



**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, March 11, 2021**  
via tele/videoconference

**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Bryan Koester, Daryl Melzer, Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky, Mike Skauge and Mary Wright.

Others present: Hemad Fadaifar, Rebecca Loewen, Charles Pena, JB Nelson, Shawn Welch, and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

**2. Approval of the February 25, 2021 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Melzer motioned to approve the minutes as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

**3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the window modifications (east elevation) at residential property 1814 E. Olive Street.**

Mr. Fadaifar presented an overview of the proposed modifications, which included a new set of windows to accommodate counter height in a remodeled kitchen. He noted that the bank of windows was hoped to provide increased natural light to the space. He also pointed out that an existing window next to the garage would be infilled and covered with stucco to match next the rest of the house.

Mr. Skauge confirmed that the proposed side windows would be casements. Mr. Skauge questioned if the applicant had considered installing double-hung windows instead. Mr. Fadaifar indicated that he was hoping to replicate the pattern of the four windows in the dining room to the left. Mr. Skauge noted that those windows were French windows. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the same exterior materials and trim would be used to match the rest of the house. Mr. O'Connor pointed out that the drawings did not show or note those details. He requested consistency of those details so that it was clear to all involved. Mr. Fadaifar stated that the new windows would be wood and trimmed out as a carbon copy of the others.

Ms. Wright questioned if true divided lights were being proposed. The applicant indicated that he was not sure, but later confirmed that snap on mullions were not being proposed. Mr. Fadaifar noted that the windows would be manufactured by Marvin.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if a half grid on top of the left and right windows (as exist in the living room) was considered. Mr. Fadaifar noted that he wanted to go for a consistent look on

the new units. He also noted that he did not prefer the vertical mullion pattern on the existing windows, but preferred the complete grid pattern similar to the two middle dining room windows. Mr. Skauge did not think it would be possible to have custom mullions installed, and Chair Kraehnke agreed. Chair Kraehnke noted a preference for the mullions as drawn.

Mr. Pachefsky also questioned if the diamond pattern on the front flower box would be replicated on the new flower box proposed for the east elevation. Mr. Fadaifar appreciated the suggestion and confirmed that it would.

Mr. Skauge questioned if the applicant would be happy with the amount of gridwork in the windows while standing at the sink. Mr. Fadaifar believed that he would. Mr. Skauge also questioned if the applicant had spoken to Marvin about the grid work on the center window pane, noting that it was a pretty good sized upgrade. Mr. Fadaifar said he had spoken with Marvin and based this design off the conversation.

Mr. Fadaifar questioned if four of the same sized windows could be installed rather than two windows aside a larger middle window. Mr. Skauge and Chair Kraehnke stated that change would need to be re-reviewed.

Mr. Skauge noted that the window as currently drawn looked a little bit busy. Ms. Wright agreed. Ms. Wright suggested that the middle window not have mullions. Mr. Melzer had concerns about introducing another window style that was uncharacteristic to the style of the house. Ms. Wright noted that a similar Arts and Crafts house on Lake Bluff and Stowell had two larger glass windows that fit with the period of the house.

Mr. Fadaifar suggested that if he had second thoughts after thinking it over that he would bring back new plans for consideration. He asked to proceed with consideration of the plans as submitted.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the current plans included a lot of thoughts with respect to the details that were not shown or noted. He wanted to see a cut sheet to confirm what type of window was being proposed. Mr. O'Connor also noted that in keeping with the rest of the house this area might need to have four windows: two outside double-hung and two fixed in the middle. He also noted that there would be a wider trim board in between the windows. Mr. Skauge was not in favor of the four window option, noting that a casing would be centered on the sink. Both Mr. O'Connor and Mr. Skauge agreed that more details need to be known. Mr. O'Connor suggested that dimensions could also be provided.

Mr. Fadaifar requested to summarize what details needed to be clarified and was informed that construction of the mullions should be confirmed through a cut sheet. It was also noted that details of the matching molding should be provided. Mr. Koester noted that since the window opening was new that the details should be shown, not just noted on the plans. Planning Director Griepentrog noted that he and the building inspector would review the plans to confirm the proper details were included before bringing it back for consideration.

No action was taken on this item.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of exterior hanging lights over the outdoor seating at commercial property 4488 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Planning Director Griepentrog noted that this project was being reviewed by the Design Review Board based on the Village's commercial outdoor lighting standards. He noted that the lighting had been installed last year during the outdoor seating season, but that formal approval was not obtained. Ms. Loewen was present to answer questions on the item and apologized for not seeking approval last year.

Mr. Koester noted that the lights looked good last year and suggested that if what they were proposing was the same that he would be willing to approve. Ms. Loewen confirmed that the plans were the same as last year. Mr. Skauge questioned if the lights were supported by an extra guy wire, and Ms. Loewen confirmed that there was.

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

**6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the modification of the front porch at residential property 4304 N. Murray Avenue.**

Shawn Welch provided an overview of the proposed project. He noted that the porch was kept off the original approval for other renovations. He noted that the roofline and structure of the porch had been modified alongside those other house improvements, but the design for the porch had not been finalized. He noted that the entrance door to the house has been relocated and that the proposed porch improvements would center the stairs up to that new door. The new handposts for the stairway would line up with window trim. The railing would be comprised of welded ½ inch solid cube steel painted black and connected to new columns that would extend down to the base. The existing brick half columns would be eliminated, but restored as foundation piers atop new footings underneath the porch. The decking and porch skirt would be constructed with ipe. Custom support brackets topped with an ipe handrail will be installed on the stair railing as a grab bar and a flatter version atop the porch railing as a drink rail.

Mr. Skauge questioned the 1x4 ipe handrail. Mr. Welch noted that the handrail could be 1x4 or 1x2 and that he wanted to see how it looked with the metal railing. Mr. Skauge did not believe that would meet code requirements. Mr. Welch responded that the stairway railing would be at least 2 inches and believed the code was acceptable to the dimension as long as one could grasp it. Mr. Welch also noted the option of installing a bracket with a handrail on the inside of the staircase.

Mr. Skauge also questioned the span of the ledger board holding up the roof. He stated that if it was original it was likely a box beam and would not support the roof and needed posts on the two interior columns. Mr. Welch confirmed that it was not original and that a triple 14 inch LVL was installed. He noted that it would eventually be wrapped in the same trim featured on the rest of the house.

Mr. O'Connor questioned if the current porch columns were the same as shown on the plans or whether they'd be boxed out to a bigger dimension. Mr. Welch noted that the current 6x6 columns would need to be brought down to the deck level. Mr. O'Connor stated that it looked very thin to what was previously there. He suggested that they should be built out to 10x10 or something proportioned to the house. He noted that the industrial style of the porch was

perhaps disconnected and should better match the house somehow. He noted that the current cement piers provided some substance to the design. He suggested that the design was transparent and almost disappears on the house. Mr. Welch agreed and stated that he had been going back and forth on the size of the columns, but thought that 10 inches would be excessive and more appropriate for a commercial building, such as a bank. He was open to exploring an 8 inch column with 6x6 material for the smaller vertical posts.

Mr. Pachefsky asked what happened to the original tapered pillars that were above the concrete piers. Mr. Welch indicated that they were removed to rebuild the roof and were rotted. Mr. Pachefsky noted that the tapered columns would be more stylistic to the vintage of the house. Mr. Pachefsky also said that he could see the design going both ways.

Mr. Skauge noted that there were examples in Shorewood where a tapered box beam is used from the roof to the floor. The example of the house to the north with three corner columns was also discussed.

Chair Kraehnke believed that wrapping the column to provide additional mass would help, particularly if the beam were treated similarly. He also liked the slimness proposed on the railing material.

Mr. Welch noted that he would consider making the columns 8x8 and the other support posts 6x6. Chair Kraehnke was unsure if the other posts needed to be thicker because the other railing was so thin. He requested to see a revised drawing to help him visualize. Mr. O'Connor agreed that he would like to see revisions. He also requested to see a section cut of the railing to better understand its proportions.

Mr. Melzer questioned if the 1x4 ipe railing would have enough support to serve as a handrail without bowing. Mr. Welch suggested that an additional bracket may be necessary. Mr. Melzer also suggested that a metal support could be installed underneath the 1x4. Mr. O'Connor also questioned the strength of the horizontal steel, suggesting that if someone rested their foot on it, it could bend.

No action was taken on this item.

Ms. Wright left the meeting at this time.

##### **5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a wall sign at commercial property 1712 E. Capitol Drive.**

Charles Pena and JB Nelson were present for discussion of this item. Planning Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the proposed sign, which he noted was believed to be an illuminated box sign with an acrylic face. He noted that type of sign was prohibited in the sign code. He also noted that the previous installation for Chemistry In Place featured a metal routed face, which the Design Review Board has approved in the past.

Mr. Nelson clarified that the proposal would reverse the design of the existing sign. Two acrylic panels would be installed, with the back panel featuring "blacked out" vinyl so that only the name and logo would shine through. It would feature a gray face elsewhere. The second layer of router cut lettering would be applied on top of that back panel and be allowed to light up from the back.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the white letters shown on the sign plan would be acrylic. Planning Director Griepentrog noted that the Design Review Board has not historically allowed an all acrylic sign face, but has approved a routed out metal or wood face to be illuminated from behind. Mr. O'Connor reiterated that an acrylic panel with blacked out lettering within a rectangular box has been interpreted as prohibited. Planning Director Griepentrog provided his recollection that the routed out signs have involved higher quality materials and provided a more dimensional look.

Mr. Nelson questioned if the same design was proposed with a routed out front panel. Mr. O'Connor stated he would be more comfortable with that if the outer material was not acrylic, but something more substantial like brushed aluminum. Chair Kraehnke and Mr. Melzer concurred.

Chair Kraehnke asked the Board if they had any other issues with the sign. Mr. Melzer stated that the content looked appropriate for the business involved.

No action was taken on this item.

#### **7. Consideration of the Design Review Board's 2020 accomplishments and future initiatives.**

Planning Director Griepentrog summarized the updates made to the Design Review Board's future initiatives as discussed at the February 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. He also noted that he provided all members with the corresponding drafts or guidelines for their review. Chair Kraehnke also provided a brief summary of his participation in the Village Committee Chairs meeting, noting a desire for additional collaboration with other groups.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the Design Review Board's 2020 accomplishments and future initiatives, as drafted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 6-0.

#### **8. Adjournment**

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:31 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director