

**The City of Lake Forest  
Building Review Board  
Proceedings of the January 7, 2026 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, January 7, 2026, at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest Municipal Services Facility, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman John Looby and Board members Eric Lohmueller, Sarah Lamphere, Scott Renken, and Sally Downey

Building Review Board members absent: Board members Justin Stamer and Chris Collins

Staff present: Luis Prado, Assistant Planner, Susan Thomas, Assistant Director of Community Development, 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 of the December 3, 2025 Building Review Board meeting.**

The minutes of the December 3, 2025 meeting were approved as submitted.

**3. Consideration of a new residence with an attached garage on a vacant lot at 855 Fox Trail Court and the associated hardscape and landscape.**

Property Owner: Arthur J. Greene Construction Company

Representative: Nick Marmitt, ALA Architect, Allison Greene

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. Marmitt stated that no variances are requested for the new house proposed on a vacant lot located in an established subdivision. He presented a site plan noting the four car side load garage. He stated that the first floor ceilings of the home are ten feet and the second floor ceilings are vaulted to keep the overall height of the house down. He presented the elevations noting that the front of the house has the most detail. He noted the sunroom and screen porch on the rear of the house. He stated that the exterior materials were selected for longevity and include stone and stucco.

Ms. Greene reviewed the proposed exterior materials including bronze LP trim, a dark brown metal roof, a synthetic roof product that imitates cedar, and smooth finish stucco. She provided material samples.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the property is a long standing vacant lot in an otherwise developed subdivision. She stated that most of the houses in the subdivision were constructed in the 1980's. She stated that the property is accessed from Lakewood Drive and is located on a short cul de sac, Foxtrail Court. She stated that the curb cut will need to be shifted slightly to avoid the curve of the bulb of the cul de sac. She noted that there are indications of wetlands on the property based on the Lake County map and the presence of a significant number of Cottonwood trees. She stated that prior to the issuance of permits, wetlands studies, if required, will need to be completed as directed by the City Engineer. She stated that the house is sited about 70' back on the lot and positioned well in relation to surrounding homes. She stated that for the most part, high quality exterior materials are proposed. She stated that stark white true cement stucco is proposed and noted that consistent with Board direction on other petitions, the color of the stucco should be softened to provide less contrast with the dark windows and to mitigate a dirty or yellowing appearance over time. She stated that although the front elevation is well detailed and articulated, the other elevations do not reflect the same attention. She stated that the south elevation could benefit from refinement of the window placement and breaking up the expanse of solid wall. She stated that the site plan does not reflect patios or terraces at either the French doors or the door in the screen porch on the rear elevation. She stated that if hardscape is proposed, it should be reflected on the plan submitted for permit or, the landscape plan should reflect landscaping in those areas. She stated that significant tree removal is proposed including the removal of high quality tree species. She stated that grading and filling on the site should be minimized to the extent possible in an effort to preserve some of the significant trees on the site. She stated that once a final grading plan is available, the required replacement tree inches will be calculated. She stated that given the limitations of the site, some payment in lieu of on site tree plantings will be required at the time of issuance of a building permit.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Lamphere complimented the house overall but commented that the color palette appears stark with the white stucco. She stated that cedar should be used for the trim. She stated that on the south elevation, the window placement appears chaotic. She commented that the north elevation is lacking detail. She encouraged softening the appearance of the house to create more interest by enhancing the details.

Board member Lohmueller agreed with Board member Lamphere's comments. He suggested that rather than lap siding, panels following the geometry of the windows could be used. He commented on the treatment of the eaves and the porch and suggested refinements to avoid the appearance of a standard spec house. He

asked for an explanation of how the shed roof on the north side of the house will be handled and questioned whether a fascia board is proposed. He suggested lowering the roofline of the garage to offset the two roof lines and reduce the appearance of the very wide elevation.

Board member Downey commented on the wood lap siding and noted concern about the number of exterior materials proposed. She stated that the south elevation does not appear to be finished and needs additional detail.

