

The City of Lake Forest  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Proceedings of the January 22, 2020 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, January 22, 2020, at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Historic Preservation Commissioners present: Chairman Bruce Grieve and Commissioners Carol Gayle, Jan Gibson, Steve Lamontagne, Bill Redfield, Elizabeth Sperry and Wells Wheeler.

Commissioners absent: None

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

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

Chairman Grieve reviewed the meeting procedures followed by the Commission and asked the members of the Commission and staff to introduce themselves.

**2. Consideration of the minutes of the December 9, 2019 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.**

The minutes of the December 9, 2020 were approved as presented.

**3. Continued consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a small, infill addition on the second floor, and associated limited demolition at 1078 Edgewood Road.**

**Property Owners: Eric and Himani Ashleman**

**Project Representative: Dave Szafarz, architect**

**John Mariani, landscape architect**

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

Chairman Grieve invited questions and comments from the Commission.

Mr. Szafarz introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. He noted that the Commission previously expressed concern regarding the massing of the addition and large expanse of windows on the front elevation. He stated that in response to the Commission's concerns, alternative designs were studied. He explained that one of the alternative designs explored incorporating a mansard roof in an effort to match the roof style on the existing house. He stated that the continuation of the mansard roof resulted in

a large mass on the second floor of the house. He stated that another alternative design reduced the number of windows in order to present a more solid appearance. He stated that this design was rejected by the homeowner because it did not provide enough natural light into the space. He stated that the currently proposed design presents three groups of double windows with narrow proportions, minimizing the expanse of glass on the addition. He added that wood panels replace the previously proposed copper panels on the exterior walls of the addition and the pitch of the roof was lowered from 4:12 to 3:12 in an effort to diminish the appearance of mass. He explained that the existing pillars and walls along the driveway are in poor condition and will be reconstructed. He stated that a wood pergola is proposed in the rear yard, on the west end of the existing pool.

Ms. Baehr stated this project was previously before the Commission in November, 2019, and at that time, the Commission expressed support for the removal of the existing skylight but requested further study of the design of the second story addition. She noted that the petitioner made revisions to the addition to respond to the concerns raised. She reiterated that the petitioner studied alternative designs noting that they were provided in the Commission's packet.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Szafarz stated that pine will be used for the exterior walls and trim because it is a smooth wood and takes paint well. He confirmed that the pillars and walls will be reconstructed with the existing brick and limestone caps.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Mariani stated that the pergola is 30 inches west of the pool and is intentionally located very close to the pool.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Szafarz stated that the exterior walls of the addition will be painted to match the existing dormer walls.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Szafarz confirmed that wood shingle for the exterior walls, to match the roof was considered however, the homeowner prefers the wood panels.

Commissioner Gayle commended the petitioner for refining the design of the addition in response to the Commission's comments.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Mariani stated that the flared eaves on the pergola was purely an aesthetic decision to enhance its appearance.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited public testimony. Hearing none, he invited final comments from the

Commission.

Commissioner Gibson stated that the revisions make the addition appear more consistent with the existing home.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Szafarz stated that the new windows on the addition will have simulated divided lights to match the existing windows on the house.

Chairman Grieve expressed appreciation for the refinements made in response to the Commission's comments. He stated that the addition as now proposed presents an aesthetically pleasing connection between the house and garage. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of the existing skylight, construction of an infill addition, construction of a pergola and reconstruction of the existing brick pillars and walls at 1078 Edgewood Road subject to the following conditions.

1. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed in response to Commission direction or as a result of design development, plans clearly detailing the areas of change must be submitted at the time of submission for permit, *along with* the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
3. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property. Care should be taken in selecting lighting fixtures for the interior of the infill addition to avoid light spillover on to the streetscape or to surrounding homes due to the extensive glazing in the infill element.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

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

- 4. Continued consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for various modifications at Ragdale, 1260 N. Green Bay Road. Modifications include replacing the existing Friend's Studio with a new, slightly larger studio, minor widening of the existing driveway entrance on Green Bay Road, softening the curve of the entrance into the existing parking lot, rehabilitation and restoration of the garden, and reconstruction of an historic gazebo.  
Property Owner: City of Lake Forest  
Project Representatives: Jeff Meeuwsen, Executive Director of Ragdale  
Heather LaHood, Woodhouse Tinucci Architects  
Philip Rosborough, landscape architect**

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

Ms. Czerniak stated that an introduction to the project was previously presented to the Commission at the December meeting and the petition is now before the Commission for action.

Ms. LaHood introduced the design team. She reviewed that the existing Friend's Studio is proposed for replacement with a new larger studio. She explained that various locations on the Ragdale property were considered for a new studio and ultimately it was decided that the most workable solution is to replace the Friend's Studio with a new studio. She stated that the Friend's Studio was constructed in the 1990's, with a small budget. She noted that it is not one of the historic structures on the property. She noted that the existing studio is in a state of disrepair and is not ADA accessible. She stated that the height of the proposed replacement studio is lower than the existing studio. She noted that the footprint of the replacement studio is larger than the Friend's Studio to replace the existing composer's studio and to accommodate a new dance studio. She added that the two existing bedrooms will be replaced with two accessible bedrooms and bathrooms. She described the form of the replacement studio as a combination of a gable roof structure and a flat roof structure. She explained that the proposed exterior materials consist of vertical board and batten wood siding which will be painted light grey, and dark stained horizontal wood siding. She added that an architectural asphalt shingle roof is proposed for the gable roof portion of the structure and a membrane roof is proposed for the flat roof above the dance studio.

Mr. Rosborough, project landscaper, stated that the original garden on the Ragdale property was a working farm garden and over time, the original concept has been lost. He stated that the intent of the proposed landscape plan is to restore many of the original aspects of the garden. He explained that

the strong axial design of the original garden will be restored as reflected in the proposed landscape plan. He stated that original garden features including the north and south archway entrances, dovecote, and wishing well will all be restored. He added that the hedges that once created the garden walls will be reestablished. He stated that the north half of the garden will be expanded and will serve as a kitchen garden for Ragdale. He explained that the center of the garden, around the wishing well, will be restored to reflect the original formal design. He stated that the location of the original garden pathways will be restored adding that an ADA surface will be provided. He stated that the east edge of the garden will be widened to allow for resident outdoor dining. He stated that discussions are underway with neighbors and Lake Forest Open Lands on the specific plant material and locations to assure that key sightlines to, from and across the garden are preserved. He stated that a slight widening of the driveway entrance from Green Bay Road is also proposed. He noted that the design of the entrance gate suggests that it is original to the property. He explained that the existing pillars and walls adjacent to the driveway entrance will be shifted north and south and will be reconstructed using the existing materials and design. He added that the entrance into the parking lot will slightly be reconfigured to improve sightlines.

Ms. Czerniak explained that the project represents about a year of study and discussions with neighboring property owners and interested parties. She stated that the project has evolved significantly over that time. She gave an overview of the standard conditions included in staff's recommendation. She added that particular attention will need to be paid to off site light impacts from the studio given the large expanse of glass in the dance studio. She added that interior window treatments may be appropriate. She noted that City staff worked very closely with Ragdale throughout the design development process since the property is owned by the City. She stated that staff recommends approval of the project.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Ms. LaHood pointed out the location of the air conditioning condensers at the rear of the studio, away from the bedroom windows. She stated that appropriate screening will be installed to minimize views of the units and noise impacts on the bedrooms.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Rosborough stated that overall, the amount of hardscape in the garden will not increase from the original garden configuration.

Commissioner Gayle commended the petitioner on the replacement studio and landscape plan. She noted that the project is attentive to the historic elements of the property.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Rosborough explained that originally, a gazebo was located in the garden and was an

iconic feature of the property. He stated that replication of the gazebo is proposed in the future. He stated that the gazebo will likely be located to the east of the proposed replacement studio after small sheds in that general area are removed. He stated that the design of the gazebo is not yet finalized adding that it will be based on historic photographs.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that the plans for the gazebo come back to the Commission for approval once the design and placement of the gazebo is finalized.

In response to comments from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Rosborough stated that the air conditioning condensers will be screened from the south by new hedges. He noted that the air conditioning condensers are setback about 20 feet from the pathway.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. LaHood stated that if the condensers are located on the flat roof, they may be visible from the main house.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Rosborough explained that the existing pillars on either side of the driveway entrance will be shifted two feet to the north and south. He added that the stone walls adjacent to the driveway entrance will be rebuilt.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. LaHood explained that while the design of the replacement studio does not directly draw inspiration from the original Shaw structures on the property, the replacement studio is intended to fit in with Ragdale's eclectic collection of structures and elements.

Commissioner Sperry explained that the existing Friend's studio and other structures on the property appear inconspicuous and blend into the landscape. She added that the existing structures on the property are complementary to the main house. She expressed concern about the design of the replacement studio, adding that it does not appear to harmonize with the other structures on the property.

In response to comments from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. LaHood explained that the replacement studio is respectful of the original house pointing out that it recedes from the house. She added that the color palette of the original house was considered for the replacement studio, but is not proposed to allow the house to stand out and remain the most prominent structure on the property. She stated that the natural materials on the exterior of the replacement studio will help the structure to blend in with its surroundings.

In response to comments from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. LaHood stated that the height of the dance studio is driven by the needs of the artists that will be

using the space. She explained that the height and form of the composer's studio is similar to that of the existing Friend's studio. She stated that blinds will be installed in the large expanse of windows in the dance studio. She added that the lawn south of the dance studio is heavily landscaped and will provide shade from that direction. She stated that the ductwork will not be exposed in the building. She explained that the building will have a full height basement below the dance studio and a crawlspace below the rest of the building. She stated that the mechanical equipment will be located in the basement and the ductwork will distribute from the floor.

Commissioner Gibson stated that the replacement studio appears large in relation to the original house. She expressed some concern about the contemporary style of the replacement studio.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Rosborough stated that the wood pillars adjacent to the driveway entrance appear in a photograph that dates back to the early 1900's. He stated that the appearance of the wood pillars and stone walls will not change, they will be reconstructed a bit further apart.

In response to comments from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. LaHood explained that they worked with a focus group of prominent dancers from the Chicago area to determine the space requirements for the dance studio. She stated that the overall height of the structure is 20 feet, including the top of the parapet wall.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. LaHood confirmed that a post is needed to support the span of openings on the south side of the dance studio. She explained that while they intend to use mostly wood for the structural framing of the building, some steel may be needed to achieve some of the longer spans.

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

Jim Opsitnik, 971 Verda Lane, stated that he had the opportunity to meet with individuals from Ragdale and Lake Forest Open Lands in the early stages of the project. He explained that originally, the proposed siting of a new studio conflicted with views across the Ragdale property to the adjacent preserved open land. He stated that the studio as currently proposed, is the result of many months of discussion and takes into account feedback from neighbors and other interested parties. He explained that the replacement studio is representative of the evolution of the Ragdale property and is respectful of the surrounding structures.

Toby Nicholson, member of the Morrison-Shearer Foundation, stated that the proposed replacement studio is ideal for dance artists. He expressed support

for the project.

Hearing no further public testimony, Chairman Grieve invited final comments from the Commission and staff.

Ms. Czerniak stated that as a point of reference, accessory structures in residential districts are permitted to be up to 25 feet tall. She stated that earlier site studies located the replacement studio further out toward the prairie which raised some concerns, however, by using the site of the existing Friend's studio, impacts to the site and surrounding area are minimized. She explained that the large expanse of glass in the dance studio is intended to bring the experience of the prairie setting into the studio space. She explained that the widening of the driveway is modest and will make maneuvering through the entrance easier. She stated that Ragdale is one of the many treasures which has evolved over time with an eye toward balancing the historic integrity of the site with creativity and adaptive reuse.

Commissioner Lamontagne commended the petitioner for working with neighbors and Lake Forest Open Lands on the design and location of the new studio. He stated that in his opinion, the juxtaposition between the contemporary style of the replacement studio and the original Shaw structures enhances the overall property. He asked that as the project is further developed the location of the air conditioning condensers be given further consideration.

Commissioner Redfield expressed support for the project.

Commissioner Gayle agreed that the design of the replacement studio aligns well with the evolution of the Ragdale property. She stated that the existing and proposed landscaping will help to soften the appearance and scale of the replacement studio over time.

Commissioner Wheeler commended the petitioner on the thoughtfulness of the design of the replacement studio and garden restoration.

Commissioner Sperry noted her concern about the design of the replacement studio in relation to the original Shaw residence, but recognized the need for a functional dance studio. She stated that the existing Meadow Studio is also a contemporary style building. She expressed support for the project.

Commissioner Gibson commended the project and the addition of a more functional space for the artists at Ragdale. She stated that she has some concern about the size of the replacement studio and the potential of overwhelming the historic house. She stated support for the garden restoration.

Chairman Grieve acknowledged the challenge of designing a new building

on the Ragdale property given the legacy of Howard Van Doren Shaw. He explained that the project as proposed reflects an innovative approach that pays homage to the evolutionary spirit of the property. He commended the petitioner on the restoration of the original garden elements. He noted that the solid wall on the east elevation of the replacement studio presents an opportunity to incorporate some type of artistic display. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness authorizing the demolition of the existing Friends' Studio, construction of a replacement studio, relocation and reconstruction of the piers and walls at the entrance driveway and minor re-alignment of the driveway into the parking lot to improve sightlines. He noted that the motion is subject to following conditions.

1. The placement of the air conditioning units shall be studied further to assure they are adequately screened. The final location shall be subject to staff approval.
2. 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 submitted at the time of submission for permit, *along with* the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
4. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. All fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property. Care should be taken in selecting lighting fixtures for the interior of the studio and appropriate window treatments shall be considered to mitigate off site impacts.
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 in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the site.

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

**5. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the south elevation as a result of converting living space into a two car garage at 877 Woodbine Place.**

**Property Owner: Constance G Addington Trust**

**Contract Purchasers: John Liapes and Mary Lukas**

**Project Representative: Cliff Town, architect**

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

Mr. Town stated that the property is on the corner of Woodbine Place and Westminster. He added that the site is approximately 50,000 square feet and the residence on the property is a contemporary style home of about 5,000 square feet. He added that the existing house has an attached two-car garage on the north side of the home. He noted that the footprint of the house is generally square. He stated that the site is heavily wooded with many mature trees. He explained that the contract purchasers are proposing to convert an existing living room into a two-car garage. He stated that this plan adds the garage space the buyer's desire without changing the footprint of the home. He stated that the new garage bay will be on the south side of the house and, as proposed, will have one double-width garage door. He explained that because of the limited width of the space, two single garage doors is not possible. He explained that the proposed modifications are reversible if a future owner wishes to convert the garage back into interior living space. He explained that the existing driveway will extend to the east to provide access to the new garage. He added that one ornamental tree and some shrubs within the footprint of the expanded driveway will be removed. He stated that some additional landscaping is proposed along the south side of the driveway to screen views of the new garage from Westminster.

Ms. Baehr reiterated that the project does not proposed a change to the footprint of the house. She stated staff support for the petition and added that a few recommendations are included in the staff report. She noted that because the space is not wide enough to accommodate two single garage doors, consideration could be given to incorporating elements of the existing garage bays into the design of the single, wide garage door. She noted that a condition is included in the staff report requiring a landscape plan reflecting existing vegetation along the south property line that is to remain and additional plantings proposed to fully screen the new garage door from the street.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Town confirmed that to comply with Code requirements, a single step is required into the house from the garage. He confirmed that the area that will be converted to a garage has a slab on grade foundation. He confirmed that the landscape island is higher than the driveway and drains toward it. He stated that the driveway will be gravel.

Commissioner Gibson observed that by using a double-width door the new garage will appear as a solid wall helping to minimize the appearance of the garage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Town stated that the new garage door will be metal and painted white to blend with the stucco on the exterior of the existing home. He explained that the existing fireplace in the space that will be converted to the garage will be closed off preserving the opportunity for a future owner of the property to re-open it. He stated that the portion of the new driveway that extends to the east is intended as a backup area, not for parking vehicles, and may be able to be reduced in size.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Town stated that the new garage door is taller than the existing garage doors to accommodate the homeowner's vehicle. He clarified that the new gravel driveway does not have a pervious base and therefore is reflected as an impervious surface in the calculations presented to the Commission.

Commissioner Gayle commented that in her opinion, the garage door should be simple to avoid drawing attention. She agreed that assuring that there is adequate landscaping along the south property line will be important in order to screen the garage door and driveway from the street. She commended the petitioner on proposing a gravel driveway as opposed to asphalt to minimize the amount of water runoff.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Town stated that the existing floor in the space proposed for conversion to a garage is wood. He explained that the proposed garage floor is approximately 10 inches above grade so the driveway be sloped to account for the grade difference.

Commissioner Lamontagne suggested that as the project is further developed, landscaping along the south property line and drainage should be studied further. He agreed with Commissioners Gibson and Gayle that the design of the garage should be kept simple and subtle.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited public testimony, Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson expressed support for the project adding that the reversibility of the modification is commendable.

Commissioners Wheeler and Gayle agreed with Commissioner Gibson.

Chairman Grieve explained that at first he thought two single doors, or the appearance of two single doors, was preferable however, he noted that upon further thought, a single garage door, treated as a solid, will diminish its appearance. He suggested that the finish of the garage door be similar to that of

the adjacent stucco wall and if possible, the recess of the garage door be kept to a minimum to minimize the appearance of the garage door. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations at 877 Woodbine Place, subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. The character of the new garage door shall be designed to mitigate its appearance on the south elevation to the extent possible.
2. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission with the modifications as detailed above. 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 submitted at the time of submission for permit, along with the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
3. A landscape plan shall be submitted at the time of submittal for building permit. The plan shall detail all existing trees and vegetation proposed to remain and any proposed removals and any new plantings that are proposed including the location of proposed plantings, species, number and size at time of planting. Particular attention should be paid to the south property line with the intent of screening the garage door and expanded driveway from the Westminster streetscape.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation during construction shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
5. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures should be provided at the time of submittal for permit and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

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

**6. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations including the addition of a portico and dormers and related modifications at 401 E. Westminster.**

**Property Owners: Jeff and Laura Torosian**

**Project Representatives: Richard Bories and James Shearron, architects**

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

Mr. Shearron introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. He explained that the goal of the project is to enhance the appearance of the home and make improvements to the functionality of the home. He stated that most of the proposed alterations are purely aesthetic in nature. He gave an overview of the various exterior alterations including replacement of the existing asphalt shingle roof with a wood shingle roof, replacement of the existing aluminum siding with wood shingle, the addition of a Federal style cornice around the home, and the installation of operable wood shutters. He stated that in addition to the proposed exterior alterations, a new portico at the front entrance, an expanded rear deck, and dormers on the front and rear elevations are proposed. He added that a Lannon stone retaining wall and steps are proposed on the north side of the property, to articulate the existing grade change that occurs in front of the house. He stated that the proposed portico, because of its location within the front yard setback, requires a zoning variance and review by the Zoning Board of Appeals. He noted that the house with the proposed portico and dormer additions does not exceed the allowed square footage. He presented historic precedents for the design of the Federal style portico and dormers. He noted that currently, the front entrance does not have protection from the weather. He explained that the design of the portico is intended to reflect delicate proportions and detailing, consistent with the Federal architectural style. He stated that the proposed dormers will provide additional light into the upper floor and add detail and interest to the house. He explained that the dormers are pediment style dormers and reflect Federal style proportions.

Ms. Baehr explained that the homeowners wish to enhance the appearance of the house and more fully align it with the traditional architectural style. She added that the modifications proposed are also intended to address some of the less compatible changes that were made to the house over the years. She stated that the proposed portico and dormers reflect traditional detailing and proportions, consistent with the style of the home. She added that the proposed elements help to break up the mass of the front elevation and create a more balanced appearance. She noted that the proposed exterior materials are all high quality, natural materials, consistent with the City's design standards. She stated other alterations proposed around the exterior of the house are intended

to improve the overall appearance and functionality of the home.

Commissioner Gayle expressed admiration for the home and its siting on the property. She commended the petitioner for improving the functionality of the home.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Shearron stated that the windows on the first floor are original to the house and the windows on the second floor are replacement windows installed by a previous owner. He added that the original windows are true divided lites and the replacement windows are simulated divided lites. He stated that the stucco that will be applied to the foundation will be a natural, warm color.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Shearron explained that the two center columns of the portico are offset from the pilasters adjacent to the front door to provide a comfortable amount of space between them to walk through. He added that this condition is a common occurrence in Federal style architecture. He confirmed that the existing stairs to the basement on the rear of the home will remain. He explained that the basement stairs are steep enough to allow sufficient head room after the rear deck is expanded over a portion of the stairs. He stated that mahogany is being considered for the cornice and window trim, however, a more sustainable species of wood will also be considered.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Torosian stated that the existing overhead electric service on the rear of the house is not in use.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Shearron clarified that the new roof will be wood shingle, not wood shake. He added that the exterior of the home will also be wood shingle. He stated that each course of shingles will have a five inch exposure. He noted that the wood shingles on the exterior walls will be painted white.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Shearron stated that the bay window above the front entry will have pilasters on each of the mullions. He explained that other windows around the house will have Federal style surrounds. He stated that the proposed dormers are detailed with narrow and delicate proportions, with a classic pediment. He explained that the steps leading from the front of the house to the motor court are "waterfall" steps to add elegance to the site. He added that the steps will not have a railing unless required by Code.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Mr. Shearron explained that sidelights cannot be installed adjacent to the front door because of existing interior walls. He stated that the area around the front door will be clad with flush wood boards to accentuate the front entry.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Shearron stated that the light fixtures on either side of the front door will be minimal and discreet in appearance.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited public testimony, Hearing none, he invited final comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson expressed admiration for the elegant design of the portico and dormers.

Commissioner Sperry agreed with Commissioner Gibson and expressed support for the project.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the petitioners were very thoughtful in the design of the project.

Commissioner Lamontagne commended the petitioners on the level of detail put into the project. He encouraged the petitioners to consider the suggestions made by the Commission in regard to the type of wood used for the architectural details.

Chairman Grieve stated that the proposed alterations are true to the architectural style of the house. He expressed support for the petition, adding that the home will be complementary to the neighborhood. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the additions and alterations to the existing residence located at 401 E. Westminster 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 submitted at the time of submission for permit, *along with* the plans originally presented to the Commission, and will be subject to review by staff, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to verify that the plans are consistent with the intent of the Commission and the approvals granted.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan to protect trees and vegetation during construction must be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
3. Details of exterior lighting, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures should be provided and

all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property.

4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a materials staging and construction vehicle parking plan must be submitted to the City for review and will be subject to City approval in an effort to minimize and manage impacts on the neighborhood, neighboring properties and existing trees and landscaping during construction.

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

**7. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the design aspects of a new condominium building and the conceptual landscape and hardscape plans. The building is phase three of the McKinley Road Redevelopment project. The development site is located on the east side of McKinley Road, east of the phase one and two buildings, between Deerpath and Westminster.**

**Property Owner: City of Lake Forest**

**Contract Purchaser: 361 Westminster LLC (Todd Altounian and Peter Witmer)**

**Project Representative: Peter Witmer, architect**

Chairman Grieve asked the Commission for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he stated he had a conversation with the Chairman of the Plan Commission to understand the Commission's discussions on the project to date. He stated that the conversation will have no bearing on his ability to objectively consider the petition.

Ms. Czerniak stated that a number of years ago, an Ad Hoc group was formed to consider the future of the area located on the east side of the railroad tracks and McKinley Road, between Westminster and Illinois Road. She stated that the area was referred to as the Cultural Corridor because at that time, the Lake Forest/Lake Bluff Historical Society, the Library, and Gorton Community Center were all located along the east side of McKinley Road. She stated that the Historical Society was located in the former Quinlan Coach House at that time, the former Masonic Temple building. She stated that the Historical Society moved into the building, which was owned by the City, in the late 1990's for what was intended to be a short time period. She noted that during the study of the area, it was recognized that the three office buildings on McKinley Road, between Westminster and Deerpath, presented a redevelopment opportunity. The Ad Hoc group recommended that in the future, the area should be redeveloped with multi-family residential uses to provide housing options near the Central Business District. She noted that the group recommended that office uses be directed to the west side of the railroad tracks, near restaurant and retail businesses. She noted that when the opportunity for redevelopment of the area presented itself, the City encouraged the developer to acquire all three office parcels so the area

could be planned and redeveloped in a comprehensive manner for multi-family residential use rather than incrementally, parcel by parcel. She noted that at about the same time as the office parcels were being assembled for redevelopment, the Historical Society was considering options for a long term location. She noted that the Coach House was built as an outbuilding to a former estate and was never intended as a public building. She stated the City Council was concerned about the failing condition of the building. She stated that the Historical Society considered a significant expansion of the existing building and the possibility of constructing a new building on the site. She noted however that the former Christian Scientist Church became available during those discussions and ultimately, the Historical Society relocated to that site, about a block east of the Library. She stated that in 2016, after the Historical Society vacated the building, the Historic Preservation Commission considered a request for approval of the demolition of the Quinlan Coach House at the request of the City Council, and approved the demolition of the building. She noted that the parcel formerly occupied by the Quinlan Coach House today, remains in the City's ownership and is under contract to be sold to the developer for the third phase of the McKinley Road Redevelopment. She stated that the City Council determined that incorporating the City owned parcel into the larger development offered some opportunities to the community. She stated that the planning process for this area has been long and stems from the direction set out in the Master Plan which was recommended by the Plan Commission and approved by the City Council. She explained that the Master Plan directed that the area should be redeveloped for multi-family residential use, with underground parking for residents, and that the development should provide publicly accessible sidewalks and green space. She revised that phase one of the development is constructed and occupied and phase two of the development is under construction. She stated that the third and final phase of the project has been reviewed by the Plan Commission over the course of several meetings to achieve a plan that is aligned with the approved Master Plan. She noted that the Commission has not taken final action on the petition pending review of the design aspects of the building by the Historic Preservation Commission. She stated that the Plan Commission heard considerable public testimony and directed the developer to make numerous modifications to the plan in response to comments heard. She stated that the Plan Commission recognized that the Master Plan and the Purchase/Sale Agreement, both approved by the City Council, provide some clear direction for development of the phase three parcel. She noted that the approvals and the agreement that are in place allow the phase three parcel to be developed with up to 14 units, in no more than two buildings. She noted that the agreement states that if a second building is proposed, at the north end of the phase three parcel, on Westminster, that building is limited to not house more than six units. She stated that the plan originally presented to the Plan Commission proposed two buildings on the phase three parcel. She noted that the plan as now presented proposes one building on the phase three parcel which is setback from Westminster a considerable distance. She stated that the plan as now presented does not propose a building on the Westminster street frontage. She stated that

the Historic Preservation's focus is the design aspects of the building and landscaping. She reviewed that in its review of all petitions, the Commission does not dictate an architectural style, but reviewed architectural elements and detailing to assure that the selected style is generally followed. She added that the Commission also reviews the exterior materials, hardscape materials, landscaping and exterior lighting. She noted that the land use, density and setbacks are not under the purview of the Commission. She explained that several months ago the petition was scheduled to be presented to the Historic Preservation Commission however, a significant change occurred in the plans in response to input from the neighbors; the plan for the site was modified to remove the second building originally proposed close to the Westminster streetscape. She stated that the two buildings, a multi-family building on the southern portion of the site, and a duplex on the north portion of the site were approximately 15 feet apart and were perceived as a single mass with a strong presence on the streetscape. She stated that the buildings in the earlier proposal were taller than the single building now proposed. She explained that this project is different than a typical petition because it is part of a larger planned development which is partially within the historic district. She noted that at the last Plan Commission meeting, the Commission indicated that the plans as now presented appear to be generally consistent with the previously approved Master Plan. She stated that preliminary engineering plans are under review. She explained that after the Historic Preservation Commission's work is complete, the project will return to the Plan Commission for a formal recommendation to the City Council. She stated that the City Council will ultimately consider the petition and the recommendations from the Commissions. She explained that the first two phases of the redevelopment project, the area where the former office buildings were located, are not located within the historic district and therefore, were reviewed by the Building Review Board from a design perspective. She acknowledged that at the time the Quinlan Coach House was presented to the Historic Preservation Commission for demolition, the Commission could have considered realigning the boundaries of the historic district to exclude the property however, in the past, when a building within the boundaries of the historic district is demolished, the property has remained in the district to provide the opportunity for review of the replacement structure by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Chairman Grieve invited questions from the Commission to staff.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the land use, density, and building setbacks were considered by the Plan Commission and preliminarily determined to be consistent with the Master Plan as approved by the City Council. She stated that the land use aspects of the development are not under the purview of the Historic Preservation Commission however, the design aspects of the building are under the Commission's purview.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Czerniak stated that the land use and overall site plan aspects of a development are always reviewed by

the Plan Commission prior to review of the design aspects of buildings, landscaping and hardscape by the Historic Preservation Commission. She stated that the Plan Commission has been intimately involved with this project over the course of several years beginning with the development of the Master Plan and moving through the various phases of the development. She explained for instance when a new single family residence is presented to the Historic Preservation Commission for design review, the Plan Commission has already addressed the land use, density, lot configuration, ingress and egress, and the streetscape. She stated that the Plan Commission acknowledged that the phase three parcel is a transition parcel, with higher density, more intense uses to the west; and lower density, less intense uses to the east. She stated that the Plan Commission spent a significant amount of time working with the developers to achieve a building form that creates a reasonable transition given the distinctly different uses in the area. She confirmed that the building scale regulations do not apply to multi-family structures. She explained that based on discussions before the Plan Commission, the project moved away from the greater mass that was created by two separate buildings in the third phase of the development. She explained that the current plan provides for green space on the Westminster streetscape and green space on the north side of the Library. She reiterated that the Plan Commission forwarded the petition to the Historic Preservation Commission for review of the design aspects of the building and landscaping after a preliminary review which confirmed that the plan as presented aligns with the approved Master Plan.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Czerniak stated that the seventeen standards used by the Commission to evaluate every project should be applied to the proposed building, landscaping, hardscape and exterior lighting proposed in this petition.

In response to questions from Chairman Grieve, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the buildings in phases one and two of the development were reviewed by the Building Review Board and approved by the City Council. She explained that the parcels on which the first two buildings are located are not in the Local Historic District however, the phase three parcel is within the boundaries of the District, right along the edge. She agreed to provide the Commission with the plans approved by the Building Review Board for the earlier phases.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission for staff, Chairman Grieve invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Witmer stated that the third phase of the development was always intended to differ from the earlier phases given the location of the third phase away from the McKinley Road streetscape and at the edge of a single family residential neighborhood. He stated that setting the building back from Westminster creates an open space, essentially a front yard, along Westminster at the entry to the single family home neighborhood. He noted that the development offers publicly

accessible green space and underground parking as required by the earlier approvals and agreements. He pointed out that access to the underground parking garage is not visible from the street. He explained that the massing of the building presents a one-story element on the north side of the building, along the Westminster streetscape, and steps up to two and then three stories as the building extends south, behind the two buildings in the earlier phases. He noted that the building must relate to both the higher intensity development to the west and the lower intensity development to the east. He stated that the building has a series of terraces and porches that help to break up the mass. He stated that the proposed exterior materials and architectural detailing are consistent with the two other buildings in the development. He noted that while the two buildings in the earlier phases of the development have flat roofs, the building in phase three is proposed with a mansard roof, to scale down the building and allow the third floor to be located within the roof form. He explained that this design reduces the actual height of the building as well as the appearance of height. He stated that the mansard roof is higher at some points to fully screen the mechanical equipment located on the roof noting however that the variation adds interest to the building. He noted that the mechanical equipment consists of residential type air conditioning condensers, not commercial units. He noted that the elevator override is also fully screened by the roof element. He stated that the front elevation of the building, the west side, has multiple entry points with covered entries and portico elements. He noted that the elevations are articulated with recessed areas and projecting bay windows. He stated that the third building is proposed at about seven feet lower than the first and second phase buildings. He explained that landscaping will be consistent throughout the development and includes an allée of Honey Locust trees, boxwood and hydrangea along with other plantings. He stated that there has been discussions with the neighbors to the east about some additional plantings on their properties, and potentially replacing some lower quality vegetation on their properties, at the developer's cost. He stated that drainage is being carefully considered with the goal of perhaps improving upon existing conditions on the neighboring properties. He noted that a fence is proposed along the east and south property lines. He stated that the fence on the east property line will be wood and the fence on the south property will be iron.

Ms. Czerniak reviewed the Plan Commission's request that the Historic Preservation Commission pay particular attention to the following: the articulation of the west facing portion of the building that is viewed from McKinley Road, the overall massing and roof forms recognizing that the building must bridge the transition from the larger buildings to the west to the single family neighborhood to the north and east, screening the driveway entrance to the underground garage from Westminster, landscaping along the north and east edges of the phase three building to provide a transition to the single family neighborhood, screening of mechanical units and exterior lighting.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Witmer stated that the slope of the ramp to the underground parking is about 10 percent and the ramp is proposed at 20 feet wide. He confirmed that the ramp will be heated. He explained that a mansard roof was chosen because it allows the third floor to be incorporated into the roof without creating the appearance of a three story building and increasing the height of the building.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that rather than a building designed in an historic architectural style, a more contemporary design could complement the surrounding historic buildings.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Witmer stated that first two buildings are designed as 1920's brick buildings with some Art Deco elements. He stated that the architectural style for the building in the third phase draws elements from various architectural styles as a transition building between different types of development. He stated that the third building is intended to read as a streetscape of row houses. He stated that the height of the phase one and two buildings is 41 feet. He stated that at the southwest corner, the third building is 36 feet, 6 inches and, as the grade slopes down toward the north end of the site, the highest point of the building is 39 feet. He stated that the third building can accommodate up to eight units. He confirmed that the building will be condominiums and that parking for all of the units will be provided in the underground garage. He stated that the green space at the south end of the building is approximately the same square footage as the Greensward in Market Square. He confirmed that the street on the west side of the phase three building, the existing alley, is a two-way street. He confirmed that it will be widened and will be wider than the east/west street between the first two buildings. He explained that each of the units will have some type of outdoor space. He confirmed that guest parking is available on the street between the first and second buildings. He stated that a parking study was done and provided to the Plan Commission. He stated that sufficient parking is provided on the site to support the development. He noted that as required by the Master Plan and Purchase/Sale Agreement, a portion of the phase two site will be transferred to the City for additional parking spaces for the Library. He confirmed that the green space south of the third building is consistent with the green space required in the Master Plan north of the Library.

In response to questions from the Commission Sperry, Ms. Czerniak stated that the maximum height for a single family home is 40 feet and in the Central Business District, the permitted building height is 35 feet.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Witmer explained that the larger units are provided with more parking spaces. He stated that an affordable housing unit can be accommodated on the second floor. He said that they are willing to work with the neighboring property owners to the east to determine the appropriate height for the fence along the east property line. He noted that

because there is a significant grade change on the site, the height of the fence will need to be adjusted accordingly. He commented that if the fence is too tall, it may impact the viability of landscaping in the area. He explained that a third floor is necessary to make the project viable. He stated that based on extensive study to date, a single building in phase three is more appropriate than two buildings as originally proposed. He noted that two buildings spread out on the site and eliminate the green space on the Westminster streetscape. He explained that any space between the two buildings would be insignificant and from Westminster, the two buildings would appear as a very large, single mass.

Commissioner Gibson expressed concern about the height and mass of the building in relation to the Library. She added that the view of the library dome will be impacted by the building.

In response to Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Witmer stated that the Library will be more visible than it was in the past as a result of the green space proposed.

In response to comments from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Witmer stated that the building will likely be visible from Deerpath noting that the former Historical Society building was visible from some points on Deerpath.

Commissioner Sperry requested the petitioner provide an image depicting the view of the three building from Deerpath.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Witmer confirmed that the single story element at the north end of the building, closest to Westminster, is a screen porch.

Commissioner Gibson suggested reconsideration of the detailing of the mansard roof and expressed concern about the arched windows in the dormers. Commissioner Gayle stated that the multiple forms and elements on the building appear distracting. She suggested consideration of simplifying the design of the building perhaps matching more closely the detailing of the two earlier buildings.

In response to comments from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Witmer stated that the phase three building is intentionally different from the earlier buildings to provide variety within the development and recognizing that the third building is in a transitional location.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lamontagne, Mr. Witmer stated that the recessed area on the east elevation is an alcove for the air conditioning units for the first floor units. He stated that the east facing porches near the south end of the building are approximately 12 feet wide and 18 feet long. He noted that on the first level the porch is screened, and on the second and third levels, the porches are open. He added that the porches will have iron railings. He stated that the porches are intended to be a focal point at the east end of the street

which enters the site from McKinley Road. He noted that the porch uses heavier elements to create the desired visual terminus. He noted that a focal point in that area was contemplated by the Master Plan.

Chairman Grieve stated that some elements of a 1920's row home are apparent, however some portions of the building appear more similar to the style of a modern apartment. He added that the stacked bay windows do not seem consistent with the style of a 1920's row home. He added that the use of a different material for the stacked bay windows appears distracting. He explained that historically, although built at the same time, each section of a row home would have a distinct character by using different color schemes and detailing.

Mr. Witmer stated that the design intent is more similar to traditional English row homes which are visually identical. He noted that the use of the same materials on all three buildings ties the overall development together.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Witmer confirmed that the brick and limestone will be the same on all three buildings.

Commissioner Sperry suggested that the detailing of the building should be simple, rather than employing a variety of design elements.

Commissioner Gibson expressed concern for the neighbor to the east given the significant grade change.

In response to questions from Commissioner Redfield, Mr. Witmer stated that there is a backup generator for the sump pumps in the parking garage. He added that there are drains on the ramp into the parking garage.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Witmer confirmed that there are elevators in all of the buildings.

Commissioner Lamontagne suggested consideration of repeating the massing shown on the north side of the building at the south end of the building in place of the multi-level porch.

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

Jim Opsitnik spoke on behalf of the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation stating that some members have expressed concern about the mass of the third building. He explained that the first two buildings appear well-built, however the mass of the third building appears too large for the site. He stated that even with the recessed areas and the stepped down massing, the size of the building is significant. He stated that the east elevation appears overbearing as viewed from the east neighbors. He stated that the building sited is very close to the east

neighbors. He explained that a massive landscape effort will be needed to diminish the appearance of the building from the neighbors. He noted that the neighbors will lose their privacy. He stated that a three story building of this scale is not appropriate for the site. He suggested that the landscape plan will need to be thorough, detailed, and fully implemented in order to provide some level of screening.

Jim Babowice, attorney for the Donovan's, stated that the Donovan's reside directly east of the development. He noted that the proposed building totals 22,929 square feet and the distance between the building and the Donovan's home is minimal. He explained that throughout the public review process, the building setback from Westminster has increased however the distance between the building and the Donovan's home has not changed. He stated that the height of the building will dominate the streetscape. He explained that if a duplex was proposed on the site, in accordance with the City's building scale requirements, a duplex of 5,625 square feet would be permitted. He encouraged the Commission to consider the height and mass of the building in relation to the surrounding single family residences.

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

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Witmer stated that the setbacks were discussed over the course of five Plan Commission meetings. He noted that the distance from the east property line to the building is 15 feet. He stated that the landscaping will be high quality and is an important element of the development. He explained that eliminating the third floor, and removing two units, is not feasible if the project is to be viable. He agreed to further study the building height in an effort to achieve further reduction in the overall height. He stated that there is limited ability to reduce the height further due to the structural requirements. He commented that reducing the height of the building slightly will not make a significant difference in the exterior appearance but could drastically change the quality of the interior of the units.

Commissioner Lamontagne suggested that the petitioner provide a perspective view of the building from the east.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the north, west and south elevations have more variation than the east elevation. He suggested that the east elevation be further articulated.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Witmer confirmed that there is approximately four feet of grade change between the building and the driveway for the neighboring house to the east.

Chairman Grieve noted the Commission's mandatory adjournment time and asked for final comments from the Commission and direction to the petitioner. Hearing no further comments, he suggested that the petitioner work to diminish the appearance of the building by using different materials and detailing. He recommended that the petitioner be more specific in the drawings with some of the height and distance dimensions.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the architect and staff will provide the additional information as requested by the Commission. She invited the Commissioners to forward any additional specific requests or direction to the petitioner to her.

Hearing no further comments from the Commission, Chairman Grieve invited a motion to continue consideration of the petition to the next meeting.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to continue the petition to allow the petitioner to respond to the comments made by the Commission and consider revisions as suggested.

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

#### **OTHER ITEMS**

#### **8. 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.

#### **9. Additional information from staff.**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr  
Assistant Planner