

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the June 3, 2021 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, June 3, 2021, at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Bruce Grieve and Commissioners Jan Gibson, Maureen Grinnell, 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 asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes from past meetings of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Consideration of the meeting minutes was postponed.

**3. Consideration of a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the construction of a detached three car garage, a single story addition at the front of the residence and various exterior alterations. The property is located at 420 Washington Road.
Property Owners & Project Representatives: Deborah Kiersch and Erik Wisch**

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

Mr. Wisch introduced the petition and explained that he and his wife were immediately interested in the home at 420 Washington Road when it was listed for sale in October 2018. He noted that the home has been vacant for many years and is in a serious state of disrepair. He stated that it is likely that many would look at the house as a tear down. He stated that he and his wife explored many different options for renovating the home. He explained that early on, after considering the siting of the house adjacent to a shallow ravine which could not be replicated with a new residence, they decided to restore the house rather than build new. He also noted

that the house is part of a unique subdivision adding that they want to preserve that tradition. He explained that the plan as presented expands the house and adds a garage to the property. He reviewed that a single story addition is proposed on the front of the home to allow for a proper sized entry foyer with a closet and powder room. He noted that the house currently does not have a functional garage. He noted that the proposed garage is sited to create a courtyard area between the garage and house, and preserve mature trees on the site. He said the addition and the garage will have gable roofs with an 8:12 pitch to match roof on the house. He noted that the shed dormer on the garage is a 3:12 pitch. He stated that the scale of the addition and garage are subordinate to the original home and will appear consistent with the other elements in this unique neighborhood. He said that various alterations are proposed the existing home including replacing the windows and creating some new window openings in some areas. He stated that the existing windows are in poor condition and cannot be salvaged. He said double casement windows are proposed where possible, to match the original windows. He acknowledged that some of the proposed windows differ from the original windows because they must meet egress requirements. He explained that although the styles of the original and new windows differ slightly, the windows will all be white. He stated that they have the original plans for the home at 460 Washington Road, a house which is very similar to their house and was built by the same builder. He noted that the plans show windows of different sizes and with varying muntin patterns. He noted that larger windows are proposed in the family room for natural light and to provide views of the yard. He acknowledged that the proposed renovations do not exactly replicate the original design he noted however that the intent is to follow the simple cottage charm while making the home functional.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that the petition is a request for approval of a single story addition on the front of the home, a new detached three car garage and various exterior alterations to the residence. She stated that the property is accessed from a private drive off of Washington Road that is shared by four homes. She noted that the residence is not easily visible from Washington Road. She stated that the property is about 23,000 square feet. She noted that the site is bordered to the east and south by a shallow ravine. She stated that the residence features simple forms and simple roof lines with some Craftsman style architectural detailing. She reviewed that the Commission considered a petition for the property in October 2019 which was presented by another contract purchaser. She stated that project did not move forward. She stated that the current petitioners purchased the property in November, 2019 and came forward last year with plans for a new garage and a two story addition to the south side of the home, toward the ravine, which required zoning variances. She stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals considered the request for variances and directed that the petitioner consider alternatives to the two story addition to minimize the extent of variances needed. She explained that in response to the Zoning Board of Appeals' direction, and after much study, the petitioner

revised the plans to eliminate the two story addition entirely. She stated that the plans as now proposed incorporate a small single story addition adding that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended approval of the variances that are required for the project as now proposed. She explained that the single story addition on the front of the home improves the functionality of the entrance. She noted that the addition is small in size relative to the overall size of the home adding that in total, the addition is approximately 140 square feet. She explained that the existing garage is under the home and accommodates only a single vehicle. She stated that the petitioner is proposing a detached three car garage on the west side of the property adding that the existing below grade will be converted into finished basement space. She noted that the front of the proposed garage faces west toward the existing residence, with the shorter side elevation facing north, minimizing the appearance of mass as viewed from the shared private driveway. She noted that the proposed garage is a one and a half story structure with three vehicle bays. She stated that a shed dormer creates second floor in the garage which will be used for an office. She pointed out that the shed dormer provides the necessary headroom while keeping the mass and height of the garage subordinate to the main home. She stated that some exterior alterations are proposed to the existing residence including the removal of the shutters and replacement of the windows and doors. She noted that most of the replacement windows are consistent with the existing double casement windows on the home but noted that some of the replacement windows reflect different sizes and proportions. She noted that staff recommends that all of the replacement windows closely follow the vertical, narrow proportions of the original double casement windows to the extent possible. She stated that no tree removal is proposed. She noted that the petitioner provided a conceptual landscape plan that reflects extensive landscaping planned across the property. She stated that overall, staff finds that the petition meets the applicable Standards and that the proposed additions and alterations will restore and enhance a structure that might otherwise have been targeted for demolition. She added that the staff report includes a recommendation for approval subject to conditions based on the findings detailed in the report.

Commissioner Gibson commended the petitioners for restoring the home. She commented on the distance between the house and the garage and suggested that further consideration be given to the placement of doors for convenience.

In response, Ms. Kiersch explained that the floor plan limits the opportunity to have a door on the west elevation of the house closer to the garage. She stated that the door would be in the family room which is already a small space. Commissioner Gibson questioned the use of a metal standing seam roof on the front entry addition noting that with a 4:12 pitch, the metal will be visible. She asked that consideration be given to using asphalt shingles on the addition to match the roof on house. She agreed that the window sizes and proportions should be consistent

around the home. She asked for a description of the deck proposed on the rear of the home.

In response, Ms. Kiersch agreed to work toward more consistency for the windows around the house.

In response, Mr. Wisch explained that there is an old concrete wall on the south side of the house, adjacent to the ravine that needs some repair. He explained that the proposed wood deck will extend from the rear of the home to about 36 inches from the concrete wall. He stated that there will be a planting area between the deck and wall. He stated that the deck will be within eight inches of the existing grade and will not extend into the ravine. He stated that the deck will provide an outdoor area off of the kitchen that overlooks the ravine. He stated that the deck will be supported by piers.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the amount of impervious surface.

In response, Mr. Wisch explained that the driveway is sized to accommodate the turning movements necessary to make the garage functional. He stated that some hardscape will be removed on the east side of the house.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the existing condition of the home.

In response, Mr. Wisch stated that the house needs a lot of work adding that everything except the frame structure itself and the foundation will need to be replaced including all the electrical, sewer, water, and gas lines.

Commissioner Grinnell expressed concern about the inconvenience of accessing the house from the garage.

In response, Ms. Kiersch stated that as noted, an addition was originally planned on the south side of the house which would have provided a mudroom, however after receiving input from the Zoning Board of Appeals, they decided to create a more functional entrance at the front of the home as now proposed. She stated that the front door will be the main entrance to the home. She stated that the distance from the garage to the house is about 75 feet.

Commissioner Petit commended the petitioners on the project. She agreed that further consideration of the window placement and proportions is appropriate.

Commissioner Sperry asked about the material proposed for the driveway. She stated that in her opinion, it makes sense to have a door on the west elevation to provide for convenient access into the home. She asked about the size of the deck.

In response, Ms. Kiersch stated that a pea gravel, chip and seal driveway is proposed. She added that the deck is 14 feet by 18 feet. She noted that the deck is only one step above the grade on the west side.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the door on the south elevation.

In response, Ms. Kiersch stated that the door on the south elevation provides access into the kitchen and could be used as an entrance into the home from the garage. She stated that a door on the west elevation was considered but as noted previously, a door in that location would impact the interior layout of the home. She stated that the preference is to keep the main entry on the front of the house.

Commissioner Lamontagne agreed that further consideration should be given to the sizes and proportions of the windows in an effort to achieve greater consistency that is currently reflected on the plans. He asked whether the existing chimney will be painted and asked for information on the gutters and downspouts. He pointed out that with a 4:12 roof pitch on the front addition, the metal roof will be a snow slide. He suggested that if metal is used, snow stops should be considered.

In response, Mr. Wisch stated that the portion of the brick chimney above the roofline will be painted to match the white painted brick below. He stated that six inch half-round gutters will be installed.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the changes proposed to some of the openings on the home.

In response, Ms. Kiersch explained that some of the openings on the front elevation will be impacted by the addition. She added that the proposed windows on the front elevation are evenly spaced and will align vertically. She stated that the openings on the other elevations are being shifted slightly.

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

Rommy Lopat, 410 Woodland Road, commended the petitioners for restoring the home. She asked if consideration was given to some type of roof element over the front door to provide protection from the weather.

In response, Ms. Kiersch stated that the roof eave extends over the front door about 22 inches providing some shelter. She added that they would like to install a gas lantern above the front door which would have to be eliminated if a roof was added over the door.

Brian and Deana Butler, 410 Washington Road, stated that they are very excited about the petitioner's plans for the garage and addition. They stated that the petitioners are restoring a rundown, unattractive home. They stated that the area is very private adding that the placement of the garage will make their property feel even more private.

Hearing no further public testimony, Chairman Grieve invited final questions and comments from the Commissioner.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked about the garage roof and landscaping.

In response, Mr. Wisch confirmed that the new garage will have an asphalt shingle roof to match the home. He explained that a landscaped area is planned north of the shared private drive consistent with the landscaped area on the south side of the property.

Commissioner Lamontagne stated that the project will be a great improvement to the area and commended the petitioners on their thoroughness and on the various studies that were completed. He added that the petitioner's plans allow for the home to be preserved and restored consistent with the original character. He commented that when he first reviewed the plans, he thought that the proposed garage would make the site feel overbuilt however, when he visited the site and saw the staking of the garage footprint the intended courtyard effect became clear. He reiterated that refinements to the window proportions should be considered.

Commissioner Sperry expressed support for the petition.

Commissioner Petit asked about the water damage on the east side of the house.

In response, Mr. Wisch confirmed that the east side of the house is a low point on the site and some deterioration has occurred in that area. He stated that work is underway with an engineer and landscape architect to establish proper drainage in that area.

Commissioner Grinnell expressed support for the petition.

Commissioner Levitsky commended the petitioner on the plans to restore the home and on the proposed changes which, in his opinion, will make the home better. He explained that normally, when someone buys a home that has been abandoned for many years, approval of a demolition is requested. He encouraged the petitioner to work closely with an engineer to resolve the drainage issues on the site.

Commissioner Gibson suggested that the petitioners be allowed to work with City staff on refinements to the windows. She reiterated her concern about the metal standing seam roof and asked the petitioners to consider using asphalt shingles on the front addition. She asked that the petitioners give further consideration to how the deck on the south side of the house will function.

Chairman Grieve summarized the Commission's comments. He stated that he enjoys the fact that the existing house is not completely symmetrical. He explained that the Commission's standards suggest that everything should be symmetrical, but noted that there are some wonderful architects that incorporate asymmetry into homes resulting in windows that do not match. He stated that there is almost always a reason for the asymmetry. He stated that the home has a cottage feel and stated that in his opinion, the asymmetrical elements are part of the character. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Sperry made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving construction of a detached three car garage and a single story addition at the front of the residence and approving various exterior alterations all as reflected on the plans presented to the Commission. She stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report and is subject to following conditions.

1. Conduct further study of the items noted below and consider refinements to the plans to address the following:
 - a. Establish an additional entry to the home on the west elevation, closer to the garage.
 - b. Use asphalt shingles for the roof on the front addition to match the existing roof on the home.
 - c. Review the proportions and style of the windows in an effort to achieve a more cohesive appearance across all the elevations of the home and garage and greater consistency with the style and form of the existing windows.
 - d. Review the height of the windows on the garage and/or the height at which the windows are placed on the garage in an effort to reduce the large space between the top of the windows and the roof.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect any refinements made in response to the items listed in #1 above. If any additional modifications are made to the plans in response to Commission direction or as a result of final design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be included in the submission for permit, *along with* the plans 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, vegetation and the ravine during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist and the City Engineer.
4. A final landscape plan, subject to the review and approval of the City's Certified Arborist, shall be submitted prior to the rough framing inspection. If it is determined that trees on the property are negatively impacted by the construction of the garage or the regrading proposed for the property, replacement inches may be required if determined to be necessary by staff in order to comply with the Code and shall be clearly reflected on the landscape plan.
5. Details of all 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. All exterior lights must be set on timers to turn off no later than 11 p.m. except for lights with motion detector sensors.
6. 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 during construction. The petitioner is directed to coordinate with the homeowners who share the private driveway around access and responsibility for maintenance, repairs or resurfacing during and after construction.

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

- 4. Continued consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the third condominium building and final phase of the McKinley Road Multi-Family Planned Development. The building is proposed on the south side of Westminster, east of phases 1 and 2 of the McKinley Development, and north of the Library. The Commission is charged with considering the overall architectural design of the building, massing, roof forms, detailing, exterior materials, the landscape plan and exterior lighting. The building as proposed as two stories and follows the design and materials of the buildings in the earlier phases.**

Property Owner: City of Lake Forest, 373 EW LLC (Todd Altounian and Peter

Witmer)Contract Purchaser: 361 Westminster LLC (Todd Altounian and Peter Witmer) Project Representative: Peter Witmer, 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. Witmer thanked the Commission for taking the time to walk the site before the meeting. He stated that since the last time the Commission heard this petition, in February 2020, the plans have been revised in response to the input received. He stated that the revisions are intended to better align the design of the third building with the first two buildings in the development. He noted that the height of the building was reduced. He stated that recognizing that a number of issues existed with the adjacent house and property at 373 Westminster, he and his partner approached the then owners about purchasing the property to allow it to be integrated in part into the development site. He explained that by purchasing the 373 E. Westminster property, a number of issues will be able to be addressed and will allow the east portion of the property to be suitable for a new single family home. He stated that with the additional land area available by acquiring the 373 E. Westminster property, it was possible to reduce the condominium building from three stories to two stories. He explained that in the previous plans, different roof shapes and elements were explored in an effort to visually mitigate the three story building height. He stated that a two story building achieves the transition in height and scale that was requested in the discussions with the Commission to date. He stated that he spoke with the owners of the 385 E. Westminster property and, at their request, made an offer to acquire that property as well however, the property owners ultimately decided that they want to remain in the home. He reviewed the standards the Commission uses to evaluate each petition and offered comments in response to each standard. He noted that 23% of the frontage of the proposed condominium building is along Westminster while other sides of the building relate to the existing condominium buildings, the Library, the Church and the larger business district. He explained that the goal is to integrate the building well from all sides. He commented on the height of building in relation to other buildings in the area. He stated that as currently proposed, the condominium building is 31 feet adding that the average height of homes in the area is 32 feet. He commented on the proportion of the front façade in relation to other structures in the area noting that on average, the width of homes is 60 feet. He presented graphics illustrating the width and height of buildings along the Westminster and McKinley Road streetscapes. He discussed the openings on the proposed building noting that the sizes of the opening for windows and doors are similar to the size of openings on the single family homes in the area. He added that the window and door openings are consistent with the openings on the two existing condominium buildings. He stated that the revised plans use the "kit of parts" that was used in the earlier phases of the development and incorporates those elements into the building design. He noted

that the porch element on the Westminster façade is intended to relate to the porches on the homes along the street. He explained that as viewed from Westminster, the building features a central mass with a protruding wing on the east side. He noted that the larger mass of the building is setback 35 feet from the face of the façade of the building along Westminster. He commented on the spacing between structures along Westminster noting that on average, there is a 43 foot separation distance between the various buildings along the street. He noted that as proposed, the condominium building is 70 feet from the existing building on the west side. He stated that the front yard on Westminster is similar in size to the front yards of the single family homes along the street. He stated that the green space on the south side of the building is comparable to the size of the green space in the center of Market Square. He noted that the proposed building will have private outdoor spaces for the individual units. He stated that on the west elevation of the building, there are two entrances that lead to the lobbies of the building. He added that the entrances on the west elevation match the entrances on the two earlier condominium buildings. He reviewed the various exterior materials found on the single family homes in the area. He stated that brick was selected for the condominium buildings to relate to the Church, the Library and the Train Station. He stated that the building has a flat roof consistent with the two earlier condominium buildings. He noted that although the roof is flat, the cornice is detailed adding movement across the building. He added that the flat roof allows the Library dome, the gable on the Church, and the towers in Market Square to be focus points while the condominium buildings are background buildings. He stated that along the Westminster streetscape, the home at 351 Westminster steps forward toward the street and is prominent on the streetscape. He pointed out that the proposed condominium building is setback and aligns with the back of the home at 401 Westminster. He noted that the proposed building, with an open front lawn space, fits in with the residential streetscape. He stated that there are three fronts to the building, north, south and west. He noted that there are two entrance doors on the west elevation. He stated that there are both vertical and horizontal elements on the building making the overall building non-directional. He stated that there are limited trees on the site today and noted that new trees are planned along the north-south street within the development, in the green space at the south of the building, along the east side of the building and in the front yard. He said that landscaping is an important part of the development. He stated that discussions occurred with the property owners to the east about incorporating new landscaping on that property however, those discussions did not move forward. He stated that on the east side, the building is setback 15 feet from the property line providing space for new landscaping. He stated that multiple designs for this phase of the development have been prepared and presented for public discussion. He stated that ultimately, it makes the most sense for all three condominium buildings to be a consistent style as suggested in earlier meetings. He added that after the last Commission meeting in February, further study was done and the massing and

height of the building were reconsidered. He stated that by acquiring the adjacent property, a two story building was able possible. He reviewed the perspective renderings of the building in the context of the surrounding buildings. He stated that there are existing drainage issues on the adjacent properties to the east that can be addressed with this project and added an overhead electric line to the east of the proposed building can be addressed as well. He stated that the mechanical equipment on the roof will be hidden by the parapet walls. He added that the roof top space is an important element for residents because it provides private spaces for the individual units on the second floor. He stated that the roof top space has proven to work well in the two earlier condominium buildings. He stated that the interior of each unit is custom designed for the buyer he noted however that he envisions the more private interior spaces to be located on the east side of the building.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the discussion of redeveloping this area for multi-family residential use has been ongoing for the past 10 years or so. She stated that this particular development, a unified redevelopment of several adjacent parcels, resulted from a long planning process. She stated that the zoning entitlements for the development are in place. She stated like most petitions that come before the Historic Preservation Commission, much work has already occurred. She noted that for instance, subdivisions are approved and lots configured before the Commission sees petitions seeking approvals for the design aspects of new homes, the zoning entitlements are in place, and decisions have been made by other bodies about aspects such as lot sizes, setbacks and density. She stated that in this case, a decision has been made that this site will be part of a larger multi-family development and a portion of the 373 E. Westminster property has been approved for inclusion in the development site. She explained that the petition before the Commission at this time is as just described by Mr. Witmer, not any of the plans that were previously presented. She stated that the Commission is charged with evaluating the design aspects of the development based on the Commission's Standards. She explained that when this project was presented to the Commission a year and a half ago, it looked very different, it was a three story building and was called out as not presenting an appropriate transition due to the height of the building and not appearing as part of a unified development. She noted that there were concerns about the previously proposed mansard roof which had evolved based on prior suggestions to make efforts to conceal the third floor. She added that the Commission's discussion on the petition last year changed the course of the building design adding that it was the Commission's direction that caused the petitioner to consider alternatives leading to the two story building now proposed. She stated that change, ultimately resulted in the City Council's approval of the development plan. She stated that it is unusual for the Commission to see a full size mockup of a building however, that advantage exists with this petition because as now designed, the third building closely resembles the first two buildings. She noted

for the record that the Commission members walked the development site prior to the meeting along with the developer and some members of the public. She noted that the Commission was provided with a detailed staff report which presents findings in support of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Grieve invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson noted that the residence at 373 E. Westminster was presented to the Commission in 2016 for approval of demolition along with a replacement residence then proposed by the previous property owners. She questioned the process for reconsidering the demolition of the residence and a replacement residence.

In response, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that in 2016 the Commission approved demolition of the residence on the 373 E. Westminster property and a replacement house as presented by the previous property owners however, that project never moved forward and she confirmed that the approvals have since expired. She added that as part of the Council's recent approval of the incorporation of a portion of the 373 E. Westminster development site, the Council acknowledged that the existing home would be demolished and a new home built on the eastern portion of the property. She stated that the new single family home will require Historic Preservation Commission approval.

Commissioner Gibson asked if the Historic Preservation Commission will have to grant approval for the demolition of the existing house at 373 Westminster.

In response, Ms. Czerniak stated that the Council's action acknowledged the demolition of the residence. She agreed to confirm whether further action is required to approve the demolition.

Commissioner Gibson expressed concern that the Commission is reviewing the proposed condominium building first, before seeing a replacement residence that will be built next door.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked for clarification on the expiration of the previous approval of the demolition and replacement structure on the property at 373 E. Westminster.

In response, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the Certificate of Appropriateness granted to the previous property owner has expired. She stated that staff will consult the City Attorney on the process for approval of the demolition. She reiterated that the Council's action acknowledged that the house would be demolished. She noted that the Code provides for administrative approvals of demolitions in cases where the applicable criteria are clearly met. She noted that in this case, a decision was

made by this Commission in 2016 that the house was not historically significant and met the demolition criteria.

Commissioner Gibson asked if the building scale ordinance applies to a multifamily development.

In response, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the building scale ordinance applies to single family homes and duplexes.

Commissioner Gibson asked if the information in the packet accurately reflects the penthouses proposed on the roof.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the penthouses are reflected in some of the images in the Commission's packet. She added that penthouses on commercial and multi-family buildings are common and are often used to hide mechanicals and elevator overruns. She noted that the Code allows penthouses to rise above the allowable building height however, in this case, the penthouse is below the maximum allowable height and no variances are requested. She stated that the proposed penthouses are similar to those on the first two condominium buildings.

Commissioner Gibson explained that sometime ago she talked to one of the Alderman and was told that although the Commission evaluates each petition based on the Standards, the Commission must also listen to the community. She stated that she lives next to the Kelmscott development and noted that during the review process for that development, the neighbors desired certain things, negotiated and the project worked out. She stated that with the Kelmscott development there was a petition signed by 800 people. She noted for this project, a petition was signed by about 1,400 people. She stated that from what she has heard, the neighbors are not opposed to development of the site, but want something that relates to their neighborhood. She questioned how the petitioner is working with not only the immediate neighbors, but also the larger community.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the public process for this development started about five years ago. He noted that it would have been easier from the developer's perspective to not incorporate the City property and just build one large building on the three property fronting McKinley Road. He noted however they worked through the City process and Boards, Commissions and the community has been involved. He stated that through the years, in his opinion, he and his partner have really listened to the input offered and responded. He acknowledged that everyone will not agree on a final solution. He added that it would have been not to acquire the 373 E. Westminster property. He noted that the Plan Commission approved a previous version of the plan, a three story building, adding that they could have moved forward to the City Council with that plan, but did not do so after hearing

comments from the Historic Preservation Commission. He stated that he reads every letter, every public comment that is submitted. He stated that he has reached out to some of the neighbors and held a drop in meeting but unfortunately, those meetings did not result in solutions that were realistic in terms of being able to develop the property in a feasible manner. He stated confidence that the current plan is the right solution. He explained that he and his partner have spent an enormous amount of time and resources developing many different schemes for the development and considering different possibilities in response to comments heard during the public review process.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the proportion of the front façade. She explained that the images Mr. Witmer presented of existing homes in the area all seem to reflect much narrower widths in comparison to the proposed building.

In response, Mr. Witmer explained that the Westminster streetscape is only part of the context of the site adding that there are many other buildings in the area that must be considered in making the new building contextual to its surroundings. He noted that the Library and the first two condominium buildings are much wider than the proposed building. He stated that the development cannot be reviewed only in the context of the residential streetscape on Westminster. He pointed out that the Commission's Standards do not state that the project should be evaluated only in the context of historic properties, but rather that the project should be evaluated in relation to the overall surrounding area. He stated that the Westminster streetscape makes up about 20 percent of the proposed building's context, while 80 percent of the building's context is the Library, the Church, and the existing condominium buildings.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the height of the building. She stated that it appears that the penthouses are not included in the height as presented. She added that the penthouses appear to add an additional 10 or 12 feet to the height of the building.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the penthouses rise about nine feet from the roof deck. He pointed out that there is a parapet wall around the perimeter of the roof that is 42 inches tall. He confirmed that the parapet wall is included in the stated height of the building. He stated that the penthouses rise about five feet above the top of the parapet wall. He stated that the overall height, including the penthouses, is below the maximum permitted height of 35 feet. He added that the penthouses are set back from edge of the building. He explained that the penthouses are used to access the roof.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the brick and mortar work on the first two condominium buildings and if different masons completed the work.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the brick and mortar work was done on site with a single mason. He added that the same brick used on the first two buildings will be used on the third building.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the detailing around the openings.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the openings will have a large brick mold with an ogee profile.

Commissioner Gibson asked if the petitioner would consider a more traditional entrance element on the north side instead of the currently proposed screen porch to make the north elevation appear more like a front façade.

In response, Mr. Witmer explained that the north elevation is setback from the street and the open space itself is intended to relate to the front yards along Westminster. He stated that the screen porch and terrace on the north elevation are important as private outdoor space for the front unit.

Commissioner Gibson asked about lighting and protecting the neighbors from light spillover.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that there are lights at the entrances to the building, on the west elevation, along the north-south street. He stated that there are no exterior lights on the east elevation. He explained that in earlier designs, there were balcony spaces on the east elevation for the second floor units which was problematic for the neighboring properties. He explained that reducing the building to two stories eliminated the need for those balconies. He stated that lights on the porches and terraces will be directed down.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that while he was reviewing the minutes from the past meetings, the word "transition" came up frequently to describe the development. He asked the petitioner to explain how the development will serve as a transition from the Central Business District to the residential neighborhood to the east.

In response, Mr. Witmer explained that the massing of the proposed condominium building steps down in height and scale to transition from the larger buildings in the Central Business District to the single family homes.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that some of the neighbors have written letters with concerns about privacy. He asked how the petitioner plans to maintain the neighbor's privacy.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the site will be extensively landscaped. He noted that they also offered to plant trees on the neighboring property. He stated that there were similar concerns from the 333 is somewhat of a similar situation between the building at 333 Westminster condominium building when the first condominium building in the McKinley Road development was being constructed. He stated that today, there are 45 foot pine trees between the two buildings that serve as a privacy buffer. He stated that he is confident that with the extensive landscaping that is planned, incorporating both evergreen and deciduous plantings, the concerns about privacy will be addressed. He stated that eliminating the outdoor spaces on the second level and locating the more private interior spaces in the units on the east side, will also minimize impacts to the neighbors.

Commissioner Levitsky asked if the green space between the condominium building and the Library will be enclosed with a fence.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that a wrought iron fence is proposed along the property line between the Library and the condominium development, similar to the fencing at the front of the first two condominium buildings.

Commissioner Grinnell stated that her greatest concern is about the design of the north façade, facing Westminster. She stated that she understands that a screen porch element is proposed on the north elevation to incorporate a residential type element however, she noted that the screen porch does not appear consistent with the porches found on the front elevations of the neighboring homes. She noted that the north elevation visually appears more like the rear of the building than a front. She added that it appears that the north elevation has not been developed to the same level as the other elevations. She noted that the ramp to the underground garage appears to be located close to Westminster and questioned whether there would be lights at that entrance all night and how impacts on the neighbors would be mitigated.

In response, Mr. Witmer agreed to study the porch on the north elevation further. He reiterated that the building is setback considerably from Westminster and that the outdoor spaces are important for the units. He stated that he explored incorporating some additional residential elements on the building but is careful not to try to make the building something that it is not. He noted there is a row of Arborvitae across from the ramp to the garage that shields views of the garage. He explained that the garage will have motion detector lights so the lights will not be on when the ramp is not in use. He added that there will be a condominium unit above the garage so they are very sensitive to potential light and noise impacts. He stated that there are six units in the first building and the garage door does not go up and down very often. He stated that the amount of traffic is minimal. He stated that the ramp at the existing buildings has recessed lights that are effective in containing the light. He

noted that the landscape plan reflects new trees and other plantings around the garage area.

Commissioner Petit explained that as currently proposed, it appears that car headlights will shine into the screen porches on both the west and north elevations. She stated that screen porches are more commonly found on the rear of houses so it seems unusual that the screen porches are on the front facing facades of the building. She noted that on the 705 McKinley Road condominium building, the screen porch is tucked into the building and any light spillover is minimized. She added that the placement of the screen porch on the existing building also offers some relief and shadows on the building. She suggested that it may be beneficial to incorporate a screen porch on the east side of the building to create some articulation on that elevation and to minimize light spillover from the interior of the first floor units. She stated that in her opinion, the termination of the east/west street at the screen porch does not appear to highlight the entrances to the building on that elevation. She observed that the existing condominium buildings have articulation on the front façades that define the different units and entrances to the buildings. She noted that the proposed building seems to lack some of that same definition and articulation.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that there will be a considerable amount of landscaping around the screen porches to prevent headlights from impacting the space. He noted that the south elevation of the 705 McKinley Road building has a screen porch that steps out from the building similar to the screen porches proposed on the third building. He explained that the two towers and entry porticos are intended to break up the front façade and repeat elements used on the two earlier buildings. He pointed out that the massing of the building steps down at the corners. Commissioner Petit observed that there are a number of doors and Juliette balconies on the building.

In response, Mr. Witmer explained that the French doors on the east elevation are proposed to allow more light into the interior as opposed to smaller window openings.

Commissioner Petit asked about guest parking.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that there are shared guest parking spaces along the private streets internal to the development.

Commissioner Petit asked about the fencing planned on the east side of the building.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that a new six or seven foot tall wood stockade fence is proposed along the east property line.

Commissioner Petit asked which units would have the rooftop decks and whether there are any rules on what can be located on the roof top.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that each of the second floor units will have private spaces on the roof. He stated that the residents of the first building have put planters on the roof and patio furniture. He confirmed that there is a weight limit for the terraces. He stated that there have been not issues with the roof top terraces on the first building which has been occupied for over a year.

Commissioner Sperry asked why the City Council over turned the Plan Commission's recommendation on this petition with a tie breaking vote cast by the Mayor and why the petition was not returned to the Plan Commission. She stated that there is confusion over why the petition is before the Historic Preservation Commission without the Plan Commission's approval.

In response, Ms. Czerniak stated that the Plan Commission is a recommending body to the City Council. She stated that in April, the City Council voted to approve the petition, not to remand it back to the Plan Commission. She stated that the Historic Preservation Commission is charged with reviewing the design aspects of the petition based on the 17 standards in the Code.

Commissioner Sperry stated that it appears that the Plan Commission has not yet done its job as it relates to this petition. She stated that when the Commission was presented with the request for demolition of the Quinlan Coach House on this property in 2016, it was anticipated that two duplexes with a total of four units would be built on the site. She asked how many units are now proposed.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that six to eight units are planned.

Commissioner Sperry stated that when the Commission denied the petition last year, it was then presented as a three story building. She asked what the total square footage of the building was when it was a three story building.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the square footage of the three story building was 24,000 square feet approximately the same as the two story building now proposed.

Commissioner Sperry stated that the building has not gotten smaller in terms of square footage and has become wider. She asked for confirmation on whether the

size of the building was able to remain the same as a result of the acquisition of the 373 E. Westminster property.

In response, Mr. Witmer confirmed that the square footage was able to be maintained because some additional land was added to the development site.

Commissioner Sperry asked what the total square footage of the adjacent lot is as it is now configured.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the lot is a little over a half an acre.

Commissioner Sperry stated that it is her understanding that if a single family home was built on the adjacent lot, it could not exceed 8,000 square feet. She asked the petitioner to review the changes made to the design since the petition was last presented to the Commission.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the building as now presented is quite different from the design previously presented to the Commission. He reviewed that a two story building, rather than a three story building, is now proposed with a completely different roof shape. He stated that based on the Commission's input at the last meeting, the third building is now designed more in keeping with the first two buildings to present a more cohesive development.

Commissioner Sperry observed that most of the surrounding structures have gable roofs and asked the petitioner to comment.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that there is a wide variety of roof types in the general area of the building pointing out that the two other condominium buildings in the development have flat roofs.

Commissioner Sperry pointed out that the two earlier condominium buildings are not in the Historic District and were approved by the Building Review Board, not the Commission.

In response, Mr. Witmer explained that although the two existing buildings are not in the Historic District, they are part of the context that must be considered when evaluating the building for compatibility with its surroundings. He added that the Standards do not distinguish between buildings in the Historic District and those adjacent, but outside of, the District. He noted that the Standards speak to the context to which a property is visually connected.

Commissioner Sperry commented that Mr. Witmer's own statements basically admit that the priority in the current design was not to be compatible with the residential

neighborhood or with the Westminster streetscape, but instead, with the first two buildings that face McKinley Road.

In response, Mr. Witmer noted that the earlier designs presented to the Commission incorporated different roof shapes and massing and were deemed to be unsuccessful by the Commission in terms of creating a visual connection with the surrounding buildings. He stated that it makes sense that the third building relates to the two earlier buildings as suggested by the Commission at previous meetings.

Commissioner Sperry asked if the penthouses on the third building will have steel beams.

In response Mr. Witmer explained that the steel elements on the first two buildings are trellises and noted that trellises are not currently part of the design, but could be added.

Commissioner Sperry asked if the elevator overruns will be housed in the penthouses.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that the penthouses only enclose the stairwells up to the third floor.

Commissioner Sperry asked for clarification on whether the building has a third floor.

In response, Mr. Witmer clarified that the stairwells lead up to the rooftop.

Commissioner Sperry asked Mr. Witmer if he referenced a third floor of the building in his previous comment.

In response, Mr. Witmer acknowledged that he did reference a third floor.

Commissioner Sperry stated that she thought the building was a two story structure.

In response, Mr. Witmer clarified that the structure on the roof provides access to the rooftop.

Commissioner Sperry asked if there will be patios on the rooftop and if there would be grills and plumbing.

In response, Mr. Witmer confirmed that there will be patio on the roof and that there could be grills on the patios. He stated that plumbing will be provided for an outdoor sink.

Commissioner Lamontagne thanked the petitioner for reviewing the Commission's direction after the previous meeting. He added that the current petition mitigates quite a few of the concerns that were discussed during the last meeting. He stated that it is not the Commission's purview to question the density or the square footage. He asked if the kit of parts that was used on the first two buildings is identical to what is proposed on the third building.

In response, Mr. Witmer confirmed that the third building as now proposed uses the same kit of parts as the first two buildings.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked if the amount of impervious surface was reduced from the previous proposal.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that because of the additional square footage of the property that was acquired to the east, he believes the amount of impervious surface was reduced.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked if the petitioner will be able to mitigate stormwater more successfully with the current proposal.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that with a 15 foot setback on the east side, there is sufficient space to install a storm sewer which will collect the water that currently flows through the area.

Commissioner Lamontagne asked if the petitioner considered shifting the building further south.

In response, Mr. Witmer explained that shifting the building south was explored over the course of many meetings with the Plan Commission. He stated that as part of the approval of the second condominium building, it was mandated that the third building not extend any further south than proposed to preserve green space near the Library.

Commissioner Lamontagne stated that much of the discussion at this meeting has been focused on the fact that the building, as viewed by the public, fronts on Westminster. He commented that walking down Westminster, from McKinley Road into the Historic District, the streetscape has a very residential feel. He commented that although the consistency of using the same kit of parts from the first two buildings for the proposed building appears very successful, he questioned if there are ways to make the third building feel more residential and appear more human in scale.

In response, Mr. Witmer stated that he is open to further study and refinement while also maintaining the relationship to the first two buildings. He added however that in

his opinion, it does not make sense to study the use of pitched roofs but to instead, consider refinements to the kit of parts drawn from the first two buildings.

Chairman Grieve asked if there is an opportunity for gravel walkways in the development and asked for clarification on the landscaping that is planned.

Mr. Witmer stated gravel is used at the edge of the boxwood plantings. He stated that currently, gravel is not proposed for the walkways due to year round maintenance concerns. He stated that they are committed to the landscaping as reflected on the plans. He stated that the density and quality of landscaping installed for the earlier buildings will be carried through to the third building. He noted however that as the project moves forward, adjustments may need to be made depending on available species and site conditions, but the end result will be as represented on the plans.

Chairman Grieve noted that in his observation, the existing plantings along the east property line are not in good shape adding that new plants will be an improvement. He acknowledged that some are questioning whether the building is two or three stories but stated that his focus is on how the building differs from the previous proposal. He stated that in comparison to the previous plans, it appears that the overall height is reduced by about 25 percent which is not insignificant. He confirmed that the Commission received all the letters submitted by neighbors. He stated that to the extent that the letters speak to the Standards which the Commission is charged with using, it is the Commission's job to ask the questions raised and challenge the petitioner to address them. He stated that he empathizes with the comments that speak to concerns other than those that are under the purview of the Commission noting that other bodies have already made decisions that the Commissioners may or may not agree with, but noted that those aspects are not within the Commission's purview. He emphasized that the Commission cannot ask the petitioner to build a single family home instead of a condominium building. He explained that the Commission's responsibility is to review the changes made since the last meeting and determine whether or not they address the concerns that were previously raised related to the 17 Standards. Hearing no further comments or questions from the Commission, he invited public testimony.

Susan Athenson, Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, stated that she had the privilege of serving on the Historic Preservation Commission, Building Review Board and most recently, the Plan Commission. She stated appreciation for the Commission's work. She stated that she is presenting the Foundation's opinion on the appropriateness of the proposed condominium building which was detailed in a letter submitted earlier to the Commission. She noted that the letter was written by the Foundation's Advocacy Chair, Art Miller, on behalf of the Foundation. She stated her intent to summarize the letter and the Foundation's concerns. She

explained that the Foundation's mission is to protect the historic visual character of Lake Forest. She stated that the Foundation finds that the petition does not meet any of the Commission's Standards due to its visual incompatibility with the neighboring single family historic homes on Westminster, specifically with respect to height, scale, mass and style. She stated that in terms of height, the petitioner states that the building is two stories however, with the additional outdoor living space and a 12 foot tall screen porch on the roof, the building is actually three stories of living space. She stated that a three story building is incompatible with the two and two and half story single family homes to the east, west, north, and south. She stated that the transition from the three story condominium buildings on McKinley Road to the residential homes to the east actually begins with the two and a half story single family home at 351 Westminster. She noted that if the proposed condominium building has rooftop living space, the transition will be disrupted, impose on the neighbor's privacy, and change the character of the quiet residential block which is an important entrance to the east Historic District. She stated that if the proposed building is to truly be a two story building and be compatible with the surrounding homes, the third floor roof top living space should be eliminated. She suggested that a more residential roof style be considered to be more compatible visually with the surrounding homes on Westminster. She explained that in terms of scale and mass, the building as proposed is a solid, massive rectangular brick building that will dominate the smaller, lighter, more traditionally detailed residential homes on the block. She stated that the building is incompatible with the historic single family homes on Westminster and will disrupt the residential character of the streetscape forever. She stated that to reduce the appearance of scale and mass, the petitioner should follow the 2016 Master Plan and consider a different arrangement of the units into town homes, duplexes or even a single family home, with front doors facing Westminster. She explained that the building as proposed is appropriate for McKinley Road, not Westminster. She stated that the building should be refined to include more compatible, delicate and traditional residential features similar to the surrounding homes. She noted that a Westminster facing front door, instead of a screen porch on that elevation, will create a more residential and compatible appearance. She stated that a good example of a condominium development that relates to the neighboring residential homes is the developer's own Regent's Row, with its two and a half story hipped roof townhomes. She suggested that it may be appropriate to being in a consulting architect, specializing in traditional residential design, for the project. She added that the Foundation is willing to recommend architects to assist with the design. She stated that with respect to the demolition of the house on the 373 E. Westminster property and a future replacement residence, the Commission has always required that a replacement structure be proposed when requesting approval of a demolition to assure compatibility with the streetscape. She stated, in conclusion, that the City of Lake Forest has been at the forefront of developing ordinances to protect the community's historic character and to ensure that infill development is compatible

with existing neighborhoods. She noted that various Boards and Commissions, for decades, have asked property owners to compromise their goals to assure that building plans meet the Standards. She asked that the petitioner be held to the same standard by adhering to the City ordinances and process and by addressing the neighbors' and the community's concerns. She stated that the Foundation recommends that the petition be continued to allow the petitioner to address the compatibility concerns. She suggested that the Commission for a subcommittee to work with the petitioner, the Foundation and the neighbors to review appropriate design options. She thanked the Commission for its consideration.

Rommy Lopat, 410 Woodland Road, stated that she submitted an eight page analysis to the Commission and said that she will reiterate the main points of the statement. She stated that it is premature for the Commission to see this petition because the Commission must first see the proposed replacement residence on the 373 E. Westminster property before approving a wider condominium building. She stated that in her opinion, the condominium building must be sent back to the Plan Commission so that body can finish its work such as reviewing the number of units permitted on the half acre site. She noted that Mr. Witmer included the alley in the acreage but the City Code specifically excludes public or private ways from the acreage calculation. She stated that based on her calculation, four units, not eight, are permitted. She stated that with respect to the 2,800 square foot green space, it is not comparable to the greensward in Market Square which is 12,000 square feet. She reiterated that there are issues that need to be addressed by others before the Commission's review is appropriate. She stated that the style of the proposed condominium building is not clear. She noted that Mr. Witmer said the design of the third building was altered to match the existing condominium buildings at the suggestion of the Commission. She stated that in reviewing the Commission's previous discussion, she only heard the Commission direct Mr. Witmer not to combine the Second Empire and Georgian styles and to simplify the fenestration and the overall design. She stated that Mr. Witmer chose to make the building match the earlier condominium buildings and she questioned the style of those buildings. She stated that last year, Mr. Witmer described the existing condominium buildings as 1920's brick with some Art Deco elements. She stated that in her opinion, the building does not reflect a 1920's Art Deco style. She stated that Mr. Witmer's choice of style is important because it directly relates to Standard 14, compatibility. She stated that Standard 14 reads "in considering new construction, the Commission shall not impose the use of a single architectural style or period, but it may impose a requirement for consistency with the chosen style". She noted that the staff report did not provide an analysis of consistency regardless of the purported style of the building. She noted that staff claims that Standard 14 is met because the building is transitional between apartments and single family homes. She questioned what makes the style transitional. She stated that according to staff, the petition meets Standard 14 because it has residential elements such as front entries and screen

porches. She questioned whether those elements are sufficient to make it compatible with the adjacent single family homes. She pointed out that there is not a front door on the Westminster façade so Standards 9 and 11 are not met. She asked that a front door be incorporated into the north elevation. She stated that in her opinion, the staff report is skewed in favor of this petitioner and not in favor of the Standards. She stated that as proposed, the building is a monolithic design, of no historic style. She added that the massive building does not belong in the historic neighborhood and stated that it does not meet any of the Commission's Standards. She asked the Commission to deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Susan Benjamin, 711 Marion Avenue, Highland Park, stated that she worked on the City's update of the Historic District Survey and is very familiar with the buildings in the Historic District and in this neighborhood. She stated that Mr. Witmer reached out to her and asked her to review the plans for the proposed building. She stated that the design in terms of scale and materials fits into the District. She explained that what impressed her about the building is that it works to facilitate a transition to the residential neighborhood. She acknowledged that there are some areas of the design that could use some refinement. She stated that she likes that the development overall has the feeling of a Mews in England. She noted that the third building presents a bit of a change from the two condominium buildings on McKinley Road recognizing its function as a transition. She added that the development reflects paths, courtyards, outdoor rooms, and transitional green space. She stated that the petitioner presented a good landscape plan. She agreed that changes should be considered to an entrance or other elements, but noted that the green spaces were carefully thought out in terms of vistas and in terms of places to enjoy passive recreation. She stated that in her opinion, the landscaping that will settle the building into the neighborhood to the east and the end result will not be an abrupt change from the two large buildings on McKinley Road to the single family homes.

Jeff Torosian, 401 Westminster, stated that he and his family live two houses away from the proposed development. He stated that the Commission already knows how he and his wife feel and how many other neighbors feel about the development. He stated that the comparison to the first two condominium buildings is completely in appropriate. He noted that the first two condominium buildings are not in the Historic District. He explained that the petitioner designed the first two condominium buildings in a non-historic way and then the petitioner purchased properties next door, in the Historic District, and designed the third building which is on a different street, in a non-historic way. He asked why the petitioner chose to marry the design of the third building to the first two condominium buildings when nobody asked that to be done. He noted that the idea that this is a two story building is absurd. He stated that with the Master Plan for the development called for the third phase of the development, on the City property, to be townhomes like

Regents Row, or a two story condominium building. He explained that the beginning of the concept for a three story condominium building began two years ago when Commissioner Kehr on the Plan Commission suggested that the view of the third building from the train station was important so the height of the first two buildings, which is really four stories, should be maintained. He stated from that suggestion, the third building became an entire building of three stories and the idea of a single family home or townhomes on Westminster was abandoned. He commented that the petitioner is now saying that in response to input from the Commission, the building was reduced to two stories when the building was never supposed to be three stories. He stated that the structure is almost the entire width of the lot on the Westminster streetscape and it is three story building. He stated that there is no clarity that there is only a stairwell in the penthouses pointing out that there are windows in the penthouses facing every direction. He stated that the building should be two stories with no outdoor space on the roof. He noted that the north elevation is by far the worst looking elevation and has no symmetry or balance. He stated that based on the petitioner's concept, the front façade of the building faces the alley and parking garages. He stated that it is unusual that the focus of the design is on the elevation facing an alley. He stated that the Westminster elevation is important. He stated that the Commission is charged with analyzing the building's appearance from the most major street abutting the development. He stated that this petition would not be presented to the Commission if the property was not in the Historic District. He stated that in his opinion, the elevation of the building on Westminster looks like a side yard, a backyard with a porch and balconies. He stated that there are three outdoor spaces on the north side, a screen porch, a balcony above it, and the roof top deck. He stated that he does not know who the residents of the building will be and there could be big parties on the roof top which is not consistent with a residential neighborhood. He stated that it is not a problem to have a party on a patio or on a balcony facing a backyard but stated that it is inappropriate to have that kind of activity facing Westminster. He stated that there could potentially be 40 people on the roof top, 20 people on the terrace below, and people in the screen porch. He said that level of activity is inappropriate for the Westminster streetscape. He stated that the petition should not go forward without a design for a new house on the remaining part of the 373 E. Westminster property.

Sally Downey, 475 E. Westminster, stated that the petitioner is here tonight because they, in partnership with the City, see this as a continuance of a project 10 years in the making. She added that the Commission is here because of unintended consequences from the meeting in January 2020, and the neighbors are here in person, by phone and through letters because they are trying to ensure that whatever is built fits in with the beautiful historic neighborhood. She stated that at the January 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed a three story condominium building that was approved by the Plan Commission despite the fact that the Plan Commission had concerns about massing. She stated that the neighbors were at the

Plan Commission meeting, and while they did not love the final product, it did fit on the City owned property. She stated that the three story building proposed at that time was set back more from Westminster and the decreased mass in front was acceptable. She stated that plan was a compromise that the neighbors could live with. She explained that when the three story design came before the Commission, there were concerns about the lack of a proper transition to the neighborhood and a desire for the third condominium building to have a similar visual appearance to the first two condominium buildings on McKinley Road. She added that the Commission's direction along with the neighbor's concerns about massing gave the petitioner the opportunity to pursue a plan developed in 2019 that was already being discussed with the City. She stated that in 2019, the petitioner went to several neighbors to get input on the concept of expanding the condominium building onto the 373 E. Westminster property. She stated that the petitioner was simply looking for more land to expand the building, not to solve a major drainage problem or appease the neighbors and the Commission. She stated that the neighbors vehemently opposed the idea of expanding the development site and the petitioner did not pursue it, but here we are. She explained that the plan that is now presented is a brand new design as a follow up to the City Council's vote to overturn the Plan Commission's recommendation to deny the petition. She stated that the development is now expanding into the Historic District. She stated that the Commission's previous discussion about the design of the third building more closely relating to the first two buildings on McKinley Road is now a moot point because the building envelope has changed and the frontage has nearly doubled on Westminster. She stated that this is not the final piece of a 10 year development but instead, a standalone condominium building, in a residential neighborhood, in the Historic District. She stated that the property is also in an overlay district which means that even more importance should be paid toward green space. She stated that she has no comments about the current design beyond the fact that nothing about it attempts to blend with the historic residential neighborhood. She stated that this design, anywhere in Lake Forest, would face opposition. She questioned why the building's proximity to the Central Business District and mixed zoning makes it permissible to overlook the fact that it is located in an historic neighborhood. She stated that it is not just a 38 foot sliver of land in the Historic District as described by Plan Commissioner Kehr. She stated that the Historic Preservation Commission is the guardian of the Historic Districts and responsible for holding all projects to the same standards. She explained that when she proposed tearing down an abandoned house on Westminster, she was required to present a replacement structure and a full landscape plan. She stated that she followed the rules. She stated that the Commission has done a wonderful job of holding the redevelopment of the Swift property to high standards. She asked that the Commission hold this developer to the same standards. She stated that the petitioner should not be allowed to move forward with the demolition of the house without a complete plan for the property. She stated that the Commission should analyze this building like any other new

structure in the Historic District, asking whether it fits architecturally, creates an appropriate transition and provides enough green space. She stated that the building has living space on the third floor and questioned whether the neighbors will see barbecue grills and patio furniture facing Westminster. She stated that none of the neighbors have said that the petitioner can never build on the site, but all of the neighbors have said that what is built must fit into the neighborhood. She explained that living in this neighborhood is incredible and with that comes a commitment to be a steward of the houses. She added that building in this neighborhood is an honor, not a given. She said the rules must be followed adding that the condominium building should not be an exception. She explained that in 2019, when the petitioner first explored demolishing the home at 373 Westminster and expanding the condominium building on to that lot, the petitioner knew that they were entering into the hallowed historic area, but that has not stopped the developers who by their own admission offered to buy another adjacent house. She asked the Commission to limit the building to two stories and to assure that it provides an appropriate transition to the residential neighborhood and enhances the neighborhood. She stated that in her opinion, the present design does none of those things. She stated that she appreciated the Commissioner walking the site before the meeting but noted that the walk stopped once they reached Westminster and the Commission did not see how the residents who live in the neighborhood will see this project.

Reed Dailey, 385 Westminster, pointed out that the view from his house is of the east elevation of the proposed building. He stated that on the two floors, there are 36 windows that will face his house and an additional three windows on the third floor penthouses. He stated concern about light spillover and views into the building. He explained that currently, he has views of the existing condominium buildings and can see television screens. He noted that the third condominium building will be even closer to his property than the existing buildings. He stated that the distance from his property line to the proposed condominium building is 15 feet and he asked the Commission to imagine 36 windows located just 15 feet from their properties. He stated that when his family bought their house, they were thrilled because there were historic buildings around. He stated that they were told that someday there might be townhouses on the City property. He stated that it is disheartening as a new homeowner in the community to see the project proposed for the property adjacent to his property. He stated that he hears noise from the existing condominium buildings. He acknowledged that the new residents may be quiet, or they may have rooftop parties. He asked that the petitioner and Commission consider a building that looks more like residences or townhouses. He expressed concern that he will not be able to sell his house with a condominium wrapping around the property and about a loss in property value. He stated that the size and mass of the condominium building will cast shadows on this property. He asked the

Commission to visit his backyard to view the site from his property. He asked for more clarify on the height and siting of the proposed building.

Laura Torosian spoke on behalf of Lesley and Mike Lardino, 351 Westminster. She stated that they have lived in their home on Westminster for about seven years, more than half of that time, the condominium buildings have been under construction. She stated that the area next to her house has been a storage area for construction vehicles and equipment for years now and they have been dealing with the disruption, filth, noise and general aggravation of construction for about four years. She stated that they are not opposed to the land being developed in a tasteful and appropriate manner. She noted that they are concerned that the mass of the proposed building is too large and that the driveway to the underground garage is directly off their back deck. She questioned whether it would be screened by new trees or bushes. She stated that they work hard to maintain their home and take pride in it. She stated that they are concerned that they will be completely boxed in by the existing and proposed condominium buildings and left with a reduction in sunlight, as well as increased noise due to the proximity of the driveway to the underground garage and the alley. She stated that they previously requested that the utility poles and wires on their side of the alley be put underground but have not heard confirmation on whether that will happen. She stated that they have never been approached by anyone from the City asking about the impact of the development on their quality of life. She noted that many of the drawings for the project do not reflect their house. She stated that they have spoken with the developer about the impacts of construction activity including trash, dirt and dust, and contractors parked outside their house before 7 a.m. She added that although the developer generally seems helpful and genuinely receptive to their complaints, which they appreciate, many of the issues are out of his control. She stated that they want to make their viewpoint known because they are clearly one of the most affected property owners. She reiterated that they are not against development, but feel that they will likely be worse off after development, than they were before. She asked the Commission to please consider their family and home.

Hearing no further requests to speak from the public, Chairman Grieve invited a response to public testimony from Mr. Witmer.

Mr. Witmer stated that he appreciates the comments and input, but does not appreciate the personal attacks. He said that personal attacks are not appropriate and stated that he is doing his best to respond to all of the input that has been offered over the course of the project. He stated that the Commission's job is to review the project against the Standards. He stated that he and his partner have always been willing to consider modifications adding that they will continue to do so. He stated however that some of the comments are not constructive in terms of leading to a workable solution. He stated that his goal is to meet the Standards and

develop a project that fits into the community. He acknowledged that there is no single solution that will satisfy everyone.

Chairman Grieve invited final questions and comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Lamontagne re-stated that the Commission is charged with evaluating the petition on the 17 Standards. He stated that it is not the Commission's purview to argue about density and other aspects of the project. He stated that he understands the frustration of the neighbors and others, but given the role of the Commission, this is not the place to address many of the comments offered. He stated that although there have been improvements to the design since the previous proposal was presented to the Commission, based on his review of the plans as presented, the project does not yet seem to fully meet the Standards. He explained that in his opinion, there are few standards that the petitioner needs to evaluate and respond to further specifically Standards 9 and 11. He stated that one of the things that really resonated with him during the public testimony was something that Ms. Downey said, that the walking tour should have started on Westminster because the Commission's purview is the Historic District and the north elevation engages directly with the District. He stated that he is most concerned about the elevation facing Westminster. He explained that if someone was to come in ten years from and redraw the lines of the Historic District, he believes that they would redraw it excluding this building based on the north elevation as currently presented. He stated because of that very limited piece of the design, facing Westminster, he cannot support the petition as presented. He stated that that like all other properties in the Historic District, a request for approval of the demolition of the 373 E. Westminster property, as well as the proposed replacement residence should be presented to the Commission. He stated that he cannot vote in favor of the petition until that happens. He added that in his opinion, the demolition of the existing house and replacement residence on the remainder of the 373 E. Westminster property is a key component of the project. He stated that the petitioners have made some good attempts with the current design of the condominium building and adding that he believes that the project can ultimately get to a point where it meets the Standards. He acknowledged that all parties will never be happy with the height, or with the density or the massing. He stated that in his opinion, from a design perspective, more refinement is needed.

Commissioner Petit stated that when she visited the site she entered from Westminster and was disappointed that the design did not express the character of the Westminster streetscape and surrounding neighborhood. She stated that the current design does not yet appear to be the right solution.

Commissioner Grinnell stated that in reviewing the plans against the Standards she found a few areas that are problematic. She noted that the design does not meet

Standard 6, the rhythm of entrance porches. She acknowledged that the building has porches on the Westminster elevation, but noted that there is no front door. She stated that with respect to Standard 11, the directional expression of the front elevation, again, the lack of a front door on the north elevation is contrary to the comment in the staff report that the building visually appears to have two front elevations. She stated that she feels that the proposal does not meet Standard 14, compatibility, with respect to Westminster, and as a result, she cannot support the petition as presented.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that if he were a neighbor of the proposed development he would have been speaking with the rest of the neighbors during public testimony, however given the limitations of the Commission's purview as delineated by the Code, he feels that he must support the petition.

Commissioner Gibson noted that the Commission is responsible for aesthetics; the look, feel, beauty and compatibility of the building with its surroundings. She added that Commission reviews all the aspects of how a project fits into the Historic District and how the District will be impacted noting that there is always some impact. She acknowledged that this development is at the edge of a Historic District but noted that Westminster is the entrance to Historic District. She stated that she kept that in mind as she evaluated the petition. She stated that if this building is to have two front facades, on the north and the west, then both front facades have to be equal in terms of the quality and detail. She stated that means the Westminster elevation should have a front door. She noted that after the recent City Council action on this petition, the Council said that the Historic Preservation Commission would resolve the issues associated with the building. She noted however that this is a difficult petition. She noted that the two existing condominium buildings look toward Market Square, she noted however that the street between the two buildings is lost. She stated that the front facade of the third building faces west, toward the back end of the first two buildings. She stated that she cannot think of another example of the front facade of a building facing the back of a building. She stated that the public view of the third building will be from Westminster. She noted that based on the comments, the north elevation is a concern for all of the Commissioners. She stated that in her opinion, the plans as presented do not meet Standard 2 because the building fronting on Westminster is 75 feet wide, wider than other buildings on Westminster. She stated that the square footage of the two story building is the same as the square footage of the previously presented three story building. She stated that the height is problematic noting that the penthouse is intrusive and not appropriate for the Historic District. She acknowledged that the penthouses will not be visible when standing next to the building because they are set in from the edge of the building but stated that she believes that the penthouses will be visible from the homes across the street. She stated that if the north elevation is a front facade then the screen porch does not seem to fit. She explained that a front entry with a

walkway through the yard may help make the building appear more residential. She agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne's comments on the demolition and replacement structure on the property at 373 Westminster.

Commissioner Sperry commented that Mr. Witmer has presented to the Commission on a number of occasions and stated that she does not want Mr. Witmer to ever feel personally attacked. She noted that the Commission speaks to the standards and noted that the issues raised do not have to do with Mr. Witmer personally. She agreed that the Commission needs to review the proposed demolition of the 373 E. Westminster residence and the proposed replacement residence. She noted that construction of the condominium building will require a staging area adding that she assumes the staging area will be on the 373 E. Westminster property after the house is demolished. She noted that she believes that the relationship between the replacement residence on the 373 E. Westminster property and the condominium building is critical adding that the residents in the Westminster corridor deserve to see the replacement residence. She stated that she has heard both an alderman and a Plan Commissioner refer to the 38 foot parcel that was added to the development site from the 373 E. Westminster property as a sliver of land. She noted that the property is in the Historic District and it is not just a sliver of land. She stated that if the parcel was just a "sliver of land", it would not be before the Commission. She explained that the entire half acre parcel is important. She appealed to the City Council to know and ingest this. She stated that she believes that there has been a misperception and miscommunication. She explained that based on the current proposal, in her opinion, Standards, 1, 5, 8, 10, and 11 are not met. She stated that the design requires refinement to meet those standards. She stated that Mr. Witmer has admitted that there are penthouses on the structure. She noted that the Commission was told that this was a true two story structure she noted however that structures that have living space, or penthouses, on a third floor, establish that the structure as proposed is not a two story structure. She stated that the building should be called what it is, a two-and-a-half or three story structure. She stated that the neighbors do not deserve to have living spaces with grilles and terraces stories above their homes. She added that it is common sense that the building should not replicate the two earlier buildings which are not in a residential area and face McKinley Road. She reviewed that Standard 5 addresses the relationship of the structure to the properties, structures and sites, to which it is visibly related. She stated that in her opinion, it is not clear if the building is Georgian or Art Deco adding that it is a flat roof structure that relates to the other two condominium buildings and not to the overwhelmingly gable, diminutive, delicate residential structures in the historic gateway along Westminster. She stated that the scale of the proposed building is severely out of alignment with the Historic District and asked that the scale and massing of the structure be reduced. She explained that the building should not relate to first two buildings, which she pointed out, were approved by another body because they are not in the Historic District. She stated that the proposal as it relates

to Standard 11 has already been addressed and pointed out that the building may be addressed as 715 McKinley Road however, it faces Westminster and the north facing elevation should look like a front façade. She stated that she is not in support of the petition as presented.

Chairman Grieve acknowledged that this petition presents a challenge. He noted however that the areas where he is struggling may differ a bit from some of the other Commissioners because he is evaluating the petition based strictly on the Standards. He commented that the petitioner brought forward plans consistent with approvals granted to date and as a result, he is conflicted because while he may think that a 24,000 square foot building is too big for the site, no variances are requested from the Commission. He stated that there has been significant discussion and comment about aspects of the project that were decided outside of this Commission. He stated that what is difficult for him to understand, is what kind of clear direction the Commission could provide to the petition if the petition is continued. He added that he does not see how the petition could ever come back as something different from what Mr. Witmer has already been given permission to do. He stated that he does not want the petitioner to go around in circles without clear direction. He stated that he is not hearing support for the petition as currently presented. He stated that he is less clear if the Commission is prepared to continue the petition on specific points. He stated that from his standpoint, whether he agrees or disagrees with the decisions around this project made by other bodies, he believes that with some changes, the petitioner should be able to work through refinements to address the points raised that relate to the Commission's standards. He stated that he believes that there is an acceptable solution. He stated concern about some of the comments and suggestions that require the petitioner to go back and look at building townhouses, with a mansard roof or changing the style of the building go beyond the Commission's purview and are inconsistent with the previous decisions made regarding this development. He stated that at the end of the day, given the prior approvals, the building will still be close to neighboring properties and any resident can have a party on their property. He stated that he cannot think of anything that could ever be built on the site that would not be problematic for the surrounding neighbors, but from a design standpoint and aesthetics, especially on the northern part of Westminster, the comments of the Commission are thoughtful and fair. He stated that in his opinion, those comments can be accommodated with refinements to the current design. With respect to the demolition and future replacement residence on the 373 E. Westminster property, he pointed out that the Commission has previously approved demolitions without concurrently seeing replacement structures. He acknowledged that there are some questions regarding that part of the process which need to be answered.

He invited any further final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson stated that based on the Commission's comments there seems to be concern about elements of the design beyond the north elevation. She reiterated her concern about the quality and craftsmanship of the brickwork. She stated that her concerns remain about the overall massing and scale of the building and the decisions that have been made by other bodies. She stated that if the Commission denies the petition, it is possible that the petitioner would rework the petition to address the larger concerns.

Chairman Grieve stated that he is willing to support a continuance of the petition if the Commission is able to offer guidance to the petitioner on refinements that can be made to address the Commission's concerns. He stated that in his opinion, a continuance is not appropriate if the expectation is that a completely new design will be presented. He noted that the Commission is charged with acting on the petition generally as presented, not with redesigning the entire project with respect to building footprint, roof form and window styles. He stated that he believes that the comments and questions offered by the Commission can be accommodated through some further study and refinement to the current design by the petitioner.

Commissioner Lamontagne agreed with Chairman Grieve's comments. He stated support for a continuation of the petition with specific direction to the petitioner. He stated that clarification is needed on the status of the 373 E. Westminster property noting that if the prior approvals are expired, the demolition and replacement structure for the property should be considered by the Commission to gain an understanding of the Westminster streetscape. He stated that in his opinion, a conceptual plan for a replacement residence on the remaining portion of the 373 E. Westminster property should be presented to the Commission.

Commissioner Sperry agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne's comments. She stated that the Commission needs to show some goodwill and grace toward the neighbors. She stated that she does not want to continue down a path of uncertainty.

Commissioner Petit agreed with the prior comments. She stated that if the petition is continued, the petitioner should be provided with direction to allow responses to be provided to the Commission.

Commissioner Grinnell agreed with Commissioner Lamontagne's comments and stated support for a continuation of the petition.

Ms. Czerniak encouraged the Commission to provide clear direction in the motion on the additional information, study and refinements that are requested if the petition is continued. She noted that there were a several items raised consistently by members of the Commission and other comments made that did not seem to be shared by a majority of the Commission. She encouraged the Commission to focus

on the standards and the aspects of the project that are under the purview of the Commission. She reiterated the Chairman's comments that if the Commission does not see a way for the petition to move forward to a successful conclusion, then a continuance is not appropriate. She stated however from the comments offered by the Commission, it appears that there is a reasonable expectation that the petition could move forward with some modifications and if the additional information requested is provided.

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

Commissioner Lamontagne made a motion to continue the petition with the following direction.

1. Conduct further study and refine the plans with particular focus on the following Standards.
 - Standard 1: Height
 - Standard 2: Proportion of Front Façade
 - Standard 5: Spacing on the Street
 - Standard 8: Roof Shapes
 - Standard 9: Walls of Continuity.
 - Standard 10: Scale.
 - Standard 11: Directional Expression of Front Elevation
 - Standard 14: Compatibility
2. Place particular focus on refining the scale and design of the north elevation to reflect that it is an additional front of the building, not a side elevation.
3. Present a request for Commission re-consideration of the demolition of the residence on the 373 E. Westminster property.
4. Provide a conceptual plan for a future new residence on the remaining portion of the 373 E. Westminster property.

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

OTHER ITEMS

5. 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.

6. Additional information from staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner