

**The City of Lake Forest**  
**Building Review Board**  
**Proceedings of January 10, 2022 Meeting**

A meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Monday, January 10, 2022 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, Sally Downey, John Looby, Scott Renken and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: Joanne Bluhm and Timothy G. Franzen

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 the November 3, 2021 meeting of the Building Review Board.**

The minutes of the November 3, 2021 meeting were approved as submitted.

In response to a question from Board member Downey pertaining to the windows for the residence at 1525 Sage Court, Ms. Baehr stated that a window sample has not yet been provided and noted that it is her understanding that the petitioner is still considering whether to use aluminum or vinyl clad windows.

**3. Consideration of a request for approval of a residential development including 12 Senior Cottages at the northwest corner of Everett and Telegraph Roads. The cottages are configured as two attached units in a total of six buildings. The development is proposed on City owned property and is a partnership between the City, the Lake Forest-Lake Bluff Senior Citizens' Foundation and Community Partners for Affordable Housing.  
Property Owner: City of Lake Forest  
Project Representative: Timothy Archibald architect**

Chairman Diamond asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited opening comments from staff.

Ms. Czerniak stated that for some time, the City has been interested in increasing the availability of housing for seniors in the community. She stated that the City owned property on the northwest corner of Everett and Telegraph Roads was recently identified as an appropriate location for additional senior cottages. She noted that the property is zoned for commercial use however, senior cottages are also permitted by the applicable zoning and will result in a lower intensity use on the site. She stated that both the City's Housing Trust Fund Board and the City Council have endorsed the use of the City owned property for senior cottages. She noted that there is an existing senior cottage development just to the north of the site, at the end of Telegraph Road. She stated that the proposed development is a partnership with the Lake Forest - Lake Bluff Senior Citizens' Foundation, Community Partners for Affordable Housing, local professionals who are providing some portion of their services pro bono, and the City. She stated that the senior cottages are in demand, and there is a waiting list, but the units turn over only infrequently. She stated that the petition is before the Building Review Board for consideration of the design aspects of the project. She introduced Tim Archibald, the project architect.

Mr. Archibald stated that he is representing the Community Partners for Affordable Housing organization, the group that will ultimately own and develop the City property. He reviewed the location of the site noting that there is a public walking path located to the west and north of the site and public roads, Everett Road and Telegraph Road bordering the site to the south and east respectively. He stated that the walking path will be preserved along with the wetlands located to the north and west of the site. He stated that the site is a wonderful location for seniors, near shopping, services and the train station. He stated that the site is connected to the larger area with walking paths and sidewalks. He noted that various site plans were studied with the project engineers, Bleck Engineering. He noted that the development as proposed has two accesses, one from Everett Road, a right in right out access, and one from Telegraph Road. He stated that both curb cuts are pushed away from the intersection to the extent possible. He stated that internally, the cottages are located along a loop drive with curb cuts for a single car garage for each unit and some extra shared parking for guests. He stated that twelve individual cottages are proposed in a series of six duplex buildings. He stated there are four buildings around the perimeter of the property, Unit Type One, and two duplex buildings at the center of the road, Unit Type Two. He stated that the duplexes along the perimeter of the site have front facing single car garage doors and the center duplexes have side load garages. He noted that all units have front and back covered porches. He reiterated that the walking path to the west will be preserved and noted that the intent is to also preserve much of the existing berm located at the southeast corner of the site and the significant trees to the northwest of the site. He stated that recognizing the amount of landscape existing around the site, a landscape plan has not yet been developed pending a better understanding of the trees and vegetation that can be preserved. He stated that a landscape plan will be developed and presented to the Board for review at a later date. He stated that the plan provides some space and privacy for each of the cottages and is dense enough to create a sense of neighborhood without overwhelming the site. He noted that one of the duplex buildings encroaches slightly into the setback along Telegraph