Board member Renken observed that there are many large homes in the neighborhood. He acknowledged that in elevation, the home appears almost like a duplex but pointed out that in three dimensions, the appearance is less so. He suggested panelizing the area between the windows, over the front door. He suggested refinement to improve the hierarchy of forms including stepping down the roof on the left side over the extra room in the attic. He stated that using hipped roofs on the side elevations could soften the appearance of massing. He questioned the balance of stone versus stucco on the rear elevation and stated that the stone above the windows on the porch appears heavy. On the right elevation, he asked that further consideration be given to the interface of stone and stucco noting that it appears awkward for the stone and stucco to end in the same plane. He encouraged consideration of the window placement and size and further articulation overall.

Chairman Looby complimented the proposed house. He observed that the lot is densely covered with buckthorn making it difficult to envision the siting of the house on the lot. He invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions and comments.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Marmitt agreed that there is an opportunity to bring down the height of the garage roof. He agreed to further articulate and detail the side elevations and break up the large expanses of solid walls. He acknowledged that adding a hip roof to the south elevation could help to break up the wall. He agreed to panelize the area between the windows above the front door. He agreed to consider refining the eaves and the slope of the porch roof. He commented on the shed roof to the left of the front entrance confirming that there is a fascia board. He confirmed that there will be patios behind the house.

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

Board member Downey suggested removing some of the stone around the porch and adding it to the side elevations to break up the appearance of mass.

Chairman Looby stated that a softer color stucco will enhance the appearance of the stone.

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

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of a new residence on the vacant lot at 855 Fox Trail Court and the associated hardscape and the conceptual landscape plan based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion, He stated that the Board's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings adding that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. If determined to be necessary by the City Engineer, further study of potential wetland impacts on the site shall be completed prior to submittal for permit. If determined to be necessary, the site plan shall be modified to respond to the findings of the wetland study consistent with the requirements of the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance.
2. Prior to submittal for permit, the following shall be addressed:

#### Site Plan

- a. Complete any further study required by the City Engineer related to the presence of wetlands on the site. This information should inform grading, filling, and proposed tree removal on the site.
- b. Modify the site plan to shift the curb cut to the south, away from the point at which the curve of the cul-de-sac begins.
- c. Explore opportunities to limit grading and filling to the extent possible on the site in conformance with good engineering practices, to reduce the amount of tree removal required.
- d. Detail the site plan to reflect hardscape proposed for the rear yard.

#### Elevations and Exterior Materials

- e. Remove the lap siding between the windows on the west elevation and consider a panelized system.
- f. Refine the eaves to create a non-"porkchop" look.
- g. Lower the garage roof and gabled roof above the walk in closet from a one and a half story element to a one story element, improving the hierarchy of massing.
- h. Reduce the stone on the rear porch to a band at the base and add a band of stone to the south elevation to improve the consistency of materials across the elevations.

- i. Provide the height of the residence in relation to the *lowest point of existing adjacent grade* on the plans submitted for permit. Clearly delineate the existing grades on the plan. (An as-built survey will be required during the construction process to demonstrate that the height of the house aligns with the height as reflected on the plans approved for permit.)
- j. Refine the south elevation to elevate the design of the large two story mass to be more consistent with the level of detailing on the other elevations. Refine the placement of the windows and break up the solid mass of wall.
- k. Install stone with a minimum thickness of four inches on all elevations.
- l. Soften the color of the true cement stucco to achieve a less stark appearance.
- m. Use natural cedar for trim instead of an LP siding.
- n. Elevate the overall design through a more consistent use of stone on all elevations.

#### Tree Removal and Landscape Plan

- o. Remove buckthorn from the site *as authorized through a permit issued by the City* respecting limitations due to wetlands, if any, prior to updating the tree survey.
  - p. Detail the landscape plan to reflect hardscape in the rear yard. If no hardscape is proposed, the landscape plan should clearly state that the area is intended only as lawn.
  - q. Prepare a final landscape plan, once all required information is available on required replacement tree inches, that fully meets Code requirements for new residences and provides replacement inches on site to the extent *possible using good forestry practices*.
3. All modifications to the plans, including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

#### Tree Protection

- a. Submit a tree protection fencing plan. Fencing must be installed prior to issuance of permits and is subject to approval by the City.
- b. Submit a plan for pre and post construction treatment for trees intended for preservation to increase the chance of long term survival and minimum the impact of construction.

*Drainage and Grading*

- c. Submit detailed drainage and grading plans and address wetlands if required. 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. Submit details of all exterior lighting on the structures and landscape 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. Submit a plan for contractor parking and equipment 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 parking or staging is permitted within the bulb of the cul-de-sac. The adjacent and nearby streets must remain clean and passable throughout construction. Driveways may not be blocked.
5. Submit as-built drawings during the construction process to assure that the maximum permitted building height of 40 feet is not exceeded as measured from the lowest adjacent grade to the tallest peak of the roof.

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

**4. Continued consideration of a new residence with an attached garage on a vacant lot at 1206 Estate Lane and the associated hardscape and landscape.**

Property Owner and Representative: Matan Aharoni  
Managing Partner, The Aharoni Group

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. Aharoni reviewed the changes made to the plans since the last meeting. He stated that the house was shifted to the center of the property, away from the north property line, and aligned with the property lines instead of with the curving street. He stated that the siting as now proposed provides space for plantings along the north property line, along the driveway. He stated that the grade change on the property is now reflected on the north elevation of the home. He stated that the massing on the front elevation is simplified and a gable front facing dormer is now proposed. He stated that stone and stucco are applied consistently on all of the elevations. He stated that the wood panels previously proposed on portions of the exterior of the home are replaced with stucco to reduce the number of exterior materials. He pointed out that the chimney is wider than previously proposed to align it with the scale of other elements of the home. He stated that on the south elevation, the windows are larger and more uniform in style, shape, and placement. He stated that windows are shown above the garage to break up the solid wall. He confirmed that the stone is a minimum of four inches thick and presented a sample of the material. He pointed out areas where limestone is proposed. He reviewed the tree removal plan and explained that one tree is proposed for removal for the driveway, and six trees are proposed for removal to accommodate construction of the home. He noted that the driveway is located within the permitted area as it extends through the Conservation Easement. He acknowledged that the landscape plan needs to be enhanced to reflect additional plantings to re-establish vegetation within the Conservation Easement. He stated that the previous owner of the property removed vegetation in the Conservation Easement without a permit and only completed minimal replanting. He stated that a synthetic roof product is proposed in a natural color but noted that if the Board directs, a synthetic product that imitates slate could be considered.

Mr. Prado stated that the revised plans appear to be responsive to the comments offered by the Board at the previous meeting. He summarized noting the refinement to the exterior materials, dormers, chimney, and windows. He stated that as requested by the Board, the elevations now reflect the areas impacted by the grade change on the site. He stated that the house is sited further to the west than in the previous plan and parallel to the side property lines. He confirmed that the driveway is moved away from the north property line with the intention of allowing space for plantings and drainage. He confirmed that the landscape plan will need to reflect additional plantings in the Conservation Easement.

Chairman Looby invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Lohmueller commented that at the front entrance, the brackets appear heavy in relation to what is being supported and suggested adjusting the proportions and depth of the components to create visual balance. He commented that the chimney appears to hang off of the roof and suggested integrating it into the main roof. He noted that on the left side elevation, the peak of the gable could be lowered below the peak of the main roof. He asked for detail on the window surrounds, the vents, and the stucco.

Board member Lamphere stated that cedar trim should be used instead of a composite product. She suggested removal of the water table noting that many stucco homes do not have that detail. She asked for information on the base of the screen porch and the detail of the stucco.

Board member Downey agreed with Board member Lohmueller that on the front elevation, the scale of the corbels in relation to other components does not appear correct. She thanked the petitioner for responding to the Board's comments.

Board member Renken agreed that the revised plans respond well to the Board's previous comments. He stated that the proportions overall are improved and complimented the stone band at the base of the house. He commented that the fact that the peak of the gable reaches the ridge of the main house may not be visible. He observed that the window muntins do not appear to be uniform around the house. He asked for confirmation that the limitations of the Conservation Easement result in the angle of the driveway through the front yard. He agreed that the corbels should be scaled down.

Chairman Looby stated support for the water table at the base of the house. He commented that the house will fit well with the neighborhood with its classic design, simple roof lines, and subtle color. He stated support for the site plan with the house centered on the property. He invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions and comments.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Aharoni stated that the screen porch will be constructed on a foundation with a seamless transition to the outdoor patio with no grade change. He said that after studying the chimney, there is no way to integrate it into the house.

Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he stated that the trim should be cedar. He invited final questions or comments from the Board.

Board member Renken commented that opaque stain will achieve the same appearance as paint.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of a new residence on a vacant lot at 1206 Estate Lane and the associated hardscape and conceptual landscape plan. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion and stated that the Board's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to submitting plans for permit, the elements of the front entrance shall be reviewed to ensure proper proportions including but not limited to the scale of the corbels.
2. Any modifications to the plans 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. Submit a final tree plan which will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation.
- b. Submit a final and detailed landscape plan, drawn on the drainage and grading plan which will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping. The plan shall meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and, in addition:
  - I. Reflect all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices.
  - II. Reflect plantings within the Conservation Easement including ground cover, mid-level plantings, and canopy trees to restore the wooded streetscape intended at the time of subdivision. A plan for phased plantings to re-naturalize the Conservation Easement is acceptable with a financial guarantee to ensure full planting in the specified time period subject to City review and approval.
  - III. Reflect plantings to screen the neighboring properties to the north and south. The footprints of the neighboring homes, or partial footprints, should be shown on the landscape plan.
- c. 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 both on the subject property and on adjacent properties.

*Drainage and Grading*

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

the site and runoff from new construction must be addressed to avoid increasing stormwater runoff on to neighboring properties during and after construction.

#### *Exterior Lighting*

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

#### *Construction Parking, Staging, and Tree Protection*

f. A plan for contractor parking and materials and equipment 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 contractor parking is permitted on Estate Lane or on Trillium Lane.

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

### **5. Continued consideration of a new residence with an attached garage on a vacant lot at 1241 Ashlawn Drive along with the associated hardscape and landscape.**

Property Owner: Daniel Daoud

Representative: Oana Herghelegui, 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. Herghelegui stated that as a follow up to the Board comments at the previous meeting, refinements were made to the residence with a focus on softening the roof and making the structure appear more residential than office-like. She stated that the front entrance was modified with the addition of an intermediary deck space near the front door which is screened with louvers. She stated that the second floor area that is not screened is only a corridor connecting the second floor bedrooms and will not see much activity. She stated that the side elevations were not changed. She pointed out that the roof overhangs on the rear elevation were extended and that the chimney is now integrated into the roof. She stated that with the changes, the house is more welcoming and more residential in appearance. She stated that the windows in the garage were reduced and the garage overhead doors were changed to solid doors rather than glass. She acknowledged concerns raised by neighbors regarding off site light impacts. She stated that the window glass will be tinted slightly to minimize light visibility and automatic blinds will be installed at all of the windows to minimize off site light impacts. She stated that the previously proposed natural wood siding is now proposed as a grayish composite product for durability and to retain the original color. She stated that the color of the roof is

darker than originally proposed with the intent of reducing visibility. She presented samples of materials.

Mr. Prado stated that to help visualize the site and impacts of the driveway on existing vegetation, the west property line was staked. He stated that the staking confirms that most of the vegetation along the west property line will need to be removed to install the driveway as proposed leaving little space for new landscaping to minimize the impacts of headlights on the neighboring property. He stated that the wood slats now proposed on either side of the front door should help to mitigate light spillover from the first floor windows. He stated that the change from glass doors to solid doors on the garage and front of the house also helps to mitigate light spillover from the house on to the street and neighboring properties. He stated that the expanse of glass on the second floor is slightly reduced as a result of expanded headers and sills. He stated that on the rear of the house, deep overhangs should help to mitigate some of the off site light impacts. He stated that the Conservation Easement at the rear of the property will need to remain vegetated and protected during construction activity. He stated that enhanced plantings in the Conservation Easement will be required.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Renken stated that the warmer color palette, the solid doors, and the slats proposed near the front door are improvements over the previous design presented. He stated that the second floor space on the front elevation, at the great room, will still result in off site light impacts. He complimented the revised rear elevation noting that the overhangs and integration of the chimney into the house are improvements. He stated support for the changes made but noted continuing concern about light impacts from the second floor on the front elevation.

Board member Downey questioned whether the images presented realistically reflect how the house will appear on the site. She stated that although the exterior materials appear appropriate for the neighborhood and the natural setting, the inspirational photos presented do not appear to blend in with the homes in the area. She commented however that she is unfamiliar with the primary exterior material proposed. She stated that light spillover from the windows on the second floor of the front elevation will be mitigated by the setback of the house from the street and homes to the north. She stated that further steps should be taken to mitigate the concerns of the neighbors to the rear of the home. She questioned how the tinted windows will appear. She commented that the house appears to have been designed from the inside out.

Board member Lohmueller acknowledged that the overall design has improved since the last meeting. He commented that it appears that much of the interior lighting will be recessed which may help to mitigate off site impacts. He questioned the level of tint proposed for the glass in the windows. He agreed that interior window coverings would be helpful. He asked whether the architect had experience with the proposed

siding product, noting his experience with the product on decks with mixed results. He encouraged the petitioner to make sure the siding material is durable and able to withstand temperature changes and ultraviolet exposure. He cautioned that proper installation is critical. He questioned the accuracy of the site plan noting that based on a visit to the site, it appears that the driveway will be closer to the west property line than represented on the site plan.

Board member Lamphere complimented the bold design of the house. She stated support for the modifications made to the front entrance and to the garage doors. She asked for more information about the product proposed for the siding and asked for samples of the exterior materials. She questioned whether all of the windows are proposed as fixed windows.

Chairman Looby stated that the appearance of the tinted windows is important and will be subject to review and approval by the City. He urged due diligence on the proposed exterior siding material to make sure it will hold up through the seasons. He noted that the house as viewed from across the pond could be striking. He too noted the proximity of the driveway to the west property line noting that a curb along the west side of the driveway may be required. He invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions and comments.

Ms. Herghelegui presented options for screening the second floor windows on the front elevation, adding that the petitioner prefers the elevation as presented, without any further screening. She stated that gutters and downspouts will be hidden within the structure. She acknowledged the closeness of the driveway to the west property line adding that there will be little space for landscaping between the driveway and the property line. She stated that to mitigate impacts on the neighbors to the rear, depth was added to the overhang, and a few evergreens are proposed along the south property line. She stated that the windows are fixed on the front and rear elevations but not on the side elevations. She stated that no window trim is proposed. She stated that the siding product carries a warranty for durability, adding that the petitioner is aware of the importance of the long term appearance of the product. She stated that she does not know where the product is manufactured and has not used it before. She presented material samples noting that a sample of the stone proposed for the chimney is not available.

Mr. Daoud stated that he likes the proposed siding product because it offers variation. He stated that overall, his desire is to minimize contrast between the siding and the roof and to have the house appear seamless. He acknowledged that he is still working to make a final determination on the siding product, but his intention is to ensure the siding is durable and appears as reflected in the rendering. He explained that the area on the second floor, above the front entry, is a corridor with can lights on the north wall focused on the corridor and as a result, the area will not emit much light toward the streetscape or neighbors which are some distance away. He explained that the glazing on the center mass, on the front and rear elevations, is intended to lighten the structure, separate the volumes on either side, and allow

views through the house. He stated that over time, the house will disappear. He stated the intent to improve upon the property as it currently exists. He noted his preference to have clear, not tinted glass and instead rely on window shades and intentional decisions about interior lighting. He stated a willingness to plant on the neighbor's property to the west to screen the driveway. He agreed to consider a curb on both sides of the driveway. He stated that every room will have operational casement windows.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Ms. Czerniak acknowledged that it is unusual for the Board to approve unknown materials without further due diligence. She suggested that the Board require additional information to be provided to staff and require installation of an on site mockup of the product in a small area prior to final approval of the material.

Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Dan Costanzo, 584 Fletcher Circle, stated that he is speaking on behalf of several neighbors. He expressed concern about how stormwater drainage will be handled. He stated that although he appreciates the design, it is bold and innovative and will draw attention and stand out in the neighborhood, in his opinion, not in a good way. He stated that the privacy that he has enjoyed in his home will go away. He stated that he always understood that the property would be developed but did not expect this type of design.

At the request of Chairman Looby, Mr. Prado confirmed that the City Engineer completed a preliminary review of the drainage and grading plans and that the final plans will be subject to his approval prior to the issuance of a permit.

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

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of a new residence on a vacant lot at 1241 Ashlawn Drive and the associated hardscape and conceptual landscape plans. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion and stated that the Board's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation includes the following conditions of approval.

1. The application for permit shall include the following:
  - a. An auto turn study prepared by a licensed engineer to demonstrate sufficient space for vehicles of a size commonly used by families today to turn into and pull out of the garage.
  - b. Plans reflecting curbing on the driveway.
  - c. Detailed information on the proposed siding material. The material is subject to review and approval by staff.
  - d. Detail on how the corners are treated with the proposed siding material.

2. All modifications to the plans, including those 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. The following shall be submitted prior to the issuance of permit subject to staff review and approval.

*Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- a. A final tree plan shall be submitted. The plan shall identify trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation.
- b. A plan shall be submitted identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing pre and post construction treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees and vegetation intended for preservation located close to construction activity both on the property and on neighboring properties.

The Conservation Easement shall be protected with a chain link fence to prevent any encroachment not specifically approved by the City and reflected on the approved engineering plan. If limited encroachment is determined by the City Engineer to be necessary and consistent with good engineering practices, the protective fencing shall be adjusted to allow encroachment ONLY into the area approved for disturbance. Fencing shall be re-installed at the edge of the Conservation Easement immediately after the permitted work in the Conservation Easement is completed.

- c. A detailed landscape plan. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscape standards for new residences detailed in the Code and, in addition, provide all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

All areas of the site where existing trees and vegetation will be preserved must be indicated on the landscape plan including the Conservation Easement. The plan must clearly detail enhancement plantings in the Conservation Easement.

Plantings shall be comprised of primarily native species of grasses, shrubs, and trees.

- d. An escrow deposit in an amount to cover the cost of plant materials and labor shall be posted with the City prior to the issuance of a building permit to ensure planting on the entire site consistent with the approved landscape plan.

*Drainage and Grading Plans*

- e. 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 during or after construction.

*Exterior Lighting Plan*

- f. Cut sheets for all light fixtures proposed on the exterior of the residence and garage, and on the site, if any, 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.

*Contractor Parking, Staging, and Tree Protection*

- g. A plan for contractor parking and equipment 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 adjacent and nearby streets must remain passable and free of dirt and debris and driveways may not be blocked.

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

**6. Consideration of a new residence with an attached garage on a vacant lot at 290 Majestic Oak Court and the associated hardscape and landscape.**

Property Owner: 270-290 Majestic Court LLC (Marcin Kopacz 50% and John Lawson 50%)

Representative: Paul Szurley, President of SP Group Pro Inc.

Mr. Lawson reviewed the plan originally presented to the Board and the changes made in response to the Board's comments. He noted that a third post was added to the front entry, the overlapping gable on the garage was eliminated, the large stair window separated, and windows were added on the side elevations where possible. He verified the size of the garage doors as nine feet wide and eight feet tall. He stated that the house will not be solid white. He presented a tree removal and conceptual landscape plan.

Mr. Prado reviewed the comments made by the Board at the last meeting. He stated that the petitioner was asked to enhance the detailing on all elevations to a

consistent level while quieting down the front elevation. He stated that the Board requested the elimination of overlapping gables. He noted that Board members again encouraged references to the nearby historic residence. He acknowledged the changes made as described by the petitioner in response to the Board's comments. He stated that based on the Board's previous comments, there appears to be opportunities for additional improvements including simplifying the roof forms further. He commented that the proposed white siding appears stark. He requested input and direction from the Board.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Renken acknowledged that some basic improvements were made to the design since the last meeting. He commented that on the garage elevation, a large expanse of blank wall would benefit from additional windows. He suggested consideration of a 6/12 pitch rather than the 5/12 as currently proposed. He commented on the windows on the front elevation. He stated that if shutters are considered, all elevations should be looked at for proper placement. He stated that in his opinion, the shutters should not be black.

Board member Lamphere expressed continued concern about the overlapping gables. She again encouraged consideration of incorporating some reference to the historic residence to recognize that the house is part of a larger community.

Board member Lohmueller agreed that the overall design was improved since the plans were last presented to the Board. He suggested equally spacing the columns at the front entrance and centering the window between the two columns to bring order to the front entrance. He requested elimination of the boxed out eaves. He asked for clarification on the intended siding treatment and whether the hardi-board will be pre-finished or painted on site.

Board member Downey encouraged the addition of windows on the north elevation. She stated that having an auto turn study completed by an engineer will benefit future residents by ensuring sufficient space to maneuver into and out of the garage. She observed that other homes in the subdivision do not clearly reference the historic house and noted that the shutters on the historic residence are black. She suggested consideration of a soft gray.

Chairman Looby acknowledged that the modifications made since the last meeting are an improvement but added that there is an opportunity to make the house special. He stated support for the imitation slate synthetic shingles on the roof. He stated that the black and white color palette is overdone, trendy and getting tired. He pointed out that the windows are not consistent around the house. He suggested considering adding shutters or trim. He stated that the board and batten panels should be residentially scaled no larger than 12 inches. He invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions and comments.

Mr. Lawson stated that the white will not be a stark tone. He confirmed that all of the windows will be a consistent style. He agreed to add trim or shutters to the windows. He agreed to shift the front posts.

In response to a question from Board member Renken, Prado confirmed that the petitioner likely lowered the roof pitch to meet the square footage.

Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Tina Dann Fenwick, 301 S. Ridge Road, stated that shutters will enhance the house and reference the historic property. She stated concern about the loss of Oak trees and natural habitat pointing out that the Code requires natural features to be preserved. She stated that the neighborhood is a quiet, wooded area. She asked the Board to require Oak trees and other native, substantial trees to be planted to replace some of the large Oak trees that will be lost. She stated that evergreens are not consistent with the character of the area. She stated that overall, the design of the house has improved since the last meeting. She agreed that the remaining overlapping gables should be eliminated.

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

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of a new residence on a vacant lot at 290 Majestic Oak Court and the associated hardscape. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted as part of the motion and the Board's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Prior to the submittal of plans for permit, the plans shall be refined as follows:
  - a. Elevations
    - i. Shift the porch columns on the front elevation to be better centered in relationship to the front door and dining room windows.
    - ii. Further simplify the front elevation, including the massing, roof forms and number of materials.
    - iii. Eliminate the overlapping gable on the front elevation.
    - iv. Refine the north elevations with attention to balancing the window opening with the expanses of solid wall, including the addition of windows.
    - v. Refine the "porkchop" eaves.
    - vi. Add shutters proportionate to the windows on all elevations.
    - vii. Detail the roof vents as ridge vents.
  - b. Materials
    - i. Detail the Hardie Board color as "Cobblestone".
    - ii. Clearly detail the proposed materials on the plans, including the elevations, site plan and landscape plan.

- iii. Simplify the number of exterior materials to better align with the Residential Design Guidelines.
  - iv. Detail the trim as cedar and the muntins as simulated divided lites with interior and exterior muntin bars affixed.
  - v. Use a softer, less stark color palette than black and white.
  - vi. Consider enlarging the garage doors to accommodate today's vehicles.
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:

*Driveway*

- a. Submit an auto turn study prepared by a licensed engineer demonstrating sufficient space for vehicles turning into and pulling out of the garage. Consideration should be given to the size of the garage doors and how the size may affect maneuverability.

*Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- b. A final 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.
- c. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and, in addition, provide all required replacement tree inches to account for trees being removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices.
- d. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping. The plan shall demonstrate inch-for-inch replacement of trees proposed for removal. Replacement inches can be satisfied in part through plantings in the area between Majestic Oak Court and Ridge Road where trees are dead as a result of construction activity in the area.
- e. The landscape plan shall reflect high quality tree species and plantings and spacing consistent with food forestry practices to allow trees to grow to maturity and thrive.
- f. 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 both on the property and on neighboring properties.

*Drainage and Grading*

g. 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*

h. 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.

*Contractor Parking, Staging, and Tree Protection*

i. A plan for contractor parking and equipment 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. Construction access from Ridge Road must be coordinated with the Westleigh Farm Homeowner Association and will be subject to City review and approval.

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

**7. Consideration of a new residence with an attached garage on a vacant lot at 320 Majestic Oak Court and the associated hardscape and landscape.**

Property Owner: Elite Development Group (Bartek Skrzynecki 50%, Grzegorz Malicki 50%)

Representative: Paul Szurley, President of SP Group Pro Inc.

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. Lawson reviewed the modifications made since the last meeting including eliminating overlapping gables, widening the front elevation and adding windows to the side elevations where possible. He presented samples of exterior materials noting that a soft white will be used.

Mr. Prado reviewed the comments and direction offered by the Board on this petition at the last meeting. He stated that the Board encouraged the petitioner to work toward consistency with the selected transitional architectural style with references to the historic house located nearby. He stated that the Board encouraged efforts to make the house less imposing. He noted that the Board requested refinement of the front elevation including simplifying it overall, eliminating the overlapping gables, and

refining the front entrance. He acknowledged that some adjustments were made to the front entrance including reducing the height of the roof and simplifying the roof forms. He stated that the Board directed further detailing of the side and rear elevations to achieve a consistent level of design with the front elevation. He stated that modest adjustments were made to the side elevations to better balance the window openings with expanses of solid wall. He stated that the Board also directed reducing the number of exterior materials. He acknowledged the progress made but stated that staff recommends continuation of the petition to allow continued refinement to allow the house to fit into the context of the other homes in the area.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the house is changed very little from the plans previously presented to the Board. He suggested that the architect go back to the drawing board. He noted the inconsistency of the formal front entry with the rest of the house.

Board member Lamphere stated that the front entrance is too imposing, She commented that the back of the house has little relation to the front of the house. She agreed that the design process should be restarted.

Board member Downey stated that the house appears to be two different houses when comparing the front of the house to the back. She stated that the house is modest in scale on three sides and very different on the front. She stated that the front of the house does not relate to any other homes in the area and is not appropriate.

Board member Renken agreed that the two story entrance does not work. He stated that the house is a farmhouse with a contemporary front elevation. He stated that the front elevation and entrance are out of character with homes in the area. He suggested considering extending the porch across the front of the house and working to break up the full two story mass.

Chairman Looby agreed that the front entry is too large and out of proportion with other homes in the subdivision. He stated that the plans need to be reworked. He invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions and comments. He invited public comment.

Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Tina Dann-Fenwick, 301 S. Ridge Road, stated concern about light spillover on to Ridge Road and the nearby homes. She pointed out that the house will be very exposed to the road. She stated that from a design perspective, the house does not fit into the context of the neighborhood. She noted that the pillars appear to attempt to imitate a Classical style but noted that they appear out of proportion. She expressed concern about the loss of Oak trees to date in the subdivision adding that

a large number of additional trees are proposed for removal.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to continue the petition with direction to the petitioner to rework the plans to design a house that is consistent on all elevations and fits with the surrounding homes in terms of style, massing, roof forms, and detailing.

The motion was seconded by Board member Lohmeuller.

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

There was no public comment on non-agenda items.

**9. Additional information from staff.**

There was no additional information provided by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak  
Director of Community Development