



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 8, 2022

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Lybra Loest, Daryl Melzer and Larry Pachefsky.

Others present: Matthew Krier, Zach Wenger, Reggie Peters, Elan Peltz, Desara Kalogriopoulos, Ryan Boon, Mark Freding, Brian Scheive and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director

2. Approval of the August 25, 2022 meeting minutes.

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

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

Director Griepentrog confirmed that nothing had changed from the prior application, which had been remanded back to the Design Review Board from the Board of Appeals. Mr. Melzer noted that even though he still preferred the current configuration of four windows that he was willing to accept the proposal.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 4-0.

5. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of an illuminated sign at commercial property 4161 N. Oakland Avenue.

Director Griepentrog noted that a special exception was required due to the proposed dimensions of the wall sign (height and depth). He stated that the lettering was sized within what the code allowed, but that the cabinet structure was larger. He further noted that the wall sign of the neighboring tenant features similar dimensions and was approved by special exception in 2017.

Chair Kraehnke questioned how the sign would be illuminated. Zach Wenger noted that the letters would have an opaque face so that only the sides would light up and appear as a halo.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans via Special Exception due to their proposed appearance (5), size in relation to the area of the building (7) and consistency with adjacent property (9), seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 4-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dumpster enclosure at commercial property 4001 N. Downer Avenue.

Director Griepentrog noted that the installation of a dumpster enclosure is an outstanding item from the building's renovation plans that were approved in 2018. He noted that it has been under enforcement since 2020. It was noted that the proposed enclosure would be located within the northeast corner of the parking lot and screen the two commercial dumpsters, but not the individual containers associated with the three residential units, which were allowed by code.

Mr. Melzer questioned if the enclosure would be built of wood and Chair Kraehnke asked for additional details. Mr. Melzer also questioned the proposed height. Mr. Peltz noted that the gates, which open to the alley, could be either wood or metal. He did not know how high the enclosure would be but said it would be high enough to screen the dumpsters. Director Griepentrog noted that the height could not be above six feet.

Mr. Pachefsky confirmed that the building was considered commercial for zoning purposes and questioned if landscaping should be required in front of the fence that screens the parking lot. Director Griepentrog noted that site improvements should have been part of the project's original review, but the applicant asked to focus the review on the building at that time. Mr. Peltz said that he was unable to install landscaping based on project costs. He noted that underground utilities would need to be relocated or worked around. Mr. Pachefsky questioned where the underground utilities were located, and Mr. Peltz did not know exactly where they were.

Ms. Loest questioned if a similar condition existed elsewhere in the village that could be referenced. Director Griepentrog suggested that the recently built enclosure for Cloud Red was similar, although it was not located directly adjacent to the public sidewalk.

Mr. Pachefsky said more details were needed. He wanted to know what the enclosure would look like, beyond just the dimensions that were shared. He questioned what the code required. Director Griepentrog noted that it needed to be screened to the satisfaction of the Design Review Board. Mr. Melzer stated that he needed to see a plan of what the enclosure would look like. He suggested the boards could be installed horizontally or vertically and that those details would need to be shown. Chair Kraehnke stated that he would like to see an elevation drawing of at least two sides to understand what would be installed. Mr. Peltz stated that he did not have an architect on staff to draw up elevations. Chair Kraehnke reiterated that the Design Review Board reviews drawings and does not provide drawings or design projects for applicants.

Mr. Melzer motioned to deny the plans, as submitted, due to their lack of detail, seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 4-0. Chair Kraehnke suggested that Mr. Peltz submit an elevation drawing with his next submittal. He said it would be difficult for the inspectors to review if the installation matched the approval without plans to reference.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a front yard patio at residential property 4150 N. Murray Avenue.

Desara Kalogriopulos was present to discuss this item. She noted that the patio had already been installed and that she had current photos to support the hand-drawn plans. She stated that the patio was made of pavers and had the required landscape perimeter.

Ms. Loest confirmed that the flowers shown in the photos were in planters and that the other landscaping was planted in the ground. Chair Kraehnke noted that the landscaping looked to be about 18-24 inches tall, and Ms. Loest stated that they were evergreen.

Ms. Loest moved to approve the plans, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 4-0.

8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dormer (east elevation) at residential property 2324 E. Menlo Blvd.

Ryan Boon, general contractor and homeowner, was present to discuss this item. His architect, Mark Freding, joined later in the conversation. He noted a desire to use the home's attic space, which required an additional means of egress. A new dormer was required to provide adequate head clearance. He believed the proposed dormer style kept true to the design of the rest of the house. He pointed out that stucco to match the second story would be installed on the dormer.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if gutters would be installed on the dormer. Mr. Boon stated that they would not be. He noted that the dormer would be installed inside of the roofline so any water shed from the dormer would fall onto the roof. Mr. Pachefsky did not think that the gable fascia on the dormer matched the gable fascia of the existing house. Mr. Boon noted that the proposed dormer was a lot smaller than the home's existing gables. He noted that the intention was to match the new dormer to the existing house as close as possible, minus the gutter.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the dormer would look better with only one window, instead of two. He stated that since the dormer was smaller that one window might look better. Mr. Melzer pointed out that the double window matched the double windows in the dormer on the same elevation. Mr. Freding confirmed that was the intention.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted, with direction to match the existing dormer fascia detail as close as possible, seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 4-0.

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a third-floor deck and spiral staircase at residential property 3909-11 N. Farwell Avenue.

Brian Scheive was present to discuss this item. He noted that the third floor is currently finished and requires a second form of egress. However, he stated that the way that was accomplished results in not very usable space. The proposal would eliminate the second set of interior stairs and relocate that egress through an exterior spiral staircase. A set of new French doors leading onto a deck and the spiral staircase would replace the existing third story windows on the front of the house. The spiral staircase would be made of aluminum and painted white to match other trim elements. He noted that other details like the elongated Tudor arch would be carried onto the new deck.

Chair Kraehnke questioned how the new doors were proposed to replace the windows. Mr. Scheive confirmed that the width and head height would not change. Chair Kraehnke noted that he did not mind the spiral staircase addition. His only concern related to whether it would be painted in a gloss paint and appear shiny.

Mr. Melzer stated that he did not like the proposed spiral staircase. He did not believe it matched the look of the front of the house. He said it looked like essential egress that was being tacked on. Mr. Scheive responded that the spiral staircase fit very well in the space and would not reduce the usability of the second-floor deck at all. He noted that the spiral staircase waterfalled with the roofline. Mr. Melzer noted that he preferred to keep the interior staircase. Mr. Pachefsky agreed that the egress stairway should be kept inside. The layout of the rooms on the third floor was discussed. Mr. Pachefsky suggested that the layout could be redesigned to create a more usable bedroom and keep the internal staircase. He confirmed that he was not in favor of the spiral staircase addition but did appreciate the other proposed porch details. Mr. Scheive stated that he thought the spiral staircase would appear really light. Ms. Loest also stated that the proposal was not her favorite and noted that it seemed more appropriate for the back of the house not the front. Mr. Pachefsky agreed that on the street side it did not look very attractive. Mr. Melzer also noted that he would be fine with it on the back of the house.

Mr. Scheive noted that he would talk to the homeowners about other options and would come back for consideration of either this plan or an alternate.

Mr. Melzer moved to defer the item, seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 4-0.

9. Future Agenda Items.

No future agenda items were noted.

10. Adjournment.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:24 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 4-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director