Road as a result of trying to maintain an adequate distance for the cottages on the west side of the development from the walking trail. He stated that the site plan provides adequate space between the existing berm along the east side of the site and the closest cottage. He reviewed elevations of each of the two unit types noting that both are single story. He stated that the first unit type has composite clapboard siding, an architectural asphalt shingle roof, and metal standing seam roofs at the porches. He noted that design elements include shutters, dormers, and windows with muntins. He stated that the buildings are design to be clean, simple and low profile. He stated that a limited range of color palettes are being considered, a range of earth tones, to differentiate the various duplex buildings. He stated that various colors for the windows are being considered as well adding that a dark green is being considered as one option to provide a nice accent. He stated that the exterior trim is natural wood and will be painted white. He stated that the patios are concrete pavers. He stated that the first unit type is about 1,000 square feet excluding the garage and porches. He stated that the units are very livable for a person with disabilities. He stated that the second unit type has a full natural stucco exterior with score lines in the stucco, and an architectural asphalt shingle roof. He noted that shutters and louvered vents are proposed. He stated that unit type two is slightly larger at 1,095 square feet excluding the garage and the porches. He stated that the utility rooms for unit types in which the water heater and furnace will be located, are in the garage so that they can be serviced without entering the unit. He stated that the roof plan reflects gable forms as the main roof type with 12:12 and 5:12 pitches. He added that the porch will have a 3:12 pitch. He stated that larger windows are proposed at the back of the units to allow more light into and views from the bedrooms. He stated that the designs of the units are influenced by English Colonial Cottages and the French Eclectic style. He stated that the scale, detailing and overall massing of the buildings fit well and quietly into the neighborhood.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the cottages are intentionally low profile and simple in design, with a nice level of detail. She stated that an effort was made to achieve a good balance between synthetic and natural materials. She stated although there is a composite product proposed for the siding, natural materials are incorporated to give the homes a patina overtime. She explained that the intent is to nestle these cottages into a vegetated site and preserved the landscape dominate streetscapes along Telegraph and Everett Roads and along the walking path. She stated that eventually, buckthorn in the area may be removed and replaced with a native species. She stated that the site plan was developed to preserve the heritage trees on the site to the extent possible, particularly to the northwest of the development. She stated that the intent is to create a neighborhood atmosphere with a buffer on all sides. She stated that once the site begins to take shape, and it is clearer which vegetation will remain on the site, a landscape plan will be developed and presented to the Board for review.

Chairman Diamond invited Board questions and asked the petitioner to be prepared to respond to all of the questions at one time, after the Board members have all had a chance to speak.

Board member Looby noted that he served on the Zoning Board of Appeals and on

the City Council during discussion of the first senior cottages. He stated that in his opinion, the proposed site plan works very well. He noted that the scale and design of the proposed cottages fits well into the surrounding neighborhood. He added that the cottages are distinctive, without being overdone. He stated that as someone who travels through the area frequently, he believes that the ingress and egress as proposed works well with an entrance on each street, away from the intersection. He asked whether residents would be limited to one vehicle and if there would be a requirement that residents park in the garages rather than on the driveway.

Board member Downey asked about the size of the site. She commented on the floor plan and questioned whether there would be two full bathrooms in each unit and questioned whether locating the utility room in the garage would be problematic for residents. She asked whether the street will be one way.

Board member Renken stated commended the City for designating the site for this particular use. He stated that the concept of duplexes works well on the site and noted that the layout is an effective use of the space. He agreed with Board member Looby's comments about the traffic pattern. He asked if the garage will be a heated space and asked about the materials that will be used for the soffits. He suggested that consideration be given to the addition of windows to break up the blank wall of the recessed areas on the front elevation of Unit Type One. He expressed support for the muted color palette. He pointed out that "Unit Type Two" has two windows on the front elevation, one larger window with shutters and one small window without shutters. He suggested that consideration be given to replacing the small window with a larger window with shutters to create a more balanced look. He suggested adding a frieze along the front gable to break up the lower wall and the gable above.

Board member Walther stated that he travels through the area frequently and noted congestion when trains block the crossing. He stated that cars may cut through the development during peak traffic times and the parties should be aware of that possibility. He stated that he is concerned about the building at the southeast corner noting that although it is screened by a berm and vegetation, the rear of the building, particularly at the roof line, appears stark. He acknowledged that there are two small dormer windows on the expansive roof but asked that further thought be given to breaking up the roofline along the back of the building because it may be highly visible from the intersection. He pointed out that the south elevation of the southwest building and the east elevation of the northeast building will face Everett and Telegraph Roads and noted that there is only one small window on those elevations. He asked that consideration be given to adding openings to those elevations to give the buildings more visual interest from the street. He stated that the size of these buildings appears appropriate for architectural asphalt shingle roofing but noted that the nearby train station, fire station, commercial buildings, the church, the existing senior cottage development to the north, and the existing homes on the south side of Everett Road, all have cedar shingle roofs. He suggested that the petitioner consider using cedar shingle roofing for compatibility with the surrounding area. He asked if connected units will have the same color palette.

Chairman Diamond asked about the dimensions of the garage minus the utility room. Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Diamond invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions.

Mr. Archibald stated that the residents in each unit will be limited to one vehicle. He stated that regulations about parking in the driveway could be established if necessary. He stated that the City is donating about two acres of land for the development. He stated that the property to the north and west will remain in City ownership. He stated that the units are only about 1,000 square feet and it is difficult to accommodate two full bathrooms but agreed to study that issue further in conversation with the developer. He clarified that the hot water heater and furnace will be located in the utility room in the garage, but that the washer and dryer will be inside the unit. He stated that the street in the development will be two-way and noted that the access on Everett Road is designed to be right-in/right-out only. He explained that the porch on the front elevations is recessed from the front of the garage so the windows in those areas are not directly next to one another and will not likely read as being different sizes. He stated that the difference in the sizes of the windows is due to the interior spaces but agreed to study the windows further. He commented that he tried to achieve the right balance between a simple design and providing some interest. He stated that he will also study the side elevations facing the street and the large roof forms and consider incorporating additional openings or details to add interest from the streetscape. He stated his expectation that the roofs will be softened over time by trees. He stated that the garage will be either actively or passively heated. He stated that aluminum gutters and downspouts are proposed and noted that the gutter profile has not yet been selected. He agreed to revisit the stucco exterior and consider adding a trim board between the lower wall and the gable form above or making the whole gable end something other than stucco. He stated that given the intent of the project, affordable housing for seniors, cedar shingle roofs are a cost issue and a long-term maintenance concern. He explained that architectural asphalt shingles are textured and rich with shadow and are appropriate for the small scale cottages. He stated that the garage is about 21 feet and 6 inches in length and 13 feet in width. He confirmed that attached cottages will have the same color palette. He stated that if the siding is white, the windows could potentially be blue or green, or other colors. He stated that the color of the stucco will be similar throughout. He confirmed that there will be variety in the color palette, not just white and black.

Chairman Diamond invited public testimony. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Board.

Board member Looby stated that he is pleased with the petitioner's responses to the Board's questions and suggestions. He asked if the final color selections and landscape plan will come back to the Board for further review.

Ms. Czerniak suggested that with input from the Board, staff will review the final color palettes. She confirmed that a landscape plan will be presented to the Board for

review at a later date.

Board member Downey stated general support for the project. She stated that in her opinion, there should be two full bathrooms in the units to accommodate family members or caregivers. She stated that the landscaping will be important. She stated support for detailing the stucco with trim or another material.

Board member Renken stated that he is satisfied with the petitioner's responses and commented that the project is moving in the right direction. He stated that he is comfortable with the final design issues being worked through with staff.

Board member Walther agreed with Board member Renken's comments. He stated that the Board offered suggested improvements most of which seem to be relatively easy to accomplish. He stated support for moving the project forward with direction to staff to review final refinements. He stated that the petitioner appears open to considering the Board's suggestions. He pointed out that the two buildings on the west side of the property appear to be very close to some of the trees which will likely be impacted and lost and suggested consideration of moving the entire development west to avoid the need for a setback variance on the east side and to provide a greater distance between the cottages and Telegraph Road. He stated that the walking path could be moved west if necessary.

Ms. Czerniak noted that there are wetlands west of the walking path which limits the ability to shift the path. She added that relocating the path would add cost and complications to the project.

Chairman Diamond stated that he too is comfortable moving the project forward subject to final approval by staff. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he invited a motion.

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of the senior cottages residential development, subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Consider the following comments offered by the Board:
  - a. Add shutters to all the windows on the front elevation of plan A1-2.
  - b. Add windows to the side elevations of plan A1-1 to break up the solid walls.
  - c. Due to its visibility from the street, introduce an element to break up the roof form on the building at the southwest corner of the site.
  - d. Consider providing two full bathrooms in the units.
  - e. Refine plan A1-2 to break up the stucco exterior walls.
  - f. Provide additional detail to street facing elevations.
  
2. All modifications made to the plans that were presented to the Board in response to the points raised above, Board direction, and 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. Final exterior color selections will be subject to staff review prior to the issuance of each building permit.
4. An overall landscape plan shall be brought back to the Board for review as the development takes shape. The landscape plan shall detail the perimeter plantings, the vegetation that will remain along Everett and Telegraph Roads and the vegetation that will be added. The plan shall provide a "typical plan" for foundation plantings and a plan for street trees as well as any landscaping planned to enhance the privacy of the individual cottages and the public walking path.
5. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
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. No parking of construction or contractor vehicles is permitted on Everett or Telegraph Roads. Consideration should be given to using the south end of the train station parking lot if on site parking during construction cannot be accommodated.

The motion was seconded by Board member Looby and approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**4. Consideration of Consideration of a request for approval of a porch addition on the front of the residence at 383 Illinois Road.**

**Property Owners: Steven Dauer and Mary Saville-Schulte**

**Project Representative: Robert Gebelhoff, designer**

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

Ms. Saville-Schulte stated that about a year ago they made changes to their driveway and repositioned the east edge and during this improvement, the front entry steps were impacted. She presented images of the existing front entrance. She noted that the front steps now extend about 18 inches into the driveway and are in poor condition. She explained that in the process of repairing the front steps a decision was made to consider a porch to enhance the front elevation. She stated that the house is almost three stories tall, and the front façade is very plain. She added that the front windows have shutters that do appear to fit the home. She noted that there are French doors on the front façade that lead to nothing. She stated that she believes that there may have been a front porch on the home at some time in the past. She stated that a new front porch is proposed to extend across the length of the front façade. She stated that the shutters will be removed from the front windows. She presented the proposed elevations. She stated that the front porch will

give the home a greater sense of privacy from the street. She stated that many homes in the surrounding area have front porches. She stated that the porch will be constructed of natural materials in keeping with the aesthetics of the community. She noted that the porch will have an architectural asphalt shingle roof to match the house. She stated that the porch will be deep enough to accommodate a small table and chairs. She stated that hanging light fixtures with seeded glass will be used on the porch along with a few sconces on the front façade.

Ms. Baehr stated that the project is proposed to enhance the street facing façade. She stated that the porch will break up the front elevation and add interest to the front of the home. She stated that the covered porch will provide shelter from the weather at the front entrance. She reiterated that the porch will be constructed of natural materials consistent with the City's design guidelines. She noted that the shutters on the windows and the metal balcony on the front elevation will be removed. She stated that staff recommends approval of the petitions subject to standard conditions as detailed in the staff report.

Chairman Diamond invited Board questions and asked the petitioner to be prepared to respond to all of the questions at one time, after the Board members have all had a chance to speak.

Board member Walther asked about the color of the porch railing and the stone at the base of the porch columns. He recommended consideration of a white bead board for the ceiling of the porch. He pointed out that there is no overhang on the porch roof yet the existing roof on the home has an overhang and soffit. He suggested that the porch may benefit from the addition of an overhang that extends to create a shadow.

Board member Downey complimented the house and the concept of a front porch. She suggested that an eight foot width may be too narrow to accommodate furniture. She agreed with the plan to remove the shutters.

Board member Renken stated that a porch is exactly what this house needs to add articulation and shadow to the stucco façade. He stated that the porch columns look a bit narrow and should be studied further. He stated that landscaping is needed at the base of the porch to mitigate the appearance of height. He observed that arches are proposed on the porch railing, on the lattice, and on the porch gable and noted that although the arches relate to the arch on the front door, it appears that the arch element is over used on the front façade. He suggested eliminating the arches on the railing and allowing the arches on the front door and on the French doors to speak for themselves. He stated that with respect to Board member Walther's comment about the roof overhang, the porch has a hip roof form that appears to match the bay on the east side of the home. He added that in his opinion, the porch can be a simple hip roof without an overhang.

Board member Looby stated that the color of the porch will be important. He stated that the lattice below the porch should not be white because it will quickly appear



dirty. He suggested consideration of non-slippery surfaces for the porch.

Chairman Diamond agreed with Board member Looby that a non-slip surface will be important. Hearing no further comments or questions from the Board, he invited public testimony. Hearing none, he invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions.

Ms. Saville-Schulte stated that the house has charcoal color trim and the porch will be painted to match. She agreed that a non-slip surface should be used for the steps. She stated that the porch detailing will be subtle adding that she has no interest in creating an ornate appearance. She stated that the porch ceiling will be beadboard or tongue and groove. She stated that the stone at the base of the porch columns will match the natural stone along the front and rear of the home. She confirmed that landscaping is planned noting that Boxwoods will be planted in front of the lattice and perhaps a Dogwood at the east corner.

Chairman Diamond invited final comments from the Board.

Board member Renken acknowledged that the Board encourages the use of natural materials however composite products can be used for the stair treads and floor for a non-slip surface.

Board member Downey agreed with Board member Renken's comments on the arches on the railing adding that that feature may detract from the arches on the doors.

Board member Looby complimented the project.

Chairman Diamond agreed with the comments of the other Board members. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of a front porch addition subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Consider the following suggestions offered by the Board:
  - a. Increase the size of the stone columns.
  - b. Eliminate the arch detail on the porch railing.
  - c. Install an anti-slip surface on the stair treads.
2. If any modifications are made to the plans that were presented to the Board, either in response to Board suggestions 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. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, *except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels*, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
4. 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. Due to the traffic volumes and curving nature of Illinois Road, on street parking is not permitted for construction or contractor vehicles.

The motion was seconded by Board member Looby and approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**5. Consideration of a request for approval of a porch addition on the front of the  
Consideration of a request for approval of a sunroom addition on the rear of the  
existing residence at 242 Ahwahnee Lane. A building scale variance is also  
requested.**

**Property Owners: Ted and Kristin Rupp**

**Project Representative: Timothy Archibald, 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. Archibald introduced the project. He stated that a sunroom addition is proposed at the rear of the home. He noted that the addition exceeds the allowable square footage by 383 square feet, six percent. He stated that the owners have made improvements to the back yard and the proposed porch will further enhance the backyard. He stated that the project started as a screen porch addition which is permitted as a design element, without a building scale variance, however, the owners now desire a three season room. He stated that the addition is a sunroom pavilion attached to the house by a small connecting piece. He stated that the sunroom will have a large sliding door opening to a patio at the back of the home. He noted that the connecting piece between the sunroom and the house has a flat roof, and the sunroom has a gable roof to match the home. He reviewed the proposed elevations. He stated that no other variances are requested. He stated that the exterior materials of the sunroom will match the house, white painted wood trim and brick, and will have the same roof pitch. He stated that the sunroom is not visible from the front of the home and will be heavily screened on the east and west sides with landscaping. He presented the proposed landscape plan. He noted that stated that spillover light from the skylight glass walls will be minimized because the space will be illuminated only with low level light. He stated that there will be a negligible impact on impervious surface. He explained that the sunroom provides a transition to the outside and therefore, has large windows meant to connect the interior and the outdoors. He presented images of the rear yard. He presented images of alternate designs that were studied. He noted that a letter was received from the neighbor to the west stating support for the project.

Ms. Baehr stated that a building scale variance is requested. She stated that the home was built in 2016 and currently complies with the allowable square footage for the property. She explained that the sunroom will add 574 square feet to the home and as a result, the home will exceed the allowable square footage. She noted that the sunroom is entirely behind the house and will not change the appearance of the home as viewed from the street. She stated that the sunroom is an open and light structure that does not add significantly to the visual mass of the house. She added that the sunroom is much lower than the home. She stated that the staff report details findings in support of the building scale variance.

Board member Downey complimented the addition noting that light and a connection to the outdoors is important. She expressed concern about the potential for leaking with the flat roof on the connecting piece. She stated that in her opinion, the skylight takes away from the elegant, contemporary structure. She questioned whether the skylight is necessary given the glass in the sunroom. She stated that she is not clear why an enclosed sunroom is calculated differently than a screen porch.

Board member Renken stated that the sunroom is a very elegant glass box. He stated that since no one will see the sunroom, is more open to elements that may not be otherwise acceptable. He stated that the neighbor has expressed support for the project. He noted that if scuppers and an internal drain is relied on to drain the flat roof, there may be issues if there is a blockage. He added that in his opinion, if the connecting element had a saddle instead, whether copper or something else, there would be a more positive visual connection to the house. He stated that the square footage overage is minimal, and the addition is transparent and not visible from the street. He stated support for the variance.

Board member Looby complimented the addition and stated support for the skylight as proposed. He noted that sun from the south may be intense and may require consideration of special glass. He agreed with Board members Downey and Renken comments about the connecting element adding that it can be difficult to keep the snow and ice clear.

Board member Walther stated that the Board considers requests for building scale variances very seriously. He stated that in this case, the proposed structure is airy and light in appearance and is well hidden from view the street. He stated support for the requested variance. He agreed with Board member Renken's comments about the roof of the connecting element. He stated that he would eliminate the skylight.

Chairman Diamond agreed with comments made by Board member Walther regarding the building scale variance. Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, he invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions.

Mr. Archibald acknowledged that a flat roof presents a potential water issue. He stated that after considering options, the conclusion was that the roof on the sunroom would need to be raised to accommodate a gable or saddle on the connecting element. He stated that a pitched roof did not feel like the right solution,

so a flat roof is proposed. He noted that heat coils will be incorporated in the roof. He stated that to achieve the right scale and height of the sunroom, the flat roof on the connecting piece is preferred. He stated that the skylights are a personal preference of the owners and are intended to bring in as much light as possible to the space and provide the opportunity to see the sky at night. He acknowledged that screening for solar heat on the south and west sides will be important.

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

Board member Downey expressed support for the petition.

Board member Looby stated his appreciation for the alternate designs that were shared with the Board.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Diamond invited a motion.

Board member Looby made a motion to recommend approval of the sunroom addition and a building scale variance subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. If any modifications are made to the plans that were presented to the Board, 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.
2. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, *except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels*, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
3. 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 5 to 0.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

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

There was no additional public testimony presented to the Board.

### **7. Additional information from staff.**

There was no additional information presented to the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Planner