

The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of February 7, 2018 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, February 7, 2018 at 6:30 p.m., at the Municipal Services Building, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman Ted Notz and Board members Fred Moyer, Jim Diamond, Peter Dunne, Chris Bires and Ross Friedman

Building Review Board members absent: Board member Bob Reda

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

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

Chairman Notz 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 January 3, 2018 meeting of the Building Review Board.

The minutes of the January 3, 2018 meeting were approved with one clarification as requested by Chairman Notz.

3. Consideration of a request for approval of a significant addition to the rear and side of the residence at 90 Woodland Road. Demolition of portions of the house to accommodate the addition, reconstruction of the front porch and construction of a new detached garage are also proposed.

Owner: Brian Norton

Representative: Jeffry Harting - Gensburg, Toniolo, Harting Architects

Chairman Notz introduced the project. He asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Harting introduced the petition noting that he has known the property owners for 20 years and worked on their residence in Glencoe. He stated that the petitioners recently purchased the residence at 90 Woodland Road to downsize from their current home and move to a more quiet and peaceful part of the North Shore. He stated that the proposed project is intended to make the smaller home livable for his clients and for others in the future. He stated that he and his team assessed the house inside and out to determine which elements could be

repaired and restored. He stated that the inside of the house is a complete mess and the outside is in need of substantial repairs. He noted however that the basic bones of the house are good except for the rear porch addition. He stated that the intent is to retain and build upon the original character of the residence and add living spaces the homeowners require by adding to the rear and east side of the home. He noted that construction of a detached garage is also proposed.

He explained that the garage is sited to avoid impacting a large tree on the neighboring property. He said that the design of the detached garage is complementary to, but intentionally does not match the house given the location of the garage at the rear of the property and recognizing that this simple residence would not have had a highly stylized coach house. He reviewed the existing site plan noting the narrowness of the lot and proximity of the house to Woodland Road. He noted that the existing driveway is located very close to the east property line. He pointed out the two-story glass enclosed back porch noting that it is not original to the house and is planned for removal. He reviewed the existing floor plans and elevations pointing out the area in need of work. He presented the site plan with the proposed additions. He confirmed that in addition to the porch, the exterior stairs to the basement will be removed. He noted the proposed location of the two-story addition and the location of the detached garage. He noted that the front porch is in need of repair and proper railings. He reviewed the proposed floor plans and elevations noting the intent to keep the front of the house intact. He described the proposed addition noting that the rear addition steps back from the west side wall to conform to the zoning setback, and down from the main house. He described the gambrel element proposed on the east elevation and the chimney. He stated that the house is sided with stucco today, but was probably not stucco originally. He reviewed the west elevation of the residence with the proposed addition and the detached garage. He reviewed a streetscape image pointing out that the proposed addition will not change the streetscape view. He reviewed sections showing the relationship of the existing house and proposed addition. He reviewed photos of the existing conditions of the house and a massing diagram.

Ms. Czerniak commended the petitioners for recognizing the opportunities presented by working with the existing house. She noted that previously, staff received several contacts from potential buyers about demolishing the house. She stated that the new owners and their architect studied the house and determined that the bones of the house are good and recognized that the house itself adds to the character of the streetscape. She added that the petitioners have detailed the extent of demolition that will be needed to accommodate the proposed addition and determined that much of the house will be preserved, repaired, restored and updated. She noted two significant trees on the neighboring property noting that care will need to be taken during construction, in particular when reworking the driveway in order to protect and preserve the trees. She asked for Board input on the appropriateness of the window located in the chimney adding that the window appears to disrupt the strong chimney

element. She noted that questions were raised about whether the house was a Sears Catalogue house adding that the petitioner determined that was not the case. She noted that a letter was received from a neighboring property owner expressing concerns about drainage. She stated that drainage primarily flows to Woodland Road and stated that drainage and grading plans will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of building permits. She noted that particular attention will be given to how the extended driveway drains. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the petition and offers recommended conditions of approval.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Harting spoke to the proposed window in the chimney noting that he used this approach on a previous project with an oval window. He commented that with a gambrel roof, there are limited opportunities to get natural light into the house. He noted that the chimney will be engaged into the wall of the house, making the window less prominent. He confirmed that exterior materials on the addition will be consistent with those on the existing house. He stated that the intent is to match the color and size of the brick as closely as possible but acknowledged that some staining to blend the bricks at the point of connection may be needed. He confirmed that asphalt shingles are proposed on the addition consistent with the existing house.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Harting stated that he did not have any photos available of windows installed in chimneys. He confirmed that the height of the chimney will be dictated by the Code requirements. He stated that board and batten siding is proposed for the garage to create the character of a causal barn structure, understated and complementary to the house. He stated that the property is fairly flat and stated that drainage will be handled as directed by the City Engineer through the use of catch basins or over land flows to direct water to the street and away from the houses.

Board member Friedman commended the thoughtful design.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Harting stated that a specific color palette has not been selected but noted that a soft tone is intended, not too vibrant. He commented that although the house has a complicated shingle pattern with diamonds and scallops, there is no intent to paint those elements as would occur on a Victorian style house. He stated that the homeowners intend to remove the existing aluminum storm windows and replace them with wood, triple track windows with the appearance of a period storm window. He stated that stucco will remain on the lower portion of the house but will be slightly darker. He noted that the trim will be a cream color and the shingles in the gambrel ends, a lighter tone than the base of the house. He stated that the new asphalt roof will be a weathered wood look. He stated that the gutters and downspouts will be white or off white and stated that the flashing will match the existing anodized aluminum flashing. He stated that if cedar

shingles are used for the roof, copper gutters and downspouts would be appropriate. He confirmed that both gravel and brick pavers are being considered for the driveway noting that the owners prefer that the driveway not be asphalt. He discussed the chimney further acknowledging that it is challenging to run the flue up alongside the window. He stated that tongue and groove materials are proposed for the front porch. He confirmed that the porch is not intended to appear as a deck but instead, a porch consistent with the character of the house.

Board member Friedman observed that the roof work could be significant. He suggested obtaining an alternative quote for cedar shingles noting that the aesthetic effect could be dramatic. He added that despite the maintenance implications, the character of the house supports the use of wood rather than a synthetic product for the porch.

Board member Moyer questioned whether there is an historical precedent for a window in the chimney in the Dutch Gambrel style. He stated that he knows of one situation where a window occurs in the chimney, but it appears as a mistake. He acknowledged the interest in bringing natural light into the space but noted that given the floor plan, the light from the window in the chimney does not have a significant impact inside, but the window has a big impact on the exterior.

Board member Dunne applauded the new owners for taking on the project. He stated that the project is well thought out and well designed and will be good for the neighborhood. He agreed that the window in the chimney could be debated.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Ms. Czerniak stated that the technical aspects of the chimney flue and compliance with applicable Code requirements will be reviewed by the City's technical staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Harting reviewed the layout of the rooms on the second floor noting how the spaces relate to the proposed windows. He explained how the roof form affects the interior spaces. He noted that the north facing windows will not fill the room with light and as a result, the window on the east elevation, in the chimney, is proposed.

Chairman Notz stated that the project is well thought out and well designed.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Harting confirmed that two man doors are proposed in the garage explaining that one enters the garden area which is essentially a lean to shed along the side of the garage.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Harting stated that at this point, the owners have not yet considered whether or how the existing

landscaping on the property will be modified or enhanced.

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

Greg Schlax, 98 Woodland Road, stated that he lives next door, to the east and is excited about the project. He noted that seeing the two houses in the context of the addition would have been helpful especially to understand any light impacts. He noted that the siting of the garage at the rear of the property gives an openness to the back yard. He noted that in July of this year, during a heavy rain, his basement flooded for the first time in 20 years with about an inch of water. He stated concern about the construction causing additional flooding. He stated that he is interested to see what he can do to protect his property from future flooding. He commended the project.

In response to comments from Mr. Schlax, Mr. Harting said that he does not have a plan that shows the proposed addition in relation to the neighboring home. With respect to drainage, he noted that staff recommended consideration of the installation of a curb along the east side of the driveway to direct water to the street and avoid runoff on to the neighboring property. He confirmed that a civil engineer has been engaged and offered to meet with the neighbor, prior to construction, to consider whether there is an opportunity for a joint effort, such as a drainage swale or French drain, to help address ongoing drainage concerns. He noted that the lots are narrow and there is only limited space available to absorb water.

Mr. Randolph, 74 Woodland Road, stated support for the project but noted that water comes from Green Bay Road and the storm drains back up.

Mike Hursovsky, 648 Waveland Road, stated that the West Park neighborhood is a magnificent neighborhood and a National Register District. He stated that he has worked on many old houses in Lake Forest and this is one of his favorites. He thanked the petitioner for saving the house.

Susan Athenson, 901 Summit Avenue, stated that she has lived in the West Park neighborhood for all but about ten years of her life. She stated that she is pleased to see that the new owners are updating the house. She stated that the house is significant to the neighborhood because of its design and past occupants, the Fitzgeralds. She noted that she researches vintage homes in the neighborhood as part of a significant restoration and expansion of her home several years ago. She noted that she has served on both the Building Review Board and Historic Preservation Commission. She encouraged the petitioners to make sure that the original portions of the house are maintained as the dominate elements. She expressed some concern about the significant addition planned. She encouraged consideration of ways to ensure that the addition remains subordinate to the original house. She suggested stepping the roof of the addition

down and simplifying the roof forms. She noted that rather than widening the house, the addition could extend further into the deep backyard to reduce impacts on the neighbors and minimize the appearance of the mass. She encouraged the use of all natural materials. She noted that the window proposed in the chimney is more of a modern detail and inconsistent with the intent to preserve the vintage character of the house. She commended the use of tongue and groove materials for the ceiling of the porch. She suggested keeping the detailing light. She noted that to address drainage, she had to add a curb to her driveway after construction was completed. She noted that the house might be a "kit" house. She thanked the petitioners for saving the house.

In response to public comments, Mr. Norton, the property owner, confirmed that the house was a J. H. Daverman pattern house noting that the Daverman Company was out of Grand Rapids, Michigan. He noted that the cost of the house was \$1,200 and it was built in 1905.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairman Notz asked the Board for final comments, hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Friedman made a motion to recommend approval of the two-story addition, detached garage and related alterations and restoration of the residence subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The property owner shall engage a Certified Arborist to specifically recommend protective measures to be taken to avoid negatively impacting the Spruce tree on the neighboring property to the east. The plan shall detail specific recommendations on construction methods for the driveway and pre and post construction measures that should be taken to preserve the tree.
2. A landscape plan reflecting existing vegetation to remain and any additional landscaping proposed to provide some screening of the mass of the addition for the benefit of neighboring properties shall be submitted prior to the rough framing inspection and will be subject to review and approval by the City Arborist.
3. An as-built survey shall be submitted to confirm that no portion of the proposed addition exceeds the permitted overall height of 30 feet when measured from the lowest point of existing grade to the highest roof peak.
4. Further study shall be conducted of the window placement on the east elevation. Evidence shall be submitted documenting the precedent for a window in the chimney for review by staff in consultation with the Chairman.
5. Strong consideration shall be given to a cedar shingle roof.

6. Photo documentation and measured drawings of the existing front porch are required. A permit authorizing demolition of the porch shall only be issued after full documentation of the porch is submitted and the plans for reconstruction and replication of the porch are reviewed by staff to confirm that the proposed construction is consistent with the existing porch.
7. Wood shall be used for all trim, fascia, soffits and other detailing.
8. The plans submitted for permit shall detail any areas of change from the plans presented to the Board that occur through the design development process and shall fully address the above recommendations and be consistent with Board direction. Staff shall review the plans for consistency with the Board's approvals in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate.
9. The driveway, or at least portions of it, shall be a pervious surface. Curbing shall be installed along the east side of the driveway in areas where the driveway approaches the property line, to minimize drainage on to the neighboring property. Except that curbing shall not be installed in areas that may cause damage to the Spruce tree on the neighboring property.
10. All exterior lighting shall be directed downward, not out. All sources of light shall be fully screened by fixtures and not be visible from off of the site. Cut sheets of all exterior light fixtures shall be submitted along with construction plans submitted for permit.
11. A materials staging and construction parking plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review by the City Engineer, City Arborist and Director of Community Development prior to the issuance of a permit. No parking is permitted on Woodland Road.
12. During the development of drainage and grading plans, discussions with neighboring property owners are encouraged in the interest of seeking joint solutions to drainage issues.

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

4. **Consideration of a request for approval of demolition of the existing residence at 792 Morningside Drive and approval of a replacement residence, attached garage and a hardscape and landscape plan.**
Owner: LK Homes, LLC (Lori Glattly 50%, Ken Hite 50%)
Representative: Adam Lyons - The Lyons Group

Chairman Notz introduced the project. He asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Lyons introduced the project the project. He reviewed the overall neighborhood presenting photos of various homes. He pointed out that there are both front loaded and side loaded garages in the neighborhood. He stated that homes in the area are relatively modest, well maintained homes built in the 1950's and 60's. He stated the intent to construct a replacement residence that is consistent with the scale and design of other homes in the neighborhood. He noted that the existing house is pulled forward on the lot, away from the residence located to the east which is on a corner lot. He pointed out that there is existing dense vegetation along the east property line and on the neighboring property. He stated that the design for the new residence aims to mitigate the appearance of mass while taking full advantage of the allowable square footage. He noted that the primary mass of the house is pushed back from the street and a side load garage projects to the front but reads as a separate, smaller mass. He reviewed the roof plan and the floor plan. He described the linking element which provides access from the main house to living space over the garage. He reviewed a streetscape image, noting that the house is relatively consistent with the neighborhood using Georgian and Colonial elements. He stated that wood siding is proposed with a simple treatment of the gables. He noted that dormers break the cornice line in an effort to bring down the mass creating the appearance of a one and a half story residence. He reviewed each elevation. He presented some alternatives that were considered for the linking element to the garage. He stated that landscaping will play a critical part in allowing the new residence to settle into the neighborhood. He stated that the proposed residence is consistent with the scale of other homes in the neighborhood and complies with the square footage and setback requirements. He confirmed that the owners reached out to some neighbors in the area to discuss the project.

Ms. Czerniak reviewed that approval of the demolition of the existing residence and a replacement residence is requested. She stated that the demolition criteria appear to be fully satisfied noting that early plans submitted by the petitioner for renovation and addition to the existing home resulted in almost a complete demolition and likely would have produced an inferior end product as a result of retaining portions of the existing home. She stated that the existing home is unremarkable and does not contribute uniquely to the neighborhood. She stated that the side load garage concept is consistent with the character of the overall neighborhood. She noted that the City Arborist raised some concerns about the grading proposed on the site and the likely impact re-grading will have on existing trees. She stated that protection measures should be taken to protect trees and vegetation on the property, and on neighboring properties, along the perimeter of the property. She noted that the massing of the garage and linking element between the house and garage would benefit from Board discussion and direction. She noted that exterior lighting should be carefully considered, particularly given the side load garage, to assure that neighboring properties are not impacted by light.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Lyons stated that cedar is proposed for the siding and trim. He noted that detail was added at the cornice to offer shadowing. He confirmed that asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof along with prefinished aluminum gutters and downspouts. He stated that the color palette will be monochromatic and the windows, double hung, simulated divided lites. He stated that the pergola is proposed as stained cedar. He provided samples of the proposed brick for the chimney.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Lyons reviewed the exterior lighting plan. He noted that coach lights are proposed on the front façade along with recessed lighting under the porch. He stated that lanterns are proposed on the garage and on the back of the home. He stated that the garage doors will be textured aluminum carriage style doors.

Ms. Glattly stated that the garage doors will appear as wood.

Board member Friedman expressed concern about the front elevation noting that with the dormers and gables, there is a lot going on. He suggested that further study be done of different compositions. He noted that the garage element appears busy, stretched out and dominant and suggested that there is an opportunity to compress the garage and the linking element.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Lyons reviewed a massing model and commented on alternatives that were considered. He noted that the roof of the linking element was dropped down to allow the garage to appear as a stand alone element. He noted that access to the living space above the garage is through the linking element so sufficient head height must be provided. He stated that bead board will be used on the porch and either concrete, pavers or bluestone will be used for the porch surface.

Board member Friedman suggested consideration of seven foot garage doors to compress the garage and allow it to appear less dominant.

Board member Moyer stated that the overall massing concept is excellent in relation to the neighbors but noted various features are difficult and he agreed that there is a lot going on with respect to the complications and complexities of the various elements. He noted that there is an issue with the scale in that the project appears to be a diminutive rendition of a house that wants to be bigger. He noted that the scale of the front door could be improved if it was smaller. He noted that the model exacerbates the discomfort with the dark walls and white trim. He noted that with lighter walls, there would be greater continuity between the roof and walls taking away one of the complexities. He stated that the connection to the garage does not work but in contrast, the west elevation is strong. He stated that he understands the desire for additional living space above the garage but noted that the dimensions of the building and the property makes

achieving that difficult. He noted that dropping the floor level might be a lesser evil than the cliff on the east elevation as now presented. He reiterated that the main issue is the relationship of the garage to the house.

Board member Dunne agreed that making the garage less prominent and simpler could benefit the project.

In response to questions from Board member Dunne, Mr. Lyons stated that the driveway will be asphalt and confirmed that a grading and drainage plan will be reviewed by the City Engineer to assure that runoff does not impact the neighbors. He stated that the lot is relatively flat with minor topographical changes. He stated that the house to the east is sited further to the north and is screened by existing trees and vegetation along the property line. He confirmed that measures will be taken to protect the existing vegetation during construction. He stated that landscaping will be added at the front of the house to soften the hardscape and projecting garage.

Chairman Notz complimented the overall design but noted that he too has concerns about the size of the garage. He noted that the fact that the house to the east is sited much further north exacerbates how far the garage protrudes forward. He encouraged study of how to reduce the projection of the garage. He commented on the east elevation noting that he shares concerns expressed by Board member Moyer about the sense of dropping off a cliff.

In response to comments from Chairman Notz, Mr. Lyons described a porch feature that was considered to help mitigate the mass, but was ultimately not included in the final design. He stated that some of the modifications suggested would result in the loss of integrity of the linking element. He stated that he worked hard to appropriately configure the linking element.

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

Lori Glattly expressed concern about some of the Board's comments. She stated that the design for the new home is an appropriate style and noted that the home meets the desires of today's buyers. She stated that the garage will remain a three-car garage. She stated that the plan as presented is in conformance with the zoning setbacks and the square footage limitations. She noted that there are many three car garages in the neighborhood and some of those are forward on the properties. She stated that the design as proposed is in keeping with other homes in the neighborhood. She stated that making the space over the garage usable is important given the square footage limitations. She expressed frustration that the Board is questioning elements of the house when essentially she has built the same house elsewhere.

Chairman Notz explained that the Board is charged with looking at every situation

in the unique context of the neighborhood and the specific site. He stated appreciation for the points raised by Ms. Glattly.

Board member Friedman stated that it is not the Board's intent to unnecessarily delay petitions but noted that the Board must take a serious interest in the overall aesthetics of the neighborhood and community at large. He suggested that the Board's comments should be taken in that context and viewed as efforts to assist in moving the project toward a workable solution. He stated that as presented, the residence is busy and has some scale issues. He noted that various suggestions were offered for the petitioner's consideration. He noted that the desire to create living space above the garage is causing conflict and if that goal is to be achieved, the project needs further study and refinement.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Chairman Notz invited a motion.

Board member Friedman made a motion to approve the demolition alone, in advance of full resolution of issues with the replacement residence, as requested by Ms. Glattly, to allow the petitioner to move forward with the demolition.

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

Board member Friedman made a motion to continue consideration of the replacement residence with direction to the petitioner to consider the comments made by the Board and revise the plans in particular to address the mass and scale issues related to the garage and linking element. He noted that the revised plans should be returned to the full Board for further review and action.

The motion was seconded by Board member Diamond.

Board member Moyer offered that consideration might be given to breaking the large expanse of wall on the east elevation by making it a transparent element.

The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

- 5. Introduction of a request for approval of the design aspects of a new hotel, Lake Forest Hyatt Place, in Conway Park, at 200 Field Drive. The building, lighting, landscaping and signage will be presented for Board discussion and input. This petition will return to the Board for final action at a future meeting. Owner: Laurel Avenue Lake Forest LTD Partnership c/o Janko Group (Trillium Investments, Inc., Gary Janko, Janko Financial Group LLC, JFLT, LLC)
Representative: Stephen Wright, Principal, Wright Heerema Architects**

Chairman Notz introduced the project. He asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest

Board member Dunne stated that Hyatt is one of his wife's client's but noted that he will be able to rule on the petition objectively.

Chairman Notz stated that he is employed by a bank that does commercial real estate lending and the petitioner is a client of the bank. He noted however, that the petitioner is not his client and he has no vested interest in the project. He stated that he will be able to rule on the matter impartially. Hearing no objections or other disclosures from Board members, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Stephen Wright introduced the petition. He noted that the Janko Group was recently named by Hyatt as their developer of the year. He reviewed other projects in which the Janko Group has been involved. He described the 9.69 acre property proposed for development noting that it is in the Conway Park office park. He noted that currently, there are only office buildings in the park adding that a hotel has long been anticipated to serve the businesses in the park and is permitted in the zoning district. He noted that given the size of the property, in the future, an office building is planned on the site in addition to the hotel. He reviewed the proposed site plan and the rationale behind it noting that the hotel is sited on the Field Drive frontage for visibility. He noted that people coming to a hotel are often less familiar with the surroundings than those who work in the office buildings. He noted that the future office building is sited to allow visibility of the hotel from the Tollway. He stated that the hotel will occupy about 3.5 acres of the site and will have 158 rooms in a six-story building of 104,000 square feet. He stated that as required by the Code, one parking space is provided per hotel room and in addition, 27 parking spaces are dedicated to hotel staff. He stated that the parking provided exceeds the Code requirements despite the fact that the hotel and office buildings will have different peak times of operation. He confirmed that the hotel and office building will each have adequate parking spaces. He noted that parking is located around the hotel to facilitate the use of multiple entrances. He noted that Hyatt Place is the upper end, business product of the Hyatt brand and pointed out that this Hyatt Place will be designed for and unique to Lake Forest. He reviewed the first floor plan pointing out the lobby, limited service bar and restaurant, fitness center, pool and a limited number of meeting rooms to address the needs of offer users in the park. He reviewed plans for the upper floors noting that the generous rooms will be typical and familiar to Hyatt customers. He reviewed the roof plan noting that screening is planned to enclose the roof top mechanicals consistent with the requirements of Conway Park. He explained that his firm has been involved in Conway Park from the time it was developed and designed many of the buildings in the office park. He stated that Conway Park is one of the most prominent and well respected office parks in the area. He stated his expectation that the future office building on this parcel will reflect the next generation of office buildings incorporating more glass and an open feel. He stated that the hotel will be unique to Conway Park and noted the difference in design of this hotel in comparison to the hotels on the west side of the Tollway and the standard Hyatt prototype. He discussed the details of the proposed hotel noting that the windows are larger elements that relate to each

other rather than random, punched openings. He noted the distinct center element, an identifiable mark that breaks down the building and provides scale. He noted the prominent entrance canopy on the east elevation again, for visibility and ease of visitors.

He noted the location of the pool at the side of the building and noted a pergola adjacent to the restaurant to provide outdoor seating. He reviewed the exterior materials noting the brick frame and the windows surrounded by a composite metal panel. He provided samples of the bricks in two tones noting that the mortar will be a complementary color. He pointed out that a Norman brick, rather than a standard utility brick, is proposed offering a contemporary feel to the building. He noted that glass will enclose the first floor, inviting people into the space. He reviewed each elevation noting that the building has four fronts and no rear elevation. He reviewed a section of the building noting how the components help to break down the appearance of mass. He provided details of particular aspects of the building. He stated that signage is very important to the hotel noting that two wall signs are proposed, one on the west elevation and one on the east elevation along with a monument sign.

David McCallum, landscape architect, reviewed the landscape plan. He stated that all existing trees on the site will remain except the three near the driveway. He stated that the existing trees on the site include honey locust, white pine and hawthorns. He stated that the crabapple trees on the site are in poor condition and will be replaced with a variety of shade trees. He stated that the proposed landscaping includes shade trees, native grasses, perennials and various types of evergreen trees. He stated that the slight berm along the streetscape will remain. He stated that trees are proposed in the parking lot islands and along the north and south property lines. He stated that native grasses, ground cover and low evergreen shrubs are planned adjacent to the building. He noted that the monument sign near the driveway will be landscaped with ornamental shrubs and grasses.

Mr. Wright reviewed the lighting plan stating that light will be contained on the site through the use of LED, low cut off fixtures. He stated that a contemporary version of the old shoebox parking lot lights is proposed. He presented the grading plan noting that it generally follows the topography of the site noting that the northwest corner of the site is the high point. He noted that stormwater is directed off site to the ponds to the east in Conway Park.

Ms. Czerniak summarized that the Board's role is to review the design aspects of the project; the building, lighting, landscaping and signage. She noted that unlike other developments, the Conway Park Owners' Association (CPOA) has a separate review process and has oversight over and specific regulations for development in Conway Park. She noted that the Board received a letter from the CPOA stating general support for the project and identifying some issues that still need resolution. She stated that from the staff perspective, a more detailed

lighting plan and further study and development of the signage plan are needed. She noted that in addition to the signage regulations in the Code, the CPOA has adopted specific signage regulations for Conway Park that were reviewed and approved by the Board in the past. She stated that the monument sign with ground lighting appears to be consistent with the Code. She noted however that signage on buildings, above the first floor is not permitted by the Code. She noted that the CPOA stated support for a variance to allow signage at the top of the building on the west elevation. She stated that the Code does not permit and the CPOA does not support signage at the top of the building on the east elevation. She noted that signage at the top of buildings has been requested before and consistently denied. She asked the Board for input and direction to guide the finalization of the plans noting that the petition will be brought back to the Board in final form for action in the near future.

Board member Dunne commended the plan, the architectural detail and the siting on the lot. He acknowledged that it will be a challenge to get people into Conway Park to the hotel. He stated that the project is well thought out and is in keeping with the character of Conway Park.

In response to questions from Board member Dunne, Gary Janko, the Janko Group, stated the importance of helping guests to find the hotel noting that they might visit just once a year. He stated that more signage is better. He agreed that more study needs to be done to find the right solution which might include off site signage.

Board member Moyer stated that it is an excellent project in keeping with the purpose of the building and the character of the setting.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Wright further described the windows confirming that there are no intermediate mullions and the intent is not to create any divisions. He confirmed that the spandrel material is a metal panel which will be roughly equal to and intended to represent the floor. He confirmed that the metal louvers between the windows will actively provide for ventilation but the function will not be apparent from the outside. He explained that part of the grill will be functional but will be unbroken.

Board member Moyer commended the site planning and consideration given to landscaping. He stated appreciation that people will need to be able to find the hotel and stated that the signage should be user friendly, but as discreet as possible.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Wright stated that subtle lighting on the tower element is under consideration.

Board member Friedman noted that both the developer and architect are Lake Forest residents who have taken ownership of their local projects and have

proven success. He stated that the proposed structure is handsome and unlike typical hotel box-like designs.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman about the need for a hotel in this area, Mr. Janko reviewed the study that was completed noting that there appears to be a clear demand from people within the park as well as within the 25 mile radius. He noted that specific elements such as meeting rooms were added in response to input received from local businesses. He noted that other hotels in the area are dated and may not fully meet today's demands. He stated that the hotels on the west side of the Tollway do reasonably well.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Wright reviewed the screening of the roof top mechanical equipment in more detail. He explained that the screen wall is carried back to enclose the mechanical equipment adding that the parapet is more than adequate to cover the equipment. He noted that the cooling system is not as tall as what is found on an office building and confirmed that only cooling mechanicals will be located on the roof. He confirmed that two elevators are sufficient to meet the Code and the requirements of the hotel. He noted the location of the trash and recycling enclosure on the west elevation, adjacent to the building rather than out in the parking lot. He stated that the light poles will be 12 to 14 feet tall noting that with shorter poles, more will be required.

Board member Bires also complimented the design.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Wright stated that the windows will have a light tint using a high performance coating as required by the energy code. He noted that clear glass tends to turn green because of the iron and by adding a light coating, the glass will have a softer look. He stated that at the present time, there is not a timeline for the office building. He confirmed that the landscaping for the hotel and office building will occur in phases.

Board member Diamond stated support for the project and stated his hope that it will be successful.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Wright reviewed the terrace and pergola proposed on the east elevation, adjacent to the restaurant. He stated that the pergola will be wood or painted metal.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Wright confirmed that the bricks, although in two colors, will be the same size and have the same texture. He reviewed the locations where the lighter and darker bricks will be used. He provided more detail on the louvers explaining that they will appear as a screen and not like a typical hotel façade element. He described the pool patio area noting that some of the existing berming will help screen the area. He agreed that more thought should be given to how the pool patio is screened. He stated

that guests will park both on the east and west sides of the hotel.

Chairman Notz stated that he understands the sensitivity around the issue of assuring that people can find the hotel. He stated that the hotel will be located in an office park which is a bit unusual. He suggested that the Board may need to consider exceptions given the circumstances of embedding the hotel in the office park. He noted that the hotel should have prominent visibility for those visiting for the first time.

Board member Friedman agreed that the visibility needs to be considered.

Hearing no further comments or questions from the Board, Chairman Notz invited public comment.

Mr. Janko noted that Hyatt is changing the design of common areas in hotels to reflect the local history and surroundings. He added that parking demands are going down dramatically at hotels in Evanston and Milwaukee. He stated that alternative modes of transportation are reflected in the reduced parking demands but noted that adequate parking, consistent with the Code requirements, will be provided on the site.

Michael Hrusovsky, 648 Waveland Road, noted that this is something out of the ordinary and stated that in his opinion, the hotel will be good for the corporations in Conway Park and will provide a place for family and friends of residents to stay in town.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Notz invited final comments from the Board, hearing none, he invited a motion to continue the petition to allow final refinements to be made based on the Board's discussion, staff comments and the comments of the CPOA. He encouraged the petitioner to consider some screening of the patio area as the design develops.

Board member Friedman made a motion to continue consideration of the petition.

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

OTHER ITEMS

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

There was no additional public testimony presented to the Board.

7. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented from staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak
Director of Community Development