



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 12, 2021
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Lybra Loest, and Larry Pachefsky.

Others present: Danielle Assa, Jacob Assa, Sarah Boardman, Chad Griswold, Rick Dassow and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

2. Approval of the July 22, 2021 meeting minutes.

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

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the conversion of a three-season room at residential property 4151 N. Downer Avenue.

Danielle and Jacob Assa were present to describe the proposed project, which involved the enclosure of an existing three-season room. Director Griepentrog noted that house recently came before DRB for the review of the expanded deck above the three-season porch. He also requested that the applicants confirm the proposed siding, as it did not appear to match what was recently installed. Mr. Assa noted that the siding would be wood and painted the same color as the existing window trim. Director Griepentrog noted that the siding that was recently installed under the expanded deck was vertical, but the plans were showing it as horizontal. The applicants noted that the upper siding would be kept as vertical, but the new siding below would be horizontal.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the proposed siding would be of the same style currently featured on the three-season room, and that it would be painted to match the color of the existing windows. Chair Kraehnke questioned the style of windows that were proposed in the room. Mr. Assa noted that the windows would be Anderson sliding windows. Ms. Assa noted that the house currently featured a variety of casement and double-hung windows, but that all of them were manufactured by Anderson, so these new windows would match in that sense. She noted that casement windows would not work because there was landscaping in front of them.

Ms. Loest stated that she was not clear how the vertical and horizontal siding would intersect. Chair Kraehnke noted that the roof structure would remain and separate the areas. Chair Kraehnke also confirmed that the new door would match the style of an existing door. Mr. Brice pointed out that composite decking was actually installed as the vertical element, not siding. He noted that what was installed would look disjointed with the new proposal. He desired more consistency, as was previously the case before the deck extension. Mr. Koester agreed that horizontal siding underneath the deck would look better.

Mr. Brice urged the applicant to use double-hung or casement windows, since there were no other sliding windows on the house. He also noted that sliding windows were not as period-correct to houses of this style. Ms. Assa agreed, but Mr. Assa noted that he preferred sliding windows. He did not believe that the sliding windows would be noticeable. Chair Kraehnke noted that sliding windows would present differently in that one of the panes would be setback from the other. Mr. Koester agreed. Mr. Assa noted that he may not do the project, if he could not do sliding windows, but would make that decision based on whatever conditions were placed on the approval.

Mr. Koester motioned to the approve the plans, with horizontal wood siding above the roofline below the deck, and the use of either double-hung or casement windows; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 5-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a two-story rear addition and front window modifications at residential property 4139 N. Stowell Avenue.

Sarah Boardman, the interior designer and general contractor for the project, was present to discuss the item. She noted that no changes were actually proposed to the windows on the front elevation. She mentioned that the current siding would be power-washed and painted. On the front elevation the shutters would be right-sized on the upper floor and removed on the first floor. The interior will be gutted and rearranged. She noted that a new gable addition would be added to the rear/west to gain an additional 8 ft. of floor area on both stories. The siding, roofing, fascia and gutters will match the existing. She noted that an existing 1.5 car parking pad would be removed and a new rear-yard deck would be constructed. She also stated that the entryway would be restored to its original location on the north elevation and described a series of window changes to the north and south elevations based on the new floor plans. On the rear elevation she stated a new sliding door with sidelights would be installed, and a new egress window would be installed into the basement for light and safety.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the rear addition stretched the entire width of the house, but the deck would only be 16 ft. wide. He also confirmed the location of new windows on the north and south elevations, in relation to what was currently installed. Ms. Boardman noted that most of the windows are being relocated to accommodate a new interior floor plan. Mr. Koester noted that windows were being lost on the rear elevation. Ms. Boardman confirmed that and stated that additional windows could not be included due to the location of a powder room on the first floor and a closet on the second. She stated that she would've liked to include more windows, but it was a matter of privacy. Chair Kraehnke noted that he would've liked to see a window in the closet or powder room to balance out that elevation, even if it needed to be a bit smaller.

Chair Kraehnke questioned the proposed materials on the new side entry porch. Ms. Boardman noted that the columns holding up the roof gable would be wood and that horizontal wood

railings from column to column would be utilized. She stated that the wood would be painted black to match the rest of the trim. Ms. Boardman confirmed that the steps, stairs and skirting would all be concrete with new footings.

Chair Kraehnke questioned the proposed window trim. Ms. Boardman noted that the existing house has aluminum wrapped trim, which would be mirrored on the new windows with wood. Mr. Brice questioned what the windowsill would be, specifically if the current sill nosing would be replicated. Ms. Boardman confirmed that it would.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the whole roof would be replaced. Ms. Boardman stated that the existing asphalt shingle roof is in really good shape and that the house is being set up for solar panels down the road. It was her hope that they would only have to patch the roof on the new gable addition, but would not know until the existing roof is investigated.

Mr. Pachefsky confirmed that the flower boxes on the front of the house would remain. He questioned if the first-floor shutters would be kept as well, but was informed that they would not. Ms. Boardman noted that for her to install shutters they should technically be able to close, which she could make happen on the second story, but not the first story bay window because there was not enough room between the windows. Mr. Pachefsky suggested that including wider shutters on the first floor would make the house look more consistent and enhance the second floor. Chair Kraehnke stated that he did not think shutters on a bay window would be historically accurate. Mr. Brice and Koester agreed with Chair Kraehnke.

Chair Kraehnke noted a drafting error on the plans which did not include a horizontal mutton on the top sash. Ms. Boardman confirmed that was an error. Chair Kraehnke also questioned the windows within the basement egress bays and was informed that those would be interior egress windows that pulled in.

Mr. Koester questioned the rear sliding door. Ms. Boardman stated that there was not enough room for the interior swing of French doors, but wanted to get as much light into the rear of the home as possible. She also noted that the single light would mirror the new entry door and that there is a sliding door on the current rear elevation. Chair Kraehnke questioned if muttons could be considered on the new sliding doors and sidelights, as they were installed on the current door. Mr. Koester agreed with that suggestion and stated that it would also match the upper window sashes.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if any Board members had thoughts on adding additional windows to the rear elevation. Mr. Brice stated that he would prefer the extra windows, but noted that if one were added to the closet, one would also need to be added to the powder room for balance, but he also acknowledged that this was the back of the house. Ms. Boardman restated that privacy was also an issue.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, but with muttons added to the back door and sidelights, windowsills and trim to match the existing house, and notation of concrete steps and wood porch materials; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 5-0.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window alteration and landscaping modifications at commercial property 4121 N. Wilson Drive.

Chad Griswold provided an overview of the proposed project. He noted that one of the basement level windows needed to be increased so that it was within 44” of the floor line and had a minimum 20 sq. ft. for it to qualify as access for fire safety purposes. He noted that the window did not need to be operable and that the Fire Department would simply break the glass to get in, if they ever needed to. He pointed out that a dividing pattern would be added to the window to provide a similar look to the other basement windows. He also noted that the it would generally match the same height of the upper window. Two wing walls would be installed on either side of the extended window, sedum would be planted in between, and decorative stone and a drain would be installed at the base. Lastly, he described the proposed landscaping plan, noting that it was largely a clean-up of what was currently already planted.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the purpose of the new window was driven by the Fire Department. Mr. Griswold noted that the building does not have a sprinkler system, and clarified that the window was not intended for egress, but would provide visible access to the lower level for emergencies. It was noted that the only other option would be to sprinkler the building. Ms. Loest questioned if the access window needed to be on the front of the building, and Mr. Griswold confirmed that it did for visibility purposes.

Mr. Koester moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 5-0.

7. Discussion and possible recommendation of modifications to front and street side yard patio requirements, as detailed in 535-9F(2).

Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the proposed changes that had been updated since the last meeting. He noted that the clarifying language related to natural vegetation, “such as shrubs, ornamental grasses or perennial plants that provide screening through the winter months. High quality, decorative masonry or concrete walls, and permanent planters, no higher than 3 ft., may be used in combination with natural vegetation to achieve year-round screening.” was added to the proposed amendment. Chair Kraehnke liked the update and noted that it was pretty clear. Mr. Brice agreed and stated that he liked the addition of planter walls, which provide greater flexibility to applicants.

Director Griepentrog noted that the next step for consideration would include review from the Plan Commission, since this language appears in the Zoning Chapter. Upon recommendation, the changes would be brought to the Village Board for approval.

Mr. Koester motioned to recommend approval, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 5-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of an awning over a rear exit door at residential property 4414 N. Farwell Avenue.

Rick Dassow joined the meeting to discuss this project. Mr. Dassow detailed that 6” x 6” solid cedar beams with Bavarian-style gussets are being proposed to support a new awning featuring a metal roof over the rear door.

Chair Kraehnke questioned which roof style this awning was proposed to match. Mr. Dassow noted that the roof would duplicate the existing roof over the bump-out on the rear of the home. Mr. Brice questioned if the proposed awning will fit in the space given the overhang of the roof over the bump out. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the new awning roof would intersect with the existing gutter, and Mr. Dassow confirmed that it would. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the applicant considered just extending the existing roof over the bump out to also cover the door. Mr. Dassow noted that the awning had the aesthetic of what his clients were looking for. Mr. Pachefsky also questioned if the red roofing material that is featured on the front of the house over the door was considered for this awning. Mr. Dassow stated that the proposed roofing material was preferred by his clients for cohesiveness purposes. Mr. Koester stated that the red slate roof on the front overhang did look nice, but that he was ok with what was being proposed.

Ms. Loest motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 5-0.
Motion

8. Adjournment

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:29 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 5-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director