

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the November 20, 2024 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, November 20, 2024, at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Maureen Grinnell, and Commission members Lloyd Culbertson, Tina Dann-Fenwick, Geoffrey Hanson, Robin Petit, and Leif Soderberg.

Commissioners absent: Elizabeth Daliere

City staff present: Abigail Vollmers, Senior Planner, Luis Prado, Assistant Planner, and Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

1. Introduction of Commissioners and staff, overview of meeting procedures.

Chairman Grinnell reviewed the meeting procedures followed by the Commission and asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes of the September 25, 2024 meeting of the Commission.

The minutes of the September 25, 2024 were approved.

3. Consideration for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving a change to a previously approved roof material for a single-family residence at 205 N. Green Bay Road and amending a previously granted Certificate of Appropriateness.

Property Owner: John Plant

Presented by: John Plant

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest, hearing none, she invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Plant requested approval of a change in roofing material from cedar shake as originally presented and approved, to a synthetic roof product. He stated that the home is under construction and added that no other changes are proposed. He stated that the proposed synthetic product is Davinci imitation slate with straight coursing and a 10" exposure. He reviewed the color palette and stated that the color of the synthetic roof product is "European" and the gutters and flashing are a charcoal color. He stated that he is requesting the change because of cost, insurability, and for the appearance. He stated that natural slate was considered but

would require structural changes to the house to support the additional weight which was not anticipated when the house was designed.

Ms. Vollmers commented that a slate-like appearance is appropriate on an English Cottage style. She noted that as previously acknowledged by the Board, the long-term durability and appearance of synthetic roof products is not yet fully understood adding that the petitioner should be aware of some possible uncertainty. She noted that roof material can and will be replaced over time and an alternate material could be considered in the future.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hanson, Mr. Plant explained that the request to use a synthetic roof product is primarily driven by insurance issues and by his experience with mold on a cedar roof at his existing house. He added that he likes the appearance of the synthetic slate product.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann Fenwick, Ms. Vollmers clarified that the limestone gable ends are proud of the roof and as a result, there is no concern about visible edges of the synthetic product.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit Mr. Plant explained that he prefers the proposed synthetic product over asphalt shingles from an appearance perspective as they align with the character of the house.

In response to a question from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Plant stated that the product has a manufacturer's warranty and an installation warranty from the builder.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited public comment. Hearing no requests to speak, she invited final questions or comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick expressed support for the proposed change from cedar to a synthetic imitation slate roof product because of the location of the home away from the Green Bay Road streetscape.

Commissioners Petit and Culbertson stated support for the petition.

Commissioner Soderberg expressed support for the petition noting that the proposed roof material meets the criteria previously established by the Commission for synthetic roof products.

Chairman Grinnell stated support for the change to a synthetic imitation slate roof product because the house is new construction, and no historic materials are involved. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Hanson made a motion to approve an amendment to a previously granted Certificate of Appropriateness approving the use of a synthetic imitation slate roof product in place of the previously approved natural cedar shingles on a new house at 205 N. Green Bay Road. He stated that the motion is based on the findings as detailed in the staff report which are adopted by the Commission as part of the motion and includes the Commission's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the approval is subject to the following condition.

1. The synthetic slate product shall be consistent with the product information presented to the Commission. If any modification in the final roof product is proposed, the product will be subject to review and approval by City Staff in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Culbertson and approved by the Commission by a 6 to 0 vote.

4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving Replacement of Original Sunroom Doors.

Property Owner: Jennifer Chase

**Presented by: Fred Wilson, Morgante Wilson Architects
Susan Benjamin, Benjamin Historic**

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, she invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Chase stated the intent to be a good steward of the home and explained that shortly after purchasing the house she noticed the poor condition of the windows and sunroom doors. She stated that the windows are currently being restored. She noted however that the six sets of doors in the sunroom are beyond repair based on expert opinions and she requested approval of replicating rather than replacing the doors.

Mr. Wilson stated that the sunroom was added to the home in 1938 and was designed by Ambrose Cramer. He stated that the feasibility of restoring the sunroom doors was carefully considered but found to not be workable due to the extent of deterioration and the fact that the doors do not function properly and cannot be secured. He presented and reviewed the proposed shop drawings for replicating the doors reviewed.

Ms. Benjamin noted her involvement in reviewing the proposed replication and stated support for the approach proposed.

Ms. Vollmers explained that the ongoing window restoration project was approved administratively. She stated that the request to replace the sunroom doors is presented to the Commission since it involves removal of original material. She noted the extensive evaluation process the petitioner undertook before deciding on replication, rather than

restoration. She noted that findings are presented in the staff report in support of the petition. She noted that the petitioner's consultant describes the proposed approach as best-in-class given the use of weather resistant mahogany wood and the reuse of the original hardware.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick Mr. Wilson explained that the door jambs will be replaced but the trim and original hardware will be reused.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Wilson explained that mahogany was selected because it is durable and can withstand the difficult weather conditions near the Lake. He stated that a triple point lock is proposed to securely fasten the door in the jamb. He stated that the exterior surfaces will replicate the existing two-tone details.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Wilson confirmed that the windows will be single pane. He stated that storm windows may be contemplated in future but are not currently planned.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited public comment.

Jim Opsitnik, 971 Verda Lane, spoke on behalf of the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation and stated support for the petition and complimented the design team on the thoroughness and attention to detail.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission, hearing none, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Soderberg made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the removal of the original sunroom doors and replacement with replicated doors at 1421 N. Lake Road. He stated that the motion is based on the findings in the staff report and incorporates the Commission's deliberations as additional comments. He stated that the motion is subject to the following condition.

1. Submit plans for permit that are consistent with the plans on which the Commission based its approval. Any and all changes and enhancements made to the plans after the Commission's review must be clearly highlighted on the plans submitted for permit and a copy of the plans presented to the Commission must be included for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review the plans submitted for permit for consistency with the Commission's approval and consult with the Chairman as appropriate.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hanson and approved by the Commission by a 6 to 0 vote.

5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of the existing bridge which connects to the building to the west, and construction of a replacement bridge a short distance to the north. The building is addressed as 680-684 Bank Lane.

Property Owner: Schreiber Family Investments, Inc.

Presented by: Frank Torchia, architect, IA+D Studios

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, she invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Schreiber explained that his family's foundation occupies the second floor of the former Marshall Field building on Bank Lane and the second floor of the building to the west. He stated that the existing connection bridge is not functional and has not been functional for decades. He stated that a replacement bridge is proposed to connect the two office spaces.

Mr. Torchia reviewed the relationship of the two buildings noting that the floors of the two buildings are not aligned which presents a challenge given the narrow alley that the bridge spans. He stated that the distance between the buildings is not sufficient to allow a ramp to be constructed in compliance with today's Code requirements. He stated that to resolve the issue, both stairs and a lift are proposed in conjunction with the replacement bridge. He stated that the bridge itself will be level with the lift and stairs accommodated in a closet type space in the Marshall Field building. He noted that the bottom of the replacement bridge is proposed at 10 feet above the ground in order to make the bridge functional and Code compliant. He stated that the top of the arch of the existing bridge is 12'10" above the ground and 9 feet above grade where the bridge meets the buildings. He explained that if an arch is configured underneath the replacement bridge, the top of the arch would be 10 feet above grade and roughly seven feet above grade where the bridge meets the buildings. He stated that the vertical columns and the horizontal edge of the bridge will be the dominant visual elements of the replacement bridge. He stated that the replacement bridge will be stucco, the same material as the existing bridge adding that the windows and slate are planned to be reused to the extent possible. He stated that any new slate that is needed will be selected to match the original slate.

Mr. Prado stated that this is a unique project with the goal of recreating a connection between the two buildings that will be functional and meet current Codes. He confirmed that reuse of the existing bridge is not feasible due to changes that have occurred inside the buildings that have closed off the bridge and due to current accessibility requirements. He stated that the staff report provides findings in support of the petition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hanson Mr. Torchia confirmed that adding an arch to the replacement bridge will lower the bridge confining the Amidei

Market space below. He expressed concern that with an arch, the bridge may feel too low or squat and may encumber use of the alley.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Torchia confirmed that the bottom of the replacement bridge without the arch is proposed at 10 feet above grade.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Torchia agreed to give further thought to options that would incorporate an arch with an appropriate curve, not too flat.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that if desired, the Commission could issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of the existing bridge and continue consideration of the replacement bridge either with a subcommittee or by the full Commission at a future meeting with direction to explore options for incorporating an arch into the replacement bridge.

Commissioner Petit requested a cross section showing the two buildings and how the arch relates to each building and options for an arch.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Schreiber confirmed that Amidei is aware of the proposed work and prefers that it is completed over the winter, while the market is closed.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Schneider confirmed the intent to complete the project while the market is closed for the season.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Torchia stated that the openings left by the removal of the existing bridge will be bricked up as has occurred elsewhere on the building. He stated that the brick salvaged from the construction of the replacement bridge will be used. He stated that the exterior ladder that accesses the mechanical equipment and a door will be moved to accommodate the replacement bridge. He confirmed that limited interior remodeling will be needed to accommodate the replacement bridge.

In response to a question from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Torchia stated that the width of the bridge will increase from four feet to seven feet. He stated that the lift will be a platform that can accommodate a wheelchair.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Torchia confirmed that the openings left by the removal of the existing bridge will be bricked up. He stated that no windows will be added to either building.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hanson, Mr. Schreiber stated that there is not sufficient space inside the buildings to accommodate a ramp to address the grade change.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited public comment.

Jim Opsitnik, 971 Verda Lane, spoke on behalf of the Like Forest Preservation Foundation and stated support for incorporating an arch in the replacement bridge. He suggested that detailed drawings be provided to clarify the different floor levels in the two buildings and the intended placement of the replacement bridge. He stated that the arch is an important element of the bridge and adds charm to the alley.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Hanson expressed a desire for the full Commission to be involved in reviewing the details of the replacement bridge rather than a subcommittee given the importance of Market Square. He stated support for approving the removal of the existing bridge if that is helpful from a timeline perspective.

Commissioner Petit stated support for recreating a functional bridge. She reiterated her request for sections to clarify the floor level and height above grade challenges. She agreed that the arch element is interesting but stated incorporating the arch is not her primary concern.

Chairman Grinnell stated support for involving the full Commission in further review of the replacement bridge given the significance of Market Square. Hearing no further comments, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Hanson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the removal of the existing bridge between 680 – 684 Bank Lane and 675 and 709 Forest Avenue based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Commission's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following condition.

1. Any and all changes and enhancements made to the plans for removal of the bridge after the Commission's review must be clearly highlighted on the plans submitted for permit and a copy of the plans presented to the Commission must be included for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review the plans submitted for permit for consistency with the Commission's approval and consult with the Chairman as appropriate.
2. Submit a construction parking and staging plan. The plans shall be subject to City approval prior to the issuance of building permits.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Culbertson and approved by the Commission by a 6 to 0 vote.

Commissioner Hanson made a motion to continue the petition for the replacement bridge between the buildings addressed as 680 – 684 Bank Lane and 675 and 709 Forest Avenue with direction to provide sections illustrating the challenges presented by the different floor levels and the height above grade, and with direction to explore opportunities to incorporate an arch underneath the bridge and provide illustrations and a mock up to the extent possible with attention to whether an appropriate shape can be achieved with an arch.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Culbertson and approved by the Commission by a 6 to 0 vote.

6. Consideration for a Certificate of Appropriateness for partial demolition, replacement addition, and building scale variance at 1320 Elm Tree Road.

Property Owner: Chicago Land Trust Title

Presented by:

Scott Streightiff, Streightiff Architects, LLC

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, she invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Streightiff stated that demolition of a previous addition is proposed along with a replacement addition of 1,027 square feet. He stated that the existing house complies with the allowable square footage, but the proposed addition requires a building scale variance. He stated that the addition is proposed to accommodate a larger kitchen, a family room, a Code compliant second staircase, and a larger laundry room. He stated that the addition is on the rear of the house and will be only minimally visible from the streetscape and the front of the house. He stated that the proposed work will not alter the historic areas of the house.

Ms. Vollmers commented that the proposed modifications are consistent in design and materials with the historic home. She noted that the lot is smaller than others in the area and therefore the square footage is relative to the smaller lot size. She commented on two quirky areas related to the addition and noted that they result from the historic character of the house. She stated that no tree removal is proposed. She stated that the staff report presents findings in support of the building scale variance and the overall petition.

In response to a question from Commissioner Culbertson, Mr. Streightiff reviewed the extent of the encroachment of the addition into the backyard and confirmed that the addition is twice as large as the existing addition. He stated that the addition will

have a basement adding that the house has a partial basement which will be connected to the basement under the addition.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Streightiff clarified the portion of the addition that requires a zoning setback variance. He stated that the windows in the house were replaced in 2012 and are wood with aluminum cladding. He stated that the windows in the addition will match the new windows in the house.

In response to a question from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Streightiff stated that the basement will be finished space. He stated that the air conditioning units for the addition will be located on the north side of the home and the heating mechanicals will be located in the basement. He reviewed the roof form and points out that the second story addition will be stepped down from the main roof of the house and the single-story addition will be stepped down from the second story addition. He stated that the fireplace will have interior and exterior exposure.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hanson, Mr. Streightiff confirmed that mature trees in the front yard screen views of the addition. He pointed out the extensive landscape screening on the north property line obscuring views of the addition from the neighboring property.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Streightiff confirmed that the fence will be replaced after it is removed temporarily during construction.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited public comment. Hearing no requests to speak, she invited final questions and comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Petit expressed concern about potential light impacts to neighbors given the amount of glass proposed on the addition.

Commissioners Culbertson and Hanson expressed support for the petition.

Commissioner Soderberg stated support for the petition and for the building scale variance given the limitations of the house.

Chairman Grinnell expressed support for the petition noting that the proposed changes are carefully thought out and appropriate to upgrade the home. Hearing no further comments, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Soderberg made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of a previous addition, a replacement addition, and a building scale variance for property at 1320 Elm Tree Road based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Commission's deliberations as

additional findings. The stated motion is subject to the following conditions of approval;

1. Any and all changes and enhancements made to the plans after the Commission's review must be clearly highlighted on the plans submitted for permit and a copy of the plans presented to the Commission must be included for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review the plans submitted for permit for consistency with the Commission's approval and consult with the Chairman as appropriate.
2. Submit a tree protection plan as needed and a construction parking and staging plan. The plans shall be subject to City review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits. The adjacent public streets must remain unobstructed and passable at all times.
3. Submit an exterior lighting plan and cut sheets of proposed fixtures. All light sources must be screened from view from off of the site and directed down. All lights, except for motion detector lights, must be set on timers to turn off no later than 11pm.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hanson and approved by the Commission by a 6 to 0 vote.

7. Consideration for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations, garage and screen porch addition, and building scale variance at 600 N. Mayflower Road.

Property Owner: Judy & Eric Nygard

Presented by: Nick Marmitt, ALA Architects & Planners, Inc.

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, she invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Nygard stated that they recently purchased the home. She stated that the architect of record has not been confirmed but is believed to be Boyd Hill. She stated that the proposed modifications are intended to align with Mr. Hill's style. She stated that past additions and alterations are proposed for removal with the intent to replace the elements with improvements more in keeping with the style of the house. She stated that the historic fence along Mayflower Road was recently restored. She stated that the original storage shed which is located in the front yard setback, adjacent to the fence, will be removed. She stated that the proposed garage and screen porch additions are designed to match the existing roof forms. She noted that the second story roof will be changed to a hipped roof and raised by a couple feet. She stated that the new windows will match the configuration and groupings of the existing windows. She stated that utilities will be incorporated into the chimneys and mechanicals will be relocated indoors. She concluded by noting that a decorative

brick pattern will be added at the entry doors. She stated that no trees are proposed for removal.

Mr. Marmitt commented that the positioning of the garage addition works well with the shape of the house. He also pointed out the continuity of the roof types.

Ms. Vollmers stated that the residence appears to have been originally designed to meld the indoors with the surrounding natural landscape and ravine. She confirmed that many of the details of the home appear to reflect characteristics commonly found on Boyd Hill designs. She stated that the proposed garage and screen porch additions are designed in keeping with the character of the original home. She pointed out the low overall height of the home as a defining feature. She stated that a building scale variance is requested noting that because there is non-table land which does not visually support the mass of the home, only half the land area of the non-table land is included in calculating the allowable square footage. She commented that as proposed the additions are reasonable in size. She stated that findings in support of the building scale variance and the overall petition are detailed in the staff report.

In response to a question from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Nygard confirmed that the footprint of the second story is not changing, only the roofline. She confirmed that the recently repaired fence along Mayflower Road will remain. She presented samples of proposed materials. She stated that the existing roof is asphalt however they prefer an alternate material.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hanson Ms. Nygard stated that many contemporary homes have slate roofs.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Ms. Nygard stated that the existing siding is wood and stated that she was not able to get samples of the proposed metal siding material. She stated that the driveway will remain asphalt.

Commissioner Petit asked that a mockup of the proposed siding material be installed noting that the Commission has not seen the proposed product in the past.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Ms. Nygard stated that the metal siding has grain that attempts to mimic natural wood. She stated that a board and batten pattern is proposed adding that the material will be white. She confirmed that the screen porch is intended to remain open and not be enclosed for use as a three season room. She reiterated that she is not interested in using asphalt roof shingles but instead prefers a synthetic product.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited public comment. Hearing none, she invited final questions and comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Culbertson expressed support for the petition and the exterior materials as proposed, steel siding and synthetic imitation slate roofing.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated support for the modifications overall and urged the petitioners to consider architectural asphalt roofing instead of a synthetic product.

Commissioner Petit complimented the overall design but stated that more information and a mockup is needed to determine whether the proposed steel siding material is appropriate.

Commissioner Hanson stated support for the petition but questioned the choice of roofing material.

Commissioner Soderberg expressed support for the petition but agreed that a mockup of the proposed siding material would be helpful.

Chairman Grinnell agreed that a mockup of the siding material is needed. She expressed support for the petition subject to more information about the siding. She noted that the home has many characteristics worth preserving. Hearing no further comments, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Culbertson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the exterior alterations, garage and screen porch additions, and a building scale variance at 600 N. Mayflower Road based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Commission's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Provide an on-site mockup of the proposed siding product along with other siding materials including engineered wood and natural wood products for Commission review and a final decision on the siding material.
2. Any and all changes made to the plans after the Commission's review either as a result of Commission comments or as a result of final design development, must be clearly highlighted on the plans submitted for permit. Staff is directed to review the plans submitted for permit for consistency with the Commission's approval and consult with the Chairman as appropriate.
3. Submit a tree protection plan as needed and a construction parking and staging plan. The plans shall be subject to City review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits. The adjacent public streets must remain unobstructed and passable at all times.
4. Submit an exterior lighting plan and cut sheets of proposed fixtures. All light sources must be screened from view from off of the site and directed down. All

lights, except for motion detector lights, must be set on timers to turn off no later than 11pm. Special efforts shall be made to avoid light spillover from the skylights into the ravine and on to the streetscape or neighboring properties.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hanson and approved by the Commission by a 6 to 0 vote.

OTHER ITEMS

5. Opportunity for the public to address the Historic Preservation Commission on non-agenda items.

There were no additional public comments.

6. Additional information from staff.

Ms. Vollmers asked for Commission action on the proposed 2025 Historic Preservation Commission meeting schedule.

Chairman Grinnell invited a motion.

Commissioner Petit made a motion to approve the schedule as presented.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Culbertson and approved by the Commission by a 6 to 0 vote.

Ms. Vollmers stated that a special meeting is scheduled on December 10th and stated that she will follow up with a poll of the Commission.

Ms. Vollmers stated that spring dates are being explored for the CAMP workshop.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Abigail Vollmers
Senior Planner, Community Development