

**The City of Lake Forest**  
**Building Review Board**  
**Proceedings of May 2, 2018 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, May 2, 2018 at 6:30 p.m., at the City Hall Council Chambers, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

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

Building Review Board members absent: None

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

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

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 March 7, 2018 meeting of the Building Review Board.**

The minutes of the March 7, 2018 meeting were approved as submitted.

**3. Consideration of a request for approval of the demolition of a one-story, rear addition, and the construction of a second floor addition, front porch and related alterations. Modifications to the existing detached garage are also proposed. The property is located at 1192 Griffith Road.**

**Owner: Jonathan Vold**

**Contract Purchasers: Matt and Amy Cicero**

**Representative: Peter Childs, Childs Development and Jeff Letzter, designer**

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

Mr. Letzter introduced the petition explaining that the project involves the demolition of a one story rear addition which comprises about 30 percent of the existing house and construction of a second floor addition over the original house. He noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals recently recommended approval of a front yard zoning setback variance to allow the house to align with others along the street. He presented images of the existing residence noting that it was built around 1910 when many of the homes in the neighborhood were constructed. He stated that many of the homes in the area have been modified over the years some with second floor additions. He

presented an image of the streetscape with the house as proposed, with the second floor addition, noting the similarity in massing with other homes on the block. He reviewed existing and proposed elevations and floor plans. He noted that the house is designed to follow a Colonial Revival style. He stated that a structural engineer reviewed the existing foundation and framing and determined that they are adequate to support the proposed second floor. He reviewed the demolition plan noting that with the exception of the one-story rear addition, the exterior walls and foundation of the house will remain. He stated that much of the interior will be gutted and reconstructed. He presented a rendering of the house with the proposed second floor noting the color palette and exterior materials. In response to comments in the staff report, he reviewed the proposed south elevation explaining that the proposed cantilevered second floor bay provides the opportunity for a larger bedroom. He reviewed the roof plan. He stated that the existing garage will remain but will be re-sided and detailed to match the house. He stated that with the removal of the rear addition, there will be less impervious surface on the site than exists today. He reviewed a conceptual landscape plan pointing out that a patio of pavers is proposed at the rear of the house.

Ms. Czerniak stated that based on the information submitted by the petitioner, modification of the existing home is appropriate rather than completely demolishing the home and building a new house. She stated that the proposed demolition of the one-story rear addition meets the applicable criteria. She confirmed that the Zoning Board of Appeals voted in support of a front yard variance to allow the front of the home to follow the established patterns of the siting of homes along the street. She stated that the house, with the proposed second floor addition, fits into the streetscape and be an upgrade to the existing home. She stated that the reduction in the amount of impervious surface is a positive. She asked for Board input on the cantilevered bay and the pattern of fenestration on the south elevation. She stated that the exterior materials are appropriate for this neighborhood and generally consistent with the City's design guidelines. She stated that the staff report presents findings in support of the petition and details the recommended conditions of approval. She noted that in particular, attention should be paid to the light fixtures to assure that the source of the light is screened to avoid impacts on neighboring homes.

In response to questions from Board member Dunne, Mr. Letzter reviewed the exterior materials and stated that the intended color palette includes light gray siding, white trim and charcoal black architectural asphalt shingles on the roof. He provided material and color samples to the Board.

Board member Moyer complimented the rendering noting that it shows landscaping extending along the sides of the home unlike the landscape plan. He encouraged adhering to the plantings as reflected in the rendering.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Letzter clarified that no fencing is proposed.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Mr. Letzter confirmed that the

drawing which shows the bay window on the south elevation offset from the upper element is more accurate than the rendering. He confirmed the locations of the decorative supports under the bay window. He stated that efforts could be made to center the cantilevered section on the second floor over the bay noting however that it would require modification of the interior space.

Chairman Notz suggested adjusting the lower bay to center it under the projecting second story element instead of shifting the second story element.

Mr. Letzter offered that it may be possible to reduce the width of the second floor projection to match the width of the bay to achieve the desired centering.

In response to Board member Reda, Mr. Letzter agreed to reconsider whether the brackets are appropriate for the simple style of the house. He stated that as proposed, the windows only have muntins between the glass panes. He stated that consideration could be given to adding a higher window on the north elevation to achieve a more balanced appearance. He stated that a more traditional wood porch, instead of the proposed iron and concrete porch, could be considered along with some landscaping near the porch.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Letzter confirmed that gray siding is proposed, white windows and trim, dark roof shingles, and white aluminum gutters and downspouts. He stated that the roof of the front bay will copper. He described the window surround treatment. He acknowledged some discrepancies between the rendering and the elevations noting that the rendering was completed as the early vision of the house. He confirmed that the exposed concrete foundation will be painted. He stated that the existing curb cut will remain and the new driveway will be in the same location as the existing driveway. He stated that the first floor will need some strengthening but confirmed that the foundation and exterior walls are in good shape. He stated that for the most part, the existing window openings will be reused, with new windows inserted. He confirmed that the louver vent on the front elevation will function as ventilation for the attic in combination with soffit and ridge venting.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Letzter explained that some additional structural support will be added to the floor and as needed, the existing floor joists will be repaired. He stated that the method that will be used to support the second floor is still being considered noting that a clear span approach may be used or supports and columns. He stated that all exterior lighting will comply with the City's requirements to prevent negative impacts on the surrounding homes. He stated that only limited exterior lighting is proposed, at the front and back door.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Letzter confirmed that the existing garage will remain and will be upgraded to match the house.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Letzter agreed that the window in the stair landing on the north elevation could be shifted to the east to create a more

balanced elevation. He stated a preference for having windows consistently located at either the first or second floor level, rather than between the floors.

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

David Mattoon, representing the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, stated that the Foundation supports the staff recommendation.

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

In response to a question from Board member Friedman, Mr. Letzter confirmed that the siding is gray, not green as it appears in the sample.

Board member Reda stated that landscaping is needed to screen the tall foundation wall. He suggested that the supports under the projecting element on the south elevation, and the fenestration on the north elevation, be reconsidered and refined. He stated that wood, rather than concrete and metal, should be considered for the front porch for consistency with the overall neighborhood. He stated that the items can be addressed through conditions and review by staff.

Board member Moyer suggested a condition requiring that the project proceed in conformance with the color and detail depicted in the rendering. He stated that the gray tone, as described by the petitioner, should be used as opposed to the greenish tone of the sample presented to the Board.

Board member Dunne agreed that the color palette should be consistent with the colors depicted in the rendering.

Chairman Notz stated continued concern about the off-center location of the bay window on the south elevation. He stated that as presented, the elevation is not in full conformance with the applicable standards. He stated that he understands the benefits of using the existing bay, but noted that given the significant changes proposed to the elevation, getting the bay "right" will be important to the overall composition. He noted that by shifting the bay, the elevation will be more balanced. He noted that the shift can be made without interrupting the interior space on the first or second floors. He added that he could support slightly increasing the size of the bay window if that helps to improve the overall balance. He stated that improving the overall balance of the south elevation is necessary in order to comply with the standards.

In response to comments from the Board, Mr. Letzter agreed to make modifications to the south elevation to achieve a better balance of the various elements. He stated that the balance may be achieved by shifting both the first floor bay and second floor projecting element. He stated that he is confident that he can achieve the desired result.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Letzer stated that there is no chimney because a direct vent fireplace is proposed in the living room. He noted the flue element on the exterior wall which will be screened by landscaping.

Board member Moyer pointed out the window that is shown on the elevation below the projecting element noting that typically, a support element would be located below a cantilevered projection. He stated support for the Chairman's recommendation to shift the bay commenting that it would not have an adverse impact on the plan. He stated that overall, the project will be a great improvement and the presence of the house on the streetscape will be improved.

In response to Chairman Notz, Ms. Czerniak stated that the comments of the Board are clear and if the Board desires, staff can review the refined plans to assure compliance with the Board's direction.

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

Board member Reda made a motion to approve the demolition of the one story, rear addition. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report.

The motion was seconded by Board member Freidman and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

Board member Reda made a motion to approve the second floor addition and various alterations to the house based on the findings detailed in the staff report and the Board's deliberations. He stated that the approval is subject to the following conditions.

1. The plans shall be revised as follows:
  - The front porch shall be wood and designed in a manner consistent with the overall character of the neighborhood.
  - The south elevation shall be modified to achieve a more balanced appearance. The first floor bay and the second floor projecting element shall be centered on each other.
  - The fenestration on the north elevation shall be refined to break up large expanses of unbroken wall and to improve the overall balance and rhythm of the elevation.
  - Simulated divided lite windows shall be used.
2. Modifications made to the plans to address the Board's conditions of approval, as a result of exploring the Board's suggestions, or as a result of final design development, shall be clearly called out as part of the submittal for building permit. A copy of the plans as submitted to the Board for review shall accompany the plans submitted for permit and areas of change shall be highlighted in some manner. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman

as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

3. The detailing, massing, colors and landscaping shall be generally consistent with how they are depicted in the rendering presented to the Board.
4. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be provided at the time plans are submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view.
5. A plan for construction parking and material staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development. On street parking is limited to two cars immediately in front of this property due to the narrowness of the street.

The motion was seconded by Board member Freidman and approved by a 7 to 0 vote.

**4. Consideration of a request for modifications including reorientation and expansion of the existing garage and reconfiguration and expansion of the existing driveway. A variance is requested to allow the width of the garage to exceed the permitted width. The property is located at 635 Buena Road.**

**Owners: David and Deb Moore**

**Representatives: Jon Clair, architect**

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

Mr. Clair stated that the Moore family has lived in the house for 17 years noting that they are out of town and unable to be at the meeting. He stated that the proposed project was reviewed and approved by the Pond's Subdivision Home Owners' Association. He added that the Zoning Board of Appeals voted unanimously to recommend approval of a variance to allow the portion of the driveway located in the front yard setback to exceed the maximum permitted width of 16 feet. He stated that a variance for the width of the garage is requested from the Building Review Board to allow the garage to exceed the permitted 24 foot width by 15 feet. He reviewed the plan to re-orient the existing two car side load garage to a front load garage and add a third garage bay. He stated that the house, and garage, sit higher than the neighboring property and as a result, the driveway currently pitches toward the neighbor, causing a draining issue. He presented photos of the existing house and of the neighbors' homes noting many three car garages and many front facing garages. He stated that the petitioners have talked with the neighbors and the neighbors support the project as proposed. He explained that the current driveway configuration does not provide space for on-site parking without blocking the garage and as a result, visitors park in the street. He added that there is not a convenient link between the driveway and the front door.

He noted that a covered porch is proposed to provide protection from the weather and to clearly call out the front door. He reviewed the front elevation noting the proposed dormers. He stated that the house is a cross between a ranch and a contemporary style. He stated that the dormers will match the existing materials, colors and detailing. He explained that the subdivision was approved as a planned unit development and as a result, the individual lots are smaller than the minimum lot size in the zoning district in order to preserve common open space. He stated that grass and landscaping will be planted in the area where the existing driveway is removed to slow water runoff from the site. He noted that the serpentine driveway will provide opportunities to landscape the front yard to screen views of parked cars and the garage doors. He stated that turning the gable on the third garage bay, diminishes the appearance of mass and sets it apart from the main mass of the house. He stated that the garage doors will be custom made. He reviewed the side and rear elevations of the new garage bay noting a change in the location of a window from the plans included in the Board's packet. He reviewed the floor plan and roof plan noting the use of copper roofs on the dormers. He stated that the plan provides a better connection between the driveway and front door than exists today. He noted that other options for adding a garage bay were considered but noted the large Red Oak tree near the garage which would be impacted by other options. He added that currently, cars parking under the Oak tree are impacted by debris falling out of the tree.

Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the Ponds Subdivision was a Planned Preservation Subdivision and as a result, the lots are smaller than those normally found in the applicable zoning district. She noted that most of the homes in the subdivision are pulled forward on the lots, right up to the front setback line, to maximize the open space at the rear of the homes, resulting in limited options for expansion or driveway reconfiguration. She confirmed that the petitioners studied options for adding a garage bay. She noted that retaining the existing side load garage and locating a third bay further back on the lot would require removal of the large Red Oak and maneuvering into and out of the three garages could be difficult. She confirmed that there are a number of front facing garages in the neighborhood. She stated that the modifications to the home add some detail and interest and provide protection from the weather at the front door. She stated that findings are presented in the staff report in support of the petition.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Clair reviewed the siting of the existing and proposed garage bays and hardscape area. He confirmed that the intent is to match the roof shingles and cedar siding noting that the house was recently re-roofed so a complete new roof is not planned.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Clair described the garage doors noting the intent to have panels with vertical bead board. He reviewed the landscape plan noting that there is significant existing landscaping some of which will be relocated on the site. He stated that a mix of perennials, annuals and some ornamentals is planned. He stated that the intent is not to try to create a barrier in front of the house, but to soften the views of hardscape and the garage doors from the

street. He confirmed that no changes are proposed to the house except those described on the front elevation.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Clair acknowledged that the garage doors will make up half of the front elevation so it will be important that they are properly styled and detailed. He stated that all necessary steps will be taken to protect the Oak tree during construction.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Mr. Claire reviewed the size of the trees proposed to screen the driveway. He agreed that the landscaping will need to have some height to break up the expanse of asphalt.

Board member Moyer observed that the existing house has a certain irrationality to it and noted that the proposed garages, which do not relate to each other, are consistent with the overall style. He stated that on a consistent basis, the Board does not support front facing garage doors but acknowledged that, as stated in the staff report, there are other front facing garages in this neighborhood.

In response to questions from Board member Dunne, Mr. Claire explained that the house sits about three feet higher than the street and the neighboring property. He stated that the pitch of the driveway will be maintained to direct as much water as possible to the street and away from the neighbor.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Claire clarified the proposed siting of the third garage bay noting that it is parallel to the house. He reviewed the roof plan explaining how the transition between the existing roof and new roof will occur.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Ms. Czerniak stated that the curb cuts within the right of way will need to comply with the Code requirements relating to maximum width and permitted materials.

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

Mr. Mattoon, representing the Preservation Foundation, suggested that the Board consider a plan that better preserves the greenery along the streetscape.

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

Board member Reda made a motion to approve the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report and the Board's deliberations. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. The plans submitted for permit shall detail the garage doors to assure that they are consistent with the representations made to the Board that the doors will be



of high quality detailing, design and materials given that they will comprise a significant part of the front elevation.

2. Any modifications made to the plans as a result of final design development or in response to comments offered during the Board's review shall be clearly called out as part of the submittal for building permit. A copy of the plans as submitted to the Board for review shall accompany the plans submitted for permit and areas of change shall be highlighted in some manner. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be provided at the time plans are submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view.
4. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted at the time the plans are submitted for permit. The City Arborist is directed to verify that landscaping of varying heights and a density sufficient to provide screening of views of the garage doors, the expanse of hardscape and cars parked in the driveway, to the extent possible, is reflected on the plan. The plan shall include replacement of two parkway ash trees with two, three inch shade trees.
5. A pre and post construction maintenance plan for the Red Oak shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City Arborist before any permits are issued to authorize work on the site.
6. A plan for construction parking and material staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.

The motion was seconded by Board member Freidman and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

**5. Consideration of a request for approval of a new residence with an attached garage on the site of a previous demolition at 104 Washington Circle. Approval of the conceptual landscape plan is also requested.**

**Owners: Tom and Judith Westberg**

**Representative: Monica Artmann-Ruggles, architect**

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

Ms. Artmann-Ruggles, introduced the project noting that the petitioners intend to build a retirement home on the property. She stated that when the Westbergs recently

bought the property, there was a dilapidated cottage standing on the site that was the subject of various Code violations. She stated that the Westbergs removed the cottage from the site due to health and life safety concerns, the demolition was previously approved by the Board. She described the established neighborhood noting the location of homes near the street and pointing out that many of the homes have front porches. She stated that the proposed location of the new house is staked on the site. She described the property as a flat site, with little landscaping and one very large evergreen. She pointed out the existing driveway along the north property line adding that the driveway will remain in generally the present location, adjacent to the driveway for the neighboring property to the north, with some additional space between the two driveways for limited landscaping and drainage. She stated that the house is sited consistent with other homes on the street and as a result, requires a variance from the front yard setback. She reviewed the proposed setback of the new house in relation to the siting of other homes and to the street. She stated that the house is sited to strike a balance between the differing setbacks of other homes with the closest corner of the open front porch proposed at about 25 feet from the front property line, instead of adhering to the required 40 foot setback. She noted that the two story portion of the house, at the closest point, is proposed at about 29' 10" from the front property line. She noted that the cottage that was previously located on the site was set back further from the street than other homes in the neighborhood and created a visual gap in the streetscape. She reviewed the site plan and the proposed landscaping. She stated that the house is designed to accommodate a first floor master suite and an attached garage. She reviewed the numerous site plans that were explored in order to accommodate the petitioners' desires given the narrow lot. She reviewed the elevations noting the limited two story element in keeping with the massing of other homes on the street. She noted the one story elements at the rear of the house and the enclosed courtyard and reviewed the floor plans, the details of the front porch and the attached garage at the rear of the property. She stated that the proposed residence complies with the square footage and height limitations of the Code. She stated that the selected Queen Ann style will be a nice addition to the neighborhood. She reviewed the exterior materials including cedar siding, cedar shakes, wood trim, asphalt roof shingles, fiberglass windows and a wood front door with sidelights. She reviewed a few of the alternate site plans that were considered and described the pros and cons of each. She stated that an attached garage is important to the petitioners. She stated that the goal is to design a home consistent with the massing and styles of other homes on the street while meeting the needs of the petitioners for their retirement home.

Ms. Czerniak noted that a replacement residence for this property was brought before the Building Review Board by prior owners, but never built. She confirmed that the Board previously approved the demolition of the cottage on the site. She stated that given the health and life safety concerns about the deteriorating condition of the cottage, demolition of the structure was a condition of the issuance of the Transfer Stamp at the time of the recent sale. She asked for Board input on the siting of the house noting that as further transition occurs in the neighborhood, the siting of this house could set a precedent for others. She stated that the staff report includes

findings in support of the petition and recommendations for conditions of approval.

In response to questions from Board member Dunne, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles reviewed the building sections and the simple massing model. She confirmed that the elevations, but not the model, are accurately detailed. She agreed to reconsider the size of the garage windows on the south elevation and the size of windows on the front elevation.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles stated that the exterior material on the first floor is beveled cedar siding with cedar shakes on the second floor. She agreed to consider the addition of lattice with vines between the windows to help mitigate the appearance of length of the house and to visually benefit the neighbors.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles noted that the configuration of the house provides for natural light throughout the home. She stated that the driveway is shifted over slightly to allow for some plantings between the two driveways to avoid the appearance of a wide double driveway. She reviewed the landscape plan noting the intent to add plantings along the streetscape. She stated that the narrow lot limits the options for the footprint of the house. She agreed to shift the house slightly south, to the extent possible, but noted the limitations of the zoning setbacks.

In response to questions from Board member Freidman, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles confirmed that that house will not exceed the permitted square footage requirements.

Board member Friedman observed that the house is very long noting that he understands the programmatic issues and acknowledging that the courtyard concept has merit. He noted that the length of the house will increase construction costs due to the expansive foundation and roof. He questioned whether all available options have been thoroughly examined and questioned whether a more efficient layout could be achieved. He noted that the neighbors to the north and south will be impacted by the length of the home. He suggested reconsidering the size of the courtyard and encouraged consideration of reducing the overall length. He stated that the proportions, aesthetics and detailing are all nicely done. He stated that consideration should be given to increasing the space between the two driveways to more than two feet to allow for plantings to soften the expanse of pavement from the streetscape.

In response to comments and questions from Board member Friedman, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles pointed out that the attached garage gives the impression that the house is stretched adding that the garage adds 40 feet to the appearance of the length of the house. She stated that it was a challenge to come up with a floor plan that fully meets the petitioners' needs. She stated that the courtyard, and the two story mass which steps down to a one story mass, achieves the petitioners' goals. She noted that the two story mass does not extend the full length of the house, mitigating the impacts on the neighboring property owner. She stated that the petitioners have talked with the neighbors and did not receive any negative comments. She stated that an elevator

was not explored as an alternative to a first floor master bedroom.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles confirmed that the courtyard will be accessible through French doors. She described the front porch noting that the floor will be bluestone or stone, the columns will be wood and the ceiling will be bead board. She stated that the front porch is proposed at eight feet wide to make it usable. She stated that a standing seam metal roof is proposed on the porch.

Board member Bires agreed with Board member Dunne's comments about the sizing of the garage windows and stated support for breaking up the length of the elevation with a combination of windows and trellis treatment.

Chairman Notz agreed that the house appears very long. He stated that he understands the petitioners' goals and the limitations of the lot. He encouraged further consideration of ways to mitigate the length adding that by bringing the garage closer to the house, the length might be able to be reduced to some extent. He stated that he is struggling with finding the length of the house consistent with the scale of the neighborhood and the applicable criteria.

In response to comments and questions from Chairman Notz, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles stated that consideration could be given to reducing the width of the courtyard. She noted that the current configuration provides the opportunity for natural light into the kitchen, breakfast room and family room. She stated that the owners desire an attached garage noting that the current plan avoids a front facing garage on the site.

Board member Friedman acknowledged the hard work that went into the plan but noted that the program and lifestyle desired by the owners and the shape of the lot may not be aligned.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz about the windows, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles agreed that the sizes of the windows could be reconsidered but noted that some windows are egress windows and must meet minimum size requirements. She added that both of the owners work from home and desire as much natural light as possible.

In response to a question from Board member Diamond, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles agreed that the front door and sidelights can be simplified.

Board member Moyer noted that the Board may be reacting to the design because it is different from what the Board normally sees. He pointed out that the plan meets the applicable requirements and presents two stories to the streetscape consistent with many of the surrounding homes. He stated support for the project.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Ms. Artmann-Ruggles confirmed

that the windows on the front elevation will be centered over the front door. She reviewed the windows proposed on the north elevation. She stated that consideration was given to the adequacy of the driveway apron and confirmed that it is adequate to allow ingress and egress to the garage. She stated that the garage door is 18 feet wide.

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

Mr. Mattoon, representing the Preservation Foundation, stated that the primary massing of the front of the house is handled in a manner that is consistent with the neighborhood. He noted that the exterior materials are appropriate. He suggested that the proportions of the windows on the front elevation be reconsidered. He asked that alternatives to the attached garage be considered to mitigate impacts on views from the neighboring homes.

Mr. Westberg stated that he and his wife recently purchased the property because they were looking for a small lot, in an established neighborhood. He stated that they have worked hard with their architect to design a house that fits well with the other homes in the area. He stated that the neighbors are supportive of the project. He acknowledged that the house is longer than other homes but noted that having a first floor master bedroom and an attached garage are important to meet their needs. He stated that he is Scandinavian and enjoys the sunlight noting that the long southern exposure will bring light into the home most of the day. He agreed that the garage windows could be enlarged. He asked the Board for approval of the home noting that it is practical and consistent with the Code requirements.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Notz returned the matter to the Board for deliberation and action.

Board member Bires noted that there are some inconsistencies between the elevations and the rendering making it hard to picture how the house will appear from the streetscape. He noted that he is willing to reconsider his earlier objections to the length of the house.

Board member Diamond noted that he too initially found the length of the house difficult to reconcile with the standards however, he noted that Board member Moyer's comments are helpful in reconsidering the length. He noted that care should be taken to be sensitive to the impacts on the neighboring properties.

Board member Friedman stated that he stands by his earlier observations and objections to the excessive length of the house. He stated that the house as presented does not fit the character of the street despite the fact that it is a beautiful home, for a different location. He stated that there are ways to mitigate the length without substantially impacting the program. He stated that the Board is being asked to approve a petition that does not meet the applicable parameters.

Board member Reda stated that his first impression too was that the length of the house was inconsistent with the applicable criteria however, as he considered other houses in the neighborhood, he found a quirkiness to the character of the homes. He observed that with the railroad tracks to the west, it is important to have space for plantings to provide a buffer for the home. He noted that there are some other homes on the block that are quite long and stated that the house proposed will not likely be any more obtrusive than existing homes. He stated continued concern about the oversized windows on the front elevation and asked that they be refined.

Board member Moyer noted that as with any project, it will evolve as design development continues. He suggested that consideration could be given to the mudroom and bathroom noting that some refinement in that area may shorten the house a bit.

Board member Dunne stated general support for the project. He noted that the unique home, meets the needs of the owners, on a unique lot. He asked that further consideration be given to reducing the courtyard in an effort to reduce the overall length of the house somewhat. He stated that although he would like to see the length reduced somewhat, he is willing to support the project as presented.

Chairman Notz stated that as proposed, the house is out of context with the neighboring homes. He stated that the homes to the north and south are not nearly as deep as the proposed house. He acknowledged that the one-story configuration helps to mitigate the impact of the length. He asked that further work be done in an effort to reduce the length of the house.

Ms. Artmann-Ruggles stated that schemes were developed with a smaller courtyard but noted that it needs to be functional and large enough to get sunlight. She stated that she will study it further. She confirmed that she will review the windows for consistency in size and shape.

Board member Friedman noted this house is about 100 feet in depth.

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

Board member Reda made a motion to continue the petition based on the Board's discussions with direction to the petitioner to study the opportunity for reducing the length of the house and make refinements to the window sizes and placement. He stated his support for the project.

The motion was seconded by Board member Dunne.

Ms. Artmann-Ruggles suggested that rather than a continuance, a subcommittee could be appointed to review changes and keep the process moving.

Board members Friedman and Moyer agreed that a subcommittee could be helpful in

the case of this petition.

The motion to continue the petition failed with a vote of 3 (Friedman, Dunne, Bires) to 4 (Moyer, Notz, Reda, Diamond).

Board member Reda made a motion to approve the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report and on the deliberations of the Board subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The plans should be modified to respond to the items listed below if so directed by the Board. If additional modifications are made to the plans as the result of final design development or in response to Board direction, the modifications shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
  - a. The residence should be shifted back from the front property line an additional five feet to minimize the encroachment into the front yard setback and minimize the impact of the two story portion of the house on the streetscape.
  - b. Conduct further study in an effort to reduce the overall length of the house.
  - c. The portion of the driveway located to the rear of the widest part of the residence should be shifted away from the north property line to provide a minimum of five feet for plantings between the driveway and the north property line. Explore shifting the house to the south slightly.
  - d. The front entrance should be simplified by reducing the extent of lights proposed around the door.
  - e. Refine the windows for consistency around the house. Reduce the size of the windows on the front elevation and center the window above the front door. Increase the size of the windows on the south elevation of the garage.
  - f. Incorporate lattice and plantings to visually reduce the appearance of the length of the house.
  - g. The windows on the garage shall be increased in size for greater consistency with the windows on the house.
2. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate the project is consistent with the applicable Code requirements subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. Grading or filling on the site should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices, to properly direct drainage. A curb should be installed along the north edge of the driveway as reflected on the preliminary grading plan.
3. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation and to protect trees and vegetation on neighboring properties during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.

4. The final landscape plan shall be subject to review and approval by the City Arborist. Plantings along the north property line shall be reflected on the plan.
5. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view from off the site.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood during construction and to minimize impacts on trees intended for preservation. On street parking is limited to two vehicles due to the narrowness of the street and the proximity to the intersection.

The motion was seconded by Board member Moyer and was approved by a vote of 4 to 3 with Chairman Notz and Board members Friedman and Dunne voting in opposition based on their earlier comments about the length of the house.

6. **Consideration of a request for approval of two attached single family residences with garages, the overall site plan and conceptual landscape plan. The property is located at 279 Scott Street.  
Owner: Weidenhamer Family Trust (Joseph Weidenhamer, trustee 100%)  
Representative: Scott Streightiff, architect**

This item was postponed at the request of the petitioner to allow for plan revisions.

#### **OTHER ITEMS**

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

There was no public testimony presented to the Board on non-agenda items.

5. **Additional information from staff.**

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak  
Director of Community Development