

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of August 8, 2024 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Thursday, August 8, 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, Sally Downey, and Justin Stamer

Building Review Board members absent: Eric Lohmueller Joanne Bluhm, and Sarah Lamphere

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 June 5, 2024 and July 18, 2024 Building Review Board meetings.

The minutes of the June 5, 2024 meeting were approved as presented.

Consideration of the minutes of the July 18, 2024 meeting was postponed.

3. Consideration of a request for a time extension of a previous approval for a new residence and associated hardscape and landscape plans at 410 Oak Knoll Drive. No changes to the previously approved plans are proposed.

Property Owner: Fidelity Wes of Oak Knoll LLC (Mike Demar, 100%)

New Contract Purchaser: Jane Myagmarjav

Representative:

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

Mr. Prado stated that the Board previously approved this petition for a new house on a vacant lot in 2021. He stated that plans were never submitted for permit following the Board's approval because the sale of the property fell through. He stated that there is now a new contract purchaser for the property who would like to proceed with construction of the home as previously approved. He stated that the Board's approval has expired and noted that the property owner and the contract purchaser

are requesting extension of the prior approval. He reiterated that no changes are proposed to the previously approved plans. He stated that if the Board votes to approve the time extension request, plans will need to be submitted and the permit issued by December 31, 2024. He stated that alternatively, the Board can direct that the owner submits plans for review as a new petition.

Hearing no questions or comments from the Board, and no public comment, Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to approve the time extension as requested until December 31, 2024. He noted that the plans as previously approved and the conditions must be adhered to.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Chairman Looby recognized a member of the public who wished to comment.

A resident of the Oak Knoll Woodlands Subdivision, which was developed by Mike DeMar of Fidelity Wes Oak Knoll LLC, expressed frustration with the developer and City staff because of the delay in completing the final work in the subdivision.

In response, Ms. Czerniak acknowledged that there are outstanding items that need to be completed by the developer in the subdivision. She stated that ideally, the construction of the new homes in the subdivision should be completed before the City directs the developer to proceed with the final lift on the street, final repairs to damaged curbs, and replacement of parkway trees. She stated that the goal is to leave the new subdivision in good condition before the developer is released. She confirmed that the City is holding a financial guarantee from the developer.

4. Continued consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of demolition of a residence and approval of a new single-family residence, tree removal, and hardscape and landscape plans at 370 S. Ridge Road.

Property Owner: Allen and Susan Mandell

Representative: Stuart Shayman, Architect

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

Mr. Shayman stated the intent to construct a new house at 370 S. Ridge Road. He noted that this petition was first presented to the Board in June adding that since that time, he and the petitioners met with City staff to review the comments offered by the Board at the June meeting. He reviewed the changes made since the last meeting. He stated that the columns at the front entrance are now proposed as stucco instead of with metal cladding. He stated that the color palette was softened from the previously proposed gray and black to a more neutral color. He provided samples of

the proposed materials. He noted that the ceilings and soffits will be cedar providing a significant contrast to the stucco. He stated that the petitioners desire to use concrete tile on only one wall near the entrance. He stated that in response to the Board's input at the last meeting, more extensive use of the tile on the exterior was eliminated. He pointed out that the tile carries through from the one exterior wall to the interior of the home. He stated that the tile wall will not be visible from the street adding that the tile is recessed back from the front columns. He pointed out that the material on the ceiling of the front entry porch also carries through to the interior of the house and extends out to the overhang at the back of the house. He stated that in response to previous Board comments, some of the window headers and control joints on the stucco were adjusted to align across the home. He acknowledged that the proposed grade change on the site was raised as a significant issue. He stated that the house is 27 feet from the west property line and as now planned, a retaining wall will be installed to allow the existing grades to be maintained along the west property line. He stated that in the original plan, there was about a four foot drop down to grade near the west property line. He explained that with the retaining wall, the slope is reduced to two feet and a planting area will be located between the pool deck and the wall to pick up and slow down water coming off of the elevated hardscape. He stated that with the retaining wall, the slope down to the swale planned along the west property will be reduced. He added that the retaining wall in combination with plantings on both sides of the retaining wall will provide privacy between the pool and the terrace, and the neighbor to the west. He stated that in response to concerns raised at the last meeting, the pool equipment was relocated to the north side of the property, near the garage, and away from the neighboring property. He acknowledged that the loss of trees is a concern but stated that the proposed footprint of the house and pool, and the planned regrading, will impact the trees. He stated that it may be possible to save three to four smaller trees but stated that the larger trees cannot be saved. He presented a rendering and reviewed the color palette noting the dark framing around the windows and the neutral stucco. He reviewed the grading and drainage plan noting the intent to direct water straight south, rather than to the west. He stated the intent to pick up as much water as possible in the planting areas. He acknowledged that significant tree replacement will be required.

Mr. Vollmers stated that at the June meeting, the petition was continued by the Board with direction to the petitioner to further study and address several items. She confirmed that in response to the Board's comments, the pool equipment was moved away from the neighboring property and is now located along the north elevation of the home. She stated that the landscape lighting was reduced to mitigate impacts on the neighboring property and to comply with the City's lighting guidelines. She stated that other concerns raised by the Board including the grading, drainage, removal of significant trees, and screening along the west property line have not yet been fully addressed. She stated that minor modifications have been made to the proposed residence in an effort to give it a more residential character. She confirmed that since the last meeting staff met with the petitioners and their architect to review the comments and concerns raised by the Board. She commented that the proposed architectural style is not typical for the area as evidenced by the images

provided in the Board's packet but noted that the difference is mitigated by the extensive vegetative screening that exists along Westleigh and Ridge Roads. She noted that the City's Certified Arborist visited the site and confirmed that the plan as currently proposed, with the grade change and extensive hardscape, impacts several heritage Elm, Oak, and Hickory trees. She stated that based on the current information, 282 replacement inches will be required. She acknowledged that the retaining wall proposed around the elevated pool terrace may provide the opportunity to save some trees, possibly five smaller trees to the south of the pool terrace. She stated that given the potential for tree impacts beyond those identified at this time, the City's Certified Arborist will inspect the site periodically during construction activity to assess the trees intended for preservation and if appropriate, require additional replacement tree inches. She stated that as proposed, the grade will increase about two feet along the east side of the house and about four feet at the west edge of the pool terrace. She stated that in addition to the retaining wall west of the pool terrace, a swale is proposed to direct the water to the south, away from the neighboring property to the west which is at a lower grade. She noted that there may be limited space in the area between the west edge of the pool terrace and the west property line for planting trees and vegetation to screen the pool. She commented on the changes to the house noting that on the front elevation, the placement of the windows and scoring in the stucco were refined and are better aligned for consistency. She noted that the areas where wood detailing is proposed were clarified along with the location of sliding glass doors. She stated that the color palette was soften and commented that the cedar detailing adds to the softening of the appearance of the home. She noted that the tile proposed at the entrance to the home is placed to avoid visibility of the edges of the tiles on the front facing tiles. She noted that a letter was received from a neighboring property owner and was provided to the Board.

Chairman Looby invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Stamer asked for confirmation on whether the retaining wall is faced with tile similar to the tile at the entrance. He stated that the landscape plan should reflect plantings around the pool equipment and above and in front of the retaining wall. He stated that overall, the landscape plan should include more plantings to make up in part for the trees that will be lost.

Board member Downey stated that it is clear that the color palette and design of the home reflect the desires of the petitioners and noted that the home will not have much visibility from the streetscapes given the existing vegetation. She acknowledged that limited changes were made to the plans since the last meeting in response to the Board's comments including slight adjustments to the hardscape in an effort to preserve some additional trees. She stated that there is no way to build the house that is desired without impacting a significant number of trees on the site. She encouraged the petitioners to continue to make efforts to preserve additional trees. She noted that if the buckthorn along Ridge and Westleigh Roads is removed, the house could be highly visible from the street.

In response to questions Mr. Shayman confirmed that the retaining wall will be accented with the same tile that will be used at the front entrance. He confirmed that the tile will be set on Durock board.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Ms. Vollmers stated that tile, unlike stone or brick veneer material, does not need to be four inches thick given the nature of product.

Board member Renken complimented the changes made since the last meeting noting that the use of wood in some locations softens the appearance of the home. He stated that the tile accent at the front entrance gives the home more of a residential, as opposed to a commercial, feel. He noted that the house is below the allowable square footage and added that the Board does not dictate a specific architectural style but instead, offers recommendations on possible refinements to allow the design guidelines to be more fully met. He suggested consideration of toning down the color of the stucco to avoid the appearance of a stark white house. He expressed concern about the loss of significant trees, Oaks and Hickory trees, on all sides of the home. He suggested shifting the house noting that the large lot provides the opportunity to move the house 15 feet one way or another to preserve some additional trees. He commented that some of the trees identified for preservation will likely not survive the construction activity based on the current site plan. He stated that overall, he supports the direction of the plan adding that he would prefer to see the buckthorn along the streetscapes remain to preserve the landscaped streetscapes. He noted that if the buckthorn is removed and the site opened up, the streetscapes will be distinctly different from the current character.

Chairman Looby agreed that efforts should be made to adjust the site plan in an effort to save trees on one side of the house or the other noting that with the current plan, significant trees on all sides are likely to be lost. He stated that replacement trees should be planted on the site after construction to replace the trees that are removed or impacted. He stated support for the tile with a Durock backing. He stated that if the buckthorn along the streetscapes is removed, consideration should be given to a constructing a wall or a fence or planting dense replacement plantings to maintain screening of the home from views from the street. He stated that all of the sliding glass doors on the house must exit on to a threshold and not open into bushes or landscaping.

In response to questions from Board, Mr. Shayman presented a sample of the proposed window noting the tinted glass and dark bronze frame. He confirmed that the petitioners intend to retain the buckthorn screening along the streetscapes for privacy. He stated that in the future, a fence or wall may be considered along the streetscape but stated that currently, there are no plans for either. He confirmed that all of the sliding doors have appropriate stoops and pointed out several large windows that may appear as sliding doors, but do not open. He stated that to date staff has identified a requirement for about 280 inches of replacement trees adding

that number appears to include a double inch for inch assessment for some of the Oak and Hickory trees. He stated that the surface of the outdoor kitchen will be white stucco to match the house. He stated that the retaining wall is proposed as light grey stacking blocks with possibly some tile accents. He stated that there will be a fence around the pool equipment for visual and noise screening. He agreed that consideration can be given to softening the color of the stucco.

Ms. Mandell stated that because no parking is possible on Ridge Road, the circular driveway is a necessity to provide on site parking for guests. She confirmed the intent to keep the buckthorn along the streetscape adding that they do not want to see the adjacent roads from the house. She stated that a natural landscape is planned rather than formal landscaping.

Mr. Mandell noted that the updated Statement of Intent that was submitted by the architect responds to all of the Board's previous questions. He questioned why landscaping is required on the far side of the wall noting that no one will see it. He asked for further direction on the color palette noting that at the last meeting, the Board directed that the grey tone was too muted so white is now proposed and now referred to as being too stark white.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. 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 the demolition of the existing residence at 370 S. Ridge Road 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 Stamer and was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the replacement residence, attached garage, and the preliminary landscape and hardscape plans 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. The following elements shall be studied further and revised.
 - a. Modify the grading plan to minimize changes in grade to those absolutely necessary to meet good engineering practices as determined by the City Engineer.
 - b. Provide a mock-up of the stucco color on site prior to installation which will be subject to staff review and approval.
 - c. Detail all sliding doors that open to the exterior in a manner consistent with all applicable Code requirements.

- d. Consider shifting the house and reductions in the amount of hardscape to reduce impacts on healthy Oak and Hickory trees.
2. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to Board direction or discussion and those made during the final design development process, 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 plans as presented are consistent with the Board's approval or if further Board review is required prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

Tree Removal and Landscaping

- a. A tree removal 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.
- c. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan must reflect foundation plantings around the entire structure, replacement trees inches, and dense, year round plantings to the west of the pool terrace at various levels to mitigate the impact of light and activity on the neighboring property to the west. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping. Consideration shall be given to the City's recommended planting list. All existing vegetation intended to remain on the site shall be clearly noted on the final landscape plan.

Drainage and Grading

- d. Detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling shall be limited to the absolute 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 volume or speed on to neighboring properties.

Exterior Lighting

- e. Details of exterior lighting shall be included 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

- 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. No construction parking or staging is permitted on Ridge or Westleigh Roads.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

5. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of a building scale variance and approval of the design aspects of a replacement detached garage with second story living space at 360 Butler Drive. The existing garage is proposed for demolition.

Property Owners: Caitlin Dore and Tim Volk

Representative: Douglas Clark, 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. Clark stated that the large family initially bought the property because of the opportunity to create living space for aging parents above the existing garage. He noted however that investigation revealed that the foundation of the garage is not adequate to support the desired renovations and expansion of the garage and as a result, the project as now presented proposes demolishing the garage and replacing it with a new two story structure. He presented photos of the existing garage, the site, and views from the street. He noted the existing vegetation on and around the site which partially screens the garage. He noted in particular, the wall of evergreens along the north property line. He noted that to the west, the backyard is separated from the property to the west by a split rail fence. He stated that as proposed, the new garage has an expanded footprint and extends to the west, beyond the footprint of the existing garage. He stated that only two small crab apple trees will need to be removed to accommodate the new structure. He reviewed the plans of the proposed garage noting the recessed entry to provide shelter from the weather. He stated that storage space and a workshop are proposed in the garage because the house has a very small, damp basement. He noted that a bathroom and sauna are proposed on the first floor of the structure. He stated that the existing green house will be disassembled and reconstructed on the site. He reviewed a floor plan for the space above the garage noting that it is modest and provides both stairs and an elevator for easy access. He reviewed the elevations noting that the design incorporates gables and dormers to match the house and for symmetry. He stated that the roof over the entry is pushed back for architectural reasons, to call attention to the entry, and to give the structure a residential feel. He pointed out that on the north elevation, the only place for a window is in the attic space. He suggested the addition of a circular vent to break up the solid wall. He noted that a hipped roof form is used on the rear elevation and pointed out the elevated deck that extends across the rear of the structure and is accessed by sliding doors from the second

floor space. He acknowledged the comments about the elevated deck in the staff report but noted that an at grade patio would not benefit the second floor space at all. He stated that the expense of the elevated deck could be reduced from 40 to 20 feet to reduce the amount of the square footage overage. On the south elevation, he noted the proposed location for the reconstructed greenhouse. He provided a section of the proposed structure. He stated that the neighbor to the west submitted a letter in support of the project without additional landscape screening. He suggested that if the neighbors do not object, the Board should not require landscape screening. He provided samples of the proposed exterior materials and colors including composite siding and cedar shingles for the roof to match the house. He stated that the bricks will be selected to match the house as closely as possible.

Mr. Prado stated that a building scale variance is requested to allow construction of a replacement two story detached garage. He stated that the existing residence and garage are under the allowable square footage. He stated that the new garage as proposed, with the elevated rear deck, results in the overall property exceeding the allowable square footage by 13 percent. He stated that without the elevated rear deck, the overage is reduced to eight percent. He stated that with some modification and landscape enhancement, the criteria for a building scale variance at the lower percentage, can be met. He noted that the height of the garage is close to the maximum allowable height of 25 feet and as a result, as built drawings confirming the height of the structure will be required during the construction process. He reviewed some aspects of the design that could benefit from discussion and refinement including the roof form at the front entrance and the imbalance of solids and voids and the window placement on the north and south elevations. He stated that staff recommends removal of the elevated deck to reduce the building scale overage and to minimize impacts on the neighboring property to the west. He stated that an at grade patio could provide usable outdoor space. He stated that additional plantings along the west property line could help to mitigate the impacts of the larger structure on the private spaces of the neighboring property. He noted that all brick veneer should be a minimum of four inches thick to remain consistent with past Board requirements. He stated that a detailed landscape plan will be required to reflect existing landscaping that is intended to remain and the species, size at time of planting, and location of all proposed landscaping. He confirmed that a letter of support for the project was received from the neighbor to the west and was provided to the Board.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Downey noted that when considering a request for a variance, the Board must consider the need and the criteria. She complimented the overall property and the existing landscaping. She agreed that a small window or vent could improve the north elevation. She stated that a clear rationale was provided by the architect for the roof form as proposed. She acknowledged that an at grade patio on one or more sides of the structure would not be as convenient as the elevated deck for the residents of the second floor space, but stated concern about the elevated deck as proposed adding that she cannot justify a variance for that feature. She pointed out that noise

impacts on neighbors will be increased with an elevated deck.

Board member Stamer agreed with Board member Downey's comments regarding the elevated deck. He suggested that on the north elevation, consideration be given to ways to add a window noting that it would offer balance and practicality noting that the second floor space could benefit from ventilation offered by a window in that location.

Board member Renken commented on the elevations. He complimented the front facing gable and the symmetry of the gables. He suggested the addition of a window in the vertical space in each gable. He suggested consideration of replacing the hipped roof on the first floor with a gable. He suggested mirroring the steep pitch on the back of the structure. He commented further on options for the roof forms. He suggested that the deck on the rear could be reduced by 50 percent adding that it masks the fact that the windows on the first and second floor do not align. He complimented the detail on the columns on the front elevation, at the entry and suggested that the same detail should be used to support the deck. He suggested consideration of arches between the columns on the rear elevation.

Chairman Looby noted that the depth of the elevated deck limits the usability adding that it will be difficult to bypass a single chair set out on the deck. He stated that an at grade patio will provide for better functionality. He commented that the elevated deck appears tree house-like. He stated that additional landscaping is needed along the west property line to screen the larger structure.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Clark agreed that windows could be added but would be difficult to clean. He noted that to the north, the new structure will be screened by the existing evergreens. He clarified that there is no intention that the elevated deck will be used for grilling or entertaining.

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 Stamer made a motion to recommend approval of demolition of the existing garage, a building scale variance, and the design aspects of a new two story garage. He 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. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. Revise the plans as follows and provide the additional material requested:
 - a. Modify the roof across the gap above the front porch.
 - b. Modify the roof on the rear elevation.
 - c. Refine the relationship of windows to wall massing on the north and south elevations to create a better balance.

- d. Eliminate the elevated, rear deck and if desired, replace it with an at or near grade deck in the same footprint.
 - e. Specify four-inch-thick brick veneer at a minimum.
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 verify that 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 the following must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.

Tree Removal and Landscaping

- a. A tree plan identifying any trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation.
- b. A plan 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 grading and construction activity.
- c. A detailed landscape plan. The plan must reflect existing plantings that are intended to remain, foundation plantings, replacement tree inches, and landscaping between the garage and the west property line. The landscaping west of the garage should provide for significant year-round screening to respect the privacy of the rear yard of the neighboring home to the west.

Drainage and Grading

- d. Detailed drainage and grading plans. 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. A lighting plan and details of exterior lighting. 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

- f. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging. Butler Road must remain unobstructed and passable at all times. No staging or parking near the corner is permitted.
4. During construction, at a time directed by City staff, submit as built drawings while construction is in progress to confirm that the height of the proposed garage does not exceed the maximum allowable height of 25 feet and conforms to the approved plans.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

6. Consideration of a new residence, detached garage, and hardscape and landscape plans for a vacant lot at 24 Washington Circle. The house previously located on the property was demolished in 2019.

Property Owner: Gary Pennella

Contract Purchaser: Peter Childs, Developer

Representative: Jeffrey Letzter, Project Manager

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

Board member Stamer stated that he has a business relationship with Mr. Letzter but is not involved in this project. He stated that he is able to review the petition objectively.

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

Mr. Letzter stated that the lot is vacant adding that the previous home on the site was demolished by the current property owner several years ago. He stated that a new two story, Colonial Revival style home and a detached garage are proposed for the property for the contract purchaser. He noted that he reviewed the staff report and made changes in response in an effort to expedite the Board's review. He presented revised plans which differ from the plans in the Board packet. He reviewed the surrounding neighborhood noting that many of the lots are narrow. He presented photos of the neighboring homes. He reviewed the proposed site plan noting that no variances are requested. He pointed out the open front porch and the small at grade patio at the rear of the home. He pointed out that the existing grade on the site drops about two and a half feet across the lot adding that as measured from the point of lowest existing grade, the proposed house is under the 30 foot height limitation. He noted that the plans now presented reflect windows of all the same size on the front elevation with wider and more detailed trim than initially proposed. He stated that on the east elevation, the windows are aligned, and the grille pattern is consistent across the various windows. He stated that on the rear elevation, the overlapping gables were eliminated, the roof line was simplified, and the windows

aligned and centered in the gable. He stated that the windows on the west elevation were also modified and now align. He reviewed the floor plans noting that the house is narrow to fit on the lot and comply with the zoning setbacks. He reviewed the roof plan. He commented on the detailing on the house noting the copper arch above the front door. He stated that the detached garage matches the style, color, and materials on the house. He presented images of the design inspirations. He stated that the contract purchaser prefers shutters on the front of the house but noted that adding shutters to the other elevations for consistency would require relocating windows. He noted that the side elevations are only minimally visible from off the site and proposed allowing shutters only on the front elevation. He stated that the drainage and grading plans are available, and the landscape plan will be further detailed to meet the City's requirements. He stated that in his opinion, the home will fit nicely into the neighborhood.

Mr. Prado stated that the Board is asked to review the design aspects of a new residence, detached garage, hardscape and landscape proposed for the vacant property. He confirmed that the previous house on the site was demolished after several years of neglect. He stated that as proposed, the new house will be 29 feet in height as measured from the point of lowest existing grade adjacent to the house to the tallest peak. He stated that during construction, an as built drawing will be required to confirm that as constructed, the home conforms to the approved plans and Code limitations. He stated that in the past, the Board has required consistent use of shutters on all elevations but acknowledged the explanation offered by the petitioner. He noted that the staff report suggests consideration of simplifying the roof forms and refining the windows for consistency. He acknowledged that the revised plans address those items. He noted that the colors as proposed are stark in comparison to the older homes along the street which have subtler color palettes. He stated that a detailed landscape plan will be required at the time plans are submitted for permit. He noted that one letter was received and was provided to the Board.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Stamer noted that receiving the updated plans at the meeting limits the time the Board has to review and understand them. He stated support for the changes to the south elevation. He suggested some further study of whether there is an opportunity to add windows to the east elevation. He asked for further clarification on the exterior materials.

Board member Downey agreed that the overall height of the structure as built, needs to be verified for conformance with the approved plans and the Code. She stated that in this case, she can support shutters on only the front elevation but noted that others may try to follow suit. She stated that consistent use of shutters around the house elevates the architecture and if it can be achieved, it should be. She complimented the south elevation. She noted that the windows on the east elevation do not appear to be properly scaled for the space. She encouraged

further consideration of the color palette noting that the newer black and white house nearby does not enhance the streetscape. She stated that in her opinion, a start color palette would detract from the design of the home.

Board member Renken asked for confirmation of the color palette. He suggested consideration of adjusting the pitch of the roof on the side elevations to improve the appearance of the front gable. He noted that on the rear elevation, the top half of the chimney is too skinny. He stated that shutters could be added to the larger windows on the side elevations with a single shutter on the smaller windows. He stated that the addition of shutters will enhance the overall appearance of the home.

Chairman Looby agreed that shutters should be considered on the side elevations to fill the blank space and add interest. He commented that the solid shutter is stronger than the shutters with slats. He agreed that the color palette and the pitch of the roof could be improved. He commented that Artic White is very bright and overused.

Board member Stamer asked for an explanation of why the chimney is off center on the elevation.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Letzter agreed to re-center the chimney on the rear elevation and adjust the width in the higher portion of the chimney. He reviewed the materials and color palette noting that wood is proposed for the trim, fascia, and soffits along with copper accents. He stated that architectural asphalt shingles and hardi-board siding are proposed. He agreed to refine the windows on the east elevation and to consider adding shutters to the side elevations as discussed by the Board adding that there is not space for shutters on the rear elevation. He stated that the roof shingles are proposed as black with some variation, not solid black. He stated that Arctic White siding is proposed with black windows. He stated that the front door will be stained a grayish tone. He stated that porch ceiling will be visible at the radius with a bead board stained to match the front door. He stated that black shutters are proposed. He agreed to study the roof pitch further. He agreed to consider softer, less stark colors and to consider an alternate color for the shutters. He stated that the brick on the chimney will be a traditional reddish color.

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

Barbra Jensen, a neighbor, stated that she submitted a letter to the Board. She stated concern about any change in grade between her driveway and the proposed driveway and the impacts from construction trucks and drainage. She noted that the original driveway was located on the other side of the property.

Carol Terrace, a neighbor, stated that her property is adjacent to a vacant lot on either side after the homes were demolished several years ago. She stated that she is uncertain where the property line is in relation to the fence that was installed before she purchased the property. She stated that there is unkempt vegetation between

the properties that has caused problems with the sanitary sewer, hangs over her driveway and blocks sightlines. She stated that the vegetation should be removed.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Looby invited final questions and comments from the Board. Hearing no further comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Stamer made a motion to recommend approval of a new single family residence and detached garage on a vacant lot at 24 Washington Circle and the associated preliminary hardscape and landscape plans. He noted that the approval is based on the revised plans provided to the Board at the August 8, 2024, meeting. He stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion and incorporates the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Revise the plans as follows and provide the additional material requested:
 - a. Consider the use of shutters on all four elevations to elevate the overall design.
 - b. Study the windows on the east and south elevations to create a more regular arrangement of openings for consistency with the City's Residential Design guidelines.
 - c. Widen the upper part of the chimney, above the base and center the chimney.
 - d. Reconsider the pitch of the front facing roof.
 - e. Consider the use of less stark, softer colors for siding, windows and shutters to better blend with the overall character of the streetscape.
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 verify that 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, the following must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.

Tree Removal and Landscaping

- a. A tree plan identifying any trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation. Clean up and removal of existing scrub trees and vegetation along the property lines is encouraged.
- b. A tree protection plan identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction, if needed, and describing pre and post construction treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees intended for preservation which are located close to construction activity.

- c. A detailed landscape plan reflecting, at a minimum, foundation plantings around the entire residence and the number of trees required by the Code for new construction. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping. Consideration shall be given to the City's recommended planting list.

Drainage and Grading

- d. Detailed drainage and grading plans. 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. An exterior lighting plan and details of exterior lighting. 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. Off site contractor parking may be required. Parking on Washington Circle is not permitted due to the narrow, curving nature of the street.
3. Submit as built drawings while construction is in progress to confirm that the height of the residence does not exceed the maximum allowable height of 30 feet as measured from the lowest point of existing grade and conforms to the approved plans.

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

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

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

8. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was provided by staff.
The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak
Director of Community Development