

Historic Preservation Commission  
Proceedings of the August 23, 2023 Meeting

A meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, August 23, 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, Tina Dann-Fenwick, Geoffrey Hanson, Robin Petit and Leif Soderberg.

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. Recognition of past Commission member Jan Gibson – Chairman Grinnell**

Chairman Grinnell recognized former Historic Preservation Commissioner Jan Gibson for her service on the Commission and for her expertise and commitment. She presented her with a plaque.

**3. Consideration of the minutes of the June 21, 2023 work session and the June 28, 2023 meeting of the Commission.**

The minutes of the June 21, 2023 work session were approved as presented.

The minutes of the June 28, 2023 meeting were approved with corrections as requested by Chairman Grinnell.

**4. Continued consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for additions to the front, rear and west side of the residence at 845 Maplewood Road. Alterations to the exterior façade materials, architectural style and roof massing are proposed. A building scale variance is requested.**

**Property Owners: Megan and Tristan Hoag**

**Project Representatives: Scott Streightiff architect**

**David Heller, 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. Streightiff stated that since the last meeting, the plans have been further developed and detailed as requested by the Commission. He presented samples of the proposed exterior materials and color palette. He stated that to reduce the amount of impervious surface, pavers will be used for portions of the driveways. He presented details of the proposed entry gate and stone pillars and noted that they will be softly up lighted. He stated that the stone pillars will be at both driveway entrances but noted that gates will only be installed at the Sheridan Road entrance. He stated that an aluminum fence with Lannon stone piers is proposed along Sheridan Road along with a boxwood hedge. He presented an image of the proposed fence and landscaping. He presented the landscape plan and noted that the plan includes an existing tree inventory and identifies the trees proposed for removal.

Ms. Baehr reviewed that at the last meeting, the Commission indicated general support for the petition and requested further development and detailing of the plans. She stated that the plans now presented are responsive to the questions and comments offered at the last meeting. She noted that the staff report includes a recommendation to replace the proposed ornamental trees with some additional shade trees to help to mitigate the increased size and height of the home over time.

In response to a question from Commission Culbertson, Mr. Heller stated that the property owners prefer plantings with more color and seasonal interest but agreed to consider adding some shade trees.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Heller clarified that pachysandra is proposed along the fence on Sheridan Road. He confirmed that the intention is to have a uniform, rather than natural appearance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Streightiff confirmed that the fence along Maplewood Road will be removed and will not be replaced. He stated that the Maplewood Road street frontage will be landscaped.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Ms. Baehr stated that the addition of shade trees will help to satisfy the criteria more fully for a building scale variance by helping to mitigate views of the additional building mass and height from off of the site.

Commissioner Daliere commented that shade trees are more in keeping with the character of the streetscape than ornamental trees adding that the second criteria for a building scale variance requires mitigation of the additional square footage with vegetation.

In response to a question from Commissioner Daliere, Mr. Heller confirmed that the arborvitae along the south property will remain.

In response to a question from Commissioner Petit, Mr. Heller stated that the amount of hardscape that will be brick or pavers totals about 1,600 square feet. He stated that bricks or pavers may also be used on the driveway aprons.

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

Commissioner Soderberg commended the petitioner for addressing the Commission's comments.

Commissioner Daliere thanked the petitioner for being responsive to the previous comments and stated support for the petition subject to the addition of shade trees along Maplewood Road to satisfy the criteria for a building scale variance.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Chairman Grinnell agreed that the petitioner was very responsive to the Commission's questions and comments and seems amenable to adding some shade trees to the yard. She invited a motion.

Commissioner Petit made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for additions to the front, rear and west side of the residence, exterior alterations and a building scale variance at 845 Maplewood Road. She stated that the motion includes the Commission's adoption of the findings as detailed in the staff report and incorporates the Commission's comments 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 final design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, *along with* the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan must be submitted reflecting at a minimum, 15 replacement tree inches, and plantings that offer screening of the parking areas and the increased mass and height of the home to the extent possible as viewed from the street and neighboring properties. The plan shall include shade trees to help mitigate the increased scale and height of the home. The plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the City's Certified Arborist.

3. A detailed grading and drainage plan must be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit and will be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. Attention should be paid to avoiding drainage impacts on neighboring properties as a result of the construction both in the short term, during construction, and over the long term.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees, vegetation and the ravine during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist and the City Engineer.
5. Details of all exterior lighting shall be provided 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 adjacent streets and the neighborhood during construction and to minimize impacts on trees intended for preservation. No on street parking is permitted on Sheridan Road or Maplewood Road due to traffic volumes and the location of the property at a corner. Contractors may need to park off site and shuttle to the site if adequate on site parking cannot be accommodated without impacting trees and vegetation intended for preservation.

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

**5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the construction of a pool house and pergola at 105 Mayflower Road.**

**Property Owners: Karl and Joan Gedge**

**Project Representative: Wells Wheeler, architect**

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

Commissioner Petit noted that Mr. Wheeler is a friend but stated that she is able to consider the petition objectively.

Chairman Grinnell noted that Mr. Wheeler was formerly a member of the Historic Preservation Commission but noted that she too will be able to consider the petition objectively.

Mr. Wheeler stated that earlier this year, the property owners started work on an inground pool and once that project was underway, they decided to add a small pool house to provide changing rooms and to house pool equipment. He noted that originally, the pool equipment was proposed to be on a concrete slab at the west end of the pool. He stated that the pool house is proposed on the west side of the pool and is on axis with the west gable of the house. He presented photos of the house noting that it was designed by architect Ike Colburn. He presented a floor plan of the pool house noting that the west door will access the pool equipment room and the east door provides access to the changing room. He presented an overall site plan and noted that a pergola is proposed on the east side of the pool house. He stated that the pool deck is bluestone. He pointed out that the property is heavily wooded and will remain so limiting off site views to the pool and pool house. He presented a landscape plan for the area near the pool and pool house. He stated that the fence enclosing the pool will likely be extended to the pool house to meet Code requirements. He presented elevations of the pool house noting that the style and detailing are based on the home. He stated that the pool house will be cement stucco with a cedar shingle roof and the pergola will be cedar. He presented building sections and perspective drawings of the pool house noting that it is intentionally simple.

Ms. Baehr stated that the proposed structure appears to meet the Commission's standards and is designed in the same style and borrows details from the residence. She stated that there is significant landscaping on the property. She stated that no variances are requested.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Baehr confirmed that the pool and pool fence were approved and permitted, and the pool house was brought forward later, as a separate project.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Mr. Wheeler confirmed that there is no intention to remove vegetation between the pool house and Mayflower Road.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Mr. Wheeler confirmed that the location of the pool house was staked on the site. He stated that the intention is to keep the interior of the small pool house open to the roof rafters.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Baehr stated that a landscape plan was approved previously by the City Arborist for the area around the pool. She stated that the plan was modified to add landscaping near the pool house.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Mr. Wheeler reviewed the location of the fence that will be extended to the pool house.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Mr. Wheeler clarified that the fence terminates at the east side of the pool house. He stated that the door to the mechanical room will be painted to match the door on the house. He confirmed that the pool house is setback 20 feet from the top of the ravine to comply with the steep slope setback.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, Mr. Wheeler agreed that locating the pool equipment in the pool house is an improvement over locating the equipment on a concrete slab out in the open as originally proposed. He stated that to add a restroom in the pool house, the sanitary sewer line would need to be extended adding to the cost of the project.

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

Commissioner Hanson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving a pool house and pergola at 105 Mayflower Road. He stated that the motion includes the Commission's adoption of the findings as presented in the staff report and 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 included in the 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 included with the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets for all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures, except those illuminated by natural gas at low light levels, shall direct light down and the source of the light shall be fully shielded from view. All exterior lights shall be set on automatic timers to go off no later than 11 p.m. except for security motion detector lights.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials' staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on adjacent streets, the neighborhood, and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

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

**6. Continued consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the existing cedar shingle roof to be replaced with a synthetic material on the residence located at 333 Woodland Road.**

**Property Owners: Mary Therese and Greg Williams**

**Project Representative: Mary Therese Williams**

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

Ms. Williams stated that she and her husband purchased the home several years ago with the knowledge that the roof needed to be replaced. She stated that over the past four years she has researched different roofing options and ways to address moss accumulation and rodent invasion. She stated that she also consulted a contractor who works on historic homes and her insurance broker. She stated that she concluded that replacing the roof with another cedar shingle roof is not an option she wants to pursue. She explained that the DaVinci roof product she is proposing is in keeping with the beauty the home and will not adversely impact the neighborhood. She stated that replacing the cedar shingle roof with asphalt shingle in her opinion, will not add to the appearance of her home. She reviewed the questions and comments raised by the Commission about the roof product at the last meeting. She presented images of a newer hotel in Montana with a DaVinci roof noting that the roof blends in well. She pointed out the keyways, end caps, and the roof cap in the images. She noted that the images reflect how the DaVinci roof product can be installed in three tiers to have the appearance of randomness. She noted that composite roofs were installed on homes on Symphony Street in Lake Forest but were not installed properly and as a result, present an even look that does not look natural. She stated that she contacted roof supply companies across the Country, and they stand behind the DaVinci synthetic product. She noted that she learned about another composite roof product, CeDUR and stated that she was told by three supply companies that CeDUR is a bad product. She stated that three years ago, she replaced a portion of the garage roof with cedar shingles and noted that the shingles are very thin and are lifting already. She presented images of homes in the community with cedar shingle roofs and composite roofs and acknowledged that there is a distinguishable difference but stated that the integrity of the surrounding neighborhood is not negatively impacted. She noted that as a cedar shingle roof ages, it changes colors. She stated that the proposed roof product looks like an aged wood shingle. She explained that the DaVinci brand roof product has more dimensionality and character than an asphalt shingle roof. She stated that she needs to replace the roof by October and will be disappointed to replace it with asphalt shingles. She stated that her hope that is that the Commission can reach a decision now and noted that the Commission originally heard her request at the end of June,

Ms. Czerniak stated that the Commission has identified this issue as an important one and to date, has devoted time to it and has committed to continued consideration and study. She noted that this is not the first time that the Commission has been faced with evaluating new materials for consistency with the Commission's standards

adding that each time, the Commission has very diligently and thoughtfully considered whether the new products warrant moving away from the requirements for traditional and historic materials in the Historic Districts. She reviewed that there was a time when the Commission required true divided lite windows and after much study, due diligence, and after the evolution of simulated divided lite products to an acceptable quality and character, the Commission approved the use simulated divided lite windows going forward. She noted that the Commission concluded that the quality of simulated divided lite windows evolved to a point that they offer shadow, depth, and profiles that all closely match the quality and historic appearance of true divided lite windows. She explained that the same due diligence occurred before the Commission ultimately moved away from requiring all wood windows to approving aluminum clad wood windows after the product evolved to a point where it satisfied the applicable standards. She reviewed that the Commission held a workshop in June to get information about the various synthetic/composite products now available for siding, trim and roofs. She stated that the Commission invited six architects who frequently work in the Historic Districts in Lake Forest and other North Shore communities to talk about their experiences with and opinions of the different products available in the context of historic districts. She reviewed that the Commission has committed to continuing to evaluate new materials that become available and to conduct a follow up workshop to view various roof installations in the context of different neighborhoods. She stated that the Commission has discussed the possibility of identifying characteristics of different roof products that could satisfy the 17 Standards. She stated that to date, the Commission has raised concerns that the synthetic roof products have not evolved to a point where they meet the applicable standards. She noted that the Commission raised concerns about the product attempting to imitate a natural product instead of having a texture and finish that create a distinct material with characteristics that are compatible with the Historic District. She reviewed that the petition was previously considered by the Commission at the June meeting and was continued to allow further study. She stated that the petition is back before the Commission now, before the Commission completes further study, at the request of the petitioner. She provided background on the house that is the subject of this petition noting that the home was originally roofed with asphalt shingle and was reroofed with asphalt shingle in 1964. She added that in 2001, a previous owner removed the asphalt shingle roof and replaced it with cedar shingles. She noted that either asphalt or cedar shingles are appropriate and commonly used on residences of this architectural style. She added that both asphalt and cedar shingles have traditionally been used in the Historic Districts and that both roof types are found on homes surrounding the petitioner's home, on the same block. She noted that the Commission has acknowledged that because old growth wood is not readily available for cedar shingles and despite the fact that many homes are still being reroofed and built with cedar shingle roofs, it is timely for the Commission to spend additional time studying and evaluating the various alternative roof products that are available. She noted that cedar roofs require maintenance as with any element of an historic home. She stated that there is a recommendation in the staff report to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving replacement of the roof with cedar or asphalt shingles



and a recommendation to deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a synthetic roof to be installed based on the information reviewed to date by the Commission and pending further study by the Commission.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick noted that she visited homes outside of the Historic District with synthetic roofing and found that many of the homes have a more modern look or are new construction. She noted that there is a significant difference between the areas in which synthetic roof products have been installed and the Historic District. She noted that cedar shingles are thinner and less durable than cedar shakes and suggested that the problems experienced by the petitioner with the current cedar roof likely revolve around past maintenance practices and the expected longevity of cedar shingles.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Ms. Williams stated that she considered various types of cedar roof products. She stated that has learned that many insurance providers no longer insure cedar roofs. She stated that her roof contractor told her that about 40 percent of the roofs he installs are composite roofs. She stated that in her opinion, either cedar shingles or shakes are an inferior product adding that the longevity of wood cannot be guaranteed.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated that she recently replaced her roof and prior to doing so, did quite a bit of research. She stated that certified cedar shingles are available and noted that cedar shingles are available in thicknesses up to three quarters of an inch which protects against level four hail damage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak stated that to date, the Commission has not approved the use of synthetic roofing. She noted that recently, the City issued a permit for a cedar roof replacement however, the roofer used a synthetic product instead. She stated that as in any case where work is not consistent with the approval granted, the matter is being pursued from an enforcement perspective. She noted that prior to approving the use of a synthetic siding product on a new house in the Historic District, the Commission viewed a side by side mock-up of natural and synthetic products and identified characteristics of the synthetic product that aligned with the Commission's standards and noted that the product did not attempt to imitate a natural material. She stated that the Commission does not specify specific manufacturers of products, but instead identifies characteristics of products and determines whether or not given the characteristics, the standards are satisfied. She noted that given the fact that there are varying qualities of products, identifying key characteristics could clarify what types of new products may be acceptable to the Commission based on the standards that must be applied.

Commissioner Petit noted that the Commission previously expressed concern about the treatment at the edges of the synthetic product and noted that the Williams' home has front facing gables which will display that edge, which is distinctly different from the profile of a cedar roof, prominently to the street. She noted that the images

of cedar roofs presented by the petitioner are primarily hip roofs, without prominent front facing edges. She expressed concern about the Commission establishing guidelines or identifying characteristics until there is a better understanding of the product and its performance. She expressed concern about a decision that could allow an inferior product to be used.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hanson, Ms. Williams noted that the randomness found on a cedar roof can be achieved with a synthetic product through installation methods such as layering. She stated that her selected product, DaVinci, has a more random multi-width product than other similar products but noted that in her opinion, the random product appears engineered. She confirmed that the synthetic shingles are available in various widths, four, six, eight and ten inches. She stated that her roof contractor is recommending the eight and ten inch widths which is a standard installation.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Williams confirmed that the garage will also be reroofed.

Commissioner Dalieri noted that many of the images shown in the petitioner's presentation are of newer buildings, rather than historic buildings.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Williams stated that there are many historic districts that allow synthetic roof products. She stated that she has seen the CeDUR product and thought it looked great however she noted that she has heard from roofers that they believe that manufacturer produces an inferior product.

Commissioner Dalieri reiterated that the Commission cannot dictate a specific manufacturer but can identify visual characteristics that need to be met.

Ms. Williams noted that the Commission has the ability to consider each petition on its own merits regardless of previous approvals without concern for setting a precedent.

In response to questions from Commissioner Soderberg, Ms. Czerniak explained that the Commission could choose to identify particular physical or visual characteristics that potentially could allow a synthetic roof product with certain visual qualities to satisfy the 17 standards. She noted that the visual qualities could include sheen, finish, texture, thickness, or the fact that the product does not imitate a natural material. She noted that the Commission may determine that certain products may be appropriate on new construction in the Historic District, but not on historic structures. She stated that it is important that the Commission maintain some consistency in how petitions are evaluated. She confirmed that if a homeowner proposes to replace a cedar shingle roof with another cedar shingle roof, no Commission review is required. She stated that as part of the permitting process, specifications of the proposed material are considered and after installation, the roof is inspected to verify that installation occurred consistent with the approved plans and the permit that was issued. She stated that if a significant change is proposed, staff refers the petition to

the Commission. She suggested that after the Commission determines that it has enough information to do so, the Commission will need to take a position on the use of various types of synthetic products. She noted that this topic will not go away.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that natural slate has been approved on some historic houses even if it was not the original roof material. She noted that the Commission consistently requires that the elements of a structure, fenestration, entrances, pillars, roof forms, or exterior materials, are consistent with and appropriate for the architectural style of the structure.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Williams stated that natural slate is not an option due to cost.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Ms. Czerniak stated that she believes that the cedar roofs in the vicinity of the Williams' home are primarily shingles rather than shakes.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dann-Fenwick, Ms. Williams stated that the ridge caps and end caps for the synthetic roof can be cut on site, so the edges are clean.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick noted that the synthetic roof products are thin and hollow underneath and as a result, an end piece is needed at the gable ends to cover the exposed edge of the synthetic shingle. She stated that a significant concern with the synthetic product is how the ends are finished. She noted that the cedar shingles overlap slightly and have a thickness that is not found and is visually different than the synthetic product. She stated that it is unclear to her how the synthetic product manufacturers will manage to eventually overcome the problem at the edges without adding the extra end cap.

Commissioner Soderberg stated that many of the homes in the Gloucester Crossing development were reroofed with a DaVinci synthetic roof product and have end caps. He stated that he is unsure if the end cap is required for installation reasons, or if the end cap is required for certain types of shingles. He observed that different products have different styles and may use different technologies and installation methods.

Ms. Williams stated that she is unsure if the product she is proposing is hollow underneath.

Commissioner Petit noted that when the Commission considered a synthetic siding product the petitioner prepared a side by side mock up on the site and effectively demonstrated the visual qualities after installation of both the natural product and the synthetic product. She suggested that a mock up could be helpful in allowing the

Commission to evaluate roof products adding that it is difficult to review the product based on pictures.

Commissioner Dalieri suggested that the petitioner allow the Commission to complete its study of roof materials and then return to the Commission for a decision.

Commissioner Culbertson noted that it is his understanding that the petitioner wants to replace the roof before October.

Chairman Grinnell noted that the Commissioners are hesitant to act quickly on an important issue that will have broad implications. She stated that the Commission wants to do the right thing. She noted that the Commission recognizes that the petitioner has concerns about cedar shingles and has found a solution that seems to her to address those concerns. She explained that the Commission is obligated to consider the request based on the 17 Standards and stated that the Commission's evaluation has identified several Standards that are not met which is a concern. She pointed out that the home originally had an asphalt roof and noted that asphalt is an appropriate material for the style of home.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hanson, Ms. Czerniak stated that the Commission considers color palettes for new construction but noted that for a roof replacement, unless the color is determined to be incompatible with the house or neighborhood, the project would be approved administratively by staff.

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

Bob Moulton-Ely, 420 Woodland Road, stated that the quality of the DaVinci product has already been addressed since it has already been installed in the community outside of the Historic District. He stated that the CeDUR roof product has negative reviews. He stated that unless the City is willing to subsidize the installation and maintenance of cedar and slate roofs, asphalt or synthetic roofs manufactured by DaVinci are the options. He stated that he would rather see a DaVinci roof product than an asphalt roof on the home. He stated that his home is also in the Historic District and stated that he would prefer the DaVinci product over an asphalt product.

Alice Moulton- Ely, 420 Woodland Road, stated that she and her husband strongly support the petition to reroof the home with DaVinci brand roof shingle. She explained that she visited homes in the community with synthetic roofing and stated that she could not tell the difference between the synthetic roofing and natural cedar shingle roofs. She stated that she and her husband lived in a 1730 house in New Jersey, and it had original windows and a wood shingle roof that was installed correctly, meaning that the shingles were nailed to horizontal laths or sheathing boards spaced several inches apart. She stated that she asked a roofing contractor about cedar shingle roofing, and he said that long lasting heartwood shingles are not available except as special orders from Canada and even then, they are in short

supply. She stated that she has confirmed this fact through research. She stated that today, cedar shingles are installed with sheets of plywood underneath to prevent water leaks, but as a result, the wood shingles do not dry out. She questioned how the petitioner can be expected to use cedar shingles, which are, in her opinion, an inferior product that will be installed using a questionable method which will cause the roof to fail prematurely. She stated that she installed 30 year asphalt shingles on her garage, and they started cracking and falling off within ten years. She stated that the particular asphalt shingle product she used was later recalled. She stated that regardless of durability, in her opinion, an asphalt shingle roof would not look right on a Colonial Revival home. She stated that asphalt shingle is not a historic material. She stated that the best solution to a durable, long lasting and appropriate roof is a synthetic product that looks like wood shingles like the one exhaustively researched by the petitioners. She stated that she and her husband are ardent historic preservationists adding that her husband fully restored a mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century church in Missouri. She noted that until a few years ago she was on the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation Board and served as secretary, treasurer and president. She urged the Commission to support the petition.

Jason Ackerman, 1087 Edgewood Road, stated support for the petition. He stated that both the Commission and the petitioner are in unenviable positions. He stated that the petitioner has done exhaustive research to find the right solution for the home. He commented that unfortunately the petitioner is the first to bring this issue before the Commission but noted that moving to synthetic products appears to be the direction the industry is moving. He recognized that this is an opportunity for the Commission to decide whether to pivot and change with the evolution of a new product. He stated that the Commission has studied and approved new products in the past and acknowledged that maybe synthetic roof products have not evolved enough or maybe it has. He stated that someone has to be first and commended the petitioner for the research that was completed and for bringing the issue forward. He added commended the Commission for going through the process of trying to find the right solution and acknowledged that it is not easy. He encouraged the Commission to make a decision so the petitioner can move forward one way or another. He added that if synthetic roof products are not approved, it would be disappointing as a neighbor and homeowner. He encouraged the Commission to complete its study and if appropriate develop characteristics or standards under which synthetic roof products could be acceptable. He encouraged a decision sooner, rather than later.

Marcy Kerr, Executive Director, Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, noted that the Foundation provided written correspondence to the Commission. She thanked the petitioner for the stewardship of the beautiful residence noting that it contributes to the Historic District. She stated that it is obvious that the petitioner cares deeply about the home and its historic character. She stated that the Foundation believes that the proposal does not adhere to the Commission's Standards. She urged the Commission to think carefully about making a commitment to accept synthetic roof products noting that once the Commission grants approval, it will be difficult to regulate the

various types of synthetic products that are available. She acknowledged the need to be progressive when considering projects in the Historic Districts but noted that decisions require careful thought and consideration. She acknowledged that guidelines on synthetic materials could be helpful in evaluating future requests and providing direction to petitioners. She thanked the Commission and the petitioners for the efforts and study to date. She stated that the Foundation agrees that there needs to be more research and asked the Commission to continue the petition.

Jan Gibson, 59 Franklin Place, acknowledged that the petitioner has done quite a bit of research but stated that more research is needed. She noted that the National Park Service outlines four circumstances that warrant the consideration of substitute materials and suggested that those be considered in evaluating this request. She stated that the first circumstance is important and relates to this petition because speaks to whether the historic material is unavailable. She noted that if the historic material is not available, then other materials can be considered. She acknowledged that Redwood forests which were once plentiful are now depleted but noted that Alaskan Yellow Cedar trees are prevalent in the Northwest and provide wood for cedar shingles. She stated that the second circumstance that warrants consideration of substitute materials is whether or not craftsmen are available to work with the historic materials. She noted that the third circumstance under which substitute materials are allowed is if there are inherent flaws in the original materials. She stated that the fourth circumstance under which substitute materials are allowed is if the building codes require different materials. She noted that it is very important that cedar shingles be installed properly with strapping underneath and proper nails. She stated that asphalt shingle would be acceptable in this case because of the use on the original home, or cedar shingles. She stated that based on the discussion, it does not seem like the Commission is ready to approve synthetic roofing.

Hearing no further requests to speak, Chairman Grinnell invited final questions.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Williams stated that cedar shingles are not an option and stated that asphalt shingles do not offer the character or the look she wants to achieve.

In response to questions from Chairman Grinnell, Ms. Williams stated that the roofing season ends in October. She asked how a mock up could be done. She stated that when she looked at the synthetic roof product up close, it does not look good, but noted that it looks better up on the roof, at a distance.

In response to questions from Commissioner Dalieri, Ms. Czerniak stated that if the Commission decides to establish standards on which synthetic roof products would be evaluated, staff will draft the standards based on the Commission's discussion and direction and present them for review. She noted that the Commission has requested a tour to view various roof products as installed adding that the Commission could, as

part of that workshop, discuss standards or desired characteristics that would be needed in a synthetic product.

Chairman Grinnell stated that the Commission's challenge is the desire to make the best possible decision, as quickly as possible, but noted that there are a number of repercussions when the Commission starts approving non-traditional materials in the Historic Districts. She stated that approving non-traditional materials will be a big change for the Commission and for the properties in the Historic Districts.

In response to questions from Commissioner Petit, Ms. Czerniak stated that approval of synthetic roofing in this case could set a precedent for future Commission considerations. She stated that in issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Commission must make findings in support of the decision. She stated that although the Commission considers the specific facts of each petition individually, there is consistency in the Commission's decisions overall. She stated that it is important that the Commission is clear on what is being approved and how the standards are satisfied.

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

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated that she understands that synthetic roof material is intended to last for 40 years but noted that plastics degrade over time. She noted that at this time, it is unknown for instance how the plastic material will be affected by prolonged exposure to the sun. She noted that the oldest synthetic roof referenced in the materials provided by the petitioner was installed in 2013. She stated that the end caps and ridge caps are distinctly different in appearance from a cedar roof and noted that it is unclear how those elements will affect the overall appearance of the house particularly on the front facing gables.

Commissioner Soderberg stated that he believes that synthetic products are becoming more widely available but questioned how the Commission can embrace this direction to the satisfaction of all constituencies and from a balanced point of view. He stated concern about the unknowns related to the aging of the synthetic product and the precedent being set with approval at this time. He acknowledged that there may be data demonstrating how the product ages but noted that the Commission has not yet seen that information. He stated that the Commission has to be prepared to stand behind the decision because more petitions will come forward. He questioned the visual compatibility of a synthetic roof product on older homes and on homes of different architectural styles. He questioned whether, at this time, the Commission is confident that the right framework is in place in terms of being able to evaluate synthetic roof products each time this type of request comes before the Commission. He stated that in his opinion there is more work to be done to be able to evaluate synthetic roof materials in a disciplined fashion.

Ms. Williams stated that with respect to the question about how the synthetic roof product ages, she stated that a coating of some type can be applied.

Commissioner Dalieri thanked the petitioner for bringing the topic forward and initiating the Commission's deliberations. She stated that to date, the Commission has not yet developed a list of characteristics that may make a synthetic roof product acceptable. She referenced Standards 7 and 9 noting that in her opinion, the product presented does not satisfy those standards. She stated that going forward, synthetic roof manufacturers may be able to address the end caps and ridge caps which appear to be visually incompatible with the historic home. She agreed that little is known about how the product may degrade over time. She noted that Standard 15 refers to replacement of historic materials adding that originally, the house was roofed with asphalt shingles.

Commissioner Hanson stated that the materials provided by the petitioner were well written and well researched. He noted that there are homes in his neighborhood with synthetic roof products and stated that he approached the petition with a bias toward finding reasons to approve the petition and in the spirit of approaching the petition with an open mind. He stated that his opinion changed when he visited various homes with synthetic roofs. He stated that he was disappointed with what he observed. He stated that the synthetic product was clearly distinguishable as such. He stated that one of the hurdles that the Commission has to overcome is more procedural in nature, setting a precedent with this decision with respect to future requests to use synthetic products in the Historic District. He explained that the Commission has to have parameters and set predictable standards for use of new materials so that residents are informed as they make plans to improve their homes. He stated that in his observations, there is real visual difference between the synthetic product and traditional roof products with respect to two attributes, uniformity and sheen. He stated that in the Historic District, there is a higher standard. He explained that as much as he would have liked to approve the petition, Standards 7 and 12, are clearly not met. He stated that he cannot support the petition.

Commissioner Culbertson commended the Commissioners for offering excellent comments which speak to the complexity and difficulty of the issue. He stated that he lives in a neighborhood, outside of the Historic District, with some homes that have synthetic roofs that were original to the homes when they were built several years ago and commented that in his opinion, the roofs do not look very good. He acknowledged that synthetic roof products have likely evolved since those homes were constructed. He stated that in his opinion, the synthetic roof products do not match up visually to natural cedar. He stated that the synthetic roof products may ultimately evolve to a point where they could be acceptable in Historic Districts. He stated that the Commission is required to apply the Standards in the Code. He stated that it is difficult to imagine finding that a synthetic roof on an historic David Adler home would satisfy the standards. He reiterated that the synthetic roof product may evolve to a point where it meets the standards but noted that it is not there yet to allow use in the Historic District.



Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated that Standard 15 is the most relevant to this petition in her opinion because what is proposed is a repair/replacement of a deteriorated feature, so the Commission is bound by this Standard. She pointed out that Standard 15 states that in the event that replacement is necessary, the new material need not be identical, but should match the material being replaced in composition, color, texture, and other visual qualities. She stated that the synthetic roof product does not meet the standard. She also acknowledged that the product may evolve in the future.

In response to questions from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the Commission could take two votes if desired, one to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for either a cedar or asphalt shingle roof and a second vote on the request for a synthetic product. She acknowledged that the Commission has the ability to continue the petition to allow time for continued study but noted that the petitioner has requested clear direction.

Commissioner Culbertson stated that he is not sure that the Commission will be able to come to a resolution on whether or not the use of synthetic roof products is consistent with the standards before October when the petitioner wants to replace the roof.

Commissioner Soderberg stated interest in a mock up but acknowledged that based on the products currently available, he does not believe a mock up will change his evaluation. He stated that the Commission has visited many homes with synthetic roofs outside of the Historic District over the past couple months.

In response to a question from Commissioner Culbertson, Ms. Williams stated that she does not want the petition to be continued.

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

Commissioner Culbertson made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the replacement of the existing roof at 333 Woodland Road with either cedar or asphalt shingles.

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

Commissioner Culbertson made a motion to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a synthetic roof at 333 Woodland Road at this time.

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

## **OTHER ITEMS**

### **5. Opportunity for the public to address the Historic Preservation Commission on non-agenda items.**

Alice Moulton-Ely, 420 Woodland Road, suggested that a Construction Codes Commission could help a material analysis of the synthetic roof product.

Christy Nevin, 436 Woodland Road, questioned how long the Commission's study of synthetic roof products will take. She noted that cedar roofs are becoming an issue for insurers.

Chairman Grinnell stated that the Commission is going to continue to review synthetic products with a particular focus on roof materials. She stated that there may be a difference between materials that may be acceptable on new construction in the Historic Districts as opposed to what may be acceptable on an historic structure.

Commissioner Dann-Fenwick stated that the question of insurance depends on the insurer. She noted that some insurers have brought in cosmetic clauses which means that if you have hail damage and it just affects the appearance and not the integrity of the roof, then a claim would not be accepted.

Commissioner Petit commented that a synthetic siding and trim product was approved by the Commission by a 4 to 3 vote for a new house after many months of study and identification of characteristics that met the Standards. She noted that synthetic siding and trim products have been around a long time and have evolved.

Marcy Kerr, Lake Forest Preservation Foundation, invited the Commission to attend a program on September 17<sup>th</sup> titled The Value of Sensitive Development in Historic Lake Forest.

### **6. Additional information from staff.**

There was no additional information presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Planner