



**Design Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, August 25, 2022**

**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Lybra Loest, and Ryan O'Connor.

Others present: Nicole Culbreth, Matthew Krier, Nick Wimmer, Doug Buster, and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director

**2. Approval of the August 11, 2022 meeting minutes.**

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

**3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window to door alteration on the rear elevation of residential property 4111 N. Newhall Street.**

Nicole Culbreth was present to discuss this item. She noted that the property owners would like to replace the existing set of windows on the rear of the home that lead into the dining room with a set of paneled patio doors. The doors would lead onto a new rear yard deck.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the wall was clad in stone. Ms. Culbreth confirmed that it was and noted that they would be working with a mason to restore the area to match, including newly fabricated trim. Mr. O'Connor confirmed that the new door would be a sliding door. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the existing head height would be maintained. Director Griepentrog confirmed that the basement window would be kept.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the item as submitted, seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window modification on the rear elevation of residential property 3915 N. Stowell Avenue.**

Matthew Krier of Design Group Three provided an overview of the proposed project. He noted that the property owners would like to increase the amount of natural light into their dining room and are requesting to enlarge the three existing casement windows on the rear of the property. He noted that the two new outside casement windows would be operable. He also noted that the siding on the bumped-out portions of the home on the south and west elevations would be replaced.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the new windows and siding looked much better. He commented that the expanded windows seemed more appropriate in that they closer matched the other sill

height. Chair Kraehnke agreed. Mr. Krier noted that the new siding would be brown LP SmartSide siding with new trim and corner treatments to match the existing. Mr. Brice questioned if the mulls between the three windows would be similar to what is existing. Mr. Krier confirmed that they would and noted that the new windows were three individual units. Mr. Krier noted that they wanted to keep the existing rhythm that is featured on the other windows.

Mr. Brice moved to approve the item as submitted, with center mulls between the units to match the existing width with all trim to match, including proper sills; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 4-0.

**5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for architectural modifications to the originally approved plans for the construction of a 43-unit apartment building at commercial property 4414 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Nick Wimmer and his architect Doug Buster were present for this item. Director Griepentrog pointed out that this project was previously approved in October 2021 and had recently applied for building permits. Several details from the original approval had changed on the permit set, so those changes were being brought to the DRB for approval. He noted the modifications were minor in nature and related to some windows, material changes and updated tower details.

Chair Kraehnke requested to go through the changes elevation by elevation. Mr. Wimmer passed out a detail sheet of the proposed changes. Mr. Buster noted that he believed that the prior approval was provided to the renderings not the elevations. He noted that the renderings were more accurate to the plan set that was submitted for permitting. Director Griepentrog noted that both renderings and elevations were included in the prior submission and requested that for clarity the DRB review the permit set that is now on file for final design approval.

On the east elevation Chair Kraehnke noted that a few additional windows were being added and some additional window detailing was being cleaned up. Mr. Buster also confirmed that the parapet was raised to match the height on the street. Chair Kraehnke noted that he liked the previous parapet that related only to the balcony section, but understood it was an elevational issue. It was noted that the renderings from the prior submission did not show this area.

Chair Kraehnke questioned the changes on the north elevation. Mr. Buster stated that the changes were a result of refining the building. Chair Kraehnke noted that conceptually the building remains the same.

On the west (front) elevation, Chair Kraehnke questioned if some of the base materials had changed. He noted the new plans showed more brick. Mr. Wimmer confirmed that the design had been simplified and now features more brick at the base to be less choppy. Director Griepentrog noted that the renderings did show brick in these locations. Mr. O'Connor liked the brick base elements. Mr. Buster noted that the extended brick provided more verticality to the design, as opposed to breaking the building up horizontally by materials. Chair Kraehnke noted that increased brick lessened the presence of a base. Mr. O'Connor stated that the design felt lighter as a result.

Mr. O'Connor asked the applicant to explain the biggest changes. Mr. Wimmer pointed out that the tower detail had been updated to increase the glass and ceiling height of that unit. Mr. Buster referenced the lessened horizontal emphasis on the west elevation, which eliminated the

“layer cake” effect. Director Griepentrog noted the addition of a stairway into the parking garage on the south elevation. Mr. Buster explained that was due to fire code requirements. Chair Kraehnke questioned if that stairway would be locked. Mr. Buster stated that both the door and the gate down the stairway would be locked. Mr. Wimmer noted that there wasn’t really any other option.

A neighboring resident was in the audience and questioned how traffic would function with respect to the underground parking access off the alley. Mr. Wimmer noted that drivers would be able to turn either north or south and that the ramp accommodated two-way traffic. He stated that a Chevy Suburban was utilized in their turning template, and it was able to make the turn. The neighbor also questioned the width of the alley and whether cars would be able to pass each other. It was noted that the alley in this section of the block was 20 ft., but that it narrowed to 15 ft. further north.

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

**6. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of signage (scrim panel images) on construction fencing at commercial property 4414 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Nick Wimmer was present to discuss this item. Director Griepentrog provided a brief overview of his memo for this item, which noted that the Village does allow real estate signage without a permit, but only up to 20 sq. ft. and on private property. This request exceeded that amount and was to be located within the public right of way, so a Special Exception was required. It was noted that the request was for an alternating scheme of signage and blue scrim along both N. Oakland Ave. and E. Lake Bluff Dr. Six 8’ x 5’ signs were proposed and would repeat in order to cover the entire area. The blue area was originally proposed to be 8’ x 5’ as well but was requested to be reduced to 4’ x 5’ as part of the discussion. Mr. Wimmer noted that the signage would be up from about mid-September through summer 2023.

Mr. O’Connor questioned how many times the set of images would repeat. Mr. Wimmer believed it would repeat a total of 4.5 times total on both sides. Ms. Loest stated that she would prefer it to have twice as much blue. Mr. O’Connor said that he would rather see the set of images only once on each side and suggested that it be centered. He suggested that repeating the images multiple times was overkill. Ms. Loest agreed and said that it could be visually noisy. Chair Kraehnke stated that he was less concerned about the proposed signage because it would only be up temporarily and would be printed on scrim panel which is partially see through. Mr. Brice agreed that repeating multiple images could be a bit intense.

Chair Kraehnke created a mock-up of the repeating images for reference. Mr. O’Connor reiterated his suggestion that the images should not repeat and be centered on each street with blue scrim occupying the remainder of the space to the corners. Mr. Wimmer stated that he would prefer to start the images at the corner of Oakland and Lake Bluff and would be willing to occupy the remainder of the space to the outer corners with blue. Ms. Loest agreed with placing the signage nearest the corner where traffic is controlled. Mr. Brice did not believe that repeating beyond that would do anything to advance the overall message.

Mr. O’Connor moved to approve the plans by Special Exception conditioned upon 8 feet of blue between each image and the sequence of signs happens only once per street frontage

starting at the corner of Oakland and Lake Bluff based on the purpose of the proposed signage, type of materials and its temporary nature; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0.

**7. Future Agenda Items.**

Director Griepentrog stated that minor modifications to the new apartment building proposed at the corner of Capitol and Stowell would likely be coming back to the Design Review Board for consideration. He noted that the revisions were similar to those reviewed at tonight’s meeting for the development at Oakland and Lake Bluff in that the approved design differed slightly from the plans that were submitted for permitting.

Director Griepentrog noted that the previously reviewed plans at 2031 E Wood Place would be coming back to the DRB for reconsideration based on direction from the Board of Appeals. He explained that the motion to deny an aspect of the plans needed to specify under what grounds the denial was voted on.

Director Griepentrog also provided a brief update on the Village’s Commercial Zoning Update and stated that the Design Review Board would be invited to an upcoming Plan Commission meeting to hear more about the proposed draft, prior to presenting it to the public via an open house.

**8. Adjournment.**

Mr. O’Connor moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:04 p.m.; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director