

The City of Lake Forest
Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the March 21, 2018 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, March 21, 2018, at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

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

Commissioners absent: Bob Alfe

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 February 28, 2018 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The minutes of the February 28, 2018 meeting were approved as submitted.

3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for additions and alterations to the existing coach house on the property located at 301 N. Sheridan Road.

Property Owners: Davon and Yvonne Bruce
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.

Mr. Breseman introduced the petition and reviewed the history of the property. He noted that homes in the area of Maplewood and Sheridan Roads are an eclectic mix including English Manor style homes, 1950's ranch homes, and more traditional homes. He noted that Lake Forest College is located across Sheridan Road from the property. He noted the curvilinear, tree lined character of Maplewood Road. He stated that the Bruce's home was originally designed by Russell S. Walcott for Charles Glore adding that it is in the English Manor style and retains a high degree of architectural integrity. He stated that no changes have been made to the footprint of the original structure and the interior spaces remain uncompromised. He noted that the pool house was designed by James Otis Jr. in 1966 and has Tudor influences with some contemporary elements which were consistent with designs of the mid-sixties, but not appropriate to the original house. He stated that the coach house, which is the subject of this request, was designed by Quinn Christensen and constructed in the 1940's. He explained that

the coach house was originally designed as a two car garage, with gardener's and chauffeur's quarters. He stated that a third bay was added at a later date. He stated that the petitioners bought the property in 2014 and have many improvements to the property including renovating the pool house to achieve greater consistency in style with the original residence. He stated that the current proposal requests approval of renovations to and expansion of the coach house. He reviewed the proposed changes. He noted that the proposed shed dormers on the east and north elevations are consistent with the dormer at the service entry on the main house. He noted that all of the dormers are sited to avoid interrupting the main ridge of the coach house roof. He noted that the shed dormer proposed on the west elevation provides head room in the second floor space. He pointed out that the massing of the shed dormer is purposefully subdued to make it appropriate for the west elevation, the least visible elevation of the structure. He noted that an exterior stair, with a simple roof to offer protection from the weather is proposed to provide access to the second floor living space. He stated that the proposed changes to the structure create an appropriate composition, rhythm and balance. He pointed out that the garage doors are integrated with the new gable element and that the relocated openings on the structure relate to the interior spaces. He commented on the simple detailing and noted that the existing clay tiles on the roof will be reused. He stated that carriage doors will be used and the exterior materials will match the existing with copper gutters, stucco and clay roof tiles. He stated that casement windows will replace the existing and inconsistent double hung windows that exist today. He reviewed the demolition plan noting that the interior of the coach house will be gutted. He reviewed the roof plan noting the parts of the existing shed roof that will be surgically removed and replaced with the dormers. He reviewed various early studies and explained why the plan as presented was determined to be the best solution. He pointed out that the proposed massing retains the simple nature of the structure and picks up, in a limited way, the detailing on the existing house. He explained that historically, the house was most commonly approached from Sheridan Road but today, access is mostly from Maplewood Road and as a result, the connection between the coach house and the main house should be significant, but not overpowering. He reviewed each elevation, existing and proposed, and reviewed a section noting that the space is being built out within the existing roof line. He presented a colored rendering with views from the southeast and southwest.

Ms. Czerniak stated that no variances are requested. She commented that today the coach house is a tired structure and it is fortunate that the current owners see the value in restoring and expanding the structure. She stated that small residential units, in accessory buildings, offer a unique housing product helping to fill a gap in the types of units that are available in the community. She stated that the proposed changes will upgrade the structure while preserving its character as secondary to the main residence. She stated that the staff report included findings in support of the petition subject to standard conditions of approval.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Breseman clarified that there is one main gable with two dormers facing east, one facing north as a clerestory window

and a shed dormer facing west. He explained that adding a full second story would have overwhelmed the structure. He stated that instead, the changes proposed are quaint and completely within the existing roof structure and add to the richness of the property. He clarified that the color of window muntins and mullions are black similar to the windows used to upgrade the pool house. He reiterated that the existing windows are not appropriate.

Commissioner Sperry complimented the project.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the Commission has previously approved aluminum clad wood windows.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Breseman confirmed that the windows are wood on the inside and will be simulated divided lites, with a spacer bar and muntins on the interior and exterior. He confirmed that the main house has metal windows. He noted that the detailing will be the same as that used on the pool house windows. He stated that the windows will not look like a modern window.

Commissioner Wheeler complimented the choice of the windows observing that they are energy efficient. He observed that most of the dormers spring from a point below the ridge and noted some concern about the large dormer which springs from a point at the ridge.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Breseman explained that the main house is a two and three story structure which allows the opportunity to use the dormer elements in a different way. He noted that the coach house is a one-story element, with a steeply pitched roof and explained that the dormers as proposed fit within that context.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mrs. Bruce stated that she has no intention of removing or harming the Shagbark Hickory Tree.

Commissioner Gayle commented that in her opinion, the planned modifications will enhance the sad-looking structure. She stated support for the various changes proposed.

Commissioner Redfield stated support for the overall design as proposed. He agreed that the building today is plain noting that the planned changes will add interest.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Mr. Breseman clarified that there will be no change to the existing roof line length.

Chairman Grieve stated that it was helpful to see the rendering. He observed that the shed dormers appear a bit out of proportion and asked that they be further studied during the final design development process. He observed that the rendering shows a softer pitch on the top of the dormer which is much more subtle than what is portrayed

in the rendering.

In response to comments from Chairman Grieve, Mr. Breseman explained that on the east side, the roof is cut out to allow egress for the bedroom without having to push the dormer farther out, creating a more massive element. He reiterated that the dormer on the west elevation is functional and simple in nature. He stated that the east elevation relates directly to the original house and needs to have a slightly elevated level of detail.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve Mr. Breseman noted that the original blue prints for the coach house are from the 1940's.

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

Peggy Pandaleon, representing the Preservation Foundation, noted that the Foundation submitted a letter to the Commission in support of the project. She stated that the letter however urges caution in considering the appropriate level of detailing.

Tom Swarthout, 987 Maplewood Road, commented that he was involved in the pool house renovation noting that the windows proposed for the coach house were successfully used on the pool house. He stated that the windows in the main house are leaded glass but noted that lead can no longer be used and would not be appropriate for a secondary structure.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Pandaleon clarified that the Foundation's discussion centered on making sure that the coach house remains secondary to the main house. She added that the details and finishes should not be overdone. She pointed out that the detail on the windows on the garage door appears to be more than would historically appear on a secondary structure.

Hearing no further comments from the public, Chairman Grieve returned the petition to the Commission. Hearing no further comments or questions from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovations and expansion of the coach house based on the findings in the staff report, on the testimony presented and incorporating the Commission's deliberations. He added that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, *along with* the plans originally presented to the Commission, 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.

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
3. A landscape plan for the area immediately around the coach house shall be submitted along with plans submitted for permit. The plan shall detail existing vegetation that will be preserved and any additional landscaping proposed around the coach house.
4. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction. No construction vehicle parking is permitted on Sheridan Road or Maplewood Road due to the narrowness of the roads and proximity to the corner.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gayle and approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

OTHER ITEMS

4. 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.

5. Additional information from staff.

No additional items from staff were presented to the Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak
Director of Community Development