



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 14, 2023

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Lybra Loest, Daryl Melzer, Larry Pachefsky and Chris Schorse

Others present: Julie Voeller, Brett Williams, Jan Wexner, David Haya, Michelle Swier, Elwira (Elly) Wolko, and Planning Director Bart Griepentrog

2. Approval of the August 24, 2023 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 6-0.

4. 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 Voeller of Ruvin Brothers was present to discuss this item. Chair Kraehnke reminded the Board that they had seen these plans at the last meeting. He confirmed that no changes to the design of the house had been made. Ms. Voeller provided a brief overview and noted that the design conformed to the property's zoning requirements. Director Griepentrog noted that a 10-day notice had been provided to the neighborhood, so the plans were available for consideration. He reminded the Board that their review should be based on the purpose and intent statements within the Code [535-31(1)].

Mr. Pachefsky confirmed that the existing driveway approach would be maintained. Mr. Pachefsky questioned the difference in height between the proposed house and the neighboring houses. Chair Kraehnke and Director Griepentrog confirmed that the proposed height of the house met zoning standards.

Mr. Brice questioned condition (c) within the purpose and intent statement which noted that designs shall be "compatible with their surroundings." Ms. Voeller stated that the design was a modern version of a farmhouse in line both with the changing neighborhood and the house that was previously on the lot. She also noted the construction of a house on the block behind this block [E. Wood Pl.] with a similar design.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he liked the design and agreed with the description of it as a modern farmhouse. He believed the materials matched other renovations, particularly in their maintenance free aspects. He was unsure if the design matched other houses on this particular

block but noted that the village is so small and not every block should be the same. Mr. Pachefsky also stated that he liked the style and that the house looked very nice.

Chair Kraehnke noted that he took issue with the garage door being prominent in the design, particularly with respect to the purpose and intent's focus on walkability. He stated that most houses in Shorewood had either an inset or rear yard garage, which he would have preferred. He noted that would give the design more verticality, which would be more in line with other houses on the block. Mr. Pachefsky confirmed that the house was not served by an alley. Ms. Voeller pointed out that the new house on E. Wood Pl. also had a front-facing garage. She stated that the front-facing garage would allow for a larger backyard. Mr. Brice questioned if there was any consideration to installing two, separate garage doors to lessen the visual impact. Ms. Voeller noted that would involve additional cost and space. She confirmed that the proposed door was a standard door 16 feet in width. Chair Kraehnke suggested that the door could be made to look like two doors.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that there were no neighboring residents in the audience.

Mr. Melzer motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 4-2. (Mr. Brice and Ms. Loest voting nay.)

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a dormer (north elevation) at residential property 3542-44 N. Murray Avenue.

Brett Williams of Paul Davis and homeowners Jan Wexner and David Haya were present for this item. Mr. Williams stated that adding the new dormer would allow the homeowners to finish the attic in conjunction with the second-floor tenant space. He noted that the new dormer would be finished with the same materials as featured on the existing dormer on the south elevation. He stated that the entire roof would be reshingled as well.

Ms. Loest questioned if the new dormer would be set back in the same location as the existing one on the opposite side of the roof. It was noted that it would not be. Mr. Pachefsky also pointed out that the new dormer would be taller. Mr. Brice said that the height of the proposed dormer was an issue for him. He also noted that he did not like that the new dormer was not set back because the definition of the roof was lost. He would prefer to see a distinct separation of the dormer from the roof. Mr. Williams said that he could look at pushing the dormer back slightly but noted that would create a second valley which could create roof issues. He also suggested that he could look at lowering the ridge of the dormer but stated that the required head clearance in the stairwell could be tight.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the window within the new dormer qualified for egress and suggested that it might be too high. Mr. Williams stated that he believed it did and noted that egress windows also provide access into the space and were not just for exiting. Mr. Brice stated that the window might not have to be designed for egress because there were two internal routes. Mr. Williams stated that he was also trying to capture as much natural light and ventilation. Chair Kraehnke suggested that the dormer could be slimmed down or moved over. He agreed with Mr. Brice that there should be some sort of separation to create a shadow line between the new dormer and the existing roof.

Mr. Brice questioned if the pitch shown on the dormer roof was accurate. Mr. Williams believed that those details were on a different drawing and could not remember off hand.

Mr. Schorse questioned if the Board was requiring that the dormer be set back six inches and lowered to the height of the other dormer. Mr. Melzer was not sure the dormer could be lowered that much. Mr. Brice suggested that the item should be tabled so that revised drawings could be submitted. Mr. Williams said that his time frame was tight because they wanted to get the improvements done before the weather turned. He said that he could set the dormer back at least six inches and would look into lowering it as much as he could, but also noted that the height of the dormer would be hard to see from the street. He requested that conditional approval be considered.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned the termination height of the dormer roof, noting that the edge of the new dormer was cut off higher but the existing dormer's roof angled down evenly just above the windows. Mr. Williams stated the termination of the new dormer had to be higher for head clearance. Mr. Pachefsky noted that the new dormer looked strange. Chair Kraehnke said that they were definitely different designs, noting that the existing dormer was gabled, and the new dormer featured a clipped gable.

Chair Kraehnke said that he would be happy to compromise not lowering the ridge of the dormer as long as it was stepped back from the front plane of the house. Mr. Brice stated that he believed there would be space available to drop the dormer. He noted that seeing a revised section showing head clearance would be helpful. Ms. Loest confirmed that revised plans could be reviewed in two weeks. Mr. Brice said that if the dormer could not be redesigned based on required clearances, then the conversation is completely different, but he wanted that to be confirmed on revised drawings or modifications made to both the height and front plane of the dormer.

Mr. Brice motioned to defer action for the submission of revised drawings showing separation of the dormer from the plane of the existing roof and a drop of height in the ridge from the existing main ridge; seconded by Mr. Schorse. Vote 5-1. (Chair Kraehnke voting nay.)

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of sliding patio door and new windows (second floor rear elevation) at residential property 4440 N. Marlborough Drive.

Michelle Swier was present to discuss this item. She noted that the plans involved the relocation of doors and windows associated with an interior renovation. She stated that the two existing windows within the primary bedroom would be moved to the guest bedroom where a door and window were currently installed. She noted that a new sliding patio door would be installed in the primary bedroom that would provide access to an updated roof deck. She stated that the swapping of doors and windows would make each room more functional.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that nothing structurally was changing to the roof. Ms. Swier also confirmed that all of the materials, trim and finishes would match the existing house. Mr. Brice questioned the plan for the siding infill, and Ms. Swier noted that the siding would match the existing and that the entire wall may be replaced for consistency, but at a minimum it would be woven in without a cut seam. Mr. Brice also confirmed that the mullion between the two windows would be maintained and that all trim would be installed exactly as it was, including the sill profile.

Ms. Loest motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 6-0.

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a new window (north elevation) at residential property 4314 N. Newhall Street.

Elwira Wolko, homeowner, was present for this item. Ms. Wolko noted that the agenda item was incorrect. She clarified that she was proposing to remove an existing window, not install a new one.

Mr. Schorse questioned what room was losing the window. Ms. Wolko informed that the room was used as a library, but also noted that the room had another window. Board members confirmed that siding would be infilled to match. Chair Kraehnke noted that the existing siding was pretty wide and might be difficult to find, but he emphasized that the Board wanted to make sure that the infill looked seamless.

Mr. Schorse motioned to approve the plans, as submitted seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 6-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for outdoor lighting at commercial property 1530 E. Capitol Drive.

No applicants were present to discuss this item. Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the item noting that this started as a complaint from a neighboring property regarding late night loitering. In response, the bank installed additional exterior lighting on both the building and the drive-thru canopy. That lighting is subject to permits and the Village's commercial outdoor lighting regulations, which require that all fixtures above defined brightness and color temperature be shielded. The neighbor who complained about the loitering has also subsequently complained about excessive light levels from the installation.

Mr. Pachefsky believed that the light fixtures that were installed could simply be tilted downward to not shine into the neighbor's house. Director Griepentrog stated that if the fixtures were installed incorrectly that his inspectors could enforce adjustments, but that the lighting plan first needed to be approved. He asked the Board to consider the plans before them, including the proposed shields on the fixtures. He noted that the brightness of the proposed lighting was 21,700 lumens and the Village's code required anything above 4,000 lumens to be "aimed, shielded or located, so as to minimize glare." He also pointed out that the color temperature of the proposed lighting was 4,000K and that anything above 2,200K shall be "fully shielded, preventing glare."

Chair Kraehnke stated that he did not see an adequate shield on the plans or installed fixtures. Ms. Loest questioned if the Board could reject the plans based on the lack of an acceptable shield. Director Griepentrog confirmed that they could. Mr. Brice reminded the Board that they are not obligated to review plans without the applicant attending the meeting. Director Griepentrog reminded the Board that this matter involves an Enforcement of Village Code and could turn into a citation if the lighting is not removed or in compliance. Chair Kraehnke believed the Board should defer action until the applicant was present to represent their perspective.

Mr. Schorse questioned which lights were under review. Director Griepentrog noted that the two lights that were installed on the rear of the drive-thru were the ones that were being complained about but noted that all exterior light fixtures needed to be reviewed and approved.

Mr. Pachefsky stated that he believed the Board should take action in order to help the neighbor. Ms. Loest agreed. She did not see the point in waiting and pointed out that they were requested to attend and chose not to. She did not believe the fixtures were adequately shielded on the plans. Chair Kraehnke suggested that the plans could also be denied because the fixtures were not properly aimed or shielded. He pointed out that the brightness far exceeded the minimum levels defined in the code and noted that adequate shields were therefore important. Director Griepentrog believed that the Board could also deny the proposed light levels based on the purpose and intent defined in the code. Chair Kraehnke also stated that the Board could approve the plans and that staff could enforce whether or not the fixtures and shields were properly aimed and installed correctly.

Director Griepentrog pointed out that the applicant, via email, indicated that the fixtures were shielded. Chair Kraehnke pointed out that the plans include a "top visor." Mr. Pachefsky did not believe that was an adequate shield. Ms. Loest agreed that the proposed visor did not qualify as a shield.

Mr. Schorse motioned to deny the plans based on the four light fixtures [attached to the drive-thru] not being adequately shielded; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 6-0.

8. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were discussed.

9. Adjournment.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:17 p.m.; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director