

MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

October 12, 2016 (Special Meeting)
Memorial Hall – Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale
6:00 P.M.

Chairman Bohnen called the special meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to order at 6:00 p.m. on October 12, 2016, in Memorial Hall in the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale IL.

Present: Chairman Bohnen, Commissioner Gonzalez and Commissioner D'Arco,
Absent: Tom Willet
Also Present: Chan Yu, Village Planner; Applicants for Case HPC-03-2016 and HPC-04-2016

Minutes

Chairman Bohnen introduced the minutes from the September 14, 2016 meeting. Chairman Bohnen asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. With none, he requested a change on page 2 in regards to lighting. The way it is referenced, it appears to be citing electrical lighting. Instead, the architect pointed out that the dormer location was chosen to not affect natural lighting. Chairman Bohnen asked for a motion to approve the minutes contingent on rephrasing the sentence. Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion and Chairman Bohnen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearing – Recommendations forwarded to the next Board of Trustees meeting. All those wishing to provide public testimony must be sworn in, after the applicant makes their presentation, and will be recognized by the Chair to speak.

Case HPC-01-2016 – 306 S. Garfield Avenue AND 26 E. 3rd Street Local Landmark Application. The applicant is nominating the home at 306 S. Garfield Avenue AND the coach house at 26 E. 3rd Street for designation of a Landmark.

(Please see the attached transcripts dated September 14, 2016, and October 12, 2016, for Case HPC-01-2016 included as part of this record)

Chairman Bohnen introduced the application as a public hearing item and a continuation of the Landmark request from September 14, 2016. He reviewed that Frank, Janice, himself and Chan, Village Planner visited the subject property on October 11, 2016, with the applicant to understand the wall, as mentioned by a neighbor during the public hearing comment period on September 14, 2016. Chairman Bohnen asked, how we proceed to landmark the properties separately, to keep the house and coach house separate.

Chan responded it would be filed under a single application.

Commissioner D'Arco stated her question is, since it is two separate parcels of land and PIN numbers, even though they are both owned by the same owner, what would happen if the owner sells the second property individually. Given potential tax issues, she recommended landmarking the home on 306 S. Garfield Avenue and the coach house on 26 E. Third Street separately, since they are separate tax parcels. However, she is not sure how to do this.

Chan Yu explained that the application has Findings and Recommendations that point to historical and architectural elements of the property that the HPC would like to landmark. He said he never came across any hard rules in the historic preservation ordinance that would prohibit them from creating a separate Findings and Recommendations for one address and Findings and Recommendations for the other.

Commissioner D'Arco stated yes, that is her intent, in case the properties were sold separately.

Chan added, the home at 306 S. Garfield Avenue and the coach house at 26 E. Third Street will each have its own Findings and Recommendations.

Commissioner D'Arco added, we agreed to not reference the wall in the landmark.

Chairman Bohnen also added the wall does not date back to the structure.

Chan mentioned the wall also isn't 50 years old.

Chairman Bohnen replied no, it's about 30 years old (as the homeowner indicated).

Chairman Bohnen said he will ask for a motion to landmark the subject properties as discussed, and that Chan will handle the details.

Chan replied yes, he will include the Findings and Recommendations for the next meeting for approval.

Commissioner Gonzalez asked Chan to make sure they will be separate.

Chan responded yes.

Chairman Bohnen asked for a motion to landmark the structure at 306 S. Garfield Avenue and the structure at 26 E. Third Street. Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion for approval, Commissioner D'Arco seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously (3 Ayes and 1 absent)

Public Meeting – Certificate of Appropriateness

Case HPC-03-2016 – 134 S. Park Avenue - Proposed additions to the first floor for a new family room, kitchen, prep kitchen and 2-car garage; and additions for the second floor for new bedrooms, closets and bathrooms.

Chairman Bohnen introduced the next item on the agenda as a public meeting for 134 S. Park Avenue. However, he added a preface that there's good reason to have a public hearing, and everyone (HPC) has agreed, but since it was already scheduled as a public meeting, asked the HPC if they are content to move forward to see how it goes.

Commissioner D'Arco asked if we can review and decide for a public hearing later.

Chairman Bohnen responded we should clarify it with Chan prior to the discussion. You can't change the meeting into a hearing, but you can call for another hearing.

Chan replied correct, you can formally continue it by motioning for a scheduled public hearing date.

The HPC agreed to move forward with the public meeting and see where it goes.

Chairman Bohnen introduced Bruce George, the architect for the 134 S. Park St. applicant.

Bruce George, of Charles Vincent George Architects, introduced himself and the property as a colonial revival styled home, on a large property. For context, he explained the block is made up of a variety types of homes. He reviewed the grey on the site plan is the original outline of the home. It's a great stock home for Hinsdale, however doesn't live that well in the inside of the home surprisingly. The kitchen he mentioned is very small for the size of the house, and there is no formal living space in the home. To that end, the Frey's (applicant) are converting it to something more livable and what people are asking for in a home these days. He reviewed the patio and adding an attached garage to the home. They will be keeping a portion of the existing detached garage for zoning purposes. It currently sits in an area where if demolished, would not be able to construct in the area anymore. Bruce mentioned he knows there is concern for the attached rear portico that used to be an old carriage drop off. They tried really hard to keep it and the homeowners are very interested in preserving every aspect they could to the home. There really aren't any modifications in the front or sides of the house. As far as the south porch goes, the only change is replacing the glazed windows with thermal pane to help create a 3-season room versus a 1-season room as it sits now. They initially tried to work with the rear portico but it became obvious with the layout of the garage and addition, that it would have pushed out the addition further and created a very dysfunctional floor plan. Mr. George mentioned they tried open up one side of the link way between the old house and new house that is a gallery feature they created to somewhat mimic the location of where the portico was.

Commissioner D'Arco asked where that would be.

Mr. George replied if you walk through the foyer past the stairs and you're walking towards the family room. There's an area where there are doors that open up to an outdoor patio that is where the gallery space is. And that is where the portico stands right now.

Commissioner D'Arco asked where the current kitchen is.

Mr. George replied the current kitchen is where the dining room is now. So we are basically taking the front dining room and converting it into a study. He noted, if you've ever been inside the house, it actually looks more like a study than a dining room. He also added they aren't really touching anything inside the room, except for building out that corner to create a side private office. The dining room is moving back to where the kitchen is.

Commissioner D'Arco asked if you are basically doubling the square footage on each floor with both additions.

Mr. George replied yes, about doubling the square footage of the house.

Commissioner D'Arco asked if the increase is about the same on both floors.

Mr. George replied the second floor is a good deal smaller than the first floor. He added that the owner wanted to convey the kitchen is a newer remodel and has no historic value. He also expressed that are trying to keep the new rooms comparable to the existing rooms of the house. In terms of the second floor, they are building out from the garage and the new kitchen portion of the house. They are not building over the new family room section of the house. We are also laying out the second floor modifying some of the exist walls. It has a dysfunctional plan as it sits right now in terms of a market and resale point of view. We are trying to create a bathroom for each of the rooms in this house and a second floor laundry as well. The exterior of the house is shown on page 2 of the packet, and it pretty much is as it stands, a colonial revival home. There is a portion of the house, where the new garage and bedroom would peek out at the north side of the house. But it is pretty far back, all the way at the back of the house. We do not feel this impacts the front view of the house driving down the street in either direction. The other picture above that is the north side of the house, and it shows the existing half round sunroom and the link of the area for the new addition of the house. To the right is a window where the existing stair hall is and the reason why it's at a different height. On the left side of the link, they tried to do everything to mimic the details off the existing building, for example, the stone foundation and the fireplace brick to match the brick on the home. To conclude, he reiterated the plans intend to match with the existing elements of the home, and opened the discussion for questions.

Commissioner D'Arco asked if there is anywhere else around the house the porte cochere can be moved to.

Mr. George replied he tried very hard to save the porte cochere but the reality of creating a functional floor plan that is sellable is always there. Nobody is going to spend a million to two million dollars on a project that is dysfunctional in the end. We tried to create a glass

link through the porte cochere but it'd push the whole building back. However that created a lot of issues for the location of the garage. That's significant because garages are a big part of architectural planning because they block light and big blocks of space you have to work around. By pushing the building back, it'd take up half the backyard and create a long drawn out plan that he doesn't think anyone would want. There are ways to do anything, but does it make sense? We believe we created a plan that makes the most sense while keeping everything the possibly could with the house.

Chan pointed out in an attachment in the memo, there is a street view photo of what you can see from the street. The house setback is essentially almost twice as what is minimally required. He wanted to point out that the elevation and site plan is great, but there is a street view photo of the home too in the packet.

Commissioner D'Arco asked about Chan's comment about the setback.

Chan responded the front setback is about 67 feet from the street and the minimum requirement for the R-1 (District) is 35 feet, so your view of the house from the street is significantly further than required by Code.

Commissioner D'Arco expressed that she's familiar with the house, and she is all for updating the house for today's living standards. The only thing she is struggling a little bit with is that the seller signed a document when they landmarked this house. And a significant portion of that is the very prominent entrance port and rear porte cochere. That is a struggle for her because that was a significant portion of the landmark designation. So it's hard to go back for the seller to say he didn't realize these were the restrictions. She's not sure how much disclosure was given to the buyers, but it sounded like through other conversations that the buyers may not have known this was the case. That's not within our purview to determine but you have your hands tied because it is a significant portion significant meaningful part of landmarking the home, and now it's being considered to be demolished.

Mr. George replied there's a lot of ways to view historic preservation and that it is always thought of favorably that adaptive reuse of buildings is always better than the wrecking ball. And we have to be able to reuse these buildings for future living conditions for the way people live. The landmark feature in this case is in the middle of the building so it is pretty much destined to create a dysfunctional plan. You can't create additions to the north side or south side because that's where the formal living rooms are. Thus, we have to build outwards or not do it. That's why it's important to have some leeway and I don't know what else to say about that. We really did look at so many options as to what we can do, but to make it a functional plan for something someone is going to want to live in and somebody is going to want to buy from them, we felt that we had to take down the porte cochere down. We'd be willing to repurpose some of the porte cochere and reutilize the columns and perhaps adding it to the side of the gallery.

Commissioner Gonzalez stated but then you'd be changing the features. He added he has a lot of experience with historical buildings and preserving them. The issue is, how much are

you going to intrude into the existing home. The mass of the design is substantial so there's room for creativity, there's room for flexibility, and maybe the mass of the house has to be reduced. But to say it's this or nothing, because that's what I'm starting to hear, I don't necessarily agree with.

Mr. George replied I didn't say it's this or nothing.

Commissioner Gonzalez replied I know what you said, I'm just hearing the degree of difficulty you're suggesting in order to achieve this mass I'm not necessarily convinced that is the ultimate decision.

Ms. Shannon Frey, the owner of the home introduced herself and would like to answer some questions. To respond to the size of the addition, it is large, and larger than what her and her husband would like to do. However, we can scale down the addition, but it doesn't change that we're only adding a kitchen, bedroom, master bedroom, master closet, laundry room. We're not adding a ton of rooms. We're just adding what is necessary. If you ever go to the home, it's 1.15 acres.

Commissioner Gonzalez replied he has not walked it, but familiar with the property.

Ms. Shannon Frey said it's massive. She reviewed the dimensions and areas of the site plan and the various addition plans to the HPC. After we're done with this, we'll have to keep it this way in order to sell it. But if it financially hurts me, and I can't build what I want, then it makes sense for me to go through the process of un-landmarking it, which we know is an option. We don't want to change the home, we love it and always have. This is our third historic home in Hinsdale. We're one of the rare people that would buy an old home and do the work. Whether or not my addition is 5,000 SF or 2,000 SF, I still have to get rid of the portico. It's the only part of the home to attach the addition without compromising the integrity of the structure, and the portico is in the middle.

Commissioner D'Arco expressed that on the side of the home would look odd because you have the dining circle.

Ms. Shannon Frey explained that she doesn't want the addition to appear to be a simple add-on. She wants the additions to look like it is original to the home. She reported that everyone knows their house and they receive compliments all the time. People also tell her that they built their home to look like their house. She also expressed interest in potentially adding the home on the National Registry. Ms. Frey continued to present other areas of the home they are preserving through the addition plan.

Mr. Frey introduced himself, and told the HPC that they also own the historic farm house at 104 E. 4th Street. He explained the addition completed on the farm house paid no attention to the existing features of the structure. Since the flow of the home was not carefully thought out, new additions will cost about the price of purchasing a new home. And this was the reason for purchasing the home at 134 S. Park Avenue. He believes, 104 E. 4th Street will be demolished inevitably. He also explained that the home at 134 was on

the market for 3 years, and the price dropped a million dollars. He expressed that the home is not functional as is, and nobody wants to live in the house because of this reason.

Commissioner D'Arco expressed that there are implications to buying a landmarked home, and they should have been laid out prior to selling/buying the home.

Ms. Shannon Frey explained this home was originally landmarked with Susan Benjamin, and she did know the implications. However, if the process is going to be so burdensome, we also know there is a process to un-landmark the home. Susan Benjamin told her that their plan is within the guidelines of the National Registry. Ms. Frey mentioned that it sounds like the porte cochere is the sticking point and is happy to repurpose it through the work.

Discussion in regards to allowing an addition to a landmarked home/significant historical feature and due diligence on purchasing a landmarked home ensued.

Chairman Bohnen acknowledged that there is more discussion to be had, however, due to a time constraint of having another meeting at 7:30 PM by the Plan Commission, asked for a motion to continue this application. Commissioner Gonzalez made the motion to continue it for discussion, Commissioner D'Arco seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously (3 Ayes and 1 absent)

Public Meeting – Certificate of Appropriateness

Case HPC-04-2016 – 304 S. Lincoln St. - Proposed new front porch in the front yard abutting Lincoln Street; new screened porch and chimney on side yard; and new balustrade and stairs on the corner side yard abutting Third Street.

Mr. Peter Coules introduced himself as the attorney representing the applicant at 304 S. Lincoln Street. He gave a review of when the home was landmarked and who the architect is for the project. The porch they plan to demolish is in disrepair and they will do anything they can to save what's there now. Mr. Coules also reviewed the architectural features of house and the new porch. He introduced the architect, Mr. Jim Prisby to explain the design of the new porch.

Mr. Jim Prisby approached the dais with larger drawing plans and explained the materials and issues of the existing porch. He explained some of the designs were based on building code requirements. Additional discussion ensued on the materials of the structure.

Chairman Bohnen recommended visiting the structure to review the existing features of the home prior to continuing the application for the next meeting. Mr. Bohnen asked for a motion to continue this application. Commissioner Gonzalez made the motion to continue it for discussion, Commissioner D'Arco seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously (3 Ayes and 1 absent)

Discussion

2016 Preservation Award to the Village of Hinsdale for the Oak Street Bridge and First Street Brick pavement between Elm Street and Park Avenue.

Chairman Bohnen reviewed that he spoke with the Hinsdalean on October 12, 2016, and they will have the photographs completed and ready, and Mr. Bohnen will discuss it at the next meeting.

Adjournment

With no additional discussion, Commissioner Bohnen asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Gonzalez made the motion and Commissioner D'Arco seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:19p.m. on October 12, 2016.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chan Yu', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Chan Yu, Village Planner

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) ss:
COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
Case No. HPC 01-2016)
306 S. Garfield Avenue)
and 26 East 3rd Street)

CONTINUED REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had
and testimony taken at the Special Meeting of
the above-entitled matter before the Hinsdale
Historic Preservation Commission, at 19 East
Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois, on the
12th day of October, 2016, at the hour of
6 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

- MR. JOHN BOHNEN, Chairman;
- MS. JANICE D'ARCO, Member;
- MR. FRANK GONZALEZ, Member.

ALSO PRESENT:

- MR. CHAN YU, Village Planner.

* * *

1 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: The first item on
2 our agenda is the continued public hearing on
3 306 South Garfield.

4 MR. YU: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: Both Janice and Frank
6 joined me and Chan over at the home Monday
7 morning. We walked the grounds and spoke with
8 the owner. I think we walked away with an
9 understanding as to the wall that was in
10 question and how we would proceed to landmark
11 that, Chan.

06:04:16PM

12 But Janice had a question, and I
13 can't answer it. I don't know, maybe you can.
14 If we want to proceed and go forward with this,
15 how do we break out the house and the coach
16 house?

17 MR. YU: It would be under one
18 application so it would be together.

19 MS. D'ARCO: So I guess my question is
20 because it is two separate parcels of land, even
21 though they are owned by the same owner, they
22 are separate PIN numbers for the property.

06:04:43PM

1 need to run that by counsel.

2 MR. YU: Right. Well, the application
3 has findings and recommendations pointing to
4 elements of architectural things that are
5 significant that you would like to landmark. I
6 don't see any hard rules in the historic
7 preservation ordinance that says that we can't
8 break it out. For example, findings and
9 recommendations for one address and findings and
10 recommendations for the other address. So in
11 this case, it would be 306 Garfield Avenue for
12 the main house, and then we can have its own
13 separate --

06:06:10PM

14 MS. D'ARCO: That's what I meant.

15 MR. YU: We can do that.

16 MS. D'ARCO: Because if the seller of
17 306 decides to sell 26 east, then 26 east would
18 still need to have their landmark portion.

19 MR. YU: Right. Right. No. You are
20 right, yes. So then the coach house would have
21 its landmark status and its individual findings
22 and recommendations.

06:06:33PM

1 So if the owner sells that second
2 piece of property that has an existing home on
3 it, what are the implications for that coach
4 house that's been landmarked because it would
5 have to be some prorated tax status because only
6 a certain percentage of that property is
7 landmarked.

8 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: Yes.

9 MS. D'ARCO: Because the house, the
10 front of the house wouldn't be but the coach
11 house would, and then the big house next to it
12 would be landmarked. So I think we probably
13 need to wrap our hands around what are the
14 implications taxwise for just having the coach
15 house separately on a property that's
16 independent of the historic house that's also
17 going to be landmarked.

18 MR. YU: Right. Right.

19 MS. D'ARCO: My recommendation would be
20 to do two of them separately because they are
21 two separate tax parcels, taxable land parcels.
22 But I'm not sure what the answer is, I think we

06:05:10PM

06:05:35PM

1 MS. D'ARCO: And I think we agreed not
2 to landmark the walls, right?

3 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: Yes.

4 MS. D'ARCO: Because again in the event
5 they ever sold it and wanted to make some
6 modifications and tear down the walls, they
7 wouldn't --

8 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: The walls are not
9 dating back to the date of the structure.

10 MR. YU: I don't think it's 50 years
11 old.

06:06:58PM

12 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: They are not.

13 MS. D'ARCO: The wall?

14 MR. GONZALEZ: No, they aren't.

15 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: About 30 she said.
16 So we are in agreement then we are
17 going to make a motion here to landmark the
18 house and the coach house. And you will handle
19 the details?

20 MR. YU: Correct. So the findings and
21 recommendations would be to -- At the next
22 meeting I will have the recommendations and

06:07:17PM

1 findings.
 2 MR. GONZALEZ: Just make sure they are
 3 separate.
 4 MR. YU: Yes.
 5 MR. GONZALEZ: That's no different than
 6 any other property that -- because people, folks
 7 can own two properties. But homes can be
 8 different ages.
 9 MR. YU: Sure.
 10 MR. GONZALEZ: Not in this case. But,
 11 yes, it makes sense to perform it separately.
 12 MR. YU: Yes.
 13 MS. D'ARCO: Because the tax
 14 advantage --
 15 MR. GONZALEZ: Oh, you'd create a
 16 migraine on the tax paperwork.
 17 MS. D'ARCO: Well, you don't get the
 18 full tax advantage of the --
 19 MR. GONZALEZ: I don't know who makes
 20 that judgment call.
 21 MR. YU: The tax freeze, yes.
 22 MR. GONZALEZ: Which one gets the tax

06:07:38PM

06:07:57PM

1 benefit, the most or the least if they are
 2 separate. They are separate.
 3 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: So may I have a
 4 motion to landmark the two structures, the one
 5 at 306 South Lincoln and the one on 3rd Street.
 6 MR. GONZALEZ: Motion to landmark.
 7 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: Second, please.
 8 MS. D'ARCO: Second.
 9 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: Roll call vote.
 10 Frank?
 11 MR. GONZALEZ: Here.
 12 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: Janice?
 13 MS. D'ARCO: Here.
 14 CHAIRMAN BOHNEN: And I vote aye.
 15 * * *
 16 (Which were all the proceedings had
 17 in the above-entitled cause.)
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

06:08:24PM

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) ss.
 2 COUNTY OF DU PAGE)
 3
 4 I, JANICE H. HEINEMANN, CSR, RDR, CRR,
 5 do hereby certify that I am a court reporter
 6 doing business in the State of Illinois, that I
 7 reported in shorthand the testimony given at the
 8 hearing of said cause, and that the foregoing is
 9 a true and correct transcript of my shorthand
 10 notes so taken as aforesaid.
 11
 12
 13
 14 _____
 Janice H. Heinemann CSR, RDR, CRR
 License No 084-001391
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

0	B	32:4, 32:13, 33:13, 33:17, 34:8, 34:13	35:8	License [1] - 35:14 Lincoln [1] - 34:5
01-2016 [1] - 28:5 084-001391 [1] - 35:14	BEFORE [1] - 28:3 benefit [1] - 34:1 big [1] - 30:11 BOARD [1] - 28:16 BOHNEN [13] - 28:17, 29:1, 29:5, 30:8, 32:3, 32:8, 32:12, 32:15, 34:3, 34:7, 34:9, 34:12, 34:14	date [1] - 32:9 dating [1] - 32:9 decides [1] - 31:17 details [1] - 32:19 different [2] - 33:5, 33:8 down [1] - 32:6 DU [2] - 28:2, 35:2	HEINEMANN [1] - 35:4 Heinemann [1] - 35:14 hereby [1] - 35:5 HINSDALE [1] - 28:3 Hinsdale [2] - 28:10, 28:12 historic [2] - 30:16, 31:6 HISTORIC [1] - 28:3 Historic [1] - 28:11 home [2] - 29:6, 30:2 homes [1] - 33:7 hour [1] - 28:13 house [13] - 29:15, 29:16, 30:4, 30:9, 30:10, 30:11, 30:15, 30:16, 31:12, 31:20, 32:18 HPC [1] - 28:5	M
1	break [2] - 29:15, 31:8 business [1] - 35:6	E	ILLINOIS [2] - 28:1, 35:1 Illinois [2] - 28:12, 35:6 implications [2] - 30:3, 30:14 independent [1] - 30:16 individual [1] - 31:21 item [1] - 29:1	main [1] - 31:12 Matter [1] - 28:4 matter [1] - 28:10 meant [1] - 31:14 Meeting [1] - 28:9 meeting [1] - 32:22 Member [2] - 28:18, 28:19 MEMBERS [1] - 28:16 migraine [1] - 33:16 modifications [1] - 32:6 Monday [1] - 29:6 morning [1] - 29:7 most [1] - 34:1 motion [3] - 32:17, 34:4, 34:6 MR [24] - 28:17, 28:19, 28:21, 29:4, 29:17, 30:18, 31:2, 31:15, 31:19, 32:10, 32:14, 32:20, 33:2, 33:4, 33:5, 33:9, 33:10, 33:12, 33:15, 33:19, 33:21, 33:22, 34:6, 34:11 MS [13] - 28:18, 29:19, 30:9, 30:19, 31:14, 31:16, 32:1, 32:4, 32:13, 33:13, 33:17, 34:8, 34:13
2	Case [1] - 28:5 case [2] - 31:11, 33:10 certain [1] - 30:6 certify [1] - 35:5 CHAIRMAN [12] - 29:1, 29:5, 30:8, 32:3, 32:8, 32:12, 32:15, 34:3, 34:7, 34:9, 34:12, 34:14	east [2] - 31:17 East [2] - 28:6, 28:11 elements [1] - 31:4 entitled [2] - 28:10, 34:17 event [1] - 32:4 example [1] - 31:8 existing [1] - 30:2	I	N
3	Case [1] - 28:5 case [2] - 31:11, 33:10 certain [1] - 30:6 certify [1] - 35:5 CHAIRMAN [12] - 29:1, 29:5, 30:8, 32:3, 32:8, 32:12, 32:15, 34:3, 34:7, 34:9, 34:12, 34:14	findings [6] - 31:3, 31:8, 31:9, 31:21, 32:20, 33:1 first [1] - 29:1 folks [1] - 33:6 foregoing [1] - 35:8 forward [1] - 29:14 frank [1] - 34:10 Frank [1] - 29:5 FRANK [1] - 28:19 freeze [1] - 33:21 front [1] - 30:10 full [1] - 33:18	J	O
5	Chairman [1] - 28:17 Chan [2] - 29:6, 29:11 CHAN [1] - 28:21 Chicago [1] - 28:12 coach [6] - 29:15, 30:3, 30:10, 30:14, 31:20, 32:18 COMMISSION [1] - 28:3 Commission [1] - 28:11 continued [1] - 29:2 CONTINUED [1] - 28:8 correct [3] - 29:4, 32:20, 35:9 counsel [1] - 31:1 COUNTY [2] - 28:2, 35:2 court [1] - 35:5 create [1] - 33:15 CRR [2] - 35:4, 35:14 CSR [2] - 35:4, 35:14	F	JANICE [2] - 28:18, 35:4 Janice [4] - 29:5, 29:12, 34:12, 35:14 JOHN [1] - 28:17 joined [1] - 29:6 judgment [1] - 33:20	need [3] - 30:13, 31:1, 31:18 next [2] - 30:11, 32:21 notes [1] - 35:10 numbers [1] - 29:22
6	6 [1] - 28:14	G	L	land [2] - 29:20, 30:21 landmark [8] - 29:10, 31:5, 31:18, 31:21, 32:2, 32:17, 34:4, 34:6 landmarked [4] - 30:4, 30:7, 30:12, 30:17 least [1] - 34:1
50 [1] - 32:10	6	Garfield [3] - 28:6, 29:3, 31:11 given [1] - 35:7 GONZALEZ [10] - 28:19, 32:14, 33:2, 33:5, 33:10, 33:15, 33:19, 33:22, 34:6, 34:11 grounds [1] - 29:7 guess [1] - 29:19	land [2] - 29:20, 30:21 landmark [8] - 29:10, 31:5, 31:18, 31:21, 32:2, 32:17, 34:4, 34:6 landmarked [4] - 30:4, 30:7, 30:12, 30:17 least [1] - 34:1	October [1] - 28:13 OF [6] - 28:1, 28:2, 28:3, 28:8, 35:1, 35:2 old [1] - 32:11 one [5] - 29:17, 31:9, 33:22, 34:4, 34:5 ordinance [1] - 31:7 own [2] - 31:12, 33:7 owned [1] - 29:21
6 [1] - 28:14	D	H	land [2] - 29:20, 30:21 landmark [8] - 29:10, 31:5, 31:18, 31:21, 32:2, 32:17, 34:4, 34:6 landmarked [4] - 30:4, 30:7, 30:12, 30:17 least [1] - 34:1	land [2] - 29:20, 30:21 landmark [8] - 29:10, 31:5, 31:18, 31:21, 32:2, 32:17, 34:4, 34:6 landmarked [4] - 30:4, 30:7, 30:12, 30:17 least [1] - 34:1
A	D'ARCO [13] - 28:18, 29:19, 30:9, 30:19, 31:14, 31:16, 32:1,	handle [1] - 32:18 hands [1] - 30:13 hard [1] - 31:6 hearing [2] - 29:2,	above-entitled [2] - 28:10, 34:17 address [2] - 31:9, 31:10 advantage [2] - 33:14, 33:18 aforsaid [1] - 35:10 agenda [1] - 29:2 ages [1] - 33:8 agreed [1] - 32:1 agreement [1] - 32:16 ALSO [1] - 28:20 answer [2] - 29:13, 30:22 application [2] - 29:18, 31:2 architectural [1] - 31:4 Avenue [3] - 28:6, 28:12, 31:11 aye [1] - 34:14	above-entitled [2] - 28:10, 34:17 address [2] - 31:9, 31:10 advantage [2] - 33:14, 33:18 aforsaid [1] - 35:10 agenda [1] - 29:2 ages [1] - 33:8 agreed [1] - 32:1 agreement [1] - 32:16 ALSO [1] - 28:20 answer [2] - 29:13, 30:22 application [2] - 29:18, 31:2 architectural [1] - 31:4 Avenue [3] - 28:6, 28:12, 31:11 aye [1] - 34:14

<p>owner [3] - 29:8, 29:21, 30:1</p>	<p>34:7, 34:8 see [1] - 31:6 sell [1] - 31:17 seller [1] - 31:16 sells [1] - 30:1 sense [1] - 33:11 separate [7] - 29:20, 29:22, 30:21, 31:13, 33:3, 34:2 separately [3] - 30:15, 30:20, 33:11 shorthand [2] - 35:7, 35:9 significant [1] - 31:5 sold [1] - 32:5 South [2] - 29:3, 34:5 Special [1] - 28:9 ss [2] - 28:1, 35:1 State [1] - 35:6 STATE [2] - 28:1, 35:1 status [2] - 30:5, 31:21 still [1] - 31:18 Street [2] - 28:6, 34:5 structure [1] - 32:9 structures [1] - 34:4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">W</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>p.m [1] - 28:14 PAGE [2] - 28:2, 35:2 paperwork [1] - 33:16 parcels [3] - 29:20, 30:21 people [1] - 33:6 percentage [1] - 30:6 perform [1] - 33:11 piece [1] - 30:2 PIN [1] - 29:22 Planner [1] - 28:21 pointing [1] - 31:3 portion [1] - 31:18 PRESENT [2] - 28:16, 28:20 preservation [1] - 31:7 PRESERVATION [1] - 28:3 Preservation [1] - 28:11 proceed [2] - 29:10, 29:14 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 28:8 proceedings [1] - 34:16 properties [1] - 33:7 property [5] - 29:22, 30:2, 30:6, 30:15, 33:6 prorated [1] - 30:5 public [1] - 29:2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>tax [7] - 30:5, 30:21, 33:13, 33:16, 33:18, 33:21, 33:22 taxable [1] - 30:21 taxwise [1] - 30:14 tear [1] - 32:6 testimony [2] - 28:9, 35:7 THE [1] - 28:3 together [1] - 29:18 transcript [1] - 35:9 true [1] - 35:9 two [5] - 29:20, 30:20, 30:21, 33:7, 34:4</p>	<p>walked [2] - 29:7, 29:8 wall [2] - 29:9, 32:13 walls [3] - 32:2, 32:6, 32:8 wrap [1] - 30:13</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>years [1] - 32:10 YU [13] - 28:21, 29:4, 29:17, 30:18, 31:2, 31:15, 31:19, 32:10, 32:20, 33:4, 33:9, 33:12, 33:21</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>RDR [2] - 35:4, 35:14 recommendation [1] - 30:19 recommendations [6] - 31:3, 31:9, 31:10, 31:22, 32:21, 32:22 REPORT [1] - 28:8 reported [1] - 35:7 reporter [1] - 35:5 roll [1] - 34:9 rules [1] - 31:6 run [1] - 31:1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>under [1] - 29:17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>VILLAGE [1] - 28:3 Village [1] - 28:21 vote [2] - 34:9, 34:14</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p>second [3] - 30:1,</p>		