

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

**Tuesday, September 26, 2017
Village Hall Conference Room
40 East Center Avenue
7:00 P.M.**

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 Meeting Minutes**
- 4. Consideration of the August 17, 2017 RBC Meeting Minutes**
- 5. Discussion Regarding Committee Work Plan (Tour of Village and Lake Bluff Residential Built Environment)**
- 6. Staff Report**
- 7. Chair's Report**
- 8. Committee Member's Report**
- 9. 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 things is to make sure that we did not miss anything.

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 relation 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, that an Advisory Board would address the matter. 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 other problems.

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 stated planning principles dictate that you want multi-family housing closer to downtown and public 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 so we 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 is 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 that it discourages 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 we are collecting data from certain communities regarding their zoning regulations and trying to put it in a useable format. The plan 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 it involve 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 LEED 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 LEED 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 entail 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

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

August 17, 2017

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Village of Lake Bluff Residential Building Ad Hoc Committee (RBC) met on August 17, 2017 in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue) at 6:30 p.m. and the following members were present and then departed on the van tour of Lake Bluff.

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)
Elizabeth Jensen (resident)

2. Tour of Village

VA Irvin said RBC Members submitted certain property addresses, neighborhoods and or blocks which they would like to visit on the tour. The tour began on East Blodgett Avenue (200 Block) and the RBC was shown a few homes that were early in the tear down phase of the late 1990s. VA Irvin commented on the architectural features of one home noting there was not a lot of articulation on the elevations and it has a flat roof and not too far off the maximum in terms of bulk.

An RBC Member commented on the different types of houses along this street and asked if the lots were standard size on Blodgett Avenue. Member Russell said the lots are predominately 75 ft. frontages and the houses could be higher which is evident by the copula on one of the homes.

The RBC was shown 405 and 407 East Blodgett Avenue which raised some concern in the community when they were built. The homes have similar architecture and scale but meet the current zoning regulations. Member Russell said people were unhappy because the two similar style homes were built at the same time near one another.

In response to a comment from Member Andersen, VA Irvin said Staff receives complaints regarding bulk from time to time. A discussion regarding the type of homes/variety followed.

The tour continued to view homes on Bluff Road. VA Irvin said some of the lots are dealing with huge buffer yards between the structure and roadway.

Member Fischer said 701 Bluff was a Walter Frasier design which was documented before the home was demolished. Member Fischer said the tear down was a challenge but they managed to build a nice smaller scale home on the property. Member Russell said another challenging aspect was they wanted to use some of the existing foundation but the home was built prior to the current building regulations.

The RBC was shown 709 Birch Road and VA Irvin said there was concern regarding the bulk. An RBC Member said there is a ravine behind the property which makes a larger home possible.

In response to a question from Member Richards, VA Irvin said the ravine is included in the lot size. He said that a new single family home will be built next door to the home located at 709 Birch Road.

The RBC was shown a ranch style home, and Member Andersen said the home sold as a tear down in 2006.

The RBC was shown lots along East Washington Avenue and VA Irvin said the lot on the left and immediately to the west are interesting because they are rather shallow lots with a lot of frontage and these features creates a bulky appearance from the street. He said both lots are under the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) and not as tall as the code would allow, but present larger and bulky because of their limited setbacks.

Member Russell said corner lots must have equal setback requirements on Birch Avenue. This is a very unique lot because it is possibly the longest table land property (250 ft.) on the east side.

The RBC was shown an original pastor cottage style home and VA Irvin noted the east elevation encroaches on the neighboring property. Member Russell said this is not the first time an older home was found to be over the lot line. He said if the home was demolished the developer would have to rebuild according to current zoning regulations. A discussion followed.

The RBC was shown an iconic Lake Bluff home located at 244 East North Avenue that probably would not meet the existing code regarding height.

The RBC was shown 239 East Washington Avenue which was granted zoning relief for the existing encroaching side yard for the second story addition. VA Irvin said this part of town is interesting because there are a lot of “alley loaded” properties along the north side of East Washington Avenue.

The RBC was shown an olive colored house that fronted East Washington Avenue which violated the daylight plane. Member Russell said the structure contributed to the establishment of the daylight plane regulations and noted it is located approximately 5 ft. from the property line.

The RBC was shown new construction homes in the R-4 District along East Center Avenue build at approximately 99.2% of the maximum FAR with further setback requirements. Member Andersen said he understands it should not matter what is next door, but if there are a couple of homes built to the maximum bulk limits it kind of stacks up visually.

The RBC was shown an area with recent new additions and different architectural features. VA Irvin said the diverse housing stock and different massing creates a pleasing streetscape.

The RBC was shown 219 East Scranton Avenue that was granted a variation relief because the existing shed dormers violate the daylight plane regulations. The structure was built before the daylight plane regulations and the owner requested to repeat the element going further back and convert the two story flat to a single family home.

The RBC was shown 210 East Center Avenue that might be labeled the poster for historic preservation. VA Irvin said the house to the east of it was a recent tear down and the rear of the property is at the max in terms of lot coverage.

Member Russell said 50 ft. lots normally has 10 ft. driveways and create a lot of impervious surface which contribute to stormwater for various areas. The impervious surface regulations and detached garage bonus which was developed to keep garage doors off the street was developed about the same time.

Member Andersen said this area near 339 East Center Avenue is interesting because the Village agreed to allow the two lots to be sold to the neighboring property owner. VA Irvin said the fenced area of the lots actually extends to East Prospect Avenue and reviewed the conditions of the agreement. A discussion followed.

The RBC was shown a single family home that was torn down to create two as-of-right lots in the 400 block of East Center Avenue. VA Irvin said there was no zoning relief required and both of the homes were built to the maximum FAR. He said a lot of the older trees on East Center Avenue were saved and the Village plans to plant additional trees to create more buffer along the parkway. He reviewed the articulating dormers and porch areas in comparison to the structured homes built during the peak tear down period.

The RBC was shown 403 East Center Avenue whose owners sought zoning relief to make use of the third story but would exceed the bulk limitations. The PCZBA struggled with the request because it would increase bulk on the southern elevation, but nowhere else.

The RBC was shown 550 East Center Avenue that was granted a variation for a garage which has not been built to date.

The RBC was shown 512 Sunrise Avenue. VA Irvin said this is another unusual lot because it is a smaller lot that does not meet code and now per the zoning code it is permanently attached to this home and no longer a buildable lot. He noted the main house has an unusual roofline and the home to the south does not meet the current code, but could be labeled a Lake Bluff iconic structure.

Member Andersen said there was controversy regarding the tear down of this landmarked cottage home (512 Sunrise Avenue) but he did not think anyone will lose any sleep over the property which is now being used for additional open space.

Member Richardson expressed her disagreement with Member Andersen. She advised that she and Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Chair Nelson toured various areas of Lake Bluff and they both agreed there are some homes that should be demolished, remodeled or rebuilt. Also, the differences that have occurred in the streetscape overtime has been great.

The RBC was shown 617 Sunrise Avenue. VA Irvin said the porch was an addition to the home. The usable area of the porch is really deep and this is one of the issues being addressed by the ABR

because the Zoning Code provides a bonus for porches but they tend to be more aesthetic instead of a functional area.

Member Andersen asked if that was the intent of the bonus to make it visually attractive. VA Irvin said the idea was to incentivize that type of architecture. A discussion regarding the porch bonus followed.

The RBC toured East Prospect Avenue a street with massive right-of-ways and homes that are setback further from the street. VA Irvin provided information regarding a workshop for 419 East Prospect Avenue.

Member Andersen commented on 500 Moffett Road which caused concern because it was initially built on a 75 ft. lot and contributed to the bulk ordinance.

The RBC was shown several cottage homes on smaller heritage lots along East Prospect Avenue. Member Richardson advised she used to live in one of the homes and noted how a change to the neighboring house affected the daylight plane.

Member Richardson said there was a question raised at the last meeting, should there be regulations in place that would allow someone to tear down a house like this and rebuild on these non-conforming lots. Member Richardson said she anticipated the HPC submitting information to the Village Board regarding heritage lots and homes that could be rebuilt according to the existing footprint. A discussion followed.

Member Andersen said rows of homes like these really add to the diversity, character and charm of east Lake Bluff and because we have these minimum lot sizes of 7,500 sq. ft. we are not getting anything new and small built. There are a lot of people that desire new smaller construction homes in Lake Bluff. He would like to discuss if there are places in Lake Bluff zoned for the construction of smaller house, this is a market segment not addressed by the Village's housing stock.

VA Irvin said Member Russell had a good comment regarding unintended consequences regarding tear downs. Member Russell said he is in favor of the concept to allow people to build on the existing footprint with the same volume on Heritage Lots but cautioned that code changes met incent tear downs of these cottages.

The RBC was shown a house with a blue roof located at 130 East Prospect Avenue which caused controversy when it was built. Member Andersen said the house might appear less bulky if it had a natural colored roof.

The RBC was shown Lansdowne Subdivision with a lot of new construction homes. VA Irvin commented on the most recent subdivision which consist of 7 lots and is in the final build out process. The homes have interesting architecture and, given the lost size, are not bumping up against the maximum FAR.

The RBC toured East Sheridan Road and VA Irvin showed 405 East Sheridan Avenue that was recently featured in The Wall Street Journal.

The RBC was shown the home at 39 Sunset Place built by a national builder which is currently doing infill lots around the North Shore. VA Irvin said these are the developers that did the Colonel

Sexton Subdivision on East Center Avenue. VA Irvin said the new construction indicates that people are investing in the community which raises the EAV.

Member Andersen said there are homes in this area built on 100 ft. wide lots and asked what would be the harm in having two 75 ft. wide lots in this particular zoning district and would allow for two more modest build homes in the area.

The RBC was shown an area with large setbacks along East Sheridan Road. Member Russell said this is land that the Blair Family owned and donated to the Lake Bluff Park District. The lots north of downtown were donated to the Village. A discussion regarding property rights/restrictions followed.

The toured continued to the west side of Lake Bluff. VA Irvin said Blodgett Avenue has an emergency track crossing which the public safety has access to in the event that the viaduct floods.

Member Andersen commented on one of the tear downs noting it was probably one of the newly constructed homes in this neighborhood with a side yard and curved sidewalk.

The RBC was shown tear downs for this area. VA Irvin commented on the lot with the ranch house in the 600 block of Pine Court that could be torn down and as-of-right create two buildable lots without zoning relief.

An RBC Member asked if the house on Mountain and Sunrise Avenue was one of the first to come under the current regulations. Member Russell stated the height and FAR regulations were established in the 1990s.

The RBC toured the multi-family zoning district (R-5 District). VA Irvin said the R-5 District is predominately clustered around the train station. There were conversations to determine if the R-5 District promotes multi-family and if multi-family housing should be spread out through the Village. Currently, there are some subdivision and communities that have sprinkled multi-family housing into single-family areas. VA Irvin said currently Block One is the only area zoned for three story development as-of-right within the Central Business District (CBD).

Member Andersen commented on a home for sale in the R-5 District and asked if the Village really wants to promote R-5 zoning for this area. He commented on a 50 ft. lot and said what has happened in the R-5 District is the zoning regulations are designed for single-family homes. They use the single-family zoning overlay in a multi-family district. The same restrictions apply for multi-family districts as they do for R-4 Districts. He commented on the current code restrictions regarding size, setback, parking, etc. and expressed his opinion to promote multi-family you have to say this is the space allocated for multi-family and be less restrictive.

In response to a comment from Member Andersen, VA Irvin said the building with the six units was approved pursuant to a special use permit in the 1980s and was originally zoned CBD and rezoned R-5 District. Member Andersen said there are six units on a 100 ft. wide lot and if you can get three units on a 50 ft. wide that would make economic sense and provide the type of housing that is currently not available in town.

Member Bishop asked if the existing three story building could be extended to the end of the block. VA Irvin said the current setback is 15 ft. but the tool that could be used for properties that are

adjacent to the CBD is the PMD tool which has a height restriction of 30 ft. He said the three story building with the dry cleaners on the first floor and apartments on the upper level was recently sold.

VA Irvin said the property owners for these multi-family units on East North Avenue and business building at the end of East Scranton Avenue have undergone the ABR process and have begun improvements to their property. VA Irvin said when Block One was reconstructed, the west side of the Bank had a setback from the property line of 15 ft. and that is the setback goal for the northern end of Block One should it ever be redeveloped. He said the area further north is slated to remain green belt. The Village's Comprehensive Plan views the green belt as continuing all the way out of town, to include the eventual razing of older structures and homes.

Following a request from Member Andersen, the RBC toured East Washington Avenue between Oak and East Sheridan Road. Member Andersen said this area is a concern for him because this is such an idea location for nice multi-family homes and noted some of the existing conditions are an embarrassment to the area.

In response to a comment, Member Russell said the second story additions violate the bulk regulations for this area.

VA Irvin provided information on the existing pink house located at 701 Park Place, the properties on Ravine Avenue and Carriage Way.

Member Russell said, in his opinion, there are no severe problems and people are still able to build in town.

Member Andersen expressed his agreement with Member Russell that Lake Bluff looks good and his opinion that about 98% of Lake Bluff is awesome.

VA Irvin said there are a lot of areas in the United States where there are shopping center that have increased their vitality and utility by having residential space placed above. The group discussed if Carriage Way was such a place and questioned if it could support mixed use residential.

Member Andersen said there are not a lot of people living in downtown Lake Forest and he thinks the area would feel more vital if they still had residential walkable components like Lake Bluff.

3. Adjournment

The tour concluded at Lake Bluff Village Hall at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

R. Drew Irvin
Village Administrator

MEMORANDUM



Date: September 21, 2017

To: Chair Moss and Members of the
Residential Building Ad Hoc Committee

From: Drew Irvin, Village Administrator

Subject: Committee Work Plan

It is anticipated that the Residential Building Ad Hoc Committee (“RBC”) will discuss the recent tour and related issues the evening of Tuesday, 9/26.

Chair Moss has indicated that he wants RBC Members to review the meeting minutes, think about the tour, and focus thoughts on the 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.

The RBC should then decide which of these issues should be explored further and what that examination looks like.

As always, please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments at (847) 283-6883.