

The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of August 4, 2022 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Thursday, August 4, 2022 at 6:30 p.m., at the Municipal Services Building, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman Jim Diamond and Board members, Joanne Bluhm, Timothy G. Franzen, Scott Renken and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: Sally Downey and John Looby

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. Continued 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: Simoneau Family Trust

(Michael Simoneau 50%, Alison Simoneau, 50%)

Developer: Peter Childs

Project Representative: Jeff Letzter, project manager

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. Letzter stated that the petition was presented to the Board in June and was continued at that meeting to allow further study on the siting of the residence on the property. He stated that since that meeting, the petitioners requested a zoning variance for the driveway which allows the residence to be sited closer to the street, more in line with other homes along the streetscape. He stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended approval of the variance. He reviewed the currently proposed site plan and pointed out that the driveway configuration as now proposed, close to the south property line, is similar to the driveways on other properties along the street. He stated that the curb cut remains in the current location. He stated that in response to the Board's comments at the June meeting, corner board and the muntins in the lower window sashes were eliminated and stone is proposed on the chimney instead of brick. He reviewed the proposed floorplans. He noted that in response to comments at the last meeting, the chimney on the north side of the house was shifted slightly away from

the setback line. He noted previous comments about the mix of roof forms and pitches and stated that the proposed roof forms are relatively simple. He stated that the front facing roof element is steeply pitched, consistent with the intended architectural style of the home. He acknowledged that the roof forms on the rear of the house have a shallower pitch avoid exceeding the allowed height of the home due to the lower grade at the rear of the property. He noted that a detached garage is proposed at the rear of the property and will match the architectural style and exterior materials of the residence. He noted that a retaining wall and curb are proposed along the driveway to manage drainage since the driveway is proposed at only one and a half feet from the south property line. He stated that there is arborvitae on the neighboring property to the south, along the property line, for screening. He noted that the neighbor to the south expressed support for the location of the driveway along the south property line at the last meeting. He acknowledged that there is still work to be done on the landscape plan.

Ms. Baehr reiterated that at the June meeting, the Board discussed the siting of the home in relation to other homes along the street and encouraged the petitioner to seek a variance. She stated that the Board also discussed some of the design elements and encouraged more consistency with the petitioner's intended Shingle style for the home. She acknowledged that some refinements were made to design elements to follow the Shingle style more accurately. She stated continued staff concern about locating the driveway only one and a half feet from the south property line leaving no space to accommodate drainage or landscaping on the property. She noted that in the past, the neighbor to the south expressed concern about drainage. She stated that staff recommends shifting the driveway further away from the property line in the areas where that is possible, to the rear of the home. She stated that the proposed retaining wall will need to rise above the surface of the driveway to provide a barrier to direct stormwater runoff to the street or the rear yard and not on to the neighboring property to the south. She noted that at the previous meeting, the Board encouraged the incorporation of some permeable materials into the driveway to mitigate runoff. She added that the Board previously requested a more detailed landscape plan. She stated that to date, the plans do not yet reflect pervious driveway material or enhanced landscaping. She stated that 55 replacement trees inches are required based on the tree removal as currently proposed. She stated that further clarification is needed on the proposed color palette.

Chairman Diamond invited questions from the Board and asked that the petitioner respond to all of the questions after all Board members have had an opportunity to speak.

Board member Renken stated that in his opinion, the revised plans satisfactorily address the design related comments from the last meeting. He noted that the petitioner explained the reason for different pitches on the roof forms at the front and back of the house. He pointed out however that the sides of the rear gable have different pitches which presents an awkward appearance. He stated support for the siting of the home as now proposed, in alignment with the predominate pattern along the street. He stated that he sees merit in a straight driveway which will not be achievable if a portion

of the driveway is shifted away from the property line.

In response to a question from Board member Renken, Mr. Letzter stated that the shed roof projects from the rear gable making it appear that the sides of the gable have different roof pitches.

Board member Bluhm agreed with Board member Renken's comments. She asked that the petitioner work with the neighbor to the south to assure that there are no drainage issues and asked the petitioner to remove the buckthorn to clean up the appearance of the site.

Board member Franzen agreed that all of the Board's previous comments are addressed by the revised plans. He stated that in his opinion, shifting the home toward the front of the lot is a significant improvement. He agreed with the recommendation in the staff report that the portion of the driveway behind the house should be shifted away from the south property line.

Board member Walther also agreed with the recommendation to shift the portion of the driveway behind the house away from the south property line. He expressed concern about the location of the driveway near the neighbor's trees along the south property line noting that if the driveway is shifted north, there may be less impact to the trees. He pointed out that there are discrepancies on the plans with respect to the dimensions of the overhang and asked that the overhang be reflected consistently on the plans. He stated that the 12 inch overhang is more appropriate for the style of the home than the six inch overhang shown in some areas. He noted that as described by the materials provided to the Board, the proposed exterior color palette is very dark. He noted that although some other homes in the neighborhood have dark exteriors, there is a more weathered appearance that does not appear as stark as proposed for this house. He asked for clarification on the proposed color of the trim and asked which side of the cedar shingle will be exposed.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Diamond invited public testimony, hearing none he asked the petitioner to address the Board's questions.

Mr. Letzter provided samples of the proposed stone and asphalt shingle roof material and presented the proposed color palette. He stated that the cedar exterior walls will be painted a very dark grey. He stated that the rough side of the shingle will face out and the trim will be smooth. He stated that the trim will be dark gray to match the cedar shingle walls with the exception of the porch trim which will be white. He stated that the gutters will be black. He stated that the intent is to differentiate the house from the neighboring homes. He stated that the petitioners are concerned about incorporating permeable materials as part of the hardscape due to maintenance issues. He agreed to raise the retaining wall above the surface of the driveway to prevent runoff on to the property to the south.

Hearing no further comments from the petitioner, Chairman Diamond invited final comments from the Board.

Board member Renken agreed that the driveway should be shifted away from the south property line given the proximity to the trees on the neighboring property and drainage concerns. He stated that the proposed color palette is not preferred but acknowledged that the petitioners desire the scheme. He stated that the porch trim should remain white instead of black like the other trim.

Board member Bluhm stated that she has seen other homes with a similar color scheme noting that it can be attractive. She stated support for shifting the driveway away from the south property line. She deferred to the City Arborist on what distance and treatment will best help to preserve the trees near the property line, on the neighbor's property. She stated that the eave overhang should be consistent all around the house and garage.

Board member Franzen stated support for the proposed color palette. He stated that he does not believe incorporating permeable materials as part of the hardscape is necessary.

Chairman Diamond stated general agreement with the comments made by other Board members.

Board member Walther stated that although the Board may be supportive of the entire driveway being asphalt, the City Arborist may determine that permeable materials are necessary near the trees to minimize negative impacts.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of the new residence, the conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The site plan shall be modified to shift the portion of the driveway behind the home away from the south property line to provide more pervious space along the property line subject to review and approval by the City Arborist and City Engineer.
2. Consider incorporating some impervious material into the driveway if determined by the City Arborist to be beneficial in preserving the trees on the neighboring property.
3. A curb shall be installed along the south edge of the driveway in all areas where the distance from the property line is two feet or less. The curb shall be at least four inches higher than the driveway surface.
4. Provide for a consistent eave overhang all around the house and garage.

5. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached with areas of change highlighted, 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.
6. The final landscape shall include, but not be limited to, all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed currently estimated at 55 inches, and in addition, shall meet the minimum landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code including ground cover, mid-level and canopy trees, and evergreens across the site. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
7. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate that the project is consistent with the applicable Code requirements and will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. Grading or filling on the site should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices, properly direct drainage, and mitigate off site impacts. Given the proximity of the driveway and impervious surface to the property line, diligent review of the drainage and grading plan by the City Engineer is required to assure no negative impact to the adjacent property to the south.
8. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation and to protect trees on neighboring properties during construction, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. In addition, a maintenance plan, including pre and post construction treatment for trees to be preserved must be submitted.
9. 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.
10. 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 on street parking of construction vehicles or contractor's vehicles is permitted due to the narrowness of the street and the proximity to the high school.

11. The construction site shall be maintained in a neat and orderly fashion. Debris must be removed from the site on a daily basis and the street must be regularly cleaned to eliminate caking mud.

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

3. Consideration of a request for approval for demolition of the existing residence and construction of a replacement residence at the property located at 1455 Edgewood Road.

Property Owners: Jamie and Sophia Childs

Project Representative: Jeff Letzter, project manager

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. Letzter stated that the petitioners propose to demolish the ranch style home and construct a replacement residence on the existing foundation. He stated that the existing detached garage will remain. He stated that a two-story farmhouse style residence is proposed. He stated that a structural engineer evaluated the existing foundation and determined that it is adequate to support a new two-story residence. He stated that the existing home and foundation encroach into the side yard setback and noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended approval of a variance to allow the new residence to encroach into the side yard but to a lesser extent due to the design of the new home. He stated that because the existing foundation will be reused, except for the addition of a mudroom at the rear of the home, the footprint of the house will remain the same as the existing house. He stated that the new residence is simple in massing, has gable roof forms, and a small front porch. He explained that the proposed mudroom addition is a small single-story structure, with a balcony above. He stated that the number of homes on the north and south elevation is minimized for privacy reasons since there are neighboring homes. He reviewed the proposed floor plans. He noted that the proposed residence complies to the allowable square footage and height. He presented a streetscape image showing the proposed residence in relation to the neighboring homes. He pointed out that the east side of the street is developed with mostly ranch homes and the west side of the street with some two-story homes. He stated that the existing ranch homes will likely be redevelopment at some time in the future because they are small. He reviewed the topography of the site. He acknowledged that additional landscaping will be needed to comply with the City's requirements.

