



# **Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, May 11, 2023**

## **1. Call to order.**

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

Members present: Wesley Brice, Lybra Loest, Larry Pachefsky, and Mary Wright (acting Chair).

Others present: Nick Wimmer, Jean Roberts-Guequierre, Jeff Worcester, Randy Chappa, Tricia Ognar, Tyler Hart, and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog

## **2. Approval of the April 27, 2023 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Brice. Vote 4-0.

## **3. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of wall signage at commercial property 4414 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Nick Wimmer was present to discuss this item. Director Griepentrog provided an overview of his memo, noting that the sign required consideration by special exception due to the placement above the first story and the size of the “S” and “t” within the design which were above 18 inches. Mr. Wimmer added that the sign would be backlit.

Ms. Wright stated that she believed the “S” was too large. She asked if the “S” could be reduced to the same height as the “t”. Mr. Wimmer noted that the sign was designed to match the project’s logo. He liked that the “S” was larger and noted that any reduction in that would require reduction in the whole sign, which was scaled to fill the proposed space above the windows. Ms. Wright noted that she believed the sign was too big. She further noted that in an effort to keep signage more uniform that approvals via special exception should be limited, particularly when signage could be installed meeting the Village’s standards.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the sign could be reduced to match the Village’s height standards. Mr. Wimmer restated that reducing the sign would not look good in terms of proportion on the space where it was proposed to be installed.

Ms. Wright confirmed that the canopy did not have an edge that would allow for the signage to be installed on that instead. Ms. Wright maintained her opinion that the sign, as proposed, was too big.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned the requirement that signage be located between the first and second floor. Director Griepentrog provided the Board with the definition of sign band, which relates to “the wall area on the exterior of a structure located above a commercial storefront and below the second-floor line.” He noted that the sign was being requested as a special exception. Mr. Pachefsky asked if a monument sign could be installed instead. Director Griepentrog did not believe there was adequate space between the building and public right-of-way to install a monument sign. Ms. Wright questioned if a sign could be installed on top of the canopy. Mr. Wimmer stated that in theory it could be, but the backlighting would go directly into the windows or require uplighting. Ms. Wright questioned if the windows were associated with a residence, and Mr. Wimmer noted that area was a business center/co-working space. He also noted that this wall sign was the only proposed identification sign on the project. Ms. Wright reiterated that she would like to see a smaller sign be proposed.

Director Griepentrog showed examples of how other new developments (LightHorse and Mosaic) installed signage on their projects. Ms. Wright noted that she liked how the LightHorse installed their sign above the canopy.

Mr. Brice stated that he believed the proposed sign could be shrunk and be proportional to the space. He also stated that the location above the second floor seemed problematic. He did not believe that was a very pedestrian-oriented sign for the building, which is something the Board was trying to promote. He stated that if the project was on a larger, suburban street with greater expanses it might not be too bad, but for someone walking in front of the building the sign would be more difficult to see than it if were on top of the canopy.

Ms. Wright motioned to defer the item and requested that modified plans be brought back to the Board that relocated the sign to the canopy or met the Village’s height requirements, or both; Mr. Brice seconded the motion. Vote 3-0 with one abstention (Ms. Loest).

**5. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dormer with windows and window reconfiguration 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 for the further consideration of this item. Director Griepentrog noted that two additional detail sheets were provided to respond to the questions that were raised at the last meeting. The first detailed the location of the proposed roofline on the rear porch. Mr. Worcester said the drawings confirmed that the roofline would not intersect with the second-story window. Director Griepentrog confirmed that the cross-tail beams shown on the previous plan were still being proposed.

Mr. Worcester noted that they were also requesting to modify the location of a window on the east elevation up about four inches and over approximately six inches to accommodate new kitchen counters and a sink. Director Griepentrog noted that revised plans for the east elevation, including the window referenced by Mr. Worcester, were provided. Those plans now show siding on the proposed dormer, as opposed to cedar shakes.

Ms. Wright confirmed that no changes to the kitchen window have been proposed since the last meeting. She noted that the Board had concerns with that window being higher than the other windows on that elevation. Ms. Roberts-Guequierre pointed out that she provided photos of houses within her neighborhood that she believed showed similar conditions. Ms. Wright

questioned if the examples were original to the house. Mr. Brice agreed that additional context was required to understand the examples. Ms. Wright also pointed out that some examples showed windows on different facades. Ms. Loest noted that it was the Board's job to review the plans with respect to how they would affect the applicant's house. Ms. Guequierre stated that she believed the examples showed that the modifications to her house would fit in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Brice stated that he had issues with the details of the proposed window besides the height. He noted that the center mull would not match the other windows. He noted that conversation from the last meeting confirmed that the applicant wanted the modifications to look like it belonged to the house, and he did not think the proposed window would. He referenced the windows directly adjacent to the proposed modification, which maintained their original spacing and framing details. Mr. Worcester and Ms. Roberts-Guequierre agreed that the new window would not replicate those existing details.

Ms. Wright questioned if the Board wanted to make a suggestion to modify the proposed window. Mr. Worcester and Ms. Roberts-Guequierre said that they would rather just take the proposed window modifications off of the plan. Mr. Worcester requested that the rest of the plans be approved.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the plans, as submitted. No second was obtained.

Mr. Pachefsky noted that his own kitchen has a bulkhead window, and he believed that bringing more light into the kitchen was a good thing.

Mr. Brice stated that the proposed window, even with the transom, could be designed in a way to match the design language of the other windows on the house.

Ms. Roberts-Guequierre once again requested that the other modifications be reviewed without the proposed kitchen window. Mr. Brice stated that he would also remove the dormer window from consideration because it had the same center mull issues that he identified on the proposed kitchen window. Ms. Wright agreed. Mr. Worcester stated that the dormer was a unique element. Ms. Roberts-Guequierre asked to confirm that the windows would not be approved but that the rest of the build could happen. Director Griepentrog stated that there currently was no motion to consider.

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the plans as submitted with the removal of the kitchen and dormer windows; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0.

**6. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for window modifications on the east and west elevations at residential property 1916-18 E. Jarvis Street.**

Mr. Chappa was present for the further consideration of this item. Director Griepentrog noted that the plans contain modifications to both the east and west elevations. On the west elevation he pointed out that an existing bathroom double-hung window was proposed to be shrunk in size and filled-in with glass block. He noted that the pair of double-hung kitchen windows on both the first and second floor of the east elevation were proposed to be removed and replaced with a single double-hung square window. He further noted that the proposed modifications to the east elevation were already completed and showed a photo of what the proposed final condition would look like, if approved.

Director Griepentrog noted that nothing was approved at the last meeting, so all elements were up for consideration. Mr. Chappa suggested that the improvements on the east elevation were approved, but not the glass block window on the west. Director Griepentrog pointed out that the motion to approve the plans at the last meeting, which was successful, was ultimately rescinded and the matter was deferred for further consideration. Mr. Chappa stated that was not his understanding, so he completed the work on the east elevation. Director Griepentrog stated that no permission to proceed with the work was provided.

Ms. Wright confirmed that the proposed glass block window on the first floor of the west elevation would not match the corresponding window on the second floor. Mr. Chappa suggested that they would match in the future, but not as part of this proposed renovation. On the east elevation Ms. Wright confirmed that the new square windows would be double-hung.

Mr. Brice stated that the changes on the west elevation worked in terms of the proposed size but noted that the detailing of the rest of the window was important, particularly the sill and the trim around it. He noted that the work that was already completed on the other two windows did not have that same level of detailing. He pointed out that there was no sill or matching side trim on those. Ms. Wright agreed. Mr. Chappa believed the side trim matched and noted that you cannot get replacement windows with a bottom sill. Mr. Brice noted that it needed to be made and pointed out that you can buy sill trim. Ms. Wright pointed out that the newly installed windows don't match the details of the adjacent windows. Mr. Pachefsky agreed that the trim details needed to match the bottom, sides and top. Mr. Pachefsky pointed out how the siding butts up against the trim board on the adjacent windows and believed the new window was pushed in. Mr. Chappa stated that the details matched and suggested the photo was not clear because it was taken on an angle. Mr. Brice questioned if the trim overlapped the window sash.

Mr. Chappa stated that the house was ugly, and he was trying to make a beautiful kitchen. He stated that this was the only way he could do it.

Ms. Wright asked for guidance from the code. Director Griepentrog provided the Board with their purpose and intent statement from 535-31F(1). He suggested that the items listed within subdivision (a) seemed to be the most relevant to residential projects. Ms. Wright stated that the proposed improvements did not meet the standards of high-quality construction. Mr. Brice agreed.

Mr. Brice made a motion to deny the plans, as submitted, noting that they did not promote high-quality, durable, well-designed, well-constructed, and attractive buildings or structures. He further noted that this was evident in the work that was already performed. Ms. Loest seconded the motion. Vote 4-0.

**7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window to door modification at residential property 2608 E. Menlo Blvd.**

Tricia Ognar was present to discuss this item. She noted that she was converting a room on the back of her house into a studio and wanted to install an exterior door into that space. She noted that she had a pair of original doors from elsewhere in the house and that she would be installing one half of that pair of doors as the new door to the exterior with a storm door on the outside.

Ms. Wright suggested that additional details needed to be provided, including the proposed materials and dimensions. Director Griepentrog requested that the Board ask the applicant any questions they had related to the photoshopped plan that was provided so that she could either answer them or prepare to bring back revised plans with those details. Ms. Wright questioned if the photoshopped plans were accurate. Ms. Ognar noted that the stoop may change from cement to wood. Director Griepentrog pointed out that the Board was not being asked to review the proposed stoop associated with the new door, just the door itself and how it was proposed to be trimmed.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned what the other exterior doors looked like. Ms. Ognar noted that the image for the photoshopped plan was taken from an existing door on the house. Mr. Pachefsky questioned how wide the door would be. Ms. Ognar acknowledged that it was narrow and believed it was 30 inches wide. Mr. Pachefsky asked if she was comfortable having an exterior door that was so narrow. Ms. Ognar said that she was because it would only be used to access the back garden. Mr. Brice questioned if the door was reviewed for code conformance, and Director Griepentrog confirmed that any code issues would be reviewed during the permitting process. Ms. Loest said that the door looked fine and that any functional issues were not the Board's concern.

Mr. Brice noted that he would like to see the proposed exterior trim match the widths that are on the building. Ms. Ognar confirmed that the trim would match, and that the door would fit in with the house.

Ms. Loest motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, subject to the trim matching the width of the other exterior doors; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 4-0.

**8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window modifications at residential property 2004 E. Kensington Blvd.**

Tyler Hart, project manager, was present to discuss this item. He stated that the homeowner was proposing to remove two windows on the west elevation, one of which would be completely removed from the living room and the other which would be replaced with two smaller windows. The smaller windows are being proposed to accommodate a kitchen renovation. He also noted that a window on the north elevation was being removed to accommodate a new pantry, which is being made possible by the internal relocation of the stairway to the basement.

Ms. Wright stated that she did not have a problem with the window removals, as long as they were being patched correctly with matching siding.

Mr. Brice questioned what was adjacent to the west elevation where the windows were being removed. Photos showed that the neighboring house was located in close proximity. Mr. Brice stated that he was concerned that a large blank wall was being created with nothing to break up the mass of the façade. Mr. Hart stated that the removal of the window, which directly faced the neighbor's house, would bring more privacy. He also noted that this wall was the only spot to logically place a television within the living room.

Mr. Brice requested that the existing window trim and traditional sills be matched on the new windows. Mr. Hart confirmed that the plan was to match as much as they can.

Mr. Brice motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, subject to the new exterior window trim matching the existing windows, a traditional sill to match being installed, and patched siding being woven in to blend with the rest of the facade; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 4-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for modifications to the front porch at residential property 4497 N. Woodburn Street.**

No applicant for this item was present.

Ms. Wright motioned to defer consideration to a future meeting when representation was present; seconded by Mr. Brice. Vote 4-0.

**9. Future Agenda Items**

No future agenda items were discussed.

**10. Adjournment.**

Ms. Wright moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:59 p.m.; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director