

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of October 1, 2024 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, October 1, 2024 at 6:30 p.m., at the Municipal Services Building, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman John Looby, Board members Scott Renken, Sally Downey, Justin Stamer, Sarah Lamphere and Joanne Bluhm

Building Review Board members absent: Eric Lohmueller

Staff present: Luis Prado, Assistant Planner, Abigail Vollmers, Senior Planner, and Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

**1. Introduction of Board members and staff, overview of meeting procedures –
Chairman Looby**

Chairman Looby reviewed the role of the Building Review Board, and the meeting procedures followed by the Board. He asked the members of the Board and staff to introduce themselves.

3. Recognition of past Board member Jim Diamond.

Chairman Looby recognized the contributions of Mr. Diamond and reviewed the extensive list of projects in which he was involved. He noted that Jim aptly led the Board as Chairman over the course of several years.

2. Consideration of the minutes from the September 4, 2024 Building Review Board meeting.

The minutes of the September 4, 2024 meeting were approved as presented.

4. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of alterations and an addition above an attached garage at 744 Northmoor Road.

Property Owner: Marshall Reminton Pettygrove and Brittney Teasdale

Presented By: Dean Maggos, Project Manager

Chairman Looby asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Maggos pointed out the location of the proposed addition and explained that the addition will provide a bedroom over the existing one story garage. He reviewed the front elevation noting that care was taken to mimic the existing front elevation which is one and a half stories. He stated that the existing gable over the garage is a fake façade which is eliminated with the addition. He stated that on the opposite

side of the front elevation, a false dormer is proposed to create balance with the proposed addition over the garage. He reviewed the rear elevation with the proposed addition. He stated that the project was a challenge adding that various designs were considered including options that did not require a zoning variance, before landing on the preferred design as now presented. He stated that the design presented works best with the existing house and the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Prado reviewed that an addition over the existing attached garage is proposed along with various alterations around the house. He noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals recently recommended approval of the variance required to allow the proposed addition subject to review by the Building Review Board. He noted that the staff report calls out the potential for refinement to the gable and dormer proposed on the front elevation to enhance the overall design. He noted that the staff report also suggests further study and refinement of the windows on the north elevation. He stated that subject to those considerations, the staff report recommends approval of the petition.

Board member Stamer noted inconsistencies in the window division patterns. He commented on the south elevation noting that the ridges of the dormers do not align and suggested consideration of increasing the height of the main ridge to mimic the slope of the larger gable. He commented that the false dormer proposed on the front elevation does not appear to be necessary or of benefit to the interior space. He stated that it appears small and a bit out of place. He suggested eliminating the false dormer or making it larger so that it can benefit the interior of the home.

Board member Downey observed that in the presentation, the window in the center gable on the south elevation appears to now match the other windows. She observed that the garage already creates an elongated across the front of the home and as a result, the proposed addition does not further elongate the front façade of the house. She encouraged further study and refinement of the windows on the north elevation noting that there are many windows, existing and proposed, of various sizes. She questioned whether the window in the east dormer the same size as the window in the west dormer. She agreed with Board member Stamer that some minor refinements will provide consistency and some symmetry overall.

Board member Lamphere asked whether any changes are proposed to the entrance canopy and asked for clarification on the exterior materials. She noted that there are some discrepancies between the plans and the description offered by the petitioner. She commented that overall, there appears to be quite a few exterior materials proposed.

Board member Bluhm commented that the addition appears a bit awkward. She encouraged further study of the gable over the garage.

Board member Renken stated that overall, the project will improve the house by removing the false front. He stated that all of the peaks appear to be at the highest

point possible but noted that there may be an opportunity to increase the height slightly. He suggested that the false dormer could be incorporated as a benefit to the interior space. He stated that in his opinion, it is better to have the dormer than to eliminate it. He encouraged further consideration of the windows on the rear elevation. He suggested further study of the back shed dormer noting that pulling it off of the main ridge and making some other adjustments could improve the element. He agreed that some minor adjustments will improve the end product.

Chairman Looby agreed that the plan presented, with some refinement, presents a good solution for meeting the owners' needs in a small space. He agreed with the comments from the other Board members in particular that the windows need to be refined for more consistency and that more details are needed on the proposed materials. He invited responses from the petitioner to the Board's questions.

Mr. Maggos reviewed the exterior materials noting that earth tones are proposed. He stated that shake siding is proposed on the gables. He stated that the trim board is proposed as a taupe and the windows, off white. He agreed to give further thought to the windows on the rear elevation and overall to achieve greater consistency.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Ann Dowd, 140 Wooded Lane, complimented the project.

Linda Martinat, 820 Northmoor Road, complimented the project as well.

A resident who stated that he lives across the street from the project asked about the anticipated duration of the project.

Mr. Maggos stated the intention to complete construction in four to six months.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Looby invited final questions from the Board.

In response to Board member Bluhm, Mr. Maggos stated that no shutters are proposed and confirmed that the canopy over the front door will remain. He stated that consistent trim colors will be used around the house.

In response to a question from Board member Lamphere, Mr. Maggos stated that it has not yet been determined whether the windows in the gables will be casements or double hung.

Board member Renken offered that casement windows may be required in the gables to provide for egress from the second floor.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited a

motion.

Board member Stamer made a motion to recommend approval of an addition and alterations to the residence at 744 Northmoor Road based on the findings presented in the staff report and incorporating the Board's comments as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to the submittal of plans for permit make the following refinements based on Board direction. The refinements shall be subject to staff approval.
 - a. Refine the design of the proposed dormer and gable to better fit the south elevation with attention to symmetry and proportionality.
 - b. Refine the size and arrangement of windows on the north elevation for consistency.
 - c. Consider making the false dormer a true dormer or eliminating it.
 - d. Detail the plans to specify the window material, fiberglass or metal clad wood windows and note that the windows will have simulated divided lites with muntins affixed to the interior and exterior with a spacer bar between the glass.
 - e. Refine the front elevation and roof plan to address the roof saddle.
2. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to Board direction or discussion and as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans as presented are consistent with the Board's approval and to determine whether further Board review is required prior to the issuance of permits.
3. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect all trees intended for preservation that may be impacted during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

Tree Removal and Landscaping

- a. A tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify trees proposed for removal, and trees identified for protection and preservation.
- b. A plan shall be submitted identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing pre and post construction treatments proposed to increase the chances of long-term survival of the trees intended for preservation which are located close to construction activity.
- c. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted showing the existing landscaping. Any landscaping negatively impacted by construction shall be replaced.

Drainage and Grading

d. Detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling **is limited to the minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices.** The property must continue to accept water that is tributary to the site and runoff from new construction must be addressed to avoid increasing stormwater runoff on to neighboring properties.

Exterior Lighting

e. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.

Construction Parking, Staging, and Tree Protection

f. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

5. Continued consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of mid-project revisions to previously approved plans for additions and alterations to the residence at 821 Northmoor Road. A building scale variance is requested.

Property Owner: Black House LLC – Series 821 Northmoor

Presented By: Patrick Shaver, President of Black House

Chairman Looby asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Shaver stated that they are continuing to work through revisions to the plan taking into account the plans and square footage as approved in 2022 and the as built conditions that now exist. He acknowledged that field changes were made that impacted the height, massing, and square footage of the home. He acknowledged that a building scale variance is now requested and initially, a square footage variance was not required. He stated that the as built condition complies with the zoning variance granted in 2022. He reviewed that a building permit was issued after the Board's approval in 2022, and construction proceeded, and some inspections occurred, until work was stopped. He stated that the City requested an as built height survey in July 2024 which identified an increase over the height reflected on the approved plan. He noted that the height causes an increase in the building square footage calculation. He stated that he believes that mistakes were made in calculating the square footage of the house throughout the process. He stated that

at this point, reverting back to the original plan will be difficult and result in a house that will be less desirable. He proposed the addition of arborvitae to provide a buffer for adjacent residences. He stated that he is willing to seek input from the neighbors to determine the most effective locations for the new plantings. He stated that to address the height of the home, the clerestory element will be lowered to bring it into compliance with the allowed 30 foot height limit. He stated that shades will be installed in the home to address concerns about light spillover adding that the glass in the bathroom will be covered with a film. He presented samples of the exterior materials. He stated his interest in working with the Board to move the project forward to completion in the interest of all parties.

Ms. Vollmers reviewed the history of the petition and the process of working to get accurate and fully dimensioned plans. She noted various concerns raised by the neighbors including the height and mass of the structure, drainage, light spillover, landscape screening, and the ongoing condition of the site. She stated to date, the petitioner has only identified lowering the clerestory in response to the concerns raised.

Ms. Czerniak stated that it is in the interest of all parties to find a way to move the project forward. She suggested that the Board may want to direct the petitioner to develop several options that address the concerns raised including, but not limited to the square footage and height overages. She suggested that the Chairman could appoint a subcommittee of the Board to work with the petitioner in an effort to return to the Board with a workable plan.

In response to questions from Chairman Looby, Mr. Shaver presented a sample of stucco in a light gray color. He stated that a darker gray was originally proposed. He stated that vertical siding is now proposed which will be treated with pine tar. He stated that the mechanicals are roughed in on the roof.

Chairman Looby asked that samples of the siding prior to and after the application of the coating be presented for Board review. He expressed concern that the mechanicals will create an industrial appearance. He invited questions and comments from the Board and noted that a continuation of the petition is needed to allow further work by the petitioner and input from a Board subcommittee.

In response to a question from Board member Renken, Mr. Shaver stated that vertical siding, in his opinion, will look sharp. He added that vertical siding will also allow for better drainage down the wall since no fascia is proposed.

Board member Stamer stated that it is unfortunate that the petitioner is trying to assign blame to the City. He noted that the grade at the garage was lowered with no approval or consultation with the City and the overall height of the structure was increased. He stated that the height limitations must be adhered to in deference to the neighborhood. He stated that in his opinion, the entire project needs to be revisited, or the house torn down.

Board member Downey commented that two years ago the Board granted approval to a specific plan. She expressed frustration that the petitioner is not taking responsibility for the decisions he made to significantly modify the house during construction without any further review or approvals. She thanked the petitioner for finally cleaning up the job site. She stated that as currently constructed, the house does not meet any of the applicable standards. She noted that the massing, color, and siding have all changed in addition to other elements. She noted that the staff is recommending accepting the lowering of the garage which she sees as a gift. She stated that this project does not reflect how the City operates. She stated that in her opinion, the project should revert back to the approved plan. She stated that the petitioner's problems are not the responsibility of the Board to solve.

Board member Lamphere noted the time devoted to date to this project by staff and the Board. She stated that the petitioner should focus on a solution and not on disputing the City's process.

Board member Bluhm stated that the Board approved one house and another one was built.

Board member Renken stated that this is a complex issue at this point and resolution needs to be reached. He stated that it could be helpful to delve into the square footage and understand what made the 19 foot calculation line come into play as construction proceeded. He stated that consideration needs to be given to what is reasonable from everyone's standpoint. He stated that a solution needs to be reached so the house can be completed.

Chairman Looby invited a response to the Board comments from the petitioner.

Mr. Shaver stated that he wants to get the house completed for the neighbors' benefit and for his own interests. He stated that he put considerable time into designing and building the home.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Ann Dowd, 140 Wooded Lane, commented on the smaller house that was approved in February 2022. She stated that at that time, the square footage complied with the allowed size of a home on the property. She stated that the neighbors are very upset about the size and height of the residence. She stated that it is difficult to understand what the petitioner is proposing to change at this point. She acknowledged that from the photos, the proposed changes appear to lower the house but stated concern about the uncertainty of what is proposed. She stated that if a significant square footage overage is allowed on this site, it will be requested on other properties in the neighborhood. She stated that the Board has spent considerable time on this petition adding that the site remains an eyesore. She asked whether the original architect is

still involved in the project.

Alexandra Carlson, 139 Wooded Lane, stated that she is the neighbor to the west of the house under construction. She stated that she has lived in Lake Forest all her life and genuinely wants to be a good neighbor but asked that the petitioner be a good neighbor in return. She invited the neighbor into her backyard to view how the house as currently built towers over her house. She stated that the City regulations are in place for a reason. She recognized that bringing the house into compliance will take time and will cost money but noted that is the result of not following the rules.

Resident at 745 Northmoor Road stated that construction appeared to be abandoned in June of this year adding that the site is overgrown, and the fence dilapidated. He stated that the house does not seem to even closely resemble any of the other homes in the neighborhood. He questioned how much longer the neighborhood will need to tolerate the uncompleted home. He stated that he does not want to live with ongoing construction noting other construction projects in the neighborhood. He stated that the house was originally an odd ball house in the neighborhood and has been made worse by the petitioner. He stated that he wishes the petitioner well and hopes to see the project finished soon but noted that the neighbors will need to live with the end product.

Mr. Carlson, 139 Wooded Lane, stated that all regulations need to be met. He stated that tinting the windows will not provide privacy for his home. He stated that he does not want to have to wait for trees to grow for privacy.

Linda Martinat, 820 Northmoor Road, stated that the property was red tagged and then the red tag was removed. She stated that she too wants the house done and agreed that the original house was also an eyesore. She said that she expected construction to be completed by now. She noted the construction activity up and down the street adding that construction sites should be kept clean.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairman Looby invited a response to public testimony from the petitioner.

Mr. Shaver reiterated that he is proposing to plant arborvitae and is willing to work with the neighbors to determine where the arborvitae should be planted. He said that he takes ownership of the unapproved changes that were made. He apologized to the neighbors for the impact on their privacy and livability adding that he did not think the changes would have an impact on the neighboring homes. He stated that he will do whatever he can to enhance the privacy of the neighboring properties. He stated that he recently cleaned up the site himself.

Chairman Looby thanked the public for their comments. He asked the petitioner to engage the architect to prepare the drawings and complete the building scale calculations. He urged the petitioner to move quickly to bring a solution back to the Board to allow this project to move forward. He invited a motion to continue the

petition with direction to the petitioner to prepare options for review and input from a Board subcommittee and return quickly to the full Board for review.

Board member Downey made a motion to continue the petition with the direction as stated by the Chairman.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

4. Opportunity for the public to address the Building Review Board on non-agenda items.

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

5. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was provided by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak
Director of Community Development