

**The City of Lake Forest**  
**Building Review Board**  
**Proceedings of June 2, 2021 Meeting**

A meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, June 2, 2021 at 6:00 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, Timothy G. Franzen, John Looby, Scott Renken and Richard Walther.

Building Review Board members absent: None

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development  
Jennifer Baehr, 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 from past meetings of the Building Review Board.**

Consideration of the minutes was postponed.

**3. Continued consideration of a request approval of a replacement residence,  
conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan. The property is addressed as 1825  
Telegraph Road.**

**Property Owner: Bel Sogno, LLC (Michael Donato 50%, Wendy Donato, 50%) Project  
Representative: Bill Massey, architect  
Rick Vanselow, builder**

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. Massey stated that the petition was presented to the Board last month it was continued with direction from the Board. He stated that the current plans take into account the Board's comments. He stated that the notes on the exterior elevation drawings were updated to indicate that the trim and rakeboards will be wood, stained or painted to complement the color of the window frames. He stated that in response to the Board's request to consider ways to make the front elevation more prominent, he reviewed the early design development process. He stated that the initial concept was a recessed entrance with columns and a shed roof but noted that

concept was discarded because the entrance was not prominent in comparison to other elements of the home. He an alternative with a large, rectilinear stone surround and a double door was explored however, he explained that the property owner prefers a single door which led to a different design in which the entrance is more prominent and distinct from the rest of the home. He stated that the current design reflects a solid wood door with sidelights and a transom, embellishments in response to the Board's comments. He noted that in response to the Board's direction to study the roof forms, particularly the garage roof, to find a way to allow the signature bay window to stand. He noted the relationship between the garage and the cabana which creates a complicated roof form. He presented renderings showing various iterations of the cabana and the different roof forms that were explored; parallel gables and a hipped roof. He stated that ultimately, a cross gable roof form on the cabana, similar to the form on the other side of the garage, was determined to be the preferred option. He stated that the gable on the north side of the garage is necessary because of the depth of the garage and to work with the cabana roof. He added that the gable on the north side of the garage breaks up an extremely long, straight roof form. He noted that a small gable is used on the front of the garage to align with the small gable on the front of the house. He reviewed the options considered for the windows on the front elevation, in the stairway. He stated that punched openings for stacked windows on the first and second floors, similar to the other windows on the home, were explored. He noted that other designs were studied. He stated that the owner desires to maximize the amount of glass to fill the stairwell with natural light and provide a view from the stairway. He stated that as proposed, the windows read as a two story element with simple horizontal bands between the windows on the first and second floors. He stated that metal is used for the separation for structural reasons given the height of the windows. He noted that the Board suggested incorporating embellishments on the small gables on the front elevation. He noted that the overall design incorporates stone, metal banding, sills and headers, and rough textured stone. He stated that to pick up on the small window in the gable on the rear elevation, a traditional gable louvered vent was added on the gables on the front elevation. He noted that a detailed exterior lighting plan was provided including examples of potential light fixtures. He stated that frosted glass is proposed to assure that the light is a glow rather than a bright spot. He stated that a detailed landscape plan was submitted to assure that the minimum requirements are satisfied. He added that they intend to continue to develop the landscape plan as the site takes shape and noted that landscaping beyond the minimum standards is planned. He noted that samples of the proposed exterior materials were provided at the site.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that the petition was presented to the Board last month and continued with a request for further study of some elements, refinement and additional information. She noted that the petitioner provided an updated statement that addresses the Board's comments from the previous meeting. She stated that updated landscape and lighting plans as well as the various design studies that were done in response to the Board's comments, are included in the Board's packets. She stated that overall, staff finds that the design as refined is consistent with the City's Design Guidelines and noted that a recommendation in support of the petition is included in the staff report along with suggested conditions of approval related to the final landscape plan, a grading and drainage plan, and a construction parking and staging plan.

Board member Looby thanked the owner and the architect for responding thoroughly to the Board's comments and studying alternatives. He stated that the home is beautiful. He stated that he reviewed the samples of the exterior materials that were provided on the site and complimented the stonework. He stated that he hopes the owner is pleased with the refinements.

Board member Walther asked if a gate is proposed at the front of the home noting that other homes of this stature along Telegraph Road have fencing or gates at the front of the property. He noted that many homes in the area have extensive landscaping in the yards fronting Telegraph Road and inquired if more landscaping that reflected on the plan is anticipated. He stated that the primary focus of the home should be the main mass of the structure and the central entry door and pointed out that the location of the parking area and the landscape plan appear to shift focus to the breezeway between the main mass of the home and the garage, away from the front door. He asked the petitioner to comment on how the landscaping accentuates what they intend to be the primary focal point of the home.

Chairman Diamond thanked the petitioner for addressing the Board's previous comments. He stated that the home will be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood.

Board member Downey stated her appreciation for walking the Board through the steps that were taken to address the Board's previous comments noting that the result exceeded her expectations. She stated that although she understands Board member Walther's point about highlighting the front door, she understands that the driveway and landscaping are oriented to direct people to the side entry. She added that landscaping the front door will be important to enhance that entrance.

Board member Bluhm that the petitioner did a great job responding to the Board's comments. She agreed with Board member Downey's comment about landscaping at the front entrance. She stated that in her opinion, she does not think a gate is needed, adding that she can only think of one home on Telegraph Road that is gated. She stated support for the petition and the conditions recommended in the staff report.

Board member Renken stated that he was not at the previous meeting when this petition was considered but appreciates seeing the evolution of the changes. He stated that the home has great proportions noting that the massing is centered on the main area of the house and steps down away from the center. He stated support for the petition as presented. He noted that whether the owner decides to add gates or not, the landscaping should work with each of the two curb cuts.

Board member Franzen noted that he also was not at the previous meeting at which the petition was considered. He stated appreciation to Mr. Massey for walking the Board through the design process, how the Board's comments were considered and how the project evolved.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Diamond invited

public testimony. Hearing none, he invited the petitioner to address the Board's questions.

Mr. Massey stated that to date, entrance gates have not been discussed. He confirmed that more thought will be given to enhancing the landscaping between the house and Telegraph Road to create a visual and sound buffer. He stated that the arc of the driveway is still being refined and to Board member Walther's point, it will be aligned so that initially, the focus is on the front door. He stated that the formal entry to the home is through the front door but the family entry is through the side door. He explained that the intent is that each entrance will have a different character.

Board member Walther noted that the plans a cluster of trees on each side of the driveway and several large trees in front of the primary mass of the house. He observed that over time, as the landscaping matures, views of the house from the street will be lost. He stated that he reviewed the samples of the exterior materials that were provided by the petitioner. He stated that at the previous meeting, he expressed concern about the prominence of the stairwell feature and the large number of aluminum clad windows which may appear too industrial or commercial. He stated that having seen the windows, he is more comfortable with the large expanse of windows proposed on the front elevation.

Board member Looby stated that based on the landscape plan, it appears that the lot will appear fairly heavily wooded very quickly. He stated that it is an impressive house.

Board member Bluhm agreed with Board member Looby's comments. She stated the house will be a great addition on a beautiful piece of property.

Board member Downey agreed with the comments of the other Board members and stated her appreciation to the petitioner for being responsive to the Board comments. She thanked the petitioner for presenting the various design studies and complimented the house.

Board member Renken stated that based on the pictures and renderings, the propose exterior materials appear to be of high quality. He commended the petitioner for a strong presentation.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of a replacement residence and the site and landscape plans based on the findings as presented in the staff report and subject to the following conditions.

1. Any modifications to the plans presented to the Board either in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, 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.

2. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate the project is consistent with the applicable Code requirements and will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. Grading or filling on the site should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices and properly direct drainage.
3. The final landscape shall include, but not be limited to, all required replacement tree inches for trees removed from the site, shade trees and plantings in the front yard to soften the appearance of the home from the street. The proposed plantings shall follow the natural character along the streetscape.
4. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation and to protect trees on neighboring properties during construction, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
5. Details of all exterior lighting shall be provided with the plans submitted for permit. 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 Downey and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

**4. Continued consideration of a request for approval of models for the remaining 19 lots in the Amberley Woods Courtyard Homes development located on the south side of Amberley Court, between Saunders Road and Conway Farms Drive, south of Route 60. Property Owner: McNaughton Development (Paul R. McNaughton, 100%)  
Project Representatives: John Barry, McNaughton Development  
Rick Swanson, 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. Barry stated that the plans for the new homes at Amberley Court have been refinements further since the last Board meeting in response to the Board's comments and direction. He stated that at the end of the last meeting, he took away two points; that the home designs are moving in the right direction with respect to the architectural designs and that there were continued questions and concerns about some of the proposed exterior materials. He stated that in an effort to address the remaining comments from the Board, they engaged a consulting architect, Rick Swanson, to assist with further refinement of the plans.

Mr. Swanson stated that he worked with a subcommittee of the Board toward further refinement of each of the models that will be offered to buyers. He stated that the windows were refined to achieve alignment between the windows on the first and second floors, the massing was refined to create a hierarchy of forms, and the front entrances were enhanced so they are more prominent on the front facades.

Mr. Barry stated that the French Country homes have architectural asphalt shingle roofs, aluminum gutters and downspouts, and Hardie board, a fiber cement material, for the fascia, soffits and shutters. He added that the French Country designs will also incorporate stucco boards that will imitate the appearance of cedar for the window headers. He stated that natural wood will be used for the columns and brackets. He noted that a four inch thick stone veneer is proposed for the accent elements. He stated that stone chimneys are now proposed on the French Country homes instead of stucco chimneys. He stated that the windows are fiberglass with simulated divided lites. He added that prefinished garage doors and wood front doors are proposed. He explained that the elevations in the Board's packet reflect all the changes made after discussions with the Board subcommittee. He stated that the homes designed in the Shingle style will have cedar shingle roofs, aluminum gutters and downspouts, stone chimneys and prefinished Hardie Board fascia, soffits and shutters. He stated that the Shingle style homes will be sided in a Hardie Board shake with a smooth finish. He added that the columns, brackets and front doors will be natural wood and the garage doors will be a prefinished material. He pointed out that the muntin patterns for the windows on the Shingle style homes will be consistent with the Shingle style. He stated that the Tudor homes will have architectural asphalt shingle roofs, stucco and brick exterior walls, stucco window headers and cedar columns and brackets. He stated that the anti-monotony guidelines as now proposed will not permit adjacent lots to utilize the same floorplan and architectural style adding that if the same floor plan is used, the architectural style must be different or, if the architectural style is the same, the color palette much be different. He stated that the same floor plan will not be used for three consecutive lots. He stated that at least 25 percent of the 19 lots, or five lots, will have side loaded garages. He stated that they maintain a matrix of the different floorplans, styles and garage or orientations as the development is built out and will provide that information to the City. He stated that they will work with their architect to select the exterior colors. He stated that the updated landscape plans now reflect some landscaping along the sides of the homes recognizing that drainage ways need to be kept clear.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that this petition was presented to the Board in February and again in April. She stated that at the April meeting, the Board continued the petition with direction to the petitioner to do some further refinement of the exterior materials and certain design elements of the proposed homes. She added that in an effort to assist in moving the petition forward to approval, the Chairman of the Board appointed a two member subcommittee of Board members Walther and Looby to offer further input and guidance to the petitioners. She noted that the intent of the subcommittee was to assist the petitioner in finding ways to more fully satisfy the City's Design Guidelines and develop plans that are generally consistent with the quality and character of the five existing homes on Amberley Court. She stated that the plans as now presented address many of the

concerns and comments previously offered by the Board related to the architectural design and exterior materials. She stated that the exterior materials now proposed include a mix of natural materials and composite materials. She stated that the proposed facade materials are stucco, composite shake siding, stone and brick. She stated that the petitioner is proposing asphalt shingle roofs for the French Country and Tudor designs and cedar roofs for the Shingle style homes. She stated that fiberglass windows with muntins on the interior and exterior are proposed on all of the homes along with shutters of a composite materials. She stated that natural wood is proposed for the porch columns and the brackets. She stated that the chimneys are stone or brick, with clay chimney pots. She explained that during the last meeting, based on the review of the previously proposed material samples, the Board directed that natural wood be used for all trim, fascia, and soffits. She added that the petitioner, instead of using natural wood for those areas, is now proposing a composite material for the trim, fascia and soffits. She stated that a sample of the proposed composite material was provided by the petitioner and was made available for the Board's review prior to the meeting. She stated that the roof material has been a subject of discussion throughout the Board and subcommittee review processes. She explained that based on direction from the Board at the last meeting, direction from the subcommittee and taking into account input from the owners of homes on Amberley Court, staff recommends that cedar shingles be used for the roofs of all of the remaining 19 homes. She pointed out that this recommendation is balanced with support for the petitioner's proposed to use composite, non-natural, materials for the siding trim, fascia and soffits, despite the fact that the approval of composite materials for these elements is not consistent with past Board approvals or with the existing homes in the development. She added that this compromise is intended to maintain some consistency in appearance and quality among homes in the development and recognizes that the houses as designed present very large roof forms while recognizing the petitioner's concerns about cost. She stated that a letter from the five homeowners on Amberley Woods is included in the Board's packet and expresses continued concern about the proposed exterior materials. She stated that the staff report offers a recommendation in support of the petition subject to specific conditions related to the exterior materials and also a condition that requires the developer to maintain a matrix of homes and their locations to assure that there is an appropriate mix of model and style types throughout the development, as well as a balance of front and side load garages. She added that the recommendation also includes standard conditions that speak to the need for an updated tree survey and a final landscape plan for each lot.

Board member Walther stated that he was a member of the subcommittee and commented that the subcommittee worked with the petitioner and made significant progress. He noted a table on page six of the staff report that summarizes the recommendations from the subcommittee and the compromises that were made in response to the petitioner's requests. He stated support for the recommendations as presented in the staff report. He stated that during the subcommittee meetings, he offered his opinion on cedar shingle versus the asphalt shingle roofs. He explained that the Amberley Woods Courtyard Homes, in his opinion, feel like part of a larger area. He noted that all of the homes between Route 60 and Everett Road, from the train tracks on the east to Saunders Road on the west, almost a square mile, have cedar shingle roofs. He stated that there are other similarities which make the area feel consistent. He stated that the Hardie

Board materials are an improvement in quality and character over the originally proposed L.P. Smartside material. He said that there was discussion during the subcommittee meetings about the factory finished painting and the high sheen that results making it visually identifiable as a manufactured versus a natural product. He stated that the petitioner confirmed that the exterior materials will be painted on site in order to more closely replicate painted natural wood and lessen the glossy, manufactured appearance. He explained that the subcommittee felt that the use of the composite materials for the siding, trim, fascia and soffit was an acceptable compromise on the part of the Board if cedar, rather than asphalt, is used for the roofs.

Board member Looby thanked the developer and the architect for the improvements that were made. He stated that the design changes will help tie all the homes in the development together. He stated that he also served on the subcommittee and commented that various details were refined through that process. He stated his support for cedar roofs noting that the use of cedar will result in a cohesive development. He noted that the original approvals for the Courtyard Homes required cedar shingle roofs. He stated that he supports allowing the use of Hardie Board for various elements, with a smooth finish. He pointed out that the petitioner is proposing aluminum gutters and downspouts, rather than copper gutters and downspouts as originally approved for the Courtyard Homes and stated that he is willing to support that request as a compromise.

Board member Downey stated that she is impressed by how far the designs have come in a short period of time. She stated that she views the Courtyard Homes as a standalone development and stated her hope that the Board and the petitioner find a way to make this work for all parties. She stated that she has heard the petitioner's argument about the cost of building materials. She stated that the design changes that were made improves the fit of the new homes with the existing homes. She stated that she reviewed minutes of earlier meetings at which the Courtyard Homes were discussed to gain an understanding of the original intent with respect to the character and quality of the homes. She stated that the subcommittee and the staff report appear to have reached the best possible resolution, with compromise on the part of all parties, to allow the use of some composite materials. She noted that composite materials have improved since the Board's original approval of the Courtyard Homes. She stated that in response to the concerns raised by the neighbors, she stated that she does not believe that the use of composite materials for siding and trim will negatively impact their homes however, there is a significant difference between the asphalt shingle and the cedar shingle roofs. She acknowledged that some asphalt shingles have a better appearance than others but stated that in her opinion, a cedar shingle roof is the appropriate way to finish the houses. She recognized that the cedar shingle roof will add cost. She stated that the Board has met half way compromising to allow the use of composite materials. She stated her hope that the neighbors will be satisfied with the end product. She suggested that a model with a side load garage should be one of the first homes built so that buyers can see that option. She stated support for changing the colors of the brick or stone if the same homes are built on adjacent lots.

Board member Bluhm agreed that the designs of the homes have greatly improved from the plans initially presented to the Board. She stated support for the proposed composite



materials. She stated that in her opinion, this development will likely attract empty nesters who prefer low maintenance homes. She stated that she is struggling with the roof material. She agreed that from an aesthetic perspective, a cedar roof is preferable. She noted however that the cost of materials has increased significantly. She questioned whether allowing the use of composite materials for siding and trim, rather than requiring wood, would cover the cost of cedar shingles. She stated that in her opinion Amberley Woods does not appear as part of Conway Farms, but acknowledged that driving through the area someone may assume that it is. She acknowledged that cost is not the Board's issue.

Chairman Diamond stated appreciation for the improvements made to the designs of the homes. He stated that adhering to the anti-monotony guidelines will be important. He confirmed that the cost of building materials is not within the Board's purview. He stated support for cedar shingle roofs, adding that he does not want to see a patchwork quilt along Amberley Court.

Board member Franzen commended the improvements made to the designs of the homes. He added that there appears to be good variations among the designs presented. He stated that he strongly supports the use of cedar shingles for the roofs as opposed to asphalt shingles. He acknowledged that wood products are very expensive right now, but noted that with time, the costs will come down somewhat. He questioned how the design matrix will be followed if there is a particular model that is very popular noting the importance of variety along the streetscape.

Board member Renken stated that he reviewed the background information and history of the Amberley Woods development and pointed out that in the earlier discussions, the same concerns about anti-monotony, exterior materials, and the quality of the architecture were raised. He commended Mr. Swanson for refining the architecture of the homes from the first plans presented by the McNaughton Group. He added that some of the changes that were made are subtle, but add authenticity and consistency with the selected architectural styles. He stated that as an architect and a builder he has seen the evolution of composite materials over the last 20 years. He stated that composite materials are more accepted in higher end homes than they were in the past. He stated that in his opinion, the simulated divided lite, fiberglass windows are as technologically good as a wood clad window. He stated support for the use of composite materials for the siding and trim. He stated however that he is conflicted on the issue of the asphalt shingle versus cedar shingle for the roof. He stated that although economics is not the purview of the Board, he would like to see the Amberley Woods homes completed. However, he noted that from the perspective of cohesiveness of the architecture and the quality of the design, he agrees that cedar shingle should be used for the roofs.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Chairman Diamond invited public testimony.

Richard Ernest, stated that he is speaking as an individual unit owner in the condominium building in Amberley Woods. He stated his discontent with the asphalt shingle roofs proposed on the new designs for the single family homes on Amberley Court. He stated that the five existing homes are cedar shingle. He stated that in his opinion, mixing the roof

types will not present a good appearance. He asked the petitioner to consider using exterior materials that are consistent with the existing Courtyard Homes.

Wayne Urbanek, 2025 Amberley Court, thanked the Board members for their service noting that the Board's work has made the City what it is today, a desirable place to live and work. He thanked staff for all the due diligence on this petition since February. He explained that he and the other homeowners on Amberley Court wholeheartedly agree with the staff recommendation, except that they believe that natural wood should be used for fascia and soffits. He stated that using natural materials will make the new homes more compatible with the existing homes. He noted that drainage is a concern in the development and asked that the developer pay careful attention to drainage as the homes are built out. He stated that he and the other homeowners are looking forward to a quality development.

Keith Krebs, 1815 Amberley Court, stated that he purchased his home from the bank in 2012, and his next door neighbors purchased their home within about six months after he purchased his home. He explained that he knew that being first into the development was a bit of a wild card, but having been Lake Forest residents for 13 years before he purchased his home in Amberley Woods, he and his family developed a sense of trust with the elected officials of Lake Forest, City staff, the Building Review Board, and other Board and Commission members. He stated that if he put himself in the developer's shoes, none of the conversations that have happened to date, either in the public forum or during the subcommittee meetings, should have been unexpected. He stated that he has no doubt that McNaughton, a professional developer, conducted due diligence around the design, materials and quality of the existing homes in the area. He stated that the comments of the Board and the neighbors should not be a surprise. He stated that everyone has talked about the cost of construction and it has been acknowledged that cost is not within the Board's purview. He noted that while building costs have increased since McNaughton bought the properties from the prior owner, the housing market has also heated up significantly, so while costs have gone up, the revenue and the price points that can be expected have also gone up.

Mr. Graziano, stated that he and his wife are very concerned about the appearance of the asphalt shingle roofs. He added that asphalt shingle roofs will change the character of the Amberley Court area.

Chairman Diamond, hearing no further requests to speak from the public, invited response to public comment from the petitioner.

In response to public testimony, Mr. Swanson stated that there is a large wetland area behind the homes along Amberley Court and there is some flow that runs along the back of the properties. He stated that the natural flow of the water is to the east, through the Stonebridge development, and then on to the Skokie drainage ditch. He stated that the Amberley Woods development was designed according to good engineering principles. He stated that he is not familiar with any specific drainage issues but stated confidence that if there is a drainage issue, it can be addressed during the construction of the houses.

In response to public testimony, Mr. Barry stated that the first three homes will be the Fenwick model, a ranch style home; the Bostonian model with a master bedroom on the first floor; and the Carlisle model with a master bedroom on the first floor and a side load garage. He stated that they plan on proposing an additional ranch model and will bring that design back to the Board in the future for review. He explained that the buyers will select the colors of the windows, brick and stucco which will enhance the variation within the development. He stated that they are still working out the details of the design matrix but in general, the floor plan, architectural style and the color palette will be tracked. He stated that in response to Board member Bluhm's question on whether the use of composite materials makes up for the cost of cedar shingle roofs, he responded no.

In the response to questions from Chairman Diamond, Ms. Baehr stated that in the past, for developments that are built out with model homes, staff has maintained a matrix in an effort to assure some diversity within the development.

In response to questions from Board member Looby, Mr. Barry stated that if the same floorplan was built on adjacent lots, a different architectural style will be required adding that the same floor could not be used on three consecutive lots.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Swanson stated that the bay windows on the side elevations will be constructed of a different material than the material on the main body of the home. He stated that the perspective renderings are intended to reflect the geometry and color palette of the homes and he acknowledged there may be some discrepancies between the elevation drawings and the renderings.

Board member Walther stated that the color palettes of the homes should primarily be earth tones and natural colors.

In response to Board member Walther's comments, Mr. Swanson explained that the developer understands the importance of proper color combinations. He added that the developer is willing to work with staff to make sure there's not a monotony of colors, or the use of trendy color schemes.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Mr. Swanson stated that an exterior lighting plan has not yet been developed but "can" lights may be used in the eave above the garage doors. He stated that a coach light fixture would be appropriate on one side of the front door, or a hanging fixture. He stated that the fixtures would be selected based on the architectural style of the home.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of the models for the remaining 19 lots in the Amberley Woods Courtyard Homes development based on the findings as presented in the staff report and subject to the following conditions.

1. The plans shall reflect the following exterior materials:
  - a. Wood shingle roofs for all model and style types.

- b. Fiber cement with a smooth finish for all siding.
- c. Fiber cement trim, fascia, soffits and shutters for the Shingle style designs.
- d. Stucco trim boards and fiber cement fascia, soffits and shutters for the French Country and Tudor style designs.
- e. Fiberglass windows with interior and exterior muntins.
- f. Aluminum gutters and downspouts.
- g. Wood porch columns and brackets.
- h. Stone and brick chimneys with clay pots.

2. Color palettes and lighting plans shall be submitted at the time the plans for each individual house are submitted for permit.

3. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, 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 developer shall maintain a matrix of homes and their locations throughout the buildout of the development to assure appropriate diversity of models and architectural styles. The updated matrix is required to be submitted with the building permit application for each home.

5. A current tree survey shall be submitted with the plans for each home to allow a determination of which trees are worthy of preservation and require protection during construction. Healthy, heritage trees should be considered in developing the site plan for each home recognizing that some trees will need to be removed to allow development of the lots.

6. Landscape plans for each residence shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit for each home.

7. Construction parking and staging plans shall be submitted to the City along with the application for building permit for each home. Amberley Court must remain passable and regularly cleaned of dirt and debris resulting from construction.

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

Board member Bluhm abstained from voting on the petition.

**5. Consideration of a request for approval of a two-car attached garage and the addition of covered porches at 713 Illinois Road.**

**Property Owner: Chance Shea**

**Project Representative: Dale Shea, contractor**

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. Shea introduced the petition on behalf of the property owner, his son. He explained that work at the site to date included relocating the driveway from the west side of the house to the east side. He stated that the existing house does not have a garage adding that his son would like to build a typical two car garage. He stated that the existing house is bland, a 25 by 40 foot box. He stated that the planned improvements are intended to make the house more attractive. He presented the proposed elevations. He noted that the existing window on the east elevation will be removed to allow the new garage to be attached to the home. He stated that there will not be an entrance from the garage to the home because the interior spaces on the east side of the home are bedrooms. He stated that there is currently no storage in the home adding that the garage will provide some needed storage space. He stated that a patio is proposed at the rear of the home. He explained that when his son purchased the house, the ground around the house was above the window wells and water was pouring into the basement. He stated that to correct the problem, the area adjacent to the house was dug out. He noted that variances are needed for the garage given the size and configuration of the lot adding that the Zoning Board of Appeals recently recommended approval of the variances. He stated that the distance from the garage to the front property line is 18 feet and 7 inches and the sidewalk is two feet from the property line providing enough space for a car to park in front of a garage without blocking the sidewalk. He said that he has spoken to the neighbors and they are in support of the project.

Ms. Baehr stated that the petitioner proposes to construct a two car garage and two open porches, one at the front entrance and the other at the rear of the home. She explained that the property is small, 7,600 square feet and an irregular shape so there are limited options for locating a garage on the site. She stated that the garage as proposed is three feet forward of the front wall of the home and approximately 20 feet from the street at the closest point. She noted that because it is unusual to locate a garage forward of the house, staff asked the petitioner to explore other options that could step the garage back somewhat from the front of the house. She stated that the location as proposed is desired by the petitioner to provide for a rear yard for the property. She noted that the elevations reflect shutters on the windows adding that the petitioner has indicated that the shutters may be removed. She suggested that if the shutters remain, they should be proportionate to the windows and consistently applied around the home. She stated that no tree removal is proposed but noted that a landscape plan is required as the project moves forward, staff to reflect the minimum plantings required by the Code including foundation plantings to soften the appearance of the home garage particularly given the proximity to the street. She confirmed that the Zoning Board of Appeals recently recommended approval of variances for this petition to allow the garage and the front porch to encroach into the required front and side yard setbacks.

Board member Renken acknowledged that it is a difficult site with an existing nonconforming situation. He stated that the house is so modest that it is almost out of place along the streetscape. He commented that the hard work of considering the

requested variances was done by the Zoning Board of Appeals which allows the garage to be built adding that it is the Building Review Board's job to make sure that the garage and the projections are aesthetically pleasing to the extent possible and that the details are correct. He observed that the house looks bigger with the garage making it fit better into the neighborhood. He noted that the projecting garage balances the forward projecting front porch and together, they frame the house. He stated some concern about the details shown on the plans and stated that some further refinement is needed. He stated that shutters do not appear appropriate for this type of house. He noted that the muntins in the windows do not appear correct adding that the windows in the garage should match the existing windows on the house. He noted that there is no header course in the brick and stated that a soldier course should be installed to cap off the garage opening. He stated that as proposed, the garage doors have arched openings and pointed out that there are no curves on the house. He suggested that if lites are desired at the top of the garage door, the top of the lites should be straight. He added that the lites in the garage door should not have muntins adding that they would likely be low quality, snap-in muntins. He noted that the existing front door is more attractive than the door shown in the elevation. He observed that the porch columns appear too thick and need to be refined adding that the base and top of the columns appear too tall. He suggested consideration of a two by four instead of a two by eight. He stated that replacing the roof on the house so that the roofs on the house and garage match is preferable.

Board member Looby agreed that the house needs a garage and noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals acknowledged that by recommending approval of variances. He stated that the garage appears to fit with the home. He agreed with Board member Renken's comments on the architectural details. He noted that a soldier course above the garage door will enhance the appearance of the home. He stated that the shutters as proposed are mismatched and noted that the sidelights on the front door appear awkward. He agreed that the roofs should match. He noted that the proposed porches will improve the appearance of the home.

Board member Bluhm stated that the garage will be a great addition to the house and will make it much more functional. She noted that as proposed, the garage is three feet forward of the house and the porch is almost five feet forward of the home. She commented that in her opinion, if the garage was moved forward to align with the porch, the front of the home would appear more balanced and there would be an area for landscaping. She agreed with the suggestion to add a soldier course above the garage door opening. She suggested that consideration be given to two, rather than one, garage door to soften the appearance. She stated that in her opinion, the house does not need shutters. She asked if consideration is being given to drainage of the below grade patio at the rear of the home to avoid water pooling on the patio. She asked whether, given the discussion about limited storage space, consideration was given to raising the roof to add attic space.

Board member Looby noted that the siting of the garage as proposed, allows vehicles to park in front of the garage without blocking the public sidewalk. He stated that moving the garage forward could result in larger vehicles extending across the sidewalk. He stated that he supports the location of the garage as proposed.

Board member Franzen stated that the addition of garage and the front porch will add to the street presence of the house. He agreed with the previous comments about incorporating additional detail into the brickwork around the garage door. He stated that the house does not need shutters and the placement of shutters is difficult with the porch columns. He stated concern about the dimensions of the porch columns cautioning that care should be taken to avoid the columns appearing too skinny. He explained that in his opinion, the garage is sited well to avoid the potential of vehicles blocking the sidewalk.

Board member Downey noted that the information from the petitioner suggests that the brick removed from the home will be used to construct the garage. She noted that there will not be enough bricks from the house to complete the garage and asked how that will be addressed.

Board member Walther agreed with the comments offered by his fellow Board members. He noted that the porch ceiling will be a large surface, six by twelve feet wide and asked how the surface will be treated. He stated that plans indicate aluminum fascia boards and soffits on the garage. He noted that when visiting the site, it appeared that the boards on the house are wood and are rotting. He stated that if the fascia and soffits on the house are wood, wood should also be used on the garage and repairs should be made on the house. He stated that it looks like based on the photographs the petitioner provided that there is one window with multiple divisions and all the rest of the windows are double hung windows with a single bar across each of the panes. He stated that the new windows should match the existing windows on the house.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Diamond invited public testimony. Hearing none, he invited the petitioner to respond to the questions raised by the Board.

Mr. Shea agreed that adding a soldier course above the garage door is a good idea. He stated that he does not object to eliminating the shutters and muntins in the windows as suggested by the Board. He agreed to study the columns further. He stated that the brick removed from the house will be used on the front of the garage so it matches the house. He stated that it should be fairly easy to find brick that is a fairly good match for the sides and rear of the garage. He stated that the existing house has a combination of aluminum and wood fascia and soffits. He stated the intent to use all aluminum fascia and soffits to minimize maintenance. He confirmed that the roof of the house will be replaced because it is at the end of its life and will match the architectural asphalt shingle on the garage. He stated that raising the roof is not economically feasible.

Board member Looby noted that for a small house, the garage door is large adding that if two single doors are workable, the aesthetics of the house would be enhanced.

Board member Bluhm agreed that two single garage doors would be an enhancement. She commended the petitioner for reusing the bricks that will be removed from the house. She stated that the project will improve the home.

Board member Renken noted that he commented that the porch columns as presented are too large but he agreed with Board member Franzen's point that the columns should not be too skinny. He clarified that the columns only need to be slightly reduced in size from what is shown on the drawings. He noted that consideration will need to be given to how light and vent requirements will be satisfied once the windows in the bedrooms along the east side of the house are removed.

Board member Franzen observed that the garage door in the drawings has the appearance of two single doors and suggested that the decision about whether to have a single door or two doors be left to the petitioner.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of a two-car attached garage and two covered porches based on the findings as presented in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations. He stated that there is a consensus from the Board that further refinement of several aspects of the project is needed however, he stated confidence that the items noted in the conditions can be addressed by staff through work with the petitioner. He noted that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. The plans shall be refined as follows:
  - a) Eliminate the shutters.
  - b) Eliminate the muntins in the windows.
  - c) Study and refine the width of the porch columns.
  - d) Enhance the porch column detailing.
  - e) Add a soldier course above the garage door.
  - f) Replace the arched windows on the garage door with rectangular windows.
  - g) Consider eliminating the muntins in the garage door windows.
2. All modifications to the plans, including those made in response to the conditions above, the Board's direction or as the result of final design development, 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 full set of dimensioned architectural plans shall be submitted at the time of application for permit.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed, landscape plan meeting, at least the minimum landscape requirements in the Code, shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall reflect new plantings in the front yard to the extent possible in an effort to soften the appearance of the home as viewed from the street.



5. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate the project is consistent with the applicable Code requirements subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. Grading or filling on the site should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices to properly direct drainage.
6. 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. All exterior lights, except for motion detector lights for security purposes, shall be set on timers to turn off no later than 11 p.m.
7. 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 Looby and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

**6. Consideration of a request for approval of a new residence on a vacant lot, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan. The property is addressed as 1535 Sage Court and is in the Oak Knoll Woodlands Subdivision.**

**Property Owner: Fidelity Wes of Oak Knoll LLC (Mike DeMar, 100%)**

**Contract Purchaser: Brian and Betsy Heckenbach**

**Project Representative: Jeff Letzter, Aspect Design Inc.**

This petition was postponed at the request of the petitioner.

**7. Consideration of a request for approval of a new residence on a vacant lot, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan. The property is addressed as 1133 Mount Vernon Avenue.**

**Property Owner: IBG Devco LLC (Charlie Murphy, 100%)**

**Project Representative: Paul Psenka, architect**

**Sean Burke, Icon Building Group**

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. Psenka introduced the project on behalf of the property owner. He stated that the footprint of the new residence is located as far north on the property as possible in order to minimize the amount of tree removal. He noted however that several trees will need to be removed to allow a reasonable footprint for the home. He stated that the house as sited, minimizes the number of Heritage trees and vegetation that will be impacted and maintains existing drainage patterns on the site. He stated that stormwater flows across the back of the property, from north to south, to a drainage inlet on the adjacent property to the south. He noted that stormwater also drains from the property to the street. He stated that the plan as proposed minimizes grading near the property lines. He stated a Colonial Revival home is proposed similar to some of the other homes on the street. He noted that many of the homes in the neighborhood were built in the 1980s and are simple in nature

with a mix of gable and hip roofs. He stated that the Colonial Revival style, with minimal detailing, is appropriate for the neighborhood adding that the home will not call attention to itself. He noted that the proposed exterior materials are consistent with other homes on the street; fiber cement siding with a five inch exposure, cedar fascia and stone at the base of the house. He stated that the windows will have a six over six muntin pattern with simulated divided lites and a simple sill and simple header detail. He presented the elevations of the home noting that the windows on each elevation are the same rhythm, size and shape. He stated that a screen porch is proposed at the corner of the home. He explained that the landscaping is designed with an undulating perimeter to blend in with the existing landscaping. He stated that the color palette selected by the contract purchaser includes blue siding. He showed images of other homes in the City with blue siding.

Ms. Baehr stated that the vacant property is on the east side of Mount Vernon Avenue, between Everett and Old Elm Roads and the property is located in an established neighborhood in which there are homes of many different architectural styles. She reiterated that the residence is sited on the north side of the property in an effort to preserve the higher quality and healthiest trees on the site which are located on the south portion of the property. She noted that the home has a front facing garage adding that facing garages are generally discouraged, in this case, a side load garage would require removal of more trees some of which are Heritage trees. She noted that there are other front facing garages in the neighborhood. She stated that the home is designed in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding homes. She noted that some of the architectural detailing reflected in the eaves and on the columns appears somewhat inconsistent with the selected style. She noted that the staff report includes a recommendation that the detail be refined to be more in keeping with traditional Colonial Revival detailing. She stated that a total of 19 trees are proposed for removal, mostly Oaks along with some lower quality trees and other vegetation. She noted that based on the species, size and condition of the trees proposed for removal, a total of 140 replacement inches will be required. She explained that taking into consideration the existing trees that will remain on the site and the size of the property, it is unlikely that the full amount of required replacement inches can be fully planted on the site and a payment in lieu of on site planting for the remaining replacement inches will be required. She noted that staff received a call from a neighbor expressing concerns about drainage in the area. She stated that staff alerted City engineering staff to the concerns so that when the grading and drainage plans are submitted for review, the neighbor's concerns can be taken into account. She added that the plans can also be provided to the neighbor if the neighbor would like to review them. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the petition and recommended conditions of approval.

Chairman Diamond pointed out that the windows have a six over six muntin pattern but the front door presents a different pattern.

Board member Walther agreed that some further work on the detailing is needed. He stated concern about the color palette. He noted that there are many neutral tones used on the homes along the street. He noted that this home will be brand new in contrast to the other homes on the street and, as proposed, will have a stark color palette which will

make the house stand out from its neighbors. He suggested that considering a different color palette would be beneficial. He commented that the use of black windows is very trendy right now adding that black windows make the home look busy. He stated that if a simple look is desired, maintaining a base color, a trim color and the red door as a highlight will achieve that goal. He noted that adding a fourth color, black windows are black complicates the appearance. He noted that the large vent on the rear of the house, on the second floor, looks out of place. He stated that he assumes the vent is for a chimney because there is a chimney box shown in the plans, but no chimney on the house. He stated that a window instead of the vent would be a better feature.

Board member Looby agreed with Board member Walther's comments. He agreed that the color palette is stark with the blue siding and black windows. He acknowledged that there are other blue homes in the area but noted that the windows do not contrast so starkly as proposed here. He stated that the blue houses typically have white windows and lighter trim color. He complimented the overall design and said that with some refinement, it will fit in well with the neighborhood.

XXXX

Board member Downey acknowledged that the architect's statement of intent emphasized the focus on appropriate detail and the desire to maintain the character of the neighborhood. She stated that to follow through with that intent, additional detailing should be incorporated in the eaves in additions to the suggestions offered by the other Board members. She agreed that the black windows stand out. She stated that in her opinion, the black windows detract from the architecture and from the bright red front door which should be the focal point of the home. She stated that as proposed, the focus is on the black windows. She observed that the blue siding appears different in the hard copy images than in the rendering noting that in one, the color appears to be a blue gray, more consistent with a Colonial style home. She noted that in the rendering, the color appears to be a blue green which is not appropriate with the proposed red door. She suggested that the blue gray is more appropriate for the siding. She acknowledged that blue may not necessarily fit in with the neutral tones in the neighborhood but stated that as long as an appropriate blue is proposed, she does not object to the blue. She noted however that the black windows detract from the overall home.

Board member Bluhm agreed with the comments about the black windows. She stated that as proposed, in her opinion, the house would look better with white windows. She stated support for blue gray siding noting that the blue gray color will tie in with the stone at the base. She noted the importance of appropriate details at the entrance to a Colonial Revival home to highlight that element. She suggested that the petitioner consider pavers particularly for the walkway noting that the pavers will be more attractive than concrete. She noted that no exterior lights are shown adding that a lighting plan is needed.

Board member Franzen complimented the house overall. He acknowledged that colors can look very different on printed documents than on a screen. He agreed that a grayish blue is the right color for the siding in terms of fitting into the neighborhood. He agreed the comments of the other Board members on the windows. He noted that white windows, rather than black, will allow the windows to fit more quietly into the house. He agreed that some additional architectural detailing, true to the Colonial revival style, will benefit the

overall project.

Board member Renken stated appreciation for the simplicity of the forms and the proportions of the home. He agreed that gray blue siding is appropriate adding that the white or light gray windows will complement the overall home. He suggested that the front door be a deeper red. He stated that a Colonial Revival style home usually has boxed eaves and explained that the detail as proposed appears more consistent with a Saltbox style with angled rafter tails. He noted that if the home is intended to be a Colonial Revival home, the details need some refinement. He stated agreement with staff's recommendation.

Chairman Diamond agreed with the comments of the other Board members. He agreed that the black windows are distracting and asked that the combination of the black windows, blue siding, white trim and red door be revisited. He encouraged the use of pavers rather than concrete for the front walkway to soften the appearance of the home. He commented that it is difficult to see so many significant trees coming down.

Board member Looby noted that the aluminum gutters and downspouts are not shown on the drawings.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Diamond invited public testimony.

Lorraine Dillon, 1130 Old Colony Road, stated that there is a low area at the corners where her property, the subject property and two other properties come together. She stated that City engineering staff has been out to look at the area in the past. She noted that with heavy rains, the low point floods. She noted concern that existing private storm drains are blocked and now functioning properly. She said that it is not clear if the drains on private properties are connected to the City sewer. She questioned whether proper drains were installed when a home was built to the south. She stated that her and her neighbors are concerned about drainage and want to assure that as the project moves forward, drainage issues will be addressed.

Ms. Czerniak stated that staff will have the City's engineering staff look carefully at the area and determine how best to treat drainage on the subject site in order to avoid adding to existing drainage issues. She noted that low areas, away from structures will likely continue to hold some water after heavy storms. She stated that the neighbor can request a copy of the drainage and grading plans when they are submitted.

Ms. Dillon stated that the drainage issues are getting progressively worse and noted that sometimes, it takes up to three days for water to recede after a storm. She acknowledged that the City will look at the plans for the new construction but noted that there are problems in existing yards that need to be addressed.

Hearing no further public testimony, Chairman Diamond invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions and comments and to public testimony.

Mr. Psenka acknowledged that incorporating a boxed eave was discussed and stated that they are not opposed to considering a boxed eave and incorporating other detailing more in line with the Colonial Revival style. He stated that black windows were requested by the contract purchaser but noted that white windows can be considered. He acknowledged that black windows are trendy right now. He explained that the vent on the rear elevation is inside a closet and agreed to change it to a window. He stated that the hope is to keep the house simple but agreed that additional detailing on the entrance portico may be appropriate. He confirmed that aluminum half round gutters and downspouts are planned adding that the roof is relatively simple so locating downspouts will not be an issue. He agreed to consider using pavers for the front walk or as a border. He stated that with respect to drainage, the City Engineer will look closely at the plans adding that there is no intention of making the existing situation worse but if possible, to make it better.

Board member Walther stated that the pitch on the roof above the front porch and above the garage is 3.5:12 and appears very shallow, particularly on the garage. He recognized that the house is close to the maximum square footage allowed and asked for Board input on the slope of the roof on the garage.

Board member Looby noted that the shallow slope will be problematic with snow adding that snow will pile up in front of the second floor windows. He agreed that a steeper pitch would be an improvement.

Board member Walther stated that it would make sense to move the face of the second floor forward, but the square footage limitation would be exceeded.

Mr. Psenka explained that the shallow pitch of the garage roof is intended to keep the roof below the windows on the second floor and meet egress requirements. He acknowledged that if the second floor was pushed forward, the roof pitch could be increased but other issues would arise.

Board member Renken suggested that the roof pitch could be increased with the addition of a copper pan below the windows. He added that this approach will not increase the square footage of the house.

Mr. Psenka stated that a copper pan would add another element to the front of the home and may call more attention than the shallow pitch roof on the garage. He stated that a 3:12 or 4:12 pitch roof is not inappropriate for the Colonial Revival style.

Board member Walther stated that he is pleased that the petitioner has listened to the Board's comments and indicated a willingness to work with staff on some refinements. He stated that the right shade of blue, such as a blue gray, can work for this house.

Chairman Diamond commented that using pavers or incorporating a border on the walkway will help to soften the appearance of the home.

Board member Looby stated that he is in support of the project with the modifications and

refinements as discussed.

Board member Bluhm agreed with the comments of the other Board members.

Board member Renken commented that the petitioner has addressed the Board's major concerns and he suggested that the final details be addressed by staff.

Board member Franzen stated that he believes the petitioner can work through the detailing and final color palette with staff. He stated that he does not have a concern with the shallow roof pitch on the front of the garage.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of a new residence, conceptual landscape plan and overall site plan based on the findings as presented in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. The plans shall be refined as follows:
  - a. Add the half round gutters and downspouts on the elevations.
  - b. Soften the front walk with pavers or alternate hardscape.
  - c. Consider further detailing and refinements to the columns and front entrance.
  - d. Replace the vent on the rear elevation with a window.
  - e. Detail the eaves to align with the Colonial Revival style.
  - f. Provide clarification on the color palette, if blue is desired, it should be a blue/gray to avoid being too stark in appearance compared to other homes.
  - g. Utilize white windows rather than black.
  - h. Refine the lite patten in the front door.
  - i. Provide a lighting plan. The exterior light fixtures shall be consistent with the architectural style of the home.
2. All modifications to the plans including the refinements noted above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, 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. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed, landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The final landscape shall include, but not be limited to, the minimum landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. If the full amount of required replacement inches which totals 140 inches cannot be accommodated on site, a payment in lieu of on site plantings will be

required before the issuance of a building permit to support plantings in the parkways in the neighborhood.

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. Grading or filling on the site should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices and properly direct drainage.
5. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation and to protect trees on neighboring properties during construction, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
6. Details of exterior lighting 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.
7. 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 Looby and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

### **OTHER ITEMS**

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

There was no additional public testimony presented to the Board.

#### **9. Additional information from staff.**

There was no additional information presented to the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Assistant Planner