

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the June 26, 2024 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, June 26, 2024, at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Commission members, Acting Chairman Lloyd Culbertson and Commissioners, Leif Soderberg, Elizabeth Dalieri, Robin Petit, and Tina Dann-Fenwick.

Commissioners absent: Chairman Maureen Grinnell and Commissioner Geoffrey Hanson

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

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

Acting Chairman Culbertson 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 May 22, 2024 meeting of the Commission.

The minutes of the May 22, 2024 meeting were approved as presented.

3. Consideration of a request to extend the expiration date of a previously granted Certificate of Appropriateness for partial demolition, additions including dormers and a pergola, and hardscape modifications at 921 Hawthorne Place until June 30, 2025. (Original Approval - March 22, 2023). No Changes to the previously approved plans are proposed.

Property Owner: Roberto Perez

Presented by: Richard Loope, Architect

Acting Chairman Culbertson asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest, hearing none, he invited a presentation from the staff.

Mr. Loope stated that the petitioner is requesting an extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness that was granted in March 2023 due to personal matters that delayed the project. He stated that an extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness is requested until June 2025.

Ms. Vollmers stated that no changes are proposed to the plans. She stated that permits for the project will need to be issued prior to June 30, 2025 if the extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness is granted.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Ms. Vollmers confirmed that the Commission has granted extensions of Certificates of Appropriateness a few times in the past in response to requests received.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann-Fenwich, Mr. Loope stated that the project was delayed because the petitioner was out of the country for an extended period of time.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Acting Chairman Culbertson invited public comment, hearing none, he invited final questions and comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Soderberg stated support for the requested extension.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Acting Chairman Culbertson invited a motion.

Commissioner Petit made a motion to grant an extension of the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for a partial demolition, additions including dormers and a pergola, and new hardscape at 921 Hawthorne Place until June 30, 2025 and noted that the previously approved conditions remain in force.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Soderberg and approved by the Commission by a 5 to 0 vote.

4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving alterations to the residence and a building scale variance to allow the addition of a single garage bay, porch, and a pool house at 121 N. Green Bay Road. Hardscape and landscape modifications are also proposed.

Property Owners: Kevin and Jane Hoffmeyer

Presented by: Michael Hershenson, Michael Hershenson Architects Ltd

Chris Isom, Isom Collective, Interior Design

Joel Balentyne, Midwest Arbor Corporation, Landscape

Acting Chairman Culbertson asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest, hearing none, he invited a presentation from the staff.

Mr. Hoffmeyer stated that the residence was constructed in 1997 and noted that it is his understanding that in the early 2000's the house was rented out for several years during which time it appears little maintenance was done. He stated that when he and his wife purchased the property, they understood that a great deal of work was needed to

address maintenance issues and upgrade the home to make it functional for their family. He stated that they hired an architect, interior designer, and a landscape architect and began an extensive review of the property and the residence. He stated the intent to bring the house up to Lake Forest standards.

Mr. Hershenson stated that he has been a practicing architect for 40 years. He stated that he reviewed the staff report which does a good job of explaining the project. He presented photos of the house noting that it has a 1990's appearance. He presented conceptual images of the house with the alterations now proposed. He stated that the addition of a single garage bay is proposed on the north elevation adding that it is designed to be subservient to the main mass of the residence. He described the proposed service entrance and the screened porch with a new chimney near the new garage bay. He reviewed changes proposed to the location of the mechanicals noting that they will be fully screened. He reviewed the changes proposed to some of the windows pointing out the windows to be removed and areas where the sizes, shapes and muntin patterns of the windows will be modified to simplify the existing busy appearance. He stated that the unusable balconies will be removed from the front and rear elevations. He stated that the materials and details of the additions will be consistent with those of the residence. He presented the simplified elevations. He stated that although a number of trees are proposed for removal, efforts will be made to preserve the significant trees on the property. He reviewed the proposed pool house noting its location on the site plan and explaining that the existing pool is a significant distance from the house so a pool house will provide restrooms and a family room near the pool for convenience. He stated that the pool house is designed to complement the house adding that a slate roof is proposed. He stated that the height of the pool house is intentionally low to minimize visibility from neighboring properties. He pointed out that the pool equipment is not currently screened and is near the neighboring property. He stated that the pool equipment will be relocated away from the neighboring property and will be screened.

Chris Isom, interior designer for the project, commented on the proposed changes to the exterior materials. He stated that the red brick color will be changed to lighten up the house. He stated that the brick will be whitewashed, and the limestone will be stained to achieve a neutral color. He stated that neither the brick, nor the limestone will be painted. He stated that some of the openings will be trimmed with contrasting colors on the limestone.

Joel Balentyne, Midwest Arbor Landscapes, stated that once the renovations to the house are completed, the landscaping will be re-worked to complement the house and property. He stated that maintenance will be completed in the landscape beds and on the trees that are intended to remain. He stated that trees will be added to screen the additions and the pool house. He reviewed the various species of trees that will be considered. He stated that gaps along the perimeter will be infilled and other areas on the property will be cleared to provide open lawn space. He reviewed the hardscape materials noting that granite cobbles, gravel chip, and gray cobbles are

proposed to complement the house. He reviewed changes proposed to the fencing in the area of the pool adding that the existing perimeter fencing on the property will be updated as needed. He stated that simple lighting is proposed in front of the house and safety lighting at the pool.

Ms. Vollmers reviewed the structures on the site that are proposed for removal including an existing screen porch, a gazebo, a playhouse, and a large play structure. She stated that the alterations planned for the existing residence focus on the windows and exterior color palette. She stated that the proposed additions include a fifth garage bay, a screened porch and service entrance both associated with the new garage bay, and a pool house in the rear yard. She stated that based on the available information, the existing residence is about 21 percent over the allowable square footage under the current calculation method. She pointed out that at the time the house was built, a different square footage calculation method was used. She stated that the proposed additions increase the overage by an additional 17 percent. She stated that staff met with the petitioners and their architect prior to submittal of the plans for Commission review and offered some initial comments to which the petitioners responded well. She stated that the staff report presents findings in support of the petition based on the applicable standards. She asked for Commission input on the proposed painting or staining of the exterior brick and limestone intended to change the exterior appearance of the home. She stated that the proposed changes to the windows, including modifications to the lite patterns and the mullions, appear to create a scale more in keeping with the house. She stated that the City's Certified Arborist reviewed the proposed tree removals and confirmed that the trees proposed for removal are not significant species or heritage trees. She stated that replacement tree inches will be required and appear to be satisfied by the plantings reflected in the conceptual landscape plan.

Acting Chairman Culbertson invited questions from the Commission.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Vollmers acknowledged that the Building Scale Summary Sheet was not included in the Commission's packet. She explained that because the house was constructed under an earlier calculation method, and the fact that the original plans for the home are not available, preparing the summary sheet was difficult and confusing. She confirmed that the existing garages exceed the allowable 800 square feet and the overage is added to the square footage of the house. She confirmed that the accessory structures that are being removed from the property were deducted from the square footage where appropriate. She stated that the amount of impervious surface on the site is reduced as a result of the plan to reduce the size of the front motor court.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that under the previous calculation method, exposed above grade basement space was not included in the square footage. She explained that when the calculation

method was modified in the early 2000's, exposed basement space was included because it adds to the appearance of the size and height of the home.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Hershenson pointed out that the original residence does not have any elements that qualify for a design bonus. He stated that portions of the additions now planned will qualify as design elements and will be counted toward the allowed square footage bonus. He stated that as a follow up to a meeting with staff, the mechanicals planned for the roof are now located on the ground and will be screened and the flat roof was changed to a gable.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Hoffmeyer commented that the change to a gable, slate roof on the new garage bay is a significant expense. He acknowledged that the house is large and noted that after living in the house for a year, the goal is to increase the overall usability of the house for his family. He confirmed that all of the windows will be changed out.

In response to a question from Acting Chairman Culbertson, Mr. Hershenson stated that the generator will be moved to the south side of the house to an area where it will be less visible than the current location.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Hershenson explained the desire to change the large stucco squares on the rear elevation to vertical siding. He acknowledged that the elements appear a bit foreign in relation to the rest of the detailing and materials. He agreed those elements could be reconsidered and changed to something more similar to the treatment on the front elevation. He reviewed the screen porch and the grade changes associated with the porch, terrace, and the breakfast room. He stated that the amount of hardscape is being reduced and noted in particular the reduction in the size of the motor court and the addition of landscaping at the front of the home.

In response to a question from Acting Chairman Culbertson, Mr. Hershenson stated that the screen porch will not be converted to enclosed space in the winter.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated that the proposed changes reduce the busyness of the exterior. She questioned the color choices noting that the classic red brick and limestone are proposed to change. She noted that the existing materials and color are consistent with the Tudor style of the building as are the traditional bays and the arches. She stated that the gray and dark windows are not consistent with the Tudor style and suggested considering a creamy beige rather than the modern colors now proposed.

In response to comments from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Hershenson stated that in his opinion, the dark windows are more timeless than white windows.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Isam stated the intent to change the tone of the brick with stain. He stated that originally, whitewashing the brick was considered but was rejected since the two neighboring houses are white. He stated that the petitioners desire a distinct, warm and inviting appearance. He stated that the gray tones are intended as accents for example on the trim around the dormers.

In response to comments from Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Isam stated that whitewashing is reversible by sand blasting the brick. He stated that a mockup of the treatment of the brick will be done on a portion of the house.

Acting Chairman Culbertson stated that samples of the color palette would be very helpful.

In response to questions from Acting Chairman Culbertson, Mr. Hershenson stated that glass doors are proposed because they look elegant and link the indoors and outdoors. He stated that overall, no changes are proposed to the window sizes on the front elevation. He confirmed that three sets of windows on the back elevation will be extended to the floor and brick will need to be removed. He confirmed that some windows will be blocked in the study and in a bedroom. He stated the intent to construct columns at the entrance to the driveway using the bricks removed from elsewhere on the property.

In response to questions from Acting Chairman Culbertson, Mr. Balentyne stated that the red pavers in the motor court will be removed and replaced with gray granite cobbles and gravel.

In response to questions from Acting Chairman Culbertson, Ms. Vollmers stated that the trees proposed for removal are mostly ornamental trees. She stated that based on the conceptual landscape plan, the required replacement inches appear to be satisfied.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Acting Chairman Culbertson invited public comment. Hearing no requests to speak, he stated that he would like to see a sample of the materials, the color palette, and alternatives for the panels on the rear elevation. He invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Soderberg stated that he understands the basis for a building scale variance adding that the house is well screened from all sides. He stated support for the variance reluctantly. He stated that there appear to be loose ends from the design perspective, materials, and colors.

Commissioner Daliere complimented the design but noted that the color palette is not her preference. She noted that the building scale provisions are intended to limit the size of residences and accessory structures and protect the character of the

community. She stated that in this case some of the criteria for a variance from the allowable square footage appear to be satisfied. She noted however that Standard 4 is not met. She stated that she is not in favor of granting a building scale of the magnitude proposed. She acknowledged that variances have been granted in the past for historic residences that do not have the necessary spaces for today's families adding that the historic homes are of significant value to the community.

Commissioner Petit expressed concern that there are no details of the square footage in the packet.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Ms. Vollmers explained that the existing screen porch and other appropriate elements that are proposed for removal were deducted from the existing square footage. She explained that the proposed fifth garage bay, new screen porch, and the pool house were added to the square footage of the existing house. She stated that in addition to the existing overage, with the appropriate elements removed, the new construction adds an additional 17 percent to the current overage. She noted that the existing and proposed screen porch are both design elements.

Acting Chairman Culbertson acknowledged that the original structure exceeds the current square footage limitations. He stated that the request before the Commission is for an additional 17 percent above the current overage. He stated that he can reluctantly accept the overage. He stated that more specifics are needed on the details of the project, the doors, the cladding, the panels on the rear elevation, the color palette, the hardscape, and the landscape. He stated that the project is complicated but could improve some visual aspects of the residence and overall property. He stated that on balance, he supports the project subject to additional details being provided.

Commissioner Dalieri commented that if every house that was constructed prior to the current limitations is granted a variance, the purpose of the regulations are not being achieved.

Commissioner Soderberg commented that the Commission reviews each petition on its own merits. He stated that variances for homes that have existing overages have been granted in the past.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Acting Chairman Culbertson invited a motion.

Commissioner Soderberg made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the alternations to the residence, landscape, and hardscape and to recommend approval of a building scale variance to allow the addition of a fifth garage bay and a pool house. He noted that the petition address is 121 N. Green Bay Road and stated that the recommendation is based on the findings detailed in the staff

report which are adopted by the Commission as part of the motion. He stated that the approval and recommendation are subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness is subject to review and approval of the final details and resolution of the open items as identified by the Commission by a subcommittee of the Commission and final action on the building scale variance by the City Council. The open items identified by the Commission include:
 - a. Color palette and treatment of the existing brick and limestone.
 - b. Treatment of the panels on the rear elevation.
 - c. Clarification and simplification of the hardscape materials and changes to the motor court.
 - d. Details of proposed entrance columns, gate (if proposed), fencing.
 - e. Final landscape plan
2. After the work of the subcommittee is completed and the Certificate of Appropriateness is issued, the plans submitted for permit must be consistent with the plans on which the final approval is based. Any further changes made during 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 members of the subcommittee as appropriate.
3. Submit a tree protection plan and a construction parking and staging plan. The plans shall be subject to City approval prior to the issuance of building permits. No parking or staging of construction vehicles is permitted on Green Bay Road. The private road must remain unobstructed and free from debris at all times. The petitioner is encouraged to consult with other property owners along the private road to determine responsibility for repair, resurfacing, or replacement after construction is completed.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Petit and approved by the Commission by a 4 to 1 vote with Commissioner Dalieri voting nay based on the reasons previously stated.

5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of a house and garage at 61 Stonegate Road.

Property Owner: Susan Svigos Revocable Trust

Representatives: Paul and Susan Svigos

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

Mr. Svigos stated that he and his wife have lived at 57 Stonegate Road for over 31 years and plan to remain in the house which was designed by Ambrose Kramer and

built in 1896. He stated that his residence is known as Rathmore and was originally a nine-acre estate with a Carriage House for livestock, gardens, and wide-open lawn areas. He explained that during the 1950's the then owner, Robert Wilson, subdivided the property into four home sites. He explained that the original Carriage House is located on one of the lots and is today adaptively reused as a single-family home. He stated that in the 1980's, Mr. Wilson built a ranch home for himself on one of the lots created by the subdivision at 61 Stonegate Road. He explained that the ranch home is located in the front yard of his historic home. He stated that in later conversations with Mr. Wilson, it was clear to him that Mr. Wilson realized that the home that was built was not appropriate for the location and that it compromised the original residence at 57 Stonegate Road. He stated that Mr. Wilson suggested to him that he buy the home when he sells it to restore the original estate property to some extent. He stated that a few months ago, he and his wife had the opportunity to purchase the property and decided to do so with the vision of consolidating the property with their property and restoring a grander driveway approach to the front of the house.

Ms. Vollmers stated that findings addressing the demolition standards are provided in the staff report. She stated that the applicable standards appear to be met. She stated that the home proposed for demolition was constructed in the 1980's and is not architecturally significant and in fact, detracts from the original historic residence located to the east. She stated that demolition of the house is not contrary to preservation goals. She stated that the petitioners do not plan to construct a replacement home on the property but instead, plan to incorporate the property into the site on which the original historic home sits to allow the driveway to be reconfigured to provide a grander approach to the home similar to the driveway approach that likely existed originally. She stated that after demolition of the residence is completed, plans for the driveway reconfiguration will need to be submitted to the City and will be subject to review and approval.

In response to questions from Acting Chairman Culbertson, Mr. Svigos confirmed his intention to re-establish the original driveway configuration and add landscaping including trees along the extended driveway. He stated that his property is well landscaped and maintained. He noted that Craig Bergmann is his landscape designer adding that he will be developing a landscape plan for the adjacent property once the home is removed.

In response to a question from Acting Chairman Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak stated that it will be up to the property owners to determine whether or not to consolidate the lots into a single tax lot. She stated that once the driveway is reconfigured, the two lots, the one on which the petitioners' home is located and the parcel on which the home to be demolished is located, will be considered a single zoning lot by the City.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Svigos stated that the adjacent lot will not be used for anything other than a reconfigured driveway and landscaping

once the house is demolished. He stated that Ms. Wilson passed away about a year ago, prior to her passing she had a caretaker. At some point during that time the caretaker's family moved into the home and that during that time, little maintenance work was done. He stated that since he and his wife purchased the property, his landscapers have been working to remove brush and trees that were dumped into the ravine by the caretaker's family. He stated that to protect the ravine, all of the work is being done by hand requiring large crews. He stated that he has full time landscapers for his property and other workers are regularly on the site maintaining the historic house. He acknowledged that summer is a busy time on his property. He stated that although the new driveway has not yet been designed, it is likely that antique granite pavers will be used similar to the historic home's existing driveway. He stated the intent to protect and enhance the historic integrity of the original home, not take away from it.

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

Mr. Leggaro, 51 Stonegate Road stated that non-residential uses are currently occurring on the 61 Stonegate Road property. He stated that the City should not allow the uses to continue.

Ms. Leggaro, 51 Stonegate Road, stated that they own a significant portion of the private driveway as it is located on their property and provides access to the homes to the east. She expressed concern about the private road being used for trucks now and later during the demolition activity. She stated that this type of activity will likely cause wear and tear on the private driveway forcing them to bear the cost of repairs.

Hearing no further public comment, Acting Chairman Culbertson returned the discussion to the Commission.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Czerniak stated that the City does not have jurisdiction over private driveways or private roads. She stated that in some cases, there is a maintenance agreement between the various residents who benefit from the private road that addresses issues about maintenance and repair. The commission can encourage communication and cooperation between property owners, issues filed with the city are handled by the code enforcement official.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Ms. Vollmers stated that when the plans for the reconfigured driveway are submitted to the City, staff will review the plans and determine whether Commission review is warranted.

Commissioner Dalieri stated that in her opinion, all applicable criteria for demolition are satisfied and she is in support of the demolition.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Acting Chairman Culbertson invited a motion.

Commissioner Soderberg made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of the house and garage at 61 Stonegate Road. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report which are adopted by the Commission as part of the motion. He stated that the following conditions of approval are incorporated into the motion.

1. Until demolition occurs, the structure must remain secure, all windows and doors closed and locked to prevent unauthorized entry. General maintenance of the structure and overall property shall continue in compliance with all Code requirements.
2. During demolition activity, all trees and vegetation, unless approved for removal by the City's Certified Arborist, shall be protected from damage. If determined to be necessary by the City's Certified Arborist, trees close to the areas of demolition activity shall be treated with pre and post construction measures to increase the chances of long-term survival.
3. The residence shall be removed in its entirety, including the basement, and the site cleared of all debris. The area of the basement shall be filled with material approved by the City and graded even with existing grades on the site. The fill shall be compacted as directed by the City.
4. Beyond the footprint of the house, grades shall not be altered during demolition activity.
5. On an ongoing basis, before, during and after demolition, the property must be maintained. All grass shall be mowed on a regular basis and trees, shrubs and other vegetation shall be regularly maintained to avoid the appearance of an unkempt or overgrown property.
6. Any new structures proposed for the property shall require review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission based on the applicable standards in the Code to assure compatibility with and a positive contribution to, the Historic District.
7. Encourage communication and coordination between the homeowners that share the private drive during the demolition of the home and subsequent landscaping to minimize disruption and inconvenience.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dalieri and was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

6. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the use of synthetic roofing for a full roof replacement at 605 E. College Road.

Property Owner: Mani and Dana Kumar

Presented by: Dana Kumar

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

Ms. Kumar stated that she grew up in an historic home and was drawn to purchase the Frost and Granger home. She stated the intention to be a good steward of the home. She stated that in an ideal world, she would replace the roof with cedar shingles or shakes but stated that it is not possible due to the low quality of cedar that is currently available. She stated that cedar cannot withstand hail damage and as a result, she is concerned about the insurability of a cedar roof. She stated that in her opinion, synthetic roof products have evolved significantly in the past five years noting that they are almost indistinguishable from cedar or slate. She stated that the fire rating of the synthetic product is important to her since the house has two bedrooms on the third floor. She stated that she would not be contemplating a synthetic roof product if she believed that it would detract from her home. She stated that Landmarks Illinois has approved the use of synthetic roof products. She presented a sample of a synthetic roof product noting that it comes in varied widths and colors and mimics natural material.

Ms. Vollmers noted that the house is identified as a Contributing Structure to the Historic District and was designed by a significant architect. She stated that this petition is presented to the Commission consistent with the established procedures which direct proposals to re-roof homes associated with significant architects with a synthetic product to the Commission for review. She stated that based on available records, the house in this petition was originally roofed with asphalt materials. She stated that architectural asphalt shingles would be an appropriate replacement roof for the current cedar shingles. She stated however that a synthetic roofing material is proposed adding that the product proposed appears to be one of the higher quality synthetic materials available. She stated that with respect to the Standard that speaks to repair of deteriorated features, cedar roofing material that is deteriorated to a significant degree cannot effectively be repaired and must be replaced. She stated that the existing cedar was installed in 2001 and is not historic in nature. She noted that in the past, the property was more heavily screened with trees along the College and Washington Roads but over time, many of the trees were removed. She suggested that some additional plantings along the streetscape could help to soften streetscape views of the house and minimize the potentially strong visual impact of a synthetic roof.

Acting Chairman Culbertson invited questions from the Commission.

In response to questions from Commissioner Daliere, Ms. Kumar stated that her house is not under the purview of Landmarks Illinois.

Commissioner Dalieri commented that there are stucco homes in the Historic District with asphalt roofs and referenced examples: 771 Barberry Lane, 633 Woodland Road, and 410 Woodland Road.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Kumar stated that she has seen stucco homes with a variety of roof materials. She stated that in her opinion, an asphalt shingle roof does not convey the same sense of beauty as a synthetic roof product. She acknowledged that the Commission stated a preference for imitation slate over imitation cedar and stated that she is willing to consider an imitation slate product. She reiterated her strong preference not to re-roof her house in asphalt.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Ms. Vollmers confirmed that the synthetic roof on the house across the street was installed without approval. She explained that a permit application was submitted for installation of an asphalt shingle roof and the permit was issued. She stated that a synthetic roof product was installed without approval and without a proper permit. She confirmed that a review was conducted after the fact based on the criteria that were put in place for synthetic roofs and the property owner was advised to submit an application for a revision to the previously approved permit. She stated that a permit for a synthetic roof was ultimately issued and the associated fines were assessed for the work that was done out of compliance with the approved original permit.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick commented that the proposed synthetic material appears very uniform which is a concern. She added that as proposed, there will be two identical synthetic roofs across the street from each other which is also a concern. She encouraged the petitioner to explore all cedar options available noting that she recently re-roofed her home with a treated cedar product.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Ms. Kumar clarified that the color of the synthetic product on the 561 Washington Road home is "Lake Forest". She stated that she is proposing to use a different color, "Natural" which has more variation in tones.

In response to a question from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Kumar confirmed that she is willing to consider using a synthetic product that imitates slate as slate.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Kumar stated that the "Natural" color imitation cedar synthetic product is installed at 321 Belle Foret Court. She stated that a different color, "Aged Cedar" is installed at 1175 Arbor Court.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Vollmers that there have been close to a thousand roof permits issued during the last year and less than ten synthetic roofs have been installed or approved in the Historic Districts.

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

Bert Kreuger, 570 N. Sheridan Road, stated that he knows first-hand that owning a 100-year-old home means that there is always something that needs to be repaired or replaced and it is always expensive. He stated that owning an historic home is a labor of love. He stated his hope that the Commission will support the petitioners desire to re-roof the house with a synthetic product. He stated that in his opinion, not many people with a trained eye travel on College Road. He stated that planting trees or putting up a stockade fence to hide an historic home is not necessary. He stated support for a synthetic roof product adding that he will likely ask for approval to re-roof his house with a synthetic product in the future. He stated that additional landscaping should not be required.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Acting Chairman Colbertson invited final questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Dalieri asked that a sample of the "European" imitation slate product be provided for the Commission's review.

Commissioner Soderberg stated that to date, the Commission has spent significant time discussing synthetic roof products and the outcome of those discussions was the establishment of evaluation criteria, submittal requirements, and procedures with a focus on homes designed by significant architects. He stated that this house was designed by a significant architect and asked that the established process be followed, and all required information and samples be provided to the Commission. He acknowledged that it is difficult to look at small samples and understand how the proposed product will appear given the specifics of a particular site. He noted that the Commission has been open and understanding as the use of this product has evolved. He noted that in his opinion, a product that attempts to imitate slate would be a better fit adding that the architecture of the house lends itself to an imitation slate product, rather than imitation cedar. He stated that in considering this petition, the Commission should be presented with sufficient information to approve a specific manufacturer, color, thickness, and installation method. He stated that it would be helpful to provide the Commission with addresses of other homes where the exact product and installation method proposed here were used.

Ms. Vollmers offered that the petitioners could be directed to provide small mock-ups of the proposed synthetic products on the roof as was done by the roofer working on a house previously considered by the Commission.

Acting Chairman Culbertson noted that based on his experience, the Brava product has evolved in recent years and is superior to some of the other synthetic roof products that are available. He stated that he is not inclined to support imitation slate on the house now being considered by the Commission. He stated that it would be

helpful to have this petition return to the Commission to allow evaluation by the full Commission. He noted that this decision will be another step in the process of allowing synthetic roof products more broadly in the Historic Districts.

Commissioner Petit stated that the treatment of the five front facing gables is the most problematic component of the request in her opinion. She stated that detailed information on installation should be presented to the Commission. She encouraged the petitioner to consider recent cedar roof installations which may have a comparable cost and warranty.

Commissioner Dalieri noted that some of the high-quality asphalt shingles have a good texture and variation and look good on historic homes.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick pointed out that the synthetic products will not weather or patina over time and will retain a "brand new" appearance which is a clear indication of a synthetic product. She added that there is a sheen or shine that is seen from various perspectives with synthetic products. She acknowledged that landscaping will not be tall enough to screen views of the roof. She stated that the prominence of the home, the nearby identical synthetic roof, and the fact that the house was designed by a significant architect are all concerns.

Acting Chairman Culbertson noted that the sitting Chairman and another member of the Commission are absent. He stated that given the importance of this decision, the matter should be continued to allow all of the required information to be submitted including addresses of home where the exact product or products proposed are installed.

Commissioner Dalieri stated support for a mock-up of the proposed products on the roof noting that it will provide a good visual in contrast to the stucco.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated support for continuing the petition.

Acting Chairman Culbertson invited a motion.

Commissioner Dalieri made a motion to continue consideration of the petition with direction to the petitioner to provide all of the required materials including, but not limited to: addresses of installations of the exact product proposed, addresses for stucco homes that have synthetic roof products installed, a mock-up of the proposed materials on the roof, and samples of enough quantity to show variation in the material of both the synthetic imitation cedar and imitation slate being considered by the petitioner. She encouraged the petitioner to look at asphalt roofs that have been installed on homes throughout the Historic Districts.

Commissioner Soderberg seconded the motion.

Ms. Czerniak suggested that to address concerns raised by the Commission, it may be helpful for the petitioner to provide details on how the roof will be installed to achieve variation, avoid a monolithic appearance, and to avoid a chunky appearance on the front facing gables.

Commissioner Dalieri amended the motion to include Ms. Czerniak's suggestion.

Commissioner Soderberg, having seconded the motion, accepted the motion as amended and the motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Acting Chairman Culbertson thanked the petitioner for coming before the Commission in a respectful and gracious manner. He stated confidence that the matter will be resolved.

OTHER ITEMS

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

There were no public comments.

6. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Abigail Vollmers
Senior Planner, Community Development