



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 27, 2021
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Bryan Koester, Daryl Melzer, Larry Pachefsky, Mike Skauge and Mary Wright (arrived during item #3).

Others present:, Michael Julian, Ron Rozman, Teresa Olson, Lisa Kurtz, Dave Kirk, Joel Agacki, Mark Porreca, Phu Ngo, John Cassanos, Chad Griswold, QianQian Liu and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

2. Approval of the May 13, 2021 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 5-0.

3. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a second story rear deck, the removal of a window and the installation of a patio door at residential property 4149 N. Morris Blvd.

Planning Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the revised plans and the homeowner, Michael Julian was available to answer any questions. It was noted that the revised plans included a site plan overview of how the deck would be installed in relation to the house and the garage, and a rendering of the rear elevation, including the location of the deck post footings. Mr. Julian confirmed that the raised deck would accommodate a parked car underneath it, noting that the house only has a 1.5 car garage.

Mr. Koester noted that he was still concerned about the size of the structure and that he did not like the concept of parking a car underneath it. Mr. Julian replied that he did not think the deck would be visible from the sidewalk from the north or south, but only from the back (west) of the property. Mr. Skauge agreed with Mr. Koester, but noted that there were restrictions on how to use the rear of the property due to its configuration. He noted that the driveway was very narrow and led to a small garage. He noted that once the deck was constructed that a two-car garage could never be built, which may affect resale value. He further noted that the applicant accommodated the Board's requests and that the building inspector would verify support issues and possible bracing requirements. Mr. Pachefsky noted that diagonal bracing may be required at the corners. Chair Kraehnke stated that he sees the value of the deck, but

does agree that it seemed quite large and featured a weird angle, which was understandable due to the site constraints.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 5-1 (Mr. Koester voting naye.)

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the removal of a window (rear elevation) at residential property 3932 N. Farwell Avenue.

Ron Rozman, the project's contractor, was present to discuss this item. He noted that the window was being infilled to accommodate a new kitchen design.

Mr. Skauge confirmed that this item only related to the removal of a window. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the window would be infilled with cedar siding and painted to match the existing.

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

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a flag-mounted sign at commercial property 4326 N. Oakland Avenue.

Teresa Olson presented an overview of the proposed sign. Director Griepentrog summarized that his memo noted no technical issues with the sign, but did note that it would be subject to the approval of a Special Privilege from the Village Board, since it extended over the right of way. Ms. Olson noted that the drawing was a little misleading in that the sign would actually be installed 5 inches above the light fixture and 5 inches below the top of the existing awning.

Mr. Skauge confirmed that the sign would not be illuminated.

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

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the removal of a window and door at residential property 2514 E. Beverly Road.

Lisa Kurtz provided an overview of the project. She noted that a window and fan would be removed from the west elevation and infilled with stucco and paint to match the house. She also noted that an exterior door would be removed from the rear (north) elevation and infilled to match. She noted that the purpose of the project was to accommodate an interior kitchen renovation.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the existing deck/stoop would remain on the rear elevation. Ms. Kurtz confirmed that it would and suggested that the homeowner was considering additional changes in the future, so they were leaving it as is for now. Ms. Wright stated that she believed the house will look better without the door. Mr. Melzer questioned if the milk chute was being removed and was informed that it was not.

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

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window alteration at residential property 4350 N. Wildwood Avenue.

Dave Kirk described that the south elevation would be revised with a modified window opening, as well as a new door and window on either side. He noted that the new window opening would feature a matching sill to the existing window to the east that was being replaced, as well as toothed-in brick to match. He noted that the milk chute would also be infilled.

Mr. Melzer confirmed that the middle window was just being shortened to match the other window opening. Mr. Kirk noted that the opening was being revised to accommodate additional lower kitchen cabinets. Chair Kraehnke suggested that shortening the window opening and aligning it with at least one of the other windows would be fine.

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

8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the removal of existing door and windows, the installation of a new door and window alterations at residential property 4079 N. Lake Drive.

Joel Agacki was present to discuss this item. He noted that the exterior southwest corner of the home would be modified as part of a larger renovation project, which involved the relocation of the kitchen. He noted that a doorway would be installed in place of two removed windows, and that an existing doorway into the garage would be removed and infilled with brick to match. He also noted that the sill of the windows on that same elevation would be raised approximately one foot. He also provided that all of the windows throughout the house would be replaced with matching windows.

Mr. Melzer noted that the proposed after picture looks like it was meant to be built that way. Director Griepentrog confirmed that the soldier course and corner masonry features would be recreated over the new doorway. Chair Kraehnke noted that the plans looked great from his perspective. Mr. Melzer agreed.

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

9. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window alteration and the replacement of a window with a sliding patio door at residential property 2717 E. Newton Avenue.

Mark Porreca provided an overview of the proposed project. He noted that the rear elevation of the house facing south would be modified by expanding a window opening and installing patio doors and small deck/landing, and replacing a garden window with a casement window. He noted the changes would accommodate an interior kitchen renovation.

Mr. Skauge questioned if French or double-hung windows were considered as a replacement to the garden window. Mr. Porreca stated that the owners preferred a casement window for ease of operation. Mr. Skauge confirmed that all of the trim details would match the existing house. Mr. Skauge questioned if simulated mullions within the new windows was possible. Mr. Porreca noted that the owners wanted an unobstructed view, but that he would pose the option of lead tape to them as an option.

Chair Kraehnke stated that the new casement windows were an improvement from the existing garden window. He appreciated that a custom size window was being installed in order to not change the size of the opening. He also noted that the door will be nice because there will be available existing brick to infill the door jam.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the basement window was being eliminated, and Mr. Porreca noted that it would not. He stated it would be behind the deck.

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

10. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a two-story rear addition at residential property 2507 E. Beverly Road.

Mr. Porreca provided an overview of the proposed addition. He noted that the addition would accommodate an expanded kitchen and family room on the first floor and a master suite on the second floor. He noted that the house was originally designed by Alexander Eschweiler and that they were fortunate to have access to the original plans. He noted that all of the rooflines, overhangs, stucco finish and all other exterior details would match the original design.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the rear addition would expand to the east. Mr. Porreca noted it would expand by about 14 feet to the east and 6 feet to the south. He noted that the existing mudroom on the back of the house, which will be removed, represented a good reference for how far south the addition would extend. Mr. Porreca also noted that the exterior of the house would be painted in its entirety.

Ms. Wright confirmed that the exterior would just feature stucco and trim, no cedar shingle. Mr. Melzer questioned if the mudroom was original, and Mr. Porreca indicated it was not. He stated it was an open porch. He noted that the overhang and brackets of the proposed roof over the new entrance door would match the rest of the house.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the addition would be nice and clean and confirmed that the existing chimney was going to be removed. Mr. Porreca noted that the chimney serviced an abandoned fireplace in the kitchen and it would be removed entirely down to the first floor.

Mr. Porreca noted that site grading would also take place to adjust the pitch away from the addition. He noted that the yard is almost a double yard.

Chair Kraehnke noted that it looked like the same window style feature 1/3 and 2/3 sizing would be replicated on the addition.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 6-0.

11. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a covered front porch, rear yard second story deck and door at residential property 4477-79 N. Woodburn Street.

Phu Ngo and John Cassanos were present to represent this item. Mr. Cassanos noted that they wanted to add some architectural interest and social opportunity to the front of the house by adding a covered porch. He also noted that a second story rear deck was proposed, which

would allow the ground floor tenant access to the back yard, while allowing the upper story tenant outdoor space. Mr. Ngo noted that an adjacent neighbor has an addition with a flat roof and upper story deck as well. He also noted that brickwork would be repaired, and the entire house would be painted.

Ms. Wright questioned the material of the rear deck railing. Mr. Cassanos noted that it was powder coated aluminum. Chair Kraehnke noted that two doors would access the new second story deck. Mr. Cassanos confirmed and noted that the existing door would provide access to an office and a new door would be installed to directly access the kitchen. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the doors would match, and the applicants confirmed that they would, despite being shown different on the rendering. Chair Kraehnke questioned the deck post material, and was informed that the tapered columns would be constructed of wood, while the decking would be composite.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the new paint scheme would look much better than the existing. Mr. Ngo stated that he thought the current house looked a bit tired. Mr. Koester agreed that the new paint would look much nicer.

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

12. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a building mounted sign (awning) at commercial property 3567 N. Oakland Avenue.

Director Griepentrog noted that the applicant requested to withdraw this item for consideration prior to the meeting.

13. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the alteration of the existing entryway and demolition of existing shed at commercial property 4121 N. Wilson Drive.

QianQian Liu provided an overview of the proposed project. She noted that the goal was to preserve the heritage of the building, while bringing some modern elements to the facade. She stated that the existing entryway would be removed in order to provide an ADA-compliant accessible entrance to the building. She stated that the new doorway would provide additional natural light to the interior space and that a black steel canopy would be installed overhead to protect it from the elements. She also noted that the existing window shutters, signage and detached garage would be removed. She noted that all of the existing window frames would be painted black to complement the brick color. She stated that the landscape would be cleaned up around the building to present a more inviting look.

Chair Kraehnke noted that there looked to be some significant interior work in the entryway to allow the door to drop down to ground level. Ms. Liu confirmed and noted that a lift would be installed. Mr. Melzer questioned what the building would be utilized for and was informed it was to become a dance studio. Mr. Skauge stated that everything they were proposing would be an improvement to the current building. He noted that it has looked tired for a long time.

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

14. Reconsideration of the application and plans on file for a window alteration (south elevation) at residential property 4459 N. Murray Avenue.

Bryan Koester was present to discuss this item. He noted that new windows associated with a kitchen remodel had been approved by the Board with plans that showed a consistent header height to the existing first floor windows. However, the contractor installed the new windows 2 inches higher than the existing header. He noted that the contractor ended up matching the second story windows above, rather than the first floor windows to the side. He was requesting that the Board would be willing to accept the revised plans, as installed.

Mr. Skauge noted that the dining room windows were located on a bump out, so matching the header height of those was less important because the eye does not see them in connection with the siding.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 5-0 with Mr. Koester abstaining from the vote.

15. Adjournment

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:22 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director