

Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the January 25, 2023 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 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 and Robin Petit.

Commissioners absent: None (one vacant position)

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

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 of the November 16, 2022 meeting of the Commission.

The minutes of the November 16, 2022 meeting were approved with corrections as requested by Chairman Grinnell.

3. Continued consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a replacement residence, landscape plan and overall site plan for the property located at 225 E. Onwentsia Road.

Property Owner: Bill Conopeotis

Contract Purchaser: Jacob Cline

Project Representative: Rick Swanson, architect

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, she noted that the Commission previously approved the demolition of the existing residence on the property and invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Swanson noted that since the last meeting, he and his client reflected on the comments offered by the Commissioners and neighbors. He reviewed the existing site plan and reiterated that the Commission previously approved the demolition of the residence subject to refinement of the design of the replacement residence and Commission approval. He reviewed the changes made to the plans since the last

meeting noting that the oval dormers were eliminated on the rear elevation, the cupola was removed, the railing around the widows walk was simplified, the fenestration was refined to achieve greater consistency on each level of the home, and the overall ornamentation around the home was softened. He stated that the landscaping on the east and south sides of the property was enhanced. He stated that the petitioners reviewed the revised landscape plan and a preliminary lighting plan with the neighbors to the east. He presented photos of the site and the existing home and views looking outward from the house. He noted that the proposed site plan has not changed since the previous meeting adding that the possibility of shifting the house was explored in an effort to preserve more trees however, it was determined that the site plan as originally presented to the Commission is the best option. He stated that the petitioner intends to make every effort to protect and preserve several mature heritage trees on the site. He stated that the replacement house as proposed is located further from the east property line than the existing house providing more space for landscaping in that area. He stated that the petitioner intends to enhance the plantings along the east property line and is willing to work with the neighbor and staff on the final landscape plan. He stated that Sugar Maple trees, instead of pear trees are now proposed for the alley along the driveway based on input from City staff. He stated that the fenestration around the house was refined to be more consistent with the chosen architectural style and noted that the ornamentation at the front door was simplified. He stated that the widows' walk was simplified and the spires removed except at the four corners of the roof. He stated that the cupola above the garage was removed. He stated that the roof geometry was reconfigured to be more consistent between the east and west wings. He noted that single garage doors are now proposed at either end of the garage mass. He reviewed that the rear elevation is intended to present a more contemporary appearance than the rest of the house. He stated that muntins are not proposed in the large rear facing windows to avoid creating a look that is too busy. He reviewed the proposed materials, limestone veneer for the exterior walls, slate roof tiles, black windows, bluestone terraces, wood carriage garage doors, and coach lights. He presented an aerial view of the house and a view of the proposed pillars and entrance gate. He presented colored renderings of the house.

Ms. Baehr reiterated that the Commission previously approved the demolition of the existing house. She stated that in response to Commission direction, the petitioner refined aspects of the replacement house which appear to address many of the Commission's comments. She noted however that many styles and sizes of dormers remain and suggested that further simplification could be beneficial to the overall appearance of the residence. She stated that staff recommends considering the addition of muntins to the rear windows for consistency with the windows around the home. She noted that the updated conceptual landscape plan reflects additional plantings along the east property line and along the driveway. She stated that as the site takes shape, the plantings along the east property line, particularly those in front of the garage bays, will need to be reviewed and if necessary enhanced to assure adequate screening. She stated that lighting on the garage should be kept to a

minimum and should be directed downward to avoid impacts on the neighboring residence. She stated that a letter received from the neighbor to the east was provided to the Commission. She noted that a mix of plantings along the east property line with mid-level, upper canopy, and lower level plantings will need to be incorporated. She noted that a construction parking and staging plan is required prior to the issuance of a permit and will be reviewed to assure that impacts to the neighborhood are minimized during construction to the extent possible.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Ms. Baehr confirmed that the gate and pillars are also before the Commission for consideration.

Commissioner Daliere acknowledged the work done by the petitioner since the last meeting to refine the plans. She asked the petitioner to consider adding muntins to the windows on the rear elevation. She expressed some concern about the various styles and sizes of dormers proposed around the residence.

In response to questions from Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Swanson stated that the petitioners prefer the large unbroken windows on the rear elevation to achieve the desired contemporary interior space. He stated that he too would be inclined to add the muntins for consistency, but noted that views of the rear elevation from off the site are limited. He stated that normally, he limits the styles of dormers used on a residence to three. He noted that an oval dormer is proposed on the front elevation. He stated that a single dormer would be inappropriate for a house of this size and scale. He pointed out that the dormers visible on the west elevation are on different masses, the back of the pool house and on the garage which are both set back a considerable distance from the west elevation of the house.

Commissioner Hanson commented that the large windows on the rear elevation appear to be more centered than in the previous plans.

In response to Commissioner Hanson's observation, Mr. Swanson confirmed that the windows on the rear elevation were reduced in size from the earlier plans. He pointed out that the windows no longer wrap the corner. He stated that the large windows are in a stairwell and are intended to create the contemporary look in the interior space which is desired by the petitioner.

Commissioner Gibson acknowledged the simplification made since the last meeting on the front door, the transom, and the windows on the front elevation. She questioned why a fourth window was added on the second floor of the east elevation. She asked about the material of the garage doors, the style of the columns, and how far the roof extends over the side porch. She stated that adding muntins to the large rear windows would improve the proportions on the rear elevation to address Standard 3. She complimented the dormers, especially those on the front of the home. She suggested small lanterns for the garage to minimize light

impacts on the neighboring home to the east. She stated concern about light spillover from the tall windows in the stairwell on the rear elevation.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Swanson explained that a fourth window was added to the second floor on the east elevation because the garage door configuration was changed, and the floor plan was slightly expanded. He acknowledged that the east elevation as now presented differs from the elevation in the Commission's packet. He stated that the garage doors will be wood. He stated that the porch roof extends about five feet over the side porch and stated that Tuscan style columns are proposed. He agreed to discuss adding muntins to the windows on the rear elevation with his client. He noted that lights were previously proposed on each side of the garage doors but to reduce off site light impacts, a single light is now proposed above each garage door. He stated that in his opinion, it is not necessary for the lights to be directed down because of the distance between the garage and the property line and the dense vegetative proposed buffer along the property line. He stated that the petitioners will work with the neighbors to the east. He agreed to work with his client to minimize spillover light from the large window at the stairwell on the rear elevation.

Commissioner Petit commended the changes made to the rear terrace and pool area and the overall refinements made to the architecture. She questioned whether gate controls or a mailbox will be incorporated into the columns at the driveway entrance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Cline confirmed that the details of the gate controls and mailbox have not been worked out noting however that those elements will not be on the street facing side of the columns.

Chairman Grinnell thanked the petitioner for the simplifications made since the last meeting particularly at the front entrance. She stated that the filigree previously proposed at the front door and on the transom appeared busy. She asked if filigree ornamentation is proposed on the front gate. She questions whether adequate space is provided between the pool and the house. She asked for clarification of the location of the stairwell and great room.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Swanson stated that simplified filigree is proposed on the front gate. He stated that there is at least six feet between the house and the pool. He pointed out the stairway and great room and noted the relationship to the rear windows. He stated that the stairway is intended as a piece of art.

Commissioner Gibson asked whether there is a pergola on the west side of the pool.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Swanson stated that a trellis is proposed on the west side of the pool supported by Tuscan columns. He stated that the columns will be nine feet and will match other columns on the house.

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

Mr. Swanson thanked the Commission for the input noting that the comments offered at the previous meeting improved the overall design.

Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Petit complimented the petition and thanked the petitioner for making the refinements suggested by the Commission.

Commissioner Culbertson stated appreciation for the changes made. He stated support for the rear windows as presented, without muntins, and for the dormers as presented given the receding perspectives in which they are viewed. He stated support for centering the windows on the rear elevation. He thanked the architect and petitioner for being responsive to the earlier comments and agreed that the project is improved as a result of the changes that were made.

Commissioner Gibson agreed that the changes made improved the project. She stated that for consistency with Standard 3, muntins should be added to the rear windows she noted however that given the limited views of the rear elevation, windows without muntins could be accepted. She noted that some of the Commission's earlier concerns were addressed by centering the windows near the stairway on the rear wall and eliminating the windows wrapping around the corner. She expressed support for the changes made to the garage doors.

Commissioner Hanson commended the petition. He thanked the petitioner for addressing the Commission's previous comments. He expressed support for the overall simplification of the design and the improved symmetry on the rear elevation. He noted that replacing the large garage doors with single doors allows the rear elevation to appear less imposing. He stated that in his opinion, the various dormers work on this particular house and adds interest. He suggested that the oval dormer on the east elevation be removed. He stated that there is a stark difference between the rear windows and the rest of the windows around the home. He stated that the desire for a large expanse of windows on the rear elevation is reasonable but noted that without muntins, the rear windows appear very different than the other windows on the home.

Commissioner Daliere agreed that many improvements to the design of the home were made since the last meeting. She agreed that the oval dormer on the east

elevation should be removed. She stated that in her opinion, Standard 3 is not adequately satisfied but acknowledged that the rear elevation will have limited visibility from off of the site. She noted that the large windows may result in bird impacts due to reflections. She stated that impact may be mitigated if muntins are incorporated into the design of the windows.

Chairman Grinnell thanked the petitioner for a willingness to interact positively with the neighbors. She invited a motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement residence, landscape plan and overall site plan. She stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and noted that the Commission's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. She stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Consideration to the addition of muntins to the windows on the rear elevation and removal of the oval dormer on the east elevation.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with the refinements as directed above. Any 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. 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 meet the minimum landscape criteria for new construction and provide for the required 104 replacement inches on site to the extent possible using good forestry practices.

The plan shall also clearly detail existing vegetation intended to remain along the east property line and new trees and vegetation planned in that area to provide mid-level, canopy and understory screening between active and lighted areas of the new residence including the garage, driveway and rear yard amenities and the existing residence to the east.

If all required replacement tree inches cannot be accommodated on the site, the number of remaining inches for which a payment in lieu of planting will be required must be noted on the plan and a payment in lieu of on site planting may be accepted at the City's discretion. The full payment in lieu of on site plantings is required prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. If

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

4. Tree Protection Plan – Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect any trees identified for preservation during construction as well as trees on neighboring properties, must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. In addition, for any trees that, as determined by the City Arborist, may be impacted by construction activity, a plan for protection, including pre and post construction treatments must be prepared by an independent Certified Arborist and submitted with the building permit application. The tree protection plan shall be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
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. All exterior lighting shall be sensitive to the impacts on neighbors and on the dark sky character of the neighborhood.
6. 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. No parking is permitted on Onwentsia Road due to the narrow, curving nature of the street and due to other construction activity in the immediate area.

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

- 4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow replacement and expansion of the existing raised terrace located at the northwest corner of the Gorton Center building at 400 E. Illinois Road.**
Property Owner: City of Lake Forest
Project Representative: Jim Lockefeer, Assistant to the Public Works Director
Project Architect: Stephen Nelson

Chairman Grinnell asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest.

Commissioner Hansen stated that his wife is a member of the Gorton Center Board and recused himself from deliberations on the petition. He stepped down from the dais.

Chairman Grinnell invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Lockefer stated that the impetus for the project is a desire to correct an ongoing drainage issue with the existing terrace. He stated that in discussing the project, the Executive Director of Gorton Community Center suggested that the terrace be expanded to better accommodate existing uses and to improve accessibility.

Mr. Nelson reviewed the existing site plan noting the location of the stairs and pointing out that the terrace is not accessible from the parking lot to those with limited abilities. He stated that the existing terrace pitches toward the building causing ongoing maintenance issues. He stated that the doors from the Stuart Community Room which open on to the terrace will be replaced in kind. He noted that two trees will be removed. He presented the proposed site plan noting that the plan is designed to maximize the size of the terrace to the extent possible while generally maintaining the existing configuration of the terrace. He stated that the grades around the terrace will be adjusted to properly direct drainage. He noted the locations of the new stairway and accessible ramp. He noted that new downspouts and gutters will be added to the northwest corner of the building. He stated that the new brick piers and metal railings will be similar to those on the existing terrace. He noted that the concrete foundation for the new terrace will extend up to the level of the terrace for durability replacing the existing brick base. He stated that the landscaping is intended to cover the concrete foundation. He reviewed the west elevation noting that the expanded terrace will project from the building. He presented an overlay of the footprint of the existing and proposed terraces. He noted that the existing terrace is about 600 square feet, and the new terrace is proposed at 1,160 square feet. He presented renderings of the proposed terrace.

Ms. Baehr stated that Gorton Community Center is identified as a Contributing Structure to the Historic District. She noted that the existing terrace follows the form of the building and is understated. She noted that the expanded terrace appears heavy and more prominent on the historic elevation, competing with the historic west facing entrance to the building. She noted that a letter was received from the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation raising some concerns and was provided to the Commission. She stated that addressing the drainage issues and providing accessibility to the terrace are important but noted that given the significance of the building, it is important that the design, massing, and detailing of the expanded terrace relate well to the historic building.

Chairman Grinnell invited Commission questions.

Commissioner Gibson agreed that the existing terrace at the northwest corner of the Stuart Community Room needs attention. She asked for more information about the details of the terrace balusters, exterior lighting, the pitch of the new terrace surface, and the existing doors from the Stuart Community Room on to the terrace. She asked

whether consideration was given to etching the concrete surface of the terrace as opposed to leaving it as plain concrete. She asked where the trash enclosure will be located. She referenced Standards 5, 9 and 14 and asked for further discussion about how the proposed expanded terrace relates to the historic building.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Nelson stated that the balusters on the expanded terrace are very similar to the existing balusters, square and spaced 3 ¼ inches apart to meet the Code requirements. He stated that there is low lighting in the existing pillars that is directed downward. He stated that similar lighting is proposed in the new pillars and will not be noticeable from off of the terrace. He stated that the terrace will slope at 3/16th of inch per foot using the existing thresholds as the starting point. He noted that it is not clear when the doors from the Stuart Community Room to the terrace were installed. He stated that etching the concrete was not included in the budget estimate. He stated that the trash enclosure will remain in its present location. He reiterated that the expanded terrace will generally follow the footprint of the existing terrace. He stated that consideration was given to locating the stairs to the new terrace closer to the entrance to the building on the west elevation however a gas meter prevents the stairs from shifting toward the entrance. He stated that the ramp is located to provide easy access to the door to the Stuart Community Room and to minimize the length needed for the ramp. He stated that space is limited and acknowledged that as proposed, the expanded terrace is tight to the sidewalk. He stated that the ramp is located to minimize its length. He stated that the project has a limited budget which in part is driving the proposed irregular shape of the terrace.

Commissioner Petit asked if other options were explored for the railing. She suggested consideration of a railing with a built-in bench or planters to soften the appearance of the terrace and break up the long expanse of the railing. She noted that the area in which the terrace is located is dark and stated that adding light will be an improvement. She suggested consideration of squaring off the terrace to more closely follow the building shape.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Nelson stated that the elements of the existing terrace are replicated given the buildings historic nature. He stated however that the incorporation of built-in benches and planters could be considered.

Commissioner Dalieri stated that there is no clear entrance to the terrace. She agreed with Commissioner Petit's suggestions and asked if other locations were explored for the ramp. She suggested incorporating materials that relate better to the historic building.

Mr. Nelson stated that various locations were considered for the ramp and the location as proposed was determined to be most effective. He reiterated that the budget is driving the configuration of the terrace and the proposed materials. He stated that there is a desire for the terrace to be low maintenance.

Chairman Grinnell agreed that the proposed plan creates confusion over the location of the front entrance to the building. She stated however that the proposed plan for the terrace appears to improve the flow of the terrace itself. She suggested visiting Oak Terrace School in Highwood noting that the entrance, walls and railings there appear to have more of a James Gamble Rogers look than the current proposal. She encouraged consideration of a railing more in keeping with the historic building. She asked how late in the evening the patio is proposed to be used. She stated support for improving access to the terrace for those with mobility challenges and acknowledged that most projects have budget limitations. She asked if the project will be funded by a private donation or outside grant.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell related to the use of the terrace, Ms. Czerniak stated that Gorton Community Center operates under a Special Use Permit which specifically calls out how the building and property may be used. She stated that any changes or expansions of use will require consideration of amendments to the Special Use Permit. She acknowledged that because Gorton Community Center is located immediately adjacent to residential uses, activity levels, lights, noise, parking, and times of outdoor activities must be carefully considered.

Mr. Lockefer stated that he does not believe the project will be funded by a private donor.

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

Nick Bothfeld, Gorton Board of Directors, stated full Board for the project. He stated that the expanded terrace is desired to allow Gorton Community Center to do more for the community. He stated that the existing terrace is basically unusable.

Karen Brody, Gorton Board member, agreed that the existing terrace is useless space and that the drainage issues need to be fixed. She stated that the new terrace will create additional opportunities and will expand the use of the adjacent rooms. She stated support for the project.

Lisa Wolfe DiGanci, Gorton Board member, agreed with the comments of the other Board members. She stated that the improvement is needed and stated that her hope is that the terrace becomes a "community hangout." She acknowledged the challenges with the terrace footprint due to the adjacent parking lot and stated that she believes that landscaping can soften the appearance of the terrace.

Jeremy Kruse, Gorton Drama Studio Artistic Director, agreed that the existing terrace is useless and not functional for classes. He stated that he would like to see students gather on the new terrace.

Martha Requa, staff member at Gorton, stated that benches would likely not be used and noted that planters would require maintenance. She stated that the stairs to the new terrace are in a good location, near the main entrance to the building and because they face west, will be used as an entrance and exit during events. She stated that the new stairs to the terrace will eliminate the need for people to enter the main door and will allow direct entrance to the Stuart Community Room. She stated that with the proposed ramp, service people can wheel carts directly into the Stuart Room and kitchen from that location.

Chairman Grinnell noted the comments about events, rentals, classes, and making the terrace a “community hangout”. She asked how these various uses will be managed.

In response to a question from Chairman Grinnell, Ms. Czerniak stated that details and limitations about the types and extent of uses are regulated by the Special Use Permit. She noted that the corner of the building where the terrace is proposed is close to neighboring homes. She stated that if the terrace is to be used differently or more extensively than it is now, for instance, as a service entrance, review and possibly consideration of an amendment to the Special Use Permit will be required. She noted that the types and extent of uses are not within the Commission’s purview.

Chairman Grinnell invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson commended the concept for the project. She pointed out that visitors mostly park on the west side of the building so the terrace is well placed. She stated support for extending the terrace to the north as proposed. She stated that in her opinion, the terrace as proposed does not interrupt the front façade. She noted that with respect to Standard 5, spacing from the street, the terrace is set far back from the street. She acknowledged that the proposed terrace has an irregular configuration and noted that there are some other irregular lines and forms on the building. She stated that with respect to Standard 14, in her opinion, the terrace works with the existing building and will be a great asset from a use perspective. She stated that initially she thought a solid wall was proposed around the terrace however, there are spaces between the balusters. She encouraged thought to be given to how to prevent spalling on the brick piers.

Commissioner Dalieri agreed that the project, expanding the terrace, is a good one. She expressed concern about the terrace surface noting that insufficient information is provided to allow a clear understanding of what is proposed. She suggested consideration of stamped concrete for the terrace surface.

Chairman Grinnell noted that concrete can crack. She stated that she is impressed with the passion and support for the project. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, she invited a motion.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow replacement and expansion of the existing raised terrace located at the northwest corner of the Gorton Center building, at 400 Illinois Road.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the motion should reference the findings that support the motion.

