

**The City of Lake Forest  
Building Review Board  
Proceedings of February 5, 2025**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, December 4, 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, Sarah Lamphere, Eric Lohmueller, and Joanne Bluhm

Building Review Board members absent: Justin Stamer

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

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

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

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

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

**3. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of demolition of the existing residence and attached garage, and approval of a replacement residence, attached garage, and the associated hardscape and landscape at 825 Morningside Drive.**

Property Owners: Richard and Amanda Small  
Representative: Diana Melichar, 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.

Ms. Melichar stated that the house, a two bedroom, Mid-Century, ranch style home, was built in 1945. She stated that the house is not associated with a significant architect. She stated that the house is slab on grade construction with underground duct work, lacks insulation in areas, has small rooms, and lacks amenities expected in homes today. She stated that the petitioners initially considered updating the home however, it quickly became apparent that the aspects of the home needing repair and replacement were extensive and after weighing the costs and expected quality of the end product, demolition and construction of a new, small home was determined to be a more reasonable option. She reviewed the proposed

replacement residence noting that it is designed in the contemporary style and will fit in with other contemporary homes in the surrounding area. She presented a conceptual rendering noting that the proposed house is a single story with consistent detailing on all elevations. She stated that the house has a strong horizontal expression with slopping roof overhangs. She said that the placement and sizes of the windows are deliberate for solar purposes and natural light. She acknowledged that there are limited windows into private spaces but noted that solid walls will be well landscaped. She pointed out that the windows on the rear elevation are intended to connect the interior space to the yard. She stated that the exterior materials were selected for durability and longevity. She stated that a natural color palette is planned to compliment the style of the home. She reviewed the existing and proposed site plans noting that the existing home encroaches into the side yard setback. She stated that the replacement residence complies with all setback requirements. She stated that one tree is proposed for removal, a pear tree which is an invasive species. She stated that unlike the existing front facing garage, the proposed garage doors are oriented to the side, away from the streetscape. She stated that the existing curb cut will be reused, and the driveway will be repaved. She reviewed the conceptual landscape and hardscape plan. She noted that the mature landscaping will remain on the site and new foundation plantings will be added along with landscaping to screen the parking area and provide screening from the street. She stated that the replacement residence will enhance the property value and replace an obsolete structure.

Mr. Prado stated that findings in support of demolition of the existing residence are detailed in the staff report. He noted that the architectural style of the replacement residence is similar to the style of the existing house and consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. He stated that findings in support of the replacement residence, and the hardscape and landscape plan are also detailed in the staff report. He asked for Board input on the balance, or lack thereof, of solid wall to window openings.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Downey stated that the case for demolition is compelling. She stated that in her opinion, the scale of the proposed residence is appropriate for the site and the neighborhood. She agreed that the large areas of unbroken wall are opportunities for landscaping. She stated that the windows as proposed make a statement adding that in her opinion, more windows are not needed. She asked that care be taken to minimize off site light impacts from the windows on the north elevation. She noted that the door to the elevator appears small.

Board member Renkin agreed that the demolition criteria are satisfied. He stated that the proposed residence is concise and well designed and fits in with the neighborhood. He stated that the beauty of contemporary architecture is the irregularity. He commented that there appears to be too much glass on the garage doors and suggested that because the garage does not need natural light, the doors

be redesigned to be more subdued. He complimented the house and its siting on the property.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the demolition. She stated that in her opinion, the placement of the windows as proposed makes sense. She stated support for the house as presented. She pointed out that the garage doors are drawn differently on the various drawings provided. She complimented the reduction of hardscape and suggested re-thinking the single arborvitae proposed at the end of the driveway.

Board member Lamphere stated support for the demolition and agreed that the contemporary design and scale of the home fit well with the neighborhood. She commented that the window in the guest room appears large. She asked about the materials and the color of the material that surrounds the garage door. She agreed that the amount of glass in the garage door appears excessive.

Board member Lohmueller commented that the design is well thought out and the scale is appropriate. He stated that it is refreshing to see a new home that enhances the streetscape. He complimented the siding and asked whether the glass in the garage door is clear or frosted.

Chairman Looby noted that the replacement residence is designed in the same contemporary style as the existing home allowing it to fit well into the neighborhood. He agreed that the extensive glass in the garage appears inappropriate adding that there will be a significant amount of light spilling from the front of the home. He suggested that the lower panels on the garage could be siding to match the house rather than windows to minimize views into the garage. He invited a response to the Board questions from Ms. Melichar.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Ms. Melichar agreed to revisit the amount of glass in the garage doors adding that the intent is to use frosted glass. She stated that the windows are placed around the house to maximize natural light into the home and views out of the home. She stated confidence that the amount of glass proposed on the house is appropriate particularly given that larger windows are often found on contemporary designs. She stated that the proposed siding material is more durable than hardi-board and is a cementitious product, molded at a very high pressure, made by Japanese companies.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final 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 and garage based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the comments of the Board as additional findings. The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and approved by a 6 to 0 vote.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the replacement residence and associated hardscape and landscape plans based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the comments of the Board as additional comments. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Study and refine the garage doors to minimize the potential for off site light impacts and to reduce the amount of glass.
2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

*Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- a. A tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation. 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.
- b. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and provide for all required replacement tree inches on the site to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping. If all tree replacement inches cannot be accommodated on the site, a payment in lieu of on site plantings may be accepted by the City.

*Drainage and Grading*

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

*Exterior Lighting*

- d. 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, Staging, and Tree Protection*

- 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. Beverly Place and Morningside Drive must remain fully passable, unobstructed and free of dirt and debris at all times.

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

**3. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of a new single-family residence, attached garage and associated hardscape and landscape plan on a vacant lot at 1080 Sir William Lane.**

Property Owners: Anthony and Elizabeth Schillaci

Representative: Daniel Bendixon, 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. Bendixon stated that a new home is proposed on one of the last remaining vacant lots in the Arbor Ridge Subdivision. He reviewed the site plan and location of the home in relation to the established neighborhood. He commented that in the streetscape image provided, the proposed home appears higher in comparison to the neighboring homes than it actually would be. He pointed out that the home to the south is a full two stories and the home to the north is a story and a half. He stated that the proposed home has a low, two-story façade. He presented a color elevation. He presented the landscape plan noting that initially, a driveway was considered on the south side of the home but instead, the driveway is proposed on the north side of the home which provides for more space, preserves trees, and is consistent with the established pattern of driveway locations along the street. He reviewed the exterior materials, stone, cut limestone sills, pebble finish stucco, and appropriately sized plantation style shutters with operable hinges and shutter dogs. He presented material samples and reviewed the color palette. He stated that aluminum clad wood windows are proposed. He stated that the home is designed in a French Provincial style and complies with the allowable square footage. He stated that the home is compatible with the other traditional two-story homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Prado stated that the Homeowners' Association of the subdivision has approved the plans for the proposed house. He acknowledged that as proposed, the driveway

is very close to the property line, three feet away, but noted that this condition is prevalent throughout the neighborhood. He stated that drainage can be accommodated within the three foot area however, plantings of any substantial size along the property line are not feasible. He stated that fences along the property lines are not permitted by the subdivision covenants. He stated that the required side yard zoning setback is 12 feet and noted that the house is proposed at a distance of 12 feet, one inch from the property line. He stated that as built drawings will be required during construction to verify that the required setback distance is met. He stated that the overall design could benefit from some simplification of the roof forms and requested Board input on that aspect of the house. He stated that the staff report provides findings in support of the petition and offers recommendations for conditions of approval.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Lamphere complimented the house noting that it is scaled appropriately and will be a nice addition to the neighborhood. She complimented the symmetry and the exterior materials. She stated that efforts should be made to provide a buffer between the driveway and the property line despite the limited space. She commented that the roof forms appear somewhat chaotic.

Board member Bluhm agreed that the house will fit well into the neighborhood but expressed concern about the closeness of the house to both of the side yard property lines. She agreed that the roof appears overly complicated as viewed from the north. She stated appreciation for the side load garage, rather than a front load garage. She acknowledged that the Homeowners' Association has approved the design but noted that some refinement could benefit the house. She stated that landscaping should be considered to screen the air conditioner units and the driveway.

Board member Renken noted that the plate height is kept low to minimize the appearance of height of the house. He stated that quality exterior materials are proposed. He observed that the width of the house is maximized and as a result, the space for backing out of the garage is tight. He suggested consideration of reducing the depth of the garage from 22 feet to 20 or 21 feet. He stated that most often, garages are located on the high side of a property, not the low side. He commented that as a result, there may need to be steps up to the house. He suggested reconsideration of the lite divisions in the window to achieve a more vertical look. He stated that the roof form is appropriate as viewed from the front but agreed that it is complicated on the sides. He suggested some further study to simplify the roof forms and perhaps reduce the cost of construction by incorporating a flat roof on a portion of the home.

Board member Downey commented that it appears that the Homeowners' Association did a thorough review of the design and improved the project during the process. She expressed concern about the tightness of the driveway apron at the garage and encouraged further review and consideration of reducing the depth of

the garage. She questioned what type of plants will thrive in the available three foot space between the garage apron and the property line. She complimented the design of the house overall.

Board member Lohmueller agreed that taller window lites, less square, could enhance the look of the house. He agreed that the driveway configuration is a concern from a functional perspective and because of the proximity to the neighboring home. He suggested consideration of making the house narrower and deeper to ease the tightness across the site. He complimented the overall design of the house.

Chairman Looby stated that efforts should be made to increase the planting space opposite the garage to a minimum of five feet to allow arborvitae to be planted to mitigate the impact of headlights on the neighboring home. He encouraged discussions with the neighbor about the potential for plantings on or near the property line. He complimented the house design. He invited response to the Board's questions and comments from the petitioner.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Bendixon stated that the driveway is not as tight as it appears noting that the turning radius is shown on the engineering plans. He stated that as proposed, the driveway should be able to accommodate larger vehicles. He acknowledged that the site is tight and that to achieve the desired home, all aspects of the building and site are maximized. He stated that concepts were studied that located the garage toward the front of the home but to achieve better interior proportions, the garage was pushed to the rear. He stated that to avoid encroaching into the setback with the chimney, the garage was reduced in size from what is desired. He agreed to explore options in response to the Board's comments with respect to the depth of the garage. He stated that the air conditioning units are located in the only feasible spot adding that plantings will be added to screen the units. He stated that in his opinion, the roof forms, as seen from the side elevations, are not complex. He presented updated elevations and said that the views of the roof forms are more accurately represented in the updated drawings because there will not be a full on view of the roof from any perspective. He pointed out the portions of the roof that will fall back into shadows in the distance. He noted that on the south elevation, the roof masses are broken up rather than appearing as a single mass. He agreed to refine the window divisions to achieve a more vertical, less square appearance. He stated that there are no plans to finish the basement. He stated that he is not aware of any communication that has occurred with the neighbor to the north.

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

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report. He stated that the deliberations of the Board are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the

following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to the submittal of plans for permit, the following shall be considered and reflected on the plans.
  - a. Consideration shall be given to reducing the depth of the garage to provide a more functional driveway and additional planting area along the north property line.
  - b. Refine the roof forms on the north and south elevations to simplify and better organize the massing.
  - c. Submit material samples. The stone must be at least four inches thick.
  - d. Window muntins shall be adjusted to be more vertical, less square. The muntins shall be affixed to the inside and outside of the windows.
2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

*Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- f. A tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify trees proposed for removal, and trees identified for protection and preservation.
- g. A plan shall be submitted identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing pre and post construction treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees intended for preservation which are located close to construction activity if determined to be necessary by the City's Certified Arborist.
- h. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. Plantings to screen the driveway and garage doors must be included along the north property line. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

*Drainage and Grading*

- i. Detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling is limited to the minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices. The property must continue to accept water

that is tributary to the site and runoff from new construction must be addressed to avoid increasing stormwater runoff on to neighboring properties.

*Exterior Lighting*

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

*Construction Parking, Staging, and Tree Protection*

- k. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development. The public street and all driveways must remain unobstructed, passable, and clean at all times.
4. Submit an as-built survey during construction to assure that the house does not encroach into the south side yard setback as measured from the point of furthest encroachment, which most often is the outside edge of the gutter, to the south property line.

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

**5. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of demolition of the existing residence and detached garage, and in support of a replacement residence, attached garage and the associated hardscape and landscape plan at 1411 Estate Lane.**

Property Owners: Allen and Susan Mandell  
Representative: Stuart Shayman, 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 Board previously approved the plans for the house in this petition for a property located on Ridge Road. He stated that since that approval in August 2024, the petitioners found the property on Estate Lane which will require less tree removal and less regrading. He presented an air photo noting that the existing 1950's house is in poor condition due to water infiltration, and is located very close to the property line, not in conformance with the zoning setbacks. He stated that the Estate Lane property is larger and more private than the property on Ridge Road. He stated that the property is accessed from Estate Lane, using a shared driveway with the house to the west. He added that the property has street frontage on Oak Knoll

Drive but stated that no access is planned from that direction. He reviewed a preliminary grading plan and presented the proposed site plan. He pointed out that an access easement for the house to the west extends all along the north side of the property, east to Oak Knoll Drive and acknowledged that presents some challenges. He stated that only one Maple tree will be impacted by the proposed grading and construction. He stated that the petitioners plan to remove the dead evergreens and other trees on the site that are in poor condition. He stated that the vegetation along Oak Knoll Drive will be preserved for privacy. He reviewed the location of the public and private storm sewers in the area and stated that the storm sewer on the subject property will be relocated to the area along the west property line. He stated a desire to use Oak Knoll Drive for construction access.

Mr. Prado confirmed that the plans presented for the proposed residence are identical to those previously presented by the petitioners for a property on Ridge Road. He stated that findings in support of demolition of the existing residence are detailed in the staff report. He stated that based on the site plan, although the property has frontage on Oak Knoll Drive, access from Estate Lane, along the shared driveway is planned. He noted that the issue of the access easement which extends across the subject property from east to west will need to be resolved before the site plan can be finalized. He stated that the existing private storm sewer that extends across the property from north to south is deteriorated and will need to be replaced as part of redevelopment of the lot.

Chairman Looby invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Lohmueller stated that he was not at the earlier meeting when the house design was originally considered. He acknowledged that the house is clearly designed specifically for the petitioners. He complimented the siting of the house. He stated that drainage will need to be resolved to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Board member Lamphere stated support for the demolition of the existing residence. She asked for clarification on the color of the windows. She complimented the project overall.

Board member Bluhm stated that the house is much better suited for the subject lot than for the property on Ridge Road. She stated support for the demolition. She asked whether the petitioner considered taking access from Oak Knoll Drive rather than from the shared driveway. She commented that a significant amount of hardscape is proposed adding that drainage will need to be carefully addressed by the civil plans. She suggested consideration of using pavers in some areas to minimize the amount of impervious surface. She noted that the pool equipment is located close to the outdoor dining area and suggested reconsideration of the placement.

Board member Renken stated support for the demolition and acknowledged that the Board previously approved the design aspects and exterior materials of the house. He commented on the siting of the house on the lot noting that the first views are of

the garage doors. He suggested shifting the house to allow the entrance to be visible upon approach. He stated that the functionality of the circle drive should be looked at carefully to assure that the radius is appropriate. He stated that the shared driveway is in poor condition and will need to be replaced and perhaps widened. He agreed that overall, the house fits better on this lot than on the previous lot.

Board member Downey commented that the solar panels are more appropriate for this lot than the previous lot given the openness of the site. She agreed that demolition of the existing residence is necessary. She agreed that a different location should be found for the pool equipment and that properly addressing drainage will be essential.

Chairman Looby stated that redevelopment of the property is an opportunity to improve drainage through the property which will benefit other properties in the area. He agreed that the house fits better on the subject lot than on the Ridge Road lot adding that the lot provides considerable privacy. He suggested considering access from Oak Knoll Drive. He invited a response to the Board's questions and comments from the petitioner.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Shayman agreed to consider using some paver products to reduce the amount of impervious surface and to consider alternate locations for the pool equipment. He stated that the siting of the house takes into account the sun but agreed to consider some shifting of the house. He stated confidence that the circle driveway is sufficiently sized as a drop off.

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

Roger Owen, 1468 Estate Lane, stated that the north/south storm sewer that extends through the subject property is causing drainage problems.

Joseph Paul D'Cruz, 1400 Oak Knoll Drive, stated that he is building a house on the property to the north of the subject property and has had problems due to the deteriorated storm sewer line that extends across the subject property. He stated that water is backing up into the excavated area. He stated that drainage needs to be properly addressed.

Kevin Morris, 1467 Estate Lane, stated that he lives immediately to the south of the 1411 property and experiences a significant amount of overland stormwater flows. He stated that the water is impacting trees along his north property line. He stated that there is a larger drainage problem in the area, beyond this property. He stated support for the petition.

Hannah Eagle, 1421 Estate Lane, stated that she was not aware of the access easement benefiting her property and providing for access out to Oak Knoll Drive. She stated that she is not in favor of vacating the easement.

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

Board member Bluhm suggested consideration of abandoning the shared driveway and taking access from Oak Knoll Drive.

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

Board member Downey made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the existing residence and garage based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the comments of the Board as additional findings.

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

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report. He stated that the deliberations of the Board are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to submitting plans for permit, address the following:
  - a. Consider shifting the house to allow the entrance, rather than the garage doors, to be visible upon approaching the site.
  - b. Show the proposed relocated private storm sewer pipe and the 20' easement for the existing public (east/west) storm sewer on the plans. All structures must be setback at least 15 feet from the new storm sewer.
  - c. Submit documentation that the access easement through the subject property which benefits the 1421 Estate Lane property has been or will be vacated OR submit a revised site plan that reconfigures the driveway, roundabout and backout area to allow future access to Oak Knoll Drive for the 1421 Oak Knoll Drive property.
  - d. Relocate the pool equipment away from the outdoor eating area.
2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

*Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- a. A tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify trees proposed for

removal, and trees and vegetation identified for protection and preservation. 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.

- b. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and provide for all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. If determined to be appropriate, the City may allow a payment in lieu of on site plantings to compensate for the required replacement tree inches. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

#### *Drainage and Grading*

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

#### *Exterior Lighting*

- 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, Staging, and Tree Protection*

- 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.

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

### **6. Consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of partial demolition of the residence, alterations, first and second floor additions, and hardscape and landscape plans for property at 980 Melody Road.**

Property Owner: Karzatron Holdings LLC  
(Karl Svensson 50%, Marzena Svensson 50%)  
Representative: Karl Svensson, Owner

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. Kacprzyński reviewed the proposed changes to the home including areas of demolition, a second floor addition in the center of the house, a two story addition at the front of the house, and a one story addition at the rear of the home to replace the existing sunroom. He said that the existing walls will be used to the extent possible. He presented conceptual images of the intended modern style. He stated that the stone on the house will remain on the front elevation only and the rest of the house will be off white stucco. He stated that the center addition has a gable roof and pointed out the dormers planned over the side wings. He stated that the roof will be asphalt shingles with an aluminum roof over the front entrance and family room.

Mr. Prado stated that a significant amount of work is proposed on the house including demolition, alterations, and additions. He stated that significant demolition inside the home was done by a previous owner without permits or inspections. He stated that based on an evaluation submitted by the petitioner and a site inspection, there appears to be significant deterioration of the foundation and exterior walls. He stated that based on the Code, if more than 50 percent of the entire structure is demolished, the project is considered a complete demolition. He stated that given the current condition of the structure and the extent of work proposed, consideration should be given to demolishing the house in its entirety and designing and constructing a replacement house that may offer a better end product. He stated that the staff report details findings in support of demolition either in whole or in part. He stated that with respect to the proposed additions and alterations, the staff report identifies a number of concerns including the relationship of the main mass to the side elements, the awkwardness of the large gables, the conflict between one of the dormers and a window, the cantilevered element proposed on the rear of the home, the balance of windows to solid unbroken walls, the inconsistency of window shapes and sizes, and use of stone extending high on the front elevation and the lack of stone being carried around the home consistently.

Chairman Looby stated that remediation work will be needed on the foundation and other components of the home that are proposed to be retained and reused. He stated that all required documentation of the existing conditions and remediation work planned will need to be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of permits for alterations and additions. He stated that the condition of the foundation is a significant concern. He invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Bluhm questioned whether a new house should be built on a questionable foundation. She noted the presence of ranch homes in the area and suggested consideration of a story and a half home, rather than a two story home. She stated that the stone on the front elevation appears to stop at an awkward spot and suggested lowering the stone. She stated that the style, size, and placement of the windows should be more consistent. She stated that the cantilevered element at

the rear of the house should be eliminated. She noted the absence of a laundry room on the first floor. She stated that the overall design needs more refinement.

Board member Lamphere stated that a full demolition of the home will offer more options for a new home. She observed that the primary bedroom is near Waukegan Road and suggested flipping the floor plan to mitigate potential noise impacts. She stated that the neighborhood is beautiful, with many historic homes, and suggested consideration of materials, style and detailing that is found on other homes in the area. She stated that the space above the garage is too large. She stated that if the goal is to appeal to empty nesters, the footprint of the home could be smaller.

Board member Lohmueller suggested that if reusing portions of the existing residence is proposed for cost reasons, not much will be saved given the work needed including reconfiguring exterior walls to accommodate new windows. He stated that the foundation likely has both structural and water infiltration issues. He stated that by starting over, the style and layout of the house could be improved cost effectively and offer a better end product. He agreed with the points raised in the staff report and stated that the plans appear to be a first draft. He stated that the stone needs to relate to some component on the house.

Board member Downey referred to the house as a gateway house designed in a transitional modern style which does not flow appropriately into the neighborhood. She stated that if the reason for keeping limited elements of the existing house is to save money, the goal may not be achieved. She raised concern about the scale of the house and imbalance of the wings to the main mass. She stated that the two story section and cantilevered element on the rear of the home appear to have no relation to other elements of the home. She stated that the stone should be carried around to all elevations of the home and not just used on the front elevation. She stated that on the front elevation, the stone does not end at a logical place. She noted the blocked window due to the proposed dormer. She stated that it may be beneficial from various perspectives to construct a new home rather than work around limited elements of the existing house.

Board member Renken stated that demolition appears to be an appropriate course of action but recognized that the petitioners appear to want to retain some elements of the existing home. He stated that if salvaging portions of the existing house is intended, each elevation needs to be reviewed for consistency and appropriate massing and design elements. He questioned whether the gables on either side of the main mass are necessary. He suggested taking the stone to the sill line and using stone on the other elevations. He expressed concern about the vertical orientation of the front entry noting that it is taller than the two story element. He stated that the front door requires articulation to provide some shadow lines. He stated that the back elevation needs further study and refinement noting that there is a blank space below the cantilevered element. He stated that more thought is needed to create consistency among the windows. He stated that the window placement and size need to be considered from the exterior of the home with attention paid to the

relationship between the first and second floor windows. He stated that overall, the house appears stark and is a white stucco box. He stated that in his opinion, the petition is not ready for approval.

Chairman Looby invited comments from the petitioner in response to the questions and comments offered by the Board.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Kacprzyński confirmed that the house is a spec home. He stated that a stucco home is desired. He pointed out that the west wing is narrower than the east wing and stated that the house is not intended to be symmetrical. He stated that the dormers could be eliminated, or on the west side, the window raised to avoid the conflict. He agreed to lower the entrance element to match the overhang. He stated that the overhang of the element on the rear of the house can be eliminated. He stated that they are working with a structural engineer to determine whether the foundation can support a second story. He stated that the existing stone on the house will be reused and since the amount of stone is limited, it is only proposed on the front elevation. He stated that the stone cannot be matched. He agreed that if the project was all new construction, he would design the house differently. He commented on the proposed window placement. He stated that he will discuss the Board's comments and suggestions with the property owner. He stated that given the limitations of the property, some aspects of the project cannot change.

Chairman Looby stated that the Board will need to see a home that presents an appearance and quality consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited public comments.

Linda Shields, 985 Melody Road, stated that the neighborhood is an historic district with beautiful houses of brick and Lannon stone. She stated that the proposed house does not fit at all into the neighborhood.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Looby invited final comments from the Board. Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, he invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to continue the petition to address the questions, comments, and suggestions offered by the Board including, but not limited to the following.

1. Conduct further study of the merits of working with the existing structure to compare the quality of the end product that may be achieved by demolishing the existing residence and constructing a new residence. *Note: Demolition of 50% or more of the existing structure overall including, but not limited to walls, roof, mechanicals, exterior materials, windows, and doors, is considered a complete demolition for purposes of calculating applicable fees.*

2. If limited portions of the existing residence are proposed to remain, conduct further study and refinement of the proposed alterations and additions with consideration given to, but not limited to, the following:

*Overall*

- a. Refine all elevations to achieve a more regular pattern and proportional arrangement of windows and solid walls to more closely align with the City's Residential Design Guidelines.
  - Add two windows to the mudroom to align with the windows on the garage.
  - Add a window in the closet on the rear elevation.
  - Use a double window in the breakfast room.
  - Improve the proportions of the windows on the side elevations.
- b. Locate the primary bedroom on the east side of the home and allow the garage to buffer the home from Waukegan Road.
- c. Eliminate the second floor and maintain the one-story ranch style.
- d. Align the wings of the house to the central mass with respect to the proportions, massing, and symmetry.
- e. Soften the elevations overall to appear less stark.

*Front Elevation*

- f. Lower the two-story gabled front entrance to match the fascia line of the second story element or make the height of the entrance a story and a half.
- g. Articulate the front entrance to create more interest, for example by recessing the front door to create shadow lines.
- h. Eliminate or lower the gabled dormers on either side of the entrance to simplify the massing and roof forms.
- i. Lower the height of the stone on the front elevation and integrate the stone element into all elevations for consistency.

*Side Elevation*

- j. Remove or refine the dormer blocking the second story study room window.

*Rear Elevation*

- k. Eliminate the second-floor cantilevered gable element on the rear.

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

**7. Additional information from staff.**

No additional information was provided by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak  
Director of Community Development