



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, June 9, 2022

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Daryl Melzer, Ryan O'Connor, and Larry Pachefsky.

Others present: Kristi Minser, Daniel Burkholder, Ryan Hundt, Dale Buettner, Connie Jo, Kerry Namin, Luis Barbosa and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director.

2. Approval of the May 26, 2022 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 5-0.

3. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for a rear one-story addition at residential property 1828 E. Kenmore Place.

Kristi Minser and Daniel Burkholder were present to discuss this item. She noted that the plans were reviewed at the last meeting and that she has brought them back with the requested changes to the addition's roofline. She stated that the roofline now mimics the shed roofs on the house, presents somewhat like a mansard and looks more residential. Director Griepentrog also noted that trim boards have been added to the corners of the newly sided addition. Ms. Minser confirmed that the proposed SmartSiding cannot be mitered.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the revisions looked much better and tied in with the existing house. He confirmed that the new roof also covers the area of the former addition that steps in from the new addition. Chair Kraehnke agreed that was a nice feature.

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

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of bay windows and a bump out (west elevation) at residential property 2028 E. Wood Place.

Ryan Hundt, who drew the plans, provided an overview of the proposed addition, which would facilitate the expansion of a renovated kitchen. (Dale Buettner arrived later during discussion.) Mr. Hundt noted that the existing windows, brick façade, gas and electric meters, and vent would all be removed to accommodate the new bay. He detailed that the new bay would cantilever out the same depth as the existing bay, which would remain. He noted that the new

bay, which has new windows to let light into the kitchen, is taller than the existing one. He stated that the siding and roof of the new bay would replicate the existing.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the roof overhangs were as large as drawn. Mr. Hundt provided further details of the existing and proposed soffit. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if there were ever windows in the existing bay. Mr. Hundt was unable to confirm and noted that a built-in banquette is currently located within it. Mr. O'Connor questioned if the basement windows under the proposed bay would remain, and he was informed that was doubtful. Chair Kraehnke confirmed they would be in-filled with brick. Mr. Pachefsky questioned how deep the bay would be and was informed it would be 15-16 inches. Mr. Hundt stated that every inch to the proposed kitchen renovation made a difference.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he was not in love with the different height of the addition, but understood the issues related to why it was proposed as it was. Mr. Hundt noted that the existing bay is soffitied which results in a smaller presence. Mr. O'Connor questioned if the existing bay could be heighted on the outside without changing the interior soffit. It was noted that would result in roofs of both bays essentially connecting, which Chair Kraehnke stated he would not like.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the homeowner would want windows in the original bay, and Mr. Hundt noted the homeowners wanted to establish a bar in that area and needed the wall space.

Chair Kraehnke stated the proposal was the best presentation of the client's desires. Mr. O'Connor agreed that he could not think of a better alternate solution to accommodate the expansion.

Mr. O'Connor confirmed that the proposed siding would match the existing. Mr. Hundt noted that it would be clad in cedar siding with mitered corners. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the rest of the house had any areas of siding with windows in it to confirm that the styling matched. Mr. Buettner noted that windows were only within the brick portions of the façade.

Mr. Pachefsky stated that he was not a fan of the first bay and was not supportive of the second one. He noted that he understood the desire for it, but that it ruined the integrity of the house. He stated that it looked odd and would not want to be the neighbor.

Mr. Melzer stated that the new bay looked better than the existing one and noted that the existing one could not be required to be removed.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 4-1 (Mr. Pachefsky voting nay).

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a rear single-story sunroom addition at residential property 4420 N. Marlborough Drive.

Ryan Hundt and Connie Jo were present to discuss this item. Mr. Hundt noted that the existing stone patio will be removed to accommodate a new addition with a sunroom and powder room. A new door will be installed on the second story to provide access to the rooftop deck on that addition. He noted that the windows in the current bump-out in the back will be replaced with a pair of doors to access a new deck. He stated that he hoped to reclaim a majority of the brick but did not believe it would be enough to clad the bottom of the new addition, which is

proposed to come up to the bottom of the new windows. The remainder of the addition would be sided. He also noted that a frieze board matching the existing bump out would be replicated on the new addition.

Mr. O'Connor stated that for a fairly small addition, it felt really big. Mr. Hundt noted that the property did have a significant downward slope.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the use of brick anchored the addition and made it feel permanent. He also stated that he liked the use of trim boards. Chair Kraehnke agreed that the plans included a lot of detailed elements that enliven the addition. He noted that matching the railings will help tie everything together.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned the width of the addition in relation to the width of the house. It was noted that the house was approximately 26 ft. wide, and the new addition would be approximately 19 ft.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the addition featured a good use of materials and took advantage of the site. He noted that the addition felt uniform to the home.

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

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a new single-family residence at residential property 3711 N. Downer Avenue.

Kerry Namin and Luis Barbosa were present to discuss this item. Photos of the existing property were shown. It was noted that the existing house was proposed to be demolished and replaced with a new two-story home with an attached garage. The new home would feature a plaster exterior, not stucco. A home featuring similar architecture was presented as an example.

Director Griepentrog informed the Board that a zoning review still needed to be performed on the proposed home to confirm compliance with setback and lot coverage. He noted that the applicant was made aware of that requirement but had yet to apply for it.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if any trim was being proposed around the windows. Ms. Namin replied that the plaster would be brought right up to the windows. Chair Kraehnke was not in favor of that, as he felt it stripped down too much detail, and suggested that some sort of trim to provide a shadow line be considered. Ms. Namin said that she was willing to consider it. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the window groupings would have plaster in between them or if trim boards would be installed. Mr. Barbosa stated that trim boards would be used. Chair Kraehnke noted that a frame around the windows would help accommodate those trim boards.

Mr. O'Connor stated that there were several details he questioned and hoped to see a revised plan to clarify those items. He pointed out the window on the rear elevation, which he believed was placed too high in relation to the proposed floor plan. He also questioned the bump out on which those windows were placed. He suggested that brackets or something could be used to help define it. Chair Kraehnke also suggested that skirt board or knee braces could be considered to give it more articulation. Mr. O'Connor noted that eave details differed on the front and rear façade and requested confirmation of what was being proposed.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned the proposed balustrades and was informed by Ms. Namin that she was thinking they would be made of concrete. Mr. Pachefsky also requested confirmation of their proposed shape. Chair Kraehnke questioned if a concrete cap was proposed for the balustrades and stone caps on the piers. He suggested that the stone caps on the brick piers be slightly higher than the railing (concrete cap).

Mr. Pachefsky questioned the elevation of the brick foundation around the house, noting that it changed height in several locations. Mr. O'Connor agreed and requested that a more consistent datum be found. Mr. Brice agreed. Chair Kraehnke said that he would be fine with the height of the brick foundation fluctuating around the house, as long as it had purpose. Chair Kraehnke also questioned if the brick and plaster were on the same plane or whether or not a drip cap would need to be installed on top of the brick. Mr. Barbosa noted that a concrete cap would be installed. Chair Kraehnke requested that detail be articulated on the plans.

Chair Kraehnke questioned what material the fascia boards would be and was informed they would be wood. Mr. O'Connor requested that gutter details also be included. Chair Kraehnke noted those details would help define the character and add shadow lines.

Mr. Brice stated that he was struggling overall with the entire design as a concept. He noted that it appeared to be trying to be contemporary, but also included details that were attempting to be traditional. He questioned the rhythm of the windows and stated that a lot of details needed to be worked out before he'd be ready to consider making a motion. He also stated that he'd like for the lot coverage and setbacks to be confirmed prior to the design.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the garage door and front door appeared to have wider trim and requested that it be treated similarly to what would be proposed for the window trim. He also requested that the entry be looked at for consideration of a possible covering.

Chair Kraehnke noted the number of questions and requested details and suggested that consideration be postponed. Mr. Melzer agreed. Mr. Barbosa thanked the Board for their comments and said they would take them into consideration.

No action was taken.

7. Future Agenda Items.

No future agenda items were discussed.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:04 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 5-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director