

Historic Preservation Commission  
Proceedings of the May 25, 2022 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, April 22, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Maureen Grinnell and Commissioners Lloyd Culbertson, Elizabeth Dalieri, Jan Gibson, Geoffrey Hanson, Ron Levitsky, and Robin Petit

Commissioners absent: None

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

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

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 the March 16, 2022 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.**

Consideration of the minutes was postponed.

**3. Lake Forest Preservation Foundation Annual Awards – Presented by Jason Smith**

Mr. Smith, on behalf of the Preservation Foundation, informed the Commission of the projects and architects recognized by the Foundation this year.

Rehabilitation Award Winners

- 245 Vine Avenue
- 509 E. Deerpath
- 375 Washington Road
- 120 E. Woodland Road
- 685 Burton Drive

Infill/New Construction Award Winners

- 301 N. Sheridan
- 347 Bluffs Edge

Preservation Award Winners

- 1890 Knollwood Road
- 115 N. Green Bay Road

- 1240 N. Sheridan Road

**4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the replacement of the dome on the Lake Forest Library at 360 E. Deerpath.**

**Property Owner: Lake Forest Library Board**

**Project Representatives: John Johnson, President, Lake Forest Library Board**

**Catherine Lemmer, Executive Director, Lake Forest Library**

**Kenneth Itle, Associate Principal, Wiss, Janney, Elstner and Associates, Inc.**

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

Mr. Johnson introduced the project team. He noted that last year, a Building Subcommittee of the Library Board was formed to oversee planning for replacement of the dome. He noted that the Subcommittee provided opportunities for public comment throughout the process which include the issuance of a request for proposals, selecting a contractor to develop plans and reviewing the options presented. He stated that the engineering and design firm, Wiss, Janney, Elstner and Associates, was selected. He introduced Mr. Itle, a preservation architect with Wiss, Janney, Elstner and Associates noting that Mr. Itle has firsthand experience with this type of project and the challenges involved. He stated that the full Library Board approved the proposal as now presented to the Commission.

Mr. Itle stated that the goal of the project is to restore the Library dome and bring it back to its original design to the extent possible. He noted that the dome was last restored in 1984 and some of the original elements were lost. He described the components of the dome: the skylight at the center, a sheet metal cornice, an octagonal course of limestone, and a brick base. He stated that the solution must address water leakage and provide for proper drainage from the dome. Pointed out that the as originally designed, the dome did not have any gutters or other elements to convey water away from the dome and surrounding masonry. He stated that as proposed, the joinery of the original 1930 dome skylight will be resealed and all cracked panes of glass will be replaced with new wired glass. He explained that as proposed, the material on the dome will be removed down to the structural gypsum deck and a new underlayment will be installed. He stated that new wood battens and new coated copper roofing will then be installed to match the original detailing. He stated that one change is proposed to the profile of the existing cornice, to allow a built-in gutter to be installed in the portion of the cornice that is currently concave. He stated that the gutter will capture water running off the dome so that it does not run down the face of the limestone masonry. He noted that the built-in gutter is an important functional improvement and will have limited visibility. He stated that the corners at the base of the dome will be rebuilt to match the existing adding that flashing will be added to appropriately divert the water. He stated that the limestone around the dome will be cleaned, and copper flashing will be added in some areas. He stated that the brick base of the dome will be repaired, damaged brick replaced, and the mortar joints will be repointed. He stated that the interior plaster will be

repaired and repainted as needed. He noted that the restoration of the murals inside the Library rotunda is not part of the current project. He stated that before work on the murals is contemplated, the dome should be watertight. He noted that the original dome was lead coated copper adding that the product was fairly new at that time having been developed in the 1920's. He stated that the thinking at the time was likely to benefit from the workability, durability and ease of construction offered by copper, with the aesthetics of a lead coating, rather than the copper and to avoid the staining that occurs as water runs off copper. He noted that leaded copper weathers to a neutral gray color. He stated that due to current health and environmental concerns, many manufacturers domestically have discontinued making lead coated copper. He stated that in place of lead coated copper, tin zinc alloy coated copper is proposed. He stated that the product has been widely used over the last 20 years adding that he has personal experience with it. He presented an image of a Church in Evanston where the product was used noting that it has weathered to a consistent, neutral gray.

Ms. Czerniak stated that replacement and restoration of the Library dome is a priority for many in the community who desire to see the tarp removed. She reviewed that the Library Board spent a significant amount time working with not just with the current consultant, but with previous consultants to assure that all appropriate investigation and study was completed. She reiterated that ensuring that the dome is watertight is critical along with finding a solution that is consistent with the original design and durable. She acknowledged concerns about the use of an alternate to the original lead coated copper but noted that the consultants presented a strong case for the use of tin zinc alloy coated copper.

Chairman Grinnell invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Petit asked if the tin zinc alloy coated copper will stain the masonry and asked whether any other work should be done as an essential part of this project.

Mr. Itle stated that the tin zinc alloy coated copper should not stain the masonry noting that any runoff from the material is neutral and light and not noticeable on the light colored stone. He explained that the scope of work proposed is comprehensive with respect to the dome and the center portion of the Library.

Commissioner Hanson pointed out that the last rehabilitation of the dome was done about 40 years ago. He asked if the current proposal to rehabilitate the dome will last longer.

Mr. Itle stated that the proposed work includes a fully adhered rubberized underlayment so if there is even a pinhole in the copper, there is a second waterproof layer which will add longevity to the dome. He noted that in the investigation of the work completed in the 1980's it was found that the solder joints were subpar.

Commissioner Culbertson asked about the expected longevity of the dome and whether a maintenance plan will need to be in place to maintain the warranty.

Mr. Itle stated that the new dome can reasonably be expected to last at least 50 years. He stated that the construction documents will specify what is covered by the various warranties, what is covered, and any obligations of the owner. He stated that his firm can guide the Library on developing a maintenance program going forward.

Mr. Johnson noted that the first evidence of water infiltration occurred in 1939, shortly after the Library was completed. He confirmed that there will be a maintenance program in place.

Commissioner Gibson asked the petitioner to elaborate on the issues related to lead coated copper. She asked for clarification on the repointing of the masonry below the dome and the replacement of the battens. She asked if the Library lobby will be closed during the rehabilitation of the dome. She asked if air conditioning affects humidity in the dome.

Mr. Itle reviewed that copper has advantages for roofing purposes, it is very workable and can be formed into complicated shapes and can easily be soldered. He stated that the disadvantage in some situations is the green aesthetic. He explained that the lead coating was developed as an aesthetic to achieve a white appearance, instead of green. He stated that lead coated copper was a reasonable choice in the 1920's, it performed well at that time but today, lead does not produce the same weathered aesthetic due to pollutants in the air, the resulting appearance can be mottled. He explained that a tin zinc alloy coating results in an aesthetic closer to that originally intended for the dome. He stated that lead is also a health hazard and many fabricators have moved away from using it. He noted that if lead can be located, it is difficult to know where it was produced and whether it is of good quality. He stated that for those reasons, tin zinc alloy coated copper is recommended and presented a sample of the material. He stated that the four brick walls at the base of the dome and the corners of the building in the courtyard areas will be repointed. He stated that there is currently a mix of mortars on the building. He stated that a single mortar mix will be used for the repointing that is required. He stated that most of the dome rehabilitation work will be completed from the exterior but noted that areas of the Library may need to be closed during plaster repair work but the building overall can remain open and operational during the project. He stated that all the battens will be replaced with new wood strips. He stated that currently, the dome is not insulated. He stated that the proposal includes adding insulation to the underside of the dome which will not be visible. He added that there is existing ductwork in the attic that can be tapped to provide cooler, drier air in the dome.

Commissioner Dalieri asked about the anticipated duration of the rehabilitation project and asked for a better understanding of the construction of the existing dome which has resulted in water penetration.

Mr. Itle estimated that the project will take six to eight months. He explained that the current construction relies on the copper sheathing to be completely watertight and as a result, if there is one seam that is not perfect, there is a leak. He stated that the new dome will have a second watertight layer underneath the copper.

Commissioner Levitsky asked about the constructability of a dome shaped roof and questioned whether this project would be better as part of a larger renovation of the Library instead of as a separate project.

Mr. Itle acknowledged that constructing a dome shape roof can be a challenge for the tradesmen in comparison to a standard roof shape but can be done. He stated that the reconstruction of the dome is a discrete project and is appropriately completed as a stand-alone project.

Chairman Grinnell asked when work on the dome is expected to begin.

Mr. Johnson stated that if the project is approved by the Commission, construction specifications will be developed, and the project will be put out to bid. He stated that the goal is to have the dome completed by the Library's 125<sup>th</sup> birthday in 2023.

Commissioner Culbertson asked about the downspouts on the building.

Mr. Itle stated that originally, the building had no downspouts. He explained that in the 1950's or 1960's, a square gutter was added on all four sides of the dome along with downspouts on the east and west sides, extending down to the flat roof portion of the Library. He stated that the existing downspouts will remain, and a gutter will be built into the base of the dome. He stated that two new downspouts will be added on the north side of the dome and will discharge on to the adjacent flat roof. He stated that the flat roof has drain inlets that connect to piping that extends through the building. He stated that the water will be drained away from the dome using a different path adding that the volume of water discharged on to the flat roof will remain the same.

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

Laura Luce, Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, noted that the Foundation submitted written correspondence to the Commission on this petition. She stated that the Foundation is concerned that the proposed tin zinc alloy coating may not appear consistent with the original material. She stated that the Foundation suggests that additional information be provided on the proposed material to allow the Commission to be confident that the material satisfies the applicable standards.

Abigail Brueggeman, speaking on behalf of the Church of the Covenants located just west of the Library, expressed support for the project. She stated that the Library's decision to restore the dome consistent with the original design intent is a beautiful way to honor the legacy of the Library. She stated that the Church members are fortunate to have a view of the dome from the Church and take a lot of pride in it as an adjacent neighbor. She stated that they are impressed with the process undertaken to restore and preserve the dome. She noted that the addition of gutters and careful selection of materials appear to be a very good solution.

Hearing no further public testimony, Chairman Grinnell asked for final questions or comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Levitsky stated support for the petition. He stated that the Library has done their due diligence and stated confidence in the solution presented.

Commissioner Dalieri stated confidence in the expertise of the consultant and noted that it appears that sufficient due diligence around the selection of the tin zinc alloy coating was done.

Commissioner Gibson stated that in her opinion, the petition adheres to the Commission's Standards and expressed enthusiasm for the solution presented.

Commissioner Culbertson agreed with the comments of the other Commissioners and expressed support for the petition.

Commissioner Hanson agreed with the approach presented by the consultant for the rehabilitation of the dome.

Chairman Grinnell commended the presentation noting that all applicable standards were addressed. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the plans as presented for rehabilitation of the Library dome at 360 E. Deerpath. She stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report adding that the Commission's comments and deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. She stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed in response to comments or direction from the Commission, or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a material staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

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

**5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow exterior alterations on the property located at 89 E. Deerpath. Approval of a hardscape plan is also requested.**

**Property Owners: Nate and Lauren Kelly**

**Project Representative: Ronald McCormack, architect**

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

Mr. McCormack introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. He stated that Bagatelle is the historic name of the property, and it is located in the Green Bay Road Historic District. He noted that the new owners of the property are committed to protecting the structure, respecting its history, and preserving the beauty of the estate. He stated that the property is on the southwest corner of Green Bay Road and Deerpath. He noted that the main house faces Deerpath, the coach house is located at the intersection, and the original studio is located on the south side of the property and now serves as a pool house. He noted that the property is surrounded by stucco and brick walls. He stated that the original home and coach house were built in 1915 and designed in the French Renaissance style by architect Edward Bennett, the original owner and occupant of the home. He stated that the studio was built in 1936 in the Art Moderne style. He stated that no changes are proposed to the front façade of the home. He stated that the wood storm doors on the French doors on the rear of the home need to be replaced and the owners desire to replace them with aluminum clad wood storm doors. He stated that the new storm doors will match the style and color of the existing storm doors. He stated that the octagonal screen porch at the southeast corner of the residence will be enclosed so that it can be used as interior space, a dining area. He stated that the screen openings will be replaced with casement windows with fixed transoms and the screen doors will be replaced with full light doors. He stated that the new windows and doors will not have divided lites to maintain the visual openness of the structure. He stated that no change is proposed to the roof of the porch. He discussed changes proposed to the original greenhouse structure on the east side of the home. He noted that the greenhouse was roofed over and converted to living space in the 1990's. He pointed out that the windows installed in the 1990's renovation are tall, narrow casement style windows that do not match the other windows on the home. He stated that the windows will be replaced with windows that are more in keeping with the proportions of the original windows. He stated that the mudroom on the east side of the house was originally an open porch that was enclosed in the 1990's. He reviewed changes proposed to the fenestration in the mudroom to make the space more functional and to provide additional storage. He stated that the entry door on the north elevation of the mudroom will be replaced with a new door that will match the proportions of the main entry door but will not have an arched top to respect the hierarchy of the front door. He stated that the only alteration proposed to the coach house is the addition of a single double hung window on the south elevation. He

stated that an outdoor entertaining area is proposed north of the pool house to create a connection with the house. He stated that an outdoor kitchen and steel pergola are planned. He stated that a glass sliding door system will be installed on the north elevation of the pool house opening to the outdoor entertaining area. He stated that the clerestory windows on the north wall of the pool house will be modified to allow for the folding door system below and to raise the sill height to align with the sill height of the adjacent windows. He noted that a full light door is proposed to replace the existing solid door on the east elevation of the pool house. He stated that the pool house structure has a number of areas that have been patched over the years with different bricks and mortar. He stated that to create a consistent appearance, the brick will be painted a cream color to match the stucco on the main house. He pointed out that many International and Art Deco style buildings are white or cream.

Ms. Baehr stated that the property is a Contributing Structure to the Green Bay Road Historic District and is prominently located at the corner of Green Bay and Deerpath. She stated that the alterations that are proposed are, for the most part, intended to improve upon less compatible alterations in past years. She stated that a building scale variance is requested adding that the structures on the property were constructed prior to the City's adoption of square footage limitations. She stated that the existing structures on the property exceed the allowable square footage based on the size of the lot. She stated this type of overage is not unusual for historic properties. She stated that no change in the building footprint is proposed however, enclosing the screen porch generates additional square because the element will no longer be considered a design element. She stated that the staff report includes findings in support of the building scale variance and for the overall petition.

Chairman Grinnell invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Levitsky asked for further explanation about the plan to paint the brick on the pool house.

Mr. McCormack stated that painted brick is a traditional look adding that painting the brick on the pool house will conceal the different types of bricks used in the past as alterations were made to the structure. He stated that this approach is preferred by the petitioners as opposed to removing the brick and rebuilding the structure with new, consistent brick. He stated that it would likely be a challenge to find a brick that matches the original brick. He stated that painting the pool house a lighter color will enhance the contemporary massing of the structure.

Mr. Kelly stated that it appears that there is very little of the original brick left on the pool house.

Commissioner Gibson asked staff for more information about the building scale variance request.



Ms. Baehr explained that the City's Building Scale Ordinance allows certain elements such as a screen porch, to be counted as design elements and excluded from the total square footage of the home. She stated that enclosing the screen porch requires the square footage of that element to be included in the square footage of the residence. She stated noted that no change is proposed to the height of the screen porch.

Commissioner Gibson asked for further information on the folding glass doors proposed on the pool house, the steel pergola and the impervious surface. She noted that when she visited the site, she observed the mix of brick types and colors on the pool house.

Mr. McCormack stated that the folding doors are each 30 inches wide and will open from the center. He stated that they will align with the windows above and will have a natural anodized finish to match the existing windows. He explained that the pergola is a simple, open structure with 6 x 6 inch steel posts and beams. He stated that the simple design related to the flat rooflines and massing of the pool house. He stated that the color and finish of the pergola will match the windows or will be a charcoal color to match the roof coping. He confirmed that the pergola will not be stainless steel.

Mr. Kelly stated that the patio north of the pool house will be flagstone. He stated that there will not be a significant increase in impervious surface.

Commissioner Dalieri pointed out that there is another screen porch on the west side of the home and asked if both the porches are original to the house and if the screen porch on the west side of the home will also be enclosed. She observed that the glass in the new windows will appear different from the glass in the original windows.

Mr. McCormack explained that the owners would like to use the smaller screen porch on the east side of the home as a dining area because of its proximity to the kitchen. He added that by enclosing the porch, the owners can enjoy the view of the garden year-round from their dining area.

Mr. Kelly stated that there are no plans to enclose the screen porch on the west side of the home. He noted that the glass in the existing windows does not appear wavy as seen in some historic buildings. He stated that the existing window profile will be matched to the extent possible.

Mr. McCormack stated that the clerestory windows in the pool house will be rebuilt with clear, insulated glass.

Commissioner Hanson asked whether the pool house brick will be painted or stained and asked whether the glass block on the pool house will be replaced.

Mr. McCormack stated that the intent is to stain the brick. He stated that the glass block is in a mechanical room and will remain.

Commissioner Petit asked about the windows on the north elevation of the pool house.

Mr. McCormack explained that the clerestory windows on the pool house will be rebuilt with the same material but shortened in height to accommodate the new folding glass doors below. He added that the shortened windows will align with the sill of the windows at the northwest corner of the pool house.

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

Commissioner Dalieri stated that the proposed windows are more fitting with the style of the home than the existing windows. She stated that the alterations proposed to the pool house are in keeping with the spirit of the modern architecture of the building. She stated that initially she had a concern about the variance but noted that since the porch already exists and no footprint change is proposed, she can support the variance.

Commissioner Levitsky stated that he is impressed by the architect's ability to make the home more functional without significantly modifying the exterior appearance. He stated support for the petition.

Commissioner Gibson commended the petitioner and homeowners. She stated support for the petition including the building scale variance.

Commissioner Petit stated support for the petition.

Commissioner Culbertson agreed with his fellow Commissioners. He asked about the process for reviewing any new exterior lighting and any changes to existing lighting.

Ms. Baehr stated that when the plans are submitted for a building permit, details of any lighting additions or changes will be required. She stated that staff will review the exterior lighting to confirm that it complies with the City's Residential Lighting Guidelines.

Chairman Grinnell invited a motion.

Commissioner Hanson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving exterior alterations on the residence and pool house, a building scale variance and additional hardscape for the property located at 89 E. Deerpath. He stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report adding that the comments and deliberations of the Commission are included as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at

the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
3. Details of exterior lighting shall be 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 material staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

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

**6. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a single-story addition and exterior alterations to the existing home, and construction of a detached garage at 151 Ridge Lane. Approval of a conceptual landscape plan and overall site plan is also requested.**

**Property Owner: Scott Carter**

**Project Representative: Richard Bories, architect and James Shearron, designer**

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

Mr. Shearron stated that approval is requested for renovations and additions to a single family home that was built in 1931 and designed in the French Directoire style by architect Ralph Milman. He stated that a new two car detached garage is proposed to replace the existing one car garage. He stated that the home does not offer any gathering space except for a formal living room at the south end of the house. He stated that the existing single car garage is off the kitchen. He stated that the plan is to convert this space to a family room. He stated that a small mudroom addition is proposed on the east side of the new family room and will not be visible from the front of the home. He stated that the addition will replicate the appearance of the porch on the south wing of the home. He stated that the proposed detached garage will be hidden behind a stucco garden wall along the east edge of the property. He noted that this property is unique in that it has access from both Ridge Lane and Oakwood Avenue. He stated that the driveway at the rear of the property from Oakwood Avenue creates an ideal opportunity to locate a new garage behind

the house. He noted that the garage is sited to respect the utility easements on the south side of the home and along the east side of the property. He stated that the new detached garage creates a courtyard area between the house and garage. He stated that an open veranda is planned on the west side of the detached garage. He reviewed proposed exterior alterations intended to enhance the French style of the home. He noted that the existing garage door on the front of the home will be replaced with a set of French doors and will be slightly shifted so that it is centered on the north wing. He stated that new openings to match the existing openings are proposed on the north elevation to provide natural light to the new family room. He stated that the mudroom addition will have a lead coated copper roof and stucco walls. He explained that the detached garage will be stucco with a flat roof and parapet wall. He noted that the garage doors face south and are designed with a chevron pattern. He reviewed the garden wall proposed along the east side of the property noting that gates will be incorporated into the wall. He stated that trees will be planted in the rear yard to create more privacy for the owners recognizing the significant trees that will be removed.

Ms. Baehr noted that some Commissioners may recall seeing a different proposal for this project a couple years ago. She stated that earlier project did not move forward, and this petition presents a different plan. She stated that the project is intended to make the home more functional for the owners and bring the home up to more modern standards with a two car, as opposed to the existing one car, garage. She reviewed that a small addition is proposed to provide space for a mudroom. She stated that the new garage and the addition are designed consistent with the style, detailing and quality of the home. She stated that natural materials are proposed to match the existing materials on the house. She noted that construction of the garage will impact two large Cottonwood trees. She stated that the City Arborist confirmed that the trees are in poor condition. She stated that replacement landscaping including new shade trees in the rear yard is planned as part of the project. She confirmed that the project complies with the square footage limitations but noted that the proposed mudroom addition is located partially within the zoning setback on the north side of the property. She stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals recently reviewed the variance request and recommended approval subject to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Historic Preservation Commission. She stated that based on staff's review, the petition meets the Commission's Standards adding that findings in support of the petition are included in the staff report.

Chairman Grinnell invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Culbertson asked for more information about the plans for the northeast corner of the property and the proposed tree removal.

In response to Commissioner Culbertson, Mr. Shearron stated that the northeast corner of the property could become a garden space or something more utilitarian. He stated that the pavement in the northeast corner of the property will be removed. He stated that landscaping will be added on the north side of the garage.

In response to Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Baehr stated that the petitioner's Certified Arborist provided a tree survey that rated the trees proposed for removal in poor condition. She confirmed that the City Arborist visited the site and agreed with the assessment. She stated that replacement inches are not required for trees that are dead or in poor condition however, as with any project, landscaping can be required.

Commissioner Petit asked for more information on the decorative trim around the mudroom addition, the balconies on the front of the home, the openings in the mudroom, the lattice detail on the rear elevation, and the entry doors on the west side of the garage. She suggested incorporating some detail from the front balconies on the porch and on the mudroom addition. She observed that the slope of the garage roof appears minimal.

In response to Commissioner Petit, Mr. Shearron stated that the trim on the mudroom addition will match the trim on the porch on the south wing of the house. He explained that the trim on the porch is wood but is completely rotted. He stated that the porch will be rebuilt with aluminum and painted white. He stated that the balconies on the front of the home are iron. He explained that they would like to replicate the porch as is within adding new detailing such as that found on the balconies on the front of the home. He confirmed that the only opening in the mudroom is the French door on the east elevation. He stated that the lattice on the rear elevation was added to enhance the French style of the home. He stated that the home is equally as elegant without it. He clarified that the north entry door on the west elevation of the garage is the only operable door. He clarified that the other door is a false door added for symmetry.

In response to Commissioner Petit, Mr. Bories stated that the slope of the garage roof is sufficient to drain adding that there are scuppers on the east side. He stated that the parapet wall on the garage extends about one foot above the roofline. He explained that during development of the construction drawings, the pitch of the garage roof will be increased if needed.

Commissioner Petit pointed out that there are no other flat roofs on the home.

In response to Commissioner Petit, Mr. Shearron stated that any other type of roof besides possibly a gable, would not embrace the French style of the home.

Commissioner Gibson asked if consideration was given to adding an arch to the door opening on the front elevation of the family room. She asked about the distance between the mudroom addition and the north property line. She pointed out that the new openings on the north elevation will be very close to the neighboring home. She asked about the amount of impervious surface on the site and drainage. She agreed with Commissioner Petit's comment about the slope of the garage roof.

In response to Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Shearron stated that adding an arch to the opening would require reworking the opening size. He stated that the original opening will be retained.

In response to Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Bories stated that the mudroom is three feet and 10 inches from the north property line.

In response to Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Shearron stated that window treatments that obscure direct views while also allowing for natural light are being considered for the windows on the north elevation.

In response to Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Bories stated that the amount of impervious surface on the site will be reduced as a result of removing a large portion of the existing driveway.

Commissioner Hanson commended the petitioner for retaining the original opening for the garage door on the front elevation as a way to show the history of the house. He asked if there will be another garden wall along the east side of the property. He questioned how Standard 8, which speaks to roof forms, is met with detached garage structure.

In response to Commissioner Hanson, Mr. Bories stated that there will not be a garden wall along the east side of the property, but landscaping will be added to that area.

Commissioner Daliere asked about the width of the garden wall.

In response to Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Bories stated that the garden wall is about 15 inches wide.

Chairman Grinnell pointed out that there is a considerable distance between the house and the proposed garage which could be factored into consideration of the roof forms. She noted that she is concerned about the potential trip hazard of a stepping stone walkway between the garage and home.

In response to Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Shearron stated that they originally considered connecting the garage to the house with a breezeway however that concept would require additional zoning variances. He explained that the hardscape presented in the plans is very conceptual adding that the details of the hardscape material and path lighting will be further developed.

Commissioner Daliere asked if consideration was given to an underground tunnel to connect the garage and the house.

In response to Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Shearron stated that underground tunnel was not considered adding that in his experience, tunnels are not used often because of the inconvenience of having to go up and down stairs.

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

Commissioner Dalieri expressed disappointment that the large Cottonwood trees will be lost but acknowledged that experts have documented that they are in poor condition. She stated that removing the trees will change the character of the property adding that large mature trees cannot be replaced.

Mr. Shearron stated that their goal is to plant new trees that will replace the canopy that will be lost with the removal of the Cottonwood trees.

Commissioner Hanson commended the petitioner for the carefully thought out project. He stated concern about the flat garage roof as it relates to Standard 8. He explained that he understands wanting to be deferential to the main structure but noted that the garage roof is very different from the existing roof forms on the property. He stated that in his opinion, the new roof form does not relate sufficiently to the forms on the house and therefore, does not meet the applicable standard.

Commissioner Levitsky stated support for the petition noting that the additions and alterations appear to be compatible with the existing home while making it more functional for the owners.

Commissioner Gibson agreed with Commissioner Hanson and suggested that the petitioner study the garage roof further. She suggested consideration of a low-pitch hip roof. She suggested consideration of planting French Horse Chestnut trees to provide shade and to in part replace the Cottonwood trees that will be lost.

Commissioner Petit agreed with Commissioner Hanson's comments on the garage roof. She suggested that the petitioner study a gentler roof shape as opposed to the flat roof. She stated that the balconies on the front of the house are delicate and lovely adding that it would be nice to incorporate some of the balcony detailing into the metal porch trim.

Commissioner Culbertson stated that in his opinion, the petitioner has presented a very elegant design. He stated support for the garage roof form as presented noting that it defers and is complementary to the roof on the primary structure.

Chairman Grinnell stated that the intent behind the alterations has merit and is beautifully executed. She asked about the proposed color palette.

In response to Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Shearron stated that the color palette will remain the same as the existing house.

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

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve a single-story addition and exterior alterations to the existing home, construction of a detached garage, a conceptual landscape plan and overall site plan. She stated that the motion is based on the findings presented in the staff report and the deliberations of the Commission are incorporated as additional findings. She stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Consideration shall be given to incorporating a pitched roof on the detached garage.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed in response to Commission comments or direction or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed, landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. If during construction, additional trees on the site are compromised in the opinion of the City's Certified Arborist, replacement inches or payment in lieu of onsite planting may be required.
4. 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.
5. 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.
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 and landscaping during construction.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Petit and approved by a vote of 6 to 1, with Commissioner Hanson voting nay.



## **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.**

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Planner