

The City of Lake Forest
Historic Preservation Commission
Proceedings of the January 23, 2019 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, January 23, 2018, 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 Bob Alfe, Elizabeth Sperry, Jan Gibson, Bill Redfield, Carol Gayle 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 November 28, 2018 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The minutes of the November 28, 2018 meeting were approved as submitted.

3. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations on the coach house at 50 W. Deerpath.

Property Owner: Andrew Rosenfield

Resident: John Sieman

Representative: Mike Malloy, architect

This agenda item was withdrawn by the petitioner prior to the meeting and was not heard.

4. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a single-story rear addition and associated limited demolition on the residence, and expansion of the dormers on the rear elevation of the coach house at 650 Lake Road. A building scale variance is also requested.

Property Owner: Lemon Property 3 LLC

Representative: Jim Rymarcsuk, Construction Project Services LLC

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

Mr. Rymarcsuk introduced the project on behalf of the property owner. He stated that the project primarily involves the restoration of the existing residence. He

explained that the appearance of the front of the house will be maintained and the proposed alterations will be in keeping with the character of the existing residence. He stated that the existing rear addition which is planned for removal, was built in 1936 and is not original to the house. He explained that the proposed rear addition will be expanded by approximately 12 feet in depth beyond the footprint of the existing rear addition. He added that the exterior of the new addition will more closely match the appearance of the main residence. He noted that the proposed materials, colors and detailing of the addition will match the existing residence. He added that the addition will involve reconfiguring the rear bluestone patio. He explained that exterior alterations include cleaning and repainting the exterior, restoring the shutters and replacing all existing windows. He noted that the existing windows will be replaced using wood windows with simulated divided lites. He stated that the existing front door will be repaired and refinished noting that it is original to the house. He explained that the fence in the front yard will be shifted six feet east and the driveway will be slightly reconfigured to remove a portion of the drive that extends toward the front entry. He stated that the alterations proposed on the north elevation include removing an attic vent and replacing a bay window with a double window. He added that the existing single car garage door on the north elevation will be replaced. He noted that the wood arch panel over the garage door will remain intact and will be restored. He explained that on the south elevation, the existing stone retaining wall will be restacked and an iron guardrail will be installed along the stone retaining wall, around a bluestone patio along the south side of the house. He added that an existing window opening on the south elevation will be converted to a door opening to allow access to the new patio from the living room. He explained that the roof was in poor condition and was replaced this past November to prevent further damage to the residence. He noted that the drawings presented to the Commission reflect the new cedar shake roof with multiple vents on the rear. He stated that the garage doors on the coach house will be replaced to match the garage door on the main house. He explained that the two existing hip dormers on the rear elevation of the coach house will be removed and replaced with a larger shed dormer. He stated that the shed roof will be a rubber material. He added that the coach house windows will also be replaced to match the windows on the main house.

Ms. Baehr explained that the proposed alterations are in keeping with the character of the residence and will help to preserve and enhance the residence. She stated that the existing house is over the maximum allowable square footage for the property by 220 square feet. She noted that with the removal of the rear addition which totals 581 square feet, the residence will be under the maximum allowable square footage for the property. She explained that the proposed replacement addition adds 872 square feet and the expanded coach house dormer adds 59 square feet to the square footage of the residence. She stated that after the removal of the rear addition, and after the construction of the new rear addition and expanded dormer, the residence will total 6,796 square feet, which exceeds the maximum square footage permitted for this property by 570 square feet, 9.15%.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Baehr explained that although the property is large, the existing residence is over the maximum allowable square footage. She added that in part, the square footage overage is due to the height of the residence which leads to a large second and third floor area based on the calculation methodology. She noted that the proposed addition is larger than the existing rear addition which will add to the square footage overage.

In response to questions from Commission Gibson, Ms. Czerniak noted that there is a specific variance criteria that speaks to historic homes.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Mr. Rymarcsuk reviewed the windows being considered. He noted that the reason the new window on the north elevation gable is located higher than other windows is because it is above a kitchen counter. He stated that the height of the rear addition chimney complies with the applicable code requirements. He added that the pitch of the roof on the addition is 1:12. He stated that the rear elevation of the addition will have two sets of French doors.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Rymarcsuk stated that the material used on both the main house and coach house roof replacement was a heavy cedar shake to match the original material. He added that they are using natural wood siding for any repairs or replacement needed on the existing siding. He stated that the shed dormer adds approximately 62 square feet to the residence.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that there does not appear to be a precedent for a shed dormer on the existing residence. He added that the only other type of dormer on the existing residence is a hip dormer.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wheeler, Mr. Rymarcsuk stated that a larger hip or gable dormer was considered. He explained that by having a larger hip or gable dormer, the dormer would become taller. He stated that the shed dormer allows for the head room needed while keeping the height of the dormer down. He confirmed that the roof vents are not visible from the street.

In response to comments from Commissioner Gayle, Mr. Rymarcsuk stated that he has enjoyed working on this project and seeing the craftsmanship and detail that the original architect, Mr. Frazier put into his design.

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

Ms. Czerniak expressed appreciation to the property owner and petitioner. She explained that this house was on the market for a number of years and the City

received a number of calls about possible demolition of the house. She added that it is a delight to see someone appreciate and preserve the property.

Chairman Grieve summarized the Commission's comments and stated that the project has been thoughtfully planned and the changes being made do not impact the character or integrity of the residence. Hearing no further comments from the Commission, he invited a motion.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for a single-story rear addition and the associated, limited demolition, and approval of expansion of the dormers on the rear of the coach house at 650 Lake Road. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and incorporates the materials submitted and presented by the petitioner and the deliberations of the Commission as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions of approval.

1. Plans submitted for permit must reflect the project as presented to the Commission. If any modifications are proposed 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.
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 and on access to the south beach parking lot and access road during construction and to minimize impacts on trees intended for preservation. No parking of construction vehicles is permitted on Lake Road during the season when the south beach parking lot is in use by buses and private vehicles.

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

5. Consideration of a nomination in support of designation of the residence at 250 Majestic Oak Court as a Local Landmark.

Property Owners: Daniel and Jeanette Hodgkinson

Representatives: Susan Benjamin and Gwen Sommers - Yant

Benjamin Historic Certifications, LLC

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

Ms. Sommers –Yant introduced the project on behalf of the property owners. She stated that the residence is located at the west end of a 1.43 acre lot. She explained that the property is in the Westleigh Farm subdivision. She noted that the house has retained its original location. She explained that because the property is so deeply setback from the road, the property retains a sense of an estate. She stated that the house is comprised of three main masses. She explained that the main center block is symmetrical and is flanked on either side by recessed wings. She noted that the residence is embellished with many classical details such as a swan's neck pediment, fluted pilasters, and egg and dart molding. She explained that the residence is designed in the Colonial Revival architectural style, as interpreted at a very specific point in time. She explained that Colonial Revival prior to the time the residence was built, was interpreted more freely. She stated that the Colonial Revival style after about 1910 became more academic, with more correct proportions and details. She noted that in the 1930's, the style was refined in response to Modernism and became glamourized in film. She explained that the north end of the house is the service wing. She stated that a garage was built on the north end of the house in 1980. She explained that the rear of the main block of the house wraps around a terrace, and at the south end, there is a porch. She stated that the property owners have begun stabilizing the house with repair and replacement of wood siding and window sills. She noted that the size, detailing and profiles of the replacement siding and sills match the original. She stated that the original owner of the house was Charles Garfield King and his architect was Howard Van Doren Shaw. She stated that King was a successful Chicago stockbroker. She noted that King purchased the land on which the residence was built from Louis Swift in 1904. The original architect, Howard Van Doren Shaw, is best known as one of the nation's leading Country House architects. She explained that Van Doren Shaw's original design of the residence reflects the earlier interpretation of Colonial Revival. She noted that the original design of the house included details inspired by the Colonial Revival style but also elements of the Arts and Crafts style, like an open porch and jerkinhead roof. She explained that during the 1930's, the Noyes family purchased the property. She stated that the Noyes' completed a number of alterations on the residence. She stated that the Noyes' architect was George Towner Senseney. She noted that Senseney had a very prestigious resume. She explained that Senseney's remodeling maintained the Colonial Revival style, but updated the residence with a more simple and accurate interpretation of the style. She stated that based on the research completed, the property meets Local Landmark designation criteria A, G and H.

Ms. Baehr stated that in addition to the three Local Landmark designation criteria identified by the petitioner, staff determined that criteria B also is satisfied. She explained that criteria B is defined as the identification of the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose work is significant to the history of the City of Lake Forest, State of Illinois, or the United States. She stated that criteria B is relevant to this property given that Howard Van Doren Shaw was the original architect for the residence.

Commissioner Redfield expressed support for the designation.

Commissioner Gayle stated that the property currently reflects the beginnings of the rehabilitation plans. She added that it is a pleasure to see the house being preserved.

In response to comments from Commissioner Wheeler, Ms. Sommers-Yant explained that the Senseney remodel reconfigured the fenestration pattern, and built a second floor above the wings which caused the original deep overhangs to be shortened.

Commissioner Alfe stated that the story behind the residence is impressive. He added that the property is well-deserving of Local Landmark designation.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sperry, Ms. Hodgkinson stated that they plan to match the original driveway approach as closely as possible. In response to comments from Commissioner Sperry, Mr. Hodgkinson explained that Local Landmark designation is requested in order to recognize the property's history. He stated that he visited the residence while it was owned by the previous property owner, the Reilly's. He noted that the property is very unique within the City.

Ms. Hodgkinson added that she appreciates the property's beauty. She confirmed that they plan to apply for a National Landmark designation.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gibson, Ms. Hodgkinson stated that the historic gate associated with the residence is currently not located on their property. She added that they are working to relocate the gate onto their property.

Jim Obsitnik, spoke on behalf of the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation and commended the property owners on the plans to restore the residence. He stated that the Lake Forest Preservation Foundation and the Historic Preservation Commission greatly appreciate the endeavor taken on by the property owners.

Chairman Grieve stated that the property owners have access to great resources throughout the City to support their restoration efforts. He explained that there is a tendency to look at properties and require that the original design and form be

retained in order to qualify as a Landmark. He noted that the in this case, property acquired additional significance with the 1930's remodel given the talent and skill of Senseney.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to recommend to the City Council approval of the designation of the residence at 250 Majestic Oak Court as a Local Landmark. He stated that the motion is based on information provided by the petitioner, the findings presented in the staff report, consideration of the applicable criteria from the ordinance and physical inspection of the property.

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.

No additional information was presented by staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner