

The City of Lake Forest
Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the May 22, 2019 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

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

Commissioners absent: None

City staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development, Jennifer Baehr, Assistant Planner

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 April 24, 2019 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The minutes of the April 24, 2019 meeting were approved as submitted.

3. Lake Forest Preservation Foundation Annual Awards - Presented by Tom Gleason, Foundation Board member

Rehabilitation Award Winners

- 511 Rosemary Road
- 1950 Merritt Lane
- 5 E. Laurel Avenue

Infill/New Construction Award Winners

- Lake Forest Academy Science Center
- Middlefork Bridge

Preservation Award Winners

- Lake Forest Train Station

Heritage Award Winners

- 1035 N. Sheridan Road
- 408 Illinois Road

4. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a garage addition at 1050 Meadow Lane. A building scale variance is also requested.

Property Owner: Alton Shader

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.

Mr. Shader stated that he and his family have lived in Lake Forest since 2010. He explained that since they purchased the residence at 1050 Meadow Lane in 2012, they have wanted to build an additional garage bay to accommodate their family. He noted that his neighbors have expressed support for the garage addition.

Mr. Deegan stated that the property is adjacent to larger properties and located in a wooded area. He noted that the location of the proposed garage addition is adjacent to the existing garage, on the west side of the house, at the rear of the property. He added that the garage is not visible from the street. He stated that the majority of the area where the garage addition is proposed is on an existing paved surface. He explained that the existing garage will become a two-car bay and the proposed garage addition, a one-car bay. He added that a portion of the existing garage will be converted into a mudroom. He noted that no changes are proposed to the exterior of the main house. He stated that the exterior of the proposed garage addition will match the exterior materials of the existing house. He noted that the existing house is 14% over the allowable square footage for the property. He explained that the property owners were unaware at the time they purchased the house that it was over the allowable square footage in its existing condition. He stated that with the proposed garage addition, the residence will be 22% over the allowable square footage for the property. He noted that although the square footage overage appears to be significant, the property itself is small compared to surrounding properties and the addition in relation to the house is minimal.

Ms. Baehr stated that with the location of the garage addition at the rear of the property, behind the larger two-story mass of the house, it will only be minimally visible from surrounding properties and from the street. She stated that the square footage of the garage addition contributes to the overage of the existing residence and a building scale variance is requested as part of the petition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Deegan stated that the roof on the existing residence was recently replaced and will not be replaced as part of this project. He added that the pedestrian door adjacent to the garage is a wood door with glass in the upper portion. He noted that the new garage doors are proposed to be wood.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Baehr confirmed that

because the existing property is over the allowable square footage for the property, the proposed garage addition requires a building scale variance.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Mr. Deegan stated that the siding on the garage addition will tie into the siding on the existing garage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Deegan stated that the new garage doors are multi-panel overhead doors with glass along the top. He added that the garage door on the larger bay is 18 feet wide.

Commissioner Gayle stated that staking the footprint of the garage addition was helpful to understand how small the addition is compared to the existing house. She noted that because the yard is spacious, the garage addition does not seem to impact the visual character of the residence.

Commissioner Redfield expressed support for the petition.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Mr. Deegan stated that the garage doors will likely be painted white to match the color scheme of the house.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the square footage makes it appear that the garage addition is more significant than it is from a visual perspective.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-car garage addition at 1050 Meadow Lane and the associated building scale variance. He stated that the motion is based on the findings as detailed in the staff report and includes 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. Details of all exterior lighting shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shielded from view from

off the property. The dark streetscape character of the neighborhood shall be preserved.

4. 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. Due to the narrow street, all parking of construction vehicles shall occur on site.

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

5. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-story rear addition to the residence at 151 Ridge Lane.

Property Owners: Scott and Julie Carter

Representative: Diana Melichar, 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. Melichar introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. She explained that the request is for a one-story addition to a single family residence. She explained that the existing floor plan is very formal in its layout and does not easily accommodate modern day living. She stated that the house was built in 1930 in a classic French style. She noted that the existing floor plan is compartmentalized into many small rooms. She explained that previously, the home had undergone renovations that were incompatible with the original architecture. She stated that the current owners first approached the design team with the intention of reversing the previous renovations and converting the existing attached garage into a family room. She added that under that plan, the existing garage space is lost, and a new detached garage is needed. She explained that a number of design concepts were developed however, due to existing conditions, easements on the property and zoning setbacks, the options for a new detached garage resulted in awkward relationships with the existing house. She added that it was also determined that the schemes that repurpose the existing garage space and add a detached garage still do not address the programmatic deficiencies of the existing residence. She explained that exploration of retaining the existing garage and constructing a family room addition was explored. She explained that the proposed family room addition provides a connection between the formal and informal spaces of the house and creates a flow among the interior spaces. She added that the house, with the proposed addition, meets the City's building scale and zoning requirements. She stated that the addition is located between the two existing wings of the house, with a flat roof to minimize the visual impact in relation to the existing house. She noted that the exterior of the addition will match the materials of the existing house. She added that a conservatory skylight is proposed in the center of the addition. She stated that a new terrace is proposed on the east side of the house and the existing driveway will be slightly reconfigured to reduce some of the

paved surface. She explained that landscaping around the home will be maintained with some enhancement. She added that dead and overgrown vegetation will be removed and replaced with new plantings.

Ms. Baehr stated that the proposed addition will provide much needed space and make the house much more functional for the homeowners. She noted that by locating the addition within the recessed area on the rear of the house, the addition fits into the massing and overall form of the existing house without disrupting the symmetry and balance. She added that there are a three trees on the property, which are in poor condition, are proposed for removal. She stated that due to the poor condition of the trees, the City Arborist does not recommend that replacement inches be required. She stated that the proposed landscape plan shows a sufficient amount of plantings that will enhance the property and provide screening between this property and surrounding homes.

Commissioner Redfield expressed appreciation for the work that went into the plans and design of the addition.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Ms. Melichar stated the skylight is not expected to impact surrounding neighbors since it will be located between two projecting bays which help to minimize its visibility.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Melichar stated that the Cottonwood trees on the property will remain and will be protected during construction.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alfe, Ms. Melichar explained that the kitchen counter will setback from the exterior wall allow the windows to extend to the floor. She stated that the opening on the south side of the addition is a fixed glass door. She explained that the fireplace in the family room will be a direct vent and a chimney is not necessary. She confirmed that there are no changes proposed to the exterior of the existing house.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Melichar confirmed that the center openings on the addition are intentionally arched to match the existing arched windows on the house.

Commissioner Gibson stated that the residence on the property was designed by Robert Milmann.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Melichar stated that the roof material for the addition has not been decided yet. She explained that the skylight only slightly rises above the parapet wall.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Ms. Melichar explained that the plans that were initially developed were rejected because they did not accommodate all the property owners' needs, impacted healthy trees and required variances from the zoning setbacks.

Commissioner Gibson expressed support for the project.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Melichar stated that finials are proposed to add more visual interest to the addition.

Chairman Grieve stated that the proposed addition complements the existing home. He invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-story addition on the rear of the residence located at 151 Ridge Lane. He stated 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 additional 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, an assessment of the existing Cottonwood tree (#89 as labeled on the Tree Survey) shall be prepared by a Certified Arborist to evaluate potential impacts to the tree as a result of the new terrace on the property. If it is determined that the tree is likely to be negatively impacted, replacement inches shall be determined by the City's Certified Arborist and the required inches shall be planted on site or a payment in lieu of on-site planting shall be made to support plantings in the parkway in the vicinity of the property. All efforts shall be made to preserve and protect the Cottonwood tree.
3. 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.
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. All exterior lights shall be turned off no later than 11 p.m. except for motion activated security lighting.
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.

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

OTHER ITEMS

8. 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.

9. Additional information from staff.

Ms. Baehr explained that a working draft of the design guidelines for the City's Historic Districts and Local Landmark properties was included in the Commission's packets. She invited feedback from the Commission noting that document is very much "in process". She added that a Commission work session is scheduled as part of the next meeting to discuss the guidelines.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner