

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of March 6, 2024 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, March 6, 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 Eric Lohmueller, Scott Renken, Justin Stamer, Joanne Bluhm, and Sarah Lamphere

Building Review Board members absent: Board member Sally Downey

Staff present: Luis Prado, Assistant Planner, Abigail Vollmers, Senior Planner, and 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 February 7, 2024 Building Review Board meeting.

The minutes of the February 7, 2024 meeting were approved as presented.

3. 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 stated that in response to the Board’s comments at the last meeting, the design of the proposed home was revisited. He stated that just prior to the meeting, he presented the latest revision to staff which reflects a centered front entry. He stated that revisions were also made to the north elevation to break up the roof and solid wall. He stated that some modifications were made to the west elevation but the expanse of glass in the family room was retained. He stated that minor modifications were made to the garage and the height of the chimney was lowered to the height required by the Code. He stated that the size of the arbor vitae planned along the north property line was increased to provide screening for the neighbor. He distributed an updated color rendering. He stated that the intended style is French

Manor. He noted that since the last presentation, the roof was lowered, flared, and simplified. He noted the variety of architectural styles in the area. He reviewed the floor plans. He provided a section noting that the outer walls are clipped to respond to the roof shape. He stated that drainage and grading plans for the site are in progress. He noted that the neighbors to the north are in support of the project. He presented samples of the proposed exterior materials noting that true limestone is proposed. He stated that the proposed color palette has been used elsewhere in Lake Forest.

Ms. Czerniak stated that at the last meeting, the Board continued the petition with direction to the property owner to soften the stark color palette, refine the roof forms, further articulate the elevations and in particular, the north elevation, reconsider the appropriateness of the quoins, and to enhance the proposed landscaping. She noted that the changes made to the north elevation appears to respond to the Board's direction. She noted that the landscaping along the north property line was enhanced to screen the driveway and garage doors from the neighbor to the north. She stated that at the time plans are submitted for permit, an auto turn diagram will be required to document that the garage apron and the driveway overall are sufficient to accommodate the necessary turning movement. She noted that the new owners of the house to the north, which was also constructed by Childs Development, have already applied for a permit to expand their driveway after finding that it does not provide sufficient space for maneuvering into and out of the garage. She stated that overall, the proposed materials are of high quality. She stated that further study and refinement will be beneficial to the project and recommended that final review and approval be delegated to a subcommittee of the Board.

Board member Lohmueller commented that stated the project has come a long way since the last meeting. He suggested further study of the front entry and suggested that given the intended French Manor style, an arch over the front entrance could be considered. He stated that the monochromatic color palette could be softened by using grey or dark blue windows. He encouraged further study of the detailing around the windows.

Board member Stamer stated that given the large expanse of the roof, black asphalt shingles will make the house appear heavy especially with the dark windows.

Board member Lamphere complimented the stone. She agreed that the black roof appears out of place and not consistent with the overall appearance of the house. She expressed concern about whether the driveway is adequately sized to easily accommodate the required turning movements.

Board Bluhm stated that in her opinion, the proposed house appears to be a smaller version of the much larger house across the street, to the house. She stated that the excessive similarity is disconcerting and inconsistent with the variety of home designs found in the area. She acknowledged that the exterior materials are a little different from the larger house and appear to be an improvement. She questioned whether the owners of the very similar home to the south have any concerns about their house

being replicated.

Board member Renken agreed that the project has improved since the last meeting. He acknowledged that quality exterior materials are proposed and complimented the smooth quoins and textured stone. He suggested that black or grey would be appropriate for the fascia and gutter. He complimented that enhanced articulation on the north elevation but questioned why the projections are truncated. He stated that the small garage doors will be problematic and suggested changing the size of the doors and the length of the garage to make the garage more functional. He stated support for the symmetry of the front entrance but noted that the front entrance needs work. He commented that overall, the house looks too and encouraged further study of the use of the quoins and refinement of the arch and the two small windows above it.

Chairman Looby agreed that the project has improved. He suggested larger arborvitae noting that fewer will be needed and the appearance will be enhanced. He stated concern about the functionality of the garage as proposed noting that it will be difficult for a vehicle to enter the first garage bay. He added that snow plowing will be difficult. He stated that the garage doors and driveway configuration should be studied further the refined.

In response to Board comments, Mr. Letzter agreed to study the front entrance further noting that increasing the height and considering the use of limestone to distinguish the entrance from the quoins may be helpful. He agreed to discuss the color palette further with the clients. He stated that consideration can be given to pulling the house back on the lot to improve the turning radius at the garage. He stated that five feet is provided along the property line for landscape screening. He pointed out that in comparison to the new house and similar house at 1415 Oak Knoll Drive, the stone proposed in this case is more textured. He pointed out differences in the front entry detail as well. He stated that landscaping is planned in front of the home to soften its appearance from the streetscape. He stated that it may be possible to increase the size of the windows above the front door adding that raising the height of the front entry may be helpful in addressing that concern. He stated that the home is proposed at the maximum square footage, so it is not possible to modify the garage to make it more functional. He agreed to consider increasing the size of the arborvitae along the north property line.

Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he returned the petition to the Board. He stated support for moving the petition forward with final approval delegated to a subcommittee. He invited a motion.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the petition based on the findings in the staff report as adopted by the Board. He stated that the petition is subject to resolving the items identified by the Board to the satisfaction of a subcommittee and subject to the following conditions.

1. The following elements shall be studied further and refined to the satisfaction of a subcommittee of the Board.
 - Refine the front entry including the windows above the entry.
 - Soften the color palette with attention paid to the roof, trim and gutters.
 - Study and refine the size and placement of the garage, the size of the garage doors, and the configuration of the driveway and garage apron to make the garage functional for vehicles. Position in of the house and of the garage and driveway.
 - Increase the size of the Arborvitae along the north property line.
2. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to direction from the Subcommittee of the Board 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 Board Subcommittee or 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 tree removal 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. The plan shall reflect significant plantings along the north property line including eight foot tall Arborvitae. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping. Consideration shall be given to the City's recommended planting list.

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 Stamer and was approved by a 6 to 0 vote.

4. Consideration of a new residence on a vacant lot at 210 Majestic Oak Court. A preliminary landscape plan will also be considered.

Property Owner: North Shore Builders, Inc.

(William J. Ryan 94%, John Rushin 3%, James A. Esperson, 3%

Representative: Doug Wirth, 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. Wirth stated that the proposed residence is designed taking cues from traditional and English Cottage style architecture. He stated that the new house is intended to relate to the historic residence to the south. He reviewed the elevations noting that the intent is to create a quaint, ranch style, cottage constructed of quality materials. He stated that along with the new residence proposed to the south, the massing and orientation of the two new homes are intended to address the street and work together with the historic residence without trying to imitate it. He stated that the design of the house is not intended to be symmetrical. He reviewed the floor plan and noted that three car side load garage. He stated that natural exterior materials are proposed including wood trim and a stone clad chimney. He stated that the property will be well landscaped.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the lots in this agenda item and the following item are in the Westleigh Farm Subdivision. She explained that the subdivision was approved as a conservation subdivision, a subdivision that allows lots to be smaller than required in the applicable zoning district in exchange for preservation of common open space. She reviewed the layout of the subdivision noting the 26 lots on the north portion of the subdivision which were based on a limited number of model homes previously approved by the Board. She explained that the seven lots at the south end of the subdivision, where the subject lot is located, are intended for individually designed homes that pay some deference to the historic residence. She commented on the proposed site plan noting that as currently configured, the driveway is located on or very close to the south property line leaving no space for landscaping of to capture runoff from the garage and driveway. She added that the driveway apron appears to be undersized and may make it difficult to pull into and out of the garage. She stated that the siting of the house appears to limit views from the streetscape to the historic home. She noted that the lot is deep enough to allow the house to be shifted back on the lot to open up the entry to the Majestic Oak Court neighborhood. She noted that the north elevation of

the home will be very visible from the common areas and open space to the north. She pointed out the large expanses of unbroken walls on both the north and south elevations of the proposed residence. She noted that several trees have been lost in the south portion of the Westleigh Farm Subdivision and suggested that trees should be re-established on the lots as they are developed to restore a mature canopy in the area over time.

Chairman Looby commented that the footprints of the houses and driveway configurations were not staked on the lots making it difficult to understand the relationship to the streetscape and the historic residence. He agreed that there appears to be an opportunity to shift the house back on the lot to provide a more welcoming entrance to the Majestic Oak Road neighborhood. He invited comments and questions from the Board members.

Board member Stamer agreed that consideration should be given to the feasibility of shifting the house back on the lot. He pointed out that the chimney as portrayed may be a little short of the Code requirement for minimum chimney heights.

Board member Bluhm asked for clarification on whether the markings on the plan indicate a brush line or wetlands. She agreed that consideration should be given to moving the house back on the lot. She stated support for the side load garage instead of a front load garage. She suggested that large windows be considered in the gable ends. She stated that the residence as proposed appears to take cues from several of the model homes to the north. She stated that in this location, the home should be unique with some reference to the historic home.

Board member Lamphere noted the unique location of the proposed residence, near an historic home and adjacent to a common area open space area and community clubhouse. She stated that in her opinion, the house appears to turn its back on the beautiful common area amenity to the north. She suggested that consideration be given to providing the house with some sort of a relationship to the common amenity.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the location of the post on the porch in front of the front door is awkward. He stated that the house seems to be configured to maximize its width on the site. He agreed that consideration should be given to providing a way for the house and site to embrace the amenity. He stated that the north façade needs attention and suggested reducing the width of the house overall to allow it to be sited more comfortably on the lot.

Board member Renken stated that as designed, it is not clear if the intent is a modern farmhouse or an English cottage. He stated that if the intent is an English cottage design, there should be greater focus on the details consistent with that style. He stated that the roof and entrance should be studied further and agreed that the spacing of the posts on the porch is not appropriate. He suggested that consideration be given to using three posts properly spaced. He suggested a stone base or thicker post be considered to allow the posts to visually support the porch roof. He noted concerns about the double gable, large expanse of unbroken siding, and lack of articulation and

windows. He pointed out that there is an opportunity for a window in the kitchen, or windows on either side of the hood, looking out toward the open space. He added that there may be an opportunity to add a covered porch at the door or a larger window on the bay. He suggested consideration of a hipped roof at the dormers. He stated that in his opinion, the arched garage doors are inappropriate. He stated that overall, the petition needs more study and refinement adding that if an English Cottage style is desired, efforts should be made to focus on elements of that style. He agreed that shifting the house back on the lot could have a positive impact on the functionality of the garage and driveway.

Chairman Looby agreed with the comments of the other Board members.

Mr. Ryan stated that although the historic residence was not required to be preserved as part of the original approvals of the development, once the residence was sold, he understood that new homes would eventually be built adjacent to the historic home. He stated that the owners of the historic residence have done a great job restoring it. He stated that the proposed new homes are sited consistent with the established setback lines on the plat of subdivision which are already further back than the normal setbacks required in the Code for the applicable zoning district. He stated that further consideration will be given to adjusting the siting of the proposed homes. He noted the difficulty in creating a house that is appealing to a buyer but does not overshadow the historic residence. He stated that some design elements were inspired by the David Adler designs of the original stable and clubhouse which were recreated at new locations as part of the development. He stated that all of the Board's comments will be considered and to the extent possible, integrated into the design. He pointed out the intent to move from a single story home on the 210 parcel to a large home on the 230 parcel as it transitions to the larger, historic home.

Chairman Looby stated support for the concept of a transition up to the historic residence. He encouraged the developer to reconsider the siting of the homes on the lots and stressed the importance of staking the footprints of the proposed homes prior to the next meeting. He suggested that before further Board comments, the plans for the proposed residence on the 230 Majestic Oak Court property be presented to the Board. Hearing no objections from the Board, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

5. Consideration of a new residence on a vacant lot at 230 Majestic Oak Court and a preliminary landscape plan.

Property Owner: North Shore Builders, Inc.

(William J. Ryan 94%, John Rushin 3%, James A. Esperson, 3%

Representative: Doug Wirth, 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. Wirth described the proposed house as a French Manor style. He reviewed the proposed materials: stone veneer, architectural asphalt shingles, stucco, and metal downspouts and gutters. He stated that the home has a traditional massing. He

presented conceptual streetscape images of the home in the context of the existing and proposed homes in the immediate area. He noted that the proposed side load garage will be screened by a hedge. He reviewed the floor plans noting that the floor plan is more formal than the previous plan for the 210 lot. He reviewed the elevations noting that all of the elevations are detailed at the same level. He pointed out that the south elevation will be visible from the King Estate, the historic residence.

Ms. Vollmers stated that as with the previous plan, the siting of the proposed residence appears to obstruct, rather than relate well to the historic residence. She stated that the new home does not appear to have a symbiotic relationship to the original residence. She stated that although not variances are requested, there may be opportunities for refinements to allow the new home to be more compatible with the surroundings. She commented that both side elevations feel heavy with large expanses of roof. She noted that there may be opportunities to break up the roof while at the same time, offering additional windows for light and vent for the second floor spaces. She stated that quality exterior materials are proposed. She stated that staff recommends further study and refinement based on the comments and direction from the Board.

Chairman Looby invited Board comments and questions.

Board member Lamphere stated that the proposed house is beautiful, with strong elements, but expressed concern that it does not relate well in placement or character to the historic residence.

Board member Lohmueller commented that the streetscape image does not appear to represent the proposed house accurately. He observed that the house appears to be in the front yard of the historic house to the south. He encouraged further thought to designing a home that fits with the parameters of this particular lot.

Board member Bluhm stated that it is difficult to look at the proposed houses individually because of the unique context in which they must be considered. She stated that the King Estate house is elegant because it is simple and straight forward. She stated that a 5,400 square foot house in the front yard of the historic residence is not appropriate. She stated the home design in the French style is beautiful but commented that the projecting garage is problematic in her opinion.

Board member Stamer stated support for moving forward with the French style home. He pointed out that it does not appear that divided lite windows are proposed and cautioned that the chimney does not appear tall enough to meet Code requirements.

Board member Renken commented that the historic home is where it is and is set on an angle in relation to the adjacent buildable lots which can be developed. He commented that the siting and styles of the new homes can be manipulated. He complimented that residence proposed for the 230 Majestic Oak Court property. He stated that the siting of the home is a concern. He acknowledged that the projecting garage pushes the home back on the lot but suggested that it should be pushed back further. He added that the proposed house on the 210 Majestic Oak Court property

should be pushed back further to allow the driveway to function properly. He complimented that proportions of the residence proposed on the 230 Majestic Oake Court parcel. He observed that two kinds of windows appear on the house, double hung and casements. He suggested that all of the windows should be casement windows, with simulated divided lites, with affixed interior and exterior muntins with a spacer bar consistent with the selected French style. He questioned whether the window surround is proposed as stone or wood and suggested that it should be limestone for consistency with the selected style. He noted that the door surround does not need to have much depth because the door itself is recessed. He stated that the stucco should not be stark white, but a softer tone. He suggested that the second floor windows should be configured to be as wide as the windows below them noting the wider windows will not only enhance the elevation but will add light to the second floor spaces. He suggested that the dormers be reviewed to verify that they are appropriate in width. He questioned whether the little window on the appendage was needed. He suggested further study of the size of the door on the rear elevation. He noted the opportunity to soften the appearance of the large roof by adding a window. He pointed out that on the garage elevation, the two arches of differing widths do not work well together and suggested consideration of three garage doors with consistent arches. He commented that there are too many windows of varying shapes and sizes. He asked for more details on the back porch and questioned whether a pergola or covered area is intended. He stated that the house can be improved with some further attention to detail. He encouraged looking at the houses as a group with respect to the siting with the goal of minimizing the appearance of a new house being located in the front yard of the historic residence.

Chairman Looby agreed that the houses should be sited further back on the lots. With respect to the house proposed on the 230 Majestic Oak Court lot, he stated that three garage doors of similar size, rather than two of differing sizes will be an improvement. He stated support for the concept of transitioning from the smaller home on the north to the larger, historic home. He encouraged siting the homes so that they appear to sweep along the streetscape. Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board, he invited public comment on both the 210 and 230 Majestic Oak Court petitions.

Tina Dann-Fenwick, 301 S. Ridge Road, stated that she lives and often walks in the area of the proposed houses. She stated that, in her opinion, the houses are not doing enough to reference the Howard Van Doren Shaw house with Classical elements such as columns, mill work, and trim work. She stated that her main concerns are the gables and the asymmetry noting that the historic residence is very symmetrical. She stated that the middle dormer does not look Classical in any way and the gables appear fake, with no depth. She questioned the appropriateness of the French style house with the neighboring English style homes.

Jannett Hodkinson, 250 Majestic Oak Court, stated concern about how the proposed homes are sited on the lots. She agreed that without staking, it is difficult to understand the relationship of the proposed homes to the street and to her historic home. She stated that the corner of the garage appears to be just 18 feet from the property line and questioned whether the garage will be difficult to access. She stated that she

always anticipated that the new homes would have front loading garages. She presented images of her driveway noting the limited space available. She noted the location of her kitchen in relation to the proposed house. She stated that in her opinion, the lots should be combined into a single lot and one house should be built, not two. She stated that she and her husband have worked hard to restore the historic residence.

Mr. Hodkinson, 250 Majestic Oak Court, stated that the house proposed on the 210 Majestic Oak Court property appears to closely resemble the model homes in the north portion of the subdivision. He stated that as a lifelong resident of Lake Forest, he is not aware of other subdivisions with homes that are so similar in appearance. He pointed out that his home, which was designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw, is unique and simple. He stated that the symmetry is beautiful. He stated that the developer should be careful about the siting to avoid negatively impacting the common area and the historic home. He stated that he is shocked to hear that an asphalt roof is proposed and stated that the roof should be cedar like the roof on his house. He questioned the accuracy of the streetscape image that is presented noting that the relationship between his home and the proposed homes does not appear to be visually correct. He stated that if the two lots are combined, the house can be pushed back and centered away from his house and the common area.

Mr. Fenwick, 301 S. Ridge Road, pointed out that the Majestic Oak Court area was the site of many mature Oak trees prior to development of the subdivision. He stated that many of the trees have since died. He suggested that Oak trees should be replanted in the area to support insects and birds.

Jane Duney, 895 S. Orchard Circle, stated that she is grateful to be in the Westleigh Farm Subdivision, a luxury tract home community. She stated that the remaining homes should be customized, individual homes designed to appeal to a diverse group of people. She thanked the Board for its careful review.

Ernie Kraemer, 785 W. Orchard Circle stated that he did not expect to see a cookie cutter house proposed for a lot on Majestic Oak Court, a house similar to his and other homes in the north part of the subdivision. He stated that a single house should be built on the two combined lots.

In response to public testimony, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the two parcels are separate, legal, buildable lots. She stated that if someone purchased both of the lots, they could be consolidated into a single lot at the owner's discretion.

Board member Lohmueller suggested that rather than transitioning to a larger house adjacent to the historic residence, it may be worth considering placing the smaller house on the middle lot, the lot just north of the historic residence.

Board member Bluhm suggested developing one of the lots located south of the historic residence instead of two homes to the north of the historic residence as the initial new homes in this part of the subdivision.

In response to Board member Bluhm's suggestion, said that approach is not out of the question. He noted however that he feels as the developer, he is being penalized for preserving and offering the historic home for sale. He pointed out that preserving the house was not required as part of the development approvals. He stated that lots were configured around the house recognizing that it may or may not remain. He stated that since the house was preserved, he understood that locating new homes near the historic home would be a challenge. He noted that the historic home is awkwardly positioned in relation to the road. He stated that landscape screening is planned but noted that it is not unusual throughout Lake Forest to be able to see another home from your home.

Chairman Looby stated that the Board understands that the lots are buildable, legal lots. He stated that the Board's intention is to work with the developer toward the best solution. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he invited a motion to continue both petitions for the new homes at 210 and 230 Majestic Oak Court to allow time for the developer to consider the comments offered by the Board.

Board member Stamer made a motion to continue both petitions to allow the petitioner to consider the comments and suggestions offered by the Board and make refinements to the plans.

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

**6. Consideration of a building scale variance for an addition and alterations at 766 Highview Terrace.
Property Owners: Scott Nehls and Susan Groh
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 he did an addition to the home about 12 years ago for a previous owner of the property. He presented images of the home. He stated that the proposed addition will be constructed on the existing footprint. He stated that alternatives were considered to avoid the need for a building scale variance, but the proposed plan was determined to work best with the existing configuration of the house. He stated that as proposed, the addition results in an overage of about 106 square feet. He reviewed the floor plans. He presented a streetscape image and a site plan. He reviewed the existing and proposed elevations. He stated that the goal is to avoid changing the front elevation. He reviewed the changes proposed to the side and rear elevations. He presented overlays of the existing and proposed elevations.

Mr. Pardo stated that a partial demolition is proposed to remove the earlier addition and allow a new and expanded addition in its place. He stated that the addition as proposed requires a building scale variance. He stated that the house was constructed in 1951 and expanded about 12 years ago. He noted that the house today is under the

allowable square footage and with the proposed addition, is 106 square feet over the allowable square footage, about three percent. He suggested that consideration be given to replacing the existing front facing octagonal window with a window that is more consistent with the shape and style of the other windows around the house. He stated that one letter was received in support of the petition and was provided to the Board.

Board member Bluhm stated that the additional square footage will add a lot to the house. She agreed that the octagonal window seems lonely. She suggested consideration of replacing the window to resemble other windows on the home more closely. She stated support for the building scale variance.

In response to a comment by Board member Bluhm, Mr. Letzter clarified that the window is round, not octagonal.

Board member Renken stated support for the petition noting that the simpler roof form proposed as part of the addition improves the appearance from the street. He commented that in his opinion, six inch exposure siding looks better than eight inch, but he acknowledged that the siding on the addition is proposed at eight inches to match the siding on the rest of the house. He suggested adding a window on the right side elevation to break up the expanse of blank space. He agreed that a double hung window would look better than the round window on the front facing elevation.

Board member Lohmueller agreed that changing out the front facing round window should be considered. He stated that the roof should be detailed further to make it clear how the roof forms will come together.

Board member Lamphere stated support for the plan noting that it will add space and value to the home.

Chairman Looby complimented the plan and agreed with Board member Renken that the addition of a window on the side elevation would be beneficial and would add a window in the bathroom. He noted that the circular window was previously in the bathroom and with the addition, will now be in the bedroom.

In response to comments from the Board, Mr. Nehls stated that his wife is fond of the circular window because it is unique.

In response to comments from the Board, Mr. Letzter agreed that adding a window on the side elevation will be helpful. He stated that replacing the round window will be discussed with the homeowners.

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

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of the addition and the building scale variance subject to the following conditions of approval. He stated

that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and adopted by the Board.

1. Consideration shall be given to adding a window on the right elevation and replacing the round window on the front elevation with a window that is more consistent with the other windows on the house.
2. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to Board direction or discussion and those made as a 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, and if not, 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 construction, 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. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

Exterior Lighting

- c. Details of exterior lighting shall be included with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures and except lights 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 house due to the narrowness of the road.

Board member Stamer seconded the motion and it was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

7. Consideration of additions, alterations and site plan modifications at 980 Melody Road.

Property Owner: Jack Harris

Representative: Andy Kacprzyński, architect

Mr. Kacprzyński described the proposed addition and rear patio. He stated that the driveway will remain. He stated that the intent is to salvage and reuse the existing foundation and basement and to the extent possible, the existing walls. He stated that the intention is to create a contemporary looking Ranch home with white stucco, natural stone, cedar beams and columns, and asphalt shingles. He reviewed the existing and proposed elevations. He stated that a standing seam roof is proposed on the flat roof elements. He stated that black aluminum clad windows are proposed.

Ms. Vollmers stated that the home was built in 1955 and is generally consistent with other homes found in the area. She stated that in general, the standards are satisfied. She stated that the three car garage proposed for the west side of the property will provide a good buffer from Waukegan Road. She stated that at this time, it is unclear how much of the house will be demolished adding that if more than 50% of the house overall is demolished, it will be considered a complete demolition. She stated that as proposed, the house is 22 percent under the allowable square footage. She suggested that the front elevation could benefit from some simplification noting that there are several competing elements in close proximity. In particular she pointed out that the small canopy to the left of the front door appears to conflict with the element over the front porch. She asked for clarification on the areas where stone is proposed. She suggested consideration of removing the small eyebrow canopy to allow the stone veneer to travel up the wall. She stated that the material of the beams on either side of the front door should be clarified noting that based on the information submitted, the columns appear to be cedar although there are some references to stone columns. She suggested softening the color of the gutters and downspouts to minimize the prominence of these elements. She stated that based on the plans submitted at least six mature trees are proposed for removal. She noted that other trees may be impacted adding that a determination of the required replacement inches will be made once more information is available.

In response to a question from Board member Renken, Ms. Vollmers suggested that the stone could extend all the way up on the front facing element instead of stopping at a random point.

Board member Bluhm questioned whether the front facing canopy is intended to provide shade or is solely a decorative element. Remove if not needed. She stated concern about the proposed vinyl windows. She agreed that the utilitarian elements of the house, the downspouts and gutters, should match the roof to avoid standing out. She stated that the stone is presented appears choppy and noted that the windows in the gables appear undersized. She asked for clarification on the rear porch noting that the intentions with respect to the roof are unclear. She stated that it is also not clear whether there is a step down from the house to the porch and suggested that having a single level may make the area more functional. She noted that the third bay of the garage is too close to the house to allow vehicle access.

Board member Stamer stated support for the design overall. He noted that the canopy ties in with the standing seam roof. He stated that he does not understand the stopping

points for the stone noting that it appears too segmented without reason. He noted that the stone may tie into the landscape and hardscape design but noted that no information on those items is provided.

Board member Lohmueller stated that in his opinion, the canopy can work and suggested that the stone could be limited to the entrance or eliminated entirely. He agreed that the third garage bay located immediately adjacent to the house is not functional for a vehicle.

Board member Renken complimented the style and quality of the proposed project adding that the project will improve the corner and streetscape. He suggested that the stone be limited to the entry adding that if the stone is carried around, it should stop at the windowsill. He stated support for the canopy. He commented that based on the drawings, the house looks stark and noted that the addition of some details could be helpful. He suggested that consideration be given to making the dormer windows taller adding that they appear squatty. He pointed out that the placement of the double and single garage doors could be switched to improve accessibility.

Chairman Looby agreed that the stone should be kept lower. He complimented the petitioner for taking a house from the 1950's that is unremarkable and revitalizing it. He asked for clarification on the intended tree removal.

In response to a question from Chairman Looby, Mr. Harris stated that the trees were evaluated and identified for removal to provide natural light to the site. He noted that there are diseases that are affecting the trees and making them weak. He noted that some of the trees are very close to the house.

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

Jan Shields, 985 Melody Road asked that the project be managed to avoid blocking the street and her driveway. She stated that she appreciates that something is being done with the house but commented that as proposed, it appears very stark. She stated that she has invested significantly in her home and noted that it is in the historic district.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Looby commented that a parking and staging plan will be required prior to the issuance of a permit and will be reviewed by staff. He stated that the street will not be able to be blocked. He asked the petitioner to consider softer colors to avoid a stark appearance.

In response to Board comments, Mr. Kacprzyński stated that stone columns are proposed at the front entrance with a wood beam on top. He agreed that the garage doors could be switched, or the single garage door could be used for storage. He stated that the color of the gutters and downspouts will match the roof. He stated that vinyl windows are proposed but can be changed to metal clad windows if desired. He stated that the intent is to do the project right and meet the requirements of the community.

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

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the petition subject to the following conditions of approval. He stated that the recommendation is based on the findings as detailed in the staff report which are adopted by the Board and incorporates the deliberations of the Board as additional findings.

1. The following elements shall be addressed and reflected on the plans presented for permit.
 - a. Use a softer, less stark, color palette overall.
 - b. Match the color of the gutters and downspouts to the roof so they do not stand out.
 - c. Consider switching the garage doors to make the inner bay accessible.
 - d. Increase the size of the windows.
 - e. Use aluminum clad wood windows.
 - f. Lower the stone on the front element to the windowsill height.
 - g. Provide a sample of the proposed stone to staff for review.
2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and those made as a 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 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

- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. 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. In addition, the plan shall reflect all required replacement inches to compensate for trees removed from the site. If the replacement inches cannot be accommodated on the site using good forestry practices, a payment in lieu of on site plantings may be accepted by the City. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping. Consideration shall be given to the City's recommended planting list.

Drainage and Grading

- h. 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

- i. 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

- j. 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. Due to the location of the property, on Waukegan Road, on street parking and staging on Melody Road shall be limited. Turning movements on to and from Waukegan Road and sightlines shall not be obstructed.

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

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,

Luis Prado
Assistant Planner