

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

**Thursday, August 17, 2017
Village Hall Board Room and Tour of Village
40 East Center Avenue
6:30 P.M.**

SPECIAL MEETING NOTICE & A G E N D A

- 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 June 22, 2017 RBC Regular Meeting Minutes**
- 4. Tour of Village (Van will depart Village Hall at approximately 6:30 p.m.; places will be provided on the van for members of the public)**
- 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**

June 22, 2017

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Village of Lake Bluff Residential Building Ad Hoc Committee (RBC) met on June 22, 2017 in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue) at 7:02 p.m. and the following members were present:

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

Absent: Jennifer Beeler

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.

Mr. Mark Stolzenburg (resident) thanked the RBC for their service. He said he read the previous minutes particularly the discussions in regards to potential zoning changes in the R-5 District to potential make it easier to build there. The current work plan stated the RBC would like to find ways to make it easier to build bigger and denser in the R-5 District. Currently the R-5 District is single-family homes and anything that is done within the district will have an impact on surrounding homes. He commented on the proposed job that was considered for a higher density structure and said this might be worth considering as well. He said consideration should be given to disburse multi-family and higher density developments throughout the Village in various sites and not just one particular location as it may have a negative impact on the existing properties. Mr. Stolzenburg said this was bought up during the Downtown Vision and Block Three (No Three On Three) discussions and should strongly be considered.

3. Consideration of the May 31, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes

Member Andersen moved to approve the May 31, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes as amended. Member Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

4. Continued Discussion Regarding Committee Work Plan

Chair Moss commented on the materials distributed in the packet. He summarized the restated list of “perceived problems” as follows: (i) need to assess if bulk regulations are balanced, forward looking, durable, (ii) promoting to point of encourage housing stock variety via diversity of product

and (iii) Historic Preservation. The best and logical approach would be to organize the topics so that we are more efficient and effective moving forward and asked for comments from the members.

Member Fischer questioned bulk regulations, one bucket, and housing stock second bucket and asked if this was zoning. She was thinking bulk regulations, zoning regulations and historic preservation as the three buckets. A discussion followed.

VA Irvin said item #1 bulk regulations are zoning regulations and a lot of items under #2 are managed through the zoning code.

Chair Moss said Items #1 and #2 become subsets under zoning and leave Item #3 as Historic Preservation. The most important thing is to make sure that we did not miss anything that we are not taking something which we did not mean to exclude or add anything not needed.

Member Bishop said she thought the only things she could think of that affects housing and also the distribution of the type of housing is the fact that we have such limited transportation options within the Village. She did not know how we wanted to address that problem in relationship to the multi-family housing issue.

VA Irvin discussed the PCZBA's update of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan transportation routes and contrasted that with the more specific issues and perceived problems that the RBC is discussing. Member Bishop said transportation could be a problem because it is becoming more of a bottle neck getting in and out of the Village and the movement of the people should be a part of the discussion.

In response to a question from Chair Moss, Member Bishop said transportation is something that should be discussed in relations to future housing locations.

Member Russell said he cannot see the RBC doing a thorough analysis of this particular issue. In terms of making any decisions on if the RBC should recommend comprehensive changes to the zoning code to such an extent that it would increase density and significantly increase the Village population by 10% that kind of thought should be one of the items considered if this group would take that route. However, he do not think the RBC will be recommending those types of changes. He agreed with Member Bishop that transportation issue should be in the background when considering changes to zoning density.

Chair Moss said if the population increase should become an issue what Advisory Board would address the matter and which area of the Municipal Code. He said the RBC is not just here to identify problems but also to identify other potential problems. Chair Moss said that while they may not offer a well-crafted solution, they might make the appropriate personnel aware of the problem.

Member Russell said as part of the PCZBA's update of the Comprehensive Plan there is a transportation component part of the Plan that includes a series of recommendations that could address this particular concern.

VA Irvin said at the May 20th PCZBA meeting they talked about an overview of all the different concepts and connecting to the greater Chicagoland area; he offered that the statics surrounding

those transportation routes, broad discussion of goals, policies and implementation status were discussed. He also said that the PCZBA will have a special meeting next month to finalize the transportation section of the Comprehensive Plan. He said this is the appropriate place to have discussions regarding the Village's long range land use plan versus the RBC which was established to address certain perceived problems.

Member Andersen said this is outside of the RBC preview, housing recommendations that the RBC may make, are more consistent with proximity to existing transportation and attractive features within the community that residents may want to frequent more in a pedestrian aspect as opposed to a vehicular aspect. In regards to multi-family housing, he think planning principles dictate that you would want multi-family housing closer to downtown and transportation.

Member Fischer said she only sees transportation as a problem if multi-family housing was permitted in L-1 or L-2 District.

Member Richardson noted that, in her view, transportation on IL176 has to do with both the density and population in Lake Bluff but also with commuters from the surrounding communities.

Chair Moss said, as we go through any of these issues and set of recommendations that we might put forward, that we should try to consider the potential consequences. The issues may not be addressed directly but identified for the sake of identification and accompany any recommendation from the RBC. He commented on the traffic on Greenbay Road and IL176 and said he do not know if the RBC has the ability to solve or come up with solutions for the issue, but some of the issues the RBC comes up with might add to that the issues and it should at least identify those type of issues while keeping transportation in mind.

Chair Moss asked if there were any thoughts on the organization of the perceived problems and his opinion that the RBC should gather as much information on the front end before making any recommendations. He would also like to get some comparison on Village Codes and materials.

VA Irvin said he can arrange a tour for the RBC. He also updated the RBC regarding on-going efforts to complete a survey of other communities regarding bulk codes.

At a request from VA Irvin regarding Architectural Board of Review (ABR) update, Member Kerouac said the ABR has identified their preliminary list of standards and/or goals regarding material standards and/or design standards for all new single family homes as follows:

- Consistent use of materials throughout
- All elevations are important;
- Corner lots should emphasize mass articulation;
- Simplicity of parts generally better;
- Fenestration must be logical and recognize adjacent properties;
- Exterior chimneys should be masonry;
- Front porches should have a minimum usable depth of 6 ft.;
- Windows must be of high quality materials and construction;
- Height should be proportional to adjacent structures and property width;
- Residential designs should not be duplicated within the Village; and

- Review/enforcement regarding any property standards is done by Staff, with only appeals or interpretation question to come to the ABR for review.

Member Kerouac said the ABR is still looking at what its recommended rules are going to be and the role of the ABR. He offered that the ABR is still struggling because it does not want to be a panel of seven reviewing every project but also they do want to have some say in what people are bringing to the community architecturally.

Member Russell asked if the ABR reached a consensus on the items or are they still considering ideas. Member Kerouac said these are goals the ABR hopes to achieve. A discussion followed.

Member Streightiff said it is hard to define or codify good or bad architecture. It is a challenge to know the motivation behind the architecture which could be for profit or motivational. Member Kerouac said Lake Bluff is a small community and the ABR is trying to do what is best for the community.

Chair Moss asked what the ABR expected the end document to look like. Member Kerouac said he think the end document will have very basic wording so as not to be so restrictive as not to discourage creativity. He states that he thinks the teeth of the guidelines will be the challenge because they should not be too strong but provide the ability for an informal review for something out of the ordinary. Member Kerouac stated that it is difficult to say what is right or wrong because architecture is a subjective art. He went on to say that he likes the control regarding the quality of materials because this will help ensure that a certain level of integrity is maintained. He said that these proposed material standards achieve valuable goals for our community.

Member Fischer asked if the material standards should be incentives or recommendations. Member Kerouac said for him the material requirements should be standards. He said that the Village already has performance standards, and he think there should be a visual standard for materials and expressed his belief the ABR may feel the same.

Chair Moss said in the beginning he understood that all the bases are important, the balancing act between architect, homeowner and builders. He asked if you can get a different look to the rear of the house or if these would be applied to the streetscape as well. Member Kerouac said the goal is to make sure all four elevations are approached in the same manner.

In response to a question from Member Streightiff regarding lot comparison, VA Irvin said the first things is we are collecting data and trying to put it in a useable format, in terms of modeling what that looks like in terms of space, right now the plans to do that is to show how that translate in terms of visual bulk in the form of a table. Member Streightiff said the formulas changes as the lot sizes change and he was thinking about it should be a comparison of the most common lot sizes.

Member Kerouac said it is a daunting process to make this a valuable tool. A discussion ensued regarding the comparison process.

Member Bishop asked if silver or platinum lead building codes would be encouraged. Member Kerouac said that is done within the code and will not be combined together as it is expensive for a resident to pursue lead certification for a single-family home. A discussion followed.

Chair Moss asked how the commissioner felt about their connection point to documents such as the Village's Strategic Plan or Comprehensive Plan should be take another look to determine where we are being consistent. He asked if they should take a look at the Village Strategic Plan and Comprehensive Plan to see how they compare.

Member Russell said he thinks a "connection point" review should be done when the RBC has determined there is a specific recommendation and to do that check to determine if the recommendation violates a guiding principle as opposed to doing it earlier.

Members Richardson and Bishop expressed their agreement with Member Russell.

Chair Moss asked if there was any other data the RBC felt they needed such as information regarding housing stock.

Member Russell said we should take the RBC tour soon and when we do the tour he would like to see the homes and lots that have generated comments which led to the establishment of the RBC.

Member Bishop noted that she thought that certain homes that have been mentioned did not come to the PCZBA because they actually satisfied the zoning regulations. A discussion regarding the tour followed.

Member Richardson said a part of the HPC discussion was what is the make-up of the houses in the Terrace Subdivision. The HPC focused on what they called the Rockland Area which is east of Greenbay Road and north of IL176 which is where the oldest part of Lake Bluff. The HPC consider if a survey of significant homes should be done for this area and then ranch homes would be considered contributing. Member Andersen said most of the ranch homes are already 50 years old and qualify to come before the HPC.

Member Richardson said at the present the HPC is not overwhelmed with requests to demolish homes but when we do, such as the one on Sunrise Avenue, it may create public concern.

Chair Moss said we need to discuss how to govern the RBC discussions to ensure proper transparency and efficiency. He said that there are three items on the list and if there was support to divide into subcommittees (3 each) to review the issues and come back to the RBC to guide the discussion or should the Committee take each item one at a time.

Member Andersen said he believes it would be difficult to break off into groups of three because there are some diverse opinions in the group. Should the group have all likeminded opinions the recommendation may not be balance in the minds of the entire group. He would prefer the RBC breakup the menu and have each member review each individual item and try to reach a consensus among the group with everyone's input; he thought this would be serving their purpose more fairly.

Member Richardson agreed with Member Andersen because she would prefer to have different opinions from the RBC regarding preservation because, if we are all working on various Advisory Boards, to have the RBC come up with some suggestions that are contradictory to the Commissions then we end up worse off than when we started.

Member Russell agreed with Member Andersen and said having more people involved with each issue you will get a bigger sampling of community opinion and, ultimately, have a better product at the end.

Member Andersen said a tour would be a great jumping off place for a lot of these discussions and he think it would be helpful for him to hear people’s opinions that, without seeing it, would be hard to describe.

Member Fischer questioned if the RBC should be looking at things in terms of new housing, renovations and historic preservation having one bundle of regulations or should there be one set of regulations across the board. VA Irvin said the current code does address new construction versus existing homes, certain dates and lots. He said that is a possibility the regulations could be customized over a period of time based on certain lot sizes.

Member Streightiff said that is a good thing to do, because we do not want to tell people what to do with their property but perhaps give an incentive to move in certain directions is a good idea.

Member Richardson said one thing the HPC talked about is how many of the people in town knew that the house they lived in is either significant or landmarked. She states that she believed the owner should be advised that the Village has done a survey and their house is considered significant for these reason so as avoid future changes that might present a challenge to preservation efforts. A discussion followed.

In response to a question from Member Fischer, Member Richardson said she did not ask the specific question “what is the Village trying to preserve” but said that the HPC has discussed the issue. Member Richardson said that during the Strategic Plan workshops that the goal was to preserve the character of Lake Bluff streetscape but she does not have a good answer to what that really means with any specificity.

Following its discussion, it was the consensus of the RBC to:

- to have each member review the items on the perceived problems list;
- review the list of significant homes to determine if they comply with current zoning or be replicated according to the current standards; and
- direct Staff to arrange a tour of the Village.

5. Village Staff Report

VA Irvin had no report.

6. Chair’s Report

Chair Moss had no report.

7. Committee Member’s Report

There was no report

8. Adjournment

There being no further business to consider and upon a motion duly made by Member Fischer and seconded by Member Richardson, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

R. Drew Irvin
Village Administrator