



**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, May 13, 2021**  
via tele/videoconference

**1. Call to order.**

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

Members present: Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester (acting Chair), Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky and Mike Skauge.

Others present: Dorothy Shashko, Rosina Bloomingdale, Genevieve Liesemeyer, Shawn Welsh, Ron Hartzheim, Michael Julian, Jill Julian, Jason Rose, Jim Himmelstein, Michael Dlugi, Abraham Elizondo, and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

**2. Approval of the April 22, 2021 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 5-0.

**7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of street side yard patio at residential property 4349 N. Woodburn Street.**

Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the project, noting that in 2020 the homeowner had a contractor install a new side yard sidewalk and driveway and within the process unknowingly installed what was also considered a side yard patio. Ms. Shashko clarified that the side yard walkway previously existed as a lannon stone walk, but was improved to a smooth surface for safety. Director Griepentrog noted that although the newly constructed area was not used as a patio that it could be in the future and required landscape screening per code. He noted that the applicant has offered to plant a row of peonies in front of it, which would match other plantings in the vicinity.

Chair Koester confirmed that previous applicants were required to install year-round landscaping. He also noted that an 18" minimum has been the typical standard. Ms. Shashko suggested that year-round screening was not possible due to snow removal. She stated that shoveling snow to the north was the only possibility. Mr. Skauge disagreed, believing that the snow could also be shoveled to the west. Chair Koester restated that year-round screening was the expectation and suggested that boxwoods could be planted. Mr. O'Connor agreed.

Mr. O'Connor motioned to approve the plans with respect to the location and size of the screening, but subject to the inclusion of year-round plantings to be confirmed by Village staff; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 5-0.

**3. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for a rear two-story addition at residential property 3958 N. Stowell Avenue.**

Ms. Liesemeyer presented updated plans to the north elevation for reconsideration. The first option, which was the homeowner's preference, involved additional cedar shakes, whereas the second option utilized stucco. It was also noted that the railing on the second story balcony had been updated.

Mr. O'Connor questioned how the roof detail stops after turning the corner onto the north elevation. Ms. Liesemeyer referred to it as a turnback.

Mr. O'Connor confirmed that the addition was co-planer with the existing house. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if a step-back on the new elevation was possible, and Ms. Liesemeyer noted that it was not since the wall was an extension of the kitchen and needed to be straight for cabinetry purposes.

Ms. Liesemeyer suggested that the additional shake balanced out the elevation, whereas the stucco looked heavy. Mr. Skauge confirmed that shakes were also installed on the east and west side dormers. Mr. Pachefsky noted that cedar shakes were historically only used on the upper story. Mr. Skauge suggested that a frieze board and drip edge should be installed at the bottom to protect from water damage. Ms. Liesemeyer agreed.

Mr. Brice noted a dislike of the partial roof on the north elevation and how it terminated. He suggested that it should be extended to the gambrel roof. Ms. Liesemeyer noted that was not possible, since the new roof stuck out further than the existing gambrel. She noted that there was no ideal place to stop. Mr. Skauge noted that this elevation was never going to be seen from the public right of way.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as detailed in option 1 (cedar shakes), with the addition of a frieze board and drip edge to protect the cedar shakes from damage; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 4-1 (Mr. Brice voting nay.)

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

Mr. Welsh presented updated porch plans including a cross section of the proposed railing. He noted that the dimensions of the primary posts were 8"x8" and that the interior posts were 4"x4". He pointed out that 5/4" Ipe with custom steel bracketing would be utilized for the top rail and stated that a grab rail would need to be installed on the stairway per code, since the top rail would not work out. He also reminded the Board that the stone pillars were to be repurposed as stone foundations, and suggested that up to three stones would be utilized to match up with the house's foundation.

Chair Koester believed that all previously questioned details had been answered. Mr. Skauge agreed.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as submitted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 5-0.

**5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a street side yard patio at residential property 2001 E. Lake Bluff Blvd.**

Mr. Hartzheim provided an overview of his proposed street side yard patio, noting that stone paver blocks would be utilized on the 24' 10" x 9' patio. He noted that four dwarf Alberta spruce bushes would be planted and provided that those bushes grow to an average height of 6' to 8' with a width of 4' to 5'. Director Griepentrog also pointed out that a 4' tall fence would be installed to enclose the patio, but reminded the Board that the code does not allow for fencing to serve as screening by itself.

Chair Koester questioned the distance from the sidewalk to the fence and was informed that it was 8 feet. Mr. O'Connor noted that the proposed landscaping satisfied the code's requirement. It was noted that if the bushes grow as expected that future trimming may be required.

Mr. O'Connor motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 5-0.

**6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a second story rear deck, the removal of a window and the installation of a patio door at residential property 4149 N. Morris Blvd.**

Mr. Rose provided an overview of the project, which involved a second-story rear deck addition. He noted that the deck would project 16' from the rear of the house and be between 13' to 10' 8" wide. One side of the deck would be angled in order to avoid the garage. Although the plans noted a height of 3' 5", Mr. Rose noted that the deck would actually be 9' to 10' off the ground. He also pointed out that a lighting plan had been provided and clarified that the light shown on the plan was not from the direct source.

Chair Koester noted that the deck looked quite large for the size of the house. Mr. Rose disagreed and said it would be just big enough for a table and grill. Mr. O'Connor suggested that it was large for a second story deck. Mr. Julian noted that it was coming off of the second floor living room. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the deck could be rotated 180 degrees so that the long edge was along the house. Mr. Rose stated that it would not work. Chair Koester restated that it felt big for the space.

Chair Koester questioned the details of the door and was informed it was a Marvin sliding French patio door with trim to match the windows. Mr. O'Connor questioned if the door header would be lower than the windows, as shown on the plan. Mr. Rose stated that it would not and that the doors and window heights would align.

Mr. Brice stated that it was hard to completely understand the project without better plans. He requested that a site plan be provided to understand the deck's relationship to the garage. He also noted that a plan view showing exactly how the deck attached to the house would be desired. Mr. O'Connor and Chair Koester agreed. Mr. Rose questioned why details were required. It was noted that the plans needed to be understood in context with the house and garage.

Mr. Brice questioned how the support columns would be treated and how they would terminate into the ground level patio. Mr. Pachefsky suggested that cross bracing may also be required.

The item was deferred for further information, as discussed.

**8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a wall sign at commercial property 3551 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Director Griepentrog summarized the memo prepared for this item and stated that the 18” halo-lit channel letter sign met technical code requirements. He noted that the Board was being asked to discuss aesthetics. Mr. Himmelstein was present to answer any questions.

Chair Koester questioned how tall the lettering for the former tenant (Super Cuts) had been. Director Griepentrog noted that he was unable to find that information. Mr. Himmelstein stated that the neighboring tenant’s sign (Select Property Group) was recently installed by their company, and he believed that sign was 19” tall. (The approved plans on file for that sign indicate they are 18”.) Mr. Himmelstein noted that based on comments provided by Director Griepentrog that the size of this sign was reduced to meet code.

Chair Koester noted that he was ok with the sign, as proposed.

Mr. O’Connor motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 5-0.

**9. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for an existing monument sign at commercial property 4156 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Director Griepentrog noted that this Special Exception consideration had been brought forth based on a recent inspection where it was noted that the sign had not been installed to its approved design. He noted that the 2016 approval had indicated routed-out tenant panels were to be installed. However, that same plan also showed an acrylic face with opaque vinyl overlay, but since that was not allowed per code, a Special Exception would have been required to install it in that manner. The applicant was seeking that Special Exception through this application.

Mr. Dluigi noted that there was a limited area available for the tenant panels. He stated that based on the small size, the copy would not be visible from routed out metal panels, unless seen from straight on. He noted that once you would step to the side, the copy would disappear. He stated that an opaque vinyl overlay would provide the same exact look and allow the copy of the tenant panels to be visible.

Mr. O’Connor thanked the applicant for the thorough explanation.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the Special Exception based on the sign’s construction type (4) and its size (7); seconded by Mr. O’Connor. Vote 5-0.

**10. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a wall sign at commercial property 4166 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Director Griepentrog summarized the content of his cover memo on the topic and noted that the sign review was a bit atypical because the sign was not located within a sign band. He noted that the cumulative sum of the sign text and logo area, the sign conformed to the required standard. He confirmed that the sign would feature open face channel letters, which per the

Village's channel letter handout have been allowed. The sign would also feature a halo-lit logo, which would also feature varying levels of opacity. Mr. Elizondo noted that the proposed sign would be slightly smaller than the neighboring tenant signage for Great Clips.

Mr. Skauge noted that the sign would be an improvement from what had been installed. Mr. O'Connor and Chair Koester agreed.

Mr. O'Connor motioned to approve the sign, as proposed; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 5-0.

## **11. Adjournment**

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:41 p.m.; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 5-0.

Recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director