

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
October 10, 2018**

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

A Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the Village of Lake Bluff was called to order on October 10, 2018 at 7:04 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room.

The following members were present:

Present: Paul Bergmann
 Jane Jerch
 Lois Nicol
 Cheri Richardson
 Robert Hunter, Vice Chair
 Steve Kraus, Chair
 Randolph Liebolt

Also Present: Glen Cole, Assistant to the Village Administrator (AVA)
 Drew Irvin, Village Administrator (VA)
 Benjamin Schuster, Village Attorney (VAT)
 John Scopelliti, Administrative Intern (AI)

2. Consideration of the September 12, 2018 Meeting Minutes

AVA Cole stated there were some corrections from Member Bergmann that he received.

Member Bergmann moved to approve the September 12, 2018 HPC Regular Meeting Minutes as amended. Member Liebolt seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

3. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors

Chair Kraus stated that the Chairperson and Members of the HPC allocate fifteen (15) minutes at this time for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the HPC on any matter within its area of responsibility that is not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the HPC.

4. A Public Hearing to Consider a Historic Landmark Nomination for 415 East Prospect Avenue (Barthold Residence)

Chair Kraus stated that anyone planning to comment or present for these hearings please stand and take the oath. A couple individuals from the audience stood up and took the oath.

Chair Kraus asked AVA Cole to give an overview of the application.

AVA Cole stated that this property has an association with the camp association and the other notable part is that it is a great example of French eclectic architecture. He stated that it gives a good view for Susan Benjamin. AVA Cole presented the map showing any pending landmark nominations along with approved landmarks and the subject of the hearing.

Chair Kraus asked if the commissioners had anything before the applicant comes forward. No one had anything.

Jenny Barthold, the applicant, approached the podium to address the commission. The applicant praised Ed Wynn for his help with getting the application together. She stated that she spent quite a bit of money on the property of land. She stated that the outdoor space is as valuable to her as the interior. She stated that she is going through this landmark nomination process because she is trying to slow down the process of demolition of these older homes within the Village of Lake Bluff. She stated that she believes that her home will become one of the casualties for demolition but she is trying to stop that from happening.

Member Jerch asked how long she has owned the home. The applicant stated that she has lived at her home since 2001.

Member Bergmann asked the applicant if they could tell, from looking in the basement, if there are different foundations to possibly show that this is another camp home. He stated that he would love for an architect/engineer to investigate the cracks throughout her home.

Member Nicol was curious about what went on at the property given the time it was bought.

Chair Kraus stated that the application needs some photographs, specifically for the Village Board, along with any elevation plans. He stated that he is intrigued that this could be a remnant of the association camp home. He stated that any questions or research that you gather after the application has been looked at can be added to the application.

The applicant stated that she has no elevation plans of her home.

Chair Kraus asked if any member of the audience wanted to address this application. No one came forward.

Following a request from Chair Kraus, Vice Chair Hunter proceeded to review the criteria for landmark designation general consideration. A discussion followed and the committee determined the following criteria applies to the application:

- 1a – The structure, building, site, or landscape has significant character, interest, or value as part of the historic, aesthetic, cultural, or architectural characteristics of the village, the state of Illinois, or the United States;

- 1d – The unique location or singular physical characteristics of a structure, building, site, or landscape make it an established or familiar visual feature; and
- 1e – The activities associated with a structure, building, site, or landscape make it a current or former focal point of reference in the village.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following architectural significance criteria applies to the application:

- 2a – The structure, building, site, or landscape represents certain distinguishing characteristics of architecture inherently valuable for the study of a time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;
- 2b – The structure, building, site, or landscape embodies elements of design, detail, material, or craftsmanship of exceptional quality;
- 2c – The structure, building, site, or landscape exemplifies a particular architectural style in terms of detail, material, and workmanship which has resulted in little or no alteration to its original construction; and
- 2d – The structure, building, site, or landscape is one of few remaining examples of a particular architectural style and has undergone little or no alteration since its original construction.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following historic significance criteria applies to the application:

- 3a – The structure, building, site, or landscape is an exceptional example of an historic or vernacular style, or is one of the few such remaining properties of its kind in the Village; and
- 3c – The structure, building, site, or landscape is associated with an organization or group, whether formal or informal, from which persons have significantly contributed to or participated in the historic or cultural events of the United States, the State of Illinois, or the Village.

As there was no further discussion, Member Bergmann made a motion to recommend the Village Board designate 415 East Prospect Avenue as a landmark and specify both the specific historic landmark designations criteria met and the specific elements of the property that merit protection. Member Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous roll call vote.

5. A Public Hearing to Consider a Historic Landmark Nomination for 400 Ravine Avenue (Caldwell Residence)

Chair Kraus asked AVA Cole for an overview of the application. AVA Cole stated that this is the Caldwell residence and the application stated that it is part of the original 1836 Cloes homestead. He stated that this structure is associated with both William F. Cochran, former Village President, and the Lake Bluff Camp Meeting Association.

Chair Kraus asked the commission if they had any questions in regards to the application before the applicant approaches the podium. There were no questions from the commission.

The applicant, Anne Shiras Caldwell, approached the podium. She stated that she moved to Lake Bluff in the 1980s and she loved the home as she consistently walked by it often when walking through the neighborhood. She stated that the oldest photograph she has is from 1910. The applicant stated that the interior has been renovated, replaced existing siding with new siding and replaced existing trim with new trim. She stated that her home was built by one of Lake Bluff's first Village Presidents. She stated that another Village President bought this home from the Camp Meeting Association. The applicant stated that the property overlooks the ravine and that she hopes the money and time she has invested in her home will last for future generations.

Chair Kraus stated that he had a story not a question. He stated that he moved in the 1970s and in the winter you could look through the front windows of this home and it was quite a beautiful view with the snow on the tree branches.

The applicant stated that she is planning on investing money into the property specifically in the roof. She stated that she has a preliminary drawing for the commission about what she intends to do for the roof.

Chair Kraus stated that these roof drawings would require another meeting with the commission. The applicant stated that she understands that.

Member Bergmann stated that the real estate research that he conducted intrigues him due to the size of the property. Member Bergmann asked the applicant if she knew how old the home to the east is at 410 Ravine Avenue and she stated it predates around the same time as her home.

Member Richardson asked the applicant how long she has lived at 400 Ravine Avenue. The applicant stated she has lived here for 21 years.

Chair Kraus asked if any individuals in the audience had any questions regarding this application.

Member Nicol stated that she is intrigued about the front 3 windows. The applicant stated that this is her favorite spot of her home.

Following a request from Chair Kraus, Member Richardson proceeded to review the criteria for landmark designation general consideration. A discussion followed and the committee determined the following criteria applies to the application:

- 1a – The structure, building, site, or landscape has significant character, interest, or value as part of the historic, aesthetic, cultural, or architectural characteristics of the village, the state of Illinois, or the United States;
- 1b – The structure, building, site, or landscape is closely identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the Village, the State of Illinois, or the United States; and

- 1d – The unique location or singular physical characteristics of a structure, building, site, or landscape make it an established or familiar visual feature.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following architectural significance criteria applies to the application:

- 2a – The structure, building, site, or landscape represents certain distinguishing characteristics of architecture inherently valuable for the study of a time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;
- 2b – The structure, building, site, or landscape embodies elements of design, detail, material, or craftsmanship of exceptional quality;
- 2c – The structure, building, site, or landscape exemplifies a particular architectural style in terms of detail, material, and workmanship which has resulted in little or no alteration to its original construction;
- 2d – The structure, building, site, or landscape is one of few remaining examples of a particular architectural style and has undergone little or no alteration since its original construction;
- 2e – The structure, building, site, or landscape is, or is part of, a contiguous grouping that has a sense of cohesiveness expressed through a similarity of style characteristics, time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials and the accents the architectural significance of the area; and
- 2f – The detail, material, and workmanship of the structure, building, site, or landscape can be valued in and of themselves as reflective of or similar to those of the majority of the other visual elements in the area.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following historic significance criteria applies to the application:

- 3a – The structure, building, site, or landscape is an exceptional example of an historic or vernacular style, or is one of the few such remaining properties of its kind in the Village;
- 3b – The structure, building, site, or landscape has a strong association with the life or activities of a person or persons who significantly contributed to or participated in the historic or cultural events of the United States, the State of Illinois, or the Village; and
- 3c – The structure, building, site, or landscape is associated with an organization or group, whether formal or informal, from which persons have significantly contributed to or participated in the historic or cultural events of the United States, the State of Illinois, or the Village.

As there was no further discussion, Member Richardson made a motion to recommend the Village Board designate 400 Ravine Avenue as a landmark and specify both the specific historic landmark designations criteria met and the specific elements of the property that merit protection. Member Bergmann seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous roll call vote.

6. Continued Significant Demolition Review – 419 East Prospect Avenue

Chair Kraus stated that there is no action required from the commission in regards to the significant demolition review of 419 East Prospect Avenue. Chair Kraus stated that VAT Schuster is prepared to talk about this application and the current status of the application, if anyone wishes to have a conversation.

There were no questions asked.

7. A Public Hearing to Consider a Historic Landmark Nomination for 419 East Prospect Avenue (Helle Residence)

Chair Kraus stated that this is a nomination that this commission recommended last month to move forward. Chair Kraus clarified that AVA Cole is the representative for this application. AVA Cole stated that Ed Wynn, along with other residents of Lake Bluff, assisted with the collection and submission of this application.

AVA Cole explained the map in front of the commission and clarified that 406 E. Prospect Ave and 502 E. Prospect Ave are pending landmark nominations dependent on the Village Board's vote. AVA Cole provided a presentation to the commission with multiple pictures of the 419 E. Prospect Ave property. AVA Cole explained the first picture of the home, a file photo from the Lake Bluff History Museum, which shows the addition to the original L shape of the home off the back and excludes the newer additions that are detached from the home (i.e. the garage).

Chair Kraus requested the record show that this picture expresses the original portion of the house excludes the garage, which is not existing in the picture, and also the western side of the home, or the L-shaped portion of the home and the rest of the home is essentially the two-story structure.

AVA Cole continued his presentation by going through a site plan of sorts for the property. AVA Cole provided a timeline to the commission in regards to the history of the property (i.e. date of construction, history of ownership, historical relevance to Lake Bluff). AVA Cole explained the Italianate style for a home, in regards to the roof, windows, doorways, porches, and belt course. AVA Cole compared this type of architecture with the existing additions to the home. AVA Cole stated that addition two is the main focus for this home. He expressed that one of the windows does not have the arched piece above it like a true Italianate style should have. He expressed that some design was copied but was not successful. He stated that the addition in the back of the property, the garage, was not a great addition. AVA Cole showed pictures of cracks in the floorboard and that the floor is starting to sink. He showed two pictures that focused on two window sills that had one big crack each but were generally in good shape. AVA Cole provided another photo that showed some water damage in one of the interior rooms on the ceiling. He provided a picture showing an exterior wall which has a pretty big crack but you can see the original red brick. AVA Cole provided the commission with pictures of attempts to solve the sinking floor issue. AVA Cole provided three examples of closed brick within the village to the commission. He stated that these pictures were provided by Ed Deegan and Nan Caldwell. AVA Cole concluded his presentation and asked the commission if they had any questions.

Member Jerch stated that she was curious as to how accurate the brick in the pictures are.

AVA Cole stated that those photos were not looked at personally and were provided by Nan Caldwell.

The applicant(s), Robert H. Helle and Ellen Way approached the podium to give a presentation to the commission.

Mr. Helle stated that he found an error in the meeting minutes from last month. He showed an original drawing of block 10. He stated that as was noted in the meeting minutes, the committee has been informed that the original home was built on Lots 2 and 3. He stated that the home was actually built on lots 3 and 4.

Ellen Way stated that she does not want to go through this process but understands that she needed to do research in order to move forward. She stated that she believes she knows more than some people may know. She stated that she is not trying to disturb the history of Lake Bluff, she is merely trying to maintain the preservation. She talked about the history and timeline of the property. She expressed that the point she wanted to make was that it was not built by Cloes. She stated that in 1882, the purchase of lots 1, 2, and 3 occurred. She explained that in 1883 lot 4 was sold, in 1887 lot 3 was deeded, in 1908 Edward W. Jeffries deeded lots 1 and 2 for \$1, and in 1912 Patridge deeded lots 3 and 4. She stated that with homes being built on these lots ties them to historic notification and keeping those homes that way seems to be a stretch.

Mr. Helle stated that it is unlikely in 1887 that a home was built and instead was not built until 1912. He stated that Abner Scranton was a very savvy real estate investor and he stated that it was very unlikely that this purchase would go through. He stated in the application that the home was constructed by the Cloes family and that they dispute that based off the research of Ellen Way. He stated that the application interprets a lot of assertions. He stated that this commission is trying to landmark a lawn due to the significance with the 4th of July parade and the 4th of July in general. Mr. Helle stated that the significance of the yard to the 4th of July parade and restricting building rights runs into "taking" issues. He stated that the residents of Lake Bluff are very respectful of private property. He stated that the commission is stating that his lawn is of such importance to the village due to the 4th of July parade. He stated that the L-form is an alteration in and of itself. He talked about the significance of this structure and that the sills and jams do not extend which is an alteration along with the stucco. He emphasized that the L-form is a significant alteration to the original structure.

AVA Cole showed a picture in regards with the stucco that Mr. Helle was talking about. Mr. Helle reiterated that stucco itself is a major alteration and the additions do a disservice to the alteration.

Mr. Helle expressed that these structures don't ordinate with the Italianate design and structure. He stated that he thinks it is ironic since the sister of this structure is sitting just south at 419 E. Prospect Ave. He stated the significance of the original house is debatable and that the major alterations do a

disservice to the original home. He expressed that the lawn does not have any historical significance. He expressed that the significance is that Cloes owned most of east Lake Bluff and that if you were planning on land marking most of east Lake Bluff than this would be significant but that is not the case. Mr. Helle finished his presentation and opened it up to the commission.

Member Bergmann stated that he believed Edward W. Jeffries was a minister. Mr. Helle stated that he owned property in Lake Bluff but was a minister in Iowa.

Ellen Way stated that the front door faces east, which is towards the direction of the tabernacle.

Vice Chair Hunter stated that he is very pleased with the information that he has heard. He stated that the notion of the closed brick is irrelevant for this application. He expressed that the notion of the lawn is not a reason to encumber an owner.

The applicant stated that they are still trying to incorporate the original brick structure of the home but they can't determine that until the first floor of the home is ripped out.

Chair Kraus requested if any other members of the audience would like to address this application.

Janet Nelson, former Historic Preservation Commission Chair, approached the podium and was happy to come back to an HPC meeting and hear that landmark nominations are becoming fairly common. She stated that we need Elmer's book and that this was the first time someone tried to lay out the history of Lake Bluff. She stated that he sent his secretary up to the county building to have her find out some of this information and if you read it, it is pretty iffy. She stated that she believes what you are hearing right now, it has been there a long time and everyone says 'oh that is the house on the corner of Moffett and Prospect'. She stated that there has been nothing exciting about that house brought forward. She expressed that there were multiple brickyards all along the lake in Lake Bluff and Waukegan back around this time. She expressed that we like to think that we know what closed brick was but she thinks we honestly don't know. She stated that Ben Cloes inherited his father's property in Sacramento and continued collecting property. She explained that he started selling property to the Camp Meeting Association. She stated that the Camp Meeting Association people had good backgrounds but were focused on collecting land. She stated that there were cottage lots and temple lots and that there were lots of lots there. She expressed that he also owned many lots around Lake Bluff. She stated that just because it is his property doesn't mean that he lived there. She stated that Ben and his wife finally found a ranch out in San Francisco in 1912 when the earthquake occurred. She expressed how very interesting this family was and how interesting the history was at this time. She stated that some of the records should be located in McHenry County because Lake County did not exist at that point.

Ed Wynn approached the podium to address the commission. He stated that he assisted AVA Cole with preparing the application before the commission. He expressed that he agrees with the applicant's statement of the L-form does not exist. He stated that we do know a lot of speculation and he looks at the facts and we know the home was built in 1870. He stated that this is around the

time of when Cloes had the property before transferring it to Edward W. Jeffries. He stated that he believes we need to be reliant on the deeds because they are notarized. He expressed that this home consists of very strong Italianate and gothic styles which are similar to 666 Maple Ave. He stated that we know that the lot is associated with Edward W. Jeffries. He stated that he believes the following statements are irrelevant. He stated that the structure of the home is not relevant but still has some historical relevance. He stated that this is not about a “taking” from an owner but this is more about the focus to trigger an advisory review to see if it will be torn down and replaced with something that is relevant to the original home. He stated that the other thing to know, is that the land boundaries do move and are not the most accurate. He explained the criteria in the code and he believes that the site is relevant to historical significance. He expressed that lots 1 and 2 have remained vacant for some time and that is a visual importance. He emphasized the idea of a landmark designation and a landmark certification, along with the difference between the two. He requested the commission to look at the facts for this property and that will state the significance of this house.

Chair Kraus opened it up for comments from the commission. He emphasized that our consideration should only be the original structure. And not any of the additions.

Ed Wynn approached the podium again. He stated that the stucco window is on the original structure and that we need to consider the stucco.

Chair Kraus stated that we need to modify our application, he asked VAT Schuster to go over the notice.

VAT Schuster stated that you can nominate a building, structure or landscape for landmark nomination. He stated you can nominate the whole building if you desire.

Chair Kraus stated that he wants to hear the commissioner’s thoughts.

Member Bergmann stated that Ed Wynn brings up some interesting points. He stated that there is no fact that a home was built on lots 1 and 2. He stated that this area represents a very wide open part of the village. He stated that we don’t want to landmark the lawn but the vista becomes important, he expressed that he is interested in the historical texture and feel of Lake Bluff. He stated that as far as the stucco goes, you either re-stucco the home, lime-stone clean it or heavily paint over it. Member Bergmann expressed that the things that intrigue him are the Italianate style of the home and that it screams 1870s/1880s. He expressed that there are questions as to when the home was built and as to what is under the home. Member Bergmann expressed that the pictures presented in AVA Cole’s presentation helped the commission see why these questions gained interest.

Vice Chair Hunter stated that he is going to agree/disagree with everything that he has heard. He stated that what really becomes relevant is the notion of open space and if someone plans to do something with the property. He expressed that his biggest problem is he totally objects anyone other than the homeowner has the right to landmark their property.

Member Jerch stated that she would like to go back to Vice Chair Hunter's previous comments. She emphasized that Mr. Helle and Ms. Way did wonderful research and she believes that Janet Nelson provided great information towards this property. Member Jerch stated that she may not be as committed as she was earlier to preserving the house and she doesn't want to dive into the realm of figuring out what is true and what is not true. She stated that she believes if this home is torn down and restored with an "upgrade" of the original home than she would be interested in moving forward with a plan like that.

Member Nicol stated that we are all very interested in having the time and history of the home connected to closed brick. She stated she believes that putting the closed brick aside, the home still has a lot of architectural interest. She expressed that she thinks it is very unique with how similar this home is to 666 Maple Avenue. She expressed that it is a very recognizable home in the village and she would like to preserve some of the architectural homes in the village.

Member Richardson stated that she is in the same boat as many other commissioners. She expressed that being a commissioner in this municipality, means that we have a strong feeling about the history of Lake Bluff and there are other things that we do that are pretty challenging. She expressed that she agreed with Chair Kraus in regards to anything we do will be focused on the original structure. She stated that hearings like this show why we do this and the importance of learning about the facts of homes and their history. She expressed that she is not as gun hoe as she was in the beginning and that she agrees with Chair Kraus.

Member Liebolt stated that he agrees with saving as much in Lake Bluff as possible.

Chair Kraus stated that he is not in favor of involuntary land marking a structure. He stated at the time that if the commission would approve that he would look at the landmark and its merits and no other things. Chair Kraus stated that the commission agreed that we are all looking only at the original structure for landmark nomination. Chair Kraus requested Member Bergmann go through the landmark nomination criteria in regards to the original structure only.

Member Richardson requested that we explain what this means for the members in the audience.

Chair Kraus stated any future alterations or significant alterations to the original structure would require an advisory review. Member Bergmann stated that if they tore down the west addition and the garage then they would be back in front of this commission due to 50% demolition of existing structure.

Following a request from Chair Kraus, Member Bergmann proceeded to review the criteria for landmark designation general consideration of the original structure. A discussion followed and the committee determined the following criteria applies to the original structure:

- 1a – The original structure has significant character, interest, or value as part of the historic, aesthetic, cultural, or architectural characteristics of the village, the state of Illinois, or the United States; and

- 1d – The unique location or singular physical characteristics of the original structure make it an established or familiar visual feature.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following architectural significance criteria applies to the original structure:

- 2a – The original structure represents certain distinguishing characteristics of architecture inherently valuable for the study of a time period, type of property, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;
- 2c – The original structure exemplifies a particular architectural style in terms of detail, material, and workmanship which has resulted in little or no alteration to its original construction; and
- 2d – The original structure is one of few remaining examples of a particular architectural style and has undergone little or no alteration since its original construction.

A discussion ensued and the committee determined the following historic significance criteria applies to the original structure:

- 3a – The original structure is an exceptional example of an historic or vernacular style, or is one of the few such remaining properties of its kind in the Village; and
- 3c – The original structure is associated with an organization or group, whether formal or informal, from which persons have significantly contributed to or participated in the historic or cultural events of the United States, the State of Illinois, or the Village.

Vice Chair Hunter stated that he was curious as to what are the next steps.

VAT Schuster stated that we should probably take a vote.

Chair Kraus stated that the demolition permit that is in place will not go away. VAT Schuster explained the process for the existing demolition permit. A brief discussion commenced.

Vice Chair Hunter stated that he was curious about the delay for the demolition application. He stated that ideally, he would love to see the house stay but it is at the wrong spot and at the wrong time.

Chair Kraus explained the next steps moving forward. He stated that if the applicant wants to go through with a demolition then they will have to go through an advisory review, given the landmark nomination is approved.

Mr. Helle approached the podium to ask a question about demolishing the rest of the home (additions).

Chair Kraus stated that if at least 50% of the gross floor area of a home is proposed to be demolished along with the home being constructed 50 years or more prior to the date on which the building official deems the application complete then it requires a significant demolition review.

VAT Schuster explained the options in front of Mr. Helle and his family moving forward. A brief discussion commenced.

Member Richardson stated she had a question about who would represent the village in this authority. VAT Schuster stated that the building commissioner would represent the village.

VAT Schuster stated that he would recommend the following: attached outline of original structure as depiction B; change nominated building to original structure; deleting the reference of section 1b, 1g, 3b, and section 1a and 2a from nominated building to original structure.

As there was no further discussion, Member Bergmann made a motion to recommend the Village Board designate the original structure at 419 East Prospect Avenue as a landmark and specify both the specific historic landmark designations criteria met and the specific elements of the property that merit protection. Member Liebolt seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (6) Bergmann, Jerch, Nicol, Richardson, Liebolt, and Kraus
Nays: (1) Hunter
Absent: (0)

8. Continued Strategic Planning and Visioning for the Historic Preservation Commission

Chair Kraus stated the Historic Preservation Commission is working towards a 1st quarter of 2019 public meeting/workshop on a Saturday with the Village Board and invitations to the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and other committees.

9. Chairperson's Report

Chair Kraus stated that he wanted to take a poll of who would be here in November and December. AVA Cole stated he has November 14 and December 12 as the respected meeting dates. Chair Kraus asked the commissioners if anyone will not be present for the November 14 date meeting. All commissioners will be present at the November 14 meeting. Chair Kraus expressed that he will not be at the December 12 meeting, and that he is the only one that will be absent.

10. Staff Report

AVA Cole stated to be clear that the two pending nominations from the September HPC meeting will be going through a second hearing at the October 22 Village Board meeting. He stated that with the three recommendations tonight, these items will also be on the October 22 Village Board agenda so a total of five landmark nominations will be discussed at the October 22 Village Board meeting.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider, Member Richardson motioned to adjourn. Member Bergmann seconded the motion. Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 9:49p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Scopelliti
Administrative Intern