

The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of June 1, 2022 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, June 1, 2022 at 6:30 p.m., at the Municipal Services Building, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Acting Chairman Richard Walther and Board members, Joanne Bluhm, Sally Downey, Timothy G. Franzen, John Looby, Scott Renken and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: Jim Diamond

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

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

Acting Chairman Walther 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. Continued 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 745 Broadmoore Drive and is in the Whitehall Meadows Subdivision.

Property Owner: Peter A. Kasdin Trust (Peter Kasdin, 100%).

Project Representative: Thomas Pins, architect

Rob Schwarz, landscape architect

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

Mr. Pins stated that the project was presented to the Board last month and noted that the plans were revised in response to the Board's comments and concerns. He stated that the previously proposed site plan reflected retaining walls and a fenced garden encroaching into the drainage easement along the south side of the site. He noted that the retaining walls have been eliminated and the fenced garden was modified to avoid encroachment into the easement. He stated that the landscape plan was updated to incorporate additional plantings in the front yard and along the driveway. He stated that the single windows on the garage were replaced with double windows with shutters to match the rest of the home. He explained that a synthetic product was originally proposed for the trim and in response to the Board's comments, natural wood is now proposed. He stated that the front door will be black, and the gutters and downspouts will be copper. He noted that the asymmetry of the west elevation was discussed during the previous meeting. He explained that the asymmetry is the result of the interior layout adding that the west elevation is not visible from the street. He noted that the two-

dimensional drawing of the west elevation does not accurately represent how the elevation will appear. He stated that a synthetic roof material is proposed for longevity and noted that either a Brava or DaVinci product is proposed. He presented samples of the proposed roof product. He noted that a natural slate roof is cost prohibitive and is not an option for the property owner. He stated that the exterior brick walls will be whitewashed so little of the natural brick color will be exposed.

Ms. Baehr stated that the revised plans appear to address most of the concerns raised by the Board. She noted that from staff's perspective, additional work is needed on the landscape plan. She noted that since the last meeting, a few Crabapple trees were added in the front yard however, the Board recommended adding shade trees in the front yard to provide a canopy to soften the home as viewed from the street. She noted that as requested by the Board, the petitioner provided a sample of the specific roof products proposed. She stated that overall, staff finds that the petition is generally compatible with the City's design guidelines and noted that recommended standard conditions of approval are detailed in the staff report.

Board member Looby thanked the petitioner for responding to the Board's concerns. He noted that the windows at the center of the west elevation were reduced in size since the last meeting. He complimented the landscaping along the driveway. He stated that the crabapple trees in the front yard should be replaced with shade trees. He added that crabapple trees do not have much longevity. He stated support for the synthetic roof product.

Board member Downey stated support for the revisions made to the plans. She noted that the whitewash brick sample appears to have a sheen and suggested a matte finish. She stated a concern about the use of a synthetic roof product since this is the first house in a new subdivision. She stated that if the Board is inclined to approve the synthetic roof material, the DaVinci product is preferable over the Brava product. She noted that the Brava synthetic product is shiny and appears to have a reflective quality. She agreed with Board member Looby that the crabapple trees with shade trees. She asked for clarification on the property address.

Board member Franzen commended the petitioner for the revisions to the plans. He agreed with Board member Downey's comments regarding a matte finish on the whitewashed brick. He agreed that the DaVinci synthetic product is the better of two options but noted that a synthetic roof does not seem appropriate for such a lovely home. He expressed concern that in the sunlight, a synthetic roof product will have a glossy appearance and will be easily recognizable as a synthetic material. He agreed that shade trees should be incorporated into the front yard.

Board member Renken thanked the petitioner for making changes in response to the Board members' comments at the last meeting. He complimented the changes made to the front elevation. He stated support for the west elevation as presented at the last meeting month, with larger windows at the center. He agreed that since this is the first home in the subdivision, a natural slate roof would be preferable. He stated that he is not supportive of an asphalt shingle roof and noted that of the two synthetic roof

manufacturers mentioned by the petitioners, DaVinci has been in the industry for a longer period of time. He agreed with staff's recommendation to incorporate shade trees in the front yard.

Board member Bluhm agreed with Board member Renken that the west elevation presented at the last meeting is stronger than the west elevation as now presented. She stated that in her opinion, natural slate would be beautiful on the home, but acknowledged the petitioner's concern about the cost. She agreed that the DaVinci synthetic roof product is used more commonly than the Brava. She stated support for the recommendations in the staff report.

Acting Chairman Walther expressed concern about the visibility of the generator from the street adding that any landscaping must offer year round screening. He noted that if the generator is located on the side of the house, that would be the concern about visibility from the street.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Pins confirmed that the whitewash on the brick will have a matte finish. He stated that the DaVinci synthetic roof product will be used. He agreed to review the placement of the windows on the west elevation.

Mr. Schwarz agreed to replace the crabapple trees in the front yard with shade trees to break up the appearance of the roof. He stated that other locations for the generator were considered however, the proposed location, in front of the garage, keeps the generator away from the primary living spaces of the home. He stated that a 48 inch tall lattice screen is proposed around the generator along with a mix of deciduous and evergreen plantings. He noted that vines could be grown on the lattice screen.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Acting Chairman Walther invited public testimony. Hearing none, he summarized the Board's comments on the landscaping in the front yard and the windows on the west elevation. He stated that there appears to be agreement that a matte finish on the whitewash brick is appropriate. He asked the Board members for further thoughts on the roof material.

Board member Downey stated that if the Board approves a synthetic roof product, other homes in the subdivision will likely follow suit. She stated that there is no question that there is a visual difference between the natural slate and a synthetic product that is intended to mimic the appearance of natural slate. She stated that based on her research, there are mixed reviews on the quality of synthetic roof products.

Board member Franzen stated that he is open to the use of non-natural materials accents or limited elements on a home but noted that he cannot support a synthetic product for a roof that will be visually dominate in a new subdivision.

Board member Renken pointed out that the roof material is the only synthetic material proposed on the house and noted that the Board recently recommended approval of a synthetic roof product for a home in the Oak Knoll Woodlands development. He noted that the difference here is that this home is the first in the subdivision. He noted that the

approval for a home in the Oak Knoll Woodlands occurred after several homes were already approved with cedar shingles. He acknowledged that the synthetic roof product has a sheen unlike natural slate. He noted that synthetic roof products have improved over the last ten years and commented that in his opinion, DaVinci is a leader in the industry. He noted that he has used the DaVinci product and was pleased with the result. He stated a preference for a synthetic roof product over asphalt shingle.

Board member Bluhm stated that although a slate roof would be preferable, she can accept a synthetic roof product in this case. She added that from the street, with the landscape screening, the synthetic roof should not be very noticeable.

Acting Chairman Walther stated that one of the mitigating factors for him is the location of the home. He stated that the home is on a dead-end street that is not easily accessible or visible. He stated that it is important that the Board's decision on the use of a synthetic product is not intended as a precedent for other homes in the development. He made a motion to recommend approval of the new residence based on the findings in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The DaVinci synthetic roof product shall be used if true slate is not used.
2. The whitewash on the brick shall have a matte finish.
3. All modifications made to the plans, 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.
4. 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 plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code.
 - a. Shade trees must be incorporated as part of the landscaping in the front yard, as opposed to crabapple trees, and the parkway trees that will be impacted by the driveway and walkway must be replaced subject to review and approval by the City Arborist.
 - b. The plan shall reflect heavy, year round screening around the generator in addition to the lattice screening.
5. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect the parkway trees during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.

6. At the time of submittal for a building permit, detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. No grading or filling shall be permitted except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices.
7. 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.
8. During construction, the stormwater drainage easement shall be fenced off to avoid encroachment of materials, equipment or alteration of the grade.
9. 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 6 to 0.

3. Consideration of a request for approval of a partial demolition of the residence and construction of a three-car attached garage and additions on the east and south sides of the home. The property is addressed as 321 Hilldale Place.

Property Owners: Adam and Carrie Seyb

Project Representative: Edward Deegan, architect

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

Mr. Seyb noted that his family has lived in Lake Forest since 2013. He stated that the proposed addition and alterations are intended to be consistent with the original design of the home while making the home more livable for his family. He stated that the closest neighbors to the area of the proposed work stated support for the project. He stated that he attempted to contact the neighbor to the south who submitted a letter about drainage concerns but did not receive a response.

Mr. Deegan stated that the home was designed by Jerome Cerny and constructed in 1937. He explained that the home features very steep pitched roof forms which are common in Cerny designed homes. He noted that the home has a symmetrical front façade. He stated that the east and west wings of the home, with mansard roofs, were additions completed in the 2000's. He stated that the designs of the proposed addition and the exterior alterations are inspired by the original architecture of the home as well as the later mansard roof additions. He stated that the architectural detailing and exterior materials of the addition will match the existing home. He stated that the addition is proposed on the east side of the house adding that the small shed located in that area will be removed. He stated that the existing driveway and the two curb cuts will remain. He said that the addition is one-and-a-half stories with a three-car garage on the first floor and a recreation space on the second floor. He stated that the garage will

be connected to the home by a single-story mudroom. He said that the siting of the garage addition follows the rhythm of the projecting and recessed areas along the front of the home. He stated that a motor court is proposed in front of the west facing garage. He stated that the existing single car garage on the east side of the house will be removed, and the existing two-car garage will be converted to living space. He added that various interior spaces will be reconfigured. He noted that a small bump out is proposed on the rear of the home to expand the family room. He added that above the bump out, a small walk-out is proposed off of the master bedroom. He presented the existing and proposed exterior elevations. He stated that all of the windows and doors will be replaced. He stated that the petitioners intend to some of the doors on the front elevation with casement windows with paneling on the lower half of the opening for security. He stated that additional openings can be added to the east side of the garage as recommended in the staff report. He stated that an outdoor kitchen and patio are proposed to the rear of the mudroom addition. He noted that the new garage will have carriage style doors. He stated that a landscape plan is being developed with a focus on the new motor court.