Ms. Baehr stated that the petition is considered a demolition and replacement residence despite the fact that the foundation will be reused for a portion of the house. She stated that the existing home is modest and was built in the 1950's. She explained that to accommodate the property owners' needs the existing home would need extensive remodeling and additions leaving very little of the existing home intact, so a complete demolition is proposed. She stated that the proposed residence appears to be generally consistent with the City's Design Guidelines with the exception of the window placement and proportions which could benefit from some refinement to present a more balanced appearance around the home. She stated that no tree removal is proposed however, as

a new residence, a landscape plan is required and must meet the minimum landscape requirements for new residential construction. She stated that the landscape plan as presented does not yet satisfy the minimum landscape requirements.

Chairman Diamond invited questions from the Board and asked the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions all together, after all Board members have had the opportunity to speak.

Board member Bluhm stated support for refinement of the window placement and proportions. She stated that the size of the windows on the front elevation seems appropriate however, the windows on the side and rear elevations appear undersized. She acknowledged that the small windows on the side elevations are intended to provide privacy but noted that window treatments and landscaping can help in that regard. She stated that shade trees should be included on the final landscape plan to help mitigate the increased height of the home. She stated that initially, she was concerned about the proposed two-story residence next to the two smaller, single-story homes but acknowledged that there are several two story homes along the streetscape.

Board member Renken suggested consideration of shifting the garage further back on the site noting the limited space between the new home proposed and the garage making turning movements difficult. He stated that shifting the garage will also open up the back yard. He stated that the simplicity of the design is attractive. He agreed that the window proportions and placement need further study. He suggested that the asymmetrical placement of windows on the front gable can be resolved by centering the windows on the wall. He stated that the bedroom windows on the side elevations are too small and should be larger to be consistent with the windows on the first floor. He pointed out that there is a large area of solid wall on the rear elevation and suggested that addition of windows to break up the solid area.

Board member Franzen agreed that the window proportions and placement should be studied further and refined to improve the appearance of the home. He stated that in his opinion, the windows on the side elevations need the most work.

Board member Walther explained that the Board has an obligation to make sure that the exterior of the home, particularly as viewed from the streetscape, is designed appropriately. He agreed that the windows definitely need further study and stated that larger openings should be provided consistent with the selected architectural style. He pointed out that the lower half of one of the windows on the front elevation will be blocked with the staircase.

Chairman Diamond agreed with the comments made by the other Board members about the windows. He stated that the landscape plan needs enhancement. Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Diamond invited public testimony.

Jamie Childs, 1172 Tamarack Lane, Libertyville, stated that he owns the property and added that his son and wife currently reside there. He explained that the site slopes

down significantly from front to back and explained that shifting the garage back further on the lot would require sloping the driveway down to access the garage or, the foundation of the garage would need to be raised. He acknowledged that maneuvering into and out of the garage is difficult but noted that the residents of the home have been living with the current condition for years.

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

Mr. Letzter stated that the garage will remain in the current location. He stated that new siding and a new roof will be installed on the garage, to match the new residence. He stated a willingness to revisit the window size and placement through working with staff. He pointed out that the interior staircase is slightly pulled away from the front wall and the front window. He stated that the window sizes are being driven by the interior furniture layout. He stated that openings may be able to be added on the rear elevation and asked for clarification on the refinement suggested to the window in the front gable.

To clarify, Board member Renken stated that currently a double window is shown on the left side of the front gable. He suggested that window be repeated on the right side to create symmetry and balance on the front elevation. He stated that the double windows should be the same distance from each of the corners of the front facing gable form.

In response to the clarification from Board member Renken, Mr. Letzter stated that the reason there is not symmetry on the front elevation is because the windows are centered in each room. He stated that staff suggested reconfiguring the proposed double window as three single windows evenly spaced across the front gable. He acknowledged that there are different options that can be considered to provide even spacing between the windows on the front elevation.

Board member Walther acknowledged that the design of the house is very simple but commented that the addition of a secondary gable form that slightly projects out from where the stairway is located could help to create the balance needed on the front elevation.

Board member Renken reiterated that the petitioner is working with the existing foundation.

Board member Walther clarified that the secondary gable form could project out only a few inches.

In response to the comments offered by the Board, Mr. Letzter stated a desire to maintain the simple massing and roof forms.

Board member Bluhm reiterated the importance of adding shade trees as part of the final landscape plan adding that the current landscape plan is comprised of small plant types that do not fully meet the Code.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the existing residence on the property at 1455 Edgewood Road based on the findings detailed in the staff report.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of a replacement residence at 1455 Edgewood Road. He stated that the motion is based on the findings as detailed in the staff report and added that the deliberations of the Board are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Refine the proportions and placement of the windows around the home to present a more balanced composition, allow for more natural light, and improve the exterior appearance of the home.
2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached, with the areas of change highlighted 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. 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.
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. Large shade trees shall be incorporated into the plan to soften the increased height of the house.
5. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation and to protect trees on neighboring properties during construction, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
6. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. 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.

7. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and approved by a vote of 5 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 7:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner