



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, May 26, 2022

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Lybra Loest, Daryl Melzer, Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky and Mike Skauge.

Others present: Russell Laframbois, Paul Giesen, Hemad Fadaifar, Kristi Minser, Daniel Burkholder, Tom Kiebzak, Teri Sullivan, Ken Collins, and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director.

2. Approval of the May 12, 2022 meeting minutes.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 6-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the reconstruction of a screen porch into an office/mudroom at residential property 4363 N. Marlborough Drive.

Russell Laframbois provided an overview of the proposed project which involved the replacement of a screened in porch on the back of the house with a new office and mudroom. It was noted that the project was not expanding from the existing footprint.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the existing screened-in porch, including its roof, would be removed in order to rebuild the new office/mudroom. Chair Kraehnke questioned why board and batons were proposed, and Mr. Laframbois stated the homeowners liked it. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the windows would be trimmed and that an asphalt shingle roof would be installed.

Mr. O'Connor stated he thought it was a good addition and a better use of space than the existing screened-in porch. He noted that board and baton was a good style.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed the location of the proposed water table board. He questioned if the planter would remain, and Mr. Laframbois noted that it would be torn out during construction but replaced and expanded to wrap around the corner of the structure upon completion.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 6-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a dormer at residential property 4253 N. Larkin Street.

Paul Giesen was present to discuss this item. He noted that the existing street-facing gable did not have an adequate ridge height to provide usable space on the second story. He stated that the existing gable would be removed and raised with the addition of sidewalls to create an owner's bedroom. He detailed that the dormer would be wrapped in lap siding to match the existing dormer on the rear of the house and that all windows and trim would match. He noted that a canopy was being added above the front door as well.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the existing gable was a faux double-gable and questioned which dimension the new gable would coincide with. Mr. Giesen noted that a portion of the front of the house is stepped back four inches and that the new gable would match the outer wall. He noted that the floor framing would be extended so that the lap siding would be on top of the face of the brick. He noted that a soffit would be installed above the recessed portion of the elevation with the medallion on it.

Chair Kraehnke questioned how the siding on the new sidewall in the proposed north elevation met up with the existing brick. Mr. Giesen stated that they also looked at squaring that wall off with siding or even extending it beyond the window, but opted for this version, which he believed worked better. He also noted that they could have tried to find matching brick to finish the whole wall but stated that would result in an outside brick corner. Chair Kraehnke stated that he would have chosen to square off the wall by extending the siding beyond the window and questioned if anyone else had any thoughts. Mr. O'Connor stated that the situation was not ideal, similar to the remnant that was being created with the recessed wall on the front elevation with the medallion. Mr. Skauge suggested that changing it from what is currently proposed would make it more awkward. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if brick to match could be found, and Mr. Giesen said it would be difficult to match both color and texture and that not enough could be salvaged from the front.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 6-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the window modifications at residential property 1814 E. Olive Street.

Hemad Fadaifar was present to discuss this item. Director Griepentrog noted that plans for window modifications at this property were approved in 2021, but since that time the plans have changed. Mr. Fadaifar stated that he believed the new plans, which involved four casement windows with grids to match the existing windows, are the most honest looking to the rest of the house.

Mr. Pachefsky stated that these plans looked much better and confirmed that the new window style was cottage. Mr. Fadaifar also noted that he now plans to keep the existing milk chute. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the current plan was stucco and noted that it should be able to be patched well. He stated that the revised plans were an improvement.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 6-0.

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a rear one-story addition at residential property 1828 E. Kenmore Place.

Kristi Minser and Daniel Burkholder were present to discuss the item. Ms. Minser noted that the new addition would be coming off the back of a previous addition in the rear yard. She noted that it would be shifted slightly to the east to avoid being placed in the side yard setback.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if any demolition was proposed. Ms. Minser noted that the east wall of the existing addition would be demolished and pushed further east by approximately 20 inches. Mr. O'Connor questioned why the new wall wouldn't be pushed further to align with the proposed addition, and it was noted that a window existed in that area that was desired to be kept. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the existing rubber roof would be extended onto the new addition. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that new LP SmartSiding would be installed on the entire addition, including the previous portion. It was noted that the home had four different types of siding.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he was not in love with the project, nor the prior addition. Ms. Minser acknowledged that they are working with what they have. Mr. Skauge questioned if corner boards were going to be used with the siding. Ms. Minser noted that she preferred trim boards, and Chair Kraehnke stated that he did not believe SmartSiding could be mitered. Mr. Melzer stated that trim boards would help. Mr. Pachefsky noted that the existing windows have grids, but the proposed ones do not. Ms. Minser stated that they preferred to not have grids.

The floor plan was discussed, and it was noted that the addition would accommodate a bedroom to allow parents to stay with them and the homeowners to eventually age in place.

Chair Kraehnke suggested that any motion consider the addition of trim boards on the inside and outside corners to match the window and door trims.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he wished there was another solution to the design of the addition. He noted that the addition continued a poor design and shifted it so that it wasn't aligned. Mr. Pachefsky agreed. Ms. Minser stated that she understood and would not consider this on the street façade, but noted it was on the back of the house.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the addition would have gutters and downspouts.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the dormer on the second story, which featured rafter tails, could somehow have been replicated. Mr. O'Connor stated that even if the roof was designed in a mansard style to replicate the roof over the dining room on the first floor it would be better. That roof style would work better proportionally and give it more weight. Chair Kraehnke agreed that it would add a lot of character to the project. Mr. Melzer questioned if the overhang of the roof would pose any issues with the property line. Director Griepentrog noted that roof overhangs may project a certain distance into the setback and would confirm prior to permitting.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if three windows on the rear façade would look better, and Ms. Minser noted that the two proposed windows flank the bed.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he would like to see a revised set of drawings inclusive of the changes that were discussed, namely the roof and trim boards. Mr. Melzer agreed.

No action was taken.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a monument sign at commercial property 4451 N. Oakland Avenue.

Teri Sullivan and Tom Kiebzak were present for this item. Director Griepentrog referenced his cover memo which reviewed the sign as a monument sign, albeit an untraditional version of one. Ms. Sullivan noted that the sign would be installed on a planter, which would be maintained on private property. She noted that the building is setback and hidden by two other properties, so they desired to have a sign closer to the right-of-way for visibility purposes. She stated that the planter would be 8 ft. wide, not 9 ft., as shown on the plan.

Ms. Loest questioned if the existing planter was Village-owned and whether it was on public or private property. Director Griepentrog confirmed that it was a Village-own planter and stated that he believed it may be on private property.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the intention is to center the planter on the bank of windows. Mr. O'Connor questioned if the sides of the planter angle out, and he was informed that they do not. Mr. O'Connor also questioned if the sign was a vinyl decal and whether or not it would be able to weather conditions. Mr. Kiebzak noted that the sign would not be a vinyl decal, but a dibond material meant for exterior installation. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the letters would be individually cut and was informed that it would be one solid sign face. Mr. Kiebzak noted that the planter would be gray, but they were unsure what shade of gray, but the sign face would match as close as possible.

Mr. O'Connor questioned if plants would be in the planter year-round. Ms. Sullivan confirmed that they would be. Director Griepentrog pointed out that his memo included reference to maintenance requirements that needed to be met.

Ms. Loest questioned if a planter had been used as a sign before. Director Griepentrog did not believe that it had. Ms. Sullivan stated that the sign manufacturer was very comfortable with the dibond sign being affixed to the planter, as proposed. She noted that holes will be drilled into the sign to allow it to be attached easily. Mr. Kiebzak noted that it could also be easily removed and replaced, if damaged. Mr. O'Connor stated that it was a good material for the proposed use. He advised the applicant to pay close attention to the color of the sign in relation to the planter.

Chair Kraehnke expressed concern in not seeing the actual planter to which the sign will be affixed. He noted that it may have rails or other trim elements and that he wanted to see the sign placed within the rails as opposed to on top of them, so as to retain the character of the planter.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the plans, noting that the sign face shall be framed within the planter; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 6-0.

8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window and door modifications at residential property 4477 N. Murray Avenue.

Ken Collins provided an overview of the proposed project, which he noted involved the replacement of windows with a set of sliding French doors to access a new rear yard patio. He also stated that when the roof over the rear porch was repaired the railing was not restored, so they were proposing to replace the existing second story door with a new window. He noted that stucco would be repaired to match around each of the areas.

Mr. Skauge questioned what type of window was being installed and was informed that it was a double-hung window to match the remainder of the rear façade. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the new window would be the same size as the existing second floor windows. Mr. Collins stated that the new window would fit within the current door opening.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the plans appeared very straightforward. He liked the new French doors exiting onto the new patio and stated that replacing the second story door with a window should be relatively simple and should look fine as long as the stucco is matched.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 6-0.

9. Future Agenda Items.

Director Griepentrog noted that he expected a future review of a street side yard parking space at 3901 N. Lake Dr. to be on a future agenda, as a result of a recent zoning review.

10. Adjournment.

Mr. Skauge moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:09 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director