



# **Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, October 26, 2023**

## **1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky and Chris Schorse

Others present: Julie Voeller, Dustin Haas and Planning Director Bart Griepentrog

## **2. Approval of the October 12, 2023 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Brice moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Schorse. Vote 6-0.

## **5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a rear two-story addition at residential property 4457 N. Prospect Avenue.**

Julie Voeller was present to discuss this item. She noted that the current white siding addition and porch on the back of the house would be removed and replaced with a new two-story addition. She pointed out that the new addition would have a gambrel roof like the existing house and that all new materials will match.

Mr. Pachefsky confirmed that brick would not be used on the addition. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the existing dormer that the addition was being attached to would also be resided. Ms. Voeller stated that it would not need to be. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the new eave and roof lines would match the existing. Ms. Voeller also noted that the overhangs will be the same. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the first-floor door on the addition was recessed. Ms. Voeller confirmed that it was and noted that it was essentially a covered porch. Mr. O'Connor stated that the plans for the addition were clean and well-aligned with the existing house, which is not always the case. Mr. Brice confirmed that the new siding would have the same corner returns. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the new window trim would also match the existing and that the new windows would carry on the cottage style features with the muttons on top.

Chair Kraehnke said that the plans looked pretty straightforward and fit in well. He also stated that he was fine with the use of siding. Mr. Pachefsky noted that he would have preferred that brick be used on the first floor of the addition to make it match and look more substantial. Ms. Voeller said that was discussed but that it would be hard to match the existing brick and be too costly.

Mr. O'Connor motioned to approve the plans as submitted; seconded by Mr. Schorse. Vote 6-0.

**7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a front yard patio at residential property 4025 N. Downer Avenue.**

Dustin Haas from Ideal Property Management was present to discuss this item. Mr. Haas noted that the project included the construction of a two-terraced lannon stone wall in the front yard in front of the proposed patio. He stated that the patio would feature a blue stone seating (patio) area.

Mr. O'Connor confirmed that the existing landscaping and concrete pad and steps were being torn out. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the photos showed the project in progress. Director Griepentrog noted that the terrace walls do not require DRB approval, but that the patio and its screening did. He provided the corresponding code section relating to patio requirements for reference.

Chair Kraehnke questioned what types of landscaping were proposed for screening. Mr. Haas stated that he was not very familiar with the plans. Director Griepentrog noted that the landscaping species were detailed on the plans. Mr. O'Connor stated that the DRB was looking to confirm that the proposed landscaping would reach a height of at least 18 inches and feature something that would be present year-round. Ms. Loest questioned if the proposed Goldi Moneywort would be present in the winter. Mr. Haas stated that the branches would remain. It was noted that hostas were also proposed as screening, but that they were low and would not be present in the winter. Mr. Pachefsky questioned what other plantings would be at least 18 inches high. Ms. Loest noted that her search showed that Moneywort was a creeping plant that would only get 2 to 4 inches tall. It was noted that the plans also contained blue green sedges, which were also low at only 6 to 12 inches in height. Mr. O'Connor questioned the height of the Sun King Spikenard. Mr. Pachefsky stated that it did not appear that the patio was adequately screened. Chair Kraehnke agreed that it was looking that way. Mr. Schorse stated that the hemlocks would provide year-round screening. Mr. O'Connor pointed out that those were only located on the corners.

Mr. Haas contacted the designer of the plans and stated that boxwoods and hydrangeas would be used for taller, continuous screening. However, it was noted that those plants weren't shown on the plans.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he believed the patio and plantings would be great, but just not tall enough to qualify for the required screening. Ms. Loest noted that the patio is elevated from the sidewalk by the retaining walls and that any screening provided at its base would look taller from the public right of way, but she also noted that the required screening height was clear in the code. Mr. O'Connor noted that this type of situation should be remembered when code updates are contemplated.

Mr. Haas stated that Japanese Yews would also be used for screening. It was once again noted that those weren't shown on the plans. Mr. Pachefsky stated that he would be comfortable considering a conditional approval, subject to the plans being updated with the plantings discussed. Mr. Brice stated that he would rather have the item come back with revised plans.

Ms. Loest motioned to defer consideration so that revised plans can be submitted with more information showing the necessary screening; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 6-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the demolition of a detached garage and the construction of a new attached garage with second story addition at residential property 4342 N. Marlborough Drive.**

The applicant asked that this item be removed from consideration, so it was not discussed.

**3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the extension of an existing dormer (north elevation) at residential property 3555 N. Murray Avenue.**

Director Griepentrog noted that the applicant was once again not present to discuss this item. He reminded the Board that the item was deferred at the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Brice motioned to defer consideration so that the applicant can be present to discuss; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 6-0.

**6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a one-story addition on the front elevation at residential property 4201 N. Lake Drive.**

Director Griepentrog noted that the applicant was not present and that he was unaware why. He showed the plans to the Board and asked if they were willing to discuss or wanted to defer.

Mr. O'Connor motioned to defer consideration so that the applicant can be present to discuss; seconded by Mr. Brice. Vote 6-0.

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

Director Griepentrog noted that these applicants were also not present. He recommended that the Board defer this item and stated that staff was still not in agreement with the plans that were submitted. Ms. Loest questioned what will happen if this item continues to be deferred.

Director Griepentrog noted that the lighting is the subject of an enforcement notice and that continued lack of follow-up could lead to citations and Municipal Court.

Mr. Schorse motioned to defer consideration; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 6-0.

**9. Future Agenda Items**

No future agenda items were discussed.

**10. Adjournment.**

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:40 p.m.; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director