

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the October 28, 2021 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, October 28, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. This meeting was conducted remotely in compliance with the Governor's Executive Order 2020-07 suspending certain Open Meetings Act provisions due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Interim Chairman Maureen Grinnell and Commissioners Jan Gibson, Ron Levitsky, and Robin Petit

Commissioners absent: Three positions vacant.

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

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

Interim Chairman Grinnell 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 June 3, 2021 and July 12, 2021 meetings of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The minutes of the June 3, 2021 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission were approved as presented.

The minutes of the July 12, 2021 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission were approved as presented.

Commissioner Gibson stated for the record that at the July 12, 2021 Historic Preservation Commission meeting, she seconded a motion made by Commissioner Sperry as detailed on page 37 of the minutes of that meeting. She clarified that her understanding of the motion was that it was based on the findings articulated by a majority of the Commissioners at that meeting detailing how the petition for the third phase of the McKinley Road Planned Development did not meet various Standards. She stated that in voting to deny the petition, she understood that the failure to meet the Standards was the reason for the denial.

Commissioner Petit stated that she has the same understanding as Commissioner Gibson. She stated that following many hours of public testimony and given the late hour, she felt there was enough information to deny the petition did not meet the Standards.

Commissioner Levitsky agreed with Commissioner Gibson's remarks.

Interim Chairman Grinnell concurred with Commissioner Gibson's statement.

3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for revisions to previously approved plans for a new residence on the vacant lot located at 730 Washington Road.

Property Owner: Joan DePree

Project Representatives: Austin DePree and Nate Lielasus, Northworks Architects

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

Mr. DePree introduced the petition and explained that since the petition was initially approved, some changes are being considered. He explained that the changes were driven by the property owner's desire to reduce the height and scale of the house and a desire to change the exterior materials from stucco to a board and batten siding. He said that his firm also designed the house that will be constructed on the vacant lot to the south which was recently approved by the Commission. He explained that the proposed changes do not alter the footprint of the house or the overall site plan. He presented images of the site and surrounding area. He stated that much thought was given to the how this house will relate to the new house his firm designed for the lot to the south. He stated that preservation of open space along Washington and Walnut Roads is a driver in both designs. He stated that key features of the overall plan remain the same as previously approved by the Commission noting that the motor court and entry remain on the west side of the property to preserve the park like streetscape along Washington Road. He stated that Craig Bergmann is the landscape architect for the project adding that a natural theme is intended for the landscape plan. He reviewed the floor plans noting that approximately 1,000 square feet was removed from the second floor. He stated that the house is designed for an empty nester, and after considering the budget, the owner decided that not as much space is needed as originally planned. He stated that with the smaller house, a cottage architectural style is proposed with board and batten siding as the primary material as opposed to stucco. He reviewed the previously approved elevations and the elevations as now proposed. He pointed out that the dormers were removed and the large bay window fronting on the center courtyard was replaced with three simple sets of French doors. He stated that the scale of the residence is significantly reduced from the earlier plan. He pointed out that the front door was embellished to make it more prominent and to establish a stronger overall hierarchy on the house. He noted that shutters are now proposed. He presented renderings of the home as now proposed. In response to a comment in the staff report, he pointed out that the house is slightly taller than the garage and is flanked by large fireplaces. He noted that the garage is intended to appear as a carriage house so in his opinion, the of the garage in relation to the house is appropriate as proposed. He stated that a cobblestone walkway to the front door is proposed to add character and a sense of warmth and modesty. He stated that the intent overall is to create a house that is subtle and modest, yet elegant. He noted

that a water feature is planned in the center of the rear terrace. He presented images of some of the neighboring homes giving the context of the site. He noted that there is great diversity of architecture in the area. He presented images that served as inspiration for the revised design of the house. He acknowledged that there is some variation among the windows intentionally to create a playfulness. He noted that despite the differences in the windows, the proportions remain the same for the different openings.

Ms. Baehr stated that the Commission previously approved a design for a new house on this property. She stated that a revised design of the residence is now presented for Commission. She stated that the proposed changes result in a Cottage style home as opposed to the more contemporary style previously proposed and approved. She noted that the various changes to the plans are outlined in the staff report. She noted that the previously approved plans are included in the Commission's packet for reference. She noted that changes are proposed to the exterior materials, windows and to the architectural detailing. She stated that no changes are proposed to the site plan or landscape plan. She stated that the second floor space in the main portion of the residence was eliminated reducing the square footage of the home by about 18 percent and reducing the height of the main mass of the home by about three and a half feet. She stated that the staff report notes concern about the appropriateness of the height of the garage in relation to the residence and notes that the windows as proposed, appear more contemporary than the other aspects of the house. She stated that written public testimony on the petition was received from the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation and was distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting. She stated that findings in support of the petition are included in the staff report subject to Commission input and direction. She noted that the staff report includes recommended conditions of approval.

Interim Chairman Grinnell thanked the petitioner for the presentation and the clarification on the reasons for the changes that were made to the approved plans. She invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson stated that she has questions relating to Standards 2, 3 and 9 and the windows and massing. She stated disappointment that the bay window on the east elevation was removed noting that it was charming and seemed to balance the two gables and add interest to the center portion of the house. She asked about the depth of the bay window as originally proposed. She stated that she understands the goal of reducing the square footage. She asked about the color of the shutters, siding and type of windows. She asked about the potential for light to emanate from the home noting that the Preservation Foundation raised concerns about light impacts. She suggested consideration of blocking the openings in the gable end, above the porch. She noted that the petitioner showed images of the Morse Ely house which has smaller window panes and suggested consideration of smaller panes.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. DePree stated that the bay window previously proposed was three feet deep and appeared to crowd the courtyard space. He stated that the siding is Dove White, a grayish white and an historically based color. He stated that the shutters will be a platinum gray, another historically recognized color. He noted that based on previous comments from the Commission, the black windows were eliminated, and white windows are now proposed. He stated that aluminum clad wood windows are proposed, with simulated divided lites and a spacer bar between the glass. He stated that the windows will be single casements that hinge from the side. He stated that eliminating the openings in the gable end will significantly change the feeling of the porch. He noted that the intent is to recreate a porch on the petitioner's current Jerome Cerny house. He stated that the lighting in the porch will be very subdued. He stated that the size of the window panes will not affect the amount of light emanating from the home. He stated that larger panes as proposed, provide for a closer connection to the outdoors. He stated that he understands the interest in making the house look 100 years old but noted that there is also the opportunity with today's products and materials, to create a more open feeling environment. He stated that as proposed, the size of the panes are not so large that they appear contemporary but simply give a nod to the fact that the house is building in the 2000's instead of in 1920. He stated that care was taken to make sure every pane has a beautiful vertical proportion and avoid a sense of being cages in from the inside. He noted that large windows are found at the Onwentsia Club for instance in the living room despite the fact that it is a 1920's building.

Commissioner Gibson cautioned against creating a waterfall that feels contrived. She suggested consideration of making the feature more of a pool with primary visibility from the terrace, rather than from the street. She stated her hope that the water feature would not be lighted.

Mr. DePree stated that the water feature is not intended to be prominent on the site but instead, add an element that activates the courtyard space. He agreed to study the water feature further.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the size of the sidelights on either side of the front door.

Mr. DePree stated that each of the panes that make up the sidelights are approximately 24 inches wide and 30 inches tall.

Commissioner Gibson suggested consideration of reducing the size of the sidelights noting that the sidelights and transom appear prominent and may emit considerable light.

Mr. DePree noted that a goal is to create an environment where interior lights are not needed during the day. He noted that the sidelights and transom bring western light

into the living room. He stated a willingness to consider adding divisions to break up the sidelights and transom and raising the panels on either side of the door.

Commissioner Gibson stated that with respect to massing and Standard 2, the main portion of the house is only a foot taller than the garage. She noted that the garage appears quite large in the rendering and asked whether consideration was given to reducing the overall height of the garage.

Mr. DePree stated consideration was given to reducing the height of the garage given the reduction in height of the house. He explained that the height of the garage was reduced and as a result, only about 70 percent of the second floor space above the garage is useable. He stated that the owner desires a separate living space above the garage which limits the ability to further reduce the height of the garage. He noted that the entry on the house is accentuated to serve as a focal point and added that the garage is not visible from the street given its location behind the house. He noted that the masses of the house and garage are separated to the extent possible, and the garage is designed in the character of a Carriage House, elevating it above a simple garage. He noted that the house under construction to the north has a three car garage that extends toward the street adding that in perspective, that garage appears larger than the house. He stated that in this petition, efforts were made to diminish the presence of the house on the streetscape by located the garage behind the house. He stated that without significantly changing the floor plan of the house, the height of the garage cannot be lowered further.

Commissioner Gibson asked if the petitioner would consider eliminating the shed on the side of the garage.

Mr. DePree stated that the garbage and recycling will be located in the shed. He noted that because the house as designed essentially with four front elevations, it is important to have a place to hide the trash/recycling containers. area. He stated that landscape is planned near the shed and added that the shed will be accessed from inside the garage.

Commissioner Gibson suggested that the driveway island be adjusted to be on axis with the front door.

Mr. DePree explained that the entry court is asymmetrical intentionally to avoid crowding the home. He noted that much of the hardscape will be a natural material to create an historic character. He stated that consideration was given to tightening the drive circle but maintaining a larger landscape area at the center was determined to be important.

Commissioner Levitsky noted that there appears to be some inconsistencies in the drawings noting that in some of the drawings the garage appears to relate better to the house than in others.

Mr. DePree noted that the renderings are drawn from different perspectives. He pointed out the rendering that best represents the relationship between the house and garage as it will appear from the neighboring property.

Commissioner Levitsky asked what is meant by the phrase, "a playful combination of windows".

Mr. DePree stated that in his opinion, it creates whimsy and interest to have the windows represent the interior spaces. He explained that the large sidelights and transom at the front entrance creates hierarchy. He stated that in many homes in Lake Forest, especially homes designed by Adler and Lindeberg, there is not a rigid, uniform size of glazing around the entire structure but instead, small sections of have a little vignette, its own symmetrical component of the house which, when considered together, add interest.

Commissioner Levitsky asked for clarification on staff's recommendation.

Ms. Baehr confirmed that staff is recommending approval of the petition subject to the conditions detailed in the staff report. She reviewed that the conditions relate to the massing of the garage in relation to the house and the proportions of the windows. She noted that the Commission is not bound to follow the staff recommendation or accept the suggested conditions.

Commissioner Petit commented that in her opinion, the proportions of the previously approved front door were more pleasing in comparison to the large contemporary front entrance as now proposed. She encouraged further study of the entrance element. She suggested that eliminating the shutters could lighten up the appearance of the side elevation. She asked if a standing seam metal roof is still proposed and asked what material is proposed for the pergolas.

Mr. DePree stated that a metal roof is proposed on the bay window on the south side of the home. He stated that the pergolas will be white painted wood. He stated that the shutters in his opinion connect the various elevations of the house. He said that as final design development is completed, all of the comments and suggestions of the Commission will be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Petit asked that special attention be given to landscape lighting given the amount of green space on Washington Road. She commended the project.

Interim Chairman Grinnell stated that series of eight windows with one window in the gable end appears crowded. She noted that in the approved plans, the windows were in the same locations but did not have shutters. She stated that rather than removing the shutters, consideration could be given to considering eliminating one of the windows in the projecting bay to echo the bay next to the front door on the west elevation.

Mr. DePree agreed to explore Interim Chairman Grinnell's suggestion. He stated that raising the window in the gable about 10 inches will also be explored. He noted that the bay on the side elevation is larger than the bay next to the front door and pointed out that a single window in the bay on the side elevation may appear stark. He stated that the spacing of the windows on the left elevation is similar to the window spacing in the gallery that connects the garage to the residence.

Interim Chairman Grinnell questioned whether the front door is wide enough to be easily accessible.

Mr. DePree stated that the door is 42 inches wide and 8 feet tall. He stated that accessibility will be considered as the progression up to the front door is refined.

Interim Chairman Grinnell suggested consideration of painting the shed the same color as the house to allow it to blend in with the larger structure.

Mr. DePree agreed and added that consideration will also be given to cladding the shed in the same material as the house.

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

Art Miller, Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, stated that the front entry is similar to the entry to a home on Stonegate that was designed by Walter Frazier in 1963. He stated that the large window panes are reflective of the international style. He noted that the entrance to the home from the garden, not the front entrance, is visible from the street. He suggested that consideration be given to using the technique used by Howard Van Doren Shaw at Ragsdale. He noted that shutters are placed on parts of the house that are not emphasized and shutters are not used on portions of the house that are intended to call attention. He stated that it is not necessary for all windows to have shutters. He suggested that further study be done on the ratio of the glass to the solid wall on the garden elevation. He noted that there is not much other than roof and glass on the elevation. He stated that the terrace is similar to the terrace at Frank Lloyd Wright's Taliesin West in that it appears a drop off. He noted that if the home is intended for elderly people, the drop off could be a problem. He stated that there may need to be a railing to meet code requirements. He stated that the garage massing has been explained adding that the garage it is not visible from the street. He suggested giving more consideration to the east side of the home which can be seen from the street.

Hearing no further public testimony, Interim Chairman Grinnell summarized the Commission's comments and suggestions noting that further study should be completed on the front entrance to consider the amount of light that may be emitted and the accessibility, consideration should be given to softening the appearance of the garage in relation to the house through landscaping or color selection, the shutters placement and need for shutters particularly on the left side,

and assuring that the water feature is natural in appearance and that the drop offs of the surrounding terraces are safe.

Commissioner Gibson commended the elimination of the dormers on the east elevation and various other changes that were made. She asked that the large sidelights and transom adjacent to and above the front door be reconsidered. She stated support for the change made to the window color, from black to white. She encouraged consideration of lowering the height of the garage.

Mr. DePree stated that consideration will be given to changing the pitch on the garage to diminish the scale of the garage.

Commissioner Gibson suggested revisiting the water feature. She stated continued concern about the large windows noting that the size of the windows is not consistent with the cottage style. She stated that the size of the panes should be reduced but noted that they do not need to be as small as the panes in cottages of the 1920s and 1930s.

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

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the revised plans for a new residence on the vacant lot located at 730 Washington Road. 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 and refinement of the following:
 - The window proportions, including the transom and sidelights at the front entrance.
 - The water feature on the terrace in an effort to achieve a more natural element.
 - The use of shutters around the home.
 - The garage roof pitch in an effort to lower the height of the garage.
 - Accessibility at the front entrance.
 - The appearance of the trash enclosure on the west side of the garage.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the refinements noted above. Any further refinements made in response to direction from the Commission or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Commission shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Commission's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.

3. At the time of submittal for a building permit, detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. The plans shall clearly reflect all existing trees and identify those proposed for removal. Grading and filling shall be limited to the minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards in the interest of minimizing stress on the trees intended to remain. The plans shall be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer in consultation with the City's Certified Arborist.
4. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect all trees identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. Chain link fencing shall be required to protect trees intended for preservation in addition to any pre and post construction treatments or maintenance required by the City's Certified Arborist.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed, landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall provide for the required replacement inches on site to the extent possible using good forestry practices and identify any remaining inches for which a payment in lieu of planting will be required prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. If during construction, additional trees on the site are compromised in the opinion of the City's Certified Arborist, additional replacement inches or payment in lieu of on site planting may be required.
6. Details of all exterior lighting shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. No landscape lighting is proposed based on the current plans. For all exterior lights on the residence, garage or elsewhere on the site, cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be provided. All fixtures shall solely direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property by the fixtures.
7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. The existing topography and trees and vegetation shall be protected from impact. Due to the curving road no parking of construction or contractor vehicles is permitted on the adjacent streets. Off-site parking at the public parking lots located nearby may be required.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Levitsky and approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

- 4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a single-story, non-original sunroom on the rear of the home and construction of additions and exterior alterations to the existing residence and garage located at 650 Lake Road. A building scale variance is also requested.**

Property Owner: Stephanie Burke

Project Representative: Diana Melichar, architect

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

Ms. Melichar introduced the petition and stated that the residence was built in 1926, in the Colonial Revival style with simple detailing and building massing. She noted that the home is mostly brick except for the clapboard siding on the second story. She stated that the south elevation was modified with the addition of a bay window in 1946. She stated that on the west elevation, the fenestration lacks organization and in 1936, was modified with a boxy one-story wrought iron screen porch. She stated that in 1976, modern sliding glass doors were added to the screen porch. She stated that the porch is in poor condition and will be removed. She stated that the detached two car garage that was added in 1947 is just four feet from the house. She noted that there is a small living space above the detached garage which has small gable dormers for light and ventilation. She noted that there are no dormers on the street facing facade of the detached garage. She pointed out that there is a single car garage, with an arched opening incorporated into the home. She stated that the home has been unoccupied for quite some time and has water issues which have resulted in mold. She stated that the owner has taken steps to address the water infiltration and has installed dehumidifiers to stabilize the structure until the home is renovated. She noted that the exterior of the home was sealed with many layers of paint in past years which has contributed to the moisture issues. She stated that the goal is to comprehensively remediate and renovate the structure, rather than demolish it. She reviewed the proposed changes noting that care was taken to maintain the street facing elevations of the home and detached garage. She stated one new window opening is proposed on the front elevation, in the current attached garage space, to take advantage of views to the Lake since this area will be converted to a home office. She stated that a door will be added to allow access from the office to an intimate front yard garden. She noted other changes to the windows around the home which are intended to provide balance and symmetry. She stated that although the home sits on a phenomenal property, it is dark with minimal views to the outside. She reviewed that the west facing living room windows will be replaced with full height French doors and the dining room will open to a glassy addition that overlooks the backyard. She reviewed the existing and proposed elevations. She noted that the additions on the west side of the home will generally be in the footprint of the sunroom which will be removed. She noted that the additions are located on the rear of the home and out of sight of neighbors and the Lake Road streetscape. She stated that the proposed additions organize the rear facade and provide balance to the rear elevation. She added that the one-and-a-half story additions are in keeping with the front of the home and the overall architecture of the home. She stated that the proposed additions provide visual and physical connections to the rear yard and outdoor living spaces and more light and ventilation the interior spaces. She stated that the additions will provide much needed space for the owner and will bring the home up to today's living standards. She noted that the proposed improvements will make the house livable for many years to come. She reviewed the details of the proposed sun room noting that the arched openings reference to the existing arched garage door on the home and the

arched openings on the interior of the home. She stated that on the north side of the home, the small, covered porch will be removed. She explained that the existing detached garage will be connected to the home with a new side entry and mud room. She noted that the front yard is large and expansive, but the driveway uncomfortably hugs the home and squeezes the garden fence at the front of the home. She noted that the existing sidewalk approach to the home is not in scale with the home's size and stature. She presented a historic photograph of the home. She stated that it is likely that the existing driveway configuration came about because of the large Elm Tree that was located in front of the home. She noted that the tree has since died and was removed but the driveway configuration remains. She stated the owner prefers to eliminate the sweeping driveway to highlight the expansive front yard. She presented the proposed landscape plan, an informal plan to complement the architecture, asymmetrical massing and sweeping roof lines. She stated that an appropriately sized front entry is planned along with an updated garden at the front of the home. She noted that the courtyard fence will be moved forward to line up with the east wing of the house. She stated that with the eliminate of the circular drive, landscaping will dominate the front of the home. She stated that a bluestone walk is proposed. She noted that the perimeter of the property will be planted to enhance the existing screening from adjacent properties. She stated that much time and effort has gone into studying the historical aspects of the home to allow sensitive renovation and additions, consistent with the existing architecture of the home.

Ms. Baehr stated that the home is identified as a Contributing Structure to the Local Historic District and was designed by a prominent architect, Walter Frazier. She noted that the property is on the west side of Lake Road and totals about 1.2 acres. She stated that the house was built in 1930 and the single story sunroom on the rear of the home was built in 1936, as an open porch. She stated that the sunroom on the rear of the home is inconsistent with the style and character of the residence and is proposed for demolition. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the demolition of the sunroom adding that it is not original to the home. She confirmed that the proposed additions are located almost entirely behind the residence with only a small portion of the mudroom addition extending beyond the north side of the house. She noted that the additions are designed to match the style and character of the existing home with steeply pitched gable roof forms and matching exterior materials and window types. She stated that a building scale variance is required for the proposed additions because the existing residence is close to the allowable square footage. She stated with the addition, the residence will exceed the allowable square footage by 570 square feet, nine percent. She stated that findings in support of a building scale are offered in the staff report. She stated that extensive landscaping is proposed to mitigate views of the additions from adjacent properties. She stated that based on staff's review of the petition the proposed additions and exterior alterations are in keeping with the character of the historic home and the surrounding neighborhood. She noted that conditions of approval are included in the recommendation in the staff report.

Commissioner Levitsky requested additional information about the history of the home noting that it was featured on the cover of a magazine in the 1930s.

Ms. Melichar stated that an historic assessment of the home was completed and was included in the Commission's packet. She stated that she is not aware of how the house ended up on the cover of the magazine adding that the home is pleasing from the street.

Commissioner Levitsky noted past concerns about light spillover from skylights.

Ms. Melichar stated that currently, the home is very dark and is like a train car with a series of rooms attached to each other in a linear manner. She explained that the house is designed with a service side on the north adding that the circulation within the house is awkward. She stated that the skylight is proposed in the stair hall to add light and connect the different areas of the home. She stated that the proposed skylight is consistent with those used on historic homes and will filter light through a glass panel. She added that the skylight will not be just a shaft. She stated that there should not be any issues with light spillover because the skylight is located on a low sloped roof and will not be visible from neighboring homes.

Commissioner Levitsky asked staff for an explanation of why Standard 4 is noted as being generally, rather than fully met.

Ms. Baehr stated that the rear elevation has large expanses of glass while the other elevations present a balance of solids to voids. She acknowledged that the large expanses of glass on the rear of the home are intended to take advantage of views to the rear yard and will not be highly visible from off the site.

Commissioner Petit complimented the project and asked if the color scheme, white siding, brick, and black shutters will remain the same. She asked if all the windows will be replaced or if some will be restored.

Ms. Melichar stated that the color scheme will remain the same. She stated that the layers of paint will be removed from the brick to allow a lime wash to be applied consistent with the original treatment. She stated that all the windows will be replaced because the existing windows are not functional and do not provide egress opportunities as required by Code. She added that there are pretty major issues with the wall construction in some areas. She stated that the new windows will have the same muntin pattern and the existing windows. She noted that there is mold in the house that will need to be addressed.

Commissioner Petit asked if the existing shutters will be replaced.

Ms. Melichar confirmed that the shutters will be replaced and will match the existing shutters.

Commissioner Gibson questioned why a Chippendale railing is proposed on the rear elevation, different from the railing on the front of the home.

Ms. Melichar explained that the railing on the front of the home is on the ground and the railing on the rear elevation is on the second floor. She stated that the design of the fencing at the front of the home has not been finalized adding that historic photos will be studied. She stated that the intent was to add some playfulness on the rear of the home.

Commissioner Gibson asked whether the two small vertical windows on the rear elevation can be eliminated.

Ms. Melichar stated that the windows are similar to the windows on either side of the front door and are intended to provide light in the hallway.

Commissioner Gibson observed that there is an arch over the single garage door, two arches on the rear elevation, and arches inside the home. She questioned whether it is appropriate to use an arch for the single car garage given that the two car garage do not have arches.

Ms. Melichar stated that changing the doors on the existing two-car garage was not considered.

Commissioner Gibson stated that there are no arches on the rear elevation and commented that rectangular windows would be more appropriate.

Ms. Melichar stated that the arched windows in the sunroom are intentional to offer an open and airy feeling and to add something special to that part of the home.

Commissioner Gibson suggested consideration of adding an arched opening on the other side of the addition to balance the arches proposed in the sunroom.

Interim Chairman Grinnell commented that the arches are intended to increase the amount of light and expand views. She stated that in her opinion, the arches do not take away from the house adding that the mix of styles does not seem inappropriate. She stated that removing the existing sunroom will be an improvement. Hearing no further questions from the Commission, she invited public testimony.

Art Miller, Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, stated that the Foundation commends everyone involved in the project. He offered some history of the home. He stated that there is a "sibling" to this Walter Frazier house by David Adler at Crab Tree Farm built in 1927. He stated that both this home and Crab Tree Farmhouse convey growth over time adding that both have masonry below and wood siding above. He explained that there are arches in some areas and not in others because the garage was a later addition and steps down from the main house. He stated that the proposed addition is warranted given the expansiveness of the back yard adding

that it will not have a negative effect on the neighboring properties. He stated that the the petitioner is making modest, respectful changes and removing some of the asphalt in front of the house. He explained that the proposal is logical adding that trying to make the home more symmetrical would conflict with the hierarchy of form.

Hearing no further comments from the public, Interim Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Levitsky expressed gratitude that the historic home is being preserved. He noted that in this case, the petitioner is proposing to reduce the amount of impervious surface which is unusual.

Commissioner Gibson agreed with Commissioner Levitsky's comments about impervious surface. She stated that the landscape plan appears balanced and commended the petitioner on incorporating native species. She stated that the plans are very well thought out. She commented that the addition of a window in the office enhances the front façade. She stated that proposed rear addition engages with the large back yard. She stated continued concern about the appropriateness of the three arches in the sunroom noting that it is unusual. She also noted that an arch on the single car garage is strange given that there are not arches on the larger garage. She stated support for the building scale variance and the demolition of the sunroom.

Interim Chairman Grinnell pointed out that the adjacent property owner submitted a letter in support of the petition. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Petit made a motion to approve the demolition of the sunroom on the rear of the home located at 650 Lake Road based on the findings as detailed in the staff report.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Commissioner Petit made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of additions, exterior alterations, and a building scale variance. She stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report and is subject to following conditions.

1. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of final design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, *along with* the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
3. Details of exterior lighting shall be submitted with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a five car detached garage and additions and exterior alterations to the existing residence located at 425 Sheridan Road. Building scale and height variances are also requested.

Property Owners and Project Representatives: Lisa Wolfe and Mark DiGanci

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

Ms. Wolfe stated that she and her husband purchased the property four years ago and at that time, the gate house was in poor condition. She stated that over the last three years, significant repair and restoration work was completed on the structure. She noted however that the 1,500 square foot gate house is not large enough or modern enough to accommodate their work and lifestyles. She stated the intention to "do right by" the gate house with a design that is compatible with the historic structure. She stated that the property is unconventional noting that the property shares a driveway with the house to the east, is bordered by a ravine to the north, and screened by thick vegetation on two sides. She stated that the property is only visible to one neighboring property, 427 Sheridan Road. She noted that Lake Forest College is located across the ravine to the north and to the west, across Sheridan Road. She reviewed the proposed site plan. She noted that as proposed, the gate house will be attached to the existing detached garage with a breezeway and the existing garage will be converted to living space. She noted that a hallway addition is proposed around the front facade of the existing garage to provide access to the proposed detached garage, the "stable". She stated that visually, the structures will appear as three separate buildings: the stable, the converted garage and the

historic gate house. She stated that the goal is to create an ensemble of visually compatible buildings. She stated that alternate locations were considered for the stable and explained that the location presented maximizes the use of the site by allowing for an ample motor court and maintaining open yard space behind the gate house for English gardens. She pointed out that the stable is sited as far back from Sheridan Road as possible. She noted that the topography of the site minimizes views of the stable from Sheridan Road. She stated that importantly, the gate house will continue to stand alone and views of it from Sheridan Road will remain unchanged. She stated that the gate house will not be crowded by other structures or be incorporated into a larger structure. She stated that there is limited historical information on the original manor house, the White Oaks Estate and the gate house, but noted that based on the available information, it appears that there was not a strong architectural connection between the two. She stated that based on available information, the gate house was never meant to be a miniature version of the manor house. She stated that since the manor house no longer exists, there is no context for reimagining the original design intent for the former estate. She stated that since the gate house likely had a "working role" supporting the estate, an English cottage style is proposed for the stable. She reviewed the existing and proposed elevations of the gate house and described it as a quirky, charming structure with no symmetry. She pointed out that each elevation reflects some unusual elements such as unique windows and multiple door openings. She reviewed the exterior materials including brick walls, a slate roof, copper downspouts and gutters, and stucco accents. She stated that unlike the Georgian architectural style or other traditional styles, there is no textbook definition for the English cottage style adding that it is more fluid. She stated that the English cottage style is common for a working estate, a collection of smaller structures with symmetrical elements and a consistent material palette. She stated that the stable utilizes the material palette from the gate house. She stated that the roof forms on the proposed stable replicate the roof shapes and slopes on the gate house. She added that the Tudor style details on the gate house will be incorporated into the new structure. She stated that a stone retaining wall, a traditional English element, is proposed in the back yard. She stated that the windows in the existing structures will be replaced with new thermal pane, aluminum clad wood casement windows with simulated divided lites. She stated that the exterior lighting is proposed mostly as gas lanterns. She stated that the proposed front façade of the existing detached garage plays off the asymmetry on the gate house with an entrance offset from the center, a pointed window and an arch at the entrance that mimics the arch on the side door of the gate house. She added that new dormers are also proposed. She explained that only limited window openings are proposed on the new stable building to camouflage the structure and minimize light impacts on neighboring properties. She stated that the overall design of the stable was driven by the English cottage style. She acknowledged that there are some discrepancies on the plans and confirmed the intent to keep the new structure under twenty five feet, the maximum height permitted for accessory structures. She noted that stables are traditionally one of the largest structures on an English cottage property and acknowledged that as proposed, the stable is larger than the 1,500 square foot gatehouse. She stated that the detached garage has five bays and a

natural center emphasized with a gable and a large window with Tudor details. She stated that the center gable is intended to visually minimize the height and size of the stables. She stated that the garage doors are inspired by traditional carriage style doors. She noted that a cupola is proposed at the center of the roof and acknowledged that the cupola exceeds the 25 foot height limitation for accessory structures. She stated that the cupola is a traditional English element and as an ornamental feature, it breaks up the mass and the length of the building. She stated that the cupola will be wood and copper and will not be lit. She presented renderings of the proposed project and reiterated that views of the stable from Sheridan Road will be screened by the brick wall and vegetation. She added that the detached garage is located approximately 165 feet from Sheridan Road. She stated that a two-story window is proposed on the back of the existing garage as a unique element. She noted that the gable element on the front of the stable carries through to the rear and provides some detail on the rear of the structure. She stated that low brick walls with acorn finials are proposed on both sides of the new driveway leading to the motor court in front of the detached garage. She stated that a pond and English garden are proposed in the rear yard. She noted that evergreen trees will be planted along the rear property line to help to screen the mass of the stable from the neighboring properties. She stated that the proposed work will require removal of 26 trees require removal about seven of which are dead or in poor condition. She noted that they are working with an arborist to develop a maintenance plan for the remaining trees in an effort to preserve them and protect them from construction impacts.

Ms. Baehr confirmed that the property is located on the east side of Sheridan Road, is bordered by a ravine to the north, and surrounded by single family homes on the south and east sides. She stated that the existing structures on the property include an historic gate house and a three car garage built in 1948. She reviewed that the petitioner is proposing to convert the existing garage into living space and build an addition to connect the gate house and the existing garage. She stated that the connection is a one story element and allows the two structures to read as separate structures with minimal impact to the historic gate house. She stated that a second addition is proposed along the north side of the existing garage, wrapping around to the east side of the structure to provide additional living space. She noted that the new building that is proposed, referred to as the stable, will replace and expand the garage space on the property. She stated that the stable as proposed is larger than a typical garage with five garage bays on the first floor and studio space on the second floor. She stated that the maximum permitted height for accessory structures is 25 feet and noted that the petitioners have stated the intent to comply with the height limit despite the dimensions reflected on some of the drawings. She stated that a building scale variance is requested, with the proposed addition and new building, the structures will exceed the permitted square footage of 4,733 square feet, by 15 percent. She stated that findings in support of a building scale variance are included in the staff report. She stated that the existing structures on the property are nonconforming with respect to the zoning setbacks and noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals recently considered and recommended approval of setback variances

for the proposed additions on the existing structures. She stated that the proposed stable complies with the required zoning setbacks for an accessory structure but noted that several members of the Board expressed concern about the size and height of the proposed stable in relation to the neighboring homes. She stated that written testimony was received from neighboring property owners and the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation and were provided to the Commission. She stated that overall, based on staff's review of the petition, many of the Commission's Standards appear to be satisfied however, questions remain around the compatibility of the size and height of the proposed stable with the historic structures on the site and the surrounding neighborhood.

Interim Chairman Grinnell invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Petit asked if the 425 Sheridan Road property will continue to be a separate property or whether it will be incorporated into the larger property. She noted that a five car garage is unusual for a two bedroom home.

Ms. Wolfe stated that 425 Sheridan Road will remain a stand alone property.

Mr. DiGanci explained that currently, they live in a large home and noted that the space above the five car garage, the stable, will primarily be used for storage. He added that he has a car collection which necessitates the five car garage. He stated that three of the bays in the stable are proposed to have lifts to accommodate additional cars.

Commissioner Petit asked about the thought process that led to hipped dormers on the stable. She noted that the gate house has shed dormers and the existing garage has hipped dormers.

Mr. DiGanci explained that some of the elements of the gate house are incorporated into the stable such as gable roof forms that are hipped back. He stated that a more traditional gable roof was explored for the stable but appeared foreign to the design. He stated that the current proposal softens the rooflines.

Commissioner Petit stated that there appears to be a large amount of stucco around the two-story arched window on the back of the house. She asked if other materials and details were considered for that element.

Mr. DiGanci stated that the proposal presented is the result of about four years of study of various materials and designs. He stated that the investment in the property will never be recouped but they want to do right by the property and the community.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that the petitioner's enthusiasm is infectious and acknowledged that the petitioners have a vision for the property. He noted that there are three components of the petition: the changes proposed to the gate house, the incorporation of the existing garage into the living space and the new

building referred to as the stable. He stated that there is not a clear hierarchy between the structures and asked the petitioner to address that concern.

Mr. DiGanci explained that driving on to the property, the gate house captures attention given its location and detail. He stated that the proposed breezeway and the existing garage step back from the gate house and are partially hidden behind a brick garden wall. He noted that ivy will be grown on the walls of the existing garage and on the new breezeway to camouflage that part of the home and allow the gate house to stand out. He stated that the stable structure will be the least dominant component on the site because it is hidden behind the other structures, and it will not be visible from the street. He noted that the stable will be dug into the ground about three and a half feet to allow it to settle into the existing topography. He noted that a pond is proposed to deal with the current flooding that occurs on the site adding that downspouts will be directed to that retention area. He noted that because of the grade change across the property, a portion of the garage will only extend 20.5 feet above grade with another portion reaching the full 25 feet that is permitted. He noted that the entrance to the stable is setback behind the gate house and landscaping. He acknowledged that the gate house is the smallest structure on the property but noted that it will be highlighted because it is most important. He stated that the stable building will not be visible except to those entering the motor court.

Commissioner Levitsky asked why the petitioner chose to put the entrance to the home in the existing garage rather than in the gate house itself.

Ms. Wolfe stated that currently, there are two entrances into the gate house, one has a tiny square landing at the staircase and the other enters into a living room. She explained that there is no opportunity to create a foyer with the existing entrances, so a new entrance is proposed. She explained that the new entrance will lead to a beautiful hallway and will be located close to visitor parking.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that two neighbors commented on the solid configuration of the back of the stable building. He acknowledged that openings were eliminated to avoid light impacts on the neighboring homes. He stated however that the back of the stable does not have a residential feel. He stated that when he visited the site and stood in the area of the stable, he could see the neighboring homes. He acknowledged that more vegetation will provide some additional screening of the building. He noted that the staff report also commented on the solid nature of the rear of the stable in an effort to achieve privacy but also noted that as a result, the building does not have a residential scale of feel. He stated that a traditional stable has openings on both sides.

Mr. DiGanci explained that openings on the rear of the stable were eliminated to reduce the overall square footage which is increased by the addition of dormers. He stated that having natural light in the space is not a concern given that the space will not be heavily used. He stated that he may have a small studio in the space, but only

for his use. He stated a willingness to add dormers to the rear of the building if additional square footage is allowed.

Commissioner Gibson thanked the petitioner for restoring the gates and walls around the property. She stated that she has questions around Standards 1, height, 10, scale and massing, and 17 pertaining to the historic structure. She stated her understanding that the detached building, the stable will not exceed the 25 foot maximum height, but the cupola will extend above the building three and a half feet. She stated concern about the overall height proposed and questioned whether the first and second floors need to be as tall as proposed.

Mr. DiGanci explained that there is 11 feet between the first floor and the underside of the structure to accommodate a lift. He stated that there will be a 12 inch structure between the first and second floors so the actual level of the second floor will be 12 feet above the garage floor. He stated that the second floor will have a hip roof and the height will vary to a maximum of nine feet. He stated that there will be a 12 inch structure at the ridge of the roof.

Commissioner Gibson stated that the staff report refers to the detached garage as a story-and-a-half structure however, there are windows in the gable ends making the structure clearly a two-story building. She asked if some of the garage stalls are open to the second floor.

Mr. DiGanci stated that the garage bays will not be open to the second floor and confirmed that there is a complete floor above the garage. He noted however, given the hipped roof, the building is appropriately considered a story-and-a-half because there is not a second floor wall on top of the first floor, only a roof. He added that because the second floor is under the hipped roof only about 50 percent of the space will be useable.

Commissioner Gibson suggested consideration of splitting the bays with a porte cochere to achieve a more delicate appearance. She expressed concern that as proposed, the building is a large mass.

Mr. DiGanci stated that they have not considered an open bay but noted that it could be problematic because the garage is set into the ground because the property slopes five to six feet from back to front. He noted that a garden wall is proposed behind the house to accommodate the lowered grade.

Commissioner Gibson stated that she walked the entire property and saw the dead and the healthy trees and is familiar with the grade change across the property. She questioned whether the grade under an open archway could be raised to allow the mass to be opened up.

Mr. DiGanci stated that two trees will be planted near the driveway, in front of the stable, to soften the elevation and overall mass. He added that the gable element

on the garage breaks up the mass and noted that gas lanterns are proposed to allow the bay to appear as an entrance.

Commissioner Gibson noted that the staff report refers to the dormers as clipped gables, but she stated that the correct term is jerkinhead, a hip roof on two sides and gable roofs on the other two sides. She stated that jerkinhead roofs are not very common in the community and instead, hip or gable roofs are used. She asked if the petitioner considered having either hip or gable dormers instead of the jerkinhead style.

Mr. DiGanci stated that both hip and gable dormers were considered. He stated that the proposed dormers were chosen because they are unobtrusive and do not overwhelm the structure. He stated that as proposed, the dormers have a small return and blend well with the overall structure.

Commissioner Gibson asked if they considered making the dormers smaller noting that as proposed, they appear large.

Mr. DiGanci stated that the size of the dormers is based on the height of the window adding that the dormers have the same steep roof pitch used on the rest of the house. He stated that a lower roof pitch on the dormers would appear out of place.

Commissioner Gibson asked if other locations on the property were considered for the stable.

Mr. DiGanci confirmed that various locations were considered including attaching the stable to the back of the existing garage structure.

Ms. Wolfe added that with the stable rotated and attached to the existing garage, the garage doors were right off the existing driveway. She stated that the mass of that structure was larger than the structure now proposed and created a motor court in the back yard eliminating green space.

Commissioner Gibson questioned the reasoning behind the large window proposed on the south elevation of the house.

Mr. DiGanci stated that the window is proposed in the only large room in the house, the room across from the foyer that will be used for greeting guests. He stated that the backyard will be landscaped and visible from the window. He noted that the room is four feet lower than the back yard, so although the window may appear large, it will not be prominent because it is set lower into the ground.

Ms. Wolfe stated that the window is in a two-story space and is intended to make a statement. She added that the window is located in the only room where you can enjoy views of the back yard.

Commissioner Gibson asked why there is half an Allee of trees blocking the view of the stables since that is a major part of the petitioner's life.

Mr. DiGanci stated that the English gardens are on one side of the Allee. He explained that the Allee was added to make sure the stable will not be visible from the street. He stated that only the dormers on top of the garage will be visible. He noted that the stable will be surrounded by a forest. He stated that the stable will almost be invisible.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the additional evergreen trees that will be planted to block views of the garage from the neighboring properties.

Mr. DiGanci stated that evergreens will be planted behind the garage, near the property line shared with the property at 414 Thorne Lane. He added that two more evergreens will be planted on the 427 Sheridan Road property to screen views of the garage from 450 Thorne Lane. He stated that the home on the 427 Sheridan Road property is closer to the house than to the stable. He stated that they have met with the neighbors and have offered to put evergreens on their properties for additional screening. He added that the evergreens will be 10 feet tall at planting. He stated that they have not selected a species but will select a wide, fast growing evergreen.

Commissioner Gibson stated that the letter from the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation suggested using different materials on the house and the stable to differentiate the new structure from the historic gate house and asked if alternate materials were considered.

Ms. Wolfe stated that it is important to keep brick as the prominent material to assure continuity on the site. She stated that stucco elements were added to break up the brick. She stated that consideration can be given to increasing the amount of stucco and reducing the brick on the new structures.

Interim Chairman Grinnell encouraged the petitioner to find a way to reduce the square footage coverage to under 10 percent. She pointed out that there is a significant amount of impervious surface on the site. She acknowledged that extensive study that has been conducted by the petitioners but noted concern about impact on the neighbors from the large mass of the rear elevation of the stable. She complimented the design of the front of the stable, facing Sheridan Road. She questioned whether four bays, all with lifts, would be workable instead of five and only three with lifts.

Mr. DiGanci stated that he understands that the Commission would like to see the building scale variance reduced, he noted however that the property is large enough for the project, but the presence of the ravine and access easement reduce the amount of allowable square footage. He stated that the property is penalized due to its unique siting.

Ms. Wolfe explained that it has always been their dream to have their Corvette collection all in the same spot.

Mr. DiGanci stated that proportionally, five bays is more appealing from an architectural perspective. He stated that the elevation as proposed has beautiful proportions.

Interim Chairman Grinnell stated that the front elevation is much different in appearance than the rear elevation. She stated that the rear elevation presents a very large mass adding that she is trying to offer possible solutions that would not greatly compromise the overall design while at the same time, being as sensitive to the design of the rear elevation as to the front. She asked whether consideration was given to an underground garage.

Mr. DiGanci stated that he can explore an underground garage but noted that an underground garage will increase the impervious surface because a ramp would be needed. He stated that the configuration of the property limits the opportunity to have an underground garage with a functional ramp.

Ms. Czerniak clarified that the building scale calculation excludes portions of property that do not serve to visually support the square footage of a structure and that is why only 50 percent of non-table land is counted toward the allowable square footage and why an access easement is excluded. She explained that as you view the proposed stable from all directions, the land area on the site that is north of the gate house really does not visually support the structure.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Interim Chairman Grinnell invited public comment.

Art Miller, Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, stated that the Foundation is concerned about Standard 17, the integrity of the historic property. He noted that the property is a Local Landmark. He stated that the main concern is the original gate house. He stated that there should be as much differentiation as possible. He stated that in the proposed plans, it is difficult to tell where the historic gate house ends and where the new breezeway starts. He suggested that the petitioners look at the brick work on the train station that was restored a few years ago. He noted that the mortar used on the quoins and window is white or light gray and a red mortar is used on the rest of the train station building. He pointed out that the plans presented indicate white trim on the gate house and on the new entrance which he noted, should be refined further. He stated that trim in other locations could be more barn-like trim or brick color so that it is not as prominent. He agreed that there is a lack of interest on the rear elevation of the proposed stable. He suggested that windows or trellis work could be added in an interesting pattern to break up the elevation. He noted that the challenge is that the smallest building is the historic part of the complex adding that the structure is the only surviving East Lake Forest gate house that he is aware of. He stated that the gate house is a very unusual structure, and it

will take some time to get this project right and determining how all the aspects can work together. He stated that in his opinion, using a different brick color is necessary on the proposed building. He stated that focus should be on de-emphasizing the newer construction on the site to assure that the gate house is respected and showcased.

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

Commissioner Petit commended the petitioner for the hard work to date. She stated that the Commission wants the best outcome for all parties. She acknowledged that the Commission asked the petitioners some tough questions and stated her appreciation for the petitioners' help in understanding the property and the project.

Mr. DiGanci stated that they want the Commission to know they too want to do what is right and that cost is not an issue. He added that they are aware of what comes along with the property being designated as a Local Landmark and noted that when they designated the gate house, they requested the designation because the gate house is very special.

Ms. Wolfe stated that the Commission's questions and comments have offered some additional ideas to explore.

Chairman Grinnell thanked the petitioners for their willingness to consider the Commission's comments and suggestions. She reiterated that it is not the Commission's intent to keep the project from moving forward, only to make sure the applicable standards are satisfied.

Commissioner Gibson stated that more work is needed on the project. She summarized that she has concerns about the scale, the height and the compatibility of the project. She encouraged the petitioner to consider four garage bays and a porte cochere to lighten up the mass of the stable. She noted that trellis work or the addition of small windows may also provide opportunities to break up the mass of the stable, particularly the rear elevation. She stated concern about the use of jerkinhead dormers because of the massing. She stated that most dormers are too big and bulky, not the way dormers are intended to be. She added that jerkinhead dormers are not used in any of the examples of English cottages provided by the petitioner. She complimented the entrance on the home. She stated that she understands that the large window on the south elevation is in an important room but noted that many windows on south elevations are screened or never opened because of the sun. She stated that of porte cocheres in Lake Forest can be provided to the petitioners. She stated that the project needs further refinement.

Commissioner Petit stated she too has concerns about the height and the spacing of structures along the driveway. She stated that the petitioners have given her more to think about and noted that she would like to revisit the site and look at it with fresh

eyes. She stated that she too has concerns about the jerkinhead dormers and the overall scale of the stable. She stated that the solution presented is not quite right yet.

Commissioner Levitsky agreed that the back of the garage needs to be broken up in deference to the neighbors. He added that Mr. Miller's comments about differentiation were intriguing adding that the idea of separating the gate house from the former garage merits consideration.

Interim Chairman Grinnell stated that it is clear that this project is a labor of love adding that she is encouraged that they are willing to continue to work on the project and take the Commission's comments into consideration. She noted the importance of the gate house but acknowledged that there may need to be changes to the property to be able to meet the petitioner's needs. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to continue the petition to allow further study and refinement of the design in response to the comments, questions and discussion of the Commission.

1. Reduce the height and size of the detached garage.
2. Study the massing of the detached garage. Consideration should be given to incorporating an open element, such as a porte cochere, that breaks up the massing.
3. Refine the dormers. Consideration should be given to incorporating a dormer style that is consistent with the historic gate house and English cottage architecture.
4. Study the rear elevation of the detached garage to identify ways to break up the solid wall and add interest more in keeping with the level of detail on the other elevations of the garage.
5. Study the two-story window on the south elevation and explore options more in keeping with the scale of the rest of the windows on the residence.
6. Consider ways to differentiate the new structures from the historic gate house.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Petit and approved by a vote of 4 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 2022 meeting dates were approved as presented.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Planner