

**The City of Lake Forest  
Building Review Board  
Proceedings of May 1, 2024 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, May 1, 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, and Sally Downey

Building Review Board members absent: None

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 April 3, 2024 Building Review Board meeting.**

The minutes of the April 3, 2024 meeting were approved as presented.

**3. Consideration of the demolition and replacement of a house and detached garage at 1129 Griffith Road. A landscaping plan will also be considered.**

Property Owner: Andres Merits Trust (Andres Merits, trustee)

Representative: Diana Melichar, 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. Melichar provided background on the house noting that the petitioner grew up in the home and now wishes to re-create it to allow him to age in the home. She noted that consideration was given to initially reusing the existing residence, but it was determined that replacing the home was the preferred option. She presented photos illustrating the condition of the existing house noting areas of water damage and areas where the home is not compliant with current building Code requirements. She noted that lifting the home and replacing the foundation would be required to meet the petitioner's needs. She stated that the exterior of the home does not have any historic or architectural merit. She noted that the detached garage is in poor condition. She stated that the petitioner desires to demolish both the home and garage and construct replacement structures. She presented the proposed site plan noting that the footprint of the replacement house and garage are in nearly the same

location as the existing structures. She noted that the closeness of the neighboring homes limit views of the side elevations of the proposed home. She noted that because the property is small, the petitioner desires living space in the basement. She stated that the replacement home is designed in a Vernacular Colonial Revival style. She stated that the proposed exterior materials include brick, aluminum clad wood windows, and asphalt shingles, all durable materials. She stated that in her opinion, the new house should increase property values in the neighborhood. She presented a streetscape image noting the similarity of the massing of the proposed residence with other homes along the street. She presented elevations of the home and garage and described the architectural details. She noted that the new driveway is pulled away from the property line to provide space for plantings and drainage between the driveway and the property line. She stated that a new front walk is proposed to connect the driveway to the front door. She concluded noting that rehabilitating the existing deteriorating residence would be costly and would not result in a quality end product. She stated that the replacement home will be a dry, accessible, energy efficient, and fire rated structure. She added that outdoor living space is planned as an outdoor amenity.

Mr. Prado stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals recently recommended approval of a front yard setback variance to allow the house to be sited consistent with the pattern of setbacks found along the street and to allow the garage to be sited as proposed in the rear yard. He stated that findings are included in the staff report in support of the demolition of the residence and garage. He stated that the proposed replacement residence is very close to the maximum permitted square footage and building height and noted that as-built drawings will be required during construction to confirm that the house does not exceed the limits as established by the Code. He noted that the staff report suggests some refinement to the north and south elevations with respect to window placement to align first floor windows with second floor windows. He noted that the petitioner indicated an interest in adding an accessible ramp to the home in the future. He suggested that consideration be given to how a ramp could be accommodated with the proposed site plan. He stated that correspondence was received from a neighboring property owner and was provided to the Board.

Chairman Looby invited questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Lohmueller stated that the proposed residence fits well into the neighborhood and complimented the front elevation. He observed that on the south elevation, the shutters look crowded against the chimney and suggested eliminating the shutters. He asked for clarification on the type of brick proposed for the new home and for details on the windows. He suggested further study of the two small roofs on the rear elevation and consideration of locating the light at the rear door to the home to the side, rather than above the door depending on the style of light proposed.

Board member Downey agreed that more information is needed on the proposed brick. She stated that the overall height of the home will need to be closely monitored during construction to assure that the maximum allowable height is not exceeded.

She agreed that the shutters appear crowded and placed inconsistently around the home. She stated that if an access ramp is planned in the future, now is the time to consider where it can be accommodated. She suggested carefully considering landscaping including arborvitae to minimize the potential for headlight impacts on the neighboring home. She noted that the space between the two driveways appears adequate for plantings.

Board member Stamer agreed that the south elevation could be improved by eliminating the shutters. He stated that in his opinion, the shutters work well on the other elevations. He acknowledged that the placement of the windows flanking the range in the kitchen is driven by the interior layout noting that although the windows cannot be aligned with the windows on the second floor, making them larger could improve the appearance of the elevation.

Board member Renken complimented the proposed house noting that it appears simple and elegant. He stated that the existing house appears to be in good condition from the outside but acknowledged that the interior photos tell a different story. He noted that there appears to be only two feet between the driveways which will limit the ability to plant in that area. On the south elevation, he suggested consideration of pulling the middle window in the stairwell up even with the second floor windows noting that the shift will provide more natural light into the second floor. He stated that he understands why the windows are located as shown on the south elevation and suggested considering eliminating the second floor windows noting that there are other windows in the bedroom. He agreed that the shutter near the chimney should be eliminated.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the demolition. She noted that if the size of the windows in the kitchen is increased, the appearance of the elevation will be improved, and additional natural light will be provided in the kitchen. She stated that if the size of the windows cannot be increased, the windows above should be removed. She stated that, in her opinion, the shutters are only necessary on the front elevation adding that the shutters located tight to the chimney should be removed. She complimented the brick mold planned for around the windows. She suggested consideration of moving the downspouts to the side elevations, off of the front elevation. She stated that the new home will fit well into the neighborhood.

Board member Lamphere agreed that the new house will be an improvement to the neighborhood and will fit well with the surrounding homes. She stated support for the demolition. She agreed that the shutters near the chimney should be eliminated and that the shutters on the front of the home should remain. She stated that if a ramp is planned in the future, the site plan should contemplate how it will be accommodated to avoid a tacked on appearance. She acknowledged that there are limitations on options for window placement and sizes due to the interior kitchen layout. She questioned whether the driveway could be gravel to help alleviate drainage issues and expressed concern that if the downspouts are moved to the side elevations, water may sheet drain on to neighboring properties.

Chairman Looby encouraged the petitioner to submit plans for the patio concurrent with the plans for the house. He asked for clarification on the proposed brick. He suggested consideration of pitching the driveway away from the house and installing a storm sewer. He invited the petitioner to respond to the questions raised by the Board.

Ms. Melichar agreed to re-look at the placement and use of shutters around the home and the placement and size of windows. She stated that aluminum clad Marvin windows are proposed with simulated divided lites and a brickmould surround. She stated that an historic appearing brick is proposed. She stated that the downspouts can be relocated off of the front elevation. She stated that given the history of water infiltration into the home, careful consideration is being given to drainage adding that water sheet drains from the street to the home. She stated that a landscape plan is being developed for how the strip of greenery adjacent to the driveway will be treated. She presented conceptual studies of a ramp to be added later but stated that for now, more landscaping is desired. She confirmed that a ramp at the rear of the home works with the site plan. She confirmed that the plans submitted for permit for the new house will include patios, walks, and landscaping. She stated that consideration will be given to the placement of the light at the rear door to the house.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Merits stated the intent to use brick that is similar in color to the brick on the existing house. He confirmed that the brick will not be glazed. He stated his intent to erect a stockade fence between the two driveways adding that vines may be grown on the fence. He stated that drainage will be properly addressed. He said that neighbors on both sides of his property have expressed support for the redevelopment of the property.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited final Board comments. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he invited motions.

Board member Lamphere made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the existing residence based on the based on the findings in the staff report which are adopted by the Board as part of the motion.

The motion was seconded by Board member Lohmueller and approved by the Board by a vote of 7 to 0.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the replacement residence, detached garage, conceptual landscape, and overall site plan based on the findings presented in this staff report which are adopted by the Board as part of the motion and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Further study shall be conducted of the following items:
  - a. Elimination of the shutters near the chimney.

- b. The size and placement of windows with the goal of achieving greater alignment.
  - c. Relocation of the downspouts to the side elevations.
  - d. Placement of the light at the rear door of the house.
2. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board comments and direction, or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached to the permit submittal for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and provide for all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed using good forestry practices. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect the parkway trees and all other trees that may be impacted during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.
5. At the time of submittal for a building permit, detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. No grading or filling shall be permitted except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices. The plans will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer.
6. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all proposed exterior light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
7. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development. Given the narrow width of the street, off site contractor parking may be required. The street must remain passable at all times and driveways of other homes may not be obstructed.

The motion was seconded by Board member Stamer and was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

#### **4. Consideration of a new residence and preliminary landscaping plan on a vacant lot at 1175 Old Colony Road.**

Property Owner: Mary Milligan Funk  
Representative: Mary Milligan Funk

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. Funk stated that she proposes to develop a vacant, infill lot which is about a third of an acre in size. She stated that the proposed home is modest in size with an attached garage and screen porch. She stated that the proposed home is 26 feet in height and 20 percent below the allowable square footage. She stated that the home is a simple design with a front loading garage. She stated that the exterior will be white stucco with simulated divided lite wood windows, soft green shutters with appropriate hardware, and limestone sills. She stated that the front door will be wood and explained that to elevate the design, copper gutters and downspouts are proposed on the front of the home with aluminum on the sides and rear. She stated that the driveway will be gravel and the front stoop will be brick or blue stone. She reviewed each elevation noting that windows on the north elevation are limited for security and because the elevation is not visible from the streetscape. She stated however that she is willing add a window if needed. In response to comments in the staff report, she presented a revised plan for the south elevation reflecting changes to the window placement noting that as now proposed, the windows are placed more consistently. She stated that the window in the stairway is intentionally placed to fill the space in a better way than previously shown. She commented on the rear of the house and garage noting that the garage extends 45 feet back from the house with only a utility area located behind it. She stated that consequentially, there is no value or functionality in placing windows on the rear wall of the garage. She stated that trees will cover the area. She presented a roof plan, floor plans, and a section. She presented a site plan noting that the siting complies with the zoning setbacks. She presented a conceptual landscape plan noting the gravel driveway, the areas where ground cover is proposed, and stated that brick or bluestone is planned for the hardscape. She stated that a detailed landscape plan will be submitted later in the process.

Mr. Prado stated that findings are presented in the staff report in support of the petition with several recommendations for areas of refinement. He stated that the site plan should be revised to reflect a driveway width of no more than 16 feet in the front yard setback and the patio behind the house if one is proposed. He noted that the staff report recommends further study and refinement of the north, south, and east elevations of the residence in an effort to achieve a stronger balance between solids and voids and to avoid large expanses of solid walls.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Downey stated that any action by the Board should include a condition requiring the driveway width to comply with the limitations in the Code. She asked for clarification on whether a basement is proposed. She confirmed that there is not a window in the bedroom on the south elevation. She questioned where the

door on the second floor leads.

Board member Stamer suggested adding a window on the south elevation to provide natural light into the bedroom. He pointed out that on the east elevation, to the left of the rear garage entry door, an additional window would benefit the home. He stated that additional detail is needed on the floor plan to allow an understanding of what is planned for the attic and how the exterior is impacted.

Board member Lamphere complimented the house noting that it will be a good addition to the neighborhood. She agreed that the house would benefit from additional windows particularly on the north elevation. She requested clarification on what is planned for the attic space. She observed that when entering the house from the garage, near the front door, a closet is impacted.

Board member Bluhm acknowledged that the placement of the windows on the south elevation is dictated by the interior adding that the revised elevation presented by the petitioner is an improvement over the elevation presented in the Board's packet. She suggested enlarging the door on the rear elevation of the garage and shifting it away from the mechanicals. She asked for clarification on whether the chimney is proposed as stucco or masonry. She complimented the copper gutters noting that they will weather naturally.

Board member Renken complimented the house but noted that the plans provided to the Board are incomplete. He noted that the second floor living space is not shown and expressed concern about the lack of windows in that space. He noted that a door is shown to an attic which, based on the elevations, will be a dark space. He stated that when the construction drawings are prepared, the area will need to be detailed. He suggested consideration of dormers on the rear elevation, similar to those on the front. He suggested consideration of the addition of shutters to fill the blank space near the high window on the north elevation. He pointed out other areas that lack detail stating that overall, in his opinion, the plans need further study, review for consistency between the floor plans and the elevations, and detailing. He suggested consideration of a window in the gable on the south elevation. He noted that no chimney cap is indicated on the plans. He stated that if copper gutters and downspouts are used on the front of the home, they should be used consistently around the home. With respect to the window detailing, he suggested consideration of a header that pops out to match the sill that is indicated.

Board member Lohmueller agreed that there are questions because of the lack of detailing on and consistency between the floor plans and the elevations. He agreed that the rear wall of the garage needs to be enhanced beyond the single door. He noted that the metal roof will be prominent adding that in the materials provided, it appears to be zinc but whatever the material, it should have some variation which will give the home an aged look. He agreed that using copper gutters and downspouts around the home would be preferable but acknowledged that cost issue. He suggested adding a detail that indicates that function of the garage.

Chairman Looby stated that a consistent material all around the house should be used for gutters and downspouts. He stated that a cut sheet is needed to clarify the proposed garage doors. He questioned whether the house is proposed as slab on grade. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he invited the petitioner to respond to the questions and comments offered by the Board.

Ms. Funk stated that she is trying to build a modestly priced house to fit in with the neighborhood. She stated that she would prefer to put copper gutters and downspouts around the house but noted that cost is a concern. She stated that she will likely use all aluminum gutters and downspouts in response to the Board's comments. She acknowledged that the plans need to be further detailed with respect to the attic. She agreed to consider modifications to the windows, the addition of shutters, and enhancing the rear elevation of the garage. She stated that the chimney will be masonry with a chimney cap. She stated that the home is proposed as slab on grade, without a basement. She noted that she is building a healthy house to minimize the potential for health issues related to mold and mildew. She stated that her goal is to build a modest price at reasonable cost so that she does not price the home above others in the neighborhood.

Chairman Looby invited public comment, hearing none, he invited final questions and comments from the Board.

Board member Bluhm stated support for copper gutters and downspouts on the front elevation to upgrade the home.

In response to questions from Board member Lamphere, Mr. Prado confirmed that the attic is included in the square footage calculation whether it is built out or not,

Board member Renken stated support for brown or bronze colored aluminum gutters and downspouts all around the home. He stated that more detail is needed on the plans and color palette. He stated that the windows and rear elevation of the garage should be studied further and refined.

Chairman Looby agreed that a single material should be used for the gutters and downspouts. He stated that details of the gutters should be reflected on the plans and suggested including a trim box.

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

Board member Stamer made a motion to indicate general support for the petition with direction to the petitioner to address the following items and return to the Board for formal action,

- The driveway shall not exceed 16 feet in width in the front yard setback.
- Provide samples of proposed exterior materials.
- Provide further detail of the materials and architectural elements on all elevations.
- Show dimensions on the plans.



- Use a single material for gutters and downspouts.
- Conduct further study and refine the north, south, and east elevations as it relates to balancing the relationship of solids and voids.
  - Consider the addition of windows, dormers, and shutters to break up large expanses of unbroken walls.
- Provide further detail on the floor plan and assure consistency between the floor plan and the exterior of the home. Provide details of the intended attic space.
- Illustrate areas of hardscape on the site plan.
- Provide a detailed landscape plan.
- Provide details on the intended chimney cap.

The motion was seconded by Board member Downey and was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

#### **5. Consideration of the demolition of an existing residence and a new single-family residence and preliminary landscaping plan at 890 Oak Knoll Drive.**

Property Owner: Charlie Pick

Representative: Charlie Pick

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. Pick stated that he was before the Board in November requesting approval to demolish the existing house because of its deteriorated condition. He stated that he has not yet proceeded with the demolition. He stated that the property is large, very deep, with many mature Oak trees. He explained that the design inspiration for the new home is a modern farmhouse with natural materials and a more natural character than typically found on this style of home. He reviewed the proposed exterior materials including 24 inch board and batten and lap siding. He stated that the color palette is warm whites and grays with gun metal, gray windows. He stated that a generous amount of stone is proposed at the front entry and on the chimney. He stated that the tight knot lap siding is intended as an accent to break up the board and batten. He pointed out the articulation on each elevation. He presented conceptual color renderings. He described the three car garage noting the carriage style doors. He stated that rectangular solar panels are proposed on the south facing roof of the garage. He described the large front porch on the house, the three clerestory windows in the great room, and the sunroom on the rear of the house with a pergola. He pointed out the simplicity of the roof lines and the windows. He stated that because of the large lot, the house is smaller than permitted. He stated that the home is consistent in scale with other homes in the area.

Mr. Prado stated that findings in support of the demolition are detailed in the staff report. He noted that the Board previously approved the demolition of the house on two occasions however, the petitioner, despite expressing concern about the house, has not yet proceeded with demolition. He stated that a condition requiring the demolition to proceed within 90 days of approval of this petition is recommended. He stated that findings are presented in the staff report in support of the proposed

replacement house with some recommendations for areas that could benefit from further study and refinement. He stated that the final landscape plan should include landscaping to screen the parking area from the streetscape and from the neighboring property.

Chairman Looby invited questions from the Board.

Board member Lamphere said that the house appears to generally be in keeping with other homes in the neighborhood. She encouraged the use of softer colors as opposed to stark white and black. She stated that further study and refinement of the on the north elevation will benefit the overall design. She noted that little detail is provided on the patio at the rear of the home.

Board member Bluhm stated support for the demolition. She agreed that further refinement of the north elevation is needed and suggested making the window over the tub larger. She stated that windows should be consistent sizes. She stated that landscaping will be important as part of the project. She asked for information on the materials proposed for the patio, the parking area, and the driveway.

Board member Renken stated that the home fits in well with the neighborhood noting that it is in between a ranch home and a two story home. He stated that the home is modest, but well detailed with good proportions on the front elevation. He agreed that the north elevation could be improved with the addition of a window or two. He also suggested the addition of a horizontal board on the north elevation. He complimented the proposed color palette and the scale of the house.

Board member Lohmueller noted that the rendering in the packet implies a black and white modern farmhouse but stated that the softer color palette as described by the petitioner is a better option. He observed that the natural wood elements at the front entry and some of the window heads might appear awkward next to Hardie board. He asked for clarification on the materials proposed and how they relate to each other. He asked for more information on the stone, whether it is veneer and whether mortar will be used.

Board member Downey noted that based on the City's Design Guidelines, no more than two primary exterior materials should be used. She stated that as she understands the plans, there appears to be multiple materials proposed. She agreed that further study of the north elevation is needed and suggested that two windows would be an improvement to the elevation. She stated concern about potential light impacts on neighboring properties due to the large windows. She stated that screening will be important.

Board member Stamer agreed with the comments made by the other Board members. He asked about the proposed green glazed tiles. He stated that the landscape plan should reflect screening around the proposed parking area in the front yard.

Chairman Looby suggested 16 inch board and batten siding rather than 24 inch to achieve a more residential scale. He asked whether the Hardie board siding material will be painted on site. He stated that more detail is needed on the garage doors and questioned whether a herring bone or board and batten pattern is proposed and whether the doors will be custom built or factory standard. He stated that the stone used on the front entry and chimney must be at least four inches thick. He invited the petitioner to respond to the questions raised by the Board.

Mr. Pick stated that the garage doors will have a carriage design and will be washed gray in steel or wood. He agreed to provide a cut sheet of the garage door at the time of submittal for permit. He stated that the stone on the residence will be four inches thick and will have a substantial look. He explained that there are two primary materials proposed on the home, stone and horizontal siding. He stated that the tight knot cedar headers are intended to break up the elevations noting that without the cedar, the home will appear stark. He stated that the intent is to create a County-look. He stated that the posts and headers at the front entry will be a richer, darker cedar. He stated that stone is only proposed at the front entry and on the chimney. He stated that there are only two primary exterior materials, lap siding and board and batten. He stated concern about putting a window in the shower on the north elevation. He agreed to explore options for the north elevation. He stated that the landscape plan presented is very preliminary. He said that the parking area in the front yard can be easily screened with plantings. He stated that there will be plantings around the garage and plantings on the north side to break up the expanse of wall. He stated that from a security perspective, he does not want more entry points to the home especially those that serve no purpose except for aesthetics. He stated that the driveway is asphalt with a polished cobble stone apron at the street and cobble stones along the sides of the driveway. He stated that the rear patio will be a unilock product for drainage. He stated that a fire pit is planned. He stated that overall, the amount of impervious surface will be close to what currently exists on the site. He stated that he believes that the driveway is configured to provide an adequate area for turning movements. He stated that his goal is to remove only two Bur Oak trees which will be replaced at 50 percent because they are in decline.

Chairman Looby invited public comment. Hearing no requests to speak from the public, he invited final questions and comments from the Board.

In response to a question from Board member Downey, Mr. Prado confirmed that the limitation to two exterior materials is not a requirement but a consideration for the Board as each petition is reviewed to assure that the design presented is not overly busy or inconsistent,

Chairman Looby stated that the garage doors should blend in with the home and not be a prominent element.

Board member Renken stated that the Board considers each house on its own merits. He stated that in his view, the proposed house is two primary materials with accent materials which are intended to add interest. He stated that the landscape plan

should reflect plantings to screen the unbroken wall on the north elevation.

In response to questions from Board member Lohmueller, Mr. Pick stated that the Hardi-board will be painted in the field because the color will be custom and not standard colors.

Board member Downy stated that trees should be part of the landscaping on the north side of the home to screen the wall.

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

Board member Downey made a motion to recommend approval of the demolition of the existing residence noting that the demolition should proceed promptly. She stated that the recommendation is based on the findings in the staff report which are adopted by the Board as part of the motion.

The motion was seconded by Board member Bluhm and approved by the Board by a vote of 7 to 0.

Board member Renken made a motion to recommend approval of the replacement residence, attached garage, conceptual landscape and overall site plan based on the findings presented in the staff report which are adopted by the Board and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He noted that the recommendation includes the following conditions of approval.

1. The board and batten spacing should be 16 inches.
2. A horizontal board shall be added to the north elevation and further study shall be conducted to determine whether additional or larger windows can be added to break up the large expanse of wall,
3. Samples of the materials and color palette shall be provided as part of the submission for a building permit.
4. All modifications to the plans including those detailed above and any others made in response to Board direction or as the result of final design development shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall, at a minimum, meet the landscaping standards for new residences detailed in the Code and provide for all required replacement tree inches to account for trees removed. The plan shall provide for a) significant

landscaping on the north side of the house to mitigate the expanse of unbroken wall and b) plantings to screen the parking area at the front of the home from the street and from the neighboring property. The landscape plan must include the quantity, species, and size at the time of planting for all new landscaping.

6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees on the site intended for preservation that may be impacted during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City.
7. At the time of submittal for a building permit, detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. No grading or filling shall be permitted except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices.
8. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
9. A plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development.

The motion was seconded by Board member Lamphere and was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

#### **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 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak  
Director of Community Development