



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 10, 2022
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Ryan O'Connor, Daryl Melzer, Larry Pachefsky, Mike Skauge, Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester (arrived during item 3), Lybra Loest (arrived during item 3), and Mary Wright (arrived during item 3).

Others present: Ryan Hundt, Joseph Lee, Todd Fox, Nancy Robjohns, Mazen Seddick, Shaun Relken, Michael Godfrey, Mary Claire Lanser, Sixto Villegas, Jerry Wick, Joe Stanton and Building Inspector Justin Burris.

2. Approval of the February 24, 2022 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 6-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the modification of windows and doors at residential property 4016 N. Farwell Ave.

Architect Ryan Hundt presented the plans detailing the proposed changes. There was discussion on the new bank of three windows on the East elevation, and it was confirmed that window trim would match the existing trim on the house. Mr. Pachefsky questioned the location of the electrical service, and it was confirmed that it would be relocated to the North of the new windows.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 9-0.

4. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a façade sign at commercial property 3512 N. Oakland Avenue.

Project manager Nancy Robjohns presented the plan for the sign, explaining that the need for the special exception was due to the business name "Uptown Pharmacy & Wellness" requiring two lines of text, and needing to fit within the sign band provided by the building owner. Mr. Burris read from the memo prepared for the meeting, noting the sizes of adjacent signs and lettering on this building, and the Special Exception related to the 22" height of the lettering on the proposed sign. Ms. Wright stated that it seems a precedent has been set for this building to allow signs that exceed the code maximum. Chair Kraehnke stated that the sign looked well

proportioned within the frame and within character for the building. Mr. O'Connor echoed the point that the letters do not appear large, and that as long as they were staying within the sign band he is ok with it; Mr. Skauge agreed with the statements made.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the plans as submitted, by Special Exception; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 9-0.

5. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a monument sign at commercial property 3970 N. Oakland Avenue.

Mr. Burris read into record the memo prepared for the DRB, noting that a special exception was required with the replacement of the existing sign that also was granted by special exception, because anytime a sign is altered, the new sign is required to comply with the current sign code, and both the height (9'8" tall) and area (33.04sq.ft.) exceed the code maximum. Ms. Wright questioned the square foot area of the new sign, and it was confirmed that the area of the sign would remain the same.

Chair Kraehnke questioned whether the tenant names would always remain white as proposed, or would they allow custom colors and/or company logos within the tenant name band. Mr. Godfrey confirmed that while they would allow custom logos, the color of the names would remain white to maintain consistency.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the plans as submitted, by Special Exception; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 9-0.

6. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the refacing of a directional sign that exceeds size limitations at commercial property 3970 N. Oakland Avenue.

Mr. Burris read into record the memo prepared for the DRB, noting that staff's recommendation is to defer the item for additional research to better understand the history and placement of the existing sign; to date there is no record of a formal approval, nor is there a Special Privilege on file as the sign is located in the Public Right of Way.

Chair Kraehnke moved to defer this item to allow staff additional time to research the history of the existing sign; Vote 9-0.

7. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for a proposed multi-family redevelopment at commercial properties 2418, 2420 and 2428 E Capitol Drive.

Ms. Lanser, on behalf of Three Leaf Partners presented a report on their neighborhood outreach efforts, answering questions and collecting feedback on the development, with specific attention on the changes that had been made since the January 27th DRB meeting. Ms. Lanser used a "fact sheet" provided to those who were contacted as a basis for the discussions.

Mr. Villegas with JLA architects presented updated plans focusing on the top ten neighborhood concerns, design changes, surrounding neighborhood architecture and the new design. As presented the top ten concerns were the parking and garage layout, East façade's lack of glazing/activation, the refuse room, delivery traffic concerns, the landscape plan, color and

material types, massing and scale, hung balconies, overall building glazing and code compliance.

Chair Kraehnke opened the floor to the public for their comments and questions.

Ms. Vicki Herman, 4071 N. Stowell Ave., stated that she was thankful for the change in color, that it is more in line with the neighborhood, and for moving the garage entrance onto the alley side of the building. Ms. Herman asked if a speed bump could be added to the alley to slow traffic exiting onto Stowell Ave.

Mr. Daniel Walsh, 4024 N. Stowell Ave., stated he did not believe that this has been a collaborative effort. He stated that the single biggest issue is the massing, and that the building when complete, will appear significantly larger than surrounding homes and businesses. He stated that the landscaping was inadequate, that the Village requires a minimum of 30% grass, plantings and natural vegetation, and that this site provides less than 10%. He stated that the building is too large for the area, and should be scaled down to fit appropriately into the neighborhood.

Ms. Karen Desing, 3952 N. Stowell Ave., stated she appreciated the neighborhood outreach, and felt that with future projects a more collaborative approach with the neighbors would garner better results with respect to the design and neighborhood support. She stated that she felt the massing had not been addressed or resolved. She stated that she believes the West façade should be considered a primary façade because it abuts a privately owned parking lot, and the West façade is visible from the street, and that more should be done to activate that side of the building. Lastly, Ms. Desing questioned the refuse collection and how that operation would take place.

Ms. Rosina Bloomingdale, 3958 N. Stowell Ave. reiterated the previously stated comments, she believes that there wasn't any collaboration with the neighborhood. She stated she appreciated the design changes that had been made so far, and that it had improved markedly, however still felt the building was too large, and did not offer any affordable units.

Mr. Jerry Wick with JLA Architects presented information beginning with an answer as to how refuse collection would function. The garbage is placed into dumpsters within an interior refuse room, and on collection day site management will wheel the dumpsters into the alley and collected; the garbage truck will then have to back out of the alley.

Ms. Andrea Alvarez, 1914 E. Edgewood Ave., stated that the project scale is too large for the space, does not like that some of the interior units face each other and feels that with number of single bedroom units it does not attract families nor support the school system.

Mr. Melzer questioned who owns the property/parking lot to the West, and how likely is it to be developed. It was unknown at the time who owns the parking lot, and the likelihood of it being developed is also unknown.

Mr. Joe Stanton with Three Leaf Partners stated that he was not aware of who the West property owner is, and that building code requirements/fire safety prohibit them from having openings on that side of the building due to the distance from the lot line.

Mr. Walsh commented on the lack of glazing/activation on the West façade as Ms. Desing had mentioned, and stated that the reason they could not have any openings on that façade is because the building is too large, and should be setback further from the side lot line. Mr. Walsh questioned the rear setback of the building on the North façade from the alley at five feet, and believed that the code required a ten-foot setback on the North elevation.

Mr. Burris explained that a zoning review had already been completed and confirmed the setbacks meet the zoning code requirements, as interpreted by Village Staff and the Plan Commission.

Mr. Villegas further confirmed that the zoning code requires a five-foot setback from the rear lot line or alley, but ten feet where the property is adjacent to a residential district, and where the property abuts a residential district on the NW corner, they did modify the building to be setback ten feet from the lot line.

Ms. Desing questioned if the West façade was moved East would it still be required to be a “firewall.” Chair Kraehnke stated that would entail a redesign of the building and was beyond what the Board was able to review at this time.

Mr. Burris explained that under the zoning code, buildings are required to be constructed or built to specific lot lines, and that arbitrarily moving a building in from certain lot lines is therefore not allowed.

Chair Kraehnke moved from public comments to Board discussion, and asked to confirm that no one would be able to see into the garage from the window boxes on the East façade. Mr. Stanton confirmed that you would not see into the garage, and that displays inside the window boxes are up for discussion. Chair Kraehnke inquired about the entrance to the residential tenants, and whether or not there was any proposed signage, or could the developer establish a placeholder sign to draw more attention to the entrance. Mr. Villegas stated there had been discussions pertaining to signage, but nothing was developed yet. Chair Kraehnke inquired as to the details of a lighting plan, and Mr. Villegas noted there would be can lights in the canopy at the entrance, as well the included lighting plan that illustrates the downward-directed lights on the North/rear elevation.

Mr. Koester stated he liked that the garage entrance was moved to the alley and away from Stowell Ave., and the main entrance moved to the East end.

Ms. Wright stated that she liked the changes that had been made, it addressed the setback and the hung balconies being changed from hung to inset.

Mr. O’Conner stated that he agreed with the design commentary from fellow Board members, and questioned if there was an opportunity to create some area of a green roof element for those apartments that overlook the parking structure on the West and North sides.

Mr. Stanton stated that had not been discussed, but was willing to consider and discuss it.

Mr. O’Conner stated that he liked the material change, that it fit in better with the neighborhood, He felt that his former concerns of the overall mass and appearing to be a building stacked on top of a parking garage had been addressed, and that the manner in which the brick steps back reduces the appearance of the overall mass. He stated that he felt the size

of the building fit this area of Capitol Drive with respect to the neighborhood and other buildings in the area on Capitol Drive.

Mr. Pachefsky stated that he agreed with the design commentary from fellow Board members and felt that the changes that were made improved the overall design of the building. He questioned the locations of the stucco in relation to the brick, and felt it appeared random and disjunct.

Mr. Villegas stated that thoughtful considerations were made in the use of materials, that the stucco was used to draw attention to the brick, to articulate the varying heights and worked visually to bring it down to a more human scale.

Mr. Brice noted that he had not been present during the initial review, and in looking at this in plan view felt that it reads as one large rectangular bar, and that additional interest could be provided with varying parapet heights, especially in the center of the building that is inset; in doing that it may read more as two smaller squares, and not a single large rectangle.

Mr. Villegas agreed that varying the parapet heights would add interest and help to scale down the overall mass.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he agreed with Mr. Brice, and now that it was being discussed felt that varying the parapet heights would be a desirable modification.

Ms. Desing questioned the window and door heights, specifically on the upper floor, in that the head heights are not aligned. Mr. Villegas stated that was due to standard patio heights being seven feet in height, and the window heights are at eight feet, however they could look at lowering the windows so that they lined up.

Mr. Walsh inquired that with all of the discussion going on, if the Board approved the design would they be approving what was submitted, or with changes per current discussions. He also inquired about the window boxes into the parking garage, and what exactly would be seen from the street view. Chair Kraehnke explained the manners in which the project could be approved, and that the code requires glazing or window displays, and that what is displayed is ultimately the decision of the owners.

Mr. Walsh noted that there is a mechanical vent/louver at the NE corner of the building that is very close to the adjacent window, and could it be moved to the North façade entirely. Mr. Villegas stated that he believed that was an error in the plan, and that the vent should be located further North on the East façade with more distance from the window. He stated that the HVAC consultant provided guidance on the necessary locations for the vents to appropriately ventilate the parking garage.

Mr. O'Conner stated that he felt there had been some very productive discussions, and that he would like to see the items that have been discussed be presented in an updated plan.

Chair Kraehnke asked Board members their opinion on the window and door head heights lining up, and the general consensus was that the Board members did not have an issue with the differing heights.

Ms. Desing stated that she liked the inset brick details on the South façade, and could they not be replicated on the West first floor parking garage wall to break up the monotony of the wide side, that is unable to have openings. Board members agreed that would be a welcomed revision.

Board members concurred that they would like to see the revisions before approving the plan. The revisions discussed were the entryway, possibly a place holder for future signage, parapet heights to articulate separation of building areas and massing, the West façade and introducing some visual interest on the grade level parking garage wall, the vent on the East façade and exploring whether it could go on the North elevation, and a green roof element, or what the plan is.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if there was a lighting design included with the submittal. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the lighting plan is part of the current approval, and Mr. Villegas presented the minimal lighting plan.

Chair Kraehnke moved to defer the plans to the next or future meeting when the developer was ready with revisions; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 9-0.

8. Adjournment

Mr. Koester moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:10 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 9-0.

Recorded by,



Justin Burris
Building Inspector