

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of April 10, 2023 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Monday, April 10, 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, Timothy G. Franzen, John Looby, Scott Renken and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: Joanne Bluhm and Sally Downey

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 ta themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes from the March 1, 2023 Building Review Board meeting.

The minutes of the March 1, 2023 meeting were approved as presented.

3. Consideration of a request for approval of a five-car garage addition on the west side of the existing home at 1051 Cedar Lane. Minor exterior alterations to the existing home and a new circular driveway with two curb cuts on Cedar Lane are also proposed.

Property Owner: Vince Gendusa

Project Representative: Samuel Pavlovic, 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. Pavlovic described the proposed garage addition and noted that it will be used to store vehicles and for storage. He reviewed a survey of the existing conditions on the site. He stated that as proposed, the project complies with the applicable zoning requirements. He presented photos of the existing single story home. He stated that some exterior alterations were made to the home recently and stated that the proposed garage will be consistent with the style and materials of the recent changes. He reviewed a site plan reflecting the proposed addition and alterations including changes to the driveway configuration. He stated that additional landscaping is planned. He acknowledged that the driveway as planned does not comply with the 16 foot width maximum within the front yard setback but will be adjusted to comply with the Code limitation. He presented a floor plan of the proposed garage noting the three

single garage bays facing Cedar Lane and two larger bays facing Waukegan Road. He noted that the existing garage bays will be converted to living space. He presented a roof plan and reviewed the existing and proposed elevations. He noted that the roof form on the addition as proposed is driven by the need to tie into the existing roof. He stated that in response to an issue raised in the staff report, consideration can be given to adding features to break up the mass of the brick wall. He presented renderings of the home with the proposed addition. He stated that the height of the garage addition is intended to match, but not exceed, the height of the home. He presented a floor plan, roof plan, and elevations of an alternate design that was considered. He stated that neighbors on Cedar Lane have expressed support for the project.

Ms. Baehr noted that concerns about the size and massing of the proposed garage addition are detailed in the staff report. She noted that the proposed garage addition presents a large mass as viewed from the street. She stated that the proposed addition disrupts the hierarchy of the home with the garage appearing large in comparison to the house. She noted that the garage addition has a commercial appearance. She stated that currently, there is limited landscaping on the property. She stated that a detailed landscape plan reflecting enhanced landscaping, particularly in the area of the proposed addition, should be required. She noted that recommendations for refinement and redesign are included in the staff report. She noted that the driveway configuration as reflected on the current plans is not in compliance with the zoning setbacks and will need to be modified. She asked for input from the Board on the overall massing and design. She stated that written testimony received was provided to the Board in advance of the meeting.

In response to a question from Board member Walther, Ms. Baehr pointed out where the driveway exceeds 16 feet, the maximum width permitted in the front yard setback.

Board member Walther asked whether the intent is to construct the addition with red bricks and paint them white, or to use white bricks. He noted that the red brick on the house was painted white. He asked how the height of the garage will be aligned with the height of the house. He agreed that enhanced landscaping is needed specifically to screen the addition from views from the neighboring properties including those located to the south. He acknowledged that the recent improvements to the home were completed without permits and vinyl windows were installed and asked what type of windows are proposed in the addition.

Board member Renken stated concern about the massing and scale of the proposed garage, the size and orientation of the garage doors, and amount of impervious surface that is proposed. He suggested considering making the gable on the garage similar to the gables on the front of the house. He commented that in his opinion, the front and rear gables on the addition are too wide. He suggested consideration of a secondary roof on the rear porch rather than incorporating the porch under a large gable roof. He stated that if the doors are narrower, more residential in scale, they could fit under a smaller gable. He suggested that the garage doors be moved to the west elevation and that consideration be given to four, rather than five, garage doors. He noted that if the garage doors are relocated to the west elevation, the amount of hardscape

needed would be reduced. He pointed out that the garage doors do not appear to be drawn properly and should extend up to the frieze. He stated that garage doors that have a more residential, as opposed to commercial appearance should be considered. He stated that aluminum clad wood windows are preferable over vinyl windows. He suggested that a decorative chimney cap be used. He stated that the alternate design should not be considered.

Board member Looby asked that consideration be given to a garage door of a different style, with less glass. He stated that the size of all of the garage doors should be consistent. He agreed that significant landscaping is needed along the south property line. He suggested incorporating permeable materials into the driveway to reduce the amount of impervious surface on the site.

Board member Franzen stated that in his opinion, the property, given its size, can support a five car garage. He asked for clarification on whether the 16 foot width limitation applies to the flare of the driveway at the curb cut. He noted that the garage doors facing west appear larger than those facing Cedar Lane. He agreed that the alternate design is not an improvement over the original proposal. He stated that landscaping should be added to screen views of the garage doors.

Chairman Diamond invited public comment.

Bob Saunders, 691 Sheffield Court, stated that his home is to the south of the subject property, 250 feet from the corner of the petitioner's home. He expressed concern about noise that will potentially emanate from the proposed open porch and bar area and the outdoor television. He stated that the bar and outdoor television will be in clear view from his home. He stated that he is entitled to the quiet enjoyment of his home while at the same time, acknowledging his neighbor's right to build on his property. He acknowledged that there have been some ongoing challenges with their neighbors. He suggested that bi-fold doors be installed in the bar area to contain the noise and asked that consideration be given to re-positioning the outdoor television to minimize views from his property. He stated that there are no other five car garages in the neighborhood. He pointed out that currently, the plans do not include any landscaping to mitigate light and noise that will impact his property.

Ruth Widstrom, 690 Sheffield Court, stated that the garage addition as proposed is massive and will negatively impact views from her home. She noted that the petitioners have indicated that a pool is also planned in the backyard. She stated that currently, standing water collects along Waukegan Road adding that she has added appropriate plantings in her yard to help mitigate the drainage. She expressed concern about the amount of impervious surface proposed given the amount of water that currently collects in the area. She questioned whether the Blue Spruce shown on the landscape plan will survive in the area due to the wet conditions.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairman Diamond invited responses to the Board questions and to public testimony from the petitioner. In response to Board comments and questions and to public testimony, Ms. Gendusa

stated that her family moved to Lake Forest from Chicago in 2019 because of the wonderful community. She noted the large trees that separate their house from the neighbors to the south. She stated a willingness to make some changes to the current plan.

In response to Board comments and questions and to public testimony, Mr. Gendusa stated that most of the homes on Cedar Lane have four car garages. He explained that the current garage design limits the intrusion of the garage addition into the backyard. He stated that the garage will not be in the line of sight from the neighboring homes to the south because their homes are sited at an angle.

In response to Board comments and questions and to public testimony, Mr. Pavlovcik clarified that the windows in the home are Marvin aluminum-clad wood windows adding that the same windows will be used on the addition. He noted that difficulty in working with the roof forms. He explained that the gables on the addition are at different heights than those on the home but have the same pitch. He stated a willingness to make refinements to the roof forms. He stated that the chimney will be masonry with a clay pot. He confirmed that the house was originally red brick and was recently painted white. He stated that a specific brick has not yet been selected for the garage but noted that the owners' preference is to find a white brick that matches the existing red painted brick to eliminate the need for painting. He stated that the addition as proposed conforms to the zoning regulations. He stated that the petitioners are willing to add landscaping along the south property line. He stated that a drainage and grading plan will be prepared by a licensed engineer, adding that the petitioners do not want standing water on the site. He acknowledged that there may be some design ideas that could minimize views of the proposed outdoor television screen from neighboring properties. He stated that the petitioners are interested in contemporary styled garage doors. He stated that the petitioners intend to screen the garage doors with landscaping. He acknowledged that the garage doors are oversized in comparison to residentially scaled garage doors. He stated that the size and dimensions of the garage doors are based on the homeowners' preference. He stated that the side facing garage doors are 12 feet wide and eight feet tall. He stated that the 33 foot depth of the garage is driven by the size of the homeowners' vehicles.

In response to comments about the size of the garage doors, Ms. Czerniak stated that the residential zoning district in which the property is located cannot be used for commercial vehicles.

Board member Walther agreed with Board member Renken's suggestion that the width of the gable on the garage addition be reduced to relate to the gables on the house. He suggested that the Board offer an opinion on whether the garage doors should face Cedar Lane or Waukegan Road.

Board member Franzen suggested consideration of a design that locates two garage doors facing Cedar Lane and three facing Waukegan Road. He noted that the City Engineer will review drainage and grading plans when they are submitted and stated confidence that drainage will be appropriately addressed. He stated that off site light

and noise impacts can be mitigated with landscaping.

Board member Walther suggested consideration of a blind or shield on the open porch to mitigate off site impacts from the bar and outdoor television. He suggested that consideration be given to Board member Renken's suggestion of locating the garage doors on the west elevation. He pointed out that if all the garage doors are moved to the west elevation, the addition could be pushed forward to avoid extending into the backyard.

Board member Renken suggested consideration of moving the driveway forward, away from the house, to provide space between the driveway and the house for landscaping.

Board member Walther expressed concern about a white brick noting that it may be difficult to match the appearance of the red painted brick on the house. He added that the two will patina differently over time.

In response to comments from the Board, Mr. Gendusa agreed to using a red brick that will be stained white to match the brick on the house.

Board member Looby noted that moving the addition forward and locating the garage doors on the west elevation will mitigate the impact of the garage mass on the neighbors to the south.

Board member Walther clarified that the Board is offering ideas for the petitioner to consider and incorporate as appropriate into a revised plan.

Board member Renken stated that the gable over the garage is wider than the gables on the home, yet it is lower. He stated that the gable on the garage must have a different pitch than the gables on the home. He stated that it is important that the roof pitches are consistent. He offered if the addition is configured with two garage doors facing Cedar Lane and three on the west elevation, the gable on the addition can be the same pitch as the gables on the home. He offered that another option is to locate all the garage doors on the west elevation with three single windows on the front elevation of the addition to match the front of the home. He explained that if all five garage doors are moved to the west elevation, the wall should be articulated with two planes, three doors on one wall plane, and two doors pushed back on a different wall plane. He noted that contemporary styled garage doors, that have a residential character, are available.

Board member Walther stated that images of the proposed garage doors and samples of the stained brick should be presented to the Board. He explained that the Board's role is to make sure that there is consistency through a neighborhood with respect to massing, roof forms, design and materials. He stated that understanding the topography of the property would be helpful to the Board in considering the petition.

In response to comments from the Board, Mr. Gendusa stated that locating all of the

garage bays on the west elevation will extend the garage into the backyard. He noted that shifting the garage forward on the site will require removing windows from the existing garage which will be converted to living space.

Board member Renken pointed out that three windows will remain on the front of the converted garage.

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

Board member Walther made a motion to continue the petition with direction to the petitioner to consider the following comments offered by the Board and return to the Board with refined plans, additional details, and samples of materials to the Board.

1. Revise the driveway configuration to meet the zoning regulations.
2. Provide an updated site plan that reflects the location of the potential future pool to allow the Board to be aware of the potential full scope of work.
3. Explore alternative designs that reduce the amount of impervious surface and consider incorporating permeable materials into the hardscape recognizing the significant increase in impervious surface proposed on the property.
4. Provide an updated tree removal plan that identifies all trees proposed for removal with details on species, size, and condition.
5. Provide a detailed landscape plan that provides screening of the addition from the street, neighboring properties and along the south side of the property.
6. Provide a preliminary site grading and drainage plan.
7. Lower the height of the garage addition to avoid exceeding the height of the home.
8. Study the roof forms of the addition in an effort to reduce the width of the front facing gable and match the pitch of the roof forms on the home.
9. Conduct further study of the massing and design of the garage addition in an effort to present a more residential appearance.
10. Explore an alternative design that reflects all or the majority of the garage doors on the west elevation rather than the front façade.
11. Incorporate openings on the west elevation to break up the solid wall.
12. Incorporate a clay chimney pot or decorative cap on the new chimney.
13. Accurately reflect the height of the garage doors on the elevations.
14. Explore garage doors that are residential in appearance and provide images of the proposed garage doors.
15. Consider a covered entry element above the rear kitchen door.
16. Consider design elements to mitigate views of the outdoor television from the neighboring homes.

The motion was seconded by Board member Looby and the Board voted 5 to 0 to approve the motion.

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

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

6. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented to the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner