

**The City of Lake Forest  
Building Review Board  
Proceedings of February 7, 2024 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, February 7, 2024 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, Sally Downey, Eric Lohmueller, and Scott Renken, (one position vacant)

Building Review Board members absent: Board members Joanne Bluhm and Justin Stamer

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

**1. Introduction of Board members and staff, overview of meeting procedures – Chairman Looby**

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 December 6, 2023 Building Review Board meeting.**

The minutes of the December 6, 2023 meeting were approved as presented.

**3. Recognition of former Board member Richard Walther.**

Chairman Looby reviewed the various projects former Board member Walther was involved in and thanked him for his expertise and contribution to the Board and community. He presented had a plaque to former Board member Walther recognizing his contributions to the Board and the community.

**4. Continued consideration of a request for a recommendation in support of partial demolition, conversion of a garage to living space, the addition of a second story over the garage, various alterations around the residence, relocation of the driveway, and a new garage at 1062 Valley Road.**

**Property Owner and Project Representative: Oana Herghelegiu, 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.

Ms. Herghelegiu reviewed the changes made to the plans since the last meeting in response to the questions and comments from the Board. She noted that the front facing round window is softened with vertical elements that replicate the siding. She

pointed out that landscaping was added below the transom windows. She stated that the carport was eliminated and replaced with a detached garage which is attached to the house with a pergola. She stated that no changes were made to the materials or massing of the proposed additions and alterations. She stated that as previously proposed, the driveway will be relocated to Marion Avenue to access the new garage and will provide an expanded back out area near the garage. She stated that the proposed garage eliminates the potential for headlights shining into the private areas of the neighboring homes. She reviewed the floor plans indicating the changes proposed at each level. She stated that the elevations and sections remain the same as presented at the last meeting. She reviewed the elevations of the garage and stated that the foundation will be minimized to the extent possible to mitigate impacts on the trees. She presented conceptual renderings of the house. She stated that the amount of impervious surface on the site will remain generally the same as what exists today because the existing driveway will be removed. She said that a preliminary drainage plan was prepared and as proposed, stormwater will be collected along the north property line. She stated that one tree will be removed to allow construction of the garage and other dead or declining trees throughout the site will be removed. She stated that the required replacement tree inches will be incorporated into the final landscape plan. She stated that the new garage is aligned with the north wall of the house and conforms to the zoning setbacks, but the eave overhang encroaches into the setback and a variance will be requested from the Zoning Board of Appeals. She reviewed elevations of the residence and garage. She stated that the railing on the roof deck will be clear glass to offer unobstructed views into the yard. She stated that a four foot tall fences with diagonal boards are proposed along the north and south property lines. She stated that the fence materials will patina over time.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the preliminary drainage was just received but will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of any permits. She thanked the petitioners for being responsive to the comments offered at the last meeting and providing clear and detailed plans.

Board member Downey thanked the petitioners for responding to the previous comments of the Board adding that the project is much improved. She stated that the proposed fence along the streetscape appears to be out of character with the neighborhood.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the project will be a great addition to the neighborhood. He stated that it is evident that the petitioners put a great deal of work into developing the plans. He stated that the modification to the round window is well done. He stated that from the plans, it appears that the windows are not operable and suggested that some operable windows should be considered. He agreed that fence may not be appropriate along the streetscape but may work on the north side. He stated that a fence along Marion Avenue could be incompatible visually with the neighborhood.

Board member Renken agreed that the modification to the round window is a good

change. He stated that the most significant change is the elimination of the carport and the addition of a new garage. He questioned whether the link between the house and garage is desired or is a zoning requirement. He noted that shifting the garage a bit may make backing out of the garage easier. He agreed that a fence along Marion Avenue may not be appropriate and is not needed. He stated no objection to the fence along the north property line.

Chairman Looby commended the project as revised and the decision to construct a garage instead of a carport. He suggested that further study be done to be sure that the turn around area is adequate in size to accommodate vehicle turning movements. He asked for clarification on whether the gravel for the driveway will be installed over a concrete base. He suggested providing a mockup of the fence to allow review and a clear understanding of what is intended.

Ms. Herghelegiu stated that the walkway is 17 feet long and is intended to preserve trees. She stated that the walkway will be covered with a wood structure. She explained that a portion of the driveway is gravel, but a concrete apron is needed near the garage to address drainage. She stated that the fence can be installed with isolated footings to minimize impacts on trees. She stated that the fence is proposed with nine and a half inch blades, three inches apart. She confirmed that the fence is planned at four feet tall. She acknowledged that originally, a six foot fence was planned.

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

Jerry Kelly, 1044 Valley Road, stated that he was not aware that a fence is proposed. He stated that based on the images shown, the proposed fence will be a stark contrast to other fences in the neighborhood. He questioned whether a four foot fence along the north property line is tall enough. He questioned how drainage will be address noting that properties in the area, including his, are very wet. He stated that the water should be direct to the street rather than on to his property. He expressed concern about the placement of the garage so close to the north property line.

Hearing no further 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 adopted by the Board. He stated that the petition is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Provide a mockup of the proposed fence for Board and staff review to allow an evaluation of the compatibility of the design of the fence overall and to determine whether extending the fence along Marion Avenue is compatible with the streetscape.
2. Provide an auto turn graphic demonstrating that the proposed garage apron and back up area are adequately sized to accommodate vehicle turning movements.

3. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to Board direction or discussion and as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans 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 verify that the plans as presented are consistent with the Board's approval and to determine whether further Board review is required prior to the issuance of permits.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

#### *Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- a. A detailed tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify all trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation including parkway trees and trees on neighboring properties if there is a potential for off site impacts resulting from construction.
- b. A plan shall be submitted identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing pre and post construction tree care treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees located close to construction activity.
- c. A final detailed landscape and tree replanting plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. At a minimum, the plan must reflect foundation plantings around the converted garage, connecting addition, and the new garage as required by the Code and additional trees if required to satisfy the required replacement for trees removed. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

#### *Drainage and Grading*

- d. Detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling is limited to the minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices. The property must continue to accept water that is tributary to the site and runoff from new impervious surface must be addressed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to avoid increasing stormwater runoff on to neighboring properties.
- e. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the drainage and grading plan shall be provided to the neighbor to the north, Mr. Kelly, at 1044 Valley Road for review and comment.

#### *Exterior Lighting*

- f. 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.

### *Construction Parking and Staging*

- g. 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. Adequate sightlines at the intersection must be maintained at all times and streets and neighboring driveways cannot be obstructed.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and was approved four to zero.

## **5. Consideration of a request for approval of the demolition of the existing residence at 1360 Everett Road and approval of a replacement residence and the associated hardscape and landscape plans.**

**Property Owners: Brian and Kasia Nienhaus**

**Project Representative: Edward Deegan, 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. Nienhaus stated that he and his wife have lived in Lake Forest for three years and hoped to expand and renovate the house but after initial study quickly realized that demolishing the house and building new would result in a better outcome. He stated that the love the property, natural character and privacy. He provided background information on his family.

Mr. Deegan stated that the residence proposed for demolition was constructed in the 1930's and is not architecturally significant. He stated that it is poorly sited on the site. He presented photos of the house and reviewed the existing site plan noting the very narrow buildable area. He stated that the proposed house meets the zoning setbacks, reduces the amount of impervious surface on the site, minimizes impacts on the vegetation on the site, and maximizes natural light into the home. He stated that the driveway entrance to the site remains in the same location and the proposed house addresses those entering on to the site. He stated that at the rear of the house, a patio and covered porch open on three sides are proposed, surrounded by woods. He reviewed the floor plans. He pointed out that from the covered front porch, there is a sight line through the house. He pointed out the motor court in front of the house and spoke to the stair element noting that the owners desire a single staircase that extends from the basement to the second floor. He reviewed the roof plan. He stated that there is a stairway in the garage for easy access to storage. He reviewed each elevation noting that the aesthetics and layout of the home directly respond to the narrow buildable area and natural character of the site. He stated that the design intent is a contemporary cottage. He commented that on the front elevation, the garage is in the fore ground, transitioning to the house with a vertical circulation element which steps up to the main mass of the house. He stated that shed dormers create visual interest. He stated that at the rear, a connecting loggia transitions from the main mass of the house to the one story element off of the back of the house,

which transitions to indoor outdoor space. He stated that the rear porch will be open air with a stone terrace. He pointed out the bay window at rear of the home which is on axis with the front door providing that clear sightline from front to back. He pointed out how the house steps back across the site, directed by the buildable area but also providing natural light throughout the home. He presented conceptual renderings noting the intended character of the house, fitting quietly into the natural surroundings. He stated that the roof materials will be asphalt and standing seam metal.

Ms. Czerniak stated that there are findings in support of the demolition in the staff report. She stated that with respect to the replacement house, staff raised a few points for discussion and further detailing some of which have been answered, the role of the stair element between the house and garage, the size of the windows in the dormer, the intent for the chimney cap recognizing that the chimney is not visible on the front of the house, the proportions of the columns on the loggia and front porch and whether they are sufficient to visually support the roof, and information about the garage doors. She stated that the house is creatively configured to avoid the need for a variance. She noted that the house is not visible from a public street. She stated that findings in support of the petition are detailed in the staff report along with recommended conditions.

Board member Lohmueller stated that given the zoning setbacks that apply to the property, it is amazing that the house could be designed to fit into the limited buildable area. He stated that in this case, it might be worth exploring some encroachment into the setbacks since this plan achieves compliance with the setbacks with lots of sections of the house connected together. He agreed that the heft of the columns should be studied further and adjusted as appropriate. He observed that the vertical circulation element appears to have some complicated roof lines and could appear awkward with the two roofs coming together. He also noted that there are many roof lines on the low element and suggested that it would be worthwhile to consider whether the roof elements could be simplified.

Board member Renken stated that the plan presents a clever solution for a lot with a challenging setback situation. He suggested consideration of widening the link between the garage and the house to avoid a spindly appearance. He also suggested pulling the stair away from the wall to allow more control over the window placement noting that would allow the lower window to be raised. He stated that the small dormers appear dainty and appropriate, not overbearing. He agreed that further study of the link between the house and garage and the heft of the columns could benefit the project. He noted that on the west elevation, the windows do not line up and alignment would be preferable. He complimented the project.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Deegan pointed out that on the garage, the dormers are set into the roof but noted that approach was not possible on the family room. He stated that instead, he adjusted the dormer size. He stated that the heft of all of the columns will be adjusted uniformly. He stated that the roof plan is generally straight forward. He stated that the garage doors will have a row of lites

across the top with panels below. He confirmed that snow clips will be installed on the roof above the front door.

Board member Downey stated support for the demolition. She suggested further refinement of the dormers on the family room. She stated that staging and parking for construction vehicles will need to be carefully considered given the shared access.

Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Mr. Edelman, 1370 W. Everett Road, stated that his property is adjacent to the south of the subject property. He stated that today, his front yard floods and cautioned that drainage should be carefully considered. He stated that the driveway entrance is difficult for delivery trucks and suggested that the driveway may need to be widened and shrubbery removed to provide access for construction vehicles.

Mr. and Ms. Nienhaus stated their intention to properly address drainage issues and to relandscape the property appropriately. They stated an interest in talking with Mr. Edelman going forward.

Chairman Looby invited final comments from the Board, hearing none, he invited motions.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the existing house based on the findings detailed in the staff report and adopted by the Board.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and approved by a four to zero vote.

Board member Downey made a motion to recommend approval of the replacement residence based on the findings detailed in the staff report and adopted by the Board. She stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. Provide samples of exterior materials at the time of submittal for permit. The samples will be subject to staff review and approval.
2. Conduct further study and refinement as may be appropriate on the following aspects of the project.
  - a. Consider pulling the stair element away from the wall to allow more intentional placement of windows around the vertical element.
  - b. Consider refinement of the dormers in the family room.
  - c. Provide details on the chimney cap.
  - d. Properly size the supporting columns for the porch and connecting walkway.
3. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to Board direction and the points listed above and as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans 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 verify that the plans as presented are consistent with the Board's approval prior to the issuance of any permits or if further Board review is required.

4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

*Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- a. A clear tree removal plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify all trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation.
- b. A plan shall be submitted identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing any pre and post treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees intended for preservation which are located close to construction activity.
- c. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. At a minimum, the plan must reflect foundation plantings around the entire structure and shall provide for replacement tree inches if required. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

*Drainage and Grading*

- d. Final drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling is limited to the minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices. The property must continue to accept water that is tributary to the site and runoff from new construction must be addressed to avoid increasing stormwater runoff on to neighboring properties.

*Exterior Lighting*

- e. 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.

*Construction Parking and Staging*

- f. 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. No contractor parking or staging of vehicles or materials is permitted on Everett Road. Construction activity must be coordinated closely with the neighbors who share the driveway. Agreements regarding any repairs or reconstruction of the driveway due to construction impacts is a private matter.

The motion was seconded by Board member Lohmueller and was approved by a four



to zero vote.

**6. Consideration of a request for approval of a new residence and the associated hardscape and landscape plans at 1400 Oak Knoll Drive.**

**Property Owner: Jamie and Sophia Childs**

**Contract Purchasers: Joseph Paul D’Cruz and Dewelyn Diana Menezes**

**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 in 2020. The Board approved a new home for the subject property for the current owners. He stated that project never proceeded adding that the present request is for approval of a new home, of a different design, for contract purchasers of the property. He stated that the house now proposed has a primary bedroom and bath on the first floor and three bedrooms on the second floor. He stated that a side loading three car garage is proposed. He stated that the exterior materials proposed include stone, an asphalt shingle roof, limestone quoins and trim, and aluminum clad wood windows. He reviewed the site plan and pointed out the neighboring homes to the north which were recently constructed. He stated that the home now presented is similar to the previously approved plan with a center entrance. He reviewed the elevations pointing out the larger windows on the rear elevation to take advantage of views of the backyard. He stated that a covered kitchen is proposed at the northwest corner of the house. He acknowledged that the plan approaches the maximum square footage permitted noting that is due to the desired dramatic two story family room. He stated that a masonry fireplace with a decorative flue is proposed. He presented the foundation, floor and roof plans. He noted that hipped roofs are used to conceal the flat portions of the roof. He noted that the house is not design in the Colonial Revival and stated that was an inaccurate description of the intended style noted in the statement of intent. He stated that a preliminary grading and drainage plan and a landscape plan were provided. He stated that in his opinion, the house will fit in well with the other homes in the area. He presented samples of the stone and roof shingles. He stated that smooth limestone is proposed instead of cast stone.

Ms. Czerniak acknowledged that the staff report focused on evaluating the house based on the intended style being Colonial Revival as stated in the petitioners’ statement of intent. She stated that based on the presentation, it is now clear that the house is intended to reflect a French inspired style. She stated that Mr. Letzter provided clarification that both the quoins and the window trim are proposed as limestone not a mix of cast stone and limestone. She stated that the staff report suggests that consideration be given to simplifying the roof forms and refining the front entrance to appear less imposing. She stated that some of the other comments in the staff report will now need to be rethought given the clarification on the intended architectural style of the home. She stated that much of the vegetation on the site is buckthorn and other low quality vegetation which will be removed. She stated that a

landscape plan will be required and will need to reflect at least the minimum landscaping required for a new home as well as landscaping to soften the appearance of the home from off of the site.

Board member Renken stated that now, with the understanding that the intended style is French Manor or French inspired, as opposed to Colonial Revival, the proposed design makes more sense. He observed that in current design, the garage projects forward, a slight negative in comparison to the house previously approved on the site. He stated that a positive result of that configuration is that the main mass of the house is setback further from the road. He stated that the north elevation has little articulation creating a long bowling alley effect for the neighbor to the north. He stated that given the French inspired style, the roof forms seem reasonable. He acknowledged that in an effort to maximize the size of the house, some of the roof forms are not as steep as may be appropriate for the style. He stated that the front elevation needs work and questions whether the quoins are an appropriate solution. He suggested that solid limestone at the corners and elimination of the black cap over the entry may address some of the concerns. He stated that overall quality materials are proposed adding that the house sits on the site nicely.

Board member Lohmueller suggested that the rendering as presented may not be doing the project justice. He stated that the home appears very stark. He acknowledged that efforts to maximize the interior volume. He complimented the quality exterior materials that are proposed but noted that they are not being used in a thoughtful way. He stated that the articulation on the front elevation appears forced and observed that in contrast, there is little articulation on the rear elevation. He stated that the project needs more work before it can be recommended for approval. He asked for detail on how the soffit is being treated. He stated that the roof needs more pitch acknowledging that will impact the interior of the home.

Board member Downey noted that she spent a great deal of time evaluating the project in the context of what was stated in the petitioner's statement as the intended architectural style, Colonial Revival. She stated that she is not prepared to offer comments now that the intended style has been clarified. She noted that no information is provided on the patio or fences. She stated that in her opinion, the pitch of the roof is not right.

Chairman Looby noted the proximity of the driveway to the north property line and pointed out that no specifications are provided on the type or size at time of planting of the proposed Arborvitae. He stated that sufficient landscaping is needed along the north property line to provide a buffer for the private areas of the house to the north. He stated that the house currently proposed is entirely different from the house previously approved and from the other two homes recently approved in the Estate Lane Subdivision. He stated that refinement of the overall design is needed. He stated that a detailed landscape plan is needed with a focus on the north side of the property. He stated that the dark roof and windows create a very stark appearance. He said that the petition needs to come back to the Board for review.

Mr. Letzter summarized that the Board is requesting further articulation of the north elevation, definition of the intended architectural style, further study and refinement of the front entry, and reconsideration of the roof elements.

Chairman Looby invited public comment.

Mr. Childs, the developer, stated that more direction is needed on what the Board would like to see.

Board member Renken summarized that the Board has asked for further study, refinement, and detailing of the north elevation, the roof, the front entry, and enhancement of the landscape plan with a focus on the north property line. He stated that as presented there is an overall plain-ness to the design and encouraged consideration of opportunity to provide some interest and character noting that as presented, the house is stark.

Mr. Letzter explained that the roof pitch is dictated by the height and square footage limitations given the spaces the contract purchasers want to achieve.

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

Board member Downey made a motion to continue the petition with direction to the petitioners to consider the comments offered by the Board and modify the design accordingly. She noted that additional information and detail should be provided as requested by the Board.

The motion was seconded by Board member Renken and approved by a vote of four to zero.

**6. Consideration of a request for approval of an addition including projecting the garage forward on the site and expansion of second floor space at 715 Forest Hill Drive.**

**Property Owners: Mike and Jen Fiocco**

**Project Representative: Michael Breseman, 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. Breseman stated that the property owners have lived in the house since 2017 and desire to expand the undersized garage to make it functional, add first floor mudroom and laundry spaces, and expand the second floor space modestly. He stated that no variances are requested. He explained that the plan proposes to project the garage forward and add a second floor over the existing garage, stepped back from the projected garage. He reviewed the proposed exterior materials noting that they will match those on the residence. He added that the architectural details on the addition will also match those on the residence. He stated that several letters of support were received from property owners in the neighborhood. He stated that in

response to concerns raised by the neighbors to the north, alternatives for the massing of the addition were explored and are provided in the Board's packet. He presented an alternative that lowers the roof of the addition slightly and offered options for window type and placement on the north elevation to protect the neighbors' privacy. He stated that the homes in the subdivision are fairly consistent with each other. He explained that he studied garage placement along the street and found four homes that have garages that project in front of the main mass of the house similar to the current proposal. He reviewed the proposed site plan noting the extent of the garage projection and the location of the proposed second floor addition. He stated that the property owners plan to relandscape the property after the project is completed. He reviewed the elevations.

Ms. Czerniak stated that she appreciates the efforts of the petitioner to explore alternatives in response to the concerns raised by the neighbor. She stated that the plan as presented is 20% below the allowed square footage, strong plan, garage projects about 11 feet. Supports as presented. Board input on the alternative windows studies presented.

Board member Downey pointed out that no variances are requested. She commented on the window placement and suggested some refinement. She stated that the alternative presented helps to bring the massing down. She stated an understanding that change is difficult for neighbors but noted that in this case, the petitioners contacted owners and studied alternatives in an effort to mitigate some of the concerns. She stated that she reviewed the light/shadow study provided by the neighboring property owner and noted that the existing 18 to 20 foot tall Arborvitae already block sunlight to the neighboring home. She reiterated that no variances are requested and added that similar improvements may occur in the future on other homes in the neighborhood.

Board member Renken also pointed out that no variances are requested and commented that the proposed addition is consistent with the design and materials of the residence. He stated support overall for the project noting that the neighbors are permitted to do something similar. He noted that the rear elevation appears blocky. He suggested consideration of ways to make the addition appear subservient to the main mass on the rear elevation with attention to how the transition from brick to siding occurs. He suggested consideration of lowering the roof in that area to break up the transition given that the materials are in the same plane. He noted that the garage doors are centered in the proposed plan, an improvement over the current garage door which is asymmetrical. He stated that lowering the fascia is helpful. He stated support for the alternative with two windows on the north elevation.

In response to Board member Renken's comments, Mr. Breseman stated that the main mass of the house will continue to read as the most important architectural element. He stated that if the addition was brick, it may detract from the main mass. He stated that horizontal siding on the addition is appropriate and makes it appear secondary to the main mass of the house. He noted that bringing the roof line down, as reflected in one of the alternatives presented, reduces the expanse of siding. He stated that there

will be trim at the point of transition between siding and brick to ease the change. He stated a preference for a clean solution.

Board member Lohmueller stated support for the proposed addition and noted that the focus should be to not make the new construction appear as an addition. He stated that in his opinion, the alternative with the roof lowered is more successful. He stated that trying to keep the window cadence on the addition consistent with the house. He stated that the windows still appear a little crowded. Focus on the front elevation, will never look right but need to do it for the family. He agreed with Board member Renken that on the rear elevation, having the two materials in the same plane is a mistake. He encouraged giving some thought to moldings.

Chairman Looby stated that the alternative presented is the best. He stated support for keeping the shutters on the north elevation. He stated support for the alternative in which the windows pierce the roof. He stated that the project will be a good addition to the neighborhood adding that the treatment of brick on the first floor and siding above is used throughout the neighborhood. He stated that it will be important to right size the driveway. Hearing no further questions from the Commission, he invited public comment.

Mr. Cast, 701 Forest Hill Road, stated that his home is directly north of the petitioners' home. He noted several concerns including impacts on natural light to his home and the loss of privacy. He stated that he appreciates the petitioners' efforts to consider alternatives. He stated that the homes are quite close, closer than other homes in the neighborhood. He noted that the living space in his home is adjacent to the garage which is proposed for expansion toward the front of the lot and upward. He stated that the proposed addition will block light to his home and presented studies he had completed. He stated that seven out of 12 months his home will be in shadow. He stated that his home is already challenged with respect to privacy because it is on the pathway to and front Cherokee School. He stated that the windows on the north side of the addition will look directly into his home. He stated that currently, both lots have drainage issues in the rear yard. He stated that the petitioners have other options included building out into the back yard. He asked that at a minimum, the second floor addition be stepped back, away from his property. He stated that he has lived in his home for 25 years and would like to support the neighbors in meeting their needs without negatively impacting his home.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that a new house could be built consistent with the allowable height and square footage, and zoning setbacks. She confirmed that a new house could be larger than what is currently proposed.

Board member Downey stated that it appears that the petitioners have done what they can to address the neighbor's concerns.

Ms. Cast stated that they will have a brick wall facing their home.

Mr. Cast said that it is difficult for them to speak given that they like their neighbors. He asked that the addition be set back.

Chairman Looby pointed out that the alternative plan presented by Mr. Breseman will reduce the impact somewhat. He stated that what is proposed is within the petitioner's rights. He reiterated that no variances are requested.

Board member Renken stated that there are square footage, height, and setback regulations for a reason. He stated that the Board cannot rule based on who has lived in the neighborhood the longest. He stated that the project, in his opinion, has been done as well as it could have been.

Chairman Looby invited a motion.

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings detailed in the staff report and adopted by the Board. He stated that the recommendation is subject to the following conditions.

1. Conduct further study and refinement of the plans related to the following. Final approval of these elements is delegated to staff.
  - a. Modify the plans to reflect the alternative plan with the lower roof line.
  - b. Conduct further study of the window placement and dormer size on the front elevation.
  - c. Present a solution to provide an appropriate transition at the point where the different materials come together on the rear elevation.
  - d. Conduct further study on the window type, size and location on the north elevation.
2. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to Board direction or discussion and those made as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit and a copy of the plans 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 that the plans as presented are consistent with the Board's approval or if further Board review is required prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

#### *Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- a. A plan shall be submitted identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction to protect vegetation intended to remain on the subject property, on the parkway, and on the adjacent property.
- b. A detailed landscape plan for the area on the north side of the house, in the area of the structure shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. At a minimum, the plan must reflect foundation plantings around the addition and to the extent feasible, additional plantings along

the north property line. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

#### *Exterior Lighting*

- c. Details of any exterior lighting proposed shall be included 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.

#### *Construction Parking and Staging*

- d. 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. On street parking of contractor vehicles shall be limited to two vehicles parked on the street, in front of the petitioners' house, during school pick up and drop off hours due to congestion in the area.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and approved by a vote of four to zero.

### **8. Consideration of a request for approval of a new residence on a vacant lot and the associated hardscape and landscape plans at 545 Whitehall Lane.**

**Property Owner: E. Jason and Sarah Burke**

**Project Representative: Jeff Letzter, Project Manager**

**Dean Botes, 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. Letzter stated that this home is proposed in a new subdivision. He stated reviewed the proposed materials including stone, limestone horizontal banding at the base and at the top, a slate roof, and copper downspouts gutters, and dormer roofs. He stated that a double front door is proposed with limestone surround. He stated that transom windows are proposed around the house. He stated that there is a four car garage on the east elevation with two double doors. He stated that the two story living room is expressed on the rear elevation offering views of the rear yard. He stated that a covered porch is proposed in the rear of the home with a fireplace. He noted that the entrance to the property is at the end of Whitehall Lane, at the northwest corner of the property. He noted that the driveway approaches the house and a motor court at the front of the house before proceeding to the east, to the garage. He stated that the driveway will be a chip and seal surface transitioning to asphalt near the garage. He stated that fencing is proposed around the site, a wood fence in the rear yard and a decorative fence in front of the house. He stated that because of the grade change, a retaining wall is required along the east side of the property. He said that the retaining wall as well as due to the driveway entrance piers will be the same stone

as the house, with limestone caps. He stated that light fixtures have not been selected but will be detailed in the submittal for permits. He stated that the house complies with the allowable square footage, coming very close to the maximum allowed. He reviewed the elevations. He pointed out the exterior staircase at the rear of the home that provides a secondary egress from the basement. He stated that the roof plan is relatively simple. He stated that the mushroom vents shown on the plans will be replaced with a ridge vent. He stated that there is no living space on the third floor. He presented images of inspirations for the design of the house.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the proposed house is located on a large lot directly west of the original Whitehall Manor Estate house. She noted that the Board has approved one other house so far in this neighborhood. She stated that the petitioner has presented a strong plan with high quality materials. She noted that the house as proposed is very close to the allowable square footage adding that the square footage limitation does not limit the ability to design an appropriate roof, but rather, the design to maximize the square footage short changes the square footage remaining to design a roof that is appropriate to the selected style and size of the house. She noted that the dormers on the main mass of the house appear correct proportionally but noted that the dormers on the secondary elements of the home appear to be oversized. She requested Board direction on that aspect of the home. She stated that there are numerous overlapping roof forms which can, used appropriately, add interest to the elevations but noted that there is a balance between over complication and appropriate articulation. She acknowledged the petitioner's comment that the mushroom roof vents will be replaced with a ridge vent. She commented that chimneys are a classic element of homes and commented that the addition of a chimney or two visible on the front elevation could enhance the prominence of the house. She noted that a detailed landscape plan and details on the fence and driveway entrance piers will be required at the time plans are submitted for permit along with a detailed lighting plan.

Board member Lohmueller complimented the house noting that it is appropriate for the area given the other large homes nearby. He suggested that consideration be given not the width of the house on the lot recognizing that in the future, a home will be built to the west. He stated that with a house of the size proposed, it will be important to avoid the appearance or feeling of crowding. He noted that the house is covering 90 percent of the width of the lot. He agreed that the mushroom roof vents are not appropriate. He stated that he would not encourage faking a chimney that would be visible on the front elevation.

Board member Downey agreed that the width of the house across the lot is a concern. She stated that it will be important to allow some space along the sides of the lot to plant a landscape buffer. She stated that the proposed house is a huge investment in Lake Forrest and sets a high standard for other homes in the subdivision. She stated that the home is a statement of elegance. She pointed out that the lights on the east elevation appear too tight. She agreed that the dormers on the front elevation appear to be too large or perhaps there are too many of them. She encouraged further study of the dormer size and placement. She stated that the front



entrance appears heavy. She stated that given the verticality of the house, the lack of chimneys may not be an issue.

Board member Renken agreed that the house is elegant. He also agreed that a chimney should not be faked if one cannot be functionally incorporated into the house. He stated that the ten foot tunnel to the front door should be reconsidered. He suggested simplifying the roof form by bringing the main mass of the house under a single roof line allowing the two gable towers to still project out. He suggested eliminating the lower dormer on the garage and right sizing the dormers on the secondary elements and considering a different element. He stated that the material of the soffits will be important given the depth of the soffits. He noted that the limestone surrounding the front door appears heavy and suggested lowering the top to lighten that element and make the second floor window pop out more. He stated that samples should be provided of the two different types of stones adding that there should be a slight contrast between the stones and suggested a gray tone to provide some depth. He suggested that the slate for the roof be selected to have some variation instead of a monotone appearance. He suggested pulling the portion of the driveway that extends from the motor court to the garage away from the house to provide space for landscaping between the driveway and the house.

Chairman Looby suggested opening up the curve on the driveway to better accommodate a snow plow. He stated that natural gas lights would enhance the front of the house. He questioned whether the existing chimney visible on the rear elevation could be extended so that it is visible on the front elevation noting that it could add a dimension to the house. He stated that the limestone around the front entrance is excessive and suggested lightening that element. He stated that the front doors will need to be carefully selected to achieve a classic look.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Letzter stated that a chimney is not appropriate for the front elevation. He stated that in his opinion, the projections on the front elevation provide sufficient detail. He agreed to study the front entry further in an effort to lower and lighten it. He confirmed that a substantial front door is proposed. He stated that the home is about 25 feet from the west property line. He noted that there are some grade and tree issues that make moving the house to the east challenging. He stated the intent to provide significant landscaping on the west side of the house and a stockade fence around the rear of the house. He agreed to study the possibility of downsizing the dormers on the secondary masses of the home and whether to recess the dormers or change the shape. He stated that the soffits will be stained tongue and groove. He stated that the light fixtures have not yet been selected. He agreed that the fixtures should on the plans appear too large and that there may be too many.

Board member Downey suggested that when planning the landscaping, consideration should be given to how the pool will be accessed for maintenance.

Board member Renken suggested studying the size of the motor court to determine if it could be reduced in size to pick up space on the west side.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings in the staff report and subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Study the following elements and provide refinements subject to final approval by staff.

The depth and amount of limestone around the front entrance.

The outer dormers – size, shape, location.

Siting on the lot to provide space for landscaping in front and on the sides of the house.

Provide samples of materials.

2. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to Board further direction or discussion, or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plans 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 verify that the plans as presented are consistent with the Board's approval prior to the issuance of any permits or if further Board review is required.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

#### *Tree Removal and Landscaping*

- a. A tree plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall identify any trees proposed for removal and trees identified for protection and preservation.
- b. A plan shall be submitted identifying the location of tree protection fencing to be installed prior to the start of construction and describing pre and post construction treatments proposed to increase the chances of long term survival of the trees intended for preservation which are located close to construction activity.
- c. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. At a minimum, the plan must reflect foundation plantings around the entire structure and the number of trees required by the Code for new construction. converted garage, connecting addition, and the new garage as required by the Code and additional trees if required to satisfy the required replacement for trees removed. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

#### *Drainage and Grading*

- d. Detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. Grading or filling is limited to the minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices. The property must continue to accept water that is tributary to the site and runoff from new

construction must be addressed to avoid increasing stormwater runoff on to neighboring properties.

#### *Exterior Lighting*

- e. 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.

#### *Construction Parking and Staging*

- f. 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 Lohmueller and approved by a vote of four to zero.

#### **4. Opportunity for the public to address the Building Review Board on non-agenda items.**

No additional public testimony was presented to the Board.

#### **5. Additional information from staff.**

No additional information was provided by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak  
Director of Community Development