

**The City of Lake Forest  
Building Review Board  
Proceedings of June 5, 2024 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, June 5, 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 and Board members Scott Renken, Joanne Bluhm, Sarah Lamphere, and Sally Downey

Building Review Board members absent: Eric Lohmueller and Justin Stamer

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.

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

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

**3. Continued consideration of a new residence on a vacant lot at 1175 Old Colony Road. A conceptual landscape plan will also be presented.**

Owned and Presented by: Mary Milligan Funk

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

Ms. Milligan Funk reviewed that a two story home is proposed on a third of an acre vacant parcel. She stated that her goal is to build a healthy house, using materials that promote the health of its occupants. She stated that the house will be slab on grade and the windows and doors will be inset to provide depth and richness. She reviewed the proposed exterior materials noting that zinc colored 12 inch wide standing seam metal, wood trim and shutters, and aluminum gutters are proposed. She stated that the house complies with the allowable square footage and height limitations. She addressed comments from the last Board meeting noting that the driveway is reconfigured to comply with the maximum width of 16 feet within the front yard setback and noted that the intended rear patio is now reflected on the site plan. She stated that the plans overall now reflect greater detail including clarification on the attic and enhanced detail on each elevation. She stated the intent to preserve as many trees on the site as possible and that landscaping that exceeds the minimum

required by the Code for a new house will be added to the site in the future. She stated that a gravel driveway is planned with a brick or bluestone border adding that the patio will also be brick or bluestone. She stated that in response to comments from the Board, the gutters, scuppers, and downspouts will be consistent around the home. She stated that the images presented reflect the actual garage door. She compared the elevations presented at the last meeting to the elevations as now proposed and pointed out areas of change including the addition of windows and shutters in some areas, modifications to some of the window groupings and sizes, and the addition of a dormer on the east elevation. She stated that in response to questions from the Board, white stucco is proposed with a smooth finish. She provided an illustration of the inset windows and doors adding that limestone sills are proposed along with simulated divided lites. She presented a sample of the green color planned for the doors. She stated that the light fixtures over the garage door and the front door will be natural gas.

Mr. Prado stated that the revised plans presented by the petitioner take into account the comments and questions offered by the Board at the last meeting. He stated that findings are presented in the staff report in support of the petition as now presented along with recommended conditions of approval.

Chairman Looby invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Bluhm complimented the changes made and thanked the petitioner for her responsiveness.

In response to a question from Board member Lamphere, Ms. Milligan Funk confirmed that the chimney will be masonry with a stucco finish.

Board member Downey thanked the petitioner for her responsiveness to the Board's previous comments. She stated that in her opinion, a stucco chimney is appropriate.

Board member Renken stated that the changes make the project even better than it was when originally presented. He noted that the revisions address the concerns about proportions and the lack of detail on the expansive, unbroken walls.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Ms. Milligan Funk acknowledged that backing out of the garage will be tight but noted that the driveway cannot exceed 16 feet in width in the front yard setback. She stated that the house cannot be pushed back due to trees in the rear yard that are intended for preservation. She stated that lightweight concrete block will be used for the wall construction and will also serve as insulation.

Chairman Looby stated appreciation for the time and effort put in by the petitioner to respond to the Board's comments. He thanked the petitioner for providing samples of the exterior materials.

In response to a question from Chairman Looby, Ms. Milligan Funk stated that she has not yet determined the material that will be used for the base of the driveway.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public. Hearing none, he invited final questions or comments from the Board. Hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Downey made a motion to recommend approval of a new residence and attached garage at 1175 Old Colony Road based on the findings presented in this staff report which are adopted by the Board as part of the motion and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Detail the exterior materials on the plans submitted for permit. The exterior materials and color palette will be subject to staff review for compliance with the materials as represented to the Board.
2. All modifications and refinement made to the plans in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review significant changes in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and recommendation for approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed tree survey must be submitted to the City for review. Tree species, condition, and size must be provided. City staff will review the existing trees in the context of the drainage and grading plan and determine the required replacement tree inches and if appropriate, require pre and post construction treatment of the trees intended to remain.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the following materials must be provided and will be subject to review and approval by the City.
  - a. A detailed landscape and hardscape plan. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscape standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches on site for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. Any inches not able to be accommodated on the site shall be compensated through a payment in lieu of on site planting and will be used to plant parkway trees in the general area of the property. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
  - b. A plan to protect the parkway trees, trees on neighboring properties, and trees on the site intended for preservation that may be impacted during site preparation and construction.

- c. A drainage and grading plan. No grading or filling shall be permitted except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices.
- d. A lighting plan including cut sheets for all light fixtures proposed outside the house and on the site. 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.
- e. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging. Old Colony Road shall remain passable and free of mud and debris at all times.

The motion was seconded by Board member Renken and was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**4. Consideration of a request for recommendations in support of approval of the demolition of the existing residence at 245 W. Westminster and in support of a replacement residence, attached garage, and a preliminary landscape plan.**

Property Owners: The Lisa M. Geneser Trust, Christ Geneser 100%

Presented by: John Krasnodebski, Architect

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

Board member Downey stated that she knows the neighbors to the west but will be able to consider the petition objectively.

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

Mr. Krasnodebski stated that the petitioners desire to demolish the existing home and construct a replacement residence. He presented photos of the house, the wooded property, and the surrounding neighborhood. He noted that the existing home is approximately 4,300 square feet in size with a partial basement and was built in 1985. He stated that the home is brick with an asphalt roof. He noted the various styles of homes along the street including historic, traditional, and more contemporary homes. He stated that the property is almost two acres in size. He presented a view of the existing house from the streetscape noting that due to trees and vegetation, it is only minimally visible. He presented a site plan of the existing home with an overlay of the proposed replacement house. He pointed out that the front door of the new home is in the same location as the front door of the existing home. He stated that the garage location is proposed to change from the east side of the property to the west with a greater setback from the side yard property line. He noted that the new home is setback double the required distance from both side yard property lines. He stated that no variances are requested. He reviewed the proposed site plan noting that a second curb cut is proposed to facilitate vehicle movement through the site adding that the reconfigured driveway will impact two Silver Maple trees located in front of the home. He stated that due to the fullness of the trees, there is not much growing

beneath the trees. He reviewed the elevations of the proposed house noting that the design is transitional, based on English Arts and Crafts architecture. He reviewed the proposed materials noting that limewashed brick, a cedar shingle roof, a limestone chimney, limestone window surrounds, bronze windows, and copper gutters and downspouts are proposed. He stated that the massing of the house is one and a half stories in the center, and steps down to single story elements on both sides. He acknowledged that further study and design refinement is needed to get the relationship of the dormers to the roof line and the windows right. He noted the subtle but elevated detail on each of the elevations around the home. He pointed out that the rear elevation is detailed similarly to the front elevation with three dormers, a screen porch, and expansive windows to take advantage of views of the rear yard. He reviewed the east elevation noting that it is mostly one story and reflects a consistent use of gables and noted the detailing of the chimney. He reviewed the west elevation noting that the low screen porch element is visible and pointed out the individual garage doors which are used to break down the appearance of scale. He acknowledged that the highest ridge at the center of the proposed home is taller than the ridge of the existing home but noted that it is below the maximum allowable height for the property. He stated that the footprint of the proposed home is only slightly larger than the footprint of the existing home. He stated that the petitioners first explored renovating the home and adding a second floor but determined that the extent of work and the limitations of working around the existing structure did not make sense and could result in a compromised end product. He added that given the limited side yard setbacks of the existing home, adding second floor massing could crowd the side yard property lines. He stated that the proposed replacement house is smaller overall than would have resulted from a renovation of the existing house. He summarized noting that the new house as proposed has simple roof lines and is under the allowable square footage. He reviewed the conceptual landscape plan noting the trees to be removed in front of the house for the driveway and the new house. He stated that 60 replacement trees are proposed including ornamental and evergreen trees. He stated that he is aware that the neighbors to the west submitted a letter and in response, he stated that additional year round landscaping can be provided along the west property line to screen the garage and provide privacy. He stated that the new plan increases the amount of impervious surface on the site by about five percent due to the house, and about 17 percent as a result of the additional driveway surface. He stated that a grading and drainage plan will be provided and noted that there are low lying areas in the deep rear yard that will remain. He concluded noting that although the existing house is livable, it does not meet the needs of the owners.

Mr. Prado reviewed that the petitioner is requesting approval of demolition of the house and approval of a replacement residence. He stated that the demolition criteria are generally met with the exception that the existing house is habitable in its current condition. He noted that the height of the proposed replacement residence is close to the maximum height permitted on the lot and noted that as built drawings will be required as construction progresses to verify that the as built height conforms to the approved plans. He stated that correspondence was received from the neighbors to the west raising concerns about the proposed relocation of the garage

to the west side of the property and potential impacts on their property as a result.

Chairman Looby invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Downey complimented the proposed residence and the high quality exterior materials. She stated support for the demolition of the existing house. She noted that the property slopes to the west and expressed concern about the potential for increased water runoff on to the neighboring property as a result of the increased amount of impervious surface. She stated that further information is needed on the proposed grading and the landscaping. She stated that with the relocation of the garage to the west side of the property, enhanced landscaping is needed along the west property line. She observed that the primary bedroom in the proposed residence is adjacent to the neighbors' garage on the east side of the home. She pointed out that if the garage and bedroom are flipped, the bedroom will have more screening on the west side of the house. She stated that visually, the site plan appears to have a great deal of hardscape in front of the house despite the large lot. She stated that drainage impacts should be considered very carefully.

Board member Lamphere complimented the design of the proposed house stating that in her opinion, it will be a great addition to the neighborhood. She agreed that drainage is a concern and encouraged the petitioners to work with the neighboring property owners to assure that there is a coordinated effort to properly direct drainage to avoid negative impacts. She stated confidence that the property will be well landscaped.

Board member Bluhm started initial concern about demolishing the existing house but stated that she accepts the reasoning as explained by Mr. Krasnodebski. She complimented the proposed replacement residence and stated that it will fit well into the neighborhood.

In response to a question from Board member Bluhm, Mr. Krasnodebski reviewed the access on to the property and into the proposed garage adding that the garage apron is sufficiently sized to accommodate the required turning movements.

Board member Renken commented that the materials provided to the Board are very complete and well detailed. He stated support for the demolition and stated that the proposed house is well designed with high quality exterior materials. He stated concern about drainage noting that the three feet along the west property line is not sufficient space to accommodate drainage and provide adequate landscape screening. He acknowledged that the driveway needs to meet the side yard setback within the front yard setback area but questioned whether the house could be moved to the east a few feet or flipped to locate the garage on the east side of the house. He noted that these shifts could allow the front of the house to be symmetrical and provide more space on the west side of the house for drainage and plantings. He noted that flipping the house would locate all of the pavement on the high side of the lot, on the east and allow a basin to be created on the west. He commented on

the front elevation noting that the windows in the side, lower masses are very large adding that in his opinion, they do not need to match the windows in the center mass. He suggested raising the bottom of the windows about 16 inches, the next horizontal mullion, to differentiate them from the windows on the main mass. He reiterated that drainage is a primary concern adding that more than three feet is needed along the west property line to address drainage and landscaping.

Chairman Looby agreed that drainage is a concern. He encouraged careful study of the garage apron to assure that there is sufficient space for vehicles to maneuver. He stated that three feet is not sufficient space for plantings along the west property line.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Krasnodebski confirmed that real limestone will be used. He agreed to consider raising the bottom of the windows on the side masses. He stated a willingness to study drainage further as well as the potential of shifting the house to the east to provide more space for drainage and landscaping on the west side. He stated that there is more than adequate pavement in front of the garage sufficient for maneuvering vehicles and agreed that consideration can be given to reducing the amount of hardscape slightly to expand the available land along the west property line. He stated that the driveway will be a combination of gravel, with a pervious asphalt base, asphalt, and a paver border.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Ms. Czerniak clarified that the total impervious surface on the site as proposed is less than 20 percent, consistent with percentages found on many other similarly sized properties.

Board member Downey stated that impacts resulting from the increased impervious surface on the site should not be the responsibility of the neighbors. She reiterated that details on how drainage will be addressed need to be developed and shared with the neighbors.

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

John Gilbertson, 265 W. Westminster, stated that he and his wife submitted a letter to the Board. He noted that Westminster slopes downhill and his property is at the bottom of the hill. He expressed concern about the amount of hardscape proposed on the site. He stated that an engineering study is needed to understand the drainage currently and how it is projected to work after the site is redeveloped. He acknowledged that the existing house is closer to the shared property line than the proposed house but noted that there are significant plantings in place now. He noted the consistent water problems on his property and the steps he has taken to address them. He stated that his house has perpetual water problems because it sits in a ditch between two properties with higher grades. He stated concerns that the new and expanded hardscape on the property to the east will increase the water runoff on to his property. He complimented the design of the new house but stated that flipping the house to locate the new garage on the east side of the property

would be a benefit to his property because there would be more space for plantings along the west property line.

Ms. Gilbertson, 265 W. Westminster pointed out that as proposed, the new house and hardscape extend to the property line shared with her home. She expressed concern that the proposed plan will result in flooding along the east side of her home. She stated that the percentage of impervious surface is misleading because all of the hardscape is on the portion of the property adjacent to her home. She expressed concern about noise and light impacts on her home and patio as a result of the proposed design.

Jessica O'Connor, 225 W. Westminster stated that if the house is flipped and the garage is located on the east side of the property, she will have concerns. She stated that she also has standing water on her property at times.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Looby stated that the drainage and grading plan will need to be reviewed by and will be subject to the approval of the City Engineer. He encouraged the petitioner to shift the house to the east to provide more space for plantings and drainage along the west property line. He invited final questions and comments from the Board.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Mr. Krasnodebski explained that the garage is located on the west side of the house to maximize views from the house to the yard and natural light into the home and to screen the pool equipment from the neighboring home. He stated that consideration was given to locating the garage on the east portion of the property however, the benefits of the currently proposed location led to the design as presented. He stated a willingness to explore shifting the house to the east to increase the space for plantings along the west property line.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Chairman Looby stated that a 10 foot wide area is large enough to support trees.

Board member Renken suggested consideration of a curb on the west side of the driveway near the west property line to direct water to the street.

In response to a question from Board member Bluhm, Mr. Krasnodebski confirmed that a wood or stone retaining wall, about three feet in height, is proposed near some portions of the west property line.

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

Board member Bluhm made a motion to recommend approval of demolition of the existing residence based on the findings presented in the staff report which are adopted by the Board as part of the motion.

The motion was seconded by Board member Renken and was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the replacement residence, attached garage, and the preliminary landscape plan based on the findings presented in the staff report which are adopted by the Board as part of the motion 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 submitting plans for permit, the following revisions should be addressed:
  - a. Shift the house and driveway to the east to increase the width of the landscaping bed along the west property line to a minimum of 10 feet OR consider flipping the house to locate the garage on the east side of the house.
  - b. Consider the addition of a curb along the west side of the driveway to direct water to the street.
  - c. Consider raising the sills of the windows on the side masses of the home.
2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board comments 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 verify that the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Include the following materials with the building permit submittal. The materials will be subject to City review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:
  - a. A detailed landscape plan. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and in addition, provide plantings to satisfy the required replacement tree inches using good forestry practices to account for trees removed from the site. The plan shall provide a buffer of trees along the west property line to the extent possible while providing for appropriate drainage to minimize impacts on the neighboring property to the west.
  - b. A tree protection plan for trees intended for preservation on the property, in the parkway, and on neighboring properties that may be impacted during construction. If determined to be necessary by the City's Certified Arborist, a pre and post treatment plan for the trees shall be provided to increase the chances of survival of the trees intended for preservation.
  - c. Detailed drainage and grading plans. No grading or filling except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices.
  - d. Details of exterior lighting including cut sheets of all light fixtures. Light sources shall be directed down and must be fully screened from view by fixtures except for those illuminated by natural gas. All exterior lights shall be set on timers to go off no later than 11 p.m.
  - e. A plan for construction vehicle parking and materials staging.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**5. Consideration of a garage addition and rear addition to an existing residence at 632 Grandview Lane.**

Property Owner: Brooke and Chris Sorto

Representative: Omar Gutierrez, 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. Gutierrez reviewed the existing elevations of the home noting that the home was designed in the Colonial Revival style with an attached garage. He stated that currently, the garage is not accessible from inside the house adding that the existing floor plan does not provide the opportunity to create an interior connection. He noted that there is limited landscaping on the property which is located mostly on the east and north elevations. He noted that the backyard is at a lower elevation adding that aspect of the property informed the options considered for additions to the home. He presented images of neighboring homes noting that the homes are all simple forms with few projections. He reviewed the proposed addition noting that the goal is an attached garage which is accessible from the interior space, some squaring off of interior rooms, and the conversion of the existing garage to a mudroom and storage area with access to the new rear patio. He reviewed the proposed floor plan. He stated that in response to a comment in the staff report, the addition of windows on the north elevation was considered but the petitioner prefers a solid wall to support interior storage space. He stated that landscaping can be used to soften the solid wall. He noted that the door and window on the south elevation are prominent and help to break up that wall. He stated that the octagonal window is whimsical and was requested by the petitioner. He pointed out that the massing of the addition is simple and pointed out that the ridge of the roof of the addition is lower than the ridge on the main mass of the home. He presented a conceptual streetscape image pointing out that views of the rear addition will be limited from off of the site. He stated that the details of the home are repeated on the addition where appropriate. He presented the rear elevation of the addition and acknowledged that the large windows are different from the windows on the house. He presented photos of the existing views of the house from the street noting the large mature trees in the front yard. He stated that any landscaping on the site that is impacted by construction activity will be replaced. He stated that a tree survey was submitted and stated that no trees are planned for removal.

Mr. Prado stated that no variances are requested for the proposed addition. He noted that the staff report calls out the opportunity for modifications to the windows to balance the relationship between the openings and expanse of unbroken walls. He suggested consideration of a rectangular shape for the rear addition rather than the proposed octagonal shape to relate to the footprint and massing of the home. He noted that there are other forward projecting garages along the street which have a

similar relationship to the street as the proposed addition.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Bluhm commented on the east elevation and suggested consideration of adding shutters under the pergola window. She stated that the garage appears narrow and encouraged consideration of increasing the width. She stated that in her opinion, given the limited visibility of the addition, the unbroken solid wall is acceptable. She suggested adding landscaping along the north elevation or continuing the small arbor to soften the solid wall. She pointed out that if the addition is squared off on the west elevation, there will be increased interior space and construction costs may be reduced. She stated that in her opinion, the octagonal shape is acceptable. She noted that a variety of muntin patterns are reflected in the drawings and suggested that consideration be given to more uniformity around the house. She agreed that if existing landscaping is impacted by construction, replacement plantings should be required.

Board member Renken stated that the project will be a great improvement to the house and will provide more articulation to the existing squarish house. He agreed that shutters on the window in the linking element would be a worthwhile addition. He noted that the opportunity to expand the width of the garage is limited because it cannot be expanded on the right side. He noted that if the garage is extended to the left, it will need to be re-centered. He complimented the dentil detail which is carried from the house on to the addition. He agreed that consideration should be given to more consistency in the use and pattern of muntins. He observed that there are double windows on the house, but casement windows on the addition. He suggested consideration of rectangular windows to align with the double hung windows or groupings of windows. He acknowledged that the roof pitch is configured to avoid the window on the second floor.

Board member Downey agreed with Board member Bluhm's suggestion that shutters be considered. She stated that initially she supported the addition of windows in the garage but noted that because of the narrowness of the garage, she can support the solid wall on the north elevation. She stated that widening the garage by a foot would improve functionality. She stated that because the rear addition appears as a sunroom, the octagon shape is acceptable. She noted concern about light impacts on the neighboring home noting that the sunroom in the evening could be very bright if there are no window treatments.

Board member Lamphere agreed that there is no need for windows on the north elevation of the garage given the intent to use the interior for storage. She agreed that some consistency with windows around the home and on the addition would be beneficial. She stated that in her opinion, the rear addition is not in keeping with the design of the house and encouraged consideration of squaring off the addition. She noted that if the addition is squared off and a flat roof is used, views from the second floor primary bedroom will be improved. She added that with a square configuration the single story element could provide the opportunity for a future owner to expand the

primary bedroom if desired.

Chairman Looby agreed that consideration should be given to widening the garage. He also encouraged consideration of the addition shutters and greater consistency between the windows on the addition and those on the front of the home. He commented that the front façade of the house is pleasing. He agreed with Board member Lamphere that a more regular configuration of the rear addition would provide more livable area, minimize costs, and provide future opportunities. He stated that the grill should be located away from the house.

Mr. Gutierrez responded to questions from the Board. He confirmed that the chimney will be removed. He stated the intention to provide a crawl space and to step the hardscape down to the grade in the back yard. He agreed to consider shutters for some of the windows. He stated that a mix of window types are found around the house, some with muntins and some without. He stated that the petitioners see no value in having muntins in the windows on the rear addition or in using double hung windows adding that the addition will not be seen from the street. He clarified that the fireplace in the breakfast room will be removed noting that it is in an awkward location. He reviewed the proposed rear patio.

In response to a question from Chairman Looby, Ms. Sorto explained that she and her husband bought the home because they saw potential in the simple home. She stated their intention to eliminate the boxy rooms, expand the living space, and open up views to the backyard. She expressed interest in considering a wider garage and shutters on some of the windows.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment, hearing none, he invited final questions and comments from the Board. Hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Lamphere made a motion to recommend approval of additions and alterations at 632 Grandview Lane. She stated that the recommendation is based on the findings as detailed in the staff report which are adopted by the Board as part of the motion. She stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. Prior to submitting the plans for permit, consider the following:
  - a. Addition of shutters on the window near the garage.
  - b. Improving the balance between solids and voids on the north and west elevations.
  - c. Consistency of the windows on the home and addition.
  - d. A square or rectangular shape for the rear addition.
  - e. Increasing the width of the garage.
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 plan. 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 removal/protection tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify any 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.

*Drainage and Grading*

- c. Detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling shall be 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*

- d. 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 and Staging*

- e. 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. Grandview Lane must remain passable at all times and driveways unobstructed.

4. Any landscaping impacted by construction activity shall be replaced in kind.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**6. Consideration of a building scale variance for additions and a pool house at 227 W. Onwentsia Road, various alterations, and hardscape and landscape plans.**

Property Owner: Christine Roth

Presented by: Tom VanDeWeghe, 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. VanDeWeghe stated that the house was originally built in 1955 and was expanded incrementally since the original construction. He stated that in his opinion, the house is a mix of pieces without any architectural cohesiveness. He stated that the house is mostly slab on grade. He stated that the petitioners purchased the house in 2020 and the additions and alterations now proposed are intended to bring a consistent style to the home and replace aging exterior materials. He stated that a building scale variance is requested to accommodate additions to the home and a pool house. He stated that the entire house will be re-sided to update it consistent with the character of the neighborhood. He pointed out that the rear elevation is a mix of gables adding that the proposed additions provide the opportunity to improve the relationship of the various elements of the home. He stated that a formal entry is proposed on the front elevation to celebrate the center of the house and the placement of the dormers as proposed is better organized. He stated that an addition is centered on the rear elevation with a cross gable and a masonry chimney. He stated the intent to address various deficiencies of the home and simplify the roof forms. He presented a site plan indicating the trees proposed for removal. He stated that new trees are planned in the front yard to provide a buffer from the street. He reviewed the proposed exterior materials including hardi-board shingles, synthetic material for the trim, and limestone veneer. He noted the Conservation Easement located along the west property line. He reviewed the plan for the addition of a pool and pool house in the rear yard. He stated that the pool equipment will be located inside the pool house and the walls will be insulated to mitigate noise from the equipment. He stated that the petitioners are committed to planting extensive landscape screening along the south property line. He presented elevations of the pool house. He presented samples of the exterior materials proposed for the house and pool house.

Mr. Prado confirmed that there is a Conservation Easement along the west side of the property which must remain vegetated. He stated that low pillars are proposed at the driveway entrance. He said that a building scale variance to allow a three percent overage is requested to accommodate the additional square footage proposed in the additions to the house and an additional 13 percent overage for the pool house adding that the existing house is within the allowable square footage. He stated that with enhanced landscape screening to screen the additional mass proposed at the rear of the home and to screen the pool house, the criteria for a building scale variance appear to be satisfied. He stated that the mechanical equipment should be screened from view and to mitigate noise. He stated that correspondence was received from neighboring property owners and was provided to the Board. He stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the petition.

In response to a question from Chairman Looby, Mr. Prado stated that removals or plantings in the Conservation Easement are subject to City review and approval.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Downey stated support for the building scale variance noting that the proposed additions and alterations visually improve upon the previous disjointed additions and modifications to the home. She agreed that the pool equipment must be fully screened, and the sound mitigated. She acknowledged the letters from the neighbors and stated that although some of the points raised are outside the purview of the Board, the tree removal that previously occurred should be compensated by replacement tree inches planted on the site.

Board member Lamphere complimented the house and the neighborhood. She stated that details of the proposed driveway entrance piers should be provided for review. She acknowledged that the building scale results from the petitioners trying to work with the existing house. She commented that the pool house appears modest. She agreed that landscaping is needed to mitigate impacts including light on the neighbors.

Board member Bluhm expressed concern that there is no hardship necessitating the square footage overage but complimented the planned improvements to the home. She suggested that on the exterior of the home, primary materials should be limited to two. She suggested consideration of extending the limestone and eliminating the panels on the front of the home.

Board member Renken stated that the amount of the variance requested is not out of line with some previous variances given the circumstances of the property. He applauded the petitioners' willingness to invest in the home. He stated that the triple gable with no windows appears awkward and suggested consideration of eliminating the third gable. He offered that a shed dormer could be considered. He complimented the modifications to the front entry. He commented on the materials and use of painted Hardi-board shingle on the first floor and stained shingles in the gable ends. He suggested consideration of consistency in the materials and treatments proposed.

Chairman Looby stated that the house is missing something on the front elevation noting that the rear elevation is more visually pleasing than the front elevation. He suggested tying the textures of materials around the home together. He stated that the building scale variance, in his opinion, is justified and complimented the pool house. He agreed that a detailed landscape plan is needed.

Mr. VanDeWeghe stated that the driveway material is currently undecided. He noted that the driveway will need to be re-worked slightly to address drainage that flows toward the house. He stated that the pool house is 19 feet tall. He agreed to study the front door detailing further and noted that the door is off center which creates some challenges.

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

comment.

Mr. Miles, 230 Poplar Road, stated concern about the 20 foot tall pool house which is proposed near the property line. He stated that the petitioners previously removed a significant number of large trees from the Conservation Easement without a permit. He asked that landscape screening be restored and enhanced on the site to screen the proposed pool and pool house.

Mr. Gescheidle, 160 Basswood, agreed that year round landscape screening is important. He expressed concern about the height of the pool house and light impacts on his home. He expressed an interest in seeing the landscape plan before the plantings are installed to assure that views from his home are considered.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Looby asked that plans be submitted to the City for the driveway entrance piers. He invited final questions and comments from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Downey Mr. VanDeWeghe reviewed the exterior materials. He stated that the stone is intended to be similar to the limestone. He agreed to reconsider the number of materials and the various textures and treatments that are proposed.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of a building scale variance 227 W. Onwentsia Road to allow additions to the residence and construction of a pool house and various alterations around the home based on the findings presented in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to submittal for permit, reconsider, refine, and further detail the following:
  - a. The proposed pillars at the driveway entrance. Include details on lights and gates if any are proposed. If the pillars are taller than four feet, they must be set back at least three feet from the property line.
  - b. The front triple gable on the second floor.
  - c. The number of exterior materials and the variety of textures and treatments of the 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, 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:
  - a. Re-establish significant plantings, including year round plantings, in the Conservation Easement.
  - b. Provide for significant plantings along the south property line to screen the pool and pool house and to mitigate light impacts on neighboring properties.
  - c. Provide for screening of all mechanical equipment.
  - d. Provide foundation plantings around the additions and any areas of the home where foundation plantings are disturbed.
  - e. Include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
  
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

*Tree Removal/Protection*

- a. A removal/protection tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify any 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.

*Drainage and Grading*

- c. Detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling shall be 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*

- d. 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 and Staging*

- e. 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. Grandview Lane must remain passable at all times and driveways unobstructed.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**7. Consideration of a request for demolition of an existing house at 370 S. Ridge Road and approval of a new residence and the associated hardscape, landscape, and lighting plans.**

**Property Owners: Allen & Susan Mandell**

**Project Representative: Stuart Shayman, Stuart D Shayman Associates 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. Shayman stated that the petitioners intend on demolishing the existing house on the 70,000 square foot, heavily wooded lot. He presented images of the existing house noting that it is a ranch style home and has not been well maintained. He stated that the property is on the corner bordered by Westleigh Road to the south and Ridge Road to the east. He stated that both of the streetscapes are heavily wooded. He presented an overlay of the footprint of the existing house with the proposed house noting the intent to expand the footprint of the new home to the west. He noted that the property has 50 foot zoning setbacks on three sides and a 20 foot setback from the west property line. He stated that currently, Ridge Road drains on to the property and water flows across the property from east to west. He stated that the plan proposes to raise the top of the foundation by 12 inches and the finished floor by 12 inches. He noted that the staff report incorrectly states that a four foot grade change is proposed. He acknowledged that the grade change is greater as the property moves to the west. He stated that the proposed house is designed in a contemporary style and consists of three parts, social space, private space, and service space and reviewed the floor plan. He stated that a partial basement is proposed. He noted other contemporary houses in Lake Forest as identified in the staff report. He presented images of the homes with large planes of wall and high windows similar to the architectural style desired by the petitioners. He presented conceptual renderings of the house and each elevation. He stated that stucco is intended as the primary building material. He stated that the tall window units around the house are sliding doors. He noted that other areas of the home are punctuated with windows and noted the clerestory window in the sitting room. He presented a landscape plan, exterior lighting plan, and images of the proposed exterior light fixtures. He stated that in response to comments in the staff report, the lights proposed along the west property line were eliminated. He presented samples of the cast cement stone proposed for entry wall noting that the stone is four inch long interlocking pieces. He stated that the stone is proposed as a dark color. He stated that the roof will be weathered zinc colored standing seam. He stated that large columns are proposed at the front and back to support the deep overhangs.

Chairman Looby stated that veneer material should be a minimum of four inches thick.

Ms. Vollmers reviewed that the petitioners are requesting approval of the demolition of the existing house and approval of replacement home and associated hardscape, landscape, and exterior lighting as well as tree removal. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the demolition based on the applicable criteria subject to Board approval of an acceptable replacement residence. She stated that as presented, the replacement home does not appear to align with the architectural or dark sky character of the area. She noted that a substantial amount of grading is proposed to elevate the house, rear terrace, and pool. She noted staff concern that the regrading could create increased stormwater runoff on to the neighboring property to the west. She noted that significant tree removal is proposed on the site adding that additional trees beyond those identified for removal may be impacted as a result of the regrading proposed, change in hydrology on the site, significant increase in impervious surface, and construction activity. She stated that based on the current information, approximately 290 replacement tree inches are required. She noted that the pool and surrounding terrace are directly parallel to the private areas of the neighboring home to the west. She noted the potential for off site light impacts not only from the pool area, but also from the house due to the expansive areas of glass. She stated that the contemporary style of the home is distinct from the more traditional style of architecture found in the surrounding area. She noted that often contemporary homes are designed using some of the same design principles as traditional architecture. She stated that the proposed color appears somewhat non-residential in character. She noted that solar panels are proposed on the roof noting that additional tree removal may be required in order to achieve optimum performance of the panels. She commented that further review of the lighting plan is needed to assure compliance with the required setbacks and to minimize off site impacts.

Chairman Looby invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Lamphere commented that the community needs more one story homes. She stated that a softer color palette should be considered. She noted that the sliding doors appear to exit into landscaping which will need to be addressed. She expressed concern about potential drainage and noise impacts on the neighboring property to the west and stated that the pool equipment should be located away from the property line. She asked for more detail on the front entry.

Board member Downey stated that she did some research on the interpretations of contemporary versus modern styles and noted that many of the defining items are found in the proposed home including a range of building materials, harmony with nature, panels of glass, and eco-friendly aspects like solar panels. She stated that the house overall adheres to the spirit of contemporary design. She commented on the roof noting that it is difficult to understand and appears different in the various drawings and it is unclear if it is flat or angled. She commented that the roof appears to have too much heft and weight in the living room area and suggested that if the roof line was symmetrical on both sides, the appearance may be more balanced. She stated that the front door appears cavernous and the front facing roof line does

not appear to create a sense of harmony with the site. She noted that the Ridge Road streetscape is heavily vegetated and pointed out that none of the properties have two curb cuts until south of Bridle Lane. She stated that the house is not grand and does not appear to warrant two curb cuts. She stated that a single curb cut with a wider drive will reduce the amount of impervious surface and preserve the landscaped streetscape. She noted that all of the sliding glass doors open on to grass and suggested pulling the hardscape up to the house noting that will pull the hardscape further away from the neighboring property. She agreed that moving the pool equipment away from the neighboring property will help to mitigate off site noise impacts. She stated that the grade change in various areas on the site needs to be clearly illustrated. She stated that she is not supportive of excessive grade change. She stated that the house will not be seen from the street so the inconsistency with the variety of architectural styles of homes in the area is not a concern. She stated that it is important to select the right type of exterior material and to refine the roof lines to achieve some consistency across the home.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the demolition. She stated that with respect to the style of the proposed replacement residence, the structure appears a little too stark and commercial. She suggested considering alternate materials or colors to soften the appearance of the exterior. She stated that the contemporary style is not the issue but instead, the starkness of the overall appearance.

Board member Renkin commented that the contemporary style is difficult to define and is subjective. He stated support for the demolition of the existing house. He expressed his hope that some of the 27 trees currently identified for removal could be saved with some adjustments. He stated that there will be a significant impact on the neighbors and on the streetscape if the trees and buckthorn are removed. He stated that preserving more of the trees will benefit the neighboring property to the west. He said that adjustments to the site plan need to be made. He stated that he is comfortable with the contemporary architectural style and the two curb cuts. He commented however that the house as presented is hard to read noting the variety of window styles, roof lines, and materials reflected on the drawings. He stated that overall, the house needs more uniformity and more order. He noted that other contemporary homes are more organized. He noted concern with the amount of impervious surface and the loss of trees. He stated that an increase of one foot in grade on the property does not surprise him given the topography. He acknowledged that the grade falls to the west and as a result, there is more house that is visible. He suggested the west wing of the house could step down a bit. He stated that the color palette should be softened, and the use of thin veneer should be avoided.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Shayman stated that the house is about 17 feet in height. He noted that potentially, a 40 foot tall house could be built on the site. He stated the intention to plant trees west of the pool and create a swale along the west property line. He stated that there is currently a six foot fence along the west property line. He stated that the Buckthorn will remain along Westleigh Road and on

the north side of the property for privacy. He stated that tinted glass is proposed on the house to mitigate off site light impacts. He stated that potentially, the pool could be shifted to the east. He stated that a sun study was done to verify the feasibility of solar panels in the proposed location. He stated that the pool equipment can be shifted away from the property line. He described the entry noting that is it on an angle with the covered area. He acknowledged that the columns at the front entrance do not read well in the drawing. He stated that two driveway entrances are important because there is no parking on Ridge Road and the petitioners entertain.

Mr. Mandell stated that they bought the lot because of the privacy. He stated that from the west, the neighbors will only see the roof similar to what is visible today. He stated that the vegetation along Westleigh and Ridge Roads will remain. He stated that no one will see the front entrance of the home. He stated that he is willing to try to save more trees if possible. He stated that about 13 of the trees to be removed are dead.

Chairman Looby suggested that further consideration be given to the trees, grading, materials, color, roof line, front entry, pool, hardscape, and overall softening and warmth. He invited public comments. Hearing none, he invited final questions and comments from the Board, hearing none. He invited a motion.

Board member Bluhm made a motion to continue the petition with direction to the petitioner to consider the comments, questions and direction offered by the Board. She noted that the Board is supportive of the demolition.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

#### **8. Opportunity for the public to address the Building Review Board on non-agenda items.**

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

#### **9. Additional information from staff.**

No additional information was provided by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak  
Director of Community Development