

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the February 24, 2021 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, February 24, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. This meeting was conducted remotely in compliance with the 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: Acting Chairman Jan Gibson and Commissioners Carol Gayle, Steve Lamontagne, Ron Levitsky, Robin Petit, and Elizabeth Sperry

Commissioners absent: Bruce Grieve

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

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

Acting Chairman Gibson reviewed the meeting procedures followed by the Commission and announced that the meeting was being conducted remotely due to the Covid-19 pandemic. She asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes of the October 28, 2020 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Consideration of the minutes of the October 28, 2020 meeting was postponed.

3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve a single story addition at the rear of the residence and an addition at the east end of the residence to accommodate an attached two-car garage. The property is located at 620 Lake Road.

Property Owners: Jeff and Kelly Brincat

Representative: Edward Deegan, architect

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

Mr. Brincat stated that he and his family have lived in their home for 11 years. He noted that they were drawn to the home because of its classic architecture. He stated that their goal is to improve the livability of their home while maintaining its classic character.

Mr. Deegan stated that the property is located at the south end of Lake Road and is approximately 4 acres in size. He added that the existing residence is designed in the Georgian Revival style. He stated that the house is sited perpendicular to the street. He explained that there are two driveway entrances to the property from Lake Road; the northern driveway which directs guests to the front of the home and the southern driveway provides access to a motor court near the side door of the house, the carriage house, and a detached garage. He stated that the home reflects many elements of the Georgian style such as two-story Corinthian columns, brick jack arches above the openings, an articulated cornice and limestone sills. He stated that the east end of the home, closest to Lake Road, presents a secondary, smaller mass in comparison to the larger primary mass of the residence. He added that the secondary mass originally served as the living quarters for staff that worked on the property. He noted that the secondary mass features some Georgian architectural detailing, but is not as ornate or elaborate as the main residence. He said that the residence was built in 1925 and originally had a parapet roof, common for the Georgian style. He noted that a pitched roof was later added to the home and remains today. He stated that the proposed garage addition is on the east side of the home, partially in the area of the existing motor court. He added that on the south side of the home, between the garage addition and the existing residence, an Orangery is proposed. He noted that the kitchen will be reconfigured to improve the connection between the indoor space and the rear yard. He explained that the garage addition will have jack arches above the windows and doors, limestone sills and areas of recessed brick to replicate the detailing on the existing residence. He stated that the east facing garage doors will have windows in the upper portion. He stated that Mariani Landscaping is developing a plan for some enhanced landscaping on the site near the proposed garage and near the terrace and Orangery. He noted that a few evergreen trees will be removed to allow for the proposed construction.

Ms. Baehr stated that the home is located on the west side of Lake Road and is oriented to the north. She noted that the rear yard is south of the house and is bordered by a ravine. She stated that the proposed garage and mudroom additions are located on the east side of the residence and are a single story with a brick exterior and classic style detailing to match the residence. She explained that the garage doors face east toward the street adding that although street facing garage doors are not typically encouraged, in this case, the garage doors relate to the service entrance, carriage house and the detached garage all on the east side of the house. She stated that if the garage doors face north or south, the most prominent elevation of the home would be impacted. She stated that an Orangery is proposed on the rear elevation of the home as a small, single-story element tucked into an existing recessed area. She added that the Orangery is proposed as an open and light filled space and is an element commonly found on Georgian style homes. She explained that the additions will require the removal of six trees and based on the size, species and conditions of the trees, a total of 57 replacement tree inches will be required to be planted on site. She added that the petitioner provided a conceptual landscape plan that reflects new plantings around the proposed additions, including

new shade and evergreen trees. She noted that based on the landscape plan provided, the total amount of replacement inches is not yet fully satisfied and noted that as the landscape plan is further developed, additional plantings will need to be incorporated to satisfy the required replacement inches. She stated that there is a Conservation Easement on the property held by Lake Forest Open Lands. She noted that the owners will need to seek approval from Open Lands before a building permit is issued for the project. She noted that overall, the proposed additions are compatible with the character of the existing residence and the additions are sited in a way that avoids significant visual impact to the residence and site. She added that the staff report offers findings in support of the petition and a recommendation for approval of the petition.

Commissioner Gayle complimented the additions.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked for more detail on the proposed windows and doors.

In response, Mr. Deegan stated that aluminum clad windows and doors are proposed with simulated divided lites. He added that the new windows will match the profile and muntin pattern of the openings for the existing wood windows. He stated that the window trim will match the detailing found on the existing home.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the potential for light spillover from the proposed Orangery.

In response, Mr. Deegan stated that the Orangery is proposed as a way to allow more natural light into the home. He noted that the Orangery provides improved access to the south lawn from the home adding that currently, the only access to the south lawn is at the center of the house. He stated that the Orangery is located between two larger forms and will not be visible from Lake Road and only minimally visible from the homes to the south limiting any off site light impacts.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the proportions of the windows on the garage addition in comparison to those on the residence.

In response, Mr. Deegan stated that the windows on the garage addition will be the same size as the windows on the existing secondary mass on the east side of the residence.

Commissioner Levitsky asked how the proposed additions will serve to preserve the existing residence.

In response, Ms. Baehr stated that the additions are proposed to make the home more functional for the current and future homeowners helping to assure its preservation long into the future.

Commissioner Sperry questioned how the proposed addition will appear from the street.

In response, Mr. Deegan stated that the only view of the garage doors from Lake Road is through the existing, narrow opening in the brick wall which provides access to the service area of the property.

Commissioner Sperry asked about the proposed use of aluminum clad windows.

In response, Ms. Baehr stated that wood windows with aluminum cladding on the exterior are proposed and have been approved by the Commission in the past.

Acting Chairman Gibson asked for more detail on the brick that will be used for the garage and the trim material.

In response, Mr. Deegan stated that to the extent possible, the existing brick from the garden walls will be reused. He stated that the trim on the garage and the pilasters on the Orangery will be wood.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Acting Chairman Gibson invited public testimony. Hearing none, she invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the proposed additions are complementary to the residence.

Commissioner Levitsky commended the petitioner on the minimal increase in impervious surface on the site.

Commissioner Lamontagne commended the homeowners for their stewardship of the property. He stated that it is notable that the proposed additions result in very little change to the property yet serve to bring the home up to today's living standards and accommodate today's lifestyle. He noted the importance of executing the detailing well, consistent with the detailing on the historic residence.

Commissioner Gayle also commended the petitioners for minimizing the increase in the amount of impervious surface on the site. She stated that the proposed additions are very tastefully designed. She that expressed continued concern about the potential for light spillover from the Orangery and asked that the petitioner be mindful of the potential for impacts on neighbors.

Acting Chairman Gibson stated that the additions appear appropriately subordinate in relation to the existing residence. She added that initially, she was concerned about the large expanses of glass on the Orangery but given that the rear of the home is more than 300 feet away from the neighbor to the south, it appears that the potential for impact is minimal. She stated that the landscape plan needs to be

developed further. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Gayle made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for a single story addition at the rear of the residence, the Orangery, and an addition at the east end of the residence to accommodate an attached two-car garage. She stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report and is 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 final 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 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 57 replacement inches on site. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
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 Levitsky and approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve a single story pool pavilion in the rear yard of the property located at 1150 Lake Road. A building scale variance is also requested.

Property Owner: Mark Campana

Representatives: Paul Konstant and Patrick Rauber, architects

Acting Chairman Gibson asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, she invited a presentation from the petition.

Mr. Rauber introduced the project and design team. He gave an overview of the property. He noted that there are three structures on the site; the main residence, a detached garage and a coach house with an attached greenhouse. He stated that there is a tennis court in the southwest corner of the property that is proposed to be removed. He explained that an in-ground pool and pool house are proposed generally in the location of the existing tennis court. He stated that a building scale variance is requested. He explained that the residence on the property was built prior to the adoption of the building scale limitations and the existing structures on the site exceed the maximum allowable square footage based on the current City Code. He stated that the existing structures on the property do not visually appear overbuilt. He stated that the overage results primarily from the steeply pitched roof forms since some of the volume space within the roofs is included in the current building scale calculation. He noted that the existing residence and other structures on the site are only minimally visible from the street and from neighboring properties due to the heavy vegetation on and around the site. He reviewed the project goals: to design the pool house in a manner that is compatible with the architecture of the residence and minimizing the additional square footage on the property. He noted that the proposed pool house totals 550 square feet and results in a 7 percent increase to the existing square footage overage. He stated that by removing the tennis court, there is a significant reduction in the amount of impervious surface on the property which will be beneficial from a drainage perspective. He stated that a civil engineer has been engaged by the petitioners to develop a drainage plan for the property.

Mr. Konstant described the proposed pool house noting that it is mostly open with only a small enclosed area for a bathroom and the pool equipment. He stated that the exterior walls of the pool house are brick and the roof will be wood shingle to match the existing residence. He added that the roof forms and pitches on the pool house are designed to match the roof on the main residence. He explained that the pool and pool house are proposed in the southwest corner of the property to maintain views across the site and to balance the configuration of structures on the site. He stated that the pool house is 16 feet and 8 inches from the west property line and 20 feet from the south property line. He noted that an accessory structure is permitted ten feet from the property line however, because the pool house will house the pool equipment, it must be located a minimum of 20 feet from the property line. He stated that at its tallest point, the pool house is 19 feet tall.

Mr. Ball reviewed that a landscape buffer is proposed in the southwest corner of the property for privacy and screening. He explained that the low point of the property is along the west property line, near the proposed pool house. He stated that the tennis court is causing some drainage issues because it does not allow stormwater to flow to

the east, following the grade of the property. He noted that gravel is planned around the pool house along with a French drain to address drainage. He noted that the base of the patio will be a compacted, clean stone which will provide some stormwater detention.

Ms. Baehr stated that the property is on the west side of Lake Road and noted that the existing residence and detached garage were built in 1959 and designed by architect Ike Colburn. She stated that the guest house was added in 1992. She explained that the petitioner recently purchased the property and is proposing a pool and pool house generally in the location of the existing tennis court, at the southwest corner of the property. She stated that the proposed pool house is a single story, mostly open structure and is designed to be compatible with the style of the existing residence. She stated that a building scale variance is requested and explained that based on the City's current calculation method, the existing conditions on the property exceed the maximum allowable square footage by 39 percent. She noted that the steeply pitched roof forms of the existing structures contribute significantly to the overage. She stated that the proposed pool house contributes an additional 550 square feet to the existing overage. She noted that the covered terrace on the pool house is a design element and is not counted toward the overall square footage. She stated that with the proposed pool house, the total square footage of buildings on the property is 11,136 square feet and exceeds the allowable square footage by 3,511 square feet equal to a 46 percent overage. She explained that the total overage is significant and greater than overages typically presented to the Commission. She noted however, an overage of this scale is not unprecedented in cases where significant historic homes are being updated to accommodate new buyers. She stated that construction of the pool house will impact a Birch tree at the northwest corner of the structure and several smaller trees that are in poor condition located on the west and south sides of the pool house. She explained that the proposed construction access on the site as shown on the conceptual landscape plan will impact a maple tree but is located to minimize impact to heritage oak trees. She added that if determined to be necessary by the City Arborist, additional measures will to protect the heritage trees during construction. She stated that staff received letters from neighboring property owners expressing concern about the visual impact of the proposed pool house adding that the letters were provided to the Commission and the petitioner. She stated that since the staff report and recommendation were prepared, additional information was submitted. She stated that there may be value in exploring some alternatives for the siting of the pool house in an effort to minimize visual impacts to the neighboring property.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked for clarification on how the square footage of the accessory structures and design elements are calculated.

In response, Ms. Baehr reviewed that the residence, a portion of the detached garage and the entire guest house and greenhouse are included in the overall square footage for the site. She noted that the open portion of the proposed pool house is considered a design element and does not contribute any square footage to

the calculation.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the brick proposed for the pool house.

In response, Mr. Konstant stated that salvaged common brick will be used and he stated confidence that a close match to the existing residence is available.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the change in impervious surface.

In response, Mr. Rauber stated that the amount of impervious surface on the site will be reduced by approximately 4,000 square feet due to the removal of the tennis court. He added that removing the tennis court will allow water to flow away from the west property line.

Commissioner Petit questioned why the pool is not sited closer to the existing patio at the rear of the home.

In response, Mr. Konstant explained that they considered siting the pool and pool house closer to the rear patio however significant trees would be impacted. He added that the new owners do not want a tennis court so the decision was made to locate the pool and pool house generally in a portion of the footprint of the tennis.

Commissioner Petit asked about the hardscape proposed for the pool deck.

In response, Mr. Konstant stated that the pool deck will be a light color stone.

Commissioner Petit asked about the landscaping.

In response, Mr. Konstant explained that there is existing landscaping along the property lines and noted that additional plantings are planned near the pool and pool house.

Mr. Ball added that a 14 foot arborvitae hedge is proposed along the south and west sides of the pool house structure.

Commissioner Gayle asked whether alternate locations for the pool and pool house were considered.

In response, Mr. Konstant stated that the petitioners are willing to consider shifting the siting pool and pool house but desire to keep them generally in the southwest corner of the property to avoid impacting trees on the site.

Commissioner Sperry commended the petitioner for reducing the amount of impervious surface on the site. She expressed concern about the proximity of the pool house and pool to the south and west property lines.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about opportunities to reduce the size of the pool house or make it more of an open structure.

In response, Mr. Konstant stated that landscaping is planned along the property lines to mitigate views of the pool and pool house from neighboring properties. He stated that only a small portion of the roof of the pool house will be visible above an arborvitae hedge that will be planted along the property lines.

Mr. Ball added that the pool house is located to the east of the neighbor's property so sunlight will reach the grass and vegetation in the rear yard of the property.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about noise impacts to the neighbors from the pool equipment.

In response, Mr. Konstant stated that the pool equipment is located inside the pool house and enclosed by brick walls to mitigate the sound.

Acting Chairman Gibson asked how the bathroom will be served with sewer.

In response, Mr. Konstant confirmed that the bathroom in the pool house will be connected to the sanitary sewer that serves the house.

Acting Chairman Gibson asked about the dimensions of the pool and the possibility of swapping the pool and pool house.

In response, Mr. Konstant stated that the pool is 60 feet long for swimming laps. He explained that by siting the pool east of the pool house, the pool house serves as a buffer from the activity in the pool for the neighbor to the west.

Acting Chairman Gibson asked about the type of plantings proposed around the pool area.

In response, Mr. Ball stated that Green Giant arborvitae are proposed because they tolerate a wet environment. He added that a rain garden is proposed on the north side of the pool house.

Acting Chairman Gibson asked for more information about the square footage overage.

In response, Mr. Konstant explained that the existing residence is 39 percent over the maximum allowable square footage due in large part to the height of the structure. He stated that the proposed pool house adds only a small amount of square footage to the existing overage.

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

Nicole Korczak, 1133 Elm Tree Road, stated that the pool house is very attractive and the design is in keeping with the spirit of the original residence. She stated that the Board's concern about the drainage is encouraging. She noted that she has spent considerable money trying to address the flooding in her backyard which she believes is the result of the impervious surface of the tennis court on the 1150 Lake Road property. She explained that she does not want to preclude her new neighbors from improving their property by adding a pool, but she has concerns about the current proposal. She expressed concern about the increase in square footage and mass to the property and the impact the pool house will have on her backyard and on the view from her home. She stated that her house sits on the back half of her property because a ravine is located in her front yard and as a result, her backyard is very small in comparison to the yards of the neighboring properties. She explained that the location of the pool house as currently proposed will obscure almost 90 percent of the views from her backyard. She stated that she provided pictures along with her letter provided to illustrate the current view from her backyard across the 1150 Lake Road property. She suggested that the pool house could be shifted slightly north to align with her garage to diminish the view of the pool house from her backyard and home. She stated that there is currently a six foot tall solid fence along the northern portion of the shared property line and a four foot tall split rail fence along the southern portion of the property line. She noted that the pool house is proposed in the area of the shorter split rail fence. She stated that there are three trees on the west side of the proposed pool house that are proposed to be removed. She acknowledged that the trees are not high quality trees but noted that they do provide canopy coverage. She suggested that the pool house be relocated to the north end of the pool, closer to the garage, instead of at the south end of the pool. She stated that location will not impact the view from her backyard. She commended the petitioner for enclosing the pool equipment to minimize noise.

Hearing no other requests to speak from the public, Acting Chairman Gibson invited a response to the public testimony from the petitioner.

In response to Ms. Korczak's comments, Mr. Konstant agreed to explore shifting the siting of the pool house to the north.

Mr. Campana said that prior to the meeting, he and his wife contacted the Korczaks to understand their concerns. He said that he will take the Commission's and the neighbor's comments to heart and will work to accommodate the concerns raised. He said that he has already directed the architect to explore shifting the pool house to the north. He added that they are also willing to explore reducing the length of the roof above the terrace on the pool house in an effort to minimize the impact to the neighbor's view. He stated that measures will be taken to protect the trees. He explained that the pool and pool house cannot be shifted much to the east because of two heritage Oak trees. He noted that the trees are already under stress from the recent construction of a new house to the south on Barberry Lane.

Ms. Czerniak offered to share the engineering plans with the neighbors when they are submitted to provide the opportunity for them to review the plans, ask questions and offer any additional comments.

Hearing no further public testimony, Acting Chairman Gibson invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Levitsky commended the petitioner and neighbors for talking to each other. He stated that it sounds like the petitioner is working to try to address the neighbor's concerns. He noted that this may take some time and questioned whether the petition should be continued until further discussions and work occurs.

Commissioner Sperry stated that it appears that all parties involved are amenable to additional conversations and that perhaps, the plans will be revised. She asked how the Commission should proceed in this situation.

In response, Ms. Czerniak stated that based on the Commission's comments, it appears that the Commission supports the petition subject to some further refinement of the siting of the pool house in response to the comments offered by the neighbors. She stated that the petitioner seems willing to make some modifications to the siting of the pool house. She stated that the Commission can continue the petition with direction to explore shifting the siting of the pool house or the Commission can approve the petition subject to resolution of the final siting of the pool house by staff, taking into consideration the neighbor's comments.

Commissioner Gayle stated that while the square footage overage is significant, the fact that most of the overage already exists and only limited square footage is being added, she is in support of granting a building scale variance. She stated that the petition appears to be moving in a positive direction with open issues related to drainage, the placement of the pool house and the preservation of trees that still have to be worked out.

Commissioner Petit expressed support for granting a building scale variance. She stated that it is encouraging to see the petitioner and neighbors come together to listen and work to address concerns and interests.

Commissioner Lamontagne stated that initially he had concerns about the significant square footage overage, however as he reviewed the criteria for a building scale variance the criteria appear to be met. He stated that the architectural style of the pool house is consistent with that of the original residence adding that the pool house will fit in very well with the landscape and will not impact the character of the streetscape. He stated that he is comfortable supporting the petition. He commended the petitioner for the attention to drainage. He advised that as the location of the pool house is further explored, the option of flipping the pool and pool house should be avoided because that could result in greater impacts on the neighbor.

Acting Chairman Gibson stated as she reviewed the petition, she had concerns about the location of the pool house in relation to the neighboring property so she is not surprised to hear concerns from the neighbors. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Acting Chairman Gibson invited a motion.

Commissioner Lamontagne made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the a pool, a single story pool house, and an attached pavilion, he noted that a building scale variance is granted as well all based on the findings presented in the staff report and subject to the following conditions.

1. The location of the pool and pool house shall be studied further to minimize impacts to the west neighbor.
2. Consideration should be given to incorporating additional openings on the south elevation of the pool pavilion in an effort to break up the large expanse of solid wall and follow the rhythm of solids to voids on the other elevations of the structure.
3. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with the above refinement. 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.
4. 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 14 replacement inches on site. 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. The landscape plan shall also reflect a sufficient landscape buffer along the west and south sides of the pool area to minimize visibility of the pool area to neighbors.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed construction access plan along with 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. The plan should include, but not be limited to protective fencing and protective measures to avoid root compaction.
6. 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. All lights except motion detector security lights shall be set on timers to turn off no later than 11 p.m.

7. 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 on existing trees and landscaping during construction.

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

5. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve replacement of the existing non-original two-story porch on the west elevation of Brown Hall on the Lake Forest College Campus with a single-story entry element.

Property Owner: Lake Forest College

Representative: David Siebert, Director of Facilities Management

Monica Willemsen, architect

Acting Chairman Gibson asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Commissioner Gayle declared a conflict of interest and recused herself.

Ms. Willemsen introduced the project team. She stated that the west façade of Brown Hall is a focal point when entering the campus. She noted that Brown Hall, originally known as University Hall, was constructed in 1878 and was the first and only building on campus for a period of time. She stated that Brown Hall was designed in the Second Empire architectural style, with elements such as a mansard roof, decorative dormers, bracketed eaves, and a porch feature. She explained that originally the second floor was the primary floor of the building and was accentuated by the original porch that led to the main entrance on the second floor. She stated that in the 1930's, the original porch was replaced entirely with a smaller colonnade element that was more consistent with the porch on nearby North Hall at that time. She added that when the original porch was replaced, the main entry to the building was relocated from the second floor to the first floor and the original entrance door on the second floor was replaced with a window. She noted that in 1968, the original entry was removed altogether creating an extensive masonry façade without any break or focal point. She stated that in 1982, the entire building was renovated and at that time, a two-story postmodern painted steel structure was introduced on the west façade and remains today. She noted that the postmodern structure is out of character with the building and is in a severe state of deterioration and needs to be removed entirely. She stated that instead of leaving the west façade as an unbroken masonry wall, a solution is proposed that harkens back to the original elements of the

building, similar to the 1930's entry element with three bays. She stated that the design of the proposed new entry element reflects detailing that is consistent with the original style of the building, appropriate to the scale of the façade. She noted that except for the repair work that will be needed where the existing steel structure penetrated the building façade, removal of the existing steel structure will have minimal effect on the existing building. She noted that a matching brick will be used for the repair work. She stated that the design of the new entry element frames the windows and door at the center of the façade. She stated that they studied many different designs for the new element adding that the entry must be accessible and as a result, returning to the second floor entry is not an option. She stated that the columns and cornice of the new entry element will have an aluminum exterior for durability purposes.

Ms. Czerniak stated that approval of the demolition of the porch structure on the west elevation of Brown Hall is requested. She noted that the existing porch presents safety issues, functional issues, aesthetic issues and accessibility issues. She stated that findings in support of the demolition are included in the staff report. She stated that an understated replacement entry element is proposed. She stated that although the original second floor entry is not being restored, the proposed entry is a recreation in part of earlier design elements on the building. She stated that the materials proposed for the new entry are appropriate for an institutional building. She stated that the proposed entry is intended to showcase the original building. She stated that Brown Hall is very prominent as you enter campus. She stated that findings are included in the staff report in support of the replacement entry. She added a letter was received in support of the project from the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation and some comments were offered by Art Miller in support of the petition.

Commissioner Petit asked about the number of bays proposed.

In response, Ms. Willemsen stated that there are three bays on the porch element which are intended to frame the primary bays at the front of the building, the center entry and the adjacent double windows. She commented that the three bays keep the entry element light.

Commissioner Petit asked how the existing below grade exit stairs will be denoted and asked about the depth of the entry element.

Ms. Willemsen explained that there is a raised curb around the exit stairs. She stated that the proposed entry element steps four feet away from the face of the building to the front face of the columns. She stated that it is not intended that people will walk along the building, through the side of the element.

Commissioner Petit suggested that the depth of the porch be studied further to enhance the functionality of the element.

Commissioner Levitsky asked how the design team arrived at the final design of the entry element given that the building had many different porches over the years.

In response, Ms. Willemsen stated that the porch had to be a single-story structure because the second level is no longer used as an entry. She stated that the design took cues from the 1930's entrance which took cues from North Hall. She added that elements of the original porch design and architectural style of the building influenced the design as well.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the dimensions of the new entry element in comparison to the 1930's porch.

In response, Ms. Willemsen stated that the new element is the same length as the 1930's porch which also had three bays. She noted that the 1930's porch was slightly deeper than the element as now proposed. She stated that the 1930's porch had six columns instead of four as now proposed.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that the existing building is very prominent and is imposing as you approach it. He questioned whether the new entry element will appear diminutive in comparison to the building.

In response, Ms. Willemsen stated that in her opinion, the proposed porch appears to complete the façade. She added that the element will provide a substantial shadow line which will highlight the element.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked for more detail on the proposed column design.

In response, Ms. Willemsen stated that columns on other buildings on campus were studied as the design concept was being developed. She noted that there is a wide variety of column styles on campus and not a single strong. She explained that a decision was made to follow the original design of the porch columns for Brown Hall.

Commissioner Sperry asked for more information about the original entrance to the building.

In response, Ms. Willemsen stated that the historic entrance to the building was on the west façade, but the primary entrance is now an accessible entry on the east side of the building. She added that the historic, second floor entrance was not accessible adding that the primary, functional entrance to the building today is from the east.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the proposed entry element appears diminutive relative to the size of the building. She asked the petitioner to consider a porch with five bays or more columns to enhance its prominence in relation to the building.

In response, Ms. Willemsen explained that considerable thought was given to the depth and number of bays. She stated that in her opinion, three bays are

appropriate. She agreed that further consideration could be given to the depth of the element.

Acting Chairman Gibson asked how the structural issues that occurred with the existing porch can be avoided with the new entry element.

In response, Ms. Willemsen explained that the existing porch is an exposed steel structure and the corrosion is substantial. She stated that the columns now proposed will be clad in aluminum and will have a stone base. She stated both will stand up well to cleaning.

Mr. Siebert stated that the existing porch has been a constant maintenance and aesthetic problem. He added that the west entrance to the building is not intended for regular use and explained that the goal is to respect the historic entry to the building while directing traffic to the back of the building. He noted that from the College's perspective, the element on the east façade is purely ornamental, not functional. He pointed out that the entry element will create a shadow on the windows underneath so there is motivation to minimize the depth of the element.

Commissioner Sperry asked about the aluminum cladding proposed for the columns.

In response, Ms. Willemsen stated that the columns will be steel with aluminum cladding on the exterior. She noted that wood is not a good option for durability reasons. She explained that stone was considered however, most of the trim on the building is either wood or aluminum so the use of stone seemed out of character with the rest of the building.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Acting Chairman Gibson invited public testimony. Hearing none, she invited comment from the Commission.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the design as presented appears anemic relative to the existing building. She suggested that the petitioner revisit the design of the porch element and develop a design more in keeping with the character of the building.

Commissioner Lamontagne stated that he initially was interested in the five bay design study that was presented in the packet until he heard Mr. Siebert's comments that spoke to the purpose and function of the element. He recognized the concerns voiced by Mr. Siebert and expressed support for the three bay design as presented.

Commissioner Levitsky agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne's comments. He stated that although he would have preferred the five bay design, in his opinion, the design as presented meets the Commission's standards.

Commissioner Petit explained that the design of the element appears understated and does not appear to fit with the building. She suggested consideration of increasing the length and depth of the element.

Acting Chairman Gibson stated that initially when reviewing the plans, the proposed replacement porch appeared out of scale with the building. She noted however that based on Mr. Siebert's explanation that the porch is intended only to be ornamental and not functional, the proposed design appears to be appropriate. She stated that she would prefer to a two story replacement porch with five bays to replicate the original porch but acknowledged that is not feasible given how the use of the building has evolved over the decades.

Commissioner Sperry asked if whether there is a way to incorporate additional bays to make the element more attractive given that it is only ornamental.

Acting Chairman Gibson stated that based on Mr. Siebert's comments, adding more bays to the porch would create a shadow across the façade of the building limiting natural light to the existing windows. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Lamontagne made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the demolition of the existing non-original porch on the west elevation of Brown Hall on the Lake Forest College Campus and a single story replacement porch based on the findings presented in the staff report and incorporating the Commission's discussion as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions.

1. Consideration shall be given to the following:
 - a. Increase the depth of the porch to provide ADA access.
 - b. Increase the number of bays from three bays to five bays.
2. 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.
3. 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.
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.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Levitsky and approved by a vote of 4 to 2, with Commissioners Petit and Sperry voting nay for the reasons stated in their

previous comments.

6. Introduction Only: Various alterations to a residence at 955 Ringwood Road North. The contract purchasers are requesting early input on concepts for modifications to the residence given its uniqueness. No Commission action is requested at this time.

Property Owners: Elizabeth Marden and William Rowell

Contract Purchasers: Mike and Melissa Ginter

Representative: Michael Breseman, architect

Nicholas Patera, Teska Associates

Acting Chairman Gibson asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest, hearing none she invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Breseman stated that the original Havenwood Estate was designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw in 1910 for the steel magnate Edward Ryerson. He noted that the property and structure that are the subject of this petition were originally the gatehouse and living quarters for the help for the Havenwood Estate. He noted that the Havenwood grounds and gardens were designed by Jens Jensen and Rose Standish Nichols. He stated that the property was sold during the Great Depression and the structures were adaptively reused as a monastery. He stated that a single-story addition was built on the west side of the structure in 1964 adding that it is not compatible architecturally with the original Shaw design. He stated that the property was purchased by John B. Davidson in the 1970's and the main estate house was demolished in 1979. He continued noting that the gatehouse, which is the subject of this petition, was preserved, and the estate property was subdivided into residential lots by a group of investors led by John Marden. He noted that the estate of Mr. Marden is currently the caretakers of the Havenwood gatehouse. He noted that Mr. and Ms. Ginter are the contract purchasers and they are exploring possibilities for the property as they decide whether or not to proceed with purchasing it. He stated that the gatehouse was designed in the Arts and Crafts architectural style, unlike the Italian Villa style of the main estate home. He commented that the gatehouse is similar to the style of the Four Winds, a residence on Laurel Avenue, which was also designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw. He stated that the contract purchasers' goal is to make the gatehouse more functional as a home for today's family. He stated that the proposed work includes enclosing the dog trot to unify and connect the east and west wings of the structure. He stated that the existing garage will be converted to living space and a new garage is proposed on the west side of the structure, in the footprint of the 1964 addition. He stated that the original carriage doors will be preserved. He stated that a family room addition is proposed on the south side of the original west wing of the structure with a connection to the kitchen with a narrow linking element. He stated that the new garage and family room addition will replicate the detailing and design elements of the original structure. He noted that there is a 400-year-old Oak tree approximately 30 feet from the proposed family room addition that will be preserved. He stated that the project will be contingent on the

Ginter's receiving a property tax freeze from the State adding that discussions with the State Historic Preservation Agency have been ongoing over the last month. He explained that based on discussions to date, a condition of the tax freeze is that the dog trot must be enclosed in a transparent manner and the footprint of the 1964 addition must be maintained although the exterior of that element can be reworked. He stated that as currently proposed, the dog trot will be enclosed with a transparent curtain wall system which will be recessed eight feet from the north façade. He stated that the exterior materials will match those on the existing building; stucco, copper, and brick. He stated that the proposed modifications will require a building scale variance of 11 percent adding that the primary mitigating factor is that the original structure was not designed to be a single-family home. He added that presently, 28 percent of the structure is dedicated to garage space and noted that the building, although simple and elegant in appearance, does not take advantage of design elements which are exempt from the building scale calculation. He pointed out that a retaining wall is located along the rear property line because the grade of the property to the south is approximately seven feet higher than the subject property. He stated that a motor court is proposed on the north side of the proposed garage and a swimming pool is proposed in the rear yard of the property. He noted that the original arbor columns in the rear yard will be preserved and explained that the columns once formed a colonnade on either side of the dog trot before they were moved to the rear yard. He presented preliminary plans for the dog trot enclosure noting that the proposed enclosure incorporates Arts and Crafts motifs from the original trellis. He presented some alternative studies for the enclosure as well in response to direction from the State Historic Preservation Agency. He stated that the intent is that the structural components of the curtain wall system will be as narrow as possible to reduce visibility.

Ms. Baehr reiterated that the petition is being presented as an introduction only in order to get some early input and direction from the Commission to assist the petitioners in determining whether to move forward with purchase of the property. She noted that several letters were received and were provided to the Commission and to the petitioner.

Commissioner Sperry expressed excitement about the petitioners' interest in the property. She agreed that the 1964 addition is incompatible with the original architecture of the structure. She expressed concern about the proposed motor court at the front of the garage and the potential impact to trees on the site and to the streetscape. She observed that the home to the south, on Havenwood Road, is very close to the shared property line. She stated concern about the proximity of the pool to the neighboring home. She noted that the neighbor provided a letter and suggested locating the pool on the west side of the property. She stated her agreement with that suggestion. She noted that the south yard is very small and congested adding that there is significant open space on the west side of the property. She expressed concern about the concepts for the dog trot enclosure and asked that the element be further studied and refined.

In response, Mr. Breseman stated that in order to make the structure functional as a single family home, the dog trot needs to be enclosed and the wings connected. He explained that if the petitioners are not successful in obtaining a property tax freeze, the project and the purchase of the property will not move forward. He stated that adjustments were made in the dog trot enclosure in response to input from the State Historic Preservation Agency. He noted that locating the pool on the west side of the site would not allow for an appropriate relationship between the residence and the swimming pool. He acknowledged the neighbor's concerns about drainage but noted that the subject property is six to seven feet lower than the property to the neighboring property making the subject property the downstream property. He stated that an arborist evaluated the trees on the property adding that only one tree is identified for removal in the location of the motor court in front of the proposed garage. He added that the tree proposed for removal is not in good condition. He stated that consideration was given to removing the 1964 addition entirely however, in order to qualify for a tax freeze, the State is requiring the footprint of the addition to be maintained. He stated that the petitioners are trying to balance all of the various requirements while at the same time, achieving their goals for the property. He stated that the 1964 addition will be reworked to achieve greater compatibility with the original structure including modifying the roof form and the fenestration pattern.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that there appears to be many different elements on the south side of the structure, where space is limited. He asked about the neighbor's assertion that a part of the structure encroaches across the property line near the southeast corner of the property.

In response, Ms. Czerniak stated that more research is needed on the issue raised by the neighbor adding that any existing encroachment is likely a private matter.

Commissioner Lamontagne commended the petitioner for the interest in trying to make the structure a functional residence when it was never intended to be a residence. He acknowledged that the challenge of doing so is significant. He stated that he appreciates the petitioner's approach of repurposing the 1964 addition into a garage instead of trying to add more square footage somewhere else on the site, which, in his opinion, would destroy many historic elements and the character of the property. He questioned whether the original carriage doors are functional.

In response, Mr. Breseman stated that the original carriage doors are double doors that swing open. He stated that the intent is to restore the carriage doors and make them functional. He stated that the existing garage doors are not original to the structure and will be replaced with new overhead doors to allow the interior space to be opened up to the rear yard.

Commissioner Lamontagne expressed concern about the treatment of the dog trot enclosure. He stated that in his opinion, the petitioner's original design is stronger than the alternate designs that were developed to respond to the State's concerns about the transparency of the enclosure. He stated that he would be very concerned if the

dog trot enclosure took on a commercial type glass curtain wall appearance. He encouraged the petitioner to pursue the original design of the dog trot enclosure and possibly use the Commission and the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation for support in this direction when going back to the State with the design of the dog trot enclosure. He suggested that further consideration be given to minimizing the impact of the proposed improvements on neighboring properties. He suggested considering some reduction in the size of the family room addition. He added that overall, the plans are moving in a positive direction. He commended the petitioner for taking on such a unique property.

In response, Mr. Breseman explained that the family room addition is elongated due to a linking element between the existing structure and the addition which is intended to preserve the south façade of the original structure. He agreed that there may be an opportunity to reduce the length of the family room addition. He noted that the height of the proposed family room is 12 feet so from a massing perspective, the addition is fairly minimal. He stated that new landscaping is planned along the property line.

Commissioner Petit expressed support for the project. She stated that the plans for the area south of the structure, the proposed pool and terraces, are a significant improvement over the driveway and parked cars currently located in that area. She agreed that there may be an opportunity to relocate the family room addition in response to the neighbors' concerns.

Commissioner Gayle stated that the property presents a significant challenge and she stated appreciation for the petitioner's interest in preserving the structure. She stated that the siting of the structure in relation to the south neighbor presents challenges in planning an addition in that area. She agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne's comments about the dog trot enclosure.

Acting Chairman Gibson stated that the dog trot is such a prominent feature of the structure and questioned whether it is possible to leave the dog trot open and still make the structure functional as a residence. She expressed concern about the functionality of the proposed catwalk on the second floor which would connect the east and west wings of the structure. She agreed with Commissioner Petit's comments and encouraged consideration of locating the family room in the area of the existing garage space, on the east side of the structure. She commended the petitioners for incorporating many of the original Shaw elements in the design of the new garage and family room addition.

In response to comments from Acting Chairman Gibson, Mr. Breseman stated that the connection of the east and west wings of the building is essential for circulation throughout the home. He explained that the catwalk will have glass panels and will almost disappear when looking through the dog trot. He stated that the location of the family room is driven by a number of factors including preserving the Heritage Oak tree.

Mr. Patera stated that the original architectural plans reflect a wing on the west side of the home extending to the south establishing a precedent for an addition at that location. He added that the addition creates a courtyard in the rear yard. He explained the existing structure is quite imposing as viewed from the street due to its length and commented that elongating the structure building further to the west is a concern. He stated that the goal is to keep the building footprint compact. He noted that from the rear yard, the home to the south looms above and the goal is to replace the current abrupt transition with a gentler transition between the homes. He stated that a trellis planted with vines is proposed along the south property line to soften the views between the two properties. He stated that the new curb cut is proposed as a narrow opening screened with landscaping to maintain the character of the streetscape.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission or petitioner, Acting Chairman Gibson thanked the petitioners and encouraged them to continue to develop plans for the property taking into account the Commission's comments and the comments of the neighbors.

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 9:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner