

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING**

**Thursday, November 16, 2017
Village Hall Board Room
40 East Center Avenue
7:00 P.M.**

MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors (Public Comment Time)

The Residential Building Ad Hoc Committee Chair and Board Members allocate fifteen (15) minutes during this item for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the Committee on any matter not listed on the agenda. Each person addressing the Committee is asked to limit their comments to a maximum of three (3) minutes.

3. Consideration of the September 26, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes

4. Continued Discussion Regarding Committee Work Plan

5. Staff Report

6. Chair's Report

7. Committee Member's Report

8. Adjournment

The Village of Lake Bluff is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, are requested to contact R. Drew Irvin, Village Administrator, at (847) 234-0774 or TDD number (847) 234-2153 promptly to allow the Village of Lake Bluff to make reasonable accommodations.

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING**

September 26, 2017

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Village of Lake Bluff Residential Building Ad Hoc Committee (RBC) met on September 26, 2017 in the Village Hall Conference Room (40 E. Center Avenue) at 7:00 p.m. and the following members were present:

Present: Brad Andersen
Jennifer Beeler
Deb Fischer
Matthew Kerouac
Cheri Richardson
George Russell
Scott Streightiff
Jim Moss, Chair

Absent: Leslie Bishop

Also Present: Drew Irvin, Village Administrator (VA)

2. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors

Chair Moss stated the RBC allocates 15 minutes for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the RBC on any matter not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the RBC.

3. Consideration of the June 22, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes

Member Fischer moved to approve the June 22, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes as presented. Member Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

4. Consideration of the August 17, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes

Member Fischer moved to approve the August 17, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes as amended. Member Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

5. Continued Discussion Regarding Committee Work Plan (Tour of Village and Lake Bluff Residential Built Environment)

Chair Moss reviewed the memorandum noting he asked RBC Members to think about the tour and focus thoughts on the following perceived issues with the Lake Bluff residential built environment:

- Zoning Code (Bulk limitations) may limit design/creativity of architects and/or not control bulk as desired;
- Proposed modification to the attic floor area (more inclusionary) will produce roof designs that look flat and have less pitch (not consistent with architectural character);

- Current height limits on residential structures in place today would preclude the construction of certain local iconic structures that are part of the architectural gems of the community;
- Provided that certain conditions are satisfied, a portion of covered outdoor porches, open entryways, open covered walks, and uncovered exterior balconies are excluded from the gross floor area of a lot. This “porch bonus” misses the mark because it doesn’t establish a minimum porch size;
- Quality of materials utilized on certain new single-family homes is not consistent with traditional, custom homes constructed within the Village;
- Preservation regulations need to protect character yet not get in the way of private re-investment;
- Preservation of certain “Heritage Lots” should be examined. A number of smaller lots that were created at the time when the Village was originally incorporated that provide smaller home sites, and contribute to unique character of Village architecture and streetscape;
- Zoning regulations are poorly adapted to smaller, R-4 lots; and
- R-5 zoning regulations very difficult to actually build under.

Chair Moss read the note from Ms. Mary Collins, Joint Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA) Member. A discussion was had regarding a certain amount of redundancy regarding various subject matters which are already being discussed by the PCZBA and Architectural Board of Review (ABR). Chair Moss stated the goal of the RBC should be to have a fresh set of eyes on different or controversial issues and determine what should be tackled.

Member Russell suggested the RBC tackle the list and Chair Moss stated the first issue was “Zoning Code (Bulk limitations) may limit design/creativity of architects and/or not control bulk as desired.” Chair Moss said that the tour highlighted for him certain issues but that this first issue was subjective and that he expected each member to have their own perception of what is bulky and or good design.

Member Andersen said the design of the home and the setbacks of that structure dictate the perceived effectiveness of the bulk regulations for him; properties with greater setbacks and significant landscaping appeared less bulky

In response to a question from Member Richardson, Village Administrator Irvin confirmed that there were no landscape requirements or review for single family homes built as of right.

Member Kerouac discussed the various definitions of the term bulk and noted the ABR is trying to emphasize articulation and noted the ABR’s proposed building material standards. Member Russell said it would be difficult to accomplish design review of new single family homes as the ABR is not interested in this practice. Member Kerouac said quality building materials should be encouraged.

Member Russell said 500 Moffett was the house that built beyond the current max building limits and predated the existing code, and he said it would not have been allowed under the current code without certain zoning relief.

Member Fischer asked about how certain communities like Libertyville uses the adjacent homes along the streetscape to guide new construction. Member Kerouac noted certain limitations of utilizing that bulk management tool.

Member Andersen suggested that if zoning relief is required there may be advantages in requiring design review and/or landscaping requirements as part of that process.

Member Kerouac said the draft amendments to the building code outlining materials standards is ready for Village Board consideration.

Member Russell said if asked today, he would say the bulk code should not be changed and that he believes that the code is achieving the Village's objectives and striking a balance between property rights and aesthetics. He went on to state that additional limitations tradeoffs could impact these objectives, especially on smaller lots. He noted that he would not vote to further restrict bulk without a significant analysis of the probable impacts on a variety sized properties and cited some examples.

Member Streightiff raised about the tool utilized by Lake Forest that says the amount of second floor square footage included in the building scale calculation is determined by the second floor plate height and overall height of the residence. For all lot sizes, the Second Floor Calculation Line is 19 feet above the top of first floor. A discussion was had about that tool.

Member Richardson agreed with Member Russell as she was present when the bulk code was created and believed that the existing zoning tools were effective as evident by the current built environment.

Member Russell said, after landscaping has had time to be established and start to grow, most all of the controversial homes had made their way into the streetscape fabric and were no longer viewed as "problematic." A discussion was had regarding the value of landscaping to the streetscape views.

VA Irvin shared with the RBC the Village of Bannockburn's bufferyard requirements.

Member Moss commented on the tree ordinance and stated that the Tangley Oaks' Subdivision HOA has strict landscape policies. Member Andersen explained how Tangley Oaks was planned, subdivided and the conservation areas.

Member Richardson said the town is lovely and the recent tour supported that statement as far as she was concerned.

A discussion was had by the RBC regarding the recently proposed modifications to attic floor area inclusion in the bulk calculations.

Member Russell said that when he testified at the PCZBA hearing he did his homework then and shared his findings with the RBC. He strongly encouraged any group recommending zoning code amendments be sure to analyze a sufficient number of properties to ensure the impacts are known and considered.

Member Russell described the current attic floor area code requirements and a discussion of the group ensued.

Member Kerouac questioned why it would be appropriate to penalize owners using existing bul. Member Andersen said he does not agree with Ms. Collins's comments regarding bulk and necessity of including more attic area in the FAR calculations. Member Kerouac said window for

basement FAR penalty if % of window trigger the requirement. He asked if an outside stairwell should be penalized to make a point that any adjustments should include a look at the whole formula. A discussion was had by the RBC about this point.

Member Moss asked about the current attic floor area inclusion requirements. He stated that this conversation addressed the “proposed modification to the attic floor area (more inclusionary) will produce roof designs that look flat and have less pitch (not consistent with architectural character)” topic. He suggested they move on to the topic of “current height limits on residential structures in place today would preclude the construction of certain local iconic structures that are part of the architectural gems of the community.”

Member Russell said along Prospect Avenue, at the NW intersection of Sunrise and Prospect was the residence owned by Mr. Thomas Zarse that is measured at 35 ft. from grade existing with the limit of 32 ft. allowed today. The group discussed the interplay between height limits and FAR. It was noted that the East Prospect ROW is a lot wider than most streets which played into how those homes were perceived with regards to bulk. Member Russell stated that there currently is no specific height data for a certain home on Mountain with a 75 ft. wide lot with a large right of way.

Member Andersen stated the streetscape and landscape character sets the context for bulk. Member Andersen went on to say the modification may not work with smaller cottages and they would need preservation tools. He added that there needs to be a plan for raising smaller scale housing stock in the Village. A discussion was had by the group about (i) preservation regulations need to protect character yet not get in the way of private re-investment; (ii) preservation of certain “Heritage Lots” should be examined; and (iii) how zoning regulations are poorly adapted to smaller (R-4 lots).

Member Moss said the Village need to find a path to work noting the preservation regulations need to protect.

Member Richardson said it is very difficult and remains a challenge to Lake Bluff and other communities.

Member Kerouac provided various examples of preservation tools. A discussion was had about design incentives and FAR bonuses. The group agreed that the word “preservation” needs to be defined.

A discussion followed which included there have been no change to the 50 year limitation and that might be worth exploring.

Chair Moss suggested the group move on to the topic of R-5 zoning regulations.

Member Anderson noted that he would recuse himself from the R-5 Multi-Family Zoning District conversations as he is the listing agent for a project that may be submitting for zoning relief, left the meeting, and did not return.

Member Moss commented on the issues he perceive with the existing R-5 Zoning District and L-1 District. Member Russell reviewed the R-5 District zoning code requirements. A discussion was had by the RBC on the R-5 regulations.

VA Irvin said the surrounding R-5 District zoning issues are presently being discussed by the PCZBA.

5. Village Staff Report

VA Irvin had no report.

6. Chair's Report

Chair Moss discussed the next steps for the RBC which would be further refining the work plan and reviewing the bulk survey results. VA Irvin stated that the survey should be ready for the next RBC meeting. There was a discussion regarding holding the next meeting on Thursday, October 19, 2017. VA Irvin said he would poll members regarding that date.

7. Committee Member's Report

There was no report from any members.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider and upon a motion duly made by Member Kerouac and seconded by Member Streightiff, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

R. Drew Irvin
Village Administrator