



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, April 27, 2023

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke (left after item 6), Wesley Brice, Lybra Loest (arrived during item 3), Daryl Melzer, Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky, Chris Schorse and Mary Wright.

Others present: Jean Roberts-Guequierre, Jeff Worcester, Gene Kenny, Jeremy Hartline, Randy Chappa, Theresa Chappa, David Guthery, Kayla Vaccaro, Megan Colvin, and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog

2. Approval of the April 13, 2023 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 7-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dormer with windows, door removal and window replacement on the east elevation, and a porch addition with a new entry door on the south/rear elevation at residential property 1901 E. Jarvis Street.

Jean Roberts-Guequierre and Jeff Worcester were present to discuss this item. Mr. Worcester noted that the project includes straightening out an internal staircase that currently winds down to the basement. He stated that the dormer on the roof would add necessary head height for the stairway going to the second floor. He noted that the kitchen sink would be relocated to the east wall and centered underneath a new, casement window with a fixed transom that would be raised to accommodate the counter height. He pointed out that the ceiling is high, and that the applicant liked the idea of expanding the window on top with a transom to capture more light. He noted that they tried to echo the style of windows in the neighborhood that had a parting sash 2/3rds of the way up.

Mr. Worcester stated that the existing aluminum siding would be patched to match. He pointed out that the plans showed cedar shakes on the proposed dormer, but that they were reconsidering that for siding to match the rest of the house.

Mr. Worcester described the new back porch addition pointing out that cable railing would be utilized. He noted that the cross-arch detail made from 4"x4" cedar was what they were thinking of using to support the roof.

Mr. Worcester said it was important to him to respect the Craftsman details on the house, which is a Sears house. He wanted the improvements to look like they belonged to the house.

Director Griepentrog clarified that the door on the east elevation was remaining and pointed out that the agenda item was improperly titled. He confirmed that the plans on file, which showed the door remaining, were what was up for consideration.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the house currently did not have any dormers. He also confirmed that the new porch would have matching rafter tail and gutter details.

Mr. Schorse questioned the photos which showed a door already installed on the rear elevation. Mr. Worcester acknowledged that it had been installed without a permit about a year ago while repairing the previously installed window. He pointed out the matching trim details that had already been installed as evidence of the quality work being proposed. Mr. Schorse questioned if any items in the rear yard would need to be relocated to accommodate the new porch, and Mr. Worcester noted that the AC would need to be moved.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he would prefer that clapboard siding be installed on the dormer to match the house. He noted that he did not have any issues with the metal roof that was proposed on the porch and dormer.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he did not think the height of the new kitchen window felt appropriate as it was higher than adjacent windows. He preferred to see the head height of the windows remain consistent on the entire elevation. Mr. Worcester stated that the expanded height of the window was desired to take advantage of the high ceilings. He also noted that it can take 6-8 months to get a window and that the window for this project has already been on order for 4 months. He did not believe the window type would be an issue in the design review. Mr. Schorse clarified that the type of window was not the issue, but it was the relocation. Ms. Wright noted that any change to the exterior of the house was to be reviewed. Mr. Worcester pointed out that the bottoms of the windows currently do not line up. Chair Kraehnke stated that he did not have any issue with the bottoms not lining up but was concerned about the tops. He noted that he would rather see two smaller double-hung windows installed that would match the character of the rest of the house. Mr. Worcester believed that there was no consistency around the house with respect to windows. Chair Kraehnke stated that in that case he would look to match something adjacent. Ms. Roberts-Guequierre pointed out that all of the windows in the house were replaced over decades. Mr. Worcester stated that he had been building for a lot of years and it did not seem weird to him to have a window be higher than others.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the new door and windows should have matching trim to the house. Mr. Brice stated that the center mullion between the two windows should match the style of the house. He noted that typical double-hung windows have a wider center mullion. Mr. Worcester pointed out that older windows had wider mullions to accommodate weights. Mr. Brice confirmed that was the look he was seeking to replicate. Mr. O'Connor and Ms. Wright agreed that they would like to see it be consistent, as well as the head height. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that Mr. Brice would like to see two separate windows installed in the kitchen, as opposed to the single window shown that matched the existing width.

Mr. O'Connor questioned where the new porch roof would be located on the rear elevation in relation to the door and existing second-floor window. Mr. Worcester stated that the new roof

would not clip the window and stated that was just a result of loose artwork. Mr. O'Connor stated it was the Board's job to approve designs that were brought to them and would like to see the plans be accurate. He noted the plans should also show the final choice of siding materials. Ms. Roberts-Guequierre confirmed that a new drawing was being requested. Mr. Worcester stated that he would provide a more accurate drawing. Chair Kraehnke said the new drawings should confirm the siding and trim board details on the dormer as well. Ms. Wright agreed that she would like the plans to be updated with specific details.

Mr. O'Connor suggested that the revised plans keep the top of the windows at the same height on the east elevation. Ms. Roberts-Guequierre stated that the window had already been ordered. Mr. Schorse and Ms. Wright stated that was unfortunate. Mr. Worcester pointed out that construction related to a permit should be done within 4 months, but that it takes 6-8 months to get a window, so they thought they were lining things up right. Ms. Roberts-Guequierre stated that if the Board required that the tops of the windows line up that the room would be darker because the bottom of the window was being shortened to accommodate cabinets. Chair Kraehnke stated that lining up the tops of windows was a standard detail. He further stated that keeping the tops consistent usually isn't a problem because it isn't typical to open up a wall to reframe a header. Mr. Brice also pointed out that traditional sills should be included on any new windows, which most contemporary windows do not have. Mr. Worcester said he would fabricate them as necessary.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if a transom window was considered over the door. Mr. Worcester noted that door was four steps down from the floor of the kitchen and does not communicate with the proposed kitchen window.

Mr. Melzer pointed out that the transom window is an obvious issue. He questioned if a fake split could be installed above two double-hung windows, which he thought would look better. Mr. Worcester questioned if he could raise the height of the adjacent window or even all of the windows on that elevation. Chair Kraehnke stated that would be better for him. Mr. Brice stated that would disjoin that whole elevation from the rest of the house. Mr. Worcester said that you could not physically see two sides of the house at the same time. Mr. Brice disagreed and pointed out you could see the front and side at the same time. Several members agreed and stated they would not be in favor of raising the top of all of the windows.

The item was deferred for future consideration subject to the submission of revised plans. Director Griepentrog stated that he would need to confirm if the item was ready for reconsideration by the Thursday prior to the next meeting.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a breezeway and garage addition at residential property 4418 N. Prospect Avenue.

Gene Kenny (homeowner) and Jeremy Hartline (architect) provided an overview of this project. They noted that the project involves a breezeway addition leading to an attached two-car garage with a workshop. Director Griepentrog pointed out that a zoning review was performed, and the proposed addition conformed to allowable standards. Mr. Hartline noted that the existing detached garage would be removed. He stated that panels and lap siding would be used to clad the addition, and that new windows, carriage doors and copper gutters would be installed. Asphalt shingles would be installed on the new hip-shaped roof to match the house. A shed dormer with double-hung windows and divided lights would be installed in

the center. He noted that the materials and colors would match the context of the existing house as well.

Mr. O'Connor confirmed that the house is brick but that the addition would be taking the wood detail from the house to clad the addition. Mr. Hartline stated this was a common approach for the accessory components of houses of this age. Mr. O'Connor confirmed that the current window in the kitchen would become an opening into the breezeway. Chair Kraehnke questioned the height of the roof above the garage and was informed that the area would be used for storage. He confirmed that panel would be installed as the siding material on the upper portion of the garage. He also confirmed that the breezeway featured a mix of paneling, windows, siding and pilasters with lights.

Chair Kraehnke stated that the improvements would be a good addition to the house. He liked the size of trim boards and paneling. He stated that the shed dormer and double-hung windows seemed appropriate. He stated that everything comes together quite nicely. Mr. O'Connor and Ms. Wright agreed that it looked good.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 8-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window modification at residential property 1916-18 E. Jarvis Street.

Randy and Theresa Chappa were present to discuss this item. Mr. Chappa indicated that he had purchased and was in the process of remodeling this duplex with identical first and second story floor plans. He noted that the existing kitchen windows on the first and second floor on the east elevation were proposed to be reduced in size to accommodate a counter. He noted that they would be installed at the same height of the existing windows and trimmed to match.

Mr. O'Connor questioned what the windows looked like prior to the start of the renovations. It was confirmed that two side-by-side windows were previously located on both floors. Chair Kraehnke noted that the original drawings that were submitted were inaccurate. Mr. O'Connor confirmed that the proposed windows, which had already been installed, were raised to be above the counter and are narrower than what was previously in place. Chair Kraehnke stated that he usually likes to keep the same window layouts, but since they were proposing to replicate the new installation on both floors that he did not have a problem with it. He noted that the head height matched others on the same story. Presuming that trim would be installed to match, he stated that the proposal was decent.

Mr. Brice stated that he had a problem with the proportion of the new windows in that they were essentially square and the other windows on the house were predominantly vertical. He noted that the pair of previous windows would've also had that vertical proportion. He did not believe that the replacements spoke the same language as the rest of the windows on the house. Mr. Chappa stated that he wanted to get the most light possible, so didn't want to install a narrower window. He also noted that the width of the window matched the width of the sink. He pointed out that an interior photo of the renovation was provided showing the location of the sink and upper cabinets on both sides of the new window. Chair Kraehnke noted that two smaller vertical windows could've been installed centered over the sink to provide additional light, acknowledging that the cabinets may have needed to be pushed further on either side. He stated he would've rather have seen that as well. Ms. Chappa indicated that would've been less functional, and she believed that the aesthetic of their proposed solution looks better. She also

noted that this window is located further down the driveway and would not be visible from the street. Chair Kraehnke noted that the Design Review Board is concerned with the exterior look of the property and not the functionality of the interior.

Mr. Melzer suggested for practicality's sake the Board should approve the proposal. He acknowledged that the window needed to be raised to create a more functional kitchen. He indicated that he also would've preferred two smaller vertical windows but did not have an issue with the window as installed. He believed that other windows on the house were also no longer original. Chair Kraehnke disagreed that the project should be approved based on practicality. He indicated that he was agreeable to the proposal because both floors were being addressed similarly. Ms. Wright stated that she was not offended by the design. Ms. Loest agreed and noted that the house maintained symmetry. Ms. Wright noted that she was not in favor of this simply because they were already installed.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 5-3. (Mr. Schorse, Mr. Brice and Mr. O'Connor voting no.)

Mr. Chappa asked to confirm that the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation was also approved. He noted that the window was proposed to be raised and filled in with glass block, but only on the first floor. Ms. Chappa noted that the second-floor bathroom window was covered by a shower surround by a previous owner. She stated that the glass block window on the first floor would be the same size as the windows on either side of it. Chair Kraehnke noted that he missed that on their submission. Chair Kraehnke asked for the dimensions of the proposed window, and Mr. Chappa said it was being reduced from 48 inches to 24 inches. Director Griepentrog asked if they were proposing to install siding over the second-story bathroom window because the drawing they submitted did not show the window. Mr. Chappa noted that no other windows were drawn on the west elevation, just the proposed change. Ms. Loest confirmed that the window conditions would be different on the first and second floors. Ms. Wright stated that she'd like the windows to match. Mr. O'Connor stated that the elevations needed to include detail of all of the windows, so that they could understand the changes and review them in relation to the other elements.

Director Griepentrog noted that procedurally if the Board wanted to continue discussion of this item that a motion to reconsider from a member of the prevailing side needed to be made, seconded and approved.

Ms. Loest motioned to reconsider the previous vote based on the fact that not all proposed modifications were discussed; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 8-0. Director Griepentrog noted that the prior approval had been nullified and that the item was back open for consideration. Ms. Chappa confirmed that the prior approval for the windows on the east elevation was no longer granted.

Ms. Wright said that she liked the idea of bringing back a complete elevation of this side of the house for review. Chair Kraehnke stated that he understood that reducing window sizes was often required to make homes more functional and noted that he wasn't sure he needed to see a more complete visualization. Mr. Schorse suggested that he didn't have a problem with the installation of a glass block window, but that the problem related to not matching the same condition on the second floor. Without seeing how it would look in relation to the other windows, he was hesitant to approve it. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the Board generally reviews complete plans. Mr. O'Connor stated he didn't have a problem with the glass block or

phasing the installation of the floors, but that his problems remained on the east elevation where two vertical windows were reduced to one narrower window. Mr. Brice stated that there would be an interplay between the glass block window and the two windows on either side of it. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the glass block window would be the same size as the windows on either side. Mr. Chappa stated that it would be close. Mr. O'Connor suggested that he make it exactly the same. Mr. Brice stated that the revised plans should also confirm trim details to match, including sills. Ms. Chappa stated that they do these renovations by themselves and could not afford to hire an architect. Chair Kraehnke stated that he was fine with the submission of hand drawings as long as they include the detail of what is being asked. Mr. Chappa said that he could provide revised drawings.

The item was deferred for future consideration subject to the submission of revised plans.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a front yard patio and the reconstruction of the portico/porch at residential property 3541 N. Summit Avenue.

David Guthery, Kayla Vaccaro and Megan Colvin (homeowner) were present to discuss this item. Mr. Guthery noted that the portico would be removed and restored as it currently stood. He stated that the roof failed under the prior owner which has irreparably damaged the brick and the structure needs to be completely demolished. He also noted that an updated patio would be installed in the front yard and the sidewalk would be relocated from the center of the yard to the side of the driveway.

Mr. Brice questioned if the photos accurately showed the portico's skewed walls. Mr. Guthery confirmed that the photo was accurate. He noted that the roof would first be removed so that the mason could deconstruct the structure and salvage the non-brick materials for restoration. New brick was proposed for the reconstruction.

Mr. Guthery noted that the flooring in the portico and patio would all be new and that they would match or complement the rear yard patio features. He stated that the patio would be constructed of blue stone with a brick border. He noted that the patio would replace an existing patio but be more functional. It would still allow a pass-through area to the front entry, but also feature an expanded rounded area in the front. The current wall in front of the patio would be removed and replaced with all new landscaping.

Mr. O'Connor questioned the proposed Hicks Yew hedges, noting that they are shown to grow 10-12 ft. high. Ms. Vaccaro stated that they would be trimmed much lower. Mr. Guthery suggested they'd be cut around 30 inches and look similar to the shape of a construction barrel. He stated this type of plant was less touchy than a boxwood.

Chair Kraehnke stated that the plans looked great. He questioned the proposed brick pattern on the restored portico, noting that the house appears to have a Flemish brick pattern, whereas the portico did not. Mr. Guthery confirmed they would try to mimic the house. Chair Kraehnke said it would be his recommendation to match the brick pattern on the house.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the plans, with a [Flemish] brick pattern on the rebuilt portico to match the house; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 8-0.

Chair Kraehnke exited the meeting. Ms. Loest took over his responsibilities as acting Chair.

7. Introduction to updates to Village of Shorewood Sign Code.

Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the proposed project to update the Village's Sign Code. He showed examples of existing and recently approved signs to highlight issues that were hoped to be clarified. He noted that the last update to the Sign Code (Chapter 445) was performed in 2007 as a result of the Central District Master Plan. He referenced that since that time the Supreme Court made a major ruling (Reed vs. Gilbert, 2015) that has impacted the enforceability of sign codes around the country. In response to that, and in his role as the Village's current Zoning Administrator, it was his desire to update and add definitions within the code; add severability and substitution clauses; detail regulations for all types of signage, including awnings; and clean-up confusing/conflicting language throughout. He also noted that a significant amount of signage has been approved via Special Exception within recent years, which likely meant the existing regulations should be tweaked. Lastly, he noted that design details, permit regulations and approval authority would be reviewed.

Director Griepentrog stated that he'd like to reorganize the Sign Code into districts (commercial, institutional and residential) by sign permanency (permanent or temporary) and attachment type (building-mounted or freestanding). Within that reorganization, existing regulations would be reviewed and updated, as necessary. He also noted that new regulations could also be introduced. In order to limit the number of Special Exceptions, he will look at clarifying the circumstances and parameters of such requests, similar to the Planning Adjustments and Design Adjustments that were introduced through the Commercial Zoning Update. Throughout the process he will review regulations for compliance with content neutrality with the Village Attorney. He also expected to include a clearly defined review process.

In terms of next steps, Director Griepentrog stated that he would bring design-related questions to the Design Review Board for discussion. He noted that a subcommittee could be formed of up to three members to facilitate discussion between meetings. Once the draft is completed, he would review the corridor for compliance and bring noted issues to the Design Review Board for confirmation and recommendation. The recommendation would be taken to the Community and Business Relations Standing Committee of the Village Board for further discussion/recommendation, before being considered for adoption by the Village Board. He expected the entire process to take about six months.

8. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were discussed.

9. Adjournment.

Mr. Melzer moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Schorse. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director