

The City of Lake Forest  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Proceedings of the September 23, 2020 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, September 23, 2020, at 6:30 p.m. This meeting was conducted remotely in compliance with Governor's Executive Order 2020-07, issued on March 16, 2020 that suspended certain Open Meetings Act provisions relating to in-person attendance by members of a public body due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present remotely: Chairman Bruce Grieve and Commissioners Carol Gayle, Jan Gibson, Steve Lamontagne, Ron Levitsky, Robin Petit, and Elizabeth Sperry

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 announced that an in-person meeting is not prudent or feasible due to the Covid-19 pandemic. He asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

**2. Consideration of the minutes of the August 26, 2020 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.**

The minutes of the August 26, 2020 meeting were approved with corrections as requested by Board member Gibson.

**3. Continued consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a single family residence and the design and siting of a replacement residence at 1020 Meadow Lane. Tree removal, landscape an exterior lighting will also be considered.**  
**Property Owners: Robert and Ann Krebs**  
**Representative: Doug Reynolds, 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. Reynolds introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. He noted that at the last meeting, the Commission indicated support for the demolition of the existing house. He stated that since the previous meeting the replacement residence was refined in response to the Commission's comments at the last meeting. He noted

that the window muntin pattern was modified and the architectural detailing on the gable ends and the dormers was refined. He added that substantial landscaping was added along the north side of the motor court to provide screening. He stated that the exterior materials are a combination of brick and horizontal siding. He explained that the site grading plan reflects that the home is raised slightly, approximately 18 inches above the existing grade, to improve drainage on the site. He stated that the landscape plan includes plantings around the foundation of the home and the perimeter of the property.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that the Commission previously considered this petition at the July meeting for the purpose of advising the petitioner on whether the demolition of the existing residence met the applicable criteria and to provide some preliminary direction on the replacement residence. She stated that the petition is now presented to the Commission action on the demolition and replacement residence. She explained that the overall massing and scale of the replacement residence is much like the existing home on the property adding that the traditional style of the residence is compatible with the surrounding historic neighborhood. She noted that the construction of the proposed replacement residence will require the removal of four trees. She added that two of trees proposed for removal are healthy and will require inch for inch replacement on the site. She stated that the staff report details findings in support of the demolition of the existing residence based on the demolition criteria and findings in support of the replacement residence based on the standards of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

In response to questions from Commissioner Levitsky, Mr. Reynolds explained that the proposed residence will have a whitewash brick exterior that matches the existing home on the property. He stated that the proposed replacement residence is intended to be similar in character to the existing home.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Reynolds explained that the proposed grading plan does not involve significant changes to the site, only some slight modifications to improve drainage. He noted that all of the stormwater from the roof will be directed to the storm sewer. He stated that an asphalt driveway with a brick paver border is proposed. He added that the proposed walkways and terrace will be either bluestone or a paver material. He stated that the proposed motor court is smaller than the existing motor court on the property.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Reynolds explained that wood siding with a six inch exposure is proposed, noting however that he would prefer to use a composite material for the siding. He added that a black slate roof is proposed. He stated that the windows will be charcoal gray. He explained that the driveway as currently configured exceeds 16 feet in width where the driveway meets the motor court at the front of the house and will be reduced to meet zoning requirements.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Reynolds confirmed that double hung windows are proposed. He explained that using a composite

material for the siding is preferred for ease of maintenance. He noted that the composite materials available today are comparable in appearance to natural wood.

Ms. Czerniak noted that the standards of the Historic Preservation Ordinance strongly encourage the use of natural materials.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Reynolds confirmed that the entire roof will be slate. He clarified that the window muntins will be charcoal gray to match the frame color. He stated that the detailing of the gable ends was refined since the previous meeting to reflect a more traditional detail. He confirmed that the existing hedge at the front of the property will remain. He explained that surface water on the site will be redirected around the house to the northeast.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Reynolds stated that the existing fence will be replaced with the exception of the stockade fence on the north side of the property.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Mr. Reynolds stated that the front door is recessed by approximately 4 feet. He explained that if the front entry was modified to have a more shallow recess, it may become lost between the two flanking gable elements.

Chairman Grieve suggested further study of the muntin pattern for the smaller dormer windows with consideration of the size of the window opening. Hearing no further questions from the Commission, he invited public testimony. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioners Petit and Levitsky expressed support for the petition.

Commissioner Lamontagne expressed appreciation for the changes made to the design in response to the Commission's earlier comments.

Commissioner Sperry stated support for the project. She suggested that the Commission have a general discussion in the future about the stark white and black color palette that is currently popular.

Commissioner Gayle commended the petitioner for incorporating elements of the existing home on the property into the design of the replacement residence.

Commissioner Gibson expressed support for the changes made to the dormers and architectural detailing. She stated that natural materials should be used.

Chairman Grieve summarized the Commission's comments. He acknowledged that the petitioner was responsive to the Commission's input at the earlier meeting. He observed that the existing house is charming and fits in well with the surrounding

neighborhood and the replacement residence possesses those same qualities. He suggested that a discussion on alternative materials be scheduled for the next Commission workshop. He acknowledged the architect's preference for composite materials but noted that composite materials have not previously been approved in this neighborhood, in the heart of the Historic District. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of the existing residence at 1020 Meadow Lane based on the findings detailed in the staff report.

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

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement residence based on the findings presented in the staff report, subject to following conditions.

1. During the final design development process, give consideration to the appropriate depth for the recess of the front door balancing the need to shelter guests with the overall visual appearance of the front facade.
2. During the final design development process, conduct further study of the proportions and muntin pattern of the windows in the dormers.
3. Natural materials shall be used for all siding, trim, fascia boards, soffits and rake boards.
4. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with the refinements as directed. Any further refinements made in response to direction from the Commission 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 Commission 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 Commission'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 provide for the required 35 replacement inches on site to the extent possible using good forestry practices. If all replacement tree inches cannot be accommodated on the site, the number of remaining inches for which a payment in lieu of on site planting will be required must be noted on the plan. The full payment in lieu of on site plantings is required prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. If during construction

additional trees on the site are compromised in the opinion of the City's Certified Arborist, additional replacement inches or payment in lieu of on site planting may be required.

6. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect any trees identified for preservation during construction as well as trees on neighboring properties, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. In addition, for any trees that, as determined by the City Arborist, may be impacted by construction activity, a plan for protection, including pre and post construction treatments as may be appropriate, must be prepared by an independent Certified Arborist and submitted with the building permit application. The tree protection plan shall be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
7. Details of exterior lighting shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures are required and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property. The right to night, dark sky goals shall be satisfied. All exterior lights, except for motion detection lights, shall be on timers set to turn off no later than 11 p.m.
8. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. Due to the narrowness of Meadow Lane, no parking of construction or contractor vehicles is permitted on the street.

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

**4. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a single detached garage, additions on the rear of the existing home, and associated exterior alterations at 540 Crab Tree Lane. A building scale variance is also requested.**

**Property Owners: John and Cindy Nedeau**

**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 petition.

Mr. Nedeau introduced the project and stated that he and his wife have owned the property for six years and have been respectful stewards of the historic residence. He explained that the proposed additions and alterations will greatly improve the functionality of the home but also preserve the historic elements of the residence.

Mr. Deegan stated that the residence is a courtyard style house and was designed by Stanley Anderson. He shared the original construction plans for the home. He explained that the proposed additions and alterations are entirely on the rear of the home and are not visible from the street. He stated that the proposed additions and alterations will create a symmetrical rear façade, consistent with the appearance of the front façade. He stated that a detached garage is proposed at the end of the existing driveway which will create an enclosed pool area in the backyard. He stated that the existing attached garage will remain. He added that the two existing garage doors will be replaced with a single garage door. He gave an overview of the site grading plan. He presented photographs of the existing residence. He stated that the existing boiler room on the east side of the house is not used and will be converted into a living room. He added that a brick chimney is proposed in the new living room. He stated that the proposed kitchen addition is located on the northwest side of the house. He noted that the existing second floor of the home only has one bedroom. He explained that the proposed modifications to the existing shed dormers will provide additional space to allow for a second bedroom. He reviewed the proposed interior layout of the residence. He explained that the new windows and architectural detailing will match the existing. He added that the additions and detached garage will have wood shingle roofs, clapboard siding, and copper gutters and downspouts.

Ms. Baehr explained that this request involves construction of a single detached garage, additions on the rear of the residence, exterior alterations to the existing residence, and a building scale variance. She explained that the existing attached garage is relatively small compared to the average size of a modern two car garage and is not sufficient for two vehicles and storage space. She stated that the proposed detached garage will provide the homeowners with the additional square footage needed to accommodate parking and storage. She explained that the petitioner is proposing an addition on the northwest side of the residence for a more functional kitchen, in a centralized location in the home. She stated that the petitioner is also proposing to convert the existing boiler room on the northeast side of the home into a living room. She added that a small addition to the east side of the house is proposed to make the converted space functional as a living room. She explained that there are two existing single shed dormers on the rear elevation and the petitioner is proposing to connect the dormers to create one large shed dormer to create more square footage on the second floor for an additional bedroom. She stated that the exterior alterations proposed around the home are intended to enhance the appearance of the residence and improve some of the less compatible changes that have been made to the residence over the years. She stated that a building scale variance is requested to allow for construction of the proposed additions. She noted that the existing residence complies with the allowable square footage for the property. She explained that the additions in total add 442 square feet to the existing home, which exceeds the allowable square footage by 186 square feet. She explained that a review of the criteria for a building scale variance is included in the staff report and based on staff's evaluation, the criteria for a building scale variance are met. She stated that the proposed additions and alterations are compatible with the character of the existing residence and a recommendation for

approval and findings in support of the petition is included in the staff report.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the proposed additions complement the existing residence very well.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Deegan stated that the existing kitchen is located in the southwest corner of the home. He added that the kitchen was originally designed as a servant's kitchen. He explained that a new kitchen will be added on the northwest side of the home, the existing kitchen will remain and be part of an in-law suite. He stated that the detached garage is in compliance with the required setbacks for an accessory structure.

Commissioner Petit thanked the petitioner for staking the proposed locations of the additions and detached garage. She stated that the proposed alterations are in keeping with the original design of the home.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Deegan explained that the floor to ceiling windows in the kitchen addition are in the breakfast nook and will not interfere with the counters and cabinetry.

In response to comments from Commissioner Levitsky, Mr. Deegan explained that the property owners have discussed the plans with both the east and west neighbors, and both are supportive of the project. He explained due to the orientation of the existing garage and driveway configuration, replacing the two single doors with one larger door will make the garage more functional. He stated that the requested overage in square footage is equal to 2.75% of the allowable square footage for the property.

Commissioner Gibson stated that in 1929, architect Stanley Anderson did a complete renovation of the residence. She stated that the proposed design is attractive. She noted that the placement of the detached garage appears to work well.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Deegan explained that connecting the existing dormers on the rear elevation allows for additional space on the second floor without altering the front façade of the home. He added that the height of the dormer will not change. He stated that the width of the chimney on the detached garage can be reduced to be more consistent with the scale of the garage structure. He stated that the current proposal does not include the replacement of the existing siding due to cost considerations.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Deegan explained that the flat roof on the boiler room will be removed and replaced with a gable roof to match the roof forms on the rest of the house. He added that a small bump out is proposed on the east elevation to create space for a new fireplace.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Deegan stated that the

footprint of the sunroom on the rear of the home is not proposed to change. He explained that the existing sunroom windows will be removed and replaced with French doors. He stated that the new windows will match the existing aluminum clad windows. He explained that the existing chimney in the boiler room will be removed and the brick reused for the new chimney. He stated that it is not clear if the existing half round windows on the home are original. He added that the half round windows proposed on the new gable ends on the rear elevation will match the size and detailing of the existing half round windows on other areas of the home.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited public testimony.

Rommy Lopat, 410 Woodland Road, stated that the proposed alterations on the rear elevation are well designed.

In response to questions from Ms. Lopat, Mr. Deegan explained that the size of the new windows on the rear elevation are consistent with the proportions of the existing windows. He stated that the boxwoods proposed along the rear elevation of the living room are a continuation of the existing landscaping and intended to soften the hardscape in the rear yard around the pool area.

Hearing no further public testimony, Chairman Grieve invited comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gayle expressed support for the petition. She added that she is supportive of the requested building scale variance.

Commissioner Gibson agreed with Commissioner Gayle. She explained that although there are large expanses of windows on the rear elevation it does not appear to be problematic.

Commissioner Lamontagne commended the petitioner on the design of the additions and alterations.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that the design is successful from both an aesthetic and functional perspective. He stated support for the building scale variance.

Commissioners Petit and Sperry agreed with the comments of the other Commissioners.

Chairman Grieve commended the petitioners noting that the proposed alterations appear to be driven by the original design of the home. He added that the removal of some elements of the existing home that appear out of place helps to enhance the overall appearance of the home.

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



motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a single detached garage, additions on the rear of the existing home, associated exterior alterations and a building scale variance based on the findings presented in the staff report, subject to following conditions.

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 identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
3. Details of exterior lighting shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures should be provided and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property. The dark streetscape character 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.

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

**5. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new residence on a vacant lot located at 774 Washington Road. The Commission will also consider the associated site plan, proposed tree removal and the landscape plan.**

**Property Owners: George and Mary Sperzel**

**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 petition.

Mr. Sperzel introduced the project. He explained that he and his wife have been looking for a new home in Lake Forest for some time and when the lots in this

subdivision became available, they immediately purchased one. He stated that he and his wife attended every public hearing during the subdivision process. He stated that they very thoughtfully considered the design of the residence with respect to its historic setting and are excited to present the proposal to the Commission.

Mr. Deegan stated that the site has a few features remaining from the original property including the original curb cut and foundations of walls around the driveway. He added that these features are incorporated as part of the plans for the new residence. He explained that the front yard setback follows the curve of Washington Road and the home is oriented at an angle on the site. He stated that the site drains naturally from the back of the property toward Washington Road and is fairly flat in comparison to Lot 2, which features significant grade change across the site. He stated that the existing curb cut will remain in its current location and a second curb cut is proposed on the southern part of the property. He stated that a circular drive is proposed and works nicely with the length of the front façade of the residence. He explained that the new curb cut is centered between two parkway trees adding that precautions will be taken to protect the parkway trees. He stated that the hedge along the street will be maintained and filled in as needed to create a continuous green barrier along the front yard. He reviewed the floor plans. He noted that the floor plan consists of various projecting and recessed masses that provide depth and articulation to the elevations of the home. He stated that the residence is a Cottage style home and incorporates elements of that style. He noted that elements such as bay windows, dormers, shutters and flower boxes are proposed. He stated that the detached garage gives the impression of a folly-like structure. He stated that the main mass of the home is brick and the secondary forms have a wood clapboard exterior. He noted that the roof is a combination of wood shingle and standing seam copper. He added that white aluminum clad windows are proposed.

Ms. Baehr stated that the property is Lot 1 of the Swift Subdivision and is located near the intersection of Washington Road and Westminster. She stated that as currently proposed, the house is generally in the center of the lot with a single detached garage structure to the north and a circular drive at the front of the home with two curb cuts. She explained that the curb cut on the south side of the site is proposed between two healthy, heritage, City parkway trees. She stated that the petitioner worked with a Certified Arborist to review the location of the curb cut in relation to the parkway trees and provided a maintenance plan for the trees with the hope of avoiding damaging impacts to the trees. She stated that further consideration of the impacts of a second curb cut is necessary. She noted that a motor court is proposed on the north side of the home between the attached two car garage and detached garage. She noted that the motor court requires further study to determine whether it is functional. She stated that the home presents a one and a half story massing with an asymmetrical front façade facing northeast, toward Washington Road. She stated that the muntin pattern should be refined in an effort to be more consistent with the selected architectural style. She stated that the proposed material palette consists of high quality, natural materials that are consistent with the style of the home

and the surrounding neighborhood. She explained that based on staff's review of the petition, the standards of the Historic Preservation Ordinance appear to be met and findings in support of the petition are detailed in the staff report with a number of conditions recommended pertaining to preservation of trees, further study of the driveway and motor court and refinement of the windows.

In response to questions from Commissioner Levitsky, Mr. Deegan explained that the siting of the house on the property was largely driven by the curved nature of Washington Road and unusual shape of the lot. He noted that the view of the house from the street will be obscured by the existing hedge. He stated that the copper roof on the bay window is a traditional element that is found on many historic homes.

Commissioner Lamontagne expressed concern about the large expanses of glass on the rear elevation given the proximity to neighboring homes.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Deegan explained that a four season room and eating area are proposed on the rear of the home and the owners desire many window in these areas. He added that the rear yard will be landscaped to provide screening. He explained that given the orientation of the home in relation to the surrounding homes, the rear elevation will not directly impact any neighbors. He stated that the impervious surface on the site is equal to 24 percent. He stated that the driveway will be asphalt with paver aprons and a paver border. He explained that instead of an attached three car garage, an attached two car garage and a single detached garage are proposed to avoid the appearance of a large garage mass. He added that the detached garage is tucked away and is set behind the front of the house and will not be prominent from the street. He explained that the proposed color palette includes whitewashed brick, an off-white color for the siding, and a bright white color for trim.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Czerniak stated that the subdivision limits Lots 2 and 3 to a single curb cut, but Lots 1 and 4 are not prohibited from having two curb cuts. She stated that the subdivision requires preservation of significant and healthy trees. She stated that the location of the proposed new curb cut will need to be reviewed carefully. She stated that if the curb cut is installed and the parkway trees are negatively impacted, the property owners could be responsible for replacement inches.

In response to questions from Commission Sperry, Mr. Deegan stated that one of the primary goals of the project was to create a circular driveway with two curb cuts. He added that the driveway as proposed meets zoning requirements. He agreed to consider incorporating permeable materials to lessen the amount of impervious surface on the site. He explained that if the detached garage was eliminated and instead, a third bay was added to the attached garage, the amount of impervious surface would increase and more trees would be impacted. He stated that as requested by staff, an auto-turn study will be completed and the configuration of the driveway and motor court refined as needed. He stated that the location of the front

entry columns are driven by the placement of the circular window and sidelights at the front door. He explained that the use and placement of various elements on the front of home and the fenestration pattern are intended to reflect the asymmetrical and eclectic qualities of the Cottage architectural style. He stated that the proposed color palette is not intended to be a stark, bright white but instead, a soft white, closer to gray.

Commissioner Sperry expressed concern about the large expanses of windows on the rear elevation and the color palette of the home given that the new residence on the adjacent property is also white.

Commissioner Gayle agreed with Commissioner Sperry's comments. She also expressed concern about the amount of impervious surface and the potential for impacts to the parkway trees and trees on the site.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Deegan stated that he does not believe light spillover will be an issue. He explained that the driveway was originally wider, but was reduced to 14 feet and complies with zoning requirements.

Commissioner Petit stated that the front elevation could benefit from some simplification and agreed that the expanse of windows on the rear elevation should be reduced.

Commissioner Gibson expressed concerns about the second curb cut and the design of the shed dormers. She suggested further study and refinement of the window and transom proportions. She comments that the spaces along the rear elevation are likely to be the most used spaces and, as a result, light spillover from the large expanses of glass is likely. She suggested further study of the pattern of solids to voids around the home and the muntin patterns. She added that further study of the siting and orientation of the detached garage is needed.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Deegan stated that the house is 31 feet tall, and the maximum allowable height for the house is 40 feet. He added that the house on Lot 2 is 28 feet tall.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited public testimony.

Rommy Lopat, 410 Woodland Road, agreed with the concerns raised by the Commission. She suggested that the walls at the driveway should be refined to have an appearance of age. She noted that the placement of the walls highlights the garage instead of the entrance to the home. She stated that the detached garage appears more like a storage shed than a garage and does not possess the same elegance of the proposed residence. She stated that given the likely impacts to mature trees, many trees will need to be planted on the site to replace the lost canopy over time. She suggested that study and refinement of the window muntin

patterns, the front porch and the dormers are needed. She stated that there does not appear to be a functional way to access the backyard from the rear of the home.

Ms. Luce, 111 Ridge Lane commented that the home appears busy with many different elements, rooflines and fenestration.

Hearing no further public testimony, Chairman Grieve invited comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson stated that in her opinion, there are many issues that need further study and refinement.

Commissioner Petit agreed with Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gayle encouraged the petitioner to consider the Commission's comments and in response, make modifications to the design of the residence and site plan.

Commissioner Sperry agreed with comments made by the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Lamontagne expressed support for the overall architectural style of the house noting that some additional study and refinement is needed. He stated that the second curb cut appears appropriate for the site and encouraged further study to determine the appropriate location for the curb cut and the proper configuration for the overall driveway. He stated that a more detailed landscape plan should be provided for the Commission's review.

Commissioner Levitsky agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne's comments.

Chairman Grieve summarized the Commission's comments and concerns. He suggested that consideration be given to reducing the amount of impervious surface on the site and the incorporation of alternative hardscape materials to soften the appearance of the home. He commented that the Cottage architectural style does not appear to be maintained in the design of the rear elevation. Hearing no further comments, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Lamontagne made a motion to continue the petition to allow further study and refinement of the design and to allow the petitioner to respond to the comments, questions and discussion of the Commission to include the following.

1. Conduct further study of the site plan as it relates to the location of the detached garage, the south curb cut, the amount of impervious surface and preservation of significant trees.
2. Study the large expanses of glass around the house and make refinements to reflect a more consistent rhythm of solids to voids around the house and to

minimize the potential for light spillover to neighboring properties and the streetscape.

3. Study the various elevations in an effort to enhance and more fully reflect the chosen Cottage style consistently around the home including, but not limited to, reconsideration of the muntin pattern.
4. Consider simplification of the front elevation and conduct further study of the front entry element to assure proper alignment of the front door and sidelights in relation to the columns and the porch.
5. Consider using an alternate to asphalt for the driveway aprons and other parts of the driveway to minimize the amount of hardscape on the site overall and to soften the appearance of the two curb cuts from the streetscape.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sperry 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.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Assistant Planner