

**The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of April 3, 2024 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, April 3, 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, Sarah Lamphere

Building Review Board members absent: Board member Sally Downey

Staff present: Luis Prado, Assistant 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 March 6, 2024 Building Review Board meeting.

The minutes of the March 6, 2024 meeting were approved as presented.

**3. Consideration of a request for approval of a new commercial building and landscape plan for a Starbucks on the southeast corner of Waukegan and Everett Roads.
Property Owner: 1015 LLC and 1045 LLC (Iosue Family)
Representatives: Jack Frigo, Real Estate
Scott Shust, 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. Frigo introduced the project team.

Mr. Shust stated that he has designed many Starbucks buildings and noted that although many elements of the buildings are mandated by the company such as overall dimensions, the building design for this site is unique and tailored to the community. He stated that the design is inspired by the Tudor architectural style. He presented images of the proposed building noting that a partial hip roof with gable elements is proposed. He stated that the roof is configured to screen the roof top mechanicals from view and the gables highlight the building entrances. He acknowledged that staff identified a concern with the location and visibility of the roof access ladder and stated the final location of the ladder can be resolved later in the

process. He reviewed the elevations noting that stucco is proposed for the high building components. He noted that spandrel glazing is proposed on the north elevation in the area of the restrooms and on portions of the west elevation which is the "back of house", to maintain a consistent pattern of solids and voids while screening the areas from views from outside. He stated that higher on the west elevation, clear glass is proposed to allow natural light into the building. He noted the drive through window on the south elevation. He stated that chimneys are proposed on the west and east sides of the building to reflect a Tudor style enhance the overall character of the building. He presented samples of materials and described the stone as a mix of darker and red tones. He confirmed that the stone and brick are four inches thick. He noted that the brick is tumbled with a rough texture and will coordinate with the color of the stone. He confirmed that true cement stucco will be used. He stated that the storefront windows will be black aluminum, the standard used by Starbucks. He stated that the roof will be asphalt shingles with lighter tones.

Carrie Mead, Mariani Landscape, stated that the landscape design is intentionally simply with a focus on durable materials due to the exhaust, salt, bad soil conditions that will impact the plantings. She reviewed the proposed plant species noting that they are appropriate for a commercial site. She stated that careful consideration was given to the size at time of planting with the goal of assuring that the plantings thrive. She stated that native species dominate the low level plantings with a splash of color in the perennials near the corner and the pedestrian pathways. She stated that street trees will be added to the south of the site to allow trees to begin to get established to enhance the approach from the south.

Mr. Prado noted that the site plan and Starbucks' drive through were approved by the City Council based on a recommendation from the Plan Commission. He stated that signage and sight lighting will be presented to the Board at a later date for review. He offered two staff observations with respect to the elevations suggesting that on the east elevation, consideration could be given to shifting the door slightly to center it under the gable. He commented that consideration could also be given to eliminating the gables to simplify the roof form.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Stamer complimented the plan. He stated that the chimneys appear awkward given that they are not functional. He stated that the patio appears small and noted that customers may enjoy an expanded outdoor area. He suggested limiting the expanse of obscured glass.

Board member Lohmueller acknowledged that with the "back of house" facing Waukegan Road presents a challenge and may appear as a service area with mechanicals like the gas meter, from the Waukegan Road streetscape. He stated that landscaping will help to screen that side of the building to some extent. He encouraged further study and refinement of the west elevation in an effort to make it appear more storefront-like along the prominent Waukegan Road streetscape. He suggested that the stucco panels could be framed out a bit more to avoid a

haphazard appearance. He noted that the canopies lack details such as brackets to provide the appearance of support. He stated appreciation for the time and effort put into developing an enhanced plan, one that goes beyond the standard Starbucks. He suggested some refinement and further thought to take the design to the next level.

Board member Lamphere agreed with the comments of the previous Board members that a bit more refinement will benefit the appearance. She suggested consideration of adding more half timbers. She noted that the dumpsters appear to be visible when entering the site and when pulling out of the drive through and suggested that consideration be given to how to address that issue. She questioned whether headlights from vehicles in the drive through, on the west side of the building, will shine into the residence units to the south. She stated that enhanced landscaping is needed along Waukegan Road.

Board member Bluhm stated that it will be good to see the corner developed. She stated support for the dormers as proposed and asked that the locations of the medallions be reviewed for consistency. She stated that landscaping along the streetscape will be very important.

Board member Renken noted that the building design reflects some Tudor elements with a contemporary twist. He complimented the exterior materials. He stated that in his opinion, the gable peaks are necessary to interrupt the simple mansard roof. He agreed that the canopies appear to be stuck on and encouraged consideration of some bracketing detail. He asked for information on how the brick chimneys are supported.

Chairman Looby stated that bike racks are needed along with a larger patio. He noted that Junipers are sensitive to animal damage. He suggested planting four inch trees to give provide for substantial landscaping at the outset. He stated support for the chimneys as presented. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited the petitioners to respond to the Board's comments and questions.

Mr. Shust confirmed that that the chimneys will be brick and will be supported by the roof. He agreed to consider adding Tudor accents to the canopies instead of the modern flat canopy style.

Ms. Mead stated that no berms are proposed along the streetscape, just landscaping. She agreed that Junipers can be difficult to sustain and are not people friendly. She stated that other species will be considered. She reiterated that the site presents landscape challenges adding that the plan is designed to set the site up for success. She stated that if four inch Honey Locusts are available, they will be considered. She stated that deciduous vegetation is planned to the south of the driveway and will screen any headlight impacts noting that the residential development is a significant distance to the south.

Mr. Frigo noted that there is a six foot fence on the south property line which will

remain or be replaced in kind. He noted that the residential development is about 300 feet to the south of the drive through. He pointed out the location of the bike rack on the site, south of the driveway. He stated that the trash enclosure will be brick with wood gates to conceal the dumpsters.

Mr. Shust described the west elevation further and acknowledged that the location of the utilities presents a challenge. He agreed that landscaping to screen the west elevation will be important.

Chairman Looby stated that the stucco should be a soft, rather than stark, white. He stated that as the trees planned along the west side of the building and along Waukegan Road mature, they should screen the west elevation of the building nicely. He invited public comment.

A resident of the area asked for clarification on the location of the sidewalks near the drive through and suggested that a knee wall is needed at the patio. She questioned whether the Honey Locust trees will have pods.

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

Mr. Frigo confirmed that the patio will be enclosed by a knee wall. He pointed out the location of the sidewalk.

Ms. Mead stated that today, Honey Locusts do not have the pods.

Chairman Looby invited final Board comments.

Board member Stamer expressed concern about the pedestrians crossing the drive through lane.

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 in the staff report which are adopted by the Board. He stated that the petition is subject to the following conditions.

1. During final design development, the following shall be addressed:
 - a. The true cement stucco shall be noted as a soft, rather than stark, white.
 - b. The canopies shall be further detailed.
 - c. Consideration shall be given to refinement to make the west elevation appear more as a store front rather than a back of house.
 - d. Consider framing out the stucco panels to allow them to appear less haphazard and consider additional half timbering.
 - e. The roof access ladder shall be located such that it is not highly visible from the streetscape or intersection.

- f. All roof top mechanical equipment shall be screened or placed to avoid visibility from the streetscapes.
2. All modifications to the plans including those made in response to the items in the first condition 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, if any, that is intended to remain on the subject property, on the parkway, and on the adjacent property.
- b. A final detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The landscape plan shall specify the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
- c. Four inch trees shall be considered.
- d. The landscape plan shall detail planting and fencing along the Waukegan Road streetscape adjacent to the vacant portion of the development site to the south of the Starbucks.

Construction Parking and Staging

- e. 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 on street parking or staging of equipment or materials is permitted due to the location on two high traffic volume streets.

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

4. Consideration of new residences on vacant lots in the Westleigh Farm Subdivision at 210, 230, and 270 Majestic Oak Court and consideration of preliminary landscape plans.

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. Ryan stated that since the last meeting, the plans were revised to respond to the comments offered by the Board and members of the public. He stated that he also had a follow up meeting with City staff. He stated that the homes were narrowed to provide improved access to the garages. He pointed out that the house previously

proposed for the lot at 230 Majestic Oak Court is now proposed for the property addressed as 270 Majestic Oak Court, away from the front of the historic residence. He stated that the homes proposed for the 210 and 230 Majestic Oak Court were moved back on the lots to improve sightlines to the historic residence from the street. He presented an illustration of the sightlines showing that there is an unobstructed view of most of the historic home. He stated that the four homes together, three new homes and the historic home, create an enclave type arrangement sweeping along the streetscape. He reviewed the site plans for each of the homes and commented on the landscaping noting that some Oak trees were added to the landscape plan with the goal of returning an enhanced tree canopy to the area over time. He stated that the project arborist recommended planting trees no larger than three to four inches in diameter for the best chance for the trees to thrive. He presented a streetscape image and noted the transition along the streetscape from the smaller home on the north lot, to the larger, historic home. He pointed out the stable which is a replica of the original Howard Van Doren Shaw stable and the clubhouse which is a replica of a David Adler building that are part of the subdivision. He noted the elements of the homes that are inspired by details on those buildings including the brick water table, detailed gable, and the dark green color. He noted changes made to the house proposed on the lot at 210 Majestic Oak Court in direct response to the Board's comments at the last meeting including enhancing the articulation of the north side elevation and eliminating the arches. He presented a floor plan. He reviewed the house proposed for the 230 Majestic Oak Court lot noting the open gables, stone base, and enhanced articulation to the side elevations. He stated that three nine foot wide garage doors are now proposed instead of a double garage door and a single door. He reviewed the house proposed for 270 Majestic Oak Court noting that the gables were widened, and the windows aligned. He stated that the home is stucco and noted that the side elevations were also enhanced. He stated that all of the homes will feature casement and double hung window all with interior and exterior muntins with a spacer bar between the glass. He stated that the exterior materials include natural wood, brick and stone.

Mr. Prado stated that two of the homes in this petition were before the Board last month, a third home that is now also presented for Board review. He noted that at the last meeting, the Board asked the petitioner to give further consideration to the designs and placement of the homes in the context of the historic home and the replications of historic structures, the stable and the clubhouse. He noted that the Board asked the petitioner to site the homes in a manner that does not directly obstruct views of the historic home, to stake the proposed homes on the sites, identify the intended architectural styles, refine the placement of windows, and to explore ways to avoid large expanses of unbroken walls and roof. He stated that in staff's review, the plans as now proposed respond directly to the previous comments and direction of the Board. He noted that the siting of the homes has been modified to respect the historic home and create a sweeping arc along the streetscape with the historic home featured prominently. He offered comments on each home suggesting that at 210 Majestic Oak Court, consideration could be given to adding a kitchen window to break up the large expanse of wall on the north elevation. He commented that an auto turn study should be provided for the 230 Majestic Oak Court property to

assure that the driveway is adequate to accommodate the required turning movements to enter and exit the garage. He suggested consideration of replacing the peak on the dormer with a soft arch to relate to the history home.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the homes as now sited and commended the relocation of the home previously proposed for the 230 Majestic Oak Court lot to the 270 Majestic Oak Court lot. She questioned the proposed use of vinyl clad windows. She stated support for the addition on window on the north elevation of the 210 Majestic Oak Court lot noting that the home still appears a bit uninspired but is improved over the last presentation.

Board member Lamphere complimented the site plan for 210 Majestic Oak Court. She stated that the staff recommendation to add a window in the kitchen appears to be workable. She stated that alternatively, landscaping could be enhanced in that area to break up the expanse of wall. She noted that the north elevation of the 210 Majestic Oak Court house will be very visible when entering the subdivision. She suggested that consideration be given to using traditional chimney caps on the new homes to echo the chimney caps on the clubhouse. She stated support for the dormers as presented.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the 230 Majestic Oak Court lot is difficult but noted that the house as now proposed and sited is more appropriate than the previous proposal. He suggested considering a material other than stone at the bottom of the walls noting that a lower brick band may be appropriate to make that element more subtle. He suggested a trellis to break up the large expanse of wall on the north elevation of the 210 Majestic Oak Court house. He stated support for the dormers as presented.

Board member Stamer commended the changes made since the last meeting. He stated support over all for the home designs presented. He noted that on the house proposed on the 230 Majestic Oak Court lot, the shed dormer on the rear elevation appears as an afterthought. He suggested that if an arch is added to the dormers on the front of the house, the rear dormer could have a similar detail to make the house more cohesive overall.

Board member Renken stated that the site plan is much improved and acknowledged the efforts of the developer to respond to the Board's previous comments. He stated that the house proposed for 230 Majestic Oak Court with the arbor vitae reflected on the landscape plan is successful and is properly oriented. He commented on the house proposed at 210 Majestic Oak Court noting that the massing is good from the front and suggested that the dormers may be more successful with gables, rather than hips. He suggested removing the cross detail and using panels instead. He noted that an eight foot door can appear tall and skinny and suggested further study of that element. He pointed out the inconsistency on the north elevation of a gable near the front a hip at the rear and suggested eliminating the hip. He suggested that a double

window rather than a single window could also be an improvement along with consistency with respect to the bump outs. He suggested that the windows could be a bit larger. He offered observations with respect to the house at 230 Majestic Oak Court and complimented the rhythm and lack of hip elements on the front elevation. He also complimented the stone and clapboard siding. He stated that on the rear elevation, the second floor windows appear small and suggested consideration of a triple window. On the south elevation, he pointed out the large plane of siding above the garage doors and suggested consideration of reducing the size of the triangle and incorporating a hip element. He acknowledged that doing so could complicate the roof and offered that alternatively, a window could help to break up the large expanse of siding. He suggested that a roof be added with brackets over the man door. He commented on the house proposed at 270 Majestic Oak Court and complimented the proportions and exterior materials. He suggested consideration of simplifying the entrance by eliminating the arch. On the north elevation, he suggested consideration of three windows, instead of the squat-y windows proposed. He suggested making the projections wider. He complimented the changes made to the garage doors. He suggested a triple dormer on the rear elevation to increase the opportunity for natural light into the space.

Chairman Looby stated support for the stone at the base of the house proposed at 230 Majestic Oak Court. He thanked Mr. Ryan for responding well to the prior comments of the Board and for having the footprints of the homes staked. He noted that the sightlines to the historic home are much improved. He invited public comment.

Mr. Hodkinson thanked Mr. Ryan for making substantial changes to the plans since the last meeting. He suggested that all homes in the subdivision are subject to approval by the Homeowners' Association. He stated that the homes in the south part of the subdivision are supposed to be custom homes but noted that in his opinion, they are uninspired. He stated that the home proposed on the 210 Majestic Oak property appears to duplicate the home to the north and the home proposed at 230 Majestic Oak Court appears similar to the homes in the north part of the subdivision. He stated that the homes are not compatible with the historic home or with the new home proposed on the lot at 270 Majestic Oak Court. He stated that the design of a custom home should reflect what is desired by the buyer. He stated a willingness to work with everyone to create a unique area. He suggested combining the 210 and 230 Majestic Oak Court lots to allow a significant house to be constructed adding that the financial return would likely be similar to the return from the two individual lots.

Ms. Hodkinson agreed with her husband's comments. She expressed concern about allowing the homes to be built before buyers are involved. She stated that if the homes are constructed by the developer, they may sit vacant. She stated that she would like to have some families with children move into the new homes. She stated concern about the house and site plan proposed for 230 Majestic Oak Court, the lot adjacent to her property to the north. She noted that her driveway is not correctly shown on the plan and agreed that a study should be done to confirm whether the driveway as proposed is workable. She stated support for the house proposed at 270

Majestic Oak Court. She stated that care should be taken when planting trees near the manholes along the street. Ms. Hodkinson pointed out that the existing historic pillars along Ridge Road need to be preserved.

Tim Knight, resident, stated that he lives nearby and expressed concern about construction traffic noting that the entrance to the subdivision is narrow. He commented that the developer still has work to complete in the north portion of the subdivision and suggested that work should be completed in that area before more homes are built.

Jan Stuart, resident, stated that the developer has filled in and planted the construction entrance that was used during construction in the north portion of the subdivision. She stated that the construction access for the remaining new homes will need to be in a different location.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Looby stated that a staging, construction access, and parking plan will be required by the City and will be subject to City review and approval before permits are issued for the additional new homes. He invited final comments from staff.

Ms. Czerniak stated that discussions between the Homeowners' Association (HOA) and the developer are private and do not involve the City. She stated that she is unsure whether private agreements between the HOA and the developer provide for or require HOA review and approval of plans for the new homes in the south portion of the subdivision in addition to City review and approval. She stated that as envisioned during the approval of the subdivision, specific plans are being developed for each of the seven lots in the south portion of the subdivision. She confirmed that the approvals for the model homes in the north portion of the subdivision do not apply to the south lots. She stated that there is no requirement that lots must be sold to individual buyers before homes are built. She confirmed that construction access and staging plans will be subject to city review and approval. She confirmed that City staff is continuing to work with the developer to assure that plantings in the north portion of the subdivision that are failing to thrive, are replaced.

In response to a question from Chairman Looby, Mr. Ryan stated a willingness to work with City staff and if appropriate, a subcommittee of the Board, to assure that the additional comments raised by the Board are satisfactorily addressed in the construction drawings submitted for permit.

Chairman Looby invited final comments from the Board, hearing no further comments, he invited a motion.

Board member Lohmueller made a motion to recommend approval of new homes and conceptual landscape plans for the properties addressed as 210, 230, and 270 Majestic Oak Court based on the findings in the staff report which are adopted by the Board. He stated that the motion incorporates the following conditions.

1. A subcommittee of the Board shall work with staff to review the plans submitted for permit to assure that the final plans align with the Board's approval and reflect the refinement requested by the Board including the following.
 - a. Traditional chimney caps shall be used on all three of the homes.
 - b. 210 Majestic Oak Court
 - The landscape plan shall reflect a density sufficient to break up the appearance of the large expanse of unbroken wall on the north elevation.
 - Consider hipped dormers in place of the gables.
 - Remove the cross detail and consider panels.
 - Study and refine the front door to avoid a tall, skinny appearance.
 - On the north elevation, address the inconsistency between the gable near the front and the hip at the rear and consider a double window rather than a single window, with larger windows, and consistency with respect to the bump outs.
 - Refine the shed dormer on the rear elevation to avoid the appearance of an afterthought.
 - c. 230 Majestic Oak Court
 - On the rear elevation, consider a triple window.
 - Study and refine the rear dormer to allow it to better relate to the house.
 - On the south elevation, consider ways to break up the expanse of siding, the triangle, about the garage doors.
 - Add a roof with brackets over the man door near the garage doors.
 - Study and refine the rear dormer.
 - d. 270 Majestic Oak Court
 - Simplify the entrance, consider eliminating the arch.
 - On the north elevation, consider three windows instead of squat-y windows and make the projections wider.
 - Consider a triple dormer on the rear elevation.

The motion was seconded by Board member Stamer 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 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak
Director of Community Development