



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, July 14, 2022

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 p.m.

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

Others present: Bryan Lenheim, Brook Meier, Jackson Leverenz and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director.

2. Approval of the June 23, 2022 meeting minutes.

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

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dormer (north elevation) at residential property 4473 N. Frederick Avenue.

Mr. Lenheim was present to discuss this item. He noted that the proposed plans would add a dormer to a bedroom on the north side of the house. He stated that no interior walls would be changing.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the dormer was proposed to extend all of the way to the back of the house. He questioned if the rear roof featured a hip or a gable and was informed that it was a gable. He pointed out that one side of the dormer would be a hip and the rear would be a gable. He questioned why the difference, and Mr. Lenheim said it was possible to match both sides, if that was preferred. Mr. Lenheim noted that the proposal was drafted as it was based on the ease of the framing and with the understanding that it was facing the alley. Chair Kraehnke noted that he would typically match the roof types on the gable but acknowledged that the house itself had a hip roof on the front and a gable on the back.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the proposed windows would match other windows on the house. Mr. Lenheim added that the dormer would be clad in dark painted cedar shakes and that the homeowner had extra shingles to install on the roof of the dormer, so that it would also match the existing house. Mr. Schorse confirmed that the new windows would be double-hung, not glass block. Chair Kraehnke questioned the floor plan, which showed two windows in the bedroom on the rear elevation. Mr. Lenheim acknowledged that the plans were not accurate and noted that one of those windows was on the first floor.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he would prefer to see the new dormer be consistent with the existing dormer on the other side, which featured a hip on both sides. Ms. Wright agreed. Mr. Brice

noted that the existing dormer was shown with an approximate 12/12 pitch, but the new dormer was shown with a 6/12 pitch. He requested that pitch of the new dormer match the existing to provide synergy. Mr. O'Connor noted that the new dormer would also have a flat roof section. Mr. Lenheim agreed.

Mr. Brice requested that the trim around the new dormer windows match the existing dormer. Mr. Lenheim noted that was the goal.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans with the modification of the dormer being constructed with a hip type roof to reflect the current style of the house with trim to match the existing dormer windows; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 8-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans of file for a change/modification to the roof line of a previously approved addition at residential property 1222 E. Olive Street.

Brook Meier was present to discuss the proposed modification to the plans. He noted that the first page of the plan set was the proposed revision, and the second page was the design that was approved last year. He pointed out that the revised designs now feature a simple shed roof, whereas the former plans featured a more complex roof design. He stated that the steel required for the former design was difficult to get. He also noted that the construction would be simplified and that although the overall height is lower more interior space would actually be created.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the exterior materials were changing. Mr. Meier noted they were not, but they were simply rendered differently on the revised plans. Mr. Melzer confirmed that the sliding patio doors on the north elevation were also slightly moved. Ms. Wright noted that the addition would not be seen from the front.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the addition was intended to be a departure from the current home and that the modification did not change that. He believed the change was straightforward.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 8-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window modifications at residential property 2031 E. Wood Place.

Jackson Leverenz was present to discuss this item. He noted that the photoshopped images show the proposed before and after of two window modifications. He stated that the current double-hung window on the rear elevation was too low to accommodate the kitchen remodel and noted that the plans show an awning style window raised up above the counter height. He noted that it would be wider than the existing window to accommodate the lost light from the shortened height. He also noted that the homeowner is requesting to replace the two middle double-hung windows within the set of four on the front elevation with a larger fixed window to provide more unobstructed views. He stated that trim on the new windows would match the existing.

Ms. Wright questioned if the upper windows on the front elevation were true divided lights. Mr. Leverenz confirmed that they were but noted there were no grills on the lower windows.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the patch associated with the rear window modification should be easy because the opening is being enlarged.

Mr. Melzer noted that he liked the four individual windows on the front better. He stated that a similar window condition was modified on his home before he moved in, and he wished it had not been. He believed the current window configuration fit the house better than the picture window. Mr. Schorse questioned which way the front elevation faced and was informed that it was south-facing and would provide good light. Ms. Wright questioned if the storm windows would also be removed. Mr. Leverenz noted there would not be a storm window on the new fixed window. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the two side windows would be replaced or left remaining. Mr. Leverenz said they would not be replaced. Mr. O'Connor agreed with Mr. Melzer and stated that he likes the proportion of the original windows. Ms. Wright agreed. Mr. O'Connor stated that he would take multiple windows over a picture window any day. Mr. Brice agreed. Mr. O'Connor stated that the larger windows reminded him of the 1970s. Ms. Wright stated that it did not look quite right.

Mr. Brice also questioned the proportion of the new rear, awning window, noting that it was 48" wide by 42" tall. He noted that proportion does not exist on any other windows on the house. Ms. Wright noted that was being proposed on the back of the house. Mr. O'Connor questioned if there were any requirements on the distance of the window to the electrical hook-up. Director Griepentrog noted that there were and that those would be confirmed within the permitting process. He stated that the hook up may be required to be relocated. Mr. Leverenz stated that they would be willing to relocate it, if required within the permitting process.

Ms. Wright questioned if there was anyway to make the proposed modification in the front prettier. Mr. Melzer stated it would be best to leave it as is. She questioned if making it a leaded window would help. Chair Kraehnke stated he would like that less. Chair Kraehnke stated that he did not mind the picture window, but acknowledged it is not what the east side of Shorewood looks like.

Chair Kraehnke also stated that the rear window modification was different than any other window proportion, but he did not find it offensive. Mr. Leverenz noted that they played with the idea of a double-hung window in the back, but thought it looked squashed. Chair Kraehnke agreed. Mr. Schorse noted it was on the back of the house so people driving by would not see it. Mr. Pachefsky stated that a casement window might work better. Chair Kraehnke suggested a double casement. Mr. Pachefsky agreed. Mr. Leverenz stated that the clients were looking for unobstructed views.

Chair Kraehnke stated that the kitchen remodel will be good. Ms. Wright agreed. Chair Kraehnke requested suggestions or a motion from the Board.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the kitchen remodel window on the rear of the house, but not the picture window in the front; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Mr. Leverenz questioned if there was a suggested compromise for the front window. Mr. Melzer stated that he would leave it be and did not believe it could be more aesthetically pleasing than it currently is. He noted he was fine with the other window replacement because it was on the rear of the house. Mr. Schorse disagreed and believed that the bigger window was the way to go. He stated that everyone is trying to get more light into their homes and have more energy efficient windows. Mr. O'Connor stated that he does not want to sacrifice aesthetics for energy efficiency. He did not believe that energy efficiency would be greatly improved with the replacement of this one

window. Mr. Melzer agreed and pointed out that the side windows were not being replaced with more energy efficient units. Vote 6-2 with Mr. Pachefsky and Mr. Schorse voting nay.

6. Future Agenda Items.

No future agenda items were discussed.

7. Adjournment.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:50 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 8-0.

Recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director