



**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, July 8, 2021**  
via tele/videoconference

**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Lybra Loest, Ryan O'Connor, Daryl Melzer, Larry Pachefsky and Mary Wright (arrived during #3).

Others present: Paul Giesen, Andy Lehn, Ryan Hundt, Jason Babcock, Ryan Mleziva and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

**2. Approval of the June 24, 2021 meeting minutes.**

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

**3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the modification of an existing window (west elevation) at residential property 3823 N. Farwell Avenue.**

Paul Giesen provided an overview of the project, which involved installing a larger window on the rear elevation. He noted that a double casement window would be installed.

Bryan Koester confirmed that the rear elevation had existing casement windows. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the new, larger window would have the same head height as the two adjacent windows. Mr. O'Connor questioned if the new window would be a wood window. Mr. Giesen noted that the new window would be a Weather Shield window and assumed it would be vinyl or aluminum clad. Mr. O'Connor confirmed that it would be painted to match.

Mr. O'Connor motioned to approve the plans, as drawn; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 8-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the expansion of an existing dormer (north elevation) at residential property 4406-08 N. Murray Avenue.**

Andy Lehn was present to provide an overview and answer questions. He noted that his architect was unable to join the call. He noted that the project would increase the size of the dormer on the north elevation of the house to make room for a stairway as part of an attic renovation.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the plans did not include a west (front) elevation. He was curious to see how the new shed roof dormer would meet up with the existing hip roof. Chair Kraehnke had the same concern, noting that the connect could look odd being that close to the edge. Mr. Lehn suggested that a house across the street from him had a similar dormer. Chair Kraehnke noted that shed dormers on hip roofs were not uncommon, but that the placement of this particular dormer being so far forward was unique. Mr. Melzer questioned if the roof plan would help show how the roofs intersect. Mr. O'Connor noted that the plans do not match. Mr. O'Connor shared his screen to provide a visual of the mismatch for clarity.

Mr. Brice questioned the proposed new siding material, noting that LP SmartSide was detailed, whereas the remainder of the siding on the house was cedar shingles. He noted that SmartSide was unable to be installed with mitered corners, so the look would be different on that dormer. Mr. Lehn noted that a Timber Crest product was proposed that would match the color and texture of the existing cedar shake. Mr. Brice noted that his concern related to how the corners would be treated and whether or not corner boards would need to be installed. Chair Kraehnke noted that he would likely not approve siding on the dormer that required corner trim. His preference would be to match the remainder of the siding details on the house. Mr. Brice and Ms. Wright agreed. Mr. Lehn discussed the option of installing corner trim boards on the remainder of the house's siding.

Mr. Koester noted that only three windows were proposed in the dormer and questioned if any other Board members thought an additional window should be considered. Mr. Pachefsky stated that he would like to see at least one more. Mr. O'Connor noted that an additional window could be added in alignment with the windows on the first and second floor below it. Mr. Brice agreed and suggested that it would help to break up the larger mass of the expanded dormer. Mr. Brice also requested that additional details of the proposed window trim be provided to match the rest of the house. He noted that most contemporary windows do not feature the same type of sill that is currently installed on the rest of the house. He also requested that the architect look at the mulls between the triple window unit and consider matching similar sizing as featured on the front and south elevations.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the dormer was large enough to accommodate the required head height for the stairway to the third floor. Mr. O'Connor noted that it looked tight, but believed it was. Chair Kraehnke noted that a larger dormer would also require a gable rather than a hip roof in the front and noted that the stair sections confirmed enough space was designed.

Action on this item was deferred for revised plans with additional information as discussed.

**5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dormer (north elevation) at residential property 1905 E. Olive Street.**

Ryan Hundt and Jason Babcock were present to discuss the proposed plans. Planning Director Griepentrog clarified that the proposed dormer is on the south elevation. In addition to the dormer, Mr. Hundt noted that siding on the home would be upgraded to fiber cement.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that seven new windows would be installed on the south side of the new, expanded dormer. Mr. Hundt also noted that a window would be replaced on the west elevation as well within its current opening. Chair Kraehnke questioned the details above the windows. Mr. Hundt explained that this eyebrow detail is also featured on the east and west elevations of the house and noted that standing seam roofing would be installed to replace the

asphalt shingles. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the new windows would be trimmed out to match the existing windows. Mr. Hundt explained the details as noted on the plans. Mr. Hundt also explained that rafters and a new roof would be extended over the existing first floor bay.

Mr. Brice motioned to approve the plans, as drawn; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 8-0.

**6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a board sign at commercial property 3514 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Ryan Mleziva was present to discuss this item. Planning Director Griepentrog noted that a memo had been provided to the Board outlining the details of this sign. He noted that the wall sign would be placed within an existing sign band, but that the proposed logo and lettering, including the halo outline was taller than the 18” allowed per code. Mr. Mleziva clarified that the lettering was 15 inches, and with the halo outline it was 18 inches, so complaint with the code. He offered to reduce the diameter of the bottlecap logo to be 18 inches to also meet code.

Ms. Wright stated that she would like to be consistent on the allowable size of the logo and requested it be reduced to within the 18-inch parameter. Mr. Mleziva agreed to do so. Chair Kraehnke noted that makes the review very easy.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, with modification that the bottlecap logo be reduced to 18 inches in diameter; seconded by Mr. O’Connor. Vote 8-0.

**7. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a painted wall sign at commercial property 3514 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Planning Director Griepentrog provided a brief overview of the Special Exception request, which involved a second, painted wall sign on the side of the building. He noted that the Sign Code only allows one sign per business, but that Special Exceptions have been approved for the installation of a second sign if the tenant space is on a corner or faces 30 feet of open space. He noted that this sign would front 30 feet of open space. He further noted that the Sign Code prohibits signs from being painted directly onto the surface of a building, but that Special Exceptions have been allowed for artistic reasons, such as “mural” signs. Lastly, he explained that the size of the sign may also require Special Exception, based on past precedent of using “street frontage” calculations, but that measurements of the façade were not provided to confirm.

Ryan Mleziva was present to discuss this item. Mr. Mleziva provided that the dimension of the side façade was 113’ long x 24’ tall, so that the maximum 60 sq. ft. sign would be allowed based on that “street frontage” measurement. He noted that the proposed sign was 7’ in diameter, so if square would only be 49’, but is actually less since the logo is a circle. He noted the desired reason for the sign related to the location of the business entrance, which is in the back on the side of the building.

Mr. O’Connor stated that he did not have a problem with the size of the proposed sign or its location but noted that he would not consider this an artistic installation but more of a brand logo, which should not be painted directly onto the building. He stated that he would prefer that it be mounted on something and not be painted directly onto the building. Chair Kraehnke asked him to elaborate on why he wanted it mounted, because he preferred that it be painted directly onto the surface. Mr. O’Connor stated that for removal purposes it would be easier to

remove a mounted sign and look better than a painted “patch” on the façade if the business were ever to leave. Ms. Loest and Mr. Melzer agreed. Mr. Mleziva indicated that he could have the sign power washed off the building if his business were to leave. Ms. Wright reminded the group that the Board did allow Black Bear to paint directly onto the side of their building. Mr. O’Connor noted that Black Bear had a newer façade with a uniform color. He also noted that he was not opposed to painted signs but was concerned about this sign’s removal someday. Chair Kraehnke reiterated that he would prefer to have it painted and suggested that it would fade and age over time to a similar patina that this wall already has.

Planning Director Griepentrog noted that the Sign Code prohibits signs from remaining once a business has closed, so enforcement of the removal of a painted sign was his concern. He noted that responsibility would fall to the property owner and stated that he would like to make sure the property owner is aware and willing to do so before this sign was to be installed. Mr. Mleziva stated that the property owner is supportive of this application.

Mr. Koester said he was ok with the sign being painted directly onto the building, but that it would be appropriate to get a letter confirming the property owner’s willingness to remove, if/when necessary. Mr. O’Connor noted that he could go either way but wanted to make sure everything was understood.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, via Special Exception, recognizing (1) the purpose of the sign and (6) location of where the sign is proposed with respect to the business’ side entrance, subject to acknowledgement of removal requirements from the property owner; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 8-0.

## **8. Adjournment**

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:23 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 8-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director