community to ensure efforts are complimentary and not duplicative.

Chair Scharnett noted that working with the Ecology Action Center could be beneficial in multiple ways, both by educating them on the potential damage that modern energy improvement techniques can have on historic homes, and furthering the discussion about appropriate methods. Commissioner Koos mentioned the importance of discussing the “embodied energy” of historic homes and the wide-scale energy savings associated with retaining existing materials and structures, when done well. He noted it would be valuable to document what the actual replacement cost of a 100-year-old building is, with same materials and workmanship.

Chair Scharnett highlighted the importance of considering the future of historic preservation as the “trigger” of 50 years ago moves into the 70s and 80s, and how “lovability” can factor into where the energy and resources of a community are spent, even if materials and craftsmanship may not equivalent to that of buildings from 150 years ago. Sustainability needs to consider preservation and reuse. Commissioner Graehling concurred. Condition and the current criteria may not—and should not—always be the primary deciding factor on which buildings are saved. Current criteria may be insufficient. How do we measure and codify “embodied energy” and “lovability?”

Commissioner Peters indicated her support for the concept and how to move forward. She inquired about the overlap between Bloomington and Normal and whether an organization could be created that would hold membership from the City and the Town, Old House Society, etc. to improve efficiencies.

Commissioner Koos noted the importance of recognizing that data has limitations. Personality and stories are important. Ms. Pemberton concurred. He noted that neighborhood associations should be incorporated in the planning and action to have the greatest impact.

Chair Scharnett inquired who was going to be responsible for different components of the project. Ms. Pemberton explained that the day-to-day work of moving the project forward would be conducted by Staff, discrete projects may be assigned to consultants, on-site survey work will be conducted by a combination of volunteers and Staff.

Ms. Pemberton explained that the goal is to provide ongoing volunteer opportunities that are meaningful and result in long-term commitment to the results of the project. She noted that efforts should strive to result in multiple layers of historic interpretation/education—local, tourist, next generation—always with a desired action in mind during the communication (think/feel/do). The primary task of the HPC though the effort will need to be as social marketers and facilitators.

Commissioner Graehling stated that she likes the structure and direction of the project.

Ms. Pemberton invited questions and concerns. She stated that she will email a copy of the presentation to the Commission.

NEW BUSINESS

Election of new Chairperson

Chair Scharnett noted his term is up and a new Chair must be elected.

Commissioner Koos nominated Commissioner Elterich for Chair. Commissioner Elterich declined the nomination.

Commissioner Graehling inquired about a procedural issue. She nominated Commissioner Koos for Chair. Mr. Koos accepted the nomination.

Chair Scharnett nominated Commissioner Peters for Chair. Commissioner Peters declined the nomination.

There were no additional nominations.

Ms. Peters inquired whether election of a Vice-Chair was also required. Ms. Pemberton answered in the affirmative. Ms. Peters inquired about the status of new members. Staff committed to investigating the status prior to the next meeting. Ms. Pemberton clarified the requirements for Commission membership.

Chair Scharnett called the question on the election of Commissioner Koos as Chair. Ayes - 6, Nays - 0. The motion passed.

Ms. Peters and Mr. Elterich nomination Commissioner Scharnett as Vice Chair. Commissioner Scharnett accepted the nomination.

Commissioner Scharnett nominated Commissioner Peters. Commissioner Peters declined the nomination.

There were no additional nominations.

Chair Scharnett called the question on the election of Commissioner Scharnett as Vice Chair. Ayes - 6, Nays - 0. The motion passed.

Discussion of future project review protocols.

Chair Scharnett brought up the issue of reviewing projects that have not formally submitted for Certificates of Appropriateness (CoA), per the public comment at the beginning of the meeting.

Ms. Pemberton explained that owners of historic properties that are *not* designated would still benefit from the knowledge and expertise of the Commission, as well as designated properties that would like to consult at the start of their projects to facilitate appropriate selection and development and make it easier once they are ready to move forward with the formal CoA process. She explained that the Plan asks the Commission to assist with community education though multiple themes and Staff has discussed how a process for formalizing pre-review might look. Commissioner Peters inquired whether Staff can provide the assistance. Ms. Pemberton explained that Staff does provide guidance, but the Commission has special expertise that may be beyond what current Staff can provide. Mr. Elterich noted that it is not uncommon for applicants to come before the HPC with no idea

how they should be proceeding on certain projects, so a version of preliminary reviews make sense. Ms. Peters asked about single person or subcommittee formats. Ms. Pemberton stated Staff has discussed both.

Commissioner Koos inquired whether this means the decision or opinion of a single member of the HPC would be expected to be binding. Ms. Pemberton explained that public bodies can not take any action outside of open meetings, so applications would still need to follow the normal process. She recommended that anything not cut and dry could be added to the regular agenda as a discussion item. Chair Scharnett asked whether a subcommittee could be delegated the responsibility for review of certain items. Ms. Pemberton answered in the affirmative, but that formal approvals would still be required at the regular meeting to validate the subcommittee's decision. Staff recommendation is to use the term "consultation" and carefully state the advisory nature of those consultations. Commissioner Graehling cautioned against any process that might result in confusion from residents, or would perpetuate a negative perception of the Commission. Staff will bring recommendations for how to proceed back at a future meeting.

Chair Scharnett discussed mid-century architecture and how to guide residents on preservation of such. He noted that materials tend to be more likely to deteriorate, so scale/form/proportion analysis tend to be more relevant for reviews. Massing for additions and modifications are going to be important. Design guidelines may need to be discussed and communicated differently. He noted that as we look at the Ordinance in the future these discussions will become important. Ms. Peters inquired whether there are State or Federal guidelines for mid-century issues. Chair Scharnett explained that the issue is just starting to arise, so guidance is limited. Landscaping may be a greater factor since so many mid-century residences are ranches (addressing flatness).

Mr. Scharnett noted that mid-century ranches are commonly demolished in favor of building something else. Commissioner Koos noted this trend is already showing up around Sunset Road. He stated his belief that landscape may need to be defined in future nominations. Chair Scharnett mentioned that landscape is very important in some areas, like Washington Street or Franklin Square. Mr. Koos mentioned accessory dwelling units should be considered as well.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Peters motioned to adjourn. Ms. Graehling seconded. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:15pm.