

The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of April 3, 2019 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, April 3, 2019 at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois

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

Building Review Board members absent: James Sykora

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development and Jennifer Baehr, Assistant Planner

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 March 12, 2019 meeting of the Building Review Board.

The minutes of the March 12, 2019 meeting were approved with one correction as requested by Board member Walther.

3. Consideration of a request for approval of storefront alterations, updated signage and lighting, and landscape enhancements at Westwood Center, 950 N. Western Avenue.

Owner: Westwood Square LLC (Todd Altounian 25%, Nicole Altounian 25%, Jennifer Bianchi 25%, James Altounian II 25%)

Representative: Peter Witmer, architect

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

Mr. Witmer explained that the existing building was built in the 1980's as a mixed-used commercial building with underground parking. He stated that the building is a combination of two-story and one-story masses. He added that the existing building features an applied mansard roof element and quoin detailing around the windows and at the corners. He explained that the building is steel frame construction which will allow the exterior facade to be removed and replaced while keeping the underlying structure intact. He stated that the façade materials on the front elevation, along

Western Avenue, and around the north and south corners of the building, will be removed. He stated that the new exterior will be comprised of a Chicago common brick with limestone window headers and sills. He added that the remaining brick will be painted off-white. He explained that a small bump-out is proposed on the north side of the building to accommodate a reconfigured stairwell and second floor lobby. He added that reconfiguration will provide natural light into the lobby and stairway and will add interest to the north elevation. He added that no other footprint changes to the building are proposed. He stated that some reconfiguration of the window openings to update and enhance the building. He explained that by enlarging the windows and increasing the height courtyard entry above the current eight and a half feet, the overall scale and proportions of the building will be improved. He stated that the mansard roof will be removed and the existing parapet wall raised to maintain the existing screening of the mechanical equipment on the roof. He stated that steel awnings are proposed above the storefronts along Western Avenue adding that the steel awnings will wrap around the building to the south to provide interest on that elevation from the streetscape. He stated that enhanced landscaping is planned around the building. He pointed out that the current entrances to the storefront spaces along Western Avenue will be removed with all entrances coming off of the courtyard. He stated that this change will provide more opportunity for foundation plantings along Western Avenue. He stated that as recommended by City staff, the existing arborvitae will remain to buffer the patio from the parking lot. He stated that the trellis in the patio area will be removed. He reviewed the proposed signage noting that individual metal letters are proposed on the awnings, above the storefront, with illumination around the edges of the letters. He stated that the names of tenants located internal to building will be displayed on metal plaques on either side of the courtyard entry fronting on Western Avenue. He added that the new sushi restaurant in the space on the north side of the property will essentially replicate the previous signage for that space. He noted that the exterior of that space was recently upgraded and will remain unchanged. He stated that new exterior light fixtures which direct light down and up, rather than out, are proposed around the building.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that significant upgrades and alterations are proposed for the building by the new owners. She stated that the intent is to recreate the building in a manner that relates more closely to other buildings in the Central Business District. She stated that the changes proposed to the exterior of the building include the application of high quality materials, consistent with the City's design standards and appropriate for a commercial building. She noted that the text on the two proposed directory sign boards on either side of the entrance to the courtyard is proposed at six inches in height, quite large for a directory type sign. For comparison she noted that normally four to five inch letters are used for signage on the awning valances. She requested Board input on this element of the petition.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Witmer explained that there is approximately 14 feet between the south wall of the building and the retaining wall on the south property line. He confirmed that there is sufficient space for limited foundation landscaping adjacent to the alley. He confirmed that a bollard may need

to be installed so that vehicles using the alley do not hit the metal awning at the southeast corner of the building. He noted that between the parking under the building, the surface parking lot on the site and the public on-street parking, there is sufficient parking available. He added that employees and valet parking can utilize the public parking lots on the east side of the railroad tracks noting that those lots are not used in the evening or on the weekend.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Witmer stated that the existing parapet wall is almost flush with the roof with the mansard element rising above it about 30 inches. He stated that the parapet wall will be raised about 30 inches to provide the same level of screening of roof top mechanicals that exists today. He stated that the window frames and metal awnings will be black and confirmed that the metal awnings are level, not canted. He stated that the public sidewalk adjacent to the building will remain adding that as needed, it will be replaced. He noted that the dumpsters are located in alcoves located around the building. He stated that the exhaust for the restaurants will be on the roof.

In response to questions from Board member Moyer, Mr. Witmer confirmed that most of the below grade space is configured for parking with the exception of small storage spaces and the area that will be used for the grease containment system. He stated that signage to identify the underground parking is not currently proposed, but agreed it could be helpful.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Witmer stated that the new windows around the building will be clear glass. He added that the directory signs will be illuminated only by light fixtures mounted to the exterior wall of the building.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Witmer explained that the proposed exterior light fixtures will direct light up and down, on to the building. He confirmed that the mansard roof will be removed and that the parapet wall will be raised on the east facing façade of the building, wrapping a short distance around the corners of the building. He acknowledged that the mechanical equipment on the roof will be visible from some vantage points as it is today. He agreed to look at the feasibility of raising the parapet along the entire length of the south elevation.

Board member Moyer observed that although raising the parapet would provide greater screening of the mechanical equipment on the roof, increasing the height of the parapet the full length of the south elevation will create a long, unbroken mass. He stated that in his opinion, the varying height along the south elevation helps to articulate the massing of the building. He suggested that consideration be given to relocating the mechanical equipment to the center of the roof to minimize visibility.

In response to comments from Board member Walther, Mr. Witmer agreed to consider smaller lettering for the directory sign and to create a mock-up for staff review. He confirmed that the coping will be limestone. He described the intended soldier course to align with the awnings along the front elevation. He confirmed that the signage

proposed on the awnings has an aluminum backer panel and that the letters will not be individually mounted.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Witmer explained that the vertical brick elements along the façade project one inch from the wall to break up the long expanse of the front elevation.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Witmer confirmed that the cap on the parapet wall is a cut limestone. He noted that there is a concrete retaining wall between the commercial property and the adjacent residential properties to the west.

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

In response to public comment from Marliiss Turek, 196 Atteridge Road, Mr. Witmer confirmed that there is sufficient space to allow trucks to use the alley on the south side of the building even with the proposed awning. He stated that doors can be added to the garbage alcoves to conceal the dumpsters. He stated that there is no intention to cover the windows adding that visibility into the spaces, from the public streets and sidewalks will be important.

In response to public comments, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the operational aspects of the new restaurant uses planned for the development were reviewed by the Plan Commission. She stated that approval of a Special Use Permit for the restaurant uses was recommended by the Commission subject to a number of conditions that speak to the various operational aspects. She acknowledged that the linear configuration of the City's Central Business District, and its adjacency to surrounding residential neighborhoods has both benefits and conflicts.

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

Board member Moyer stated that the alterations will be a great improvement to the building.

Board member Diamond expressed support for the project. He encouraged the petitioner and staff to work to address the comments raised during the public comments.

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

Board member Friedman made a motion to recommend approval of the 1) exterior alterations of the building 2) exterior lighting 3) building signage and 4) conceptual landscape plan subject to the conditions as detailed below.

1. Consideration shall be given to ways to more fully screen the mechanical equipment located on the roof from view from off of the site.
2. Signage. Metal letters, with the option of halo or backlit lighting, shall be used for the tenant signs located on the awnings. The letters on the multi-tenant directory signs shall be reduced in size. A mock-up shall be installed for all of the sign types, prior to the issuance of a permit, to allow for review by City staff. Final letter size shall be subject to staff approval. The submittal for a permit for the signage shall include detailed drawings, material specifications, full dimensions and details on lighting and mounting.
3. Any modifications made to the plans presented to the Board, either in response to direction from the Board or as part of the design development process, must be highlighted and will be subject to review and a determination by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, that the plans are in conformance with the approvals granted. A copy of the plans submitted to the Board shall accompany the revised plans for comparison purposes.
4. All signage shall only be illuminated during business hours.
5. After installation, staff is directed to inspect and evaluate the lighting intensity to verify consistency with lighting levels in the area and to verify that the source of light is fully screened from view from off of the site. The intensity of the lighting shall be reduced if determined to be necessary by staff.
6. All fencing and plantings on the site shall be properly maintained.

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

- 4. Consideration of a request for approval of demolition of a one-story element at the southeast corner side of the residence, a single-story rear addition, exterior alterations and modifications to the detached garage. A building scale variance is also requested. The property is located at 156 E. Westminster.
Owner: Chris Kelley
Representative: Jeff Letzter, designer**

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. Letzter presented the project on behalf of the property owner. He explained that the existing house was built in 1903 and noted the unique stone block exterior. He stated that a sunroom addition was added at the southeast corner of the residence in the 1950's. He explained that the project proposes removal of the sunroom addition, rebuilding the railing and posts on the front porch once the addition is removed, and

adding a family room addition on the rear of the home. He added that some new window openings are proposed around the house and some of the existing windows are proposed for removal. He explained that the existing house is over the allowable square footage by 11%. He noted that the overage is largely due to the height and roof shape of the existing house. He explained that with the removal of the sunroom and the addition of the family room at the rear of the house, the overage will be slightly reduced from the overage that exists today. He stated that the landscaping will be enhanced in the areas where work is planned.

Ms. Baehr reviewed the components of the petition; removal of the sunroom addition, addition of a family room at the rear of the house, various alterations around the residence and garage and a request for a building scale variance. She stated that according to City records, the sunroom was a later addition adding that removal will restore the appearance of the original front façade. She confirmed that the house today exceeds the allowable square footage for the property by 236 square feet adding that after the planned work, the residence will exceed the allowable square footage by 222 square feet, slightly less than the current overage. She noted that the staff report recommends further refinement of the fenestration pattern to achieve greater consistency of the window sizes. She noted that the existing chimney is proposed for removal adding that chimneys are considered a defining element in the City's Design Guidelines. She noted that a neighbor contacted staff raising concerns about use of the alley for construction vehicles, potential impacts on access to the alley and about the restoration of the alley after construction. She recommended that condition five be enhanced to address the concerns raised by the neighbor.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Letzter confirmed that the windows were revised in response to comments in the staff report. He stated that initially, the intent was to minimize changes to the existing windows due to the unique stone exterior. He noted however that it appears that there is sufficient stone to infill any openings that are removed. He confirmed that all of the existing windows will be replaced and that all of the windows will have a consistent muntin pattern. He stated that the existing chimney is not significant and does not feature any decorative elements. He stated that a small fireplace is proposed in the family room addition. He stated that a solution has not yet been reached on how to handle the massing of that element.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Letzter stated that a metal roof is proposed on the front porch and asphalt shingles are proposed to replace the worn roof on the house. He stated that wood bead board will be used for the ceiling of the front porch. He stated that walkway in the front yard will be brick.

Board member Moyer applauded the petitioner for the work planned to improve the appearance of the house he suggested that the house could be further improved by replacing the utilitarian stone block with horizontal siding for consistency with the proposed addition. He stated that in his opinion, siding would enhance and modernize the house.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Letzter confirmed that the new porch column, needed to provide support in the area where the sunroom will be removed, will be wood to match the existing front porch columns and railings. He stated that the detached garage will be re-sided and re-roofed with materials to match those on the rear addition.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Letzter stated that no shutters are proposed. He stated that currently, landscaping is not proposed in front of the new elevated deck to screen views under the deck. He suggested that a band could be added around the deck and front porch to conceal the ends of the floor boards.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Letzter agreed to do some further study of the placement of the columns on the front porch to achieve a better alignment with the window behind.

Chairman Notz stated that further study is needed to reach a workable solution on the fireplace bump-out on the east elevation of the addition. He stated that in his opinion, removal of the existing chimney does not negatively impact the appearance of the house. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited public comments.

In response to public comment from Laura Louis, who spoke on behalf of the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, Mr. Letzter reviewed the plans to improve the alignment of the fenestration around the house and on the addition.

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

Board member Bires expressed support for the petition.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Chairman Notz stated that the proposed changes will improve the functionality of the house. He invited a motion.

Board member Friedman made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the sunroom, approval of a building scale variance and approval of the design of the one-story addition, exterior alterations, and modifications to the detached garage based on the findings detailed in this report. He noted that the motion incorporates the following conditions.

1. The plans shall be revised as follows:
 - a. The placement and size of windows shall be refined to achieve greater consistency around the house and addition.
 - b. Further study shall be conducted to minimize the appearance of mass of the fireplace bump out.

- c. Consideration shall be given to centering the window on the north elevation under the gable element above.
 - d. Consideration shall be given to refining the placement of the columns on the front porch to better align with the windows behind.
2. If any modifications are made to the plans in addition to the changes detailed above, either in response to Board direction, or, as the 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.
3. A plan showing the existing landscaping on the site along the west property line shall be submitted along with the plans submitted for building permit. The plan shall reflect: additional landscaping proposed to screen the addition from the house to the west, foundation plantings in the area where the sunroom is removed and plantings to screen views beneath the elevated deck.
4. Details of any exterior lighting that is proposed shall be provided with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view by the fixture or by sight obscuring glass.
5. 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 approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood during construction.
 - a. The plan shall detail any intended use of the alley.
 - b. A Public Property Restoration bond shall be submitted to the City to assure the surrounding public property, including the alley to the north of the site, is properly repaired in the event that it is damaged by construction vehicles.
 - c. Offsite parking and shuttling workers to the site may be necessary due to the narrow street and traffic levels in the area. Parking of construction or contractor vehicles on Westminster is discouraged.

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

5. Consideration of a request for approval of a rear addition, the addition of dormers on the front elevation and related exterior alterations to the residence located at 1165 W. Deerpath.

Owners and Representatives: James and Emily Bernahl

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

Mr. Bernahl presented the petition. He said that the house is built on a slab adding that he had originally hoped to construct an addition with a basement for the mechanicals, but found it was not possible for budgetary reasons. He reviewed the proposed additions noting the addition of a staircase to the attic to replace drop down stairs. He stated that prior owners built a three season room noting that its utility is limited because it is not heated. He stated that The Zoning Board of Appeals indicated support for the required zoning variance to allow the addition to be constructed as proposed adding that the variance is needed since the mechanicals need to remain on the ground floor. He stated that there is currently landscaping along the west property line which will screen the wall of the proposed addition in the summer. He stated that stamped concrete is proposed for the exterior hardscape. He reviewed the dormers proposed on the front and rear elevations explaining that they are intended to break up the roof. He stated that although the plans indicate hipped roof dormers on the front elevation, a gable element is actually planned to align with the existing front facing gable. He said that a front porch addition is proposed as well to add interest to the front elevation. He reviewed other elements of the proposed work. He stated that the additions will be clad in white hardie board, with white trim. He noted that significant interior renovations are also proposed.

Ms. Baehr confirmed that the petition was heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Board indicated support for a zoning variance to allow the rear addition on the west side of the house to be located within the side yard setback. She noted that the rear additions on both the east and west sides of the house, as proposed, align with the existing walls of the house. She noted that the height of the overall house is proposed to be raised approximately three feet to accommodate additional attic space. She noted that the proposed additions appear to have somewhat complicated roof forms. She requested Board input on whether further study is needed to simplify the roof forms. She stated that a new front porch is proposed to extend across the full width of the front façade. She noted that two hipped dormers are reflected on the plans for the front elevation but acknowledged that the petitioner noted that the roof forms for the dormers are not accurately reflected on the plans. She noted that the dormers appear oversized in comparison to other elements of the residence. She noted that board and batten siding is proposed in the gable ends of the house, replacing the existing siding. She stated that a synthetic material is proposed

for the siding adding that the proposed material may be appropriate in this situation. She noted however that a synthetic product is also proposed for all of the trim, fascia and soffit. She stated that the Board routinely requires trim, fascia and soffits to be a natural material, particularly in combination with synthetic siding.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Bernahl stated a willingness to use a natural material for the trim, fascia, and soffit. He stated that the neighbors to the west have large arborvitae so additional plantings on his property to screen the addition will likely not be needed. He stated that no alternatives to the front dormers were not considered adding that the dormers are consistent with features found on other homes in the subdivision. He agreed that consideration could be given to reducing the size of the dormers.

In response to questions from Board Member Friedman, Mr. Bernahl stated that the dormers are sited below the chimney and are located to balance the new gable entrance. He acknowledged that the dormers are not centered on the windows below.

Board Member Friedman agreed that the dormers are located in a manner that is inconsistent with the windows below. He noted that the front door is off center creating an awkward situation. He stated that in his opinion, there are elements of the petition that need to be re-worked.

Chairman Notz suggested that consideration be given to reducing the arch over the front entry and the depth of the overhang. He stated that the entry elements overwhelm the front door and create an unbalanced front elevation.

Mr. Bernahl agreed to work with his architect to improve the balance of the front elevation and to consider refinement of the dormers, front porch and specific elements near the front door. He stated that he will give consideration to removing the window in the bathroom adjacent to the front door.

Board member Friedman encouraged the petitioner and his architect to go into the exercise with an open mind. He suggested that consideration be given to replacing the window system below the dormer in an effort to achieve better balance overall. He stated that given the constraints, achieving balance to the front entry will take some creativity. He added that the roof forms also require some attention to refine the massing, scale and complexity.

In response to questions from Board Member Friedman, Mr. Bernahl confirmed that a board and batten treatment is proposed in the gables and

horizontal siding is proposed on the exterior walls for the additions.

Board member Moyer stated that the proposed front facing dormers are overbearing and are not consistent with the dormers proposed on the rear elevation. He agreed that a different solution is needed for the front porch. He suggested that one option to consider is taking advantage of the excessive space under the large roof. He stated that the door could be pushed out, away from the adjacent bathroom, and centered. He stated that in his opinion, the petition needs further consideration by the Board after refinements are made.

Board member Bires agreed with the comments of the other Board members regarding various elements on the front elevation. He stated that the rear elevation needs refinement as well to achieve a simpler design.

Board member Walther noted that there are errors in drawings which may in part be the reason for the questions about the various elements of the project and the concerns about the complexity. He agreed that the roof form on the rear elevation is too complex. He noted that there is a vent at the top of the gable on the west elevation however, the vent is missing on the east elevation. He noted that it is important that the drawings accurately reflect what is intended. He noted inconsistencies in the windows around the house with divided lite windows on the rear elevation and windows with no lites are shown on the front and side elevations. He noted that shingles are shown on the lower portions of the front and west elevations but not reflected elsewhere around the house. He noted that the chimney will need to be raised in order to comply with the Code requirements given that the existing roof is being raised.

In response to comments from Board member Walther, Mr. Bernhal stated that he will work with his architect to clean up the drawings and confirmed that the intent is that all of the windows will match.

Chairman Notz observed that double gables are shown on the east and west elevations however, they do not appear to be functional because the gables are in the same plane. He noted that eliminating the second gable will simplify the roof lines. He suggested consideration of windows in the side gable ends, in place of louvers, to provide light into the attic. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited public comments, hearing none, he asked the Board for final comments.

Board member Friedman summarized that the overall project could use more thought in regard to massing, scale and architectural detailing with efforts made to diminish the appearance of the mass of the roof. He stated that the Board should see this project again after the issues raised are addressed. He encouraged the petitioner to have the architect in

attendance at the next meeting. He stated however that the Board does not have any concerns about the zoning variance as recommended by the Zoning Board of Appeals or the intent to improve the home.

Chairman Notz agreed that the Board supports the project overall adding that thought and creativity are needed to address the issues identified by the Board. He stated that refinement is needed but the project is not far off. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he invited a motion.

Mr. Bernahl stated that he is on a tight construction timeline and waiting until the next meeting will delay the project a month.

In response to Mr. Bernahl, Chairman Notz, with the consent of the majority of the Board, stated that as an accommodation, a Board subcommittee could review the revised plans if the plans are received in sufficient time to circulate them for review prior to the next meeting and dependent upon the subcommittee members' availability.

Board member Friedman made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Board's comments and deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. The plans shall be revised as detailed below.
 - a. Front entry.
 - Refine and reduce the scale of the porch gable so this element does not overwhelm the front elevation.
 - Center the gable over the front door.
 - b. Dormers on front elevation.
 - Center the dormers over the windows below.
 - Reduce the scale and refine the proportions.
 - c. Window on front elevation.
 - Reduce the scale of the large window on the front elevation, west of the entry.
 - d. Overall.
 - Simplify the roof forms.
2. The final plans shall be subject to review and approval by a subcommittee of the Board, appointed by the Chairman. If the Board Subcommittee is not able to satisfactorily resolve all of the open issues, at the Subcommittee's discretion, the petition may be directed back to the full Board for further review.
3. All modifications made to the plans to address the conditions of approval, to respond to the Board's direction, or as a result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit. A copy of the plans originally provided to the Board shall be included in the submittal for

comparison purposes.

4. A final landscape plan shall be submitted at the time of submittal of plans for permit. The plan shall reflect existing plantings to remain and proposed additional plantings in the area immediately around the additions and along the west property line near the rear addition. Plantings along the west property line shall provide adequate screening and softening of the rear addition in particular recognizing the large expanse of unbroken wall. The plan will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
5. Details of any exterior lighting shall be provided with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view by the fixture or by sight obscuring glass.
6. A plan for construction parking and materials' 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 Diamond and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

6. Consideration of a request for approval of a second story addition and related roof modifications to the residence at 181 Wildwood Road.

Owner: Lori Fitzgerald

Representatives: Mike Malloy, architect

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

Mr. Malloy introduced the petition noting that a second floor addition is proposed. He explained that the existing second floor is very small with bedrooms no larger than 10 by 10. He noted that the addition will provide for a master suite and home office. He presented elevations of the existing house and elevations with the proposed addition. He stated that the massing of the proposed second floor is low and does not rise above the existing roof line. He stated that the front door will be shifted to be more prominent adding that the addition will pick up the existing gable element to add balance to the house. He pointed out the windows that will be removed and discussed the roof elements and proposed dormers adding that details from the existing house will be used on the addition. He noted that there are a mix of houses in the neighborhood and stated that the proposed expansion will be in keeping with the surrounding homes. He presented conceptual images of the house with the proposed addition. He noted some modifications made to the plans since the materials were prepared for the Board's packet.

Ms. Baehr stated that this petition was considered by the Zoning Board of Appeals and received support for a variance to allow a proposed second floor addition. She stated that the proposed addition is located above the center portion of the existing residence and is comprised of a large, front facing gable roof form with a shed dormer off the gable on the north side, and a hipped roof form on the south side. She stated that the massing of the addition appears complicated due to the multiple roof forms and noted that the openings around the addition are somewhat inconsistent with those on the existing residence. She noted that the staff report recommends a condition requiring further refinement of the fenestration pattern to more closely match the existing house and overall simplification of the roof forms. She noted that the exterior materials proposed for the addition are generally consistent with the existing house. She stated that staff recommends metal, rather than bitumen, for the flat roof elements particularly those visible from the streetscape and adjacent properties.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Malloy reviewed the proposed roof materials and the detailing above the windows. He stated that the shutters will be removed. He confirmed that the overhang proposed on the addition is deeper than the overhang on the existing house and agreed to consider adding depth to the existing overhang on the front elevation. He stated that it is difficult to modify the existing dormers noting that they are at the point where the walls meet. He stated that with the addition, the existing dormers will be less of a focal point.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Mr. Malloy confirmed that the door to the south of the garage is a wooden door and will replace the existing window. He noted that the owner prefers a door in that location to better accommodate her family's needs adding that the existing window is awkward. He stated that there will be some minor landscape enhancement. He confirmed that the roof will be raised slightly.

Board member Moyer commended the project noting that it is a personal statement. He noted that since the house is eclectic, there is more freedom. He stated that the house is in scale with others in the neighborhood.

Board member Friedman commented that the home is whimsical in scale. He suggested that rather than locate a second door on the front elevation, south of the garage door, consideration could be given to locating the door just around the corner, on the side elevation. He noted that given the extensive changes proposed, an upgraded garage door should be considered, perhaps replacing the existing door with one that is detailed with lites. He agreed with Board member Walther's suggestion to bump out the eave on the existing house to add depth and a shadow line. He discussed options for adding a window noting however that no floor plans were included in the packet so it is unclear how the windows relate to interior spaces.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Malloy stated that the intent is not to modify the existing second floor bedrooms but instead, to work with the existing character of the house. He reviewed the roof element, the back portion of the hipped roof, explaining that it is configured with the intent of keeping the scale of the house down.

Board member Friedman suggested that further consideration be given to better aligning the roof elements to eliminate the awkwardness.

Ms. Fitzgerald explained that a variance was granted for an earlier addition and a condition of that variance was that a double garage door, facing the street, could not be used.

Board member Diamond agreed that enhancing the garage door would be a benefit given its prominence on the street. He suggested that a color could be selected to make the garage door less prominent. He complimented the proposed improvements overall.

Chairman Notz observed that the proposed second door of the front elevation will be more prominent than the front door. He stated that the roof form is very complicated and as a result, will be expensive to construct. He stated that the roof form needs to be simplified. He stated that the house is simple and the addition should be in keeping with that simplicity. He questioned whether the desired interior layout is driving the complexity of the roof forms. He stated that he cannot support the petition with the current level of complexity. He asked for any further questions or comments from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Malloy agreed that the pedestrian door could be relocated to the south elevation.

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

Laura Luce, representing the Preservation Foundation, stated that the Foundation agrees that the roof lines should be simplified.

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

Board member Friedman made a motion recommending approval of the petition based on the findings as detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Board's discussion and deliberations as additional findings. He noted that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. The plans shall be revised as follows:

a. The second pedestrian door shall be located on the south elevation, not

on the front elevation.

- b. The roof forms shall be simplified to achieve a design that is more consistent with the very basic roof structure of the existing house.
 - c. The depth of the eave on the existing house shall be increased to match the depth proposed on the addition.
 - d. The fenestration pattern around the addition shall be refined in an effort to achieve greater consistency between the windows on the existing residence and those in the addition.
 - e. Metal shall be used for the shallow pitched roof forms of the addition.
2. All modifications to the plans presented to the Board including the changes detailed above and any other revisions made in response to Board direction, or, as a result of final design development, shall be clearly called out. A copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review the revised plans with a subcommittee of the Board, appointed by the Chairman, if the revised plans are submitted in a timely manner to allow for such review in advance of the next Board meeting. The subcommittee may refer the petition back to the full Board if a satisfactory solution is not reached.
 3. Details of any exterior lighting that is proposed shall be provided with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view by the fixture or by sight obscuring glass.
 4. A plan showing the existing landscaping on the site shall be submitted along with the plans submitted for building permit. In addition, any additional landscaping or trees proposed for plantings should be reflected on the plan in an effort to soften views of the new full second floor element.
 5. A plan for construction parking and materials' 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. Given the narrow, curving nature of Wildwood Road, only two construction vehicles may park on the street at any time. Off-site parking for contractors may be required.

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

OTHER ITEMS

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

There was no additional public testimony presented to the Board.

5. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented from staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner