

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of November 6, 2024**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, November 6, 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 Eric Lohmueller

Building Review Board members absent: Joanne Bluhm

Staff present: Luis Prado, Assistant 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.

2. Consideration of the minutes from the October 1, 2024 Building Review Board meeting.

The minutes of the October 1, 2024 meeting were approved as presented.

3. Consideration of a new house with an attached garage, hardscape, a cabana, and a conceptual landscape plan proposed on vacant property at 250 Butler Drive.

Property Owners: Aneta and Sahil Aggarwal

Representative: Rick Swanson, Architect

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. Swanson stated that the property is located in a cul-de-sac at the west end of Butler Drive. He stated that the previous home on the site was demolished a few years ago, before his clients purchased the property, due to water infiltration. He presented an image of the previous house on the site. He stated that a large portion of the property is located in the flood plain adding that the proposed new home is sited outside of the impacted area and well within the zoning setbacks. He stated that most of the trees on the site are in the flood plain areas and will remain. He reviewed the site plan and the landscape plan and pointed out the configuration of the driveway and motor court and the access to the six car garage. He stated that a pool and pool cabana are proposed and will be designed consistent with the style of the home. He stated that the home is designed in the French Provencal style which

dates back to the early 1600's. He stated that the style is characterized by narrow tall windows, a slate roof, copper gutters, and symmetrical metal chimneys. He reviewed the proposed high quality exterior materials including stone veneer, Indiana limestone, cut limestone window sills, black windows, and a mahogany front door. He noted that the gutters will be built into the limestone cornices. He stated that although a slate roof is planned, an imitation slate roof is also being considered. He stated that insulated garage doors are proposed. He stated that the hardscape is proposed as bluestone for the walkways and entrance stoops and possibly crushed stone for the driveway. He stated that an asphalt driveway is not desired by the petitioners. He confirmed that the house complies with the allowable square footage and height. He presented inspirational images which guided the Classical style, simple, elegant, and not overly ornate. He presented a color conceptual image of the proposed residence. He pointed out that the house is symmetrical and steps down from the central main mass to two smaller masses at either end with mansard roofs. He commented that the garage is almost non-descript to avoid calling attention to it but is designed consistent with the house. He presented each elevation noting the emphasis on the front entry. He noted the large window on the rear elevation noting that it allows expansive views to the rear yard from the two story great room. He stated that in addition to the pool and pool house, an outdoor kitchen is planned as reflected on the site plan. He noted that the grade drops off behind the house requiring a retaining wall between the house and pool. He stated that the pool house will be tucked into the landscape. He acknowledged that comment in the staff report about the dormers being excessive, he stated that the property owners desire dormers but are open to input on the style and placement. He stated that plantings are planned to screen the views of the garage doors from the neighboring home. He presented a conceptual rendering of the proposed entrance gate and pillars.

Mr. Prado stated that a new house, attached garage, hardscape, a pool, a cabana, and landscaping are proposed on a vacant lot. He confirmed that the previous house on the property was demolished a number of years ago by representatives of the prior property owner due to the seriously deteriorated condition of the home. He stated that a significant portion of the property is impacted by flood plain and flood way adding that the drainage and grading plans will be reviewed by the City Engineer at the time of submittal for permit to confirm that all applicable requirements are met prior to the issuance of any permits for work on the site. He stated that the overall design of the home and the proposed materials are of high quality. He stated that reducing the number of front facing dormers from four to two could avoid an overly ornate appearance of the front elevation.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Stamer complimented the residence. He suggested that consideration be given to matching the muntin patterns from floor to floor and matching the shapes of the dormers on the house and on the pool cabana.

Board member Renken complimented the high quality of the proposed residence. He stated that in his opinion, either two or four dormers are workable on the third floor but encouraged further refinement of the dormer designs. He suggested consideration of fewer muntins in the long skinny windows to achieve a less busy look. He suggested that for a more elegant look, consideration could be given to eliminating the vertical muntins and using only horizontal muntins. He noted that in the great room, the floor plan does not match the elevation with respect to the wall of windows. He noted that the plan reflects fewer windows which could benefit the elevation. He questioned whether the design of the fence element on the roof matches the chosen style of architecture. He commented that the roof ornamentation may be an expense that is unnecessary to make the design of the house look elegant and complete.

Board member Lamphere thanked the property owners for investing in the City and complimented the house. She stated support for the dormers and agreed that matching the muntin pattern throughout the house would benefit the overall appearance.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the overall design is true to the selected architectural style and noted the appropriateness of the hierarchy of massing. He stated that the house is well designed. He agreed that reconsideration of the placement of the muntins is appropriate and agreed that rectangular lites may add more elegance to the home than square lites in the windows. He commented that on the rear elevation, the large window appears somewhat institutional and detracts from the well-designed residential project. He suggested consideration of breaking the expanse of glass up a bit. He acknowledged that the rear elevation is less critical but could be improved given the high level of design around the rest of the home.

Board member Downey complimented the overall design and the exterior materials. She commented on the dormers noting that they appear too detailed, too ornate and suggested a simpler rounded element. She pointed out that the inspirational images presented show elegant arches as opposed to an oval inserted in what appears to be a different shape. She encouraged further study of the scale of the dormers. She stated support for four dormers in a simpler, less ornate style. She commented that the radius of the driveway appears undersized. She asked that the drainage and headlight concerns raised in the letter from the neighboring property owner be considered and addressed.

Chairman Looby stated that the metal work on the house, on the gate, and on the fence should be of a consistent design. He stated that if ornate dormers are desired, two, rather than four dormers are appropriate. He cautioned that the overly ornate dormers take away from the prominence of the front entrance. He recommended natural gas lights at the front entrance. He agreed that further consideration of the lite configuration and muntin pattern is appropriate. He stated that larger panes of glass, without multiple muntins will provide expansive views of the very private lot. He complimented the overall project.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Swanson agreed that horizontal muntins, without vertical muntins, will benefit the overall design. He confirmed that the metal work throughout the property will be of a consistent design. He stated that he is undecided about the detail on the roof and stated that he will continue to study that element and talk with his clients. He agreed to study and further refine the details of the large window on the rear elevation to achieve a more residential appearance while still achieving the goal of allowing expansive views of the rear yard.

Board member Renken suggested consideration of continuing the band on the wall across the large window on the rear elevation to reduce the appearance of scale.

Chairman Looby emphasized that the configuration of the driveway should be carefully studied to assure that larger vehicles and snow plowing can be accommodated. Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comments.

Isabell Fiore, 254 Butler Drive, suggested that the petitioners should be aware that the large windows on the rear elevation of her house causes her rooms to become very warm at some times of the year. She asked that in considering the radius of the driveway and landscaping, attention be paid to minimizing the impact of headlights on her home which is adjacent to the garage. She stated her hope that the existing evergreens will survive the construction. She also requested that careful attention be paid to drainage during construction and for the long term to avoid impacting her property.

Chairman Looby stated that tree protection fencing will be required and stated that the City Engineer will review the drainage, grading, and silt fencing plans and will need to be satisfied before a permit is issued. He encouraged the neighbor to contact the City during construction with any concerns. Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, he Looby invited a motion.

Board member Stamer made a motion to recommend approval of a new house with an attached garage, hardscape, pool, cabana, and landscaping on a vacant lot. He stated that the recommendation is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporates the deliberations of the Board as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. Prior to the submittal of plans for permit, conduct further study and refinement of the following aspects of the home:
 - a. Refine and simplify the design of the dormers. Consider eliminating two of the four oval dormers on the east (front) elevation to avoid an overly ornate appearance and to allow the front entrance to be prominent.
 - b. Refine the large window in the great room, on the rear elevation to achieve an appearance more residential in character. Consider continuing the horizontal band from the wall across the window.

2. Include the following materials in the submittal for permit:
 - a. Material samples demonstrating a minimum thickness of four inches for the veneer stone.
 - b. An auto turn study demonstrating sufficient turning radii along the proposed driveway, motor court, and garage entrance.
 - c. Provide sightline studies indicating the direction of headlights. Adjust the driveway configuration to the extent possible and as needed, add landscaping to mitigate headlight impacts on the neighboring home.
 - d. Assure that all necessary flood plain and flood way information is detailed on the engineering plans.
3. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
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. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The plan must also detail plantings along the driveway and at the garage intended to mitigate headlight impacts on the neighboring property. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

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.

4. Consideration of a new house, two attached garages, hardscape and a conceptual landscape plan proposed on vacant property at 1200 Lawrence Avenue.

Property Owner: 1200 Lawrence Ave (Danuta Mikrut 100%)

Representative: Rick Swanson, Architect

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. Swanson stated that in addition to being the architect for this petition, he is the architectural review consultant for the subdivision's Homeowners' Association (HOA). He stated that the subject property is one of the last remaining vacant lots in the subdivision. He stated that the HOA's architectural review committee approved the plans for the new house and provided some direction. He reviewed a vicinity map noting the park nearby. He reviewed the site plan noting that he previously presented a plan for this property, for different owners, and pointed out that the current site plan differs from the previous plan in that the house is flipped, the driveway and garage are now on the east side of the house. He commented that the neighboring property owner to the east has, over time, located some improvements on the subject property adding that issue will need to be resolved with the neighbors. He stated that the house is the same size as previously proposed. He stated that there is one tree in the middle of the property that will need to be removed adding that other than that tree, the lot is devoid of trees except for trees planted by neighboring property owners which encroach on to the property.

He stated that stone pavers are proposed for the hardscape. He reviewed the exterior materials proposed for the residence stating that a whitewashed beige tone brick is proposed along with cut limestone, black casement windows, black gutters, a slate roof, and a dark mahogany front door. He stated that slate is proposed for the roof and explained that currently, the Arbor Ridge subdivision HOA does not allow synthetic roof products. He stated that the house is designed within the allowable square footage and allowable height. He stated that from a design perspective, the residence has a quaint cottage feel adding that although a steeper roof pitch is preferred, there is not sufficient square footage to accommodate a steeper roof. He presented a colored rendering pointing out that the brick is not stark white. He reviewed the elevations noting the balance between the use of stone and brick to avoid one material upstaging the other. He pointed out the motor court and noted the setback of the garage from the front of the house.

Mr. Prado stated that the Board recently reviewed another petition for this property for a previous property owner. He stated that house was also designed by Mr. Swanson. He said that as noted by Mr. Swanson, the garage is now on the east side of the house rather than on the west as previously proposed which could allow the existing evergreens along the west property line to be preserved. He noted that the driveway needs to be shifted slightly to conform to the applicable zoning requirements adding that an auto turn study will be required as part of the submittal of plans for permit to assure that the driveway provides sufficient space for maneuvering into and out of the garage. He reviewed that the staff report offers a recommendation for further study and refinement to simplify and better organize the roof masses. He stated that samples of the four inch thick stone should be provided for Board review or, at a minimum, at the time of submittal for permit.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Mr. Prado suggested that further study and refinement of the north and east elevations could result in improvements to the overall design of the house.

Board member Lohmueller agreed that simplification of the roof could benefit the overall project. He pointed out that a window in the rendering, the southeast window, would benefit from more space. He asked for clarification on the proposed trim.

Board Lamphere asked for clarification on the proposed shifting of the driveway. She agreed that the roof lines appear somewhat chaotic. She encouraged further study of the window placement and agreed that one or more of the windows appear to be crowded on to the elevation. She asked for confirmation of the material proposed for the roof above the two garage doors.

Board member Stamer commented that the front and west elevations have good symmetry and balance. He noted however that the rear elevation is lacking

symmetry. He suggested further study and refinement of the rear elevation.

Board member Renken noted that to comply with zoning regulations, the driveway must be shifted to the west within the front yard setback. He stated that with a slight curve, the shift will be workable. He agreed with Board member Stamer that the rear elevation would benefit from further study, simplification, and refinement. He suggested consideration of using a single hip to address the element on the right and raising the main roof slightly. He stated that the front elevation appears generally consistent with the chosen architectural style. He suggested consideration of brick, instead of stone at the front entrance. He asked for clarification on the proposed use of limestone around the front door.

Chairman Looby encouraged careful review of the driveway to make sure it is functional. He stated that the issue with the neighbor's improvements that cross on to the property needs to be discussed with the neighbor early on. He stated that the house should fit well into the neighborhood. Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, he invited public comment.

Scott Gray, 1080 Lawrence Avenue, stated that he is on the Board of the Arbor Ridge Subdivision HOA. He thanked Mr. Swanson for his work in the subdivision. He stated that the HOA is still discussing the use of synthetic, imitation roof products. He stated that the HOA will rely on the City to assure that the driveway is configured properly. He stated that the HOA looks forward to seeing the lot developed.

Dennis Meuleman, 1100 Sir William Lane, asked for confirmation that the site plan reflects distances from the property line from the furthest edge of the eaves and gutters.

In response to questions from the Board and the public, Mr. Swanson confirmed that the distances reflected on the site plan are measured from the furthest extent of the house, the edge of the eaves and gutters. He stated that the driveway will be shifted to comply with the zoning requirements and will be curved if possible. He noted that the appearance of the rear elevation is compromised due to square footage limitations which force some undesirable roof forms. He acknowledged that the size of the house is pushed to the limit allowed by the Code which creates some awkward massing in an effort to meet the clients desired interior spaces within the allowable square footage.

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

Board member Downey asked staff to assure that in the future, petitioners provide samples of the exterior materials for Board review.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the petition, the new house, attached garage, hardscape and the conceptual landscape plan based

on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations 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, the plans shall be refined as follows.
 - a. Shift the driveway to the west to comply with the zoning requirements within the front yard setback.
 - b. Modify the front sidewalk to align with the modified driveway configuration.
 - c. Refine the north and east elevations to simplify and better organize the massing and roof forms.
 - d. Refine the rear window.
 - e. Address the proposed use of synthetic slate shingles with the HOA.

5. Include the following materials in the submittal for permit:
 - a. Submit an auto turn study demonstrating sufficient accessibility for vehicles turning into and pulling out of the garages.
 - b. Submit material samples demonstrating the minimum thickness of 4" for the veneer stone.

2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

3. 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 if determined to be necessary by the City's Certified Arborist.
- c. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

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 public street must remain unobstructed, passable, and clean at all times.

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

5. Consideration of a new house with an attached garage, hardscape and a conceptual landscape plan proposed on vacant property at 1124 Fairview Avenue.

Property Owner: Thomas Feifar

Contract Purchaser: Lee Bagan

Presented By: Jeff Letzter, Project Manager

Chairman Looby asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest.

Board member Stamer stated that he is involved with the project and recused himself from participating in the deliberations.

Hearing no further declarations, Chairman Looby invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Letzter noted that a new house and front load two car garage are proposed on an infill lot in an established neighborhood. He presented a conceptual rendering of the house and noted that hardi-board composite shake siding is proposed with cedar trim, aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lites, and architectural asphalt shingles. He stated that the front door will be white. He pointed out that there are other front loaded garages along the street and smaller scale homes than

the house proposed in this petition which, unlike the other homes, is on two parcels. He reviewed the site plan noting that the grades on the property drop down on the north portion of the lot which affects how the overall height of the house is measured. He stated that the house was sited and designed to work with the existing trees and the existing topography to the extent possible. He stated that no variances are requested. He reviewed the front elevation noting the front facing gables. He noted that overall, the house is detailed simply to fit in with the other homes in the neighborhood. He reviewed the side elevations and pointed out the efforts made to line up the windows and to achieve symmetry. He reviewed the rear elevation and pointed out the projecting bay and the kitchen bay again noting the symmetry. He stated that the roof line is kept low at the stair element and noted that windows were added to break up the long unbroken wall. He reviewed floor plans and a cross section of the proposed residence. He presented images of simple Colonial Revival style homes that served as inspiration. He presented a conceptual landscape plan and noted the rear flag stone patio and asphalt driveway.

Mr. Prado stated that as built drawings will be required during construction to assure that the height of the house is consistent with the plans presented and does not exceed the allowable height given the change in topography on the site. He suggested that the front porch could benefit from further study and refinement and stated that more details on the proposed exterior materials should be presented at the time plans are submitted for permit.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Lamphere commented that the house appears to be compact and efficient. She agreed with the recommendations in the staff report.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the house will fit well into the neighborhood. He commented that the stair bump out on the north elevation creates some awkwardness with the roof. He questioned whether the 18 inch overhang is necessary. He questioned whether the stair element should it be accentuated. He questioned whether the band between the first and second floors adds or detracts from the overall design. He commented that there is a fair amount of detail on the front elevation without it. He questioned why the triangular section of roof on the second floor is set so far back. He encouraged further study of that element. He asked whether the trim will be cedar or a fiber cement product.

Board member Downey stated that she appreciates that the square footage is not maxed out given the smaller homes in the neighborhood. She stated that she has no comment on whether or not an arch is incorporated into the front porch. She commented that the small windows on the north elevation stand out not in a good way. She added that the small windows are the only windows on the house that appear to be out of scale.

Board member Renken expressed some concern with the arch commenting that in his

opinion, the house would look better without it. He expressed concern about the cantilevered dormer near the front entrance. He commented that horizontal siding is more consistent with the Colonial architectural style than shake siding. He suggested consideration of making the two windows half of a double hung window to appear as the top part of a cottage window, as wide and tall as some of the other windows on the house. He stated that the scale of the house fits nicely into the neighborhood. He suggested consideration of adding backout space near the garage.

Chairman Looby commented that the large Cottonwood tree in the front of the property will need to be removed and replaced with another tree or trees.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Letzter stated that clapboard siding rather than shake is now proposed. He stated that the band board will be removed. He agreed to study the small windows and consider configuring them as half of a double hung window. He stated that the fascia on the front elevation can be looked at and lowered if appropriate. He stated that the driveway will be reviewed to assure that there is adequate backout space at the garage. He commented on the roof noting where a saddle is proposed to shed water. He stated that the proposed pitch allows asphalt shingles to be used. He confirmed that cedar is proposed for the trim. He stated that the arch at the porch is intended to add some subtle ornamentation. He agreed that the overhang at the stair element could be reduced.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he noted that two letters were received by the Board raising concerns about drainage. He noted that the City Engineer will review the drainage and grading plans and will verify that all applicable requirements are met prior to the issuance of permits authorizing any work on the site. He invited final comments from the Board.

Board member Lamphere stated that there should be some consistency in the windows around the house.

Board member Renken stated that he supports the band around the house but acknowledged that it awkwardly transitions in some areas.

In response to a question from Board member Lohmueller, Mr. Letzter confirmed that downspouts will be located on the side elevations.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the new house, attached garage, hardscape and the conceptual landscape plan based on the findings presented in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions.

1. Prior to the submittal of plans for permit:
 - a. Give further consideration to the arch over the porch and consider refinements.
 - b. Align the fascia board on the east elevation.
 - c. Adjust the small windows to replicate the top portion of a double hung window.
 - d. Reconsider the use of the horizontal band and if it is retained, re-work the areas of transition to avoid an awkward appearance.
 - e. Review the configuration of the backout area at the garage to assure that it is functional.
 - f. Refine the stair element, consider reducing the overhang.
 - g. Detail the intended hardscape materials.

2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

Tree Removal and Landscaping

- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

Drainage and Grading

- j. 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

- k. 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

- l. 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.
4. During construction, submit as-built drawings documenting that the footprint and height of the house complies with the approved plans and the 30 foot height limitation as measured from the lowest point of the existing adjacent grade to the tallest peak of the roof.

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

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

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

7. 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