

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of February 1, 2023 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, February 1, 2023 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 December 7, 2022 Building Review Board meeting.

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

3. Consideration of a request for approval of a new residence on a vacant lot, a conceptual landscape plan, and an overall site plan. The property is addressed as 1040 Anna Lane.

**Property Owners: Craig and Jennifer Tomasino
Project Representative: Nate Lochner, Architect**

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

Mr. Tomasino thanked the Board for considering the petition and noted that he and his wife have been looking for a house for several years in various suburbs. He stated that in preparing plans, they worked with the Serena Woods Homeowners' Association.

Mr. Lochner reviewed the location of the property at the east end of Anna Lane, in the Serena Woods subdivision. He stated that the other five lots in the subdivision were previously developed. He provided photos of the vacant lot and the neighboring homes in the subdivision. He stated that consideration was given to the siting of the neighboring homes in siting the proposed residence and driveway. He presented a plat of survey noting that the property slopes from the north to the south. He pointed out the location of trees on the lot. He presented a site plan of the proposed house noting that

efforts were made to orient the garage doors away from the streetscape. He noted the centrally located driveway and motor court with the garage on the side of the home. He noted that the garage doors of the neighboring house to the west align with the garage doors of the proposed new house. He presented a rendering of the house noting the steep pitched, mainly hip roof forms with a gable element to highlight the front entrance. He noted the arch over the front door and the covered entry. He noted the articulation of the front elevation and the single-story elements on either side. He reviewed the exterior materials, stone and brick veneer exterior walls, cut limestone window surrounds, and cedar eaves. He reviewed the various elevations and pointed out the patio at the rear of the house. He noted the effort to control the number of windows on the rear elevation and pointed out that some cedar details are added to the rear elevation. He presented exterior material samples to the Board. He presented a streetscape elevation noting that in terms of the overall size and massing of the proposed house, in his opinion, it fits well with the neighboring homes. He presented a preliminary landscape plan noting the trees that are proposed to frame the views into the property. He noted plantings that are proposed around the property. He noted hardscape that connects to the rear patio. He stated that screening is proposed within the landscape buffer along the north property line. He presented a preliminary drainage and grading plan.

Ms. Baehr stated that many of the design standards are satisfied noting that the residence is designed in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding homes. She stated that high-quality exterior materials are proposed. She stated that the multiple roof forms and roof pitches are a concern and suggested some refinement. She noted that most of the trees proposed for removal are lower quality species. She noted that there are drainage easements along the two side property lines which limit the opportunity for landscaping in those areas. She stated that despite the drainage easements, some additional landscaping screening will be required.

Chairman Diamond invited questions from the Board.

Board member Looby complimented the plan. He agreed that the roof forms are complicated and suggested that refinement be considered.

Board member Downey noted the letter submitted by the petitioners adding that it is helpful in understanding the motivation for the house. She noted that a letter was received from the neighbor regarding drainage and encouraged careful attention to avoid off-site negative drainage impacts. She stated that in general, she is supportive of the roof forms but noted that the garage appears heavy and inconsistent with the rest of the house. She stated that the rear terrace appears small for a house of the size proposed. She encouraged further consideration of the garage mass and rear terrace.

Board member Renken stated that the proposed materials are high quality. He discussed the different roof pitches and acknowledged that differences are likely the result of trying to maximize the square footage in the house. He suggested consideration of eliminating a foot or two from the garage to allow the roof pitches to be refined. He noted that the wall plate on the garage appears low and encouraged

consideration of raising it. He asked whether the limestone window surround terminates at the wood fascia and suggested that the head of the window be lowered to allow the surround to continue around the windows. He observed that the surrounds appear thin. He stated support for the combination of brick and stone on the exterior walls. He agreed with the proposed orientation of the house to minimize visibility of the garage. He noted that the lot appears to be the lowest in the subdivision and cautioned that careful review of the drainage and grading plan will be important. He suggested consideration of heightened detailing of the garage doors. He stated support for refinement of the roof pitches.

Board member Bluhm agreed with Board member Renken's comments that the roof pitches should be reconsidered. She asked whether the window muntin patterns will be consistent with the patterns shown on the elevations.

Board member Walther agreed that the roof pitches should be refined and asked that consideration be given to avoiding roof forms with different pitches appearing in the same view. He pointed out that the bay window is the only element on the rear elevation with a steep roof pitch. He suggested consideration of a border along the driveway consistent with driveways of neighboring homes. He stated that an exterior lighting plan is needed.

Chairman Diamond stated that the house fits in well with the neighborhood.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Lochner reviewed the details intended for the metal garage doors but noted that the garage doors will not be visible from the street. He confirmed that the window muntins will be consistent with those shown on the elevations included in the Board's packets. He stated that limestone is not proposed above the windows but agreed to consider the Board's comments about the window surrounds. He agreed to study the garage roof forms further and explore options to break up the overall mass.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Tomasino stated that early in the design process staff encouraged simplification of the roof forms and changes were made.

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

Board member Renken stated that the project is moving in the right direction. He expressed support for the conditions of approval as recommended in the staff report. He stated that in his opinion, further refinements as requested by the Board can be delegated to staff with the understanding that the petition can be returned to the Board if satisfactory resolution of the issues identified is not reached.

Board member Bluhm agreed with Board member Renken's comments. She reiterated concern about drainage.

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

Board member Looby made a motion to recommend approval of the new residence, the conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and noted that the Board's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Conduct further study and make refinements as follows:
 - a. Simplify the roof forms and pitches to achieve a design that is more consistent around the home.
 - b. Add design elements to the roof form above the garage to visually soften the large roof mass.
 - c. Consider lowering the windows on the second floor to allow stone surrounds to be added above the windows.
 - d. Consider adding a driveway border consistent with the other driveways in the neighborhood.
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 for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
4. 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.
5. 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.
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. During construction, the stormwater drainage easement shall be fenced off to avoid encroachment of materials, equipment or alteration of the grade.
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. Anna Lane must remain unobstructed and open to traffic throughout construction.

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

4. Consideration of a request for approval of the design aspects of three buildings; a concession/restroom pavilion, a maintenance building, and a stand-alone restroom building at Deerpath Park, 115 W. Deerpath.

Property Owner: The City of Lake Forest

**Project Representatives: Chuck Myers, Superintendent of Parks and Forestry
Lacey Lawrence, Senior Associate, Hitchcock Design Group
Noah Cahan, Architect, Robert Juris Associates**

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. Myers introduced the petition noting that the major focus of the project are the improvements to the athletic fields. He stated that the buildings and other amenities may be included in the overall project.

Ms. Lawrence reviewed the existing conditions on the site. She reviewed the proposed overall site plan. She pointed out the three buildings proposed as part of the project. She noted that a hardscape storage area is proposed adjacent to the maintenance building in the northwest corner of the site. She stated that a landscape buffer is proposed around the maintenance building and the associated storage area. She reviewed elevations of the proposed north building. She stated that natural colors are proposed for the building exterior to allow it to blend in with the landscape. She stated that the exterior walls are proposed as a sandstone color along with a green metal roof. She stated that all of the windows on the building will be frosted glass noting that the windows are intended to provide light and vent into the restrooms. She stated that as alternates, depending on the budget, a shingle roof and the elimination of the brick based around the base of the building may be considered. She stated that the mechanical equipment for the building will be at grade and will be screened with a cedar enclosure. She noted the open pavilion area. She stated that lighting on the building will be minimal only as needed for safety and security. She noted that the small building on the south side of the fields will replicate the north building in exterior materials, massing and design. She presented drawings of the proposed maintenance building reiterating that the building is intended to be entirely screened by plantings. She stated that the color palette will be consistent with the other two buildings. She noted the location of the proposed playground and reviewed the hardscape pathways

planned on the site. She stated that landscaping will be extended along the length of the parking lot.

Ms. Czerniak stated that to date, this project has been discussed by the Parks and Recreation Board, an Adhoc Advisory Committee appointed by the City Manager, and the City Council on numerous occasions. She stated that final approvals have not yet been granted to allow time for the Building Review Board to review the design aspects of the buildings. She stated that the impetus for the project is improving the athletic fields adding that the buildings are amenities that may or may not be included in the budget for the overall project. She stated that the buildings are small in scale and intended to be utilitarian in nature, not intended to attract attention but to be secondary to the fields. She stated that durability and low maintenance is important. She stated that the north building will house restrooms, a small concession area, storage space, a mechanical room, and an open air pavilion. She stated that the building massing, detailing, and materials are simple. She reiterated that the intent is to bid the project with alternate materials to allow the City Council to consider options. She stated that if the brick base is eliminated, an appropriate base will be added to project the siding from the ground. She stated that elimination of the brick ornamentation would further simplify the building. She noted that in a recent petition reviewed by the Board, the Board directed that the ornamental, non-structural wrapping at the base of the columns be eliminated and that the columns be properly proportioned. She noted that removal of the wrapping at the base of the columns could simplify and give the appearance of more open space in the covered open air pavilion area. She stated that the maintenance building is intended to be concealed from view. She stated that the design and materials proposed for the maintenance building are utilitarian and industrial in nature. She stated that a detailed landscaping plan will be required to assure that the maintenance area is well screened as intended and that the screening takes into account the grading and filling that will take place on the site. She stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals is considering requests for zoning setback variances for the two buildings proposed near the north property line and to allow new lights to exceed the height limitation for accessory structures. She noted that the existing lights on the field currently exceed the allowable height but will be replaced.

Chairman Diamond invited questions from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Bluhm, Ms. Czerniak stated that park is intended to remain a community park serving primarily local residents. She noted that use of the park is not under the purview of the Building Review Board.

Board member Looby stated support for the overall project noting that it will allow increased use of the fields. He stated support for retaining the brick on the base of the north and south buildings. He agreed that the ornamental brick wrapping should be removed from the base of the columns. He asked about the width of the metal roof panels noting that, in his opinion, asphalt shingles would be more attractive. He expressed concern about the appearance of the maintenance building noting that it is not likely that the building will be able to be fully screened by vegetation. He suggested consideration of an alternate material, other than metal, for the building. He noted that

most of the maintenance buildings have been removed from the parks in recent years noting that the buildings were removed from West Park. He stated that the athletic field lights should have a dark, matte finish to minimize reflectivity.

Mr. Cahan, one of the City's consultants, stated that the metal roof panels are proposed at 16 inches.

Board member Bluhm stated that maintaining dense landscaping around the maintenance building may not be cost effective. She stated support for the brick on the base of the buildings and agreed with the removal of the brick wrapping the base of the columns. She complimented the project overall.

Board member Renken acknowledged that the buildings are secondary, an amenity to the fields and agree that the massing and the design of the buildings are appropriately conservative. He stated support for the metal roof and the brick at the base of the building. He agreed that if the brick is eliminated from the base of the columns, the proportions should of the columns should be revisited. He stated that he was surprised by the height of the field lights and asked if the fixtures of the entire light poles will be replaced. He suggested that consideration be given to lowering the field lighting to allow it to be less obtrusive to the surrounding area. He stated that the maintenance building should either be very well screened or the exterior materials upgraded.

Board member Walther agreed with the comments of the other Board members. He stated support for the brick base on the buildings. He noted that the north elevation of the north building is broken only with a few windows. He suggested a sign or artwork be considered to break up the solid wall and add interest. He noted that if the brick is removed from the columns, bicycles may be chained to the columns. He asked about the proposed soffits and lighting on the buildings and questioned whether there will be lightning or storm protection on the buildings. He stated support for bollards along the sidewalk adjacent to the parking lot. He pointed out that the driveway configuration for the maintenance building may be problematic noting that if a vehicle is backing up to the building on the north side, the driveway will be blocked. He suggested that to solve that problem, the overhead doors could be relocated to the west side to allow the driveway to remain open. He suggested installing bollards in the outdoor storage area to avoid materials and equipment from being hit by vehicles.

Board member Downey suggested that the north building be entirely brick or if that is not possible, she stated that the brick base should be retained. She asked for more detail on the proposed hardscape. She stated that the columns should be thicker. She stated that the appearance of the maintenance building is a concern adding that it will be difficult to screen and could appear as though the landscaping is hiding something. She noted that netting should be provided around the fields to protect others using the area, walking or sitting.

Chairman Diamond suggested that if the maintenance building remains as currently proposed, staggered fencing could be used to help screen the building. He agreed that ideally, the maintenance building should be more substantial.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Lawrence stated the addition of fencing around the maintenance building can be considered. She cautioned that the area is encumbered by flood plain which limits options to some extent. She stated that bicycle racks will be provided. She stated that netting up to 25 feet will be installed near the four baseball fields to protect spectators. She confirmed that bleachers are proposed behind the netting. She stated that the center walkway is an adequate distance away from the active areas of the fields to allow safe passage.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Cahan stated that the brick at the base of the columns hides the bolts and noted that the stone cap on the brick will be sloped with a drip edge to protect the structural element at the bottom of the column. He confirmed that it is possible to remove the brick base. He stated that outlets will be provided on the columns for public use. He stated that signage on the building has not been considered. He stated that the soffit material is a fiber cement board with the appearance of a bead board. He stated that a row of lighting is proposed under the open pavilion roof. He confirmed that the building is lightning protected. He stated that the building has CMU walls reinforced with grouting and rebar for durability. He stated that the interior of the building is proposed as exposed painted CMU block to resist vandalism. He confirmed that the columns are structural.

Board member Looby suggested that outlets be located on the exterior of the building rather than on the columns to avoid a trip hazard. He suggested enhancing the maintenance building with a board and batten exterior.

In response to Board member Looby, Mr. Cahan stated that the mechanical building is a pre-engineered metal structure. He stated that a structural engineer will design the foundation and another company will provide the structural framing and wall materials. He acknowledged that a board and batten cladding could be applied to the outside of the building.

Board member Renken noted that if the building is entirely CMU behind the exterior siding, it would not add significant cost to side the structure fully in brick as suggested by Board member Downey.

In response to Board member Renken's comment, Ms. Lawrence stated that the building veneer is the most expensive component of the building.

Board member Downey stated that making the north building entirely brick is worth considering given that it is the primary building on the site. She expressed concern about the color of the maintenance building, adding that the color will make the building stand out.

In response to Board member Downey's comments, Ms. Lawrence stated that the color of the maintenance building can be revisited.

In response to Board comments, Mr. Myers stated that the landscaping around the

maintenance building is envisions with multiple layers of plantings to provide dense screening, incorporating shrubs, ornamental trees, evergreens and shade trees.

Board member Looby noted that it is important that the plantings are not too close and the area not over planted to avoid stunting plant materials and to avoid the need to remove plantings in the future. He state that he is supportive of landscaping around the maintenance building but noted that the exterior appearance of the building should be improved.

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

Alexandra Potter, 560 Golf Lane, expressed support for updating the fields, but stated opposition to a concession stand which appears to elevate the use of the area. She recognized the need for restrooms. She expressed concern about the disruption and congestion that the project could bring to surrounding neighborhoods. She noted that Deerpath is already congested. She stated that the proposed buildings do not fit with the appearance of the school and recreation center. She stated that it will be difficult to make the maintenance building attractive.

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

Board member Downey stated that she would like to send a message to the City Council that the north pavilion building is the primary building of the project and should reflect a certain quality. She stated her hope that the building could be all brick. She stated support for the brick on the bottom of the building. She asked that the design of the maintenance building be revisited.

Board member Looby asked that the maintenance building be enhanced. He stated support for the brick on the base of the buildings and removal of the brick on the columns. He expressed support for Board member Walther's suggestion to add signage or art to the blank wall on the north wall of the north building.

Board member Renken noted that pre-engineered structures come in standard colors. He agreed that the color proposed for the maintenance building appears too light. He suggested a dark putty or taupe color and adding battens to enhance the appearance of the building. He acknowledged that fencing around the maintenance building would be an additional cost but suggested that the cost could be offset by less landscaping. He stated support for maintaining the brick base on the two pavilion buildings and thickening the pavilion columns. He stated a preference for metal roofing, in a muted green color, for the north and south buildings.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the brick at the base of the building and the columns. She stated support for adding interest to the north elevation of the north building as suggested by Board member Walther. She agreed that the maintenance building could be enhanced but noted that the views of the building are limited.

Board member Walther agreed with the comments of the other Board members. He suggested that the steel gable on the south building be repeated on the north building.

Mr. Cahan clarified that both the north and south buildings will have the same roof structure and will have a soffit. He stated that the beams will be wrapped with fiber cement. He noted that the elevation of the south building included in the Board's packet reflects an earlier scheme.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to recommend approval of the design aspects of the north and south buildings. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and noted that the Board's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The plans shall be refined as follows:
 - a. Eliminate the brick at the base of the columns in the pavilions.
 - b. Increase the thickness of the pavilion columns to appropriately fit the scale of the building.
 - c. Maintain the brick base on the pavilion buildings and consider full height brick for the exterior walls.
 - d. Consider adding an element of interest to the solid wall of the north elevation on the north building.
 - e. The exposed structure shall be treated consistently for the north and south pavilions.
 - f. Minimize reflectivity of the light poles and fixtures through the use of a dark color with a matte finish.
2. The maintenance building shall be revisited.
 - a. Consider applied aesthetic treatments to the exterior of the maintenance building to enhance and soften its appearance.
 - b. Explore different colors for the exterior of the maintenance building to minimize visibility.
3. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed, landscape plan for the maintenance building and the associated storage and parking area shall be

submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.

5. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect any trees intended to be preserved during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.
6. Details of all exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans for permit.
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 Downey and 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.

There was no additional information presented to the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner