

The City of Lake Forest  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Proceedings of the April 25, 2018 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, April 25, 2018, at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deer path, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Grieve and Commissioners Wells Wheeler, Elizabeth Sperry, Jan Gibson, Bill Redfield, Bob Alfe and Carol Gayle.

Commissioners absent: None

City staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

**1. Introduction of Commissioners and staff, overview of meeting procedures.**

Chairman Grieve reviewed the meeting procedures followed by the Commission and asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

**2. Consideration of the minutes of the March 21, 2018 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.**

The minutes of the March 21, 2018 meeting were approved with corrections as requested by Commissioner Gayle.

**3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to authorize building signage at Gorton Community Center, 400 Illinois Road.**

**Property Owner: City of Lake Forest**

**Tenant and Petitioner: Gorton Community Center**

**Representative: North Shore Sign**

Chairman Grieve asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Yehle explained that additional signage is proposed at Gorton Community Center for the purpose of making the building easier to identify. She stated that two signs are proposed, one on the west elevation of the building, above the entrance door, and the other, on the west facing side of the porte-cochere. She reviewed the size of the letters proposed for each location noting that a composite material is proposed for the letters, for durability. She stated that the letters will be painted with a polyurethane paint. She stated that Northshore Signs is the contractor. She stated that the letters will be mounted flush with screws and glued in place. She stated that a mock-up of a letter was put up for the Commission's benefit.

Ms. Czerniak stated that currently, Gorton Community Center has limited signage. She stated that although most people in the community know the building, it can be hard

to identify for those who are not from the community. She stated that the proposed signage is simple and direct. She clarified the locations of the two proposed signs noting that the letters on the porte-cochere will be centered over the driveway below. She stated that on a limited basis, the Commission has approved synthetic materials for signage for durability, depending on the specifics of each situation. She stated however that since the use of a synthetic product is not consistent with the signage guidelines, specific approval of the material by the Commission is required. She stated that the intention is to mount the letters directly to the existing structure, rather than mounting the letters on pins. She said that based on the information provided, there should be a slight dimensionality to the letters. She stated that the staff report presents findings in support of the petition. She noted that the Commissioner received a letter from the Preservation Foundation in support of the petition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Yehle explained that the original sign for the school is above the entrance door and part of the wall on the west elevation. She stated that the plaques on the fence are the only other identification signage on the site.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Yehle clarified the proposed locations of the two signs. She stated that a sign on the east side of the porte-cochere would not be visible from the street. She stated that a sign is not proposed on the south side of the porte-cochere because it would need to be affixed to the brick.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Czerniak stated that the signage as proposed faces away from the adjacent single family residences, towards the non-residential area. She stated that the proposed locations are visible from the street and identify key entrances to the building.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Ms. Yehle confirmed that the screws will not be visible on the front of the letters.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Yehle, stated that the letters will be mounted directly on existing wood elements on the building.

Commissioner Redfield stated support for the signs as presented.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Ms. Yehle stated that no consideration was given to modifying the historic sign above the door on the west elevation. She stated that letters are carved into a stone or a concrete panel. She stated that the letters in the news signs will be painted flat black.

In response to questions from Commissioners Gibson and Alfe, Ms. Yehle stated that the font was chosen because it appeared to best fit the style of the building and is similar to the font used in the Gorton logo.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Grieve invited public

comment. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Wheeler observed that the sample letter provided to the Commission appears glossy. He suggested that a paint with less sheen be selected. He stated support for the signs and the font as presented.

In response to a question from Commissioner Redfield, Ms. Yehle stated that they will assure that the screws are properly affixed to the letters to avoid visibility.

Commissioner Redfield stated support for the signs as proposed.

Commissioner Alfe stated support for the scale of the letters as proposed noting that the letters will be very visible against the white background.

Commissioner Sperry questioned the need for two identical signs, facing the same direction. She noted however that she is supportive of the petition.

Commissioner Gibson commented on the font noting that the font used in the Community Guide has a more classical look. She stated support for the signs noting that in her opinion, signage on the building is needed.

Chairman Grieve summarized the Commission comments noting that there appears to be support for the location, size, number and color of the signs. He asked that careful consideration be given to the paint to assure that it does not have a sheen. He noted that some of the Commissioners raised concerns about the font. He suggested that a motion be made to determine where the Commissioners are on this issue.

Commissioner Wheeler noted that the only precedent for signage is the carved lettering above the entrance door on the west elevation and that sign is difficult to read. He made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the signs as proposed based on the findings detailed in the staff report and subject to the following conditions.

1. The finish shall not appear as glossy or shiny.
2. Consideration shall be given to the use of a more classical font.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sperry and approved by a 7 to 0 vote.

Chairman Grieve encouraged the petitioner to consider the comments offered by the Commission.

- 4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to authorize demolition of a rear addition, construction of a replacement rear addition, various alterations to the existing house and construction of a detached garage at 449 E. Illinois Road.  
Property Owners: Chris and Deb Jensen**

**Representative: Edward Deegan, architect**

Chairman Grieve asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Ms. Jensen stated that her and her husband moved to Lake Forest in 2002, are active in the community, have held leadership positions in community organizations and have children in the Lake Forest schools. She stated that they both have always had an appreciation for old homes. She stated that their family is growing so they recently purchased the home at 449 E. Illinois Road and want to restore it to the original character and make the interior functional for their family. She added that her husband and son have a passion for vintage cars and they need garage space to accommodate that interest.

Mr. Jensen reiterated their love for old houses. He noted that an incompatible addition was constructed at the rear of the house in the past and they plan to replace it with an addition that is compatible with the original 1893 house.

Mr. Deegan, presented a model of the house with the proposed replacement addition. He provided an overview of the property and the neighborhood. He stated that the proposed addition and detached garage conform to all square footage and zoning requirements despite the narrowness of the lot. He reviewed some historic and current photos of the house describing it as the Quigley house, built in 1893. He noted that the fenestration on the main house is original along with the horizontal lap siding on the lower portion of the exterior walls and cedar shakes above. He said that the house has nice, clean details and is a vernacular style. He stated that the petitioners hope to restore the historic integrity of the house by removing the earlier rear addition and replacing it with a more compatible addition. He stated that the details of the replacement addition will match the original house including the lap siding, brick water table and the band that separates the lap siding from the shakes. He stated that the color palette will remain the same. He reviewed the existing site plan identifying the rear addition proposed for removal. He stated that the replacement addition will be generally in the same foot print and of the same square footage as the addition that will be removed. He reviewed existing and proposed floor plans. He noted the grand porch on the original residence noting that it will be extended along the replacement addition. He pointed out that the replacement addition is designed to preserve views from the house to the large back yard to the west. He stated that the east end of the house will remain untouched. He reviewed the roof plan and each elevation noting the detailing and materials. He noted that the rear elevation will mirror the front of the home. He stated that the existing detached coach house and shed encroach into the side yard setback. He noted that the existing garage, on the first floor of the coach house, is small adding that it was challenging to find a way to add garage space, in conformance with the zoning setback, and in a way that is not imposing on the site or compromising to views from the home. He presented the proposed garage noting that it will be linked to the existing coach house with a one story element. He reviewed the floor plan. He explained that the design presents a gable end to the east, to minimize

the massing facing the street adding that the length of the new garage is east/west, consistent with the length of the property. He noted that the garage is sited to minimize the amount of additional asphalt on the property. He reviewed the attic and roof plans for the proposed garage. He reviewed the roof forms and each elevation. He pointed out that a six foot fence extends along the south property line. He emphasized that the proposed garage is sized to accommodate one car, a vintage car.

Ms. Czerniak pointed out that this large property is at the point of transition between larger lots to the north and smaller lots to the south along Heather Lane. She stated that the property is unusual in that it is bordered by five or six properties. She stated that no variances are requested. She noted the property can support a house that is about 25 percent larger than the existing house adding that the house could extend a much greater distance to the rear. She stated that the proposed demolition appears to meet the applicable criteria. She stated that the proposed replacement addition is consistent with the massing and detailing of the original house but asked for Commission input on whether the addition should be more clearly delineated as an addition, as opposed to appearing as part of the historic residence. She noted that letters were received from two neighbors on Heather Lane raising concerns about drainage and in the case of one neighbor, the impact of the new garage on views. She noted that prior to the issuance of building permits, consistent with standard practice, a drainage and grading plan will need to be submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer. She stated that the engineer will be alerted to the concerns voiced by the neighbors to the south. She stated that with respect to blocking views, the garage is below the 25 foot height limit for accessory structures and conforms to the zoning setback. She added that as previously noted, the proposed addition and garage, together with the existing house, are in compliance with the allowable square footage. She reiterated that there is a six foot fence along the property line. She suggested that consideration be given to eliminating the high window in the south facing gable of the garage to eliminate the potential for off-site light impacts. She stated that windows could be added to the lower portion of the south elevation to break up the wall mass. She noted that some vegetation could be added along the south property line. She noted that the oak tree that is located close to the southwest corner of the house will need to be removed. She stated that the arborist's opinion is that it will not withstand the demolition of the existing addition, or the new construction. She stated that it is simply too close to the house. She noted that findings in support of the petition are detailed in the staff report.

Commissioner Redfield commented that the project appears to be quite involved.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Deegan stated that the petitioners talked with some of the neighbors about the project. He confirmed that the grading and drainage plans will be developed and care will be taken to avoid impacts on neighboring properties. He stated that the elevations may be a bit deceiving noting that the roof recedes from the south property line and at the closest point, the structure is 15 feet from the property line. He confirmed that the proposed garage is a single story, with storage space intended in the attic. He stated that a flat roof on the garage

would not be consistent with the historic character of the property.

Commissioner Wheeler commented that the proposed addition is a significant reversal from the existing addition and wondered how the earlier addition came to be. He stated that the proposed addition adheres to the design standards and is compatible with the details of the original house. He complimented the floor plan.

Commissioner Alfe complimented the proposed addition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Deegan stated that they intentionally left the muntins off the first floor windows on the rear addition to the house to maximize views to the backyard.

Commissioner Alfe encouraged reconsideration of the muntins for consistency with the original character of the residence.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Deegan reviewed the doors on the south elevation of the house pointing out the main entrance door which is original to the house. He confirmed that the main door and mud room door are the same height and style, but not the same width. He described the French doors which open from the bay in the dining room as a unique feature. He identified the existing windows and noted that the second floor windows in the addition repeat the pattern of the existing windows except for the window in the stairwell. He explained that on the first floor, the height of the windows was increased in the addition to take advantage of the views of the backyard. He stated that the petitioners just learned of the neighbors' concerns about the garage. He stated that the garage was designed taking cues from the historic coach house. He agreed that the window could be removed from the upper gable on the south elevation of the garage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Deegan reviewed the paved areas and explained how vehicles will maneuver to enter and exit the garages. He acknowledged that a three point turn will be required to exit the proposed new garage but noted that it is not intended for everyday use, but instead, for storage of a vintage car. He explained that the property is narrow and the petitioners want to avoid paving across the full width of the yard while at the same time, assuring that the new garage conforms to zoning setbacks. He stated that very little additional asphalt will be needed.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Mr. Deegan explained the rationale for the garage as designed reiterating that the proposed design minimizes the need for additional asphalt and exposure to views from the east. He stated that the added building mass extends primarily in an east to west direction.

Chairman Grieve offered that consideration could be given to the use of gravel for the expanded driveway area, instead of asphalt. Hearing no further questions from the Commission, he invited public comment.

Julie Smit, 450 Heather Lane, stated that she lives directly south of the Jensen's property. She stated no objection to the proposed addition to the house. She stated strong opposition to the proposed two story garage noting that the existing coach house is 30 feet from her family and living rooms which have floor to ceiling windows, and 20 feet from her patio. She stated that a second two story garage will obstruct sunlight to her home and further obstruct the view of trees. She stated that she will be looking at 60 feet of garages from her 90 foot wide lot. She stated concern about additional water runoff due to the additional hardscape proposed. She pointed out that water is directed to their lower lying land which is about three feet lower than the Jensen's property. She stated that she was advised by a real estate professional that the proposed garage will devalue her home. She pointed out that the Jensens do not intend to block their own view, just hers. She presented a photo illustrating how the proposed garage will limit views from her home. She stated that if the garage is moved to the west, she would have no objection to the project.

Tom Wigen, 450 Heather Lane, agreed with his wife's comments. He stated that they were not contacted by the Jensens noting that they are the most affected neighbors. He disagreed with the description of the new garage as "one story" stating that as designed, it is a two story structure. He noted that someone lives on the second floor of the coach house. He stated that the Jensens do not want to site the new garage in a way that blocks their own views. He stated that instead, views from his home will be blocked by garages along 60 feet of his property, two thirds of the width of the property. He stated that the proposed garage will be built at the expense of his property and views. He asked that a compromise, a single story garage, be considered. He stated that the owner of the property at 438 Heather Lane is out of town, but shares the same concerns. He presented photos illustrating the impacts to views from his property adding that because his property is at a lower elevation, the garage will appear taller than it is. He stated that there could be a problem with water runoff noting that when a concrete slab is poured, it will displace water as will the proposed patio. He stated that the water will no longer be able to drain into the soil. He asked for a water runoff study before any approvals are granted.

Jack Hirschfield, 462 Heather Lane, stated that the existing rear addition is an eyesore on an historic home. He stated that the Jensens talked with him and other neighbors about the proposed project. He stated support for the project as proposed. He stated that the work will add to the character of the neighborhood. He stated that he trusts the Jensens to meet the City requirements and do what is right for the neighborhood including addressing any drainage issues. He questioned the impacts on light to surrounding homes to the south noting that the sun rises over the Lake and travels west. He stated that he welcomes the proposed project.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Grieve invited further questions and comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Alfe stated that he understands the reasons for the configuration of the garage as proposed. He added that from an architectural point of view, it is logical to

maintain the roof line in relation to the coach house. He also stated that he can appreciate the neighbors' concern about obstructing views from their property however he stated that it is not practical to locate the second garage on the other side of the property.

In response to a request from Chairman Grieve for comments on the proposed demolition of the existing rear addition on the house and the design of the replacement addition, Commissioners Alfe and Sperry stated no objection to the demolition and complimented the proposed replacement addition.

Commissioner Gibson also complimented the replacement addition noting concerns about the height of the doors.

Commissioner Wheeler stated support for the proposed addition but noted the inconsistency of the west facing windows. He commented however that the reason for the inconsistency may be justifiable.

Commissioners Gayle and Redfield stated support for the addition and no objections to the demolition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the City's certified arborist inspected the tree and said that given its proximity to the house, he cannot recommend trying to work around it. She stated that even if the tree could be saved in the short term, it would not likely survive over the longer term and as a result, the design of the addition will have been compromised. She stated that replacement tree inches will be required on the property or in the parkway to enhance the streetscape.

Chairman Grieve invited comments on the proposed garage.

Commissioner Alfe reiterated that he understands the rationale for matching the roof lines to the existing coach house and for removing the high window in the south facing gable end. He noted that alternatives to what is proposed are difficult. He stated that architecturally, a lower pitched roof could be problematic. He stated that extending the existing coach house to the west could be workable, however, that would result in additional building mass being located in the side yard setback area, closer to the neighbor.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Deegan stated that the proposed garage is not designed to have living space in the attic. He pointed out that as designed, the south facing roof mass is a gable end presenting less roof mass to the south than the existing coach house. He stated that the design evolved from trying to balance all of the factors that came into play.

Commissioner Sperry stated her hope that there might be a compromise solution that minimizes the impact on the neighboring property.



Commissioner Gibson agreed with Commissioner Sperry's suggestion that a compromise be explored. She acknowledged that the south facing gable is not as intrusive as another roof form might be but expressed interest in considering alternatives. She stated support for removing the south facing window high in the gable end and adding lower windows for light and balance.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested consideration of a hip roof element to solve the height issue as one approach that could be considered. He added that consideration could also be given to dropping the ridge or adding a dormer element borrowed from the house.

Commissioner Gayle encouraged discussion with the neighbors. She recognized the irony that despite the very long property, the existing and proposed garages are both located close to the neighbor. She stated that she is not sure whether there are alternatives that are acceptable to everyone, but encouraged discussion in the spirit of compromise.

Commissioner Redfield suggested consideration of lowering the roof pitch as a compromise.

Chairman Grieve summarized that there appears to be support from the Commission for the demolition of the rear addition to the house and the replacement addition. He stated that the discussion appears focused on the garage. He stated that with respect to drainage, there is a review process that will be followed to address drainage before a building permit is issued. He stated that there may be an opportunity to improve upon the existing situation. He reviewed that the Commission's review of projects is guided by standards and the Commission must determine whether or not the standards are met. He noted that no variances are being requested and stated that he has not heard any of the Commissioners express concern that the standards are not met by the project as proposed. He commented that the Commission's standards do not speak to obstructing views from a neighboring property however, the standards do speak to the need for massing to be consistent with the historic character of a property. He observed that the siting and design of the garage appears to be an effort to be neighborly. He questioned whether any of the Commissioners wish to continue the petition to allow further study.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Ms. Czerniak stated that hardship plays a role when a zoning variance is requested. She reiterated that no variances are needed for the project as proposed. She reviewed that the Commission's role generally is to look at massing, at consistency with an architectural style, compatibility with the existing historic character and appropriateness of materials. She noted that if modifications to the garage massing or design are considered, the Commission is still obligated to review the alternate designs based on the standards. She suggested that if the Commission desires to proceed with a vote on the demolition of the addition to the residence and on the replacement addition, those elements could be separated

from the consideration of the garage. She added that consideration of the garage could be continued to allow some further due diligence on possible alternatives that might address the neighbors' concerns while still meeting the applicable standards and the owners' needs.

Ms. Jensen stated that they are not interested in building the addition if they cannot build the garage.

Chairman Grieve reviewed the options available to the Commission, noting that the Commission can consider the entire project as presented or, vote on the project elements related to the house separately. He stated that there appears to be general support for the detached garage but some interest in allowing time for further study to explore alternatives for this element. He stated that if desired by the Commission, consideration of the garage could be continued to a future meeting. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of the existing rear addition to the residence and approving the replacement addition based on the findings presented in the staff report and subject to the following conditions. He noted that the Commission's consideration of the detached garage is continued to allow further study of alternatives that may serve as a compromise to address the neighbors' concerns.

1. Consideration shall be given to the Commission's comments on the consistency of windows and doors around the residence.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If, in response to the Commission's comments or during the final design development process modifications are made to the plans presented, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
3. Double inch for inch replacement shall be required as compensation for the loss of the White Oak tree located on the south side of the house. Replacement plantings shall be reflected on the final landscape plan and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
  - a. The landscape plan shall include plantings along the south property line to provide some screening and softening of the proposed detached garage.
  - b. The landscape plan shall include plantings along the north property line to provide some screening and softening of the replacement rear addition to the residence.
4. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a Tree Protection Plan, to protect trees identified for preservation during construction, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.

5. The concerns related to drainage received from the Heather Lane neighbor shall be directed to the City Engineer for information and consideration during the review of the drainage and grading plan. Attention should be paid to avoiding increased runoff to the south, on to the Heather Lane properties.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sperry.

In response to a comments from Mr. Jensen, Commissioner Sperry clarified that the motion does not deny approval of the detached garage but instead, directs that alternatives be explored before final consideration of the garage by the Commission at a future meeting. She noted that the Commission encourages discussions with the affected neighbors in an effort to find a workable compromise.

Chairman Grieve added that the continuation does not mean that the design as now presented could not be approved, only that some further due diligence is requested in response to the concerns raised.

The motion was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

- 5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness authorizing demolition of an existing detached garage, construction of a replacement attached garage and linking element, construction of a detached garage and enclosure of an existing porch. A Building Scale variance is requested. Approval of tree removal and a replacement landscape plan is also requested. The property is located at 81 W. Laurel Avenue.**

**Property Owners: James and Linda Estes**

**Representative: Michael Breseman, architect**

Chairman Grieve asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Commissioner Redfield acknowledged that he lived in the home prior to the current owner but stated that he is able to review the petition objectively.

Mr. Breseman introduced the petition and provided a brief history of the property noting that the land was originally part of the Atteridge Farms land. He stated that the house, "House of the Four Winds" was designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw and built in 1906, and the gardens designed by Rose Standish Nichols. He stated that the carriage house was subdivided off from the property in 1955 and remains in a separate ownership today, adaptively reused as a single family home. He stated that Mr. and Mrs. Estes purchased the house in 2016 after living in England for five years where they gained an appreciation for the Arts and Crafts movement. He noted that the house is often opened for tours by the Estes as it was by the previous owners. He stated that the original house was sited by Shaw based on the topography of the site and the prevailing winds. He pointed out that the house is sited at the north side of the property and the gardens at the south end. He noted the location of the kitchen and servants'

wing at the north end of the house dictating that the garages should be located on the north end of the property. He noted that a previous architect engaged by the Estes proposed a three car garage that encapsulated the porch and disrupted the historic character of the residence due to the additional mass proposed. He stated that the earlier plan was not approved by Landmarks Illinois, an independent preservation agency that holds a Facade Easement on the property. He noted that the previous architect also explored an "L" concept for a three car garage which was pushed forward of the residence due to the proximity of the west property line, but it too overwhelmed the historic facade of the residence and was not approved. He explained that the combination of attached and detached garages, meets the owners' needs, and allows for reduced massing and a linking element that preserves the integrity of the north porch. He described the attached garage noting the hip to a gable roof form which further softens the massing. He noted the potting shed at the rear of the attached garage noting that structure also serves to reduce the appearance of mass. He stated that the detached garage is subservient to the attached garage. He noted that the over hangs of both garages were reduced from the images reflected on the materials provided to the Commission, to further reduce the sense of mass. He noted that the roof forms harken to England and add to the quiriness to the project. He noted that the materials match the existing materials on the exterior of the house: copper, stucco and wood shingles. He noted the architectural detailing. He presented historic images of the residence, current photos and photos of other homes in the area. He reviewed the plans to enclose the north porch for protection from the weather noting that the pattern of fenestration will reflect the existing openings. He added that more importance is placed on the porch than on the link. He reviewed the existing detached garage stating that it is inadequate for a house of this size and prominence. He presented the 1931 landscape plan noting the siting of the residence and original carriage house. He noted that the carriage house was subdivided off from the property decades ago and remains in separate ownership, as a single family home. He reviewed the tree survey noting the deteriorating condition of several trees on the site. He stated that enhanced landscaping is planned as part of the project and reviewed the proposed landscape plan. He noted that the existing curb cut will remain adding that reclaimed brick is proposed for the garage aprons and the widening of the driveway proposed at the front of the house. He presented a demolition plan reflecting the removal of the existing detached garage and changes to the north porch. He pointed out that the new garages are sited in a staggered fashion to minimize the encroachment into the side yard setback and appearance of mass. He noted that he discussed the project with Art Miller who recommended the use of a hip to a gable to bring the upper gable in line with the north wing of the house, and to soften the massing. He reviewed the elevations of both garages noting that the pier detail initially proposed on each elevation are now proposed only on the front elevation for simplification. He point out the soft gambrel curve on the gable and other details intended to create an English countryside, quiriness that in his opinion, Shaw would have appreciated. He stated that the detached garage is envisioned in a lighter, muted color, similar to the color of the existing garage. He stated that the detached garage is intended to read as a separate, subdued structure.

Ms. Czerniak stated that demolition of the existing detached garage is consistent with the applicable criteria. She confirmed that various concepts for adding garage space to the property were developed prior to Mr. Breseman's involvement in the project. She stated that the earlier concepts were not approved by Landmarks Illinois due to the impact on the historic integrity of the residence and overall property. She confirmed that Landmarks Illinois has endorsed the project as now presented. She stated that initially, efforts were made to develop a plan to preserve the Siberian Elm tree but after inspections of the tree, it was determined that the tree is in poor, and potentially hazardous, condition and should be removed whether or not this project goes forward. She stated that the landscape plan provides for significant plantings in the northwest corner of the property, providing for at least the required replacement inches for the trees that will be lost. She stated that the existing house exceeds the allowable square footage and as a result, a building scale variance is required to accommodate the new garages. She stated that overall, the project will be 15 percent over the allowable square footage. She noted that the criteria for a building scale variance specifically speak to variances for historically significant properties. She stated that findings in support of the building scale variance and overall project are included in the staff report.

Commissioner Redfield stated that the petitioners are forward thinking in enclosing the porch and providing garage space that can be safely accessed from the house.

Commissioner Gayle lamented the loss of trees on the site in particular, the loss of the large tree. She stated support for assuring that the landscaping planned for the site adequately replaces the trees lost in the historic context of the site.

In response to comments from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Breseman explained that initially, the mindset was to develop a plan that would preserve and protect the tree by using grade beams and piers for the foundation of the garage. He noted however that several arborists inspected the tree and all concluded that it should be removed.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he is always sorry to see a tree lost especially for a garage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Breseman stated that a three car garage is a minimum requirement for a house of this size. He noted however, the three car concepts presented diminished the integrity of the property. He stated that the concept of two, smaller structures, two car garages, breaks up the massing and works with the unusual siting of the house on the lot.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Breseman explained the siting of the garages in the limited area available. He stated that an effort was made to minimize the need for additional pavement. He stated that from a functional perspective, the option presented works. He stated that the garage doors will be beautiful.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Estes added that the turning radius into the garages was carefully considered. He noted that locating the garage doors so that they are not visible as part of the view of the front of the house would require additional tree removal and would require three point turns to maneuver into and out of the garages.

Commissioner Alfe stated that at first he struggled with the extent of encroachment proposed into the front yard. He noted however that the existing garage and shed, and other structures along the street, encroach to about the same extent or more than the proposed detached garage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Breseman stated that the pitch of the garage roofs differ from the residence because he wanted to create a certain presence by adding a soft curve to the garage roofs.

Commissioner Alfe expressed concern about the differing colors of the garages and suggested that consistency in color should be considered.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the existing landscaping along the street may need to be enhanced to camouflage the detached garage. She stated that the proposed color of the detached garage may draw the eye to the structure more than desired.

In response to comments from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Breseman stated that ultimately, the color palette will require approval by Landmarks Illinois. He explained that the concept is to set the detached garage apart from the house by using a different, subdued color, and different materials. He acknowledged that in the rendering, the detached garage appears darker than intended.

Commissioner Redfield noted that the existing garage used to be white but after he painted it dark green, it was not noticeable.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson about the detached garage, Mr. Breseman reviewed the side elevations and noted that the hip on gable roof form is found in England. He agreed that elements need to be toned down from what is reflected in the rendering noting in particular the reduction he recently made in the roof overhangs. He stated that the detached garage is intended to be different but agreed to further study and refinement of the detached garage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Breseman confirmed that the detached garage is narrower than the attached structure, but in the rendering, appears to be larger due to the perspective from which it was drawn. He stated that wood carriage doors are proposed and will be painted and agreed that the color can be toned down. He stated that the windows and trim will be the accent color.

Chairman Grieve stated that the Commission is clearly supportive of the project but is offering suggestions for consideration. He observed that the house has a long

frontage and the garages as positioned, appear to extend the overall length from a distance. He noted that all of the roof lines on the house are linear except for the one dominant curve over the main entrance. He suggested that Shaw's intention was to draw attention to that element of the house. He questioned whether the curve should be replicated drawing attention away from the original design and the main house.

In response to comments by Chairman Grieve, Mr. Breseman stated that the camber of the front entry is much greater than the minimal curve suggested on the garage roof. He stated that Landmarks Illinois supports that element of the design. He noted that the slight curve could subliminally highlight the curve of the historic main gable, without detracting from it.

Chairman Grieve acknowledged that the garages are tight to the west property line which does not allow the opportunity to step them back from the plane of the front façade of the house. He suggested that in keeping with the idea of some quirkiness, and to mitigate the appearance of adding more length to the residence as a result of the detached garage when viewed from a distance, consideration could be given to tilting the detached garage. He noted that the symmetry of the siting as proposed implies thoughtfulness, instead of quirkiness. He stated that tilting the garage about 30 percent could convey that it is not part of the larger structure. He added that if the detached garage is painted too dark, it may be more visible than intended in the winter months. He encouraged the petitioner to take the suggestions of the Commission in the spirit in which they are offered, as concepts to consider.

Mr. Breseman agreed to study the concept noting that tilting the garage by opening up the corner 100 to 110 degrees may make the detached garage feel a little less a part of the linear nature of the house.

In response to a question from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Breseman stated that the roof pitch may need to be softened to a 12/12 pitch which will bring the ridge line down and reduce the exposure of the gable. He stated that he will work on refining the element to reduce competition with other details, but would not support eliminating it.

Commissioner Sperry observed that the window on the gable end of the attached garage also pulls the eye away from the residence.

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

Mr. Knauz stated that he is the neighbor to the west of the property and lives in the original coach house that was subdivided off from the Four Winds House. He stated that aesthetically, the project is well done. He expressed concern about the loss of trees along the west property line and the visibility of the new garages from his property. He also expressed concern about drainage.

Chairman Grieve stated that he expects that both the landscaping and drainage will be carefully reviewed by staff during the permitting process. Hearing no further comments from the public, he invited a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of the existing detached garage, the new attached and detached garages, a link element between the attached garage and the residence, enclosure of the north porch and a building scale variance based on the finding detailed in the staff report. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. The petitioner and project architect are encouraged to thoughtfully consider the comments offered by the Commission.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission and must be fully dimensioned. If, during the final design development process, or in response to Commissioner comments, modifications are proposed, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
3. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a Tree Protection Plan, to protect trees identified for preservation, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City’s Certified Arborist. The plan shall include protective fencing and if appropriate, pre and post construction treatment measures at the discretion of the City’s Certified Arborist.
4. Landscaping, consistent with the final landscape plan approved by the City’s Certified Arborist, shall be planted in the areas adjacent to the new garages, along the north and west property lines, prior to the issuance of a final Certificate of Occupancy. If, due to the time of year, planting is not possible, a bond shall be posted with the City in the amount of 110% of the cost of materials and labor to assure plantings within 30 days of the start of the next planting season.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

6. **Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a pool house, elevated terrace and a pool on the property located at 1 Stonegate Road. A building scale variance is also required.**

**Property Owners: Cezary and Eva Jakubowski**  
**Representative: Diana Melichar, architect**

This item was postponed.

#### **OTHER ITEMS**

7. **Opportunity for the public to address the Historic Preservation Commission on non-agenda items.**

No testimony on non-agenda items was presented to the Commission.



**8. Additional information from staff.**

No additional items from staff were presented to the Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak  
Director of Community Development