

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 7, 2016**

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) of the Village of Lake Bluff was called to order on June 7, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue) and the following were present.

Present: Neil Dahlmann
Edward Deegan
John Sorenson
Bob Hunter, Chair

Absent: Matthew Kerouac, Member
Stephen Rappin, Member
Carol Russ, Member

Also Present: Mike Croak, Building Codes Supervisor (BCS)
Drew Irvin, Village Administrator

2. Consideration of the April 5, 2016 ABR Regular Meeting Minutes

Member Dahlmann moved to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2016 ABR meeting with the changes suggested by BCS Croak. Member Deegan seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

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

Chair Hunter stated the ABR Chair and Board Members allocate fifteen minutes during this item for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the Board on any matter not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the ABR.

4. A Discussion of Proposed Design Guidelines for Central Business District Block Two and Three

Chair Hunter introduced the agenda item and noted the ABR decided to recommend the following modifications to the design guidelines: i) choose photographs to delete from the guidelines and ii) recommend to the PCZBA to establish a new daylight plane regulation.

Member Sorenson expressed the concern that there are a fair amount of photographs being recommended for removal and he does not know if the overall design is being prejudiced by removing so many pictures.

Chair Hunter commented on the photographs dealing with single-family detached housing noting there aren't any guidelines for single-family detached housing anywhere in the Village. A discussion regarding the photographs followed.

Member Dahlmann made a motion to approve the design guidelines with the crossed out photographs removed and with the disclaimer “Photographs are intended to illustrate what is discussed in caption and other aspects of the photograph may not be suitable for development in Lake Bluff”. Member Deegan second the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

BCS Croak stated the ABR had also discussed a recommendation to the PCZBA regarding adopting a downtown daylight plane. The ABR should consider whether or not there should be any additional exceptions from the downtown daylight plane, such as dormers or gable roof ends or a limited amount of the front façade to allow more articulation to the building.

Member Deegan stated from a residential standpoint the daylight plane is a good thing which has been a successful rule in town. He stated the way it is sketched and depending on what the exceptions will be it will be difficult for the third floor to be completely viable.

Chair Hunter stated the starting point is a three story block and nobody wants a three story block. He stated what was done for Block One was an attempt to articulate the development by having setbacks and a very strong line at the top.

Member Sorenson questioned if the lot line could be adjusted to allow a Petitioner to adjust the building on site if they are using multiple parcels. Chair Hunter stated the goal is to achieve daylight plane on all four sides of the building.

Member Deegan stated it seems 24 ft. is the minimum starting point needed to achieve the height necessary to have a useable third floor. BCS Croak stated the height could be based on height above grade or it could be based on the third floor elevation above grade.

BCS Croak stated the description of what we are proposing to recommend is “The third floor of any building that is part of a Planned Mixed Development, other than detached single family homes, shall be set back so that it is below the Downtown Daylight Plane. The Downtown Daylight Plane shall be defined as a line beginning at the intersection of the exterior of the second floor walls with the extended plane of the floor surface of the third floor and continuing inward at forty five degree angle towards the interior of the building. Parapet walls, guardrails, and chimneys are permitted to extend into and through the downtown daylight plane. Rooftop mechanical units, elevator bulkheads, and stairs shall remain below the Downtown Daylight Plane.”

In response to a question from Member Sorenson, BCS Croak stated the maximum height in residential zoning district is 44 ft. but Block Three is not wide enough to achieve that height. Should all the properties be put together the maximum would be 40 ft.

Chair Hunter noted that the Design Guidelines recommend that the south side of North Avenue be no more than 2.5 stories maximum, which is currently what exists now across the street.

Mr. Lee Nysted (resident) stated he noticed the discussion never included a 35 ft. or 36 ft. height structure along Scranton Avenue nor how it would affect the rear of his property located behind the PNC bank parking lot. He stated his home is currently on the market and he

believes the potential redevelopment of Block Three is negatively impacting the sale of his home. Mr. Nysted read his written comments and provided the Board with a copy for the record.

Mr. Tom McAfee (resident) stated there is a level of confusion amongst the residents because of the actions taken by the Advisory Boards. For some residents it is difficult to understand how some of these come together with a project that could be really significant relative to the quality of life. Mr. McAfee showed a picture taken from the third floor of the Block One Development and noted his concern regarding building height. Mr. McAfee stated he does not believe the passion is irrational and he is concerned with basing the architectural standards for Block Three on the Block One Development because to continue with this massing concept down to Block Two and Three would impact the view from North Avenue. Mr. McAfee expressed his opinion that Block One was not successful as a large portion of the third floor is vacant and questioned if we really want to change the Village character.

Chair Hunter stated Block One does come up as a discussion point but it is not considered the standard by which we are trying to deliberate right now, as it would not fit into the proposed guidelines being discussed at tonight's meeting.

Mr. McAfee stated Blocks Two and Three are currently zoned for two story dwelling with a maximum height of 30 ft. and the R-5 District is dependent upon the width of parcel and he would like to know what is possible for what areas. BCS Croak stated no one could possibly get enough width in the R-5 district for the 44 ft. height and his opinion that 40 ft. height is the most that could be achieved. He stated in the Lansdowne Subdivision there are blocks that are more than 250 ft. wide and the 44 ft. height is allowed. A discussion ensued.

Village Administrator Drew Irvin expressed his understanding what the PCZBA and ABR have discussed thus far is while the current regulations would allow that, if the land mass could be put together in such away; however, what they are talking about is reducing the height for the south side of North Avenue in Block two, to reduce the height of what can be build there.

In response to a comment from a resident, BCS Croak stated the south half of Block Two is zoned CBD and the north side is zoned R-5.

Chair Hunter stated the 44 ft. building height is not an issue and will never happen pursuant to the design guidelines.

In response to a question from Mr. McAfee, BCS Croak stated the south half of Block Three is zoned CBD about two thirds of the way into the parking lot, and the eastern edge of the block is zoned R-4. Mr. McAfee asked if that was two-stories with a maximum height of 30 ft. He stated right now the current zoning for two thirds of the former PNC Bank property has a maximum height of two-stories, 30 ft., and then it would shift to 34 ft. depending on the width of the lot.

Mr. Lee asked if the main justification for allowing a three-story development was to allow the developer to make money. Chair Hunter clarified his statement from the previous meeting noting that the redevelopment of the property may not be economically feasible without a third floor.

Mr. Lee asked if there is any reason to change zoning or guidelines to allow a three-story development on Block Three. BCS Croak stated the design guidelines that are being discussed tonight are not proposing to allow a third story anywhere where you cannot do it today. A discussed followed.

Mr. Lee asked if there is an economic reason to allow a developer to make money and if there is any reason why other than for a developer to make money to allow a third floor. Chair Hunter stated it is not up to the Village to make sure a developer makes money.

Member Sorenson asked if any floor area ratio (FAR) studies for Block Three have been reviewed. Typically everything in the Village is driven off FAR and he would be curious on how the proposals compare to Block Two. BCS Croak stated the PCZBA will discuss this at their meeting.

Member Dahlmann made a motion to recommend to the PCZBA to consider adopting a downtown daylight plane as discussed in the Staff memorandum with the permitted encroachments allowed in the residential daylight plane to also be allowed in the downtown daylight plane. Member Deegan seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Sorenson, Dahlmann, Deegan, and Chair Hunter
Nays: None
Absent: Kerouac, Russ and Rappin

5. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider, Member Dahlmann moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Sorenson seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Croak, CBO, CBCO
Building Codes Supervisor