There was no second, Commissioner Gibson withdrew the motion.

Commissioner Petit asked if the intent is to include any conditions in a motion because of the limited information on the plans.

Commissioner Culbertson asked if the plans presented to the Commission are the final plans or if they are concept plans.

In response to a question from Commissioner Culbertson, Mr. Nelson stated that the plans as presented are proposed to be sent out for bids.

In response to a question from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak stated that more detailed plans are needed before any permits can be issued. She noted that an up to date legal survey is needed to confirm whether or not the expanded terrace complies with the zoning setback on the north along with a dimensioned site plan, information on materials, surface treatments and architectural details. She stated that if the Commission chooses to move the project forward, conditions detailing the Commission's expectations with respect to details and any refinements desired would be appropriate.

Chairman Grinnell stated that the terrace surface, the railing, and materials are some areas that should be detailed further.

Commissioner Daliere asked about the material of the railing.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Nelson stated that the railing is wrought iron.

Commissioner Petit stated that in her opinion, the information provided is not sufficient to allow the Commission to take action. She stated that in response to a petition with this limited level of information and detail, the Commission would normally be asking more questions and requesting additional information.

Commissioner Daliere stated that normally, material samples are provided to the Commission for review.

Commissioner Culbertson requested a more detailed and refined plan. He stated that he is not fully supportive of the plan for the terrace as presented.

Ms. Czerniak summarized that the Commission is supportive of the concept of replacing and expanding the terrace and has offered comments, questions, and direction for consideration. She stated that staff will work with the petitioner to encourage more detailed plans to be submitted that are more in line with the level of detail that is normally presented to the Commission.

Chairman Grinnell invited a motion to continue the petition.

Commissioner Gibson made a motion to continue the petition with direction to the petitioner to conduct further study and refinement of the design based on the deliberations and direction of the Commission to include, but not limited to the following:

- Provide fully detailed and dimensions plans.
- Provide information on materials, surface treatment and provide samples.
- Study, clarify, and refine the architectural detailing.
- Provide a full site plan of the Gorton campus with proposed terrace.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Petit and approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a pool house and pool at 755 Washington Road. A building scale variance is requested.

Property Owner: Mat and Alicia Phillips

Project Representative: Edward Deegan, architect

Joseph Haubert, landscape 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. Deegan noted that he approached the project considering how the original architect might have approached it. He presented photos of the existing house pointing out the gables and hipped roofs. He noted that the single-story sunroom served as a precedent for the pool house. He noted the existing half-timbering detail on the west elevation facing Washington Road. He presented the existing and proposed site plan. He noted that the proposed pool is on axis with the one story sunroom element. He pointed out that that the proposed rear terrace and pool are at various levels to conform to the topography of the site. He reviewed a section and the floor plan of the pool house noting that the basement of the pool house will be used for mechanical equipment and storage. He noted that a three-season porch is proposed on the west side of the pool house to provide a connection to the pool. He noted that the roof of the pool house is informed by the roof on the main house pointing out that the pool house is intended to appear as a secondary structure. He reviewed the details of the half timbering and brick work proposed on the exterior walls of the pool house noting that it matches the detailing on the house. He reiterated the stair stepping of the rear terraces and noted that the landscape architect is available for questions.

Ms. Baehr stated that the proposed pool house reflects symmetry, balance, and is sensitively designed, influenced by the historic home. She noted that the existing house is already over the allowable square footage which, she added, is common for historic homes. She stated that the pool house will be minimally visible from the streetscape due to streetscape landscaping. She stated that based on staff's review, the criteria for a building scale variance are satisfied. She noted that the two trees proposed for removal are in decline. She stated that the preliminary landscape plan provides a mix of new plantings in the area of the pool and pool house. She noted that the staff report recommends the addition of plantings on the east side of the property to screen the pool house and pool equipment from the neighboring property. She stated that it is important that the existing landscaping, or replacement plantings at the same or a greater density, remain along the south and west streetscape to screen views of and provide privacy for the pool and pool house. She noted that once the pool house starts to take shape, staff will work with the petitioner to evaluate whether additional plantings are necessary. She noted that the staff report includes findings in support of the petition and details recommended conditions of approval.

Commissioner Culbertson asked the petitioner to respond to staff's recommendation for more landscaping on the east side.

In response to Commissioner Culbertson's request, Mr. Haubert reviewed the landscape plan agreeing that additional plantings are appropriate on the east side of the pool house. He pointed out plantings in various locations that serve as terminations to the terraces. He pointed out additional trees proposed for the site. He stated that the pool deck will be bluestone and the retaining walls will be brick to match the house.

Commissioner Dalieri asked about the color of the brick proposed for the pool house. She noted that the neighbor at 771 Washington Road submitted a letter in support of the project. She asked whether the petitioner contacted the neighbor to the east who will be most impacted by the project.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Mr. Deegan stated that the brick on the pool house will match the brick on the house.

Mr. Phillips stated that he has been in contact with the neighbors to the east at 506 Walnut Road adding that they expressed support for the project.

Commissioner Petit complimented the project.

Commissioner Gibson noted that the existing house is very interesting adding that she walked the south lawn where the improvements are proposed. She noted that initially, she was concerned about the square footage overage. She stated that the explanation of the various levels of the terraces and the grade at the pool house answered some of her questions about the height of the pool house in comparison to the house. She asked how much of the roof of the pool house will be visible from

Walnut Road. She asked about drainage and questioned whether the amount of hardscape proposed on the site should be reduced. She noted evergreens that the evergreens on the east side of the site do not appear to be in good condition.

In response to questions and comments from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Deegan confirmed that the pool house is not at the same level of the house due to the efforts to work with the existing topography of the site. He acknowledged that it is not optimal to have to walk down stairs to get from the house to the pool but noted that the configuration works with the topography and provides privacy for the petitioner and neighbors by setting the pool and pool house at a lower level. He stated that the pool house will not be visible from the sidewalk on Walnut Road due to the existing solid fence and vegetation. He stated that water travels from north to south on the property naturally adding that the natural flow will not be interrupted. He stated that a civil engineer will prepare a drainage plan for the project.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Haubert noted that a Certified Arborist characterized the evergreen trees as having typical fall needle drop. He stated that it is typical that older Norway Spruce experience lower branch die back.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell invited public comment. Hearing none she invited final questions from the Commission. Hearing none, she commended the project commenting that the proposed improvements will enhance the property. She invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson stated that based on the architect's explanation of his inspiration and design rationale, her initial concerns about the square footage overage and the height of the pool house have been satisfactorily addressed.

Commissioner Dalieri stated concern about the square footage overage but noted that the criteria for a building scale variance appear to be satisfied. She thanked the owners for being good stewards of the property.

Commissioner Hanson stated that he admired the humility the architect took paying homage to the existing residence. He stated that the details of the house are captured well in the pool house. He stated that he finds that the building scale variance criteria are satisfied.

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

Commissioner Petit made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for an inground pool, pool house, and a building scale variance. She stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in this staff report and noted that the Commission's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. She stated that the motion is subject to 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 Commission direction or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be provided at the time of submission for permit along with the plans originally presented to the Commission and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed, landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall provide for the required 14 tree replacement inches on site. If during construction additional trees on the site are compromised in the opinion of the City's Certified Arborist, additional replacement inches or payment in lieu of on site planting may be required. The landscape plan shall also reflect enhanced landscaping along the east property line, on the east side of the pool house, to minimize visibility of the pool house and pool equipment from the neighboring property. As determined to be necessary by the City, enhanced plantings along the south and west property lines may be required to provide adequate screening from the adjacent public streets.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed construction staging and contractor parking and access plan along with a plan to protect trees and vegetation identified for preservation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.

To avoid impacting the dense vegetation along the street, access from Walnut Road is not permitted.

4. An exterior lighting plan, including cut sheets for all light fixtures, shall be included with the plans submitted for permit. 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 from off the property. All exterior lights shall be set on timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights. All exterior lighting shall be sensitive to the dark sky character of the neighborhood.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval with a focus on minimizing impacts on the neighborhood and on the adjacent public streets.

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

6. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow exterior alterations to the original stable which is an outbuilding to the main residence on the property addressed as 980 N. Green Bay Road. The alterations include the addition of an open breezeway, window and door replacement, and expansion of the existing dormers. Approval of a gravel parking court west of the original stable and associated tree removal is also requested.

**Property Owner: Chicago Title Land Trust Company
(Hartley Rogers, 50% and Amy Falls, 50%)**

Project Representatives: Phillip Liederbach and Erica Weeder, Liederbach and Graham Architects

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

Mr. Liederbach stated that the new owners will be good stewards of the property. He presented a site plan of the property which totals 15 acres. He stated that the driveway extends 900 feet into the property from Green Bay Road adding that the original stable/carrriage house, which is the subject of this petition, is located approximately 500 feet from Green Bay Road on the north side of the driveway. He stated that the stable/carrriage house is not visible from the street. He presented photos of the other structures on the property including the gate house and the main residence. He stated that rather than add on to the main house, the petitioners intend to adaptively reuse the stable/carrriage house to provide the garage space desired and the proposed renovations to the structure are for that purpose.

Ms. Weeder reviewed the elevations of the original stable/carrriage house structure pointing out the details and the locations where alterations are proposed. She noted that the existing sliding doors will be replaced with motorized garage doors for ease of use. She stated that tuckpointing and gutter work is needed on the overall structure and noted that windows will be replaced in the existing sashes. She stated that a skylight and new windows are proposed on the porch located on the north elevation of the structure. She stated that the chimney visible on the south elevation will be removed and the dormer will be recentered on the cupola. She stated that the prior replacement windows that are inconsistent with the structure will be replaced.

Mr. Leiderbach stated that the original dog trot on the west side of the structure will be reopened to provide access to the proposed motor court to the west. He noted that introducing natural light into the rear porch space with the skylight makes the space more compelling.

Ms. Weeder described the proposed motor court and pointed out the proposed stone retaining walls are proposed around the motor court. She presented a section to illustrate the grade change between the motor court and the north property line. She noted that currently, the grade pitches toward the original stable/coach house

building causing water infiltration issues. She stated that the area around the structure will be regraded and a swale will be added to redirect water away from the structure. She presented images of other motor courts that are being used as inspiration.

Ms. Baehr clarified that the petition focuses only on the stable/carriage house and the area to the west proposed as a motor court. She stated that no work is currently proposed on any of the other structures on the property. She stated that the proposed alterations are consistent with the historic character of the structure and correct less compatible changes that were made in the past. She stated that the addition of skylights is inconsistent with the historic structure and requested Commission input on the proposed installation of skylights on the north facing roof. She noted that a composite product is proposed for the window trim and stated that for consistency with the Commission's standards, natural wood should be used to maintain the integrity of the historic structure. She stated the neighbor to the north contacted staff and expressed concern about the potential visibility of the motor court, the adequacy of the existing landscaping and drainage impacts. She recommended that the Commission consider adding a condition to those included in the staff report to require year-round landscaping to screen views of the motor court from off the site. She encouraged the petition to discuss the grading, drainage, and landscape plans with the neighbor to the north.

Chairman Grinnell invited questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Hanson asked why a composite product is proposed for the window trim when all other aspects of the project appear to be focused on preserving the historic integrity of the structure.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hanson, Mr. Leiderbach stated that there are areas on the dormer and on the enclosed porches that are prone to rot and a composite product is proposed for durability. He stated that when painted, composite materials can almost have the appearance of wood. He provided a sample of Boral, the proposed composite material, noting that it has a cementitious base. He stated that he has used the product in the past with good success.

Commissioner Culbertson asked staff to comment further on the proposed use of a composite product.

In response to Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Baehr explained that in past petitions where composite products have been requested, in almost all cases, the Commission has required that natural wood be used. She stated that especially given the historic and architectural significance of this particular property and this structure, a composite product would be inconsistent with the Commission's standards and past actions.

In response to Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak stated that the Commission did approve the use of Boral on a new construction project in the Historic District

however, composite products have not been approved by the Commission for use on Contributing Structures.

Commissioner Dalieri pointed out that some of the windows on the original stable/carriage house are not currently natural wood and are more modern replacement windows. She asked if the Commission would require the petitioner to replace all of the earlier replacement windows with wood windows.

In response to questions from Commission Dalieri, Ms. Baehr explained that the Commission has the use of aluminum clad wood windows in the past on historic structures. She clarified that the petitioner is proposing to replace the existing windows with aluminum clad wood windows. She stated that with respect to elements such as siding, trim, soffits, and fascia, the Commission has consistently required the use of natural wood.

Commissioner Hanson asked how much deference should be given to the concerns of the neighbor.

In response to Commissioner Hansen's question, Ms. Baehr stated that when new driveways or parking areas are planned, it is common for adequate landscape screening to be required by the Commission to minimize visibility of parked vehicles from neighboring properties. She noted that the neighbor's concerns about drainage and existing storm sewer located in the vicinity of the motor court will be forwarded to the City Engineer for consideration when the drainage and grading plans are submitted for review and before any permits are issued.

Commissioner Gibson asked why the entire cupola roof is being replaced. She asked whether the skylight is essential to the project. She asked how the various spaces in the stable/carriage house will be used. She asked whether the windows will be customer made and about the materials proposed for use in the breezeway.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Weeder stated that the cupola roof appears to be original and is no longer water tight. She explained that the ground floor of the structure will be garage and storage space and the second floor will be living spaces. She stated that the breezeway walls will be brick and the ceiling will be stucco to match the existing soffits around the structure. She explained that the windows on the first floor will be restored while the windows on the second floor will be replaced with custom made windows with insulated glass and muntins.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Leiderbach stated that the skylight can be eliminated but noted that it will be only minimally visible from off of the site. He stated that in his opinion, the skylight will not impact the historic character of the structure.

Commissioner Petit questions the safety of the curved stoop in the breezeway. She asked if the stable doors will be refurbished or replaced. She asked whether any changes are proposed to the west facing garage doors in the courtyard and asked

for more information about the retaining walls. She suggested that the skylight could have a lower pitch or be set closer to flush with the roof to limit visibility. She stated that the skylight as proposed appears overwhelming.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Ms. Weeder explained that the depth of the stoop is related to the width of the door and is configured to comply with the Code requirements. She pointed out that the interior space on the north side of the breezeway is at a lower level than the interior space on the south side of the breezeway resulting in the unusual configuration of the stoop. She stated that the stable doors facing west on to the courtyard will remain. She reviewed the location of the retaining wall proposed on the north side of the stable and along the north and west sides of the motor court. She stated that at the tallest point, the wall is three and a half feet tall and steps down to about a foot above grade.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Leiderbach stated that the retaining wall will not be visible to the neighbor and will help to conceal cars parked in the motor court. He agreed to consider a skylight with a lower pitch, more flush to the roof.

Commissioner Daliere asked if cars will be parked in the structure after the work is completed.

In response to Commissioner Daliere's question, Ms. Weeder stated that there will be space for two cars to be parked inside the structure.

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

Commissioner Petit asked whether the existing parking space across from the stable, on the south side of the driveway will remain.

In response to Commissioner Petit's question, Ms. Weeder stated that the parking space will be removed.

Commissioner Daliere stated appreciation to the new buyers for being willing to renovate and stabilize the structure. She stated that ordinarily, she would support using materials that match the existing historic structure however, given the extent of work required on this structure and the fact that it is an outbuilding and the owners are investing in its preservation, she can support limited use of composite material. She agreed that the skylight should be closer to flush with the roof.

Commissioner Hansen agreed with Commissioner Daliere stating that in this case, the request to use a composite product in limited areas appears reasonable. He noted that initially he had concerns about the skylight but noted that it is not visible from the front of the structure and is screened by vegetation from the north and therefore, is supportive of the skylight. He noted that he is amenable to Commissioner Petit's idea

to make the skylight more flush with the roof, but stated that he is also supportive of the skylight as proposed.

Commissioner Gibson stated that with respect to Standard 8, the proposed skylight does not relate to the roof forms of the existing structure. She agreed that the skylight should be flush, or close to flush with the roof if it is to remain. She stated that she cannot support use of a composite/synthetic product. She acknowledged that the Boral product was approved for a new home in the Historic District but noted that it has not been approved for historic structures. She expressed caution about deviating from the previous positions of the Commission by allowing composite materials on historic structures.

Commissioner Culbertson commended the project. He stated that natural wood should be used rather than the composite product and agreed that the skylight should be refined to be more flush with the roof. He encouraged the petitioner to talk with the neighbor to the north about drainage and landscaping and stated support for an additional condition to assure year round screening of the motor court.

Chairman Grinnell noted the differing opinions about the use of a composite product noting concerns about establishing a precedent allowing composite materials to be used on historic structures in addition to new structures in historic districts. She agreed that natural wood should be used on historic main residences but noted that she is more accepting of a composite product on secondary structures like the stable/carriage house.

Commissioner Gibson reminded the Commission that the structure in question was designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw and expressed concern about a significant shift away from prior Commission decisions to allow non-natural materials on accessory structures on historic properties.

Commissioner Culbertson agreed with Commissioner Gibson's comments.

Commissioner Hanson asked for clarification on the areas where Boral is proposed for use.

In response to Commissioner Hanson's question, Ms. Weeder stated that the composite product is proposed for the window and dormer trim. She stated that using wood in these areas will create a chronic maintenance issue.

Commissioner Dalieri noted that the owners are going to great expense to preserve the structure and stated that the composite product will reduce the frequency of painting. She reiterated that this is a secondary structure and is minimally visible from off of the site. She stated that there is a difference between what she is willing to support for a main residence versus a secondary structure.

Commissioner Gibson stated that painting is part of the maintenance of an historic structure. She noted that although the structure is secondary, it is historically and architecturally significant.

Chairman Grinnell pointed out that secondary structures are sometimes adaptively reused and become primary residences.

Commissioner Hanson asked if there is a discernable visual difference between natural wood and the composite product.

Mr. Leiderbach acknowledged that there are a variety of composite products available and that Boral, which in his opinion is a high quality synthetic product, is not used in all cases. He stated that he understands the concern about establishing a precedent allowing non-natural materials on historic structures because not all architects and contractors are as diligent in selecting products or seeing that work is completed with quality craftsmanship as his team. He stated that they will find a durable natural wood that will perform well for the trim.

Commissioners Culbertson and Dalieri suggested that further research be done on composite products including research into what products are allowed in other historic districts.

Chairman Grinnell thanked the petitioner and invited a motion.

Chairman Culbertson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow exterior alterations, repair and restoration to the original stable/carriage house, a retaining wall, the addition of a gravel parking court west of the structure, and associated tree removal. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in this staff report and noted that the Commission's deliberations are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The pitch and shape of the skylight shall be modified to diminish its appearance.
2. Natural wood shall be used for all exterior trim.
3. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with the modification noted above. If any additional modifications are proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be included in the submission for permit along with the plans originally presented to the Commission. All changes will be subject to review by staff in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.

4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a 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. A landscape plan shall be submitted detailing year round plantings to screen views of the motor court from off of the site.
6. An exterior lighting plan and cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be included with the plans submitted for permit. Except for lights illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, fixtures shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the engineering and landscape plans shall be shared with the neighbor to the north.
8. 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 construction impacts on the neighborhood, public streets, and existing trees and landscaping.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and approved by a vote of 6 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.

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Czerniak
Director of Community Development