

The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of June 6, 2018 Meeting

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

Building Review Board members present: Chairman Ted Notz and Board members Robert Reda, Chris Bires and Fred Moyer

Building Review Board members absent: Board members Jim Diamond and Ross Friedman

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 May 6, 2018 meeting of the Building Review Board.

The minutes of the May 6, 2018 meeting were approved with one correction as requested by Chairman Notz.

3. Continued consideration of a request for approval of the design aspects of a proposed commercial development, Waterway Car Wash, including gas pumps and a convenience store. The property proposed for development is located on the southeast corner of Waukegan and Everett Roads and is commonly referred to as the former site of a gas station and garden store. The Board's purview includes the design, exterior materials and architectural detailing of all proposed structures. In addition, the Board will consider the landscaping, lighting and signage plans with attention to mitigating impacts on residential properties to the east and south, and enhancing the streetscapes.

Property Owner: IP Properties Lake Forest LLC

Ownership Representative: Alexander D. Stuart

Business Ownership Representatives: Henry Dubinsky, Waterway Owner

Michael Goldman, Waterway V.P./Counsel

Architect: Jay Suhoessel, SP Architects

738 Westport Plaza

St. Louis, MO 63146

Chairman Notz asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest, hearing none, he noted that the Board previously considered this petition in January and at that time, continued the matter to allow revisions and refinements in an effort to mitigate impacts on neighboring residential properties and to achieve compatibility with the overall business district. He noted that the Board's purview with respect to this petition includes only the design aspects of the project. He asked that comments from the petitioner and members of the public focus on the matters under the Board's purview. He invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Goldman introduced Mr. Dubinsky, the founder of Waterway Carwash and Gas; and Mr. Stuart, the property owner. He stated that Nick Patera, Teska Associates, has been the conduit between the various members of the Waterway team and will review the plans for the project. He stated that at the January meeting, Waterway representatives listened to the comments and as a follow up to that meeting, many significant changes were made to the plans. He stated that after Mr. Patera's presentation, the team will be available to answer questions noting that the revised plans will likely answer many of the questions and allow the project to move forward.

Mr. Patera stated that the plan was refined to incorporate input received at the January meeting. He provided "before" and "after" images of the proposed development. He stated that changes were made to make the project a fit for Lake Forest. He reviewed an image of the surrounding B-1 zoning district noting that the other businesses in the district are auto oriented. He stated that thought was given to how to make the Waterway development an appropriate gateway at the south end of the business district. He noted that the proposed landscaping will be an improvement over the existing streetscape. He reviewed the elevations of the proposed building noting that design elements and materials similar to other buildings in area were incorporated into the building. He noted that the front of the retail store will face Waukegan Road. He stated that since the January meeting, the signage was removed from the south facing side of the canopy located over the gas pumps. He stated that signage is needed on Everett Road to identify the business. He reviewed the changes made in response to previous comments noting that rather than adding detail to the brick on the east elevation of the building, landscaping is proposed on the neighboring property to break up the mass of the wall. He confirmed that the roof top mechanical equipment will be fully screened by a parapet wall around the recessed well on the roof. He stated, if necessary, screen walls can be installed around the mechanical units. He stated that the canopy over the gas pumps was lowered somewhat and a narrow drop down edge was added to obscure some of the light from the fixtures located under the canopy. He added that the face of the canopy is now detailed consistent with the trim on the building. He reviewed a section of the site illustrating the direction of headlights from cars entering the site from Waukegan Road. He pointed out that headlights will be directed on to the solid fence and will not impact the neighboring homes to the east. He reviewed the location, design and materials of the trash enclosure,

noting that it was moved away from the perimeter of the site in response to earlier comments. He reviewed the proposed 10-foot, solid wood fence that will serve as the transition between the business district and the neighboring residential area. He stated that the wood fence will be residential in character and will be constructed with overlapping boards so there will be no gaps in the fence. He stated that masonry piers are proposed to support the fence, in keeping with the character of buildings in the area and the car wash building proposed for the site. He commented on the automated doors that are proposed at the entrance to and exit from the car wash tunnel for the purpose of mitigating noise from the blowers. He noted that the doors are just one of a number of measures taken to reduce sound from the car wash. He reviewed the lighting that exists on the site today, 18 foot tall poles with cobra lights. He showed a conceptual image of the light that could emanate from the existing lights and an image of the proposed light intensity and coverage. He reviewed the proposed lighting plan noting that lights along the north and south property lines will have cut-off, drop down shields to minimize light impacts on the neighboring residences. He stated that the intent is to avoid projecting light on to the Rectory building from the vacuum area. He reviewed the lighting planned under the canopy noting that a four inch skirt is now proposed around the edge of the canopy to limit views of the lights located under the canopy. He stated that efforts were made to reduce the size and number of signs to more closely meet the signage regulations in the Code. He stated that the landscaping proposed exceeds what would normally be found on a site of this type. He noted that some of the landscaping is proposed on neighboring properties in an effort to maximize the buffer between the residential and commercial properties. He stated that significant efforts were made to assure that the proposed development will blend in with the Settlers' Square area.

Ms. Czerniak noted that this petition has been under consideration for many months and was before the Plan Commission at several meetings. She stated that gas stations and car washes require a Special Use Permit and noted that special uses must be found to meet specific criteria. She stated that the City Council has not yet taken action on the Plan Commission's recommendation but instead, is awaiting a recommendation from the Board and will consider the recommendations of both bodies at the same time. She reiterated that the Board's purview covers the design aspects of the proposed development including the design of the building, the exterior materials, lighting, landscaping and signage. She stated that the site is adjacent to residential development and as a result, there is some cross over between the use, off site impacts and design aspects of the project. She added that because of the multiple uses proposed on the site; a car wash, gas pumps and retail store, customers will need to move through the site creating the potential for increased impacts to adjacent uses. She stated that the proposed development fully uses the site creating a tight situation. She reviewed that at the meeting in January, the Board stated general support for the use of some synthetic materials on the building, columns and pilasters, due to the commercial nature of the use and the likelihood for moisture on the site as a result of the car wash. She noted that the Board also discussed the roof top mechanicals and the importance of fulling screening the equipment

from views from off the site. She noted that a condition is recommended requiring that if the well and parapet does not fully screen the units, an additional screen wall will be required. She commented that significant landscaping is proposed along the streetscape. She noted that because the site is tight, landscape screening on the east and south sides of the property is proposed on the adjacent properties. She recommended that documentation of how landscaping on the adjacent properties will be implemented, and how those plantings will be maintained and replaced as necessary going forward, be required prior to the issuance of permits for redevelopment of the site. She acknowledged that staff understands that an agreement regarding landscaping may already be in place with the owner of the commercial property to the east. She noted however that staff is not aware of any agreements or discussions to date with the adjacent residential developments about plantings on their properties. She noted that if the approval is based in part on landscape buffering from the adjacent residential development, then assuring that the plantings as proposed are able to occur is key. She stated that the Board is charged with reviewing lighting on the site. She noted that again, because of the adjacency to residential units, and because the business will open early in the morning and stay open into the evening hours, careful consideration of the number, intensity and direction of lighting is important. She stated that a condition is recommended in the staff report requiring that all lights on the site, except for lights required by the Code for security and safety, are turned off after business hours. She also recommended that the detailed lighting plan submitted for permit be reviewed by a lighting consultant hired by the City to verify that the lighting type, color, intensity and fixtures are appropriate to minimize impacts on the adjacent residential properties. She added that the cost of the consultant will be assessed to the petitioner in accordance with the Code. She recommended that consideration be given to lowering the height of the canopy over the gas pumps and extending the length of the skirt around the canopy in an effort to mitigate the off-site impact of the bright lights under the canopy and at the gas pumps. She noted that the plans do not show any lighting on the building but noted that some lighting will be necessary at building entrances and should be shielded and directed down. She acknowledged that the current plan reflects some reduction in signage from the plans presented in January but noted that the proposed signage still exceeds the signage permitted by the Code for a commercial site located on a corner. She pointed out that the two existing gas stations in the community do not have signage on the canopy. She stated that the conditions recommended in the staff report direct that the signage on the site conform to the Code requirements in size and number. She noted that the Board has consistently directed that signage provide identification of a business and not serve as an advertising tool. She noted that multiple signs are proposed on each gas pump detailing the types of fuel and advertising the car wash service. She added that signage is proposed on the two ten-foot tall canopies near the entrance to the car wash. She pointed out that the signage faces east and may be visible from the neighboring residential homes in the Lake Forest Chateau development. She noted that many of the signs proposed on the site are internally illuminated. She stated that most signage approved by the Board is

back or ground lit. She noted that neither of the two gas stations in Lake Forest have electronic price per gallon signs but acknowledged that such a sign may be appropriate at this site, on a State highway. She reiterated that limiting signage and lighting, and understanding whether the proposed landscaping can in fact be accomplished, are critical to determining whether the design aspects of the proposed development will be compatible with the surrounding area. She commented that if landscaping is key to meeting the design standards, then there must be certainty that it can be planted as shown on the plan and maintained on an ongoing basis. She stated that a number of additional conditions are offered in the staff report. She stated that the conditions were carefully crafted in an effort to find a way to, from a design aspect, mitigate the impacts on the neighbors and larger community.

Chairman Notz invited questions from the Board to the petitioner or staff.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Ms. Czerniak stated that her understanding is that an agreement is in place with the owner of the commercial property to the east of the car wash building to allow planting on the neighboring property. She stated that all of the proposed landscaping immediately east of the building will need to be planted on the neighboring property because there is no space for planting on the site. She stated that with respect to plantings proposed to serve as a buffer for the adjacent residential developments to the east and south, limited plantings are proposed on the development site and additional landscaping is proposed on the neighboring residential properties. She stated that to her knowledge, no agreements are in place yet with the residential neighbors to allow planting on the adjacent properties. She stated that she is not sure whether any discussions have taken place yet on this topic. She stated that as previously noted, a ten foot wood fence is proposed around the perimeter of the site. She stated that concerns were raised about the durability of a wood fence given the parking and vehicles using the site and she stated that the acoustical consultants stressed that in order for a wood fence to mitigate sound, there can be no gaps in the fence. She noted that because of these concerns, there is a recommendation in the staff report for a masonry wall, rather than a wood fence, to be constructed along the property line. She stated that it may be appropriate for the wall to be only four to six feet in height with a wood fence extending above it to reach the ten foot height.

Board member Bires complimented the petitioners for coming back with solutions to the issues raised and for making some modifications in response to previous comments raised by Board members and residents.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Patera confirmed stated that the petitioner worked hard to address the issues raised. He stated that the proposed fence will be a durable, solid wood fence with brick piers in keeping with the character of the surrounding residential area. He stated that the fence is intended to provide an appropriate transition between the B-1 property and the neighboring homes. He stated that the intent is to focus significant efforts on

landscaping noting that the trees that are planted will eventually be taller than the fence. He stated that the proposed plantings will blend in with the existing evergreens on Mar Lane to assure year round planting. He stated that eventually, the landscaping will shield all views of the commercial development from the residential properties. He stated that Mariani will be hired to do the plantings to assure that they are of high quality. He stated that the plantings can be adjusted during installations to block particular views but he stated that the landscape requirements cannot be open ended. He stated that any agreement for planting on the neighboring properties needs to be fair and mutual.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Goldman stated that the landscape plan shows what is intended. He stated that he cannot plant on someone else's property without their consent. He stated that plantings on the neighboring properties have been offered since the start of the discussions. He stated that he cannot commit to doing something that is not in his control if the neighbors do not agree.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Patera confirmed that the height of the parking lot lights has been reduced by about two feet by eliminating the concrete base which is not needed because the light poles are protected by a curb. He confirmed that the canopy over the gas pumps was lowered as well. He stated that the number of lights has not changed. He stated that lowering the canopy further could actually generate the need for more lights. He confirmed that although not shown on the plans, there would be minimal safety and security lighting at the building entrances. He pointed out that the car wash will close earlier than the fuel and retail sales and that the lights on the unused portions of the site will be turned off earlier than others.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Goldman stated that there appears to be some confusion about the canopy. He stated that since the last meeting, the height of the canopy was lowered to about 14'6" and a four inch skirt was added around the edge of the canopy. He stated that the skirt around the canopy could be extended but the height of the canopy would need to increase to allow delivery trucks or other large vehicles to pass under it. He stated that perhaps the canopy could be lowered another six inches, to 14 feet. He stated that the lights under the canopy are recessed. With respect to signs, he agreed that rather than internal illumination, the signs can be back lit or halo lit. He stated that the signs will comply with the City Code. He stated that the square footage of the proposed signs has already been reduced which was a compromise on the part of Waterway. He pointed out that there is no longer a sign at the entrance to the car wash which is different from all of their other locations. He stated that they are trying to live up to the uniqueness of the site. He stated that in addition to eliminating some signage, every sign has been reduced in size. He stated that the wall signs facing Waukegan and Everett Roads are needed to identify the business and describe the services offered. He added that the signage on the gas pumps is vital because this location will offer

Waterway fuel and the brand must be identified. He stated that the signage is identification, not advertising.

Board member Reda noted that the staff report recommends 18 conditions of approval. He stated that he has not seen a petition with such a large number of conditions during his time on the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Mr. Goldman confirmed that Waterway has reviewed the conditions and noted concerns about conditions #5 and 6 pertaining to the height of the canopy over the gas pumps as he noted in his earlier comments. He also noted that condition #10 is problematic if the neighbors do not want to enter into an agreement to allow landscaping on their properties. He agreed to set aside a specific amount in the budget for landscaping. He noted that with respect to condition #15, the signage on the canopy at the entrance to the car wash is important for way finding, but stated that they do not need to be lighted.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Mr. Patera noted that in response to earlier comments, the signage on the fuel canopy was moved from the south side of the canopy, to the west side of the canopy, and now faces Waukegan Road. He stated that Waterway would like the opportunity to further discuss the use of the company logo on the signage on the canopy skirt. He confirmed that drop down shields will be attached to all of the parking lot lights that border the residential properties. He confirmed that the windows in the retail building will be a clear, tinted glass and confirmed that there will be visibility through the windows to the interior.

Board member Moyer noted that he was not at the January Board meeting but has reviewed the material. He stated that it was helpful, during the presentation, to see images of what was presented in January, but noted that it would be more helpful if those drawings, and what is now proposed, were shown at the same scale. He noted that in comparing the canopy, before and after, because of the difference in scale, there is a deception perhaps making the current image appear miniaturized when in reality, it was only reduced in size one foot. He stated that the canopy itself is 3'6" in both cases. He noted that the drawing implies that the canopy got a lot smaller, which is not the case.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Goldman confirmed that if the skirt around the canopy is extended, the entire canopy will need to be raised.

Mr. Patera added that the lower portion of the canopy was brought down to 14'6" and the skirt added to limit the ability to see the lights under the canopy. He stated that it was the petitioner's understanding that the height at the top of the canopy was less of a concern.

Board member Moyer stated that it would be helpful to see the structural design of the canopy noting that the greatest depth is needed near the supporting piers, but a narrower depth may be workable at the edge. He stated that he understands that Waterway may have a standard drawing on which canopies are based but noted that the standard structure of the canopy may not be a good fit for Lake Forest. He stated that he is interested in seeing how the canopy is framed to understand the need for the proposed depth noting that the depth should be able to go zero. He suggested that consideration be given to tapering the roof of the canopy. He stated that there may be real potential to increase the shielding of the lights without raising the height of the canopy.

In response to Board member Moyer's comments, Mr. Patera stated that he is intrigued by the concept of reducing the depth of the canopy and suggested that Waterway would need to consult their structural advisors.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Patera explained that information on how the grade change on the site will be addressed was presented to the Plan Commission. He acknowledged that the south portion of the property is currently lower than the northern portion and noted that the grade of the site will need to meet the grades at Waukegan and Everett Roads because of the driveway entrances and will be leveled out to meet the existing grades at all four corners. He stated that no retaining walls are planned noting that a final grading plan has not yet been developed pending approval of the project. He stated however that the car wash building needs to be on a level grade. He added that the Plan Commission saw a preliminary drainage plan.

Board member Moyer noted that understanding the grades at various points on the site is important to understand the visual impact of landscaping and lighting. He stated that presently, that information is not available to the Board.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the Plan Commission reviewed a preliminary grading and drainage plan and stated that no issues were identified from the Commission's perspective.

In response to questions from Mr. Moyer, Mr. Patera acknowledged that as proposed, the signage exceeds what is allowed by Code. He stated that Waterway representatives are agreeable to adhering to the signage regulations in the City Code.

Chairman Notz shared the appreciation expressed by other Board members for the great strides made by the petitioners since the January meeting.

In response to a question from Chairman Notz, Mr. Patera stated that a minimum clearance of 14 -1/2 feet is needed under the canopy over the fuel islands. He confirmed that the west side of the canopy is higher because of the grade as it approaches Waukegan Road. He stated that consideration was given to recessing the lights into the canopy but noted that a high illumination level is needed for customers and recessed lighting would reduce the amount of light

under the canopy. He stated that the intent of the skirt around the canopy is to screen views of the lights from outside of the canopy, but not diminish the intensity of light needed for the customers fueling their cars.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Goldman stated that the decking of the canopy is very thin and as a result, the lights are flush mounted under the canopy, rather than recessed, but noted that the light source itself is recessed into the canopy. He stated that there are no drop down light fixtures. He stated that state of the art LED lights will be used. He explained that the flush mounted lights are intended to broadly light the area under the canopy and the focus fixtures are intended to specifically light the pumps. With respect to the automatic doors, he stated his expectation that the doors will be closed more often than they are open. He stated that replacing the proposed perimeter wood fence with a half masonry and half wood fence would be difficult.

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

Joanne Desmond, 1681 Yale Court, stated appreciation for the questions asked by the Board members. She stated that the residents overwhelmingly object to the proposed carwash and gas station. She questioned whether the light and noise can be mitigated sufficiently to avoid negative impacts to the community. She asked the Board to seriously look at how to mitigate the impacts on neighbors.

Wally Wade, 1028 Mar Lane, stated that he lives directly east of the proposed development. He noted the recent concern voiced by the Mayor about noise from leaf blowers and noted that the proposed Waterway project will have noise impacts on an ongoing basis on the neighbors. He stated that the proposed board on board fence is architecturally inconsistent with the site and neighborhood. He stated that a brick wall, consistent with the wall proposed around the trash enclosure, should be constructed around the east and south perimeter of the site. He stated that the wall should be similar to the wall along Everett Road for the Lake Forest Chateau development. He asked the Board to grant the neighbors peace and quiet by requiring a ten-foot brick wall around the site.

Dave Carlson, 1566 Conway Road, stated that he lives a mile north and west of the site. He noted that trees at the northwest corner of the property limit views for cars and pedestrians. He stated that a right turn lane from westbound Everett Road, to northbound Waukegan Road, is desperately needed. He asked the Board to consider taking four feet of property from the Rectory and five or six feet from the property that is proposed for development to provide the opportunity for future improvements to the intersection.

Mary Ann Redding, 1521 Kathryn Lane, Evergreen Subdivision, stated that she is the secretary of the Homeowners' Association and noted that the HOA looks at

homes in their neighborhood to assure design compatibility noting that some designs, such as a log home, would not be appropriate for the neighborhood. She stated that the proposed car wash is practically in her back yard and is not compatible with the area. She noted that the windows proposed in the development are floor to ceiling, and most windows in the area are divided into panes. She noted that the building is not set back from the street and questioned what would be displayed in or taped to the windows. She stated that the residents do not want a car wash in this neighborhood. She stated that the lighting will be bright and not consistent with quaint feel of Lake Forest. She noted that at the corner of Route 60 and Waukegan Road, there is a beautiful church, Christ Church, which is a landmark. She stated that it would be wonderful to have a beautiful building at the south entrance to this area as well. She suggested that a better location for the car wash would be next to Mariano's in Bannockburn. She stated that Lake Forest has a triple A bond rating, is located on one of the five great lakes, has a world class beach front, is located 35 minutes from the beautiful city of Chicago and only 22 minutes from O'Hare airport. She stated that Lake Forest is a special City and commented that in her opinion, allowing the car wash is an injustice and is not compatible with the architectural character of Lake Forest.

Richard Sugar, 1059 Mar Lane, stated that he lives just east of the proposed project. He thanked the Board members for their work acknowledging the difficulty in considering a project that is so fundamentally inconsistent with and unsuitable for the neighborhood. He noted that the project will add to traffic congestion in the area, will result in a building that cannot easily be repurposed, lower property values, interfere with the welfare and quality of life of those in the area and is contrary to the master plan and sustainability plan. He noted that buildings in the area are two stories noting that the proposed one-story building is inconsistent with the architectural character of the area. He stated that the recently approved Chase Bank building was required to be a two story building. He questioned why the Waterway building is not also required to be two stories. He stated that he is surprised to hear that the petitioner plans to reduce impacts on the neighboring properties by plantings on those properties. He stated that in the 2-1/2 years this project has been under discussion, Waterway representatives have never reached out to the neighbors to discuss landscaping. He suggested that is a bad omen raising questions about how willing the developer will be to resolve issues that may come up in the future. He questioned whether Waterway will be a good neighbor.

Robert Stone, 1167 Harlan Court, stated that he has been a Lake Forest resident for 13 years and a commercial real estate broker and developer for 50 years. He stated that he has serious safety concerns due to the design of the site. He questioned whether the proposed parking layout and on site circulation are workable. He noted that customers who park in some areas of the site will need to walk through rows of cars, lined up to enter the car wash, to get to the retail store. He expressed a concern about cars entering the site from Everett Road noting that they will need to make a sharp right turn to move through the site and

in doing so, will meet other cars coming from the other direction. He stated that there will be significant traffic congestion on the site as well as at the entrances and exits.

Edward Sachs, 1168 Lynette Drive, stated that landscaping takes care and money. He stated that the proposed site is a gateway to the community adding that a Special Use Permit is a privilege. He stated that the proposed development requires the City to give up a lot with respect to landscaping, the streetscape, and setbacks, in addition to many other issues. He asked the Board to reaffirm the gateway concept by assuring that the streetscape and landscaping in the area are of high quality. He stated his appreciation for the work of the Board.

Mary O'Donnell, 1184 Lynette Drive, Colony Square, stated that she lives in a charming townhome community, with picturesque landscaping that has been nurtured and reflects the investment made by the residents. She stated that her neighborhood landscaping contributes to the larger community and supports property values. She stated that what is proposed is an industrial scale, heavy traffic project at the gateway to Lake Forest. She stated that the gateway needs to be visually welcoming, like her development, noting that all must share in this obligation. She stated that the proposed project is an uninvited guest in the community. She stated that as a Special Use Permit, the development must concede to its neighbors and the community. She stated that developers want to over reach by their nature noting that profits can come at the expense of the community. She stated that the Board's role is critical at this eleventh hour of the project. She stated that if the project moves forward, the neighborhood and Lake Forest are due a landscaping master piece starting with a 15 foot garden setback from the sidewalk and a similar barrier to the south and east. She noted that the site plan shows a building abutting the office parcel to the east. She stated that plantings will be need to provide a sound and light barrier. She stated that a proven landscaper should be required, one who knows the community. She suggested that the noise consultant hired by the neighbors should confer with the landscaper. She added that Waterway should be obligated by ordinance or contract to replace dead or failing plant material and should be required to do ongoing maintenance of the landscaping. She complimented the Board for the questioned asked.

Rudy Schwartz, 1036 Mar Lane Drive, stated that he lives on the pie-shaped property located 10 to 20 feet away from the proposed car wash. He stated that he has some arbor vitae on his property, but will likely still see the car wash from his house. He stated that he is trying to sell his property because of health issues noting that the real estate broker told him that every time a potential buyer hears about the car wash, they leave. He stated that after he bought the property, he put money into it and will never get it out of the property. He stated that if the car wash is built, he will have to rent the property because the car wash will be near the bedroom window. He stated that he knew the property would develop with a commercial use, but not a car wash. He stated that today, the streets are quiet

and the neighbors are nice. He stated that sometimes traffic comes thru the neighborhood and impacts people walking on the street and stated that this will get worse with the proposed development.

Pamela Burke, 1154 Lynette Drive, Colony Square, stated concerns about the canopy over the gas pumps. She stated that it is flat noting that other gas stations have gable roofs over the gas pumps. She stated that a different roof might be less of an eyesore. She noted that the canopy in Northbrook is unsightly and very bright. She asked that close attention be paid to the intensity of the lights on the site. She stated that she has sympathy for the neighbors who live immediately south of the gas station.

Jim Monroe, 1030 Mar Lane, asked whether an asbestos study has been done of the existing building and asked that it be shared with the public.

David Cass, 1045 Mar Lane, stated that there are a lot of open issues. He noted that at the Northbrook site, the gas pumps and building are set back a considerable distance from Waukegan Road. He stated that the proposed development is large for this site. He added that at the Northbrook site, the vacuum stations are set back from the road and he observed about 15 cars in the stations. He stated that in this plan, the vacuum and drying stations are right off of Everett Road, near Waukegan Road. He stated that as cars leave the site, water will drip on to those roads. He stated that he observed that at the Northbrook site, the exit door from the tunnel never closes. He encouraged the Board members to go to the Northbrook location and determine whether that development will fit on the site in Lake Forest.

Jill Kaz, 1045 Mar Lane, stated that the proposed development will impact Everett Road, the Church and the school. She stated that traffic is already a problem in the area and adding a use that will increase the traffic is concerning. She stated that headlight impacts on homes near the Northbrook site has been an issue. She noted that at this location, headlights will shine into the Rectory as cars are exiting the car wash.

Lisa Manfield, 701 Old Elm Road, stated that the previous gas station and convenience store at the site were small. She stated a concern about safety as cars exit the site on to Everett Road noting the impact on people in the Evergreen Subdivision and beyond. She stated that there is already traffic and pedestrians from the two schools in the area particularly when students arrive at school and leave. She asked what help the City will offer to students trying to cross the streets in the area. She noted the impact of the railroad crossing in the area. She added that on the site, people will need to walk across the parking lot to get to various parts of the site. She questioned the design of the site and the access points.

David Weinsten, 1111 S. Waukegan Road, stated that the windows and design of the building make it appear as a diner.

Dave Heckert, resident, stated that he grew up in Northbrook and traveled frequently through Lake Forest and today, he is a resident because he always liked the community. He stated that the area has developed reasonably. He noted that McDonald's was designed to fit the standards of the community and had low profile advertising. He stated that when he moved to the area, he knew that the site could be redeveloped with a gas station, but not a mega car wash and stated that he is offended by the phrase, "buyer beware". He asked the Board to maintain the high standards for reasonable development. He stated that not one more sign should be permitted than allowed by the Code. He stated that no advertising signs should be allowed in the windows and a 10-foot wall should be built, in keeping with the character of buildings in the area. He stated that the landscaping should be first class. He stated that there should be a streetlight at Franz Drive and Waukegan Road with the same decorative look as other streetlights. He stated that he is concerned about Waterway being a good neighbor adding that they have not reached out to neighbors yet to talk about the project. He stated that in his opinion, this area will not have enough traffic to support the proposed business. He stated that the business will make the neighbors' lives miserable and will lower property values.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Notz invited the petitioner to respond to public testimony.

Mr. Patera stated that throughout the process, the petitioners have worked hard to accommodate the public comments. He stated that efforts were made to allow the proposed development to fit into the gateway area. He stated that the petitioners are aware that the density of landscaping is an important element. He stated that the traffic and circulation has been studied by the engineers and works. He stated that continued attention can be given to the landscape plan noting that what is proposed is not at great odds with the surrounding area.

Mr. Goldman stated that it would not be helpful at this point to respond to every single question raised. He noted however that the developer has hosted several neighborhood meetings and has taken what was learned and made the project better. He said that they appreciate the comments of the neighbors.

Chairman Notz invited a staff response to public comment.

Ms. Czerniak confirmed that traffic studies were completed by the petitioner, reviewed by the City Engineer, and presented to the Plan Commission. She confirmed that IDOT has preliminarily reviewed and approved the plans but noted that IDOT has not yet given any final approvals. She stated that final engineering plans have not yet been completed, awaiting final approval of the use, adding that final plans will require approval by IDOT before any permits are issued to allow construction to start. She stated that she is not aware of any discussion about, or plans to provide a crossing guard for school children at the Waukegan and Everett Road intersection. She noted that some lane improvements are planned at the intersection as part of a previously approved

project. She noted that a request for approval of the demolition of the existing building is part of the request before the Board. She stated that the building is interesting, and has an interesting history, but noted that the demolition request appears to meet the applicable criteria. She confirmed that as required prior to the demolition of any building, an asbestos assessment of the building must be completed along with remediation of any asbestos found. She stated that before a demolition permit can be issued by the City, a certificate will need to be submitted to document that all asbestos in the building, if there is any, has been remediated in accordance with applicable regulations. She confirmed that any underground storage tanks that may remain on the site will also need to be removed in accordance with applicable regulations. She confirmed that a condition recommended by the Plan Commission requires the automatic doors at the entrance and exit to the car wash tunnel to close between each car, any time the blower is on. She stated that the City Council has not yet taken final action on the petition, but noted that the condition is in the recommendation before the Council. She noted the careful consideration by this Board and the community of the McDonald's site and building, and more recently, the Chase Bank project. She noted that Chase Bank's original plan for the building was not approved, a different architect was brought in, and ultimately, a building design consistent with other buildings in the area, constructed of high quality materials and adaptable for future uses, was approved. She noted that at least one of the other gas stations in the community does not have a flat roofed canopy. She stated that routinely, the Board requires landscaping to screen new construction, even an addition to a house where appropriate. She stated that the landscaping is planted on the property on which the project is occurring noting that it is a unique situation where landscape screening is proposed to be planted on neighboring properties to achieve the desired screening. She stated that she is unsure how plantings on neighboring properties would be assured and then on an ongoing basis, maintained and replaced as needed. She stated that the troubling aspect is that there is not sufficient space on the property for plantings to provide the desired screening for the adjacent uses. She stated that no signage is permitted beyond what is approved by the Board. She stated that the Board most often approves signs constructed of natural materials, but on occasion, has approved synthetic materials for letters for durability. She noted however that the materials proposed for the signs is not clearly indicated on the plans at this time. She noted that there are no signs on the canopies of the existing gas stations in the community. She noted that the petitioner commented on the importance of identifying the brand of gasoline on the canopy over the fuel pumps adding however that it is identified on signage proposed at 10 locations on the gas pumps. She stated that with respect to the canopy over the entrance kiosks for the car wash, the proposed signs are located about 10 feet above the ground and face east, toward the residential development. She stated that normally, directional signs are located at a much lower level. She stated that the design aspects of the proposed project overall will have a great deal to do with whether or not the development is compatible with the surrounding development and overall community.

Chairman Notz invited final comments from the Board.

Board member Moyer reiterated that the Board's purview is design. He noted that architect, Louis Sullivan advised, "always think of the next larger context". He stated that good design is not limited to what happens between the property lines. He commented that the petitioner has made a good faith effort to recall the features of the commercial district to the north in the building façade, treatment of the building rooflines and the volumes. He stated that overall, the proposed building has a character similar to the character of other buildings in the district. He noted however, that at the same time, he is not satisfied. He stated that he will go to the Northbrook site and try to watch, listen and visualize the proposed business more fully at the Lake Forest site. He stated that further exploration is needed. He stated that the gateway issue, this site as an entrance to the business district, is part of the larger context that comes with the design for the site. He acknowledged that the proposed landscape plan is showing some commendable features however, the need to plant on an adjacent property is not something the Board has seen before. He stated that necessity speaks to the fact that the site plan needs further development. He stated that with respect to the traffic flow, the northbound entrance works nicely however, approaching the site from the west, north or east is problematic. He noted that both the traffic and landscaping speak to the fact that the site is restricted and that the features of the site plan are being not being driven by the creativity of the designers, but instead, by the limitations of the site. He stated however, he is willing to keep an open mind and consider further refinements.

Board member Reda noted that every time a new development is proposed in Lake Forest, there is objection from the neighbors. He noted that to some extent the community can control what happens on a property. He noted that from the Board's perspective, the focus must be on the architecture and the site design, not the proposed use. He stated that issues such as traffic, use and safety are not under the Board's purview. He acknowledged that a small number of issues remain for the Board to discuss and involve looking at the site plan, elevations and the applicable criteria. He stated that in his opinion, the single story building is appropriate. He stated that the issue of landscaping is a concern noting that he would like to see a commitment on a budget for landscaping on the neighboring properties. He noted however that at this point, it is not known whether the neighbors are agreeable to landscaping on their properties but stated his hope that the neighbors are open to the idea. He stated that the criteria require the Board to consider the type, color and texture of exterior materials and lighting among other items noting that in his opinion, those aspects appear to meet the criteria. He stated that it is clear that the neighbors do not want the proposed development but noted that the property is zoned for commercial use. He stated that he feels sorry for the neighbors but noted that sympathy cannot be a basis for the Board's decision. He stated that some of the issues raised are neighbor versus neighbor issues adding that in his opinion, the developer has done a great deal to accommodate the neighbors' concerns. He reiterated that the property is zoned for commercial use, used to be developed

with a gas station, and the proposed use was supported by the Plan Commission. He stated that he supports the proposed development.

Board member Bires stated that the property is an interesting and challenging piece of land noting that is likely why it has been vacant for a while. He applauded the petitioner for the progress made since the last meeting in an effort to respond to the issues raised. He stated that the neighbors have some very legitimate concerns, some within the Board's purview, and others not. He noted that there is a list of contingencies recommended by staff that will need to be addressed if the project moves forward. He stated that he feels strongly that some aspects of the project need to be detailed more fully such as how the landscaping is going to occur and the fact that only signage as approved by the Board will be allowed, no window advertising signs. He stated that although traffic is outside of the Board's purview, the site itself and the driveway aprons are not. He stated that he travels through the area frequently and is aware of the wait times at the intersection at times. He stated that he would like to think further about the signage noting that in his opinion, the signage should be consistent with signage at the other local gas stations. He stated that grading issues on the site will also need to be addressed.

Chairman Notz applauded the petitioner, adding that in spite of his personal opinions on the project, the developer has gone to extraordinary lengths to meet the concerns of a group that is vocal and in opposition to the project. He stated that the petitioner has gone to extensive lengths to minimize the impacts an active commercial site will have on the residential neighbors. He stated that given the proposed use, in his opinion, the petitioner has done as much as is reasonable and stated that he supports the petition. Hearing no further comments, he invited a motion.

Board member Reda made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the existing structure located on the property based on the findings presented in the staff report.

The motion was seconded by Chairman Notz and was approved by a vote of 3 to 1 with Board member Moyer voting nay.

Board member Reda made a motion to recommend approval of the design aspects of the proposed Waterway Car Wash and Gas Station subject to the 18 conditions recommended in the staff report and subject to additional conditions to address the issues discussed by the Board including: establishing a fixed budget for landscaping on the neighboring properties and ongoing maintenance of that landscaping to provide for adequate screening for the neighbors to the east and south, screening of roof top mechanical equipment from all views from the neighboring properties, addressing the lighting and signage, City Engineer approval of the grading plan, a prohibition on advertising signs in the windows and other standard conditions including a plan for staging and parking during construction.

Board member Bires stated that some items were discussed that will require enhancement of the conditions recommended by staff noting that for instance, some changes to the signage as now proposed was discussed.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that based on the Board's discussion, the signage will require some modification in order to comply with the applicable Code provisions. She confirmed that the project will not proceed without final approval from IDOT.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Board member Reda explained that his intent is that the City and the developer will agree on an adequate amount of money that will need to be budgeted, set aside, for plantings on neighboring properties in order to achieve the desired screening. He acknowledged that the plantings cannot be assured unless the neighbors agree, but stated that he wants to be sure that adequate funds are set aside.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Czerniak stated that mitigating the impact of the proposed development on the residential neighbors has been a key discussion point throughout the process. She clarified that landscape screening is normally required on the property that is being developed which is not the case for this development. She stated that whether or not the plantings actually occur is out of the petitioner's control. She noted that the staff report recommends that some portion of the proposed 10-foot perimeter fence, be masonry construction adjacent to the residential neighbors for durability.

Board member Reda reaffirmed that his motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Until demolition occurs, the building must remain secure and maintained in a manner consistent with the Code requirements pertaining to vacant and distressed buildings.
2. In the plans submitted for permit, the building elevations shall be detailed with dimensions to document the building foot print, the setback of the side elements from the main mass on the front elevation, and the height of the various roof forms.
3. In the plans submitted for permit, details shall be provided on the number, location and height of all roof top mechanical equipment components. Sightline studies shall be required demonstrating that the roof top mechanicals are not visible from off of the site including, but not limited to, from the second floor of the residential condominiums to the south.
4. The east elevation of the building shall be detailed in a simple manner to provide some relief from the expansive, unbroken brick wall.

5. Further study shall be conducted to demonstrate the degree to which the canopy can be lowered. A clearance, from the bottom of the skirt around the canopy of no more than 14 feet is desirable unless documentation is submitted confirming that the desired height is not workable.
6. The skirt around the edge of the canopy shall extend a minimum of 12 inches below the ceiling of the canopy to minimize views to and glare from the recessed lights under the canopy given the intensity of light that will occur in this area.
7. Brick and stone veneer on the building façade shall be a minimum of four inches thick and shall be installed on site.
8. Windows shall allow for views of the retail activity inside the building rather than be tinted dark. Consistent with the signage regulations, the windows must remain free from signs affixed to the glass.
9. Streetscape vegetation of varying heights, with seasonal variety, shall be reflected on the final landscape plan subject to the review and approval of the City's Certified Arborist. Sightlines for vehicles and pedestrians shall be kept clear at the ingress and egress points to the site.
10. A 10-foot tall constructed barrier shall be erected along the east and south sides of the property. The lower portion of the barrier located adjacent to the neighboring residential development, shall be masonry construction to a height of four to six feet.
11. At the time plans are submitted for permit, agreements, a budget and an implementation plan for plantings on the neighboring properties, as reflected on the landscape, shall be provided and will be subject to review and approval by the City Attorney. The documents and budget shall also provide for ongoing maintenance of the plantings and replacement of dead or diseased vegetation on an ongoing basis. Funding for plantings on the neighboring properties shall be set aside prior to the issuance of a building permit in a manner determined to be appropriate by the City Attorney.
12. Detail shall be provided in the final engineering plans on the hardscape treatment planned for the areas where the public sidewalk crosses the entrance and exit driveways.
13. A detailed lighting plan shall be included in the submittal for a building permit and will be subject to review and approval by a lighting consultant hired by the City, the cost of which shall be borne by the petitioner in accordance with the Code. The consultant shall review the plan to verify compliance with the following:

- a. The site lighting shall meet, but not exceed, the *minimum* safety requirements for the uses approved for the site.
 - b. Light color, temperature, foot candles and overall intensity shall be specified to minimize glare, hotspots and off site impacts.
 - c. All lights shall be horizontal to the ground with drop down shields and louvers to mitigate off site impacts.
 - d. Lights on the building and under the canopy shall be fully recessed into a soffit or structure.
 - e. The skirt around the fuel island canopy shall not be lighted.
14. The monument sign shall conform to the Code regulations which allow a two-sided monument sign of up to 24 square feet. The sign, with the exception of the electronic price per gallon component, shall be halo/backlit or illuminated with ground lighting. The graphic shall not exceed 15 percent of the total sign.
15. Wall signage, including the graphic, on the west and north facing facades shall conform to the number and size permitted in the Code.
16. Signage on the skirt of the fuel canopy and on the canopies above the pay stations for the car wash shall be prohibited.
17. Signs may be illuminated only with halo lighting, backlighting or, in the case of the monument sign, ground lighting. Internal illumination shall be permitted for the electronic price per gallon sign only. No lighting of signage is permitted under the canopy given the illumination that will be provided by the recessed canopy lights.
18. All signage shall be located to prevent views of the signs from the residential properties to the east and south with the exception of safety and security signs that may be required by the Code or public safety personnel.
19. A lighting reduction plan shall be included in the submittal for a building permit and will be subject to review and approval by City staff to confirm that after the close of business, all site lighting, to include signage lighting, is turned off with the exception of lighting required by Code or public safety personnel for safety and security.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bires and was approved by a vote of 3 to 1 with Board member Moyer voting nay for the reasons he previously stated.

Ms. Czerniak stated that tentatively, this matter is expected to be on the July 2nd City Council agenda for final consideration. She stated that it will not be on the Council agenda prior to that date. She encouraged interested parties to check the City's website to confirm the meeting date.

**4. Consideration of a request for a building scale variance to allow the addition of a three-season room at the rear of the residence at 690 Oakwood Avenue.
Owners: John and Cindy Simons
Representative: Jonathan Clair, architect**

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. Clair introduced the petition stating that the house was recently built to the full square footage permitted by the Code. He noted that the house used up the design element bonus as well as the generally allowable square footage. He reviewed images of the neighboring homes and the home itself identifying the location for the proposed screen porch. He stated that given the constraints of the lot, the options for locating a screen porch are limited. He stated that ample screening exists on the property noting the Arborvitae along the property lines with a year or two of growth. He noted the large Cottonwood tree at the rear of the property noting that care was taken to preserve the tree during the construction of the house. He stated that he met with the City's Certified Arborist to discuss foundation options for the screen porch that would not negatively impact the tree. He stated that the screen porch as proposed will be built on a slab. He stated that the porch will be a three season room and will not be heated or insulated. He stated that 16 screen storm doors will be installed. He described the roof form noting that a hip roof was initially considered; but there were some complications, so other options were explored. He stated that a low profile hip roof would have a squatty pitch. He noted that a shed roof off the bottom of the windows above would also have an extremely shallow pitch. He stated that as proposed, the roof pitch matches the existing house with a hip to allow an exposed ceiling. He noted that the intent is to avoid the look of a flat roof to help diminish the appearance of mass on the rear elevation. He reviewed the exterior materials noting that they include: asphalt shingles, wood trim and aluminum gutters all to match the existing house. He demonstrated how the screens and the storm windows will work noting that the screens roll up and disappear.

Ms. Czerniak noted that a building scale variance is requested because, as noted, the house was recently built to the maximum square footage allowed. She stated that normally, the Board has not supported building scale variances for new homes. She noted however that the request appears to meet the criteria given the fact that the proposed addition is only minimally visible from off the site and not visible from the streetscape. She confirmed that great efforts were made to preserve and protect the tree during construction of the house and stated that great care should continue to be exercised with any further construction on the site. She asked for Board input on the proposed roof form acknowledging that various forms were studied.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Claire, stated there is a six foot stockade fence and landscaping around the property. He stated that no

exterior lighting is proposed. He stated that the windows are single hung panels with no grilles.

In response to questions from Board member Reda, Mr. Clair described the framing of the windows noting that the frames will be butted into headers and footers. He confirmed that the porch will not be heated or air conditioned. He stated that the rear facing gable defines the entrance to the space in a sea of glass, adds symmetry and breaks down the mass. He stated that as a designer, he feels that the rear facing gable is appropriate. He reviewed the side elevations noting that the gable steps back from the side walls. He described the saddle proposed on the roof noting that it is necessary to allow water to drain from where the hip roof element completes itself.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Clair stated that he is not attempting to create more interior space with the rear facing gable.

Board member Moyer commented that the rear facing gable, in his opinion, helps to break down the scale of the big block of the house. He complimented the beautifully maintained property and stated support for the variance as requested.

Chairman Notz noted that with the proposed addition, the house will be over the allowable square footage by 13 percent. He suggested that to minimize the appearance of mass, a flat or minimally pitched roof should be considered. He stated that an alternate roof form could look much cleaner noting that the house is very simple house. He stated that as proposed, the three season room complicates the structure. He stated support for the addition overall with further exploration of roof forms.

In response to questions from Board member Notz, Mr. Clair explained that the pitched roof allows space for a ceiling fan. He noted that to accommodate a flat roof, the roof would need to be raised up about a foot to allow for a ceiling fan in the space.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, in invited public testimony. Hearing none, he invited final questions or comments from the Board.

Board member Reda stated that he is sympathetic to the desire for the three season room and supports the additional square footage, but expressed concern about the roof form noting that the current solution appears geared to meeting interior needs.

Board member Moyer observed that the slope of the roof as proposed differs from the roof on the front porch. He stated that it could be useful to explore matching the roof of the front porch, rather than the roof of the main house. He noted that approach would be a mid-point between what is proposed and moving to a flat roof. He commented that the interior volume is nice for the

owners as they move from the house to the porch and gives the porch a sense of destination. He commented that the scheme as presented may prove to be the better option.

Chairman Notz commented that in his opinion, the roof pitches of the front and rear porches do not need to match adding that a ceiling fan could be accommodated by having the ridge of the roof run east and west. He noted that given the Board discussion, continuation of the petition would be appropriate to allow further study. He noted that the Board appears to be supportive of the requested building scale variance. He invited a motion.

Board member Reda made a motion to continue the petition to allow the architect to explore and further detail options for the roof form.

The motion was seconded by Board member Moyer and approved by the Board by a vote of 4 to 0.

**5. Consideration of a request for approval of a duplex, 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**

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. Streightiff introduced the petition noting that a new duplex residence is proposed on property located on the southeast corner Scott Street and McKinley Road. He presented the tentative plat of re-subdivision to the Commission. He stated that the proposed structure will conform to square foot requirements in the Code. He noted that various architectural styles are present in the area. He presented images of the property and the surrounding area.

Joe Weidenhamer, property owner, reviewed the history of the property noting that it was in the ownership of a single family for decades until he recently purchased the property. He stated his hope that the property redevelopment will help to revitalize Scott Street, increase property values and create a buffer between McKinley Road and the single family home neighborhood to the east. He stated that his intent is to create a unique and upscale development along the McKinley Road corridor. He stated the intent to create two single family, attached homes in the French Country style with quality building materials. He stated that since the project was announced, he has been approached by residents looking to downsize.

Mr. Streightiff stated that the design was developed to be consistent with the neighborhood. He reviewed each elevation and presented a streetscape

image. He reviewed the proposed building materials. He stated that a board on board fence is proposed around the perimeter of the site.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Streightiff reviewed the floor plans and discussed the relationship of spaces and the limitations of the site. He agreed to explore some of the spatial relationships further, based on the Board's comments.

Ms. Czerniak noted that the previous small house on the site was demolished shortly after the property was purchased by the current owner due to health and life safety issues. She noted that the property is in a transitional area and asked for Board input on the formality of the design in relation to other homes in the area.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Streightiff described the driveway material noting that the owner would like to use gravel in areas away from the streetscape.

The Board expressed overall support for the project with encouragement to continue refining some of the spatial relationships inside the two units.

Chairman Notz noted that no members of the public were in attendance to speak on the petition. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he invited a motion from the Board.

Board member Reda made a motion to recommend approval of the residential duplex as proposed subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. True cement stucco shall be used, stone veneer shall be a minimum of four inches thick and shall be installed on site, and synthetic, imitation roof products shall not be used.
2. The plans should be modified to respond to comments and direction from the Board. Fully detailed construction drawings shall be submitted for permit reflecting the modifications directed by the Board and any changes made as a result of final design development. 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.
4. The final landscape plan shall be subject to review and approval by the City Arborist. Diversity in plantings 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. On street parking is limited to two vehicles, away from the intersection on Scott Street. No construction vehicle parking is permitted on McKinley Road. Daily parking permits can be obtained for parking in the public lot directly across the street.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bires and was approved by a vote of 4 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 from staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Czerniak
Director of Community Development