

**The City of Lake Forest  
Building Review Board  
Proceedings of June 7, 2023 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023 at 6:30 p.m., at the Municipal Services Building, 800 Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Building Review Board members present: Chairman John Looby and Board members, Joanne Bluhm, Sally Downey, Eric Lohmueller and Scott Renken

Building Review Board members absent: Timothy G. Franzen and Justin Stamer (pending orientation)

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 Looby 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 May 3, 2023 Building Review Board meeting.**

The minutes of the May 3, 2023 meeting were approved as presented.

**3. Consideration of modifications to the buildings proposed to support the athletic fields at Deerpath Park.**

**Property Owner: City of Lake Forest**

**Project Representative: Chuck Myers, Superintendent of Parks and Forestry**

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

Ms. Czerniak reviewed that the Board previously approved the north and south pavilions planned as amenities to the athletic fields and directed modifications to the maintenance building proposed in the northwest corner of the site. She noted that the maintenance building has been eliminated from the project for budgetary reasons. She stated that since the Board's approval, some minor modifications were made to the south pavilion, it was expanded to include a small garage to compensate for the elimination of the larger, previously proposed maintenance building. She stated that because of the change, the south pavilion is back before the Board for information and re-approval. She noted that the building is still 18 feet wide, but eight feet longer, 54 feet as now proposed, an increase of 126 square feet. She stated that the design of the building and the exterior materials remain the same and match those on the north pavilion. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support the south pavilion as

now presented. She stated that the conditions of approval remain the same as the conditions previously recommended by the Board.

Chairman Looby stated that the current plan is a great alternative to constructing the separate maintenance building as previously proposed. He noted that the proposed changes to the south building are minimal.

In response to questions from Board member Downey, Ms. Czerniak clarified that the condition of approval previously recommended by the Board requires that inside the pavilions, the structural beams and rafters are exposed as opposed to being concealed by a drop ceiling. She confirmed that the maintenance building was completely eliminated from the project noting that a flat hardscape area will be located in the northwest corner of the overall site for storage of field equipment such as soccer goals when not in use. She stated that the hardscape area will be screened with landscaping.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited a motion from the Board.

Board member Bluhm made a motion to recommend approval of the south pavilion as modified subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Size the columns in the pavilion to appear visually appropriate and proportional in relation to the roof structure. (The column thickness appears thin on the drawings.)
2. Set the base of the columns on an appropriate concrete plinth to provide protection from moisture.
3. Provide brick knee walls around the enclosed portion of the structure, not on the columns.
4. Expose the structure in the open portion of the pavilion.
5. Assure consistency between the design aspects and materials of the north and south pavilions.

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

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

Mr. Pavlovic reviewed the changes made since the last meeting in response to the Board's comments and direction. He reviewed a survey of the existing site conditions

and presented the revised site plan noting that the proposed garage addition was reduced slightly in size and pushed forward on the site. He stated that the driveway is configured to allow for proper turning movements but acknowledged that refinements are needed to comply with the zoning requirements. He stated that ideally, the driveway would be pushed away from the house to provide space for landscaping along the front of the house. He stated that the landscape plan is not yet been finalized pending refinement of the driveway. He noted that a fence is proposed along the south property line to provide screening for the neighbors to the south and stated a willingness to remove the neighbor's fence from a portion of the south property line if desired. He reviewed the changes made to the floor plan and elevations in response to the previous Board comments. He stated that the rooflines as now proposed are consistent in height and pitch. He stated that the garage doors are sized to accommodate a large pickup with a snowplow noting that the petitioners need a snowplow because of the large driveway. He stated that the rear patio remains the same as previously proposed. He noted the location of a possible future pool in the rear yard. He reviewed alternate designs for the garage addition that were considered and commented on the pros and cons of each noting that some of the alternatives appeared more commercial in nature. He noted that in some of the alternatives, the amount of impervious surface was greater than in the plan presented for approval. He stated that the petitioners desire a contemporary style garage door and presented some options being considered.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that the Board continue consideration of the petition in April with direction to the petitioner to consider the comments offered by the Board and neighbors, make modifications, and provide additional information. She stated that the massing and roof forms on the garage addition as modified appear more consistent with the house. She noted that the size of the garage and the width of the driveway were reduced slightly. She stated that further adjustment of the driveway is needed to comply with the zoning regulations. She noted that the garage doors as proposed still appear commercial in character noting that the Board previously raised this concern. She reviewed that at the April meeting, the Board requested a detailed landscape plan. She noted that the plan now presented is limited, not of the quality the Board usually sees. She noted that considerable work is needed to further detail the landscape plan to allow for staff evaluation. She noted that the proposed garage is large, totaling approximately 60 percent of the square footage of the house. She noted that landscaping will be important to help soften the proposed addition and the resulting activity likely on the site. She noted that the petitioner is proposing a fence along the south property line, however, there appears to be large trees on the south property line. She stated that the south property line should be staked by a licensed surveyor to allow identification of any conflicts with trees and the proposed fence. She stated that an exterior lighting plan is required to detail all proposed lighting and existing lighting on the site that was installed without review or a permit. She stated that the staff report provides findings in support of the petition subject to several conditions of approval.

In response to questions from Chairman Looby, Ms. Baehr stated that the Code allows structures to cover up to 30 percent of a zoning lot. She confirmed that a drainage and

grading plan will be required and will be subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer.

Board member Downey stated that she was not present at the meeting when this petition was previously considered but has read the meeting minutes. She stated support for the conditions as presented by staff including a requirement that the south property line be staked. She agreed that the lights that were installed without approval or permit must be shown on the lighting plan. She expressed concern about the commercial appearance of the garage doors. She noted that limiting activity and noise from the patio and future swimming pool is not under the Board's purview and is a neighbor issue. She expressed concern that a detailed landscape plan was not submitted by the petitioner as requested by the Board.

Board member Lohmueller stated that in his opinion, the garage doors facing Cedar Lane should be consistent with other garage doors in the neighborhood. He stated that the roof forms appear to be improved from the earlier plans. He agreed with the comments made by Board member Downey.

Board member Bluhm expressed support for the refinements made to the roof forms and roof pitches. She observed that a significant amount of hardscape is proposed in the front yard and suggested adding landscaping between the driveway and the house. She suggested that the garage doors should match the style of the house adding that overly busy doors should be avoided.

In response to questions from Board member Bluhm, Ms. Gendusa stated a desire for garage doors in a contemporary style.

Board member Renken acknowledged that since the last meeting, the massing of the addition was simplified, and the roof pitches aligned. He questioned whether enough consideration was given to the option of having all five garage doors on the west elevation. He suggested consideration of three larger garage doors in the middle and smaller doors set back on each side noting that approach would likely improve the appearance overall and eliminate some of the hardscape on the streetscape side of the property. He questioned whether an eight foot garage door is functional. He commented on the garage door options presented by the petitioner and stated support for option B, with the door broken up in the middle to provide some scale. He stated that a seven foot fence will offer privacy between the homes. He agreed that the landscape plan as presented does not provide enough detail to allow it to be evaluated. He stated that it would have been helpful to see complete information.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Mr. Gendusa stated that the smaller garage doors will be used for smaller vehicles.

In response to questions from Board member Renken, Mr. Pavlovic reviewed the reasons for not pursuing the option with five garage doors on the west elevation. He stated that although the amount of impervious surface at the front of the house would be reduced, the hardscape on the west side of the house would need to be expanded.

He added that with west facing garage doors, the overall square footage of the garage increases. He acknowledged that landscape and lighting plans are needed and confirmed that a civil engineer has been engaged to work on the project.

In response to questions from Chairman Looby, Ms. Baehr confirmed that the zoning issue related to the driveway can be resolved with some modification to the driveway configuration.

Ms. Gendusa stated that no exterior lights have been installed without a permit. She stated that the lights are solar and mounted on a nail.

In response to questions from Board member Bluhm, Ms. Gendusa stated that a circular driveway is desired for convenience. She stated that she prefers the garage doors facing both front and to the west.

Chairman Looby invited public comment, hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Bluhm made a motion to delegate further review of the petition to a subcommittee of the Board noting that if issues relating to the landscape and lighting plans, garage door selection, and any other open items cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the subcommittee, the petition should be returned to the full Board for further review. She stated that the motion incorporates the following conditions.

1. The petition shall be subject to approval by a subcommittee of the Board. The subcommittee review shall confirm that all the conditions of the Board's approval are met, including, but not limited to a final landscape plan, lighting plan, and final garage door selection.
2. Prior to the issuance of permits authorizing further work on the property, permits must be obtained for work to date completed without permits and all required inspections completed to the satisfaction of the City.
3. Prior to the issuance of a permit authorizing installation of a fence along the south property line, the property line must be staked by a licensed surveyor to allow for identification and resolution of any conflicts with trees.
4. The driveway configuration must be modified to comply with applicable zoning regulations.
5. Provide a lighting plan for all existing and proposed exterior lighting and specifications for all exterior light fixtures. All light 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.
6. Provide information on the location of the outdoor television, if proposed, and details on how off-site impacts will be mitigated.

7. Provide details on the design and materials of the decorative chimney cap.
8. All modifications to the plans including the refinements noted 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 provided to the Board at the June 7, 2023, meeting 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 and the subcommittee's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
9. 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 the remaining inches must be noted on the landscape plan. The full payment in lieu of on site plantings is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - o The landscape plan shall reflect the existing plantings and identify any plantings proposed for removal and plantings intended to remain.
  - o Additional landscaping will be necessary to soften the appearance of the garage and porch additions from all viewpoints, including from the south.
  - o Shade trees shall be incorporated into the landscape plan to soften the appearance of the front façade of the home.
10. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate 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 must be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to meet good engineering practices and properly direct drainage.
11. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation on the site and trees on neighboring properties during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
12. 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 Renken and was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

**5. Consideration of a request for approval of a new single-family residence on a vacant lot, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan for the property addressed as 1200 Lawrence Avenue.**

**Property Owners: Steve and Beth Bush**

**Project Representative: Rick Swanson, architect**

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

Mr. Swanson reviewed the general location of the property and noted that the proposed house is setback consistent with the other homes on the street. He presented the proposed site plan and noted that the house is designed in an English Country style to fit into the established neighborhood. He stated that to accommodate development of the lot, the arborvitae along the west property line may need to be removed along with the tree in the center of the lot. He stated that paver stone is proposed for some of the hardscape. He reviewed various aspects of the proposed residence noting the steep pitched roof forms with gables, a blend of brick and stone veneer, white aluminum clad wood casement windows, shutters, and white trim and downspouts. He stated that the front door will be a dark stained mahogany. He stated that the house follows all applicable Code requirements. He reviewed the elevations and presented photos of the proposed exterior materials. He stated that the color palette is a white washed painted brick with Federal blue detailing. He stated that the exterior light fixtures will be a properly proportioned. He stated that the garage doors are 27 feet away from the property line, an adequate distance for maneuvering. He noted the location of the air conditioner, He commented that the dormer is configured and located to allow the house to comply with the square footage limitations. He noted the chimney and clay chimney pots. He stated that the shutters will have appropriate hardware. He stated that Tuscan columns are proposed on the porches. He stated that cedar brackets will accent the overhangs. He presented a colored rendering. He stated that a copper roof will be used in appropriate locations.

Ms. Baehr stated that the neighbor surrounding the property now proposed for development was mostly developed in the late 1980's and 1990's and is mostly built out. She stated that the Homeowners' Association for the subdivision submitted a letter of approval for the proposed residence. She stated that the design of the residence and the high quality, natural exterior materials fit in well with the surrounding neighborhood. She noted that the dormer on the west elevation is slightly off center above the garage and suggested consideration of centering the dormer noting that the modification will not affect the overall square footage. She stated that the circular window on the east elevation appears out of character with the residence and suggested that it be eliminated or replaced with a window of a different shape. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the petition and recommended conditions of approval.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the design of the residence including the dormer on the west elevation as presented. She agreed that the circular window on

the east elevation should be reconsidered. She complimented the overall project.

Board member Downey stated that the property and the home are beautiful. She agreed that the circular window appears awkward and should be replaced with a reconfigured window. She stated that the dormer over the garage, in her opinion, is acceptable as presented. She observed that the west side of the house appears tight with the driveway, garage apron and landscaping.

Board member Renken commended the design of the residence and the proposed materials. He agreed that the dormer over the garage is acceptable because it is between two windows but acknowledged that it could look better if centered. He agreed that the circular window on the east elevation appears awkward. He commented on the driveway noting that 23 feet in front of the garage is workable and allows some additional space for landscaping.

Board member Lohmueller agreed that the driveway is tight. He stated that the arborvitae will likely need to come out. He commented on the gutters on the front of the garage.

Chairman Looby complimented the design of the home and stated that it will fit nicely into the neighborhood. He stated support for centering the dormer on the west elevation over the garage. He agreed that the circular window should be replaced with a different window. He noted that fences are not allowed in the subdivision adding that shifting the driveway to provide more space for plantings will benefit the petitioner and the neighbor.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Swanson stated agreed to consider a different solution to replace the round window on the east elevation. He stated that the copper roof can be treated to speed up the patina process. He stated that he originally developed the subdivision and drafted the restrictive covenants. He stated that a retaining wall of up to 18 inches in height is necessary along the west property line because of the topography of the neighboring lot. He stated his hope that the arborvitae along the west property line can be saved. He stated that he will revisit the placement of the dormer on the west facing elevation in the context of the floor plan. He stated that he prefers not to return the eave.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Rick Cooper, 1210 Lawrence Avenue, stated that he owns the house directly to the west of the subject property. He complimented the design of the house. He stated one concern, drainage and agreed that a retaining wall may be a solution to address his drainage concerns.

Hearing no further public testimony and no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based

on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the deliberations of the Board as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. The dormer shall be centered on the west elevation to present a more balanced appearance.
2. The circular window on the east elevation shall be eliminated or replaced with casement windows that match the other windows around the home.
3. Consideration shall be given to reducing the extent of the garage apron to 23 feet in an effort to preserve the arborvitae or allow space for replacement landscaping.
4. All modifications to the plans including the refinements noted 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.
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, 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.
6. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.

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. Contractors may need to park off site and shuttle to the construction site to limit congestion on the adjacent street.

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

**6. Consideration of a request for approval of a new single-family residence, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan for the property addressed as 1371 Edgewood Road.**

**Property Owners: Richard and Jennifer Sarhaddi**

**Project Representative: Jeff Letzter, project manager**

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

Mr. Letzter noted that the property was created through a recent resubdivision. He stated that a Colonial Revival style home is proposed to fit in with the streetscape. He stated that the roof is asphalt shingle and the siding, hardi board shingle shakes. He presented a street scape image noting that the house is sited and designed consistent with other homes on the street. He presented images of the neighboring homes. He pointed out that a wrap around front porch is proposed. He reviewed each elevation noting the brick chimney and French doors at the rear of the home. He reviewed the floor plans and the roof plan noting the simple roof forms. He stated that the residence complies with all applicable regulations. He presented elevations of the detached garage. He presented photos of homes that provided inspiration for the design. He noted that drainage and grading plans were prepared, and address concerns previously raised by the neighbor to the north. He stated that a nine foot driveway is proposed, two feet from the property line. He noted that the tree removal and landscape plans were just prepared and have not yet been reviewed by City staff. He stated that one parkway tree near the driveway may be impacted and if it is, it will be replaced with a new parkway tree nearby.

Ms. Baehr stated that the property is narrow and deep similar to other properties on the street. She stated that the proposed architectural style is consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. She noted that the shallow roof on the front porch appears inconsistent with the other roof forms on the house. She noted that the small windows used in limited areas on the house appear horizontal as opposed to the other windows around the home which are vertical consistent with the standard form of double hung windows. She noted that the dormers appear unusually tall and suggested that the dormers be eliminated and the windows should be lowered consistent with the other windows on the home. She noted that in previous correspondence, the neighbor to the north expressed concern about the unkempt condition of the property and in particular, the brush along the north property line. She

added that as part of this project the brush along the north property line will need to be cleaned up.

Board member Bluhm agreed that the front porch appears undersized and awkward. She stated that it is a benefit if porches are useable. She agreed that the small windows also appear awkward and referred to one of the inspirational photos provided by the petitioner noting that taller windows will improve the overall appearance of the home. She stated that the dormers should be eliminated. She suggested that an accent color could enhance the appearance of the home.

In response to questions from Board member Bluhm, Mr. Letzter stated that the color palette will likely be white with a stained porch. He stated that the desire is to avoid the dingy appearance of gray.

Board member Lohmueller agreed with the staff recommendation on the windows and encouraged consistency in the windows around the home. He noted that the neighboring homes appear more balanced in appearance and well-proportioned. He added that the multiple rooflines visible on the front elevation makes the home appear unbalanced. He stated that the front porch appears as an add on to the home rather than a thoughtful part of the original design. He suggested revisiting the proportions of the dormers and the rooflines overall to present a more consistent appearance throughout.

Board member Downey agreed with staff's recommendations with respect to the window proportions and eliminating the dormers. She stated that cleaning up the property is important. She noted that the hip roof on the front porch seems out of proportion with the rest of the home. She stated that a simple shed roof may be a better solution. She noted that the proposed amount of impervious surface is significant and drainage is a concern in this neighborhood.

Board member Renken stated that the design of the house needs a few refinements. He stated that the porch needs work and suggested that the corner of the porch should align with the corner of the house. He suggested consideration of a metal roof on the front porch. He acknowledged that some of the windows cannot be lengthened because of the placement on the house. He suggested that a casement window could be considered in place of a double hung style window. He commented on the large projecting mass on the south elevation and suggested that there be a vertical break in the wall plane between the stairhall and the study to improve the appearance of the home. He suggested lowering the windows and eliminating the dormers on the north elevation. He stated that if lowering the windows is not workable from the inside, the eave could be raised a foot to accommodate the windows. He stated raising the eave should not create a problem with square footage. He stated that the elevation will look better without the dormers.

Chairman Looby agreed that extending the porch to the corner of the south wall will improve the appearance of the house. He agreed with the other comments made by the Board members and complimented the overall project. He invited public comment.

Ms. Sarhaddi thanked the Board for the comments and stated that she is looking forward to living in Lake Forest.

In response to questions and comments from the Board, Mr. Letzter explained that the configuration of the driveway drove the need to pull the porch in from the corner of the house. He offered some options for the roof on the front porch. He agreed that the windows on the north elevation can be lowered, and the small windows changed to more vertical, casement windows. He agreed to pull in the stairwell on the south elevation to provide a vertical break in the wall plane. He stated that the amount of impervious surface is driven by the desire to have a detached garage set back from the house to provide a useable back yard. He agreed to talk with the petitioners about an accent color for the exterior of the house. He stated that simple clay flues are planned for the chimney. He presented a sample of the roof shingle.

Board member Renken questioned whether the color of the roof is the right choice with a white house.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none he invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. The plans shall be refined as follows:
  - a. The stairway on the south elevation shall be shifted in to provide a vertical break on the exterior wall.
  - b. An alternate color shall be considered for the roof shingles given the white siding proposed for the house.
  - c. Further study shall be conducted on the front porch to achieve a design that is more consistent with the style of the home and the roof forms on the home.
  - d. Replace the small double hung windows with taller windows or casement windows with a different muntin pattern for consistency with the other windows on the house.
  - e. Eliminate the shed dormers on the north elevation and adjust the windows accordingly, below the eave line.
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. The final landscape shall include, but not be limited to, all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed and 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.
4. The buckthorn and overgrowth along the north property line must be removed prior to scheduling rough inspections.
5. 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.
6. 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.
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.

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

**7. Consideration of a request for approval of a new single-family residence on a vacant lot, a conceptual landscape plan, and overall site plan for the property addressed as 107 S. Ridge Road.**

**Property Owner: Von Hanovnikian**

**Project Representative: Matthew Kustus, architect**

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

Mr. Kustus described the vacant parcel proposed for development noting that it is two acres and is sited behind another property and is not visible from the streetscape and to neighboring homes for the most part. He noted that the lot is challenging because of its location adjacent to Route 41 and the train tracks, and because it is heavily wooded. He stated that the house is sited to respond to the challenges. He stated that 30 percent of the trees planned for removal are dead or in decline. He stated that the house and landscaping are designed to minimize noise impacts from

Route 41 and the trains. He stated that the addition of berms along the perimeter of the property is also being considered as a sound buffer. He stated that the winding paths reflected on the landscape plan are intended to give the sense of walking through a woodland. He noted that the house is designed for single floor living with additional second floor space for family and friends. He noted that the home is designed in the shingle style and connects to the landscape through the use of low profile forms. He stated that each elevation is unique but incorporates common elements. He stated that synthetic products are proposed given the heavily wooded lot and for sound attenuating purposes. He stated that the trim will be fir and the gutters and downspouts will be aluminum. He noted that in response to the staff report, an imitation wood shingle roof is being considered rather than imitation slate in keeping with the character of the site. He presented samples of exterior materials.

Ms. Baehr confirmed that the site is very wooded and that the house will not be visible from the street. She stated that the home presents a strong design with simple forms. She confirmed that staff suggested that an imitation slate synthetic roof product is not consistent with the style of the house. She stated that replacement inches will be required for trees outside of the footprint of the house that will be removed. She stated that the quality and health of the trees will be taken into consideration. She stated that the staff report details findings in support of the petition and includes recommended conditions of approval.

Board member Downey raised questions about the driveway. She agreed that an imitation wood roof product is more appropriate for the style of the house than an imitation slate product.

Board member Renken commended the petition. He agreed that the petitioner should explore the options for synthetic roofs other than imitation slate.

Board member Bluhm noted the privacy of the property and complimented the project.

Board member Lohmueller encouraged that all steps possible be taken to minimize the noise impacting the house. He commented that many of the trees along the driveway and near the berms will not survive. He commended the project overall.

Chairman Looby stated that the home is distinctive. He encouraged consideration of a higher berm and encouraged planting the berms with a double row of trees in an effort to mitigate the noise from Route 41 and the railroad. He encouraged consideration of a roof product with more texture. He thanked the petitioner for providing the material samples. He invited public comment. Hearing none and hearing no further comments or questions from the Board, he invited a motion.

Board member Bluhm made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. She stated that the recommend is based on the following conditions of approval.

1. Consideration shall be given to the detail and texture of the synthetic roof material to assure that it is in keeping with the style of the house.
2. All modifications to the plans including the refinements noted 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 submitted for permit 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 provide for all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed to the extent possible using good forestry practices. If the full amount of required replacement inches cannot be accommodated on site, a payment in-lieu of on site plantings may be required. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
4. The final grading and drainage plan shall demonstrate 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, except that for noise mitigation purposes, berms may be proposed and will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer and must comply with the limitations in the Zoning Code unless a variance is granted.
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. Off site contractor parking may be required to minimize congestion on Ridge Road and to address any vehicle and pedestrian safety issues.

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

**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 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Planner