Ms. Baehr reviewed the components of the petition: partial demolition of the existing home, the addition of a garage and mudroom, and a small addition at the rear of the house. She stated that generally, the additions as presented are compatible with the existing home. She noted that the proposed garage addition projects forward of the main mass of the house despite the fact that it is a secondary element. She stated that as proposed, the east and south elevations of the garage and mudroom additions are, for the most part, solid brick walls. She noted that the staff report recommends the addition of some openings to break up the large expanse of solid wall along with landscaping. She stated that two letters were received from neighboring property owners to the south raising concerns about increased drainage from the property. She stated that a drainage and grading plan will be required at the time of submittal for permit and will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. She stated that staff will apprise the Engineer of the concerns raised by the neighbors. She pointed out that water does flow naturally to the south and west in this area. She stated that the staff report provides findings in support of the petition subject to conditions as detailed in the staff report.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the partial demolition. She stated support for shifting the new garage element back, away from the front of the property noting that does not appear to conflict with other aspects of the site plan. She agreed that openings should be added to the east and south elevations.

Board member Renken commended the concept of repeating the pattern of projecting and recessed masses along the front of the home which break down the appearance of mass. He agreed that there is merit to shifting the garage back on the site but acknowledged that it is lower than the home which makes it appear as a secondary element. He asked about the ramifications of shifting the garage back. He commented that the area above the garage doors appears bland and suggested consideration of dormers. He agreed that windows should be added to the east and south elevations to break up the brick walls. He noted that the plans are finely detailed

adding that the proposed additions blend well with the home. He commented that the expanse of windows on the mudroom presents a light and airy appearance.

Board member Franzen stated agreed that windows should be added to the east and south elevations. He stated that he is comfortable with the siting of the garage noting the separation between the garage and house.

Board member Downey stated that, in her opinion, the placement of the garage appears to take away from the home's presence on the street. She also requested an explanation of the ramifications of shifting the garage back at least a few feet. She complimented the architectural design. She asked if the vegetation and buckthorn on the east side of the site, which screen views of the house from the neighbor, will remain. She noted that it will screen views of the rear of the garage. She agreed with Board member Renken's suggestion of adding dormers above the garage doors. She noted that one of the letters submitted by a neighbor pointed out that there are existing lights on the home shine into the neighbor's house. She stated that the property owner should take care of the lighting issue.

Board member Looby also encouraged consideration of shifting the garage back on the site. He complimented the design of the additions. He noted that it appears that the proposed landscaping will help screen views of the garage. He agreed that windows are needed on the east side of the garage to break up the solid brick wall. He noted that there is not much space on the east side of the garage to add landscaping.

Acting Chairman Walther agreed that the siting of the garage feels too close to the street. He pointed out that the existing windows have a mix of different muntin patterns and suggested that consideration be given to using a consistent pattern around the home since all of the windows will be replaced. He stated that while visiting the site, he observed that the openings on the existing two-car garage, on the left side of the home, are slightly recessed from the exterior wall however the openings on the right side of the home are flush with the wall. He suggested that when replacing the openings, attention should be paid to achieving the same recess in relation to the exterior wall. He pointed out that the windows and roof plate on the garage are set at a lower height than the those on the house. He stated that the site plan and landscape plan show different driveway configurations and asked for clarification noting that there appears to be a significant amount of pavement.

Acting Chairman Walther invited the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions.

Mr. Deegan stated that the height of the roof plate and windows on the garage was intentional as a way to make the new garage subordinate to the house. He stated that there is an existing parking pad on the east side of the house that guided the placement of the new garage. He explained that by looking from west to east, the volumes of the house step forward from one another, closer to the street. He explained that the garage placement was also based on functionality and the ability to easily enter and exit the garage. He agreed to study the possible addition of dormers above the garage doors and the addition of windows to the east and south elevations. He stated that the

existing lighting issue will be taken care of adding that no additional exterior lights are proposed. He explained that the different muntin patterns on the existing windows are due to the slightly different proportions of the windows around the home. He stated that as they replace the windows, the muntin patterns will be as uniform as possible given the various window sizes. He acknowledged that the landscape plan incorrectly shows the driveway configuration. He added that as the plans are more fully developed, the architectural and engineering plans will be consistent.

Acting Chairman Walther pointed out that the driveway configuration as shown on the architectural site plan does not provide space for plantings in front of the house to screen the new garage.

Mr. Deegan stated that the existing landscape beds at the front of the house will remain.

Board member Renken stated that in some of Cerny's designs, the windows only had horizontal muntins.

Mr. Deegan acknowledged that Cerny used horizontal muntins for his French inspired designs. He explained that the openings on this particular home have wide proportions and eliminating the vertical muntins would present a contemporary appearance.

Board member Renken stated that the petitioner may want to consider simplifying the muntin patterns by eliminating some of the horizontal muntins.

In response to a question from Acting Chairman Walther, Ms. Baehr stated that driveways cannot exceed 16 feet within the front yard setback. She acknowledged that the existing driveway on the property exceeds 16 feet and is non-conforming in width. She stated that further expansion is not and any additional increase in width is not permitted within the Code regulations.

Mr. Deegan stated that they are not changing the existing driveway within the front yard setback. He stated that the connection to the motor court in front of the new garage is proposed outside of the front yard setback.

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

Board member Downey stated that the landscaping at the front of the home is important to mitigate the concerns about the placement of the garage. She suggested the Board condition approval on additional landscaping to screen views of the garage, the addition of a dormer above the garage doors, and the addition of windows to break up the expansive brick walls.

Board member Looby agreed with Board member Downey's comments. He added that the final plan should clearly show that the width of the driveway is not expanded within the front yard setback.

Acting Chairman Walther stated that clarification is needed on the driveway configuration and landscaping. He noted that there is a limited amount of space in front of the home for additional landscaping. He added that landscaping on all sides of the additions should be reflected on the final landscape plan.

Board member Downey stated appreciation for the petitioner's efforts to preserve the overall character of the significant residence.

Board member Bluhm noted that the proposed additions will impact a Heritage Oak tree and asked that consideration be given to requiring the full replacement inches to be planted on the property.

Acting Chairman Walther added that the replacement inches should be planted on site if that can be accomplished using good forestry practices. He stated that if that cannot be accomplished, a payment in lieu of on site planting will be required.

In response to questions from Acting Chairman Walther, Ms. Baehr confirmed that staff evaluated the driveway configuration as represented on the architectural site plan. She acknowledged that the landscape plan is very conceptual.

Board member Franzen stated that Mr. Deegan's approach to the garage placement makes sense given that moving from west to east the home steps forward and the new garage continues that pattern.

Ms. Czerniak suggested that the Board may also want to include a requirement for an auto-turn study to verify that the motor court is sufficient to accommodate the required turning movements. She noted that it appears that it may be difficult to access the most internal garage bay.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the partial demolition of the residence, construction of a three-car attached garage and additions on the east and south sides of the home based on the findings in the staff report. He noted that the deliberations of the Board are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. A minimum of two dormers shall be added above the garage doors.
2. Windows in a regular pattern shall be added to break up the solid walls on the east and south sides of the garage and mudroom.
3. A consistent muntin pattern shall be used around the house to the extent possible.
4. 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, highlighted, on the plans submitted for permit. A copy of the plans 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.

5. 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 plan shall, at a minimum, provide for the required replacement inches on site to the extent possible using good forestry practices. If all replacement tree inches cannot be accommodated on the site in a manner consistent with good forestry practices in the determination of the City's Certified Arborist, a payment in lieu of on site planting will be required for the remaining tree inches and must be noted on the plan. The full payment in lieu of on site plantings is required prior to the issuance of a building permit. The landscape plan shall include the following:
 - a. The plan shall detail the screening of the garage doors and motor court.
 - b. The plan shall include landscaping on all sides of the addition.
6. An auto turn study shall be presented and will be subject to review by the City Engineer.
7. 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. Careful attention shall be paid to avoiding off site negative impacts as a result of the increased impervious surface.
8. Details of exterior lighting shall be included 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.
9. 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 6 to 0.

**4. Consideration of a request for approval of a detached three-car garage and open porch addition, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan. The property is addressed as 1000 Walden Road.
Property Owner: Joseph Leicht**

Project Representative: Edward Deegan, architect

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

Mr. Leicht stated that he purchased the home last November adding that the house was originally designed by architect Stanley Anderson. He stated his intention to rehabilitate the home and enhance the property.

Mr. Deegan explained that the property is located between Walden and Ringwood Roads. He stated that the design of the home is simpler than many other Stanley Anderson designed homes. He noted that in the 1980's the home was extensively remodeled and that some permitted remodeling work is currently underway. He noted that part of the work underway includes converting the attached garage into a family room leaving the property without a garage. He stated that a new garage is proposed to the west of the existing motor court which is located in front of the home. He stated that a covered terrace with a fireplace is proposed adjacent to the new garage. He explained that as proposed, the garage has three vehicle bays, a laundry room and bathroom, and a second floor office built within the roofline to minimize the height of the garage. He stated that the design of the garage is inspired by the residence. He explained that the garage is a one-and-a-half story structure with dormers on the front and rear. He added that a porte-cochere is proposed at the center of the garage. He noted that due to the existing vegetation on the property, views of the garage from off of the property are limited. He stated that a shed dormer is proposed on the west elevation of the garage as opposed to single dormers to provide expanded second floor space. He stated that the garage will have carriage style doors.

Mr. Leicht stated that the landscape plan is a formal design. He stated that the drive approach and the edging of the motor court will be brick in a basket weave pattern. He stated that a formal arrangement of trees and boxwood hedges are proposed around the motor court.

Ms. Baehr stated that this petition includes construction of a detached garage, tree removal and changes to hardscape on the site. She stated that initially, the petitioner explained the project as simply converting the existing garage on the east side of the house to a family room. She stated that the project has evolved over time and given the current scope, it is presented to the Board for review. She stated that the proposed garage complies with the square footage limitations. She stated out that the style and design of the garage are intended to match that of the existing home. She noted general support for the proposed garage given its compatibility with the home. She noted however, a question about the compatibility of the large, shed dormer on the west elevation of the garage noting that it is not consistent with the chosen architectural style. She recommended consideration of other dormer types. She stated that eleven trees are proposed for removal some of which area in poor condition. She stated that replacement inches will be required for the healthy trees, including two Heritage trees, that are proposed for removal. She pointed out that the proposed landscaping does not yet fully satisfy the required replacement inches.

Acting Chairman Walther invited questions from the Board.

Board member Franzen noted that he lives in a Stanley Anderson home and is pleased to see this home being preserved and cared for. He agreed that the shed dormer appears out of place but noted that because the lot is heavily wooded, the dormer will not be visible. He pointed out that the south elevation of the garage presents a blank, solid brick wall and suggested adding some openings to add interest and natural light.

Board member Renken pointed out that the house is oriented with the side elevation adjacent to the street. He added that the new garage creates a courtyard effect which, in his opinion, enhances the property. He asked about the work currently occurring on the property. He acknowledged that the shed dormer is needed to provide additional space on the second floor but noted that there may be a way to alter the shed dormer to incorporate gable dormers on each end, maintaining the desired space on the second floor.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Mr. Deegan explained that when the owners purchased the property, there was a two-car garage with a breakfast nook at the east end of the home. He explained that at the start of the project, the intention was only to convert the existing garage to a family room however, given the condition of the garage structure, a complete rebuild was necessary. He noted that the portion of the house under construction is being rebuilt in the original footprint of the house.

Ms. Czerniak stated if staff had known that there was a larger scope of work planned, the entire project would have been presented to the Board for review.

Board member Looby stated that the shed dormer appears large. He stated that the placement of the garage completes the courtyard concept by visually connecting the house with the pool area. He noted that the landscape plan does not include any shade trees and asked that some shade trees be incorporated to the plan to cover the required replacement inches.

Board member Downey stated that the proposed plan elevates the elegance of the home and the property. She explained that even though the shed dormer on the west elevation has limited visibility, in her opinion, it should be consistent with the style and design of the garage. She stated that the exterior design should be a priority over the function of the shed dormer.

Board member Bluhm agreed that the garage will enhance and agreed that further study of the dormer is needed.

Board member Walther asked about the exterior light fixtures, the color palette, and the roof pitch on the existing house and proposed garage. He noted that the garage does not include the circular vent detail at the center of the pediment that is on the existing house. He pointed out that the pediment on the garage is raised about a foot above the eave line of the primary gable roof and is not consistent with the height of the

pediment on the existing home. He stated that the windows on the garage appear taller and narrower than the windows on the house.

Board member Renken pointed out that there are low-slope roofs on the north and south sides of the garage that are proposed to have modified bitumen roofing. He added that even though the north and south sides have low-slope roof forms, it appears that they will be visible as shown in the elevation drawings. He suggested consideration of metal for the low-slope roofs as opposed to modified bitumen.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Deegan stated that the garage will be constructed of reclaimed Chicago common brick and will have an asphalt shingle roof to match the existing house. He added that all the trim and molding will be wood and will match the house. He stated that the proposed windows are aluminum clad wood with simulated divided lites. He stated that the garage was designed to imitate, rather than replicate, the house. He explained that the height of the pediment above the porte cochere was driven by the arched opening and keystone detail. He stated that a circular vent was not incorporated on the garage pediment to maintain a hierarchy between the house and garage. He explained that the dormers on the garage are intended to be understated and narrow which results in smaller window sizes. He confirmed that the roof pitch on the garage is the same as the roof pitch on the house. He explained that the pitch of the garage roof was challenging because of the desire for second floor space. He stated that the north and south roof forms have a 1:12 pitch.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Acting Chairman Walther invited public testimony. Hearing none, he summarized the Board's comments noting that the type of dormer should be reconsidered, the slope on the north and south roof forms should be reduced, and shade trees must be incorporated into the landscape plan. He added that when plans are submitted for a building permit a lighting plan and specifications on the light fixtures must be included. He stated that the windows in the dormers should remain narrow, but the windows on the flanking wings of the garage should be sized to match the windows on the house.

Mr. Deegan stated that they are willing to explore larger windows on the lower portion of the garage.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of a detached three-car garage, an open porch addition, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan based on the findings in the staff report. He stated that the deliberations of the Board are also incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Consider refining the shed dormer on the west elevation of the garage to achieve a design more in keeping with the chosen architectural style and incorporating gables.

2. The pitch on the flat roofs shall be modified to minimize visibility of the flat bitumen roofs.
3. The window proportions shall be refined.
4. All modifications made 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 (highlighted) on the plans submitted for permit. A copy of the plans originally provided to the Board for review 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.
5. 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 plan shall, at a minimum, provide for the required replacement inches on site to the extent possible using good forestry practices. If all replacement tree inches cannot be accommodated on the site in a manner consistent with good forestry practices in the determination of the City's Certified Arborist, a payment in lieu of on site planting will be required for the remaining tree inches and must be noted on the plan. The full payment in lieu of on site plantings is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 - a. The plan shall reflect the existing plantings and identify any plantings proposed for removal and plantings intended to remain.
 - b. Native, deciduous trees shall be added to the plan.
6. 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. Careful attention shall be paid to avoiding off site negative impacts as a result of the increased impervious surface.
7. 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.
8. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development. Contractor parking is not permitted on Walden Road or on Ringwood Road to the narrow pavement. Contractors may need to park off site and shuttle to the work site.

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

5. Consideration of a request for approval of a new residence, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan on the site of previously approved demolitions of three existing structures. The property is addressed as 1361 Edgewood Road.

Property Owner: Lillian H. Shepard Trust (Joseph H. Duff, 30%, Rochelle M. Davis, 30%, Rudolph O. Duff, Jr. 10%, Rahsaan O. Duff-Tatum 10%, Gingi F. Wingard 10%, Laura J. Stephenson, 10%)

Contract Purchaser: Michael Simoneau and Alison Schuster

Developer: Peter Childs

Project Representative: Jeff Letzter, project manager

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

Mr. Letzter presented plans for a new single family residence. He stated that demolition of the existing structures is also proposed. He noted that the property that is the subject of this request was recently created through a resubdivision of three lots into two lots. He stated that the proposed home is a two-story, Shingle style house with a detached garage at the rear of the site. He added that the driveway is proposed on the south side of the house. He stated that the neighborhood consists of older homes and newer infill construction. He stated that many of the lots on Edgewood Road are narrow with some wider lots at the north end. He explained that the original plan sited the house about 45 feet from the street with the driveway along the south property line however, the house was pushed back to pull the driveway six feet away from the south property line in conformance with the Zoning Code. He noted that on the north side of the home, the chimney is located directly on the six foot side yard setback and the north wall of the home is approximately one and half feet off of the side yard setback line. He noted that the driveway must be a minimum of nine feet wide and runs very close to the south wall of the house and about one and half feet off the south property line along the house. He stated that the front elevation of the home presents a symmetrical design with an open porch, steeply pitched gable roofs, and bay windows. He noted that a large patio is proposed behind the home. He stated that a covered entry is proposed at the rear of the home providing access to the mudroom. He noted that the roof forms are simple, with primarily gable roof forms. He stated that the height of the home is limited to 30 feet as measured from the lowest point of existing grade to the roof ridge. He stated that there is about foot and a half grade change from the front of the home to the rear. He stated that the roof forms on the rear of the home have more shallow pitches than the roof forms on the front in order to keep the height of the home in compliance with the height limitation. He noted that the proposed detached garage will have the same exterior materials as the house. He presented images of Shingle style homes that served as inspiration for the design of the house. He stated that the proposed home will have dark gray shingle siding, white trim, a brick chimney, and a stone base on the bay windows.

Ms. Baehr noted that the resubdivision of the property is in progress which will create the

lot proposed for development in this petition. She stated that the existing structures on the overall property are in serious disrepair and were required to be demolished as a condition of the subdivision. She stated staff support for the demolition. She noted concerns with the proposed site plan for the new house noting that the house is not aligned with the pattern of front yard setbacks along Edgewood Road. She stated that staff encouraged the petitioner to consider a narrower building footprint to allow the house to be shifted closer to the street, in alignment with other homes and to accommodate a driveway that meets the required setback from the property line within the front yard setback. She noted that the driveway as proposed on the south side of the house is less than nine feet from the home to the south. She stated that because the contract purchaser intends to develop both this property and the property to the north, consideration could be given to locating the driveway on the north side of the home to avoid impacting the existing home to the south and the yard. She noted that the home as proposed is located on the north setback line which does not leave the builder any buffer in the event there is even a slight deviation from the plans. She suggested that some allowance be provided to avoid a problem and delays during construction. She noted that the petitioner stated that the home is designed in the Shingle style and there are some elements of the design that do not appear to be consistent with the chosen style, the roof pitches on the side and rear elevations, the window muntin patterns, and the corner board detail. She stated that staff recommends continuation of the petition to allow further refinement and resolution of various open issues.

Acting Chairman Walther invited questions from the Board.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the demolition. She noted that the siting of the home is very important to the character of the streetscape and stated that the home should be aligned with the predominate pattern of setbacks on the street. She stated that in her opinion, since the developer is developing both this lot and the lot to the north, any compromises on the driveway location should occur between the two properties instead of impacting an existing home. She stated that the home appears to be more of a Colonial style as opposed to a Shingle style. She encouraged the petition to consider refinements to the design to better align with the chosen architectural style. She pointed out that it unusual for a front door to be the same color as the siding and suggested consideration of a contrasting color. She suggested consideration of the use of stone on the chimney to match the bay windows.

Board member Downey noted that there is a consistent pattern of setbacks of homes along this portion of Edgewood Road and noted that as proposed, the new home is inconsistent with that established pattern. She added that the dark color of the proposed home is not consistent with the appearance of other homes on the street adding that the home as proposed will stand out rather than site quietly like the other homes on the street. She pointed out that the images of Shingle style homes presented by the petitioner present a lighter color than is proposed. She stated that the proposed windows are not consistent with the windows shown in the images of the Shingle style homes presented by the petitioner. She noted that there is a mix of paver and concrete walkways in the neighborhood. She asked about the size of the house and asked how much the width of the house would need to be reduced to allow it to be located closer

to the street.

Board member Looby stated that the primary concern is the siting of the house in relation to the street and other homes. He stated support for approval of the demolition.

Board member Franzen stated that in his opinion, the plans need further study and refinement to achieve consistency with the chosen Shingle style. He stated support for the demolition. He stated that a more detailed landscape plan is needed. He agreed that the siting of the home is problematic noting that it should be closer to the street to align with the other homes along the street. home adding that the house needs to be closer to the street.

Board member Renken stated support for the demolition of the existing structures. He noted that most of the driveways along the street are within a couple feet of or directly on the property line. He acknowledged that the zoning regulations changed since many of the homes were constructed but commented that in his opinion, it is difficult to ask the petitioner to make the home narrower in order to achieve a driveway in compliance with the current Code. He stated that the width as presented allows the home to be three rooms wide. He agreed that the home should be closer to street and encouraged the petitioner to seek a zoning variance for the driveway. He noted however that even with the driveway sited six feet from the south property line to comply with the Code, there appears to be an opportunity to shift the house closer to the street. He acknowledged that locating the driveway on, or almost on the property line is not ideal.

In response to a question from Board member Renken, Ms. Baehr stated that staff is recommending that consideration be given to locating the driveway on the north side of the property to avoid impacts on the very narrow property to the south. She noted that as proposed, the driveway extends almost the full length of shared property line.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the neighbor to the south raised concerns about the development of this property and the potential for drainage impacts. She confirmed that the neighbor's concern is in part the basis for the staff recommendation to shift the driveway and the impervious surface away from the south property line.

Board member Renken pointed out that the new house itself will be further away from the neighboring home to the south if the driveway is along the south property line between the two homes.

Acting Chairman Walther stated the siting of the house in relation to the streetscape impacts the character of the street. He stated that in his opinion, the house must be sited closer to the street in alignment with the other homes adding that if a zoning variance is necessary, the petitioner should consider pursuing a variance. He noted that the petitioner described the siding as a gray shingle but noted that the rendering presents the siding as black. He pointed out that there is an existing gray shingle house further north on Edgewood Road adding that care should be taken to avoid creating a

monotonous appearance along the street. He noted that if the petitioner wants the driveway on the south side of the house, there is an opportunity to propose this plan on the lot to north leaving this lot for future development with a driveway on the north side of the lot. He asked the petitioner to address the Board's questions.

Mr. Letzter noted that the existing driveway on the property is approximately 2.9 feet from the south property line. He stated that the petitioner would like to leave the portion of the driveway that is located in the front yard setback in the current location. He stated that beyond the front yard setback, the driveway will be shifted to within 1.5 feet of the south property. He stated that with that approach, the house can be sited closer to the street. He stated that the driveway could also be configured with a sharper angle which would also allow the house to be sited closer to the street. He stated interest in pursuing a zoning variance to allow the driveway to be sited close to the south property line. He pointed out that the driveways for most of the homes along Edgewood Road are along the south property lines adding that there are only two instances of a shared driveway on the street. In response to comments in the staff report, the agreed to eliminate the corner boards, add muntins in the lower window sashes and replace the brick with stone on the chimney. He stated that the front walk will be pavers, not concrete as reflected on the drawings. He noted that the neighboring property owner to the south has planted arborvitae along the property line which provides screening. He stated there the roof pitches cannot be adjusted because the square footage of the house is very close to the maximum allowed adding that the petitioners want to maximize the size of the house. He clarified that the shingle siding will be dark gray.

In response to additional questions from Board member Renken, Mr. Letzter stated that the overhangs on the north and south sides of the home are 6 inches in depth and the gutter is 4 inches. He acknowledged that the chimney is located on the setback line. He stated that the site is challenging from a design perspective.

Board member Renken suggested shifting the chimney slightly to avoid a potential zoning issue.

In response to Mr. Letzter's comments, Ms. Czerniak noted that the challenges are created because the house is pushing the limits of square footage, height and the setbacks. She stated that many homes in this neighborhood are smaller and as a result, offer more opportunity to properly address design issues.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Acting Chairman Walther invited public testimony.

Mark Knipfer, 1359 Edgewood Road, stated that he is the neighbor directly south of the property. He asked that the buckthorn along the south property line be cleaned up. He stated that there are two mature trees that straddle the property line that appear to be in poor condition. He asked for clarification on the intent with respect to those trees. He asked that the utility service lines to the subject property that cross his property be addressed. He stated support for the location of the driveway on the south side of the home, close to the property line adding that in his opinion, the home should closely align

with the setback pattern for homes along the street.

Hearing no further public testimony, Acting Chairman Walther summarized the Board's comments. He encouraged the petitioner to pursue a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow the driveway to encroach into the side yard setback in the front yard. He suggested that the petitioner may want to consider seeking variances for both the subject property and the property to the north to expedite the development process.

Board member Franzen stated that in his opinion, the placement of the home should not be dictated by the zoning setbacks for the driveway.

Ms. Czerniak explained that the Code provision requiring driveways to be setback from property lines is in part intended to mitigate direct drainage on to neighboring properties from the impervious surface of a driveway. She stated providing some pervious surface and landscaping along the driveway helps to protect neighboring properties. She stated that a variance may be workable if the plans reflect additional storm sewer and curbing along the property line to keep runoff on the subject property.

Acting Chairman Walther stated that hearing from the neighbor to the south was helpful and as a result, he stated that he can support a driveway on the south side of the house, near the property line. He agreed with Board member Renken that the chimney should be pulled off of the setback line to avoid issues during construction.

In response to questions from Board member Looby, Mr. Letzter stated that the driveway is 9 feet wide, the minimum width required by Code.

Board member Looby suggested permeable materials for the portion of the driveway located in the front yard to help mitigate stormwater runoff.

Board member Downey pointed out that as proposed, this home is pushing the maximums allowed in all respects. She stated that if there are any deviations during construction, the home could be in violation of the Code. She stated that in her opinion, the proposed color palette does not fit in with the neighborhood.

Acting Chairman Walther suggested that the petition be continued and asked the petitioner to provide material and color samples at a future meeting.

Board member Renken noted that after the foundation is poured, a spot survey will be required to verify compliance with the plan.

Ms. Baehr added that in addition to a spot survey, as-built drawings will be required at various times during the construction process to verify that the square footage and height of the residence conform to the approvals granted.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Acting Chairman Walther stated that he expects the house to be within four feet of the other houses along the street. He noted that there is some variation in the distances of the houses from the street, but the

variances do not appear to be more than about four feet. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he made a motion to approve the demolition of the existing structures on the site.

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

Acting Chairman Walther invited a motion on the replacement residence.

Board member Looby made a motion to continue consideration of the petition with the following direction.

1. Consider seeking a variance to allow the driveway to encroach into the extended side yard setback within the front yard setback.
2. Provide a streetscape elevation and site plan illustrating how the proposed house appears in relation to the neighboring homes from design, color and siting perspectives.
3. Study the design elements of the proposed residence including the roof pitches and window muntin patterns in an effort to align with the chosen Shingle style more closely.
4. Eliminate the corner boards.
5. Modify the plans to indicate that the chimney is stone, rather than brick, to match the bay windows on the front of the home.
6. Reduce the footprint of the house to provide "wobble room" given the small site and the fact that the proposed house maximizes what is allowed on the site in all respects.
7. Modify the plans to indicate that the walkway at the front of the home is pavers.
8. Provide a tree survey indicating species, size and condition of all trees. Identify trees proposed for removal, the required replacement inches will be calculated from the survey.
9. Provide a detailed landscape plan.
10. Reflect a curb along the south edge of the driveway.
11. Provide samples of materials and colors.

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

OTHER ITEMS

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

There was no additional public testimony presented to the Board.

6. Additional information from staff.

There was no additional information presented to the Board.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner