

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of September 6, 2023 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, September 6, 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, Scott Renken and Justin Stamer

Building Review Board members absent: Board member 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 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 themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes from the August 3, 2023 Building Review Board meeting.

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

**3. Consideration of a request for modifications to previously approved plans for the
Amberley Woods Courtyard Homes at 1825 and 1965 Amberley Court.
Property Owner: McNaughton Development, (Paul McNaughton, 100%)
Project Representative: John Barry, McNaughton Development**

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. Barry reviewed the modifications proposed to the previously approved plans for two of the models for the Amberley Courtyard Homes. He stated that a screen porch with a gable roof is proposed as an addition to the Brunswick French Country style home to be constructed on the lot at 1825 Amberley Court. He stated that the porch will be sided with cement stucco consistent with the approved exterior material for the home. He reviewed the floor plan and pointed out that the screen porch will extend seven feet beyond the home as previously approved. He stated that a rear addition is proposed on the previously approved Brunswick Shingle style home that will be constructed at 1965 Amberley Court. He noted that other minor modifications are proposed including changes to the eave detailing, window placement, and the addition of windows in limited areas. He explained that the windows were added in response to changes in the floor plan desired by the buyers.

Ms. Baehr stated that several modifications to the Courtyard Homes have been

requested by the developer since the original approvals of the model homes. She stated that the majority of the modifications now proposed appear to be generally consistent with the original approvals with the exception the placement of the windows and inaccurate proportions of the shutters proposed on the front elevations of the homes. She stated that the staff report recommends approval of the petition subject to conditions of approval as detailed in the report.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the changes proposed to the eaves and for the addition of appropriately proportioned shutters. She stated support for the addition of a second window in the bedroom on the French Country style home. She expressed concern about the spacing of the windows near the bay and noted that it appears that the windows could be shifted without negatively impacting the floor plan. She stated support for the screen porch noting that it is not visible from the streetscape. She stated support for the proposed modifications to the eaves and the addition of a double window on the gable end above the garage on the Shingle style home. She stated support for the addition of a window in the primary bedroom and noted that the window in the primary bedroom that looks into the screen porch appears awkward. She expressed concern about the window that is very close to the side of the bay noting that slight adjustments to the floor plan could allow some improvement in that relationship. She stated support for the porch addition.

Board member Lohmueller stated general concurrence with the staff report. He agreed that the elevations appear crowded with the additional windows. He suggested further study and refinement in an effort to improve the visual balance.

Board member Downey stated agreed with the recommendations made in the staff report. She stated that in her opinion, the addition of porches improves the homes. She agreed that the windows near the bays make the elevations appear crowded. She pointed out that given how close the homes are to each other, the side elevations will be very visible to the neighboring homes.

Board member Stamer asked for clarification on whether there will be mechanicals located near the proposed porch at 1825 Amberely Court and if so, where.

Board member Renken agreed with the recommendations in the staff report. He suggested that the appearance of the elevations could be improved by adjusting the placement of the windows adding that the interior space could easily be adjusted to accommodate the change. He encouraged efforts to improve the visual balance of the elevation. He stated that the Board routinely requires appropriately proportioned shutters.

Chairman Looby asked the petitioner to respond to the Board's questions and comments.

Mr. Barry agreed to consider adjustments to the window placement to avoid the appearance of overcrowding. He noted however that there are interior limitations in some areas. He stated that there will not be any mechanicals near the porch.

Chairman Looby encouraged refinement to the window placement to improve the visual balance of the side elevations on both homes.

Board member Downey stated that shutters should either be consistently applied or eliminated.

Mr. Barry asked the Board to authorize staff to administratively approve future sunroom additions that are similar to those already approved.

In response to a question from Mr. Barry, Chairman Looby agreed that if a sunroom or screen porch addition is proposed to future homes, consistent with the footprint and design of sunrooms and porches previously approved by the Board, staff may approve those elements without further Board review. He stated that if other changes are proposed in addition to a sunroom or porch, Board review is required. He invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the modifications to the previously approved model home designs for homes planned at 1825 and 1965 Amberley Court. He stated that the motion incorporates the findings detailed in the staff report and the Board's deliberations as the basis for the recommendation. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. The plans shall be refined as follows:

1825 Amberley Court

- Modify the shutters on the window at the gable end above the garage to be proportional to one half of the window size to appear functional or use a single proportional shutter.
- Revise the windows on the bay element on the west elevation to present a more balanced appearance and for greater consistency with the originally approved plans.
- Shift the window to the right of the bay window on the west elevation away from the bay or use a single window in place of the double window to provide more space between the window and the wall of the bay element.

1965 Amberley Court

- Shift the window to the left of the bay window on the east elevation away from the bay.

2. Modify the plans to respond to the conditions listed above. If additional modifications are made to the plans as the result of final design development, the modifications 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 verify whether the modifications are in

conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

All conditions of the original approval shall apply including, but not limited to:

3. The developer shall maintain a matrix of homes, the style and location, throughout the buildout of the development to assure appropriate diversity of models and architectural styles. The updated matrix shall be submitted with each building permit application.
4. An updated tree survey will be required for each lot at the time plans are submitted for permit to determine which trees are worthy of preservation and require protection during construction. Healthy, heritage trees should be considered in laying out the site plan recognizing that some trees will need to be removed to allow development of the lots.
5. Landscape plans for each residence shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit for each home.
6. A plan detailing proposed areas for construction parking and staging shall be submitted to the City along with the application for building permit for each home. Amberley Court must remain passable and free of dirt and debris at all times.

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

- 4. Continued consideration of a recommendation for approval of additions and alterations at 797 Summit Avenue. The proposed work includes removal of portions of the rear of the home and most of the roof structure, expansion of the second floor living space, and the addition of a front porch, rear covered entry, and dormers on the north and south sides of the home. Changes to exterior materials, architectural detailing, and window and door replacement are also proposed.
Property Owners: Keene and Megan Addington
Project Representative: Randy Prueitt, builder**

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. Addington thanked the Board subcommittee and stated that almost every change requested by the subcommittee is reflected in the plans. He stated that the landscape plan is not yet available.

Mr. Prueitt presented a summary of the changes made including eliminating the sidelights at the front door, increasing the width of the front door, making the proportions of the trim consistent, and refining the eave detailing. He stated that the siding and trim will all be off white. He stated that the windows will be simulated divided lites. He noted that the short windows were changed to casement windows and sills were added to the

windows. He stated that the dormer now has a shed roof form instead of a hip roof. He stated that the front windows were revised to appear mulled to be mulled together. He stated that the panels of the board and batten siding were widened to 16 inches. He stated that the windows are now aligned on the first and second floors. He stated that the porch railing was refined. He stated that the Board suggested extending the porch across the entire width of the front elevation but noted that was not possible due to conflicts with the eave returns. He stated that shutters were not added due to space limitations. He stated that petitioner prefers board and batten siding over horizontal siding. He stated that in his opinion, the height of the rear covered entry is appropriate as proposed. He reviewed the elevations pointing out each of the changes. He stated that natural materials are proposed for the trim, fascia, frieze, soffit, and rakeboards as requested by the Board.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that the Board continued the petition at the last meeting and a subcommittee was appointed in an effort to assist the property owners and builder in refining the project in response to the Boards comments and suggestions. She confirmed that since the last meeting some elements of the plans were refined. She suggested other refinements for consideration by the Board including modification of the divisions in the front door and further detailing of the eaves. She encouraged the petitioners to take advantage of a pre-permit submittal meeting offered by the City to review requirements and expectations during the plan review and construction phases of the projects to avoid delays. She stated that plans stamped by a licensed architect will need to be submitted as part of the permit application.

Board member Renken thanked the petitioners for their willingness to meet with the subcommittee and consider the comments offered. He agreed that the divisions in the front door should be revised to reflect proportions that are vertical, not horizontal. He noted that the eave returns as drawn appear to have some lines missing and do not appear to be drawn accurately. He stated that a small eave return would be appropriate and suggested that the corner board be in the same plane as the rakeboard. He confirmed that for the most part the issues raised in the subcommittee meeting were addressed.

In response to questions from Chairman Looby, Mr. Prueitt stated that the windows are aluminum clad.

Chairman Looby reminded the petitioner that in order to obtain permits, a structural analysis and report on the foundation must be completed. He added that a landscape plan will be required as part of the building permit submittal.

Board member Downey stated that how construction parking and staging will be accommodated must be carefully considered to avoid off site impacts. She stated concern about the structural integrity of the garage.

In response to questions from Board member Downey, Mr. Pruitt acknowledged that the site is tight and off site parking for contractors may be needed.

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

Pete O'Malley, 791 Summit Avenue, noted that the existing landscaping on the site has not been maintained and branches from the buckthorn and the trees are hitting his house adding that the site needs to be cleaned up. He stated that additional, quality landscaping is needed on the property. He stated that most of the existing vegetation is buckthorn and some the branches are hitting his house.

Lisa Hilgenberg, 796 Oakwood Avenue, expressed concern about construction traffic in the alley. She stated that she would like to see landscaping added to the property. She asked whether the property owners have plans to renovate the barn and expressed support for preservation of the barn due to the historic significance. She stated that during construction, use of the alley can be problematic.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Looby invited response to public comment from the petitioner.

In response to questions from Ms. Hilgenberg, Mr. Addington stated that the barn will be preserved but noted that currently, no renovation is planned.

In response to questions from Ms. Hilgenberg, Mr. Prueitt stated that construction and contractor vehicles will not park in the alley.

Chairman Looby invited final comments from the Board.

Board member Lohmueller pointed out that the materials presented to the Board are concept drawings and noted that a full permit set of construction drawings, stamped by an architect, will need to be submitted in order to obtain permits. He acknowledged that the dormers are necessary to get more space on the second floor and suggested consideration of eliminating the horizontal frieze on the dormers.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of partial demolition of the residence and the addition of a front porch, rear covered entry, dormers on the north and south elevations, expanded the second floor space. He stated that the motion includes approval of changes to the exterior materials, architectural detailing, and replacement of windows and doors. He stated that the motion is based on the subcommittee's recommendations and the findings presented in the staff report. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Revise the muntin pattern in the front door to present vertical proportions.
2. Study and refine the eave returns to present appropriate proportions and detailing consistent with the style of the home and character of the

neighborhood. Non-traditional and production style eave detailing shall be avoided.

3. 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.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed, landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscape requirements in the City Code. The landscape plan shall reflect the existing plantings and identify any plantings proposed for removal and plantings intended to remain.
5. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees identified for preservation and trees on neighboring properties during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
6. 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 6 to 0 vote.

- 5. Consideration of a request for approval of a new garage fronting on Longwood Drive and a two-story addition on the north side of the residence at 1055 Beverly Place. Exterior alterations to convert a screen porch to enclosed living space on the south side of the residence and a new driveway on Longwood Drive are also proposed. Property Owner: Theodore and Stephanie Hadjis 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 stated that an addition and alterations are proposed and reviewed alternative concepts that were studied and explained the pros and cons of each. He noted that the owners prefer a three-car garage but due to constraints of the site, a two and a half car garage is proposed with living space above in a one and a half story addition. He stated that the existing driveway is difficult to maneuver, and a straight driveway is proposed for ease of use. He reviewed the elevations noting that seven and a half feet are proposed to be added to the length of the existing garage and the height will be increased by a foot and half. He noted that a dormer is proposed to break up the mass of the second story. He presented overlays of the existing and proposed elevations to illustrate the overall change in mass and height. He presented

demolition plans and the proposed floor plans. He noted that the screen porch on the south side of the home is proposed to be fully enclosed for additional living space. He stated that the addition follows the simple roof lines eave detailing of the existing house. He noted that a conceptual landscape plan was provided to the Board.

Ms. Baehr reviewed the various components of the project, a two-story addition that includes a two-car, street facing garage, a new driveway, and enclosure of the porch on the south side of the home. She noted that the existing garage faces east and is only minimally visible from the street. She noted that the proposed garage fronts on Longwood Drive. She noted that front facing garages are common in the neighborhood but are mostly a single story tall and setback further from the street than the garage proposed in this petition. She noted that there are three healthy oak trees on the north side of the property in the area of the proposed driveway. She stated that the City Arborist expressed concern that the trees may not survive the construction of the addition and new driveway beyond a couple years. She noted that the loss of the trees which provide a significant and prominent canopy on the streetscape will exacerbate the visibility of the two story addition from the street.

Chairman Looby thanked the petitioner for staking the site and invited questions from the Board.

Board member Lohmueller thanked the petitioner for presenting the various concepts that were studied. He stated that the plan presented could work well. He acknowledged that the trees likely not survive after the construction and encouraged the petitioners to protect the trees to the extent possible.

Board member Bluhm stated that the straight driveway could work without a turnaround because cars can back out into the street. She stated that the existing row of arborvitae will help to screen the views of the garage from some perspectives. She agreed that the impact to the oak trees is a concern and agreed the trees should be protected as much as possible. She asked for more details on the siding, the material and how it will appear in relation to the existing siding.

Board member Renken stated support for the proposed enclosure of the screen porch and suggested consideration of panels and trim on the exterior instead of small sections of shingle siding. He stated that the driveway as proposed appears problematic. He noted that the proposed driveway is 16 feet wide, the maximum width allowed in the front yard setback but noted that the garage has two nine foot wide doors separated by a foot and the garage is approximately 19 feet wide. He pointed out that a vehicle cannot be driven on center with the garage bay openings. He stated that it appears that a driveway width of at least 20 feet is needed to make the garage functional. He suggested consideration of a single 18 foot wide garage door in an effort to make the garage functional. He stated that the single door can be designed to appear as two doors if desired. He suggested that consideration be given to extending the second floor of the addition to overhang slightly to break up the appearance of the two story mass of the addition. He suggested consideration of adding taller windows on the west facing elevation of the addition and removing the proposed panels above the

windows. He expressed disappointment with the concept of constructing a new driveway through the significant oak trees especially when the functionality of the new driveway is compromised due to the limited space. He suggested diligent consideration of a concept that retains the existing driveway by expanding the garage to the north to achieve a two-car garage plus some storage space. He stated that in this concept, the garage door could still face east but shifted slightly north to allow for a back-up area for vehicles. He stated that with that concept, the second floor addition could be cantilevered over the first floor slightly for additional space on the second floor. He added that most of what the petitioners desire could be achieved with this concept, at a lesser cost because a new curb cut and driveway would not be required and the trees would be preserved.

Board member Stamer stated that the dormer appears boxy and out of scale with the mass of the garage. He suggested refinement of the dormer.

Board member Downey noted that if the windows on the front elevation are increased in height, the shutters should follow to be proportional. She stated that she is comfortable with the mass of the proposed addition. She stated that Board member Renken raised some good points and offered some interesting ideas. She agreed that with the current plan, it is likely that the trees will be impacted and noted that replacement plantings should be required to soften the appearance of the increased size of the home. She stated interest in seeing the concept suggested by Board member Renken explored.

Chairman Looby stated that the proposed 16-foot driveway will be problematic. He stated that if the driveway is going to be cut through the healthy oak trees, there should be minimum excavation and carefully constructed in an attempt to minimize impact to the trees. He noted that if the driveway extends straight onto Longwood Drive, the neighbor's mailbox will need to be relocated. He stated support for exploring the concept suggested by Board member Renken. He pointed out that if the existing driveway is maintained, the cost of the project will be reduced. He stated that if the trees do not survive, replacement inches will be required to be planted on site to compensate for the loss of significant trees. He stated that the trees should be monitored over a five year period after construction to assure that they survive. He noted that losing the mature trees will significantly change the appearance of the streetscape. He suggested continuing the petition with direction to the petitioner to diligently explore the concept suggested by Board member Renken. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited the petitioner to respond to the questions raised.

Mr. Letzter stated that both Maple trees proposed for removal are in poor condition and agreed that the Oak trees will be protected. He stated that additional landscaping is proposed to help mitigate the additional mass of the home. He stated that the existing home has wood shingle siding with a tall exposure. He stated that the siding on the entire home will be replaced with a composite shingle siding. He stated that the panels can be considered for the porch enclosure. He agreed that the west (front) facing windows can be elongated as suggested by Board member Renken. He commented on the concept suggested by Board member Renken noting that storage space in the

garage would be lost in that scheme because the petitioner's desire a mudroom which would be gained by extending into the existing garage. He stated that the existing driveway does not meet the zoning setbacks and said it may require a variance if expanded. He expressed concern that the alternate plan could impact the existing patio located behind the home.

Mr. Hadjis added that the entire roof will be replaced with asphalt shingle.

Chairman Looby noted that a variance would likely be granted for a plan that is more functional than the plan presented and preserves significant trees.

Board member Renken stated that it would be worthwhile to explore the alternate concept to see if the goals of the petitioner can be accomplished while at the same time, saving money. He stated that if there is concern about losing storage space in the garage and living space on the second floor, the east wall could be shifted a few feet. He stated that the concept and the possible variations deserve careful study.

Ms. Hadjis stated that the concept described by Board member Renken is difficult to visualize adding that she would need to see the concept drawn out. She stated that the privacy of the side yard is compromised with the garage in its present location. She noted that the neighbor supports the project adding that the neighbor who submitted a letter expressing concerns about the project is not an immediate neighbor. She thanked the Board for their comments.

Board member Stamer stated that increasing the height of the windows on the garage will help to soften the appearance from the street.

Chairman Looby reiterated that the driveway as proposed is problematic and will only be more so when there are additional drivers in the family or guests. He encouraged careful consideration of the alternative concept suggested to improve the functionality of the site.

Mr. Hadjis stated appreciation for the Board's review and comments. He stated that they have been in the home for eight years and have done what is needed to make the home livable. He stated that both he and his wife are now working from home and see the deficiencies of the existing home. He stated that they considered moving and talked with relators about challenges with selling the house, including the existing driveway. He stated that they want to see a return on their investment and maintain the integrity of the neighborhood. He stated that they factored those points into the proposed design keeping in mind the ability the resale value and livability of the home. He stated that going through construction on a home is difficult and it is important that the project meets all of their needs. He stated that they will do what is possible to protect the trees but noted that diseases can impact trees and they may need to be removed anyway. He stated that additional landscaping is proposed and already underway. He stated that functionality of the site for his family and future buyers is important.

Chairman Looby agreed that functionality of the site is very important for the petitioners and future buyers. He encouraged consideration of the alternative concept and encouraged the petitioners to develop a list of pros and cons of each alternative.

Board member Bluhm stated that if the petitioners wish to move forward with the current proposal, the driveway needs to be addressed.

Chairman Looby stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals could have a difficult time recommending approval of a variance to allow a wider driveway wider than permitted by the Code in the setback because there are alternatives and the driveway as proposed is not functional. He stated that it is more likely that a variance would be supported with a plan that is functional, minimizes impact to the streetscape, and preserve the Oak trees. He expressed concern about vehicles being parked in the short driveway and being very visible from the street on a constant basis.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Czerniak offered that based on the Board's discussion, there appears to be a desire to see the goals of the petitioners balanced with a functional plan. She noted past projects where an insufficient driveway was constructed leading to ongoing issues with no ability to make changes in the future because a variance cannot be granted for a condition created by a current or previous property owner. She stated that if a more functional plan can be achieved that minimizes impacts on the streetscape and trees, a variance would likely be granted. She offered that staff will continue to work with the petitioner as alternatives are explored to balance the goals of the petitioners and functionality of the plan.

Mr. Hadjis noted that there is some urgency in moving the petition forward.

Board member Downey stated interest in expediting review of the petition.

Chairman Looby encouraged the petitioner to seriously consider modifications to make the plan more functional noting the Board member Renken offered some good ideas. He noted that doing the necessary due diligence may take some time but getting the project right will benefit the petitioners. He invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to continue consideration of the petition with the following direction.

1. Conduct detailed study and evaluation of a concept that provides for a functional driveway and an overall plan that is consistent with the neighborhood, minimizes the impact to the streetscape, and reduces impact to the significant trees on the site.
2. Eliminate the panels above the windows on the west facing elevation and incorporate taller windows with appropriately sized shutters.
3. Consider adding panels to the porch enclosure rather than smaller areas of shingle siding.

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

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 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner