

**The City of Lake Forest**  
**Building Review Board**  
**Proceedings of September 2, 2020 Meeting**

A meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, September 2, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. This meeting was conducted remotely in compliance with Governor's Executive Order 2020-07, issued on March 16, 2020 that suspended certain Open Meetings Act provisions relating to in-person attendance by members of a public body due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman Jim Diamond and Board members, Joanne Bluhm, Sally Downey, James Sykora, and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: Chris Bires and John Looby

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

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

Chairman Diamond 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 August 5, 2020 meeting of the Building Review Board.**

The minutes of the August 5, 2020 meeting were approved as presented.

**3. Consideration request for approval of changes to the previously approved plans for a new residence at 710 Green Briar Lane.**

**Property Owner: 28835 Properties LLC (Richard Hall, 50% Lena Hall, 50%)**

**Project Representative: Adam Lyons, architect**

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

Mr. Hall explained that he and his family have lived in various locations in Lake Forest for many years and noted that he has worked as a builder in the area. He noted that he was the builder for the home at 700 Green Briar Lane, the home directly west of the subject property. He stated that he originally purchased the vacant lot at 710 Green Briar as an investment property, but later decided to develop the property with a home for his family. He explained that he received approval for a new residence on the property from the Building Review Board in 2018. He stated that he did not pursue the project at that time due to some medical issues in his family. He explained that since that time, he has

rethought the project and determined that a first floor master suite is desirable. He stated that the previously approved plans were revised to reflect that change. He stated that the revised plans result in a change in the architectural style of the home from what was previously approved. He stated that as now proposed, the residence is a ranch style. He noted that the grading plan was also revised to accommodate the changes that were made to the residence. He stated that the previously approved grading plan located the required compensatory storage to the rear of the home. He noted that in the revised plan, a portion of the compensatory storage is shifted to the front of the property, in front of the house, near the street. He noted that this change will allow his family to more fully utilize the rear yard. He reviewed the floorplans. He shared photographs of homes that served as an inspiration for the revised design. He explained that the revisions to the plans present a simple residence. He stated that the previously approved plans had a series of gable roof forms and the plans now present reflect multiple hip roofs. He added that in response to staff's comments prior to the meeting, the number of different roof pitches was reduced in order to simplify the overall roof form. He noted that in to concerns about two different materials being used for the two chimneys, the size of the stucco chimney on the rear elevation can be reduced to diminish its appearance in the context of the primary chimney. He explained that two shed dormers were reflected on the west elevation of the previously approved plans and the current plan reflect a single shed dormer on the west elevation as a result of the reduced square footage on the second level of the home.

Ms. Baehr confirmed that the Board previously approved a residence for this vacant property in October 2018. She explained that after the Board's approval, the plans were submitted to the City for permit and the plans were reviewed however, the petitioner did not pick up the permit and requested that the project be put on hold. She stated that the petitioner now wishes to proceed with development of the property with revised plans. She explained that staff determined that the revisions were significant enough to warrant further Board review. She noted that the proposed changes are detailed in the petitioner's statement of intent and in the staff report. She stated that in the revised plans, the square footage of the home is reduced resulting in a more compact building footprint. She noted that the changes resulted in modification of the roof forms and roof pitches. She stated that the staff report includes recommendations that suggest simplifying the overall roof form and reducing the number of roof pitches in an effort to present a more cohesive appearance to the overall home. She added that staff also recommends that the fenestration pattern be studied further in an effort to present a more regular and balanced appearance across all of the elevations of the home. She noted that Board member Looby asked that staff share his comments; consideration should be given to further refinement of the roof forms and both chimneys should be brick for consistency. She stated that staff was contacted by the neighbor to the east about drainage. She explained that drainage on this property and the neighboring properties has been the subject of much study and discussion. She noted that the City Engineer has met with the neighbor several times and is aware of the concerns. She stated that the City Engineer will review the revised plans in the context of the history of drainage issues in this neighborhood and the neighboring properties.

Board member Bluhm stated that based on the photos presented by the petitioner as the inspiration for the home, she noted that the design intent, based on the photos, appears to be French Country. She suggested that consideration be given to incorporating elements more consistent with the French Country style such as arched dormers and arched windows. She suggested that the placement of the windows on the shed dormer should be studied further in an effort to more closely relate to the first floor.

In response to questions from Board member Bluhm, Mr. Hall confirmed that the windows on the south elevation of the garage are shorter because landscaping is proposed in that location.

Board member Sykora commended the petitioner on the recessed brick detailing, adding that it provides depth to the solid brick walls. He suggested that landscaping be incorporated on the front of the home to soften its appearance.

Board member Downey agreed with the recommendations in the staff report and stated that the roof lines and window proportions are in need of further study. She added that the single dormer on the front elevation does not appear necessary.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Hall explained that the shed dormer on the front elevation is not needed to make the upper level functional but instead, was added as a way to enhance the appearance of the front façade. He clarified that the smaller windows on the east elevation are located in bathrooms. He stated that an auto-turn study has not yet been completed to verify the functionality of the driveway.

Board member Walther suggested lowering the window in the shed dormer window on the front elevation to the same level as the other window in the front dormer. He added that eliminating the shed dormer entirely should be considered. He explained that an auto-turn study is important because in the previous plan, the garage mass was forward of the mass of the main house but as currently proposed, the single garage door is right next to the main mass of the house. He suggested that the mass of the garage should be shifted away from the home to improve the access to the single car garage bay. He added that shifting the garage mass south will also allow for landscaping along the front of the home. He stated that the complex roof form on the west elevation appears to be a result of the single car garage mass being recessed behind the two car garage mass. He suggested consideration of swapping the single car garage mass and the two car garage mass and allowing the entire garage to have a uniform width. He noted that approach will allow for the roof form to be simplified and appear more cohesive with the overall house. He added that by placing the two car garage bay closer to the main mass of the home, instead of the single car bay at that location, the access into the garage may be improved.

In response to comments from Board member Walther, Mr. Hall explained that the location of the two car garage bay at the south end of the garage mass will allow space for a boat to be parked at the house. He stated a willingness to explore pulling the driveway away from the front of the house to provide space for foundation plantings. He explained

however that doing so may create a square footage overage. He stated that he and his architect are working to reduce the number of different roof pitches. He agreed to explore expanding the soffit below the shed dormer on the west elevation to create a continuous roof form below the dormer. He stated that the windows on the west and rear elevations can be shifted to center the windows on the wall.

In response to questions from Chairman Diamond, Mr. Hall clarified that as proposed, the chimney on the rear exterior wall will be brick and the chimney through the roof will be stucco. He stated that he recently discussed the plans with Ms. Russell, the neighbor to the east. He explained that Ms. Russell commented that drainage in the area has improved since the construction of the home at 700 Green Briar Lane and the modifications made to stormwater management at that time. He explained that the revised grading plan allows for more water to be retained at the front of his property instead of in the rear yard where it could move more quickly across Ms. Russells's rear yard. He reviewed the proposed color palette and exterior materials.

In response to questions from Chairman Diamond, Ms. Baehr stated that staff will continue to work with the petitioner on the landscape plan. She stated that staff will provide Ms. Russell with the engineering plans and arrange for Ms. Russell to talk with the City Engineer about the plans.

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

Board member Walther reiterated his concerns with the proposed roof plan. He stated that the petitioner should conduct further study of the roof plan, particularly as it relates to the west elevation.

Board member Downey agreed with comments made by Board member Walther. She added that the size of the chimney at the rear of the home should be reduced.

In response to questions from Board member Downey, Mr. Hall explained that the difference in the materials of the two chimneys will not be apparent because the rear chimney is much smaller than the other chimney and comes through the roof instead of being located on the exterior wall.

Board member Joanne commended the petitioner on the proposed exterior materials. She agreed with comments made by Board member Walther.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Ms. Czerniak explained that staff can continue to work with the petitioner to address the concerns raised by the Board. She added that if the Board's comments are not fully addressed, the petition will be returned to the Board for further review.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of changes to the previously approved plans for a new residence at 710 Green Briar Lane consistent with the revised plans presented to the Board with the modifications and refinements discussed. He noted that the recommendation is based on the findings detailed in the staff report, the testimony presented by the petitioner and the Board's deliberations. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans shall be refined as follows:
  - a. The roof forms shall be simplified. In particular, the west elevation should be further studied and the roof forms refined and simplified as discussed by the Board.
  - b. Consider removing the single dormer on the front elevation. If the dormer is not removed, it should be lowered to align with the window of the garage.
  - c. The fenestration pattern shall be studied further in an effort to present a more regular pattern across all elevations of the home.
  - d. Refine the chimney as discussed during the meeting.
2. Prior to submittal of the revised plans for permit, the plans shall be submitted to staff with a narrative of the changes made in response to the above comments. Staff is directed to review the plans for consistency with the Board's direction and approval, in consultation with the Chairman. All modifications made to the plans to address the items detailed above, in response to Board direction, or, as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan. A copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes.
3. The plans submitted for permit shall be fully detailed with respect to architectural elements, dimensions and exterior materials.
4. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate the project is consistent with the applicable Code requirements subject to review and approval by the City Engineer with specific attention paid to mitigating impacts on the neighboring property to the east. Grading or filling on the site should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices, to properly direct drainage.
5. A landscape plan shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit. The plan shall reflect appropriate open spaces as required to accommodate drainage and detention on the site. To the extent possible, the 59 replacement inches (modified if necessary to account for natural tree loss that has occurred) shall be planted on site using species and sizes as approved by the City Engineer. If the replacement inches cannot be accommodated on the site, payment in lieu of on-site plantings shall be required to support streetscape plantings in the surrounding neighborhood. The plan shall reflect plantings along the east property line to screen the driveway and visibility of the garage doors, to the extent possible, to screen views from the neighboring home and the streetscape. Landscaping shall

also be provided along the front of the house. The final landscape plan shall be subject to review and approval by the City Arborist.

6. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation and to protect trees and vegetation on neighboring properties during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
7. 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.
8. 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 narrow street must remain passable at all time and kept clean, free of mud and debris.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and approved by a vote of 5 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 by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Assistant Planner