



**Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 24, 2023**

1. Call to order.

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

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

Others present: Rick Skebba, Joel Agacki, Julie Voeller, Randy Chappa and Planning Director Bart Griepentrog

2. Approval of the August 10, 2023 meeting minutes.

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

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window modifications at residential property 3924 N. Maryland Avenue.

Mr. Skebba was present to discuss this item. He noted that he was hoping to raise a second-story window up ten inches to accommodate a kitchen remodel.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the window width would not change. He also confirmed that the same trim would be kept. Mr. Skebba also noted that he'd like to keep the same sill. Director Griepentrog questioned if two double-hung windows were proposed, since the plans did not show that. Mr. Skebba confirmed that two, double-hung windows would be installed. He noted that the plans were drawn by an interior designer, not an architect. Mr. Brice confirmed that the intent was to relocate the sill vertically and keep everything else in place. He noted that he wanted to make sure that the center mullion between the two windows was maintained.

Mr. Brice motioned to approve the plans, with the condition that a pair of double-hung windows is installed and that the center mullion between the two units matches the existing condition, that all exterior trim matches existing, and that the existing sill is reused or that a traditional sill profile be installed; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window modifications at residential property 4316 N. Morris Blvd.

Joel Agacki was present to discuss this item. He noted that two windows that are currently grouped together on the second story of the rear façade would be removed and replaced with

two smaller windows that would be separated to accommodate the newly proposed interior layout. Siding would be patched in between.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the new windows would be aligned over the windows on the first floor, and Mr. Agacki stated that they generally would. Chair Kraehnke noted that he liked the current condition better but did not have an issue with the proposal. Mr. Agacki noted that the new layout was proposed in response to interior renovations. Chair Kraehnke stated that he liked that the proposed casing and sill appeared to match.

Mr. Brice motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 4-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for façade improvements at commercial property 3524 N. Oakland Avenue.

Mr. Agacki was also present to discuss this item. He stated that the owner would like to remove the infilled storefront windows and replace them with new traditional storefronts. He noted that two tenant spaces would be created and pointed out that the storefront for the northern tenant would feature a new entryway. He noted that a signage header would be installed above both new storefront openings and that a 24-inch bulkhead would be installed between grade and the windows.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the Spanish tile roof above the middle entry door would remain. Mr. Agacki pointed out that the only changes to the façade were within the red dashed lines shown on the plan.

At the request of Chair Kraehnke, Director Griepentrog provided an overview of his Design Review of these plans in conjunction with the newly updated commercial zoning code. He referenced the Design Review Process included within the adopted code and pointed out that conformance to both zoning and design standards were confirmed by staff prior to presenting this item to the Design Review Board for consideration. He noted that a neighborhood notice was not required, since new construction was not involved. He noted that the property is zoned MX-2, which required a Storefront Building. He pointed out that the existing building qualified as a Storefront Building, so the proposed changes were conforming. He noted that Storefront Buildings have six associated tables of form-based design regulations; however, only one table was relevant, since only façade changes were being contemplated. He went through the regulations within the Primary Façade table and evidenced conformance, including the supplemental tables/regulations related to Entrance Types, Minor Façade Materials and Accent Details, and Windows referenced within. He also pointed out that Bird-Friendly Design in relation to the windows would be required, but noted that was not a design concern, but rather a permitting requirement. He noted that since the plans met both zoning and design standards, the plans were before the Design Review Board to confirm conformance with the Purpose and Intent standards defined within the Design Review Process as identified in 535-31F(1).

Chair Kraehnke stated that the plans looked pretty straightforward and noted that he liked the design as it featured more glass and openings. Mr. Pachefsky confirmed that the storefront openings would maintain the existing rounded corners. Mr. Agacki noted the dashed line was provided as an approximation of the area but was not precise since the pdf tool was unable to draw radii. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the bulkhead at the bottom of the window was the same size on both storefronts. Mr. Agacki stated that the design logic was to align the window openings at the top and have equal sign bands and differentiate the bottom of the windows to

accommodate the change in grade. Mr. Pachefsky noted that the proposed design looks 100% better than what was currently in place. Mr. Brice noted some concern with the look of the required bird-friendly glass. Director Griepentrog stated that it should not be noticeable. Mr. Agacki requested that a sample be provided. Chair Kraehnke also pointed out that a traditional storefront window could be installed, and a film could be applied. Mr. Brice noted he would not want the film to block transparency into the storefront. Director Griepentrog stated he would be happy to put Mr. Agacki in touch with Chuck Hagner from the Village's Conservation Committee to discuss options.

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a new single-unit dwelling at residential property 2010 E. Jarvis Street.

Julie Voller of Ruvn Brothers, the general contractor for the project, was present to discuss this item. Director Griepentrog noted that this item required a notice to be provided to neighborhood residents within 250 feet of the property at least 10 days prior to consideration. Based on the timing of the application, a 10-day notice was not possible, so consideration of approval was not possible at this meeting. However, the item was kept on the agenda for discussion so that DRB members and neighbors could provide comment. Several neighborhood residents were present in the audience.

Ms. Voller noted that the plans involve the construction of a new home on a vacant lot. She pointed out a photo on the front of the plans that served as the design inspiration. She described the design as modern farmhouse. She stated that the plans are almost exactly like the home pictured. She noted that the first-floor footprint was slightly under 1,800 sq. ft. Director Griepentrog noted that he performed a zoning review, and the plans were slightly modified to become conforming prior to submitting for design review. Director Griepentrog noted that the Village does not have design guidelines for residential houses, so the general Purpose and Intent standards within the Design Review Process were to be referenced.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the house was close to the side setbacks on both sides.

A resident in the audience questioned the two-story glass wall that was featured in the design of the front of the house. Ms. Voller pointed out that this feature was adjacent to the staircase that led to the second floor. She noted that privacy glass would be installed that would not allow views from the outside.

Ms. Loest requested to see what the neighboring houses looked like through Google Streetview. Mr. Pachefsky confirmed that the previous house had a driveway that led to a rear yard garage.

The resident who lives to the east of the proposed home spoke and stated that her entire house was only 1,800 sq. ft., which matched the square footage of just the first floor of the proposed new house. Ms. Voller pointed out that number included the garage. The neighbor also questioned the distance of the side setback, which was confirmed to be 4' 5.5" from the property line. She stated that the previous house was not as close. She stated that her biggest concern was possible drainage issues, which have emerged since the previous house was demolished. Ms. Voller stated that the plans will be to drain the property to the front.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned how tall the proposed house was in comparison to the neighboring houses. Director Griepentrog confirmed that the height of the proposed house met zoning standards but did not know how tall the neighboring houses were.

Mr. Pachefsky said that he liked the style of the house.

Mr. Brice stated that he was approaching his review from a traditional neighborhood look and said he was not a fan of the front-loading garage. He said it would be an anomaly on the block, if not street. He noted this is why the home seemed much bigger than the neighboring houses. Director Griepentrog noted that the code did not prohibit front-loading garages. He referenced the newer home at 2100 E Wood Place that had a front-loading garage. Ms. Loest questioned if that house was on a double lot. Mr. Brice stated that he did not have a problem with the design but suggested that it was not designed for the place. He believed it would fit in well in other suburban locations around the country.

Chair Kraehnke asked if any other audience members had questions, and one resident responded that she believed it would dwarf the other houses and would look out of place, although it was a pretty house. Chair Kraehnke pointed out that the size met the Village's zoning requirements. Director Griepentrog reiterated that the design review would be based on the Purpose and Intent standards, which he read for reference of the applicant, audience and Board.

Chair Kraehnke summarized that he liked the mix of materials and the modern aesthetic of the design. However, he stated that it did seem large compared to other houses in the vicinity.

A neighboring resident asked to confirm the front setback of the proposed home and was informed that it was 28' 1" from the sidewalk to the garage. Chair Kraehnke pointed out that the setback of the neighboring houses was drawn on the plans.

No action was taken on this item. It is expected to be considered at the September 14, 2023 meeting.

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window modifications on the east elevation at residential property 1916-18 E. Jarvis Street.

Randy Chappa was present for this item. Director Griepentrog noted that this item had been reviewed earlier this year and was denied because the quality of the plans and proposed work did not meet DRB's expectations. He noted that Mr. Chappa has responded to the items raised in the previous meetings and has modified the window trim and added a sill detail. It was noted that the window trim is 4 3/4" on all sides, which matches the top of the other window trim on the house but is slightly larger than the 4 1/4" trim on the sides of the other windows. He showed photos of the project at various stages to show the applicant's progress. Director Griepentrog pointed out that siding is not reviewed by the Design Review Board and provided a comment from building inspector Justin Burris that stated no code deficiencies were present as installed.

Chair Kraehnke stated that his preference is to never install siding with a straight seam but acknowledged that DRB does not review siding installation. He stated that otherwise the spirit of the comments which requested the new window to match the house had been met.

Mr. Brice confirmed that DRB had no purview to review the siding patch. Director Griepentrog stated they had purview to require that the siding patch of the modified window area match the existing, but not purview over how it was installed.

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the plans, as submitted/installed; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 3-1. (Mr. Brice voting no.)

8. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were discussed.

9. Adjournment.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:11 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Brice. Vote 4-0.

Recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog".

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director