



**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, October 14, 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 (arrived during item 3), Bryan Koester, Lybra Loest, Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky and Mike Skauge.

Others present: Katie Gnau, Carin Gordon, Lauren Gordon-Fahn, Tony Zimborski, Meg Baniukiewicz, Jeff Hojnacki, and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

**2. Approval of the September 23, 2021 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 6-0.

**3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the conversion of a window to a door at residential property 3817 N. Cramer Street.**

Katie Gnau provided an overview of the proposed project. She noted that the plans involved the replacement of a window with a door on the rear elevation. She noted that the bungalow has a side entry, but the rear door would provide better access to the yard and garage from a renovated kitchen. She detailed that the door style would be similar to the doors on the front and side of the house. She also pointed out that the door would have a window to maintain light.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the door trim would match how the existing window was trimmed out with thicker casing. Ms. Gnau noted that the intent was to match the trim and stated that the drawing should've been more detailed. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the door would swing in and that no storm door was to be installed. He also confirmed that there was no landing immediately out of the door, just a step. Mr. Koester confirmed that the head height of the door would match the current window. Ms. Gnau also confirmed that the width of the opening would not be changing.

Ms. Loest moved to approve the plans, with door trim to match the existing windows and doors; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 7-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the removal of a second-story balcony and installation of a faux balcony at residential property 4077 N. Stowell Avenue.**

Lauren Gordon-Fahn and Carin Gordon were present to discuss the item. She noted that her contractor informed her that her existing mop porch was rotting and needed to be replaced. She stated that they would rather remove it and clean up the façade to be in line with a Mediterranean style with a faux balcony. The door would be maintained, without the exterior storm door. She noted that the size of the balcony met code requirements and that the width was chosen to properly anchor to the house.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the door threshold would be left in place. Ms. Gordon-Fahn confirmed and noted that you would not be able to step out. He confirmed that stucco would be installed up to the threshold. Ms. Gordon-Fahn stated that the stucco would be applied first and the faux balcony after that. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the balcony was needed for safety reasons. Ms. Gordon-Fahn confirmed that it was not as there were two other full staircase egresses, but that they wanted to keep it.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 7-0.

**5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a new single-family residence at residential property 2010 E. Jarvis Street.**

Director Griepentrog noted that the applicant had requested to defer their application to a future meeting and that when they wanted to come back the item would be re-noticed to the neighbors.

**6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a rear one-story addition at residential property 4036 N. Farwell Avenue.**

Tony Zimborski, the project's contractor, was present for discussion. He noted that the project involved a one-story addition on the rear of the house which would fill in the back corner and approximately double the size of the kitchen. A new composite deck, similar to the existing deck, would also be added onto the new addition.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the addition was going to be flush with the existing corner of the house. Mr. Zimborski noted that the addition would stick out about one foot beyond that corner. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that a sliding door was being proposed. He also questioned if the proposed arched-top and dormer had precedent elsewhere on the house. Mr. Zimborski noted that the current rear window featured an elliptical arch window, and that the homeowners wanted to keep that detail, so it was being proposed above the new doors. Chair Kraehnke noted that the gabled roof was necessary to accommodate the arched feature. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that wood trim of the same dimensions would be installed around the door and that stucco would be used to clad the addition. Mr. Zimborski noted that a matching fiber glass shingle would be used on the roof and that an aluminum soffit and fascia would match the house. Mr. O'Connor questioned the proposed eave distance, noting that it was not as long as the eave on the house. Mr. Zimborski noted that the homeowner did not want a larger overhang, for light purposes. Chair Kraehnke also noted that if it were larger it may interfere with the second story window.

Ms. Loest moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

**7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for second-floor addition including dormers and a first-floor addition at residential property 3850 N. Lake Drive**

Meg Baniukiewicz, the project's architect, was present for this item. She noted that the east facing wall in the existing living room would be removed to accommodate a vaulted addition. A second story addition above the first-floor office was also proposed. The new east wall would have a cascading sliding French door with a bank of transom windows above it. Two dormers would be added to the west side and the existing chimney would be extended. A covered deck would be created off the east side office and second floor library with columns to replicate those on the front elevation. The metal iron work would also be replaced with a similar cedar railing. The entire roof would be replaced with DaVinci faux slate.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the front of the house would feature a roof with two dormers and that the rear of the house would be a story and a half. It was noted that section A4 of the plans detailed the proposed dimensions. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the chimney was required to be extended, and Ms. Baniukiewicz noted that it didn't need to be but that they felt it looked better if it were. Chair Kraehnke requested material details. Ms. Baniukiewicz stated that the dormer would be clad in hardy shingle and that the existing rough cedar shingle would also be replaced with that same material. She noted the first story addition and eastern wall would be brick to match. Mr. O'Connor confirmed that it would all be painted white to match. He noted that the textural changes would be nice. Ms. Baniukiewicz also note that the upper dormer would be overhung to provide a clean transition from the brick.

Director Griepentrog noted that the proposed landscaping, pool and rear-yard patio did not require approval from the Design Review Board.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

**8. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of an illuminated projecting sign at commercial property 4195 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Jeff Hojnacki of Ascend Design provided an overview of the proposed sign. Director Griepentrog summarized his cover memo, which detailed the need for a special exception based on size and projection requirements. Mr. Hojnacki noted the sign was a contemporary take on the look and feel of a classic supper club. He noted that the scale of the sign was driven by the client's desire for a neon sign, which required a minimum tube and rational character size. He detailed that the vertical bars behind the logo would be backlit. He suggested the size was also driven by a need for the sign to be seen, noting the presence of street trees and the building's large awning. He pointed out that they designed a cardboard mock-up to confirm that this would be the minimum size for visibility. He confirmed that the sign face was about 17 sq. ft., but that there was a lot of negative space within that calculation, noting that the logo itself was only 7.5 sq. ft. He also noted that a single-face, flush mounted wall sign would not be seen and that they were only proposing to install this projecting sign. Mr. Hojnacki mentioned that he was pleased to see an allowance for neon signs and referenced Camp Bar's projecting sign. Director Griepentrog requested additional information regarding the illumination of the vertical bars and was informed that the bars were fabricated aluminum with internally illuminated translucent acrylic faces.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that a neon band would outline the trapezoid shape and that the Buttermint lettering would be neon. He questioned if the Finer Dining & Cocktails lettering would be painted or a decal. Mr. Hojnacki noted that type would be digitally trimmed layered vinyl. He also pointed out that the neon tubing would be clear by day, so the vinyl lettering was essential. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the cream background/face would not be backlit. Mr. Skauge questioned if the sign without the vertical bars met code, and Director Griepentrog pointed out that it would still project too far from the building. Chair Kraehnke noted that the square footage would be compliant in that case. Mr. Koester noted that the projection looked good to him based on where it would be placed on the building. He further noted that he liked the look of the sign. Mr. Hojnacki also pointed out that the six-inch projection from the building was also required for mounting access to the sign. Mr. O'Connor agreed on the look of the sign and noted that quality materials were being proposed.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the plans, as submitted, via Special Exception noting (7) size in relation to the building, (6) location of building and (5) appearance of proposed sign; seconded by Mr. Koester. Chair Kraehnke noted an appreciation for making an exception to the size and projection, as opposed to an additional sign on the building. Vote 7-0.

## 9. Adjournment

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:56 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director