

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of November 2, 2022 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, November 2, 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, Sally Downey, John Looby, Scott Renken and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: 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 June 1, 2022, September 7, 2022 and October 6, 2022 Building Review Board meetings.

The minutes of the June 6, 2022 meeting were approved as submitted.

The minutes of the September 7, 2022 meeting were approved as submitted.

The minutes of the October 6, 2022 meeting were approved as submitted.

3. Consideration of a request for the demolition of an existing residence and approval of a new residence, conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan. The property is addressed as 859 Northmoor Road.

Property Owner: Northmoor Lake Forest, LLC (Cara Hyde-Basso, 100%)

Project Representative: Cara Hyde-Basso, 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.

Ms. Hyde-Basso presented the request for approval of a demolition and replacement residence. She stated the intent is to construct a house consistent with the character of the neighborhood. She stated that consideration was given to reusing all or a portion of the residence but noted that replacement of the house was deemed to be more appropriate. She stated that the house is nonconforming with respect to setbacks and noted that the house does not maximize the allowable square footage. She noted that the lot is impacted by drainage issues. She noted deterioration and problems with the

existing residence and stated that extensive repairs to the existing are needed. She stated that the existing framing is not sufficient to support a second floor. She presented photos of surrounding homes noting the various styles and varying scale. She stated that an "L" configuration of the replacement home is proposed to partially conceal the garage from the street. She stated that the house will be in conformance with the allowable square footage. She noted that the driveway will be located away from the property line. She stated that to the extent possible, the existing trees and landscaping will be maintained. She reviewed the proposed materials noting that natural materials and a warm color palette are proposed. She stated that the cedar roof will offer a soft texture to complement the brick. She reviewed each elevation noting that to take advantage of the natural light, the rear elevation has more openings. She stated that the exterior lighting will have a traditional aesthetic.

Ms. Baehr stated that the demolition appears to meet the applicable criteria. She stated that the proposed residence is compatible with the neighborhood. She noted that high quality exterior materials are proposed adding that the proposed color palette and design are complementary to the surrounding homes. She noted that the transom element on the second floor of the rear elevation appears to be inconsistent with other elements on the house. She stated that no trees are proposed for removal. She stated that the landscape plan requires some enhancement including the addition of shade trees. She noted that two letters were received from neighbors in support of the project.

Board member Downey stated that the petitioner has made a strong case for the demolition. She stated that the proposed house appears to fit in with the surrounding homes. She stated that the triangular transom appears to replicate the shape of the bay window roof and expressed interest in hearing comments from the other members of the Board on that element. She asked about the detailing on the gable ends of the proposed home. She asked why on the south elevation; the three sets of French doors have transom windows and the French door at the far right of the elevation does not.

Board member Looby commended the presentation and noted that the information on the proposed materials was helpful. He stated that the demolition is warranted. He stated an interest in hearing the comments of the other Board members on the transom windows.

Board member Walther agreed with the comments of the other Board members. He asked about the materials above the front door. He stated that the windows on either side of the front door appear to be a bit out of place. He suggested careful selection of plantings below those windows to minimize the appearance of awkwardness. He noted that a significant number of exterior lights are proposed and cautioned that care must be taken to avoid negatively impacting the streetscape and neighboring homes. He noted that the impervious surface on the site is increasing significantly and asked that careful attention be paid to drainage to avoid impacting neighboring homes.

Board member Renken stated that the home will fit in well with the neighborhood. He agreed that the windows on either side of the front door are awkward and suggested lengthening the windows. He stated that the window above the front door could be

enlarged slightly. He stated that the garage door does not need to compete with the arch over the front door and suggested eliminating the arch above the garage door. He stated that the intent for the brick landscape walls is unclear on the plan. He stated that with respect to the dormer to the left of the front entry, the roof plan indicates that it extends over the valley. He observed that the garage roof is low and suggested verifying that there is adequate headroom in that area. He stated that since the triangular transom windows are on the rear of the home, that element may be acceptable. He offered suggestions to enhance the appearance of the transom and noted that at a minimum, muntins should be added to the rectangular transom window above the balcony door. He stated that the exterior light sources should be shielded. He complimented the overall design of the home.

Board member Bluhm noted that the multiple French doors could impact options for furniture placement. She stated support for the demolition. She agreed that consideration should be given to enhancing the transom windows on the rear of the house.

Board member Looby stated that some architecturally interesting plants could be used below the windows on either side of the front door. He noted that architecturally interesting plants would benefit the front of the garage as well.

Chairman Diamond stated that the residence will enhance the neighborhood. He asked whether true divided lites are proposed.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Hyde-Basso confirmed that true divided lites are proposed. She agreed to consider some architecturally interesting plantings near the front door and in front of the garage. She acknowledged that drainage needs to be carefully considered. She stated that the rear patio will be permeable pavers. She confirmed that the detailing on the gable ends is inset bricks. She explained that the French door on the right side of the south elevation intentionally does not have a transom window because the other doors in that room face the front and do not have transom windows. She stated that there is an arched window directly above the front door. She agreed to consider ground lighting, instead of wall lighting, on the east and west elevations to minimize impacts on the neighboring homes. She acknowledged that the transom on the second floor of the rear elevation appears more contemporary than the rest of the house. She agreed to consider modifications to that element. She stated that the low brick walls are proposed to conceal the air conditioning units and generator. She confirmed that there is a raised planting bed in front of the French doors on the front of the house.

Chairman Diamond invited public comment, hearing none, he invited final comments from the Board, hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Looby made a motion to recommend approval of demolition of the existing residence based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings.

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

Board member Walther thanked the petitioner for considering the Board's suggestions. He summarized that incorporating pervious materials should be considered along with refinements to the lighting plan to minimize impacts on the neighbors. He stated that year round plantings on either side of the front entrance should be required to soften the brick walls.

Board member Renken made a motion recommend approval of the residence, attached garage, conceptual landscape and overall site plan based on the findings detailed 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. Incorporate pervious materials into the hardscape plan.
2. Refine the exterior lighting plan to comply with the City's Residential Lighting Guidelines and to minimize impacts on neighboring homes.
3. Use taller windows on either side of the front door or add year round plantings under the windows.
4. Explore variations for the transom windows above the second-floor master bedroom door on the rear elevation.
5. All modifications made to the plans, including those detailed above and any additional modifications made 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 with the areas of change highlighted 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.
6. 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. In addition, plantings along the east side of the driveway shall be incorporated to screen views of the garage doors and driveway from the neighboring home. If any trees on the site are negatively impacted as a result of construction, additionally plantings may be required.
7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees on and adjacent to the site during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.

8. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate the project is consistent with the applicable Code requirements subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. Grading or filling on the site should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices to properly direct drainage. All necessary measures should be taken on the site to slow water runoff from the site given the significant increase in impervious surface proposed.
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.

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

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.

The Board voted to approve the 2023 dates for the Building Review Board meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner