

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, August 17, 2004, 5:00 p.m., Park View Room**

1. Roll call.

Present: Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Campbell, Ms. Dunn, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Oliveri, Mr. Rische, Mr. Sayas and Mr. Sobczak.

Also Present: Ms. Finn, Mr. Eich and applicants.

Absent: Mr. Francois (excused).

2A. Magood and Khurshid Akhtar, 1765 Brojan Drive – 3-Season Sunroom Addition

Per the request of the Board at the August 3rd meeting, Joe Kafka with Champion presented an updated submittal consistent with the Board's recommendation. Specifically, Mr. Kafka presented a full brick veneer with stone sill that would wrap entirely around the sunroom addition, absent that area required for the slide-by door. The conceptual design for the veneer was illustrated on a handout provided to the Board from Mr. Kafka. Sample brick material was shown to the Board, along with a photo of the project site. Upon clarification from Mr. Liechty, Mr. Kafka noted that the dark/light mix within the brick would closely match the existing material. Mr. Oliveri asked about the sill. Mr. Kafka noted that the property owner preferred a solid sill. Mr. Sobczak moved to approve the project as presented. Mr. Sobczak noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property value in the immediate neighborhood. Ms. Dunn seconded. Motion carried 8-0.

2B. Bill and Elaine Wolters, 1900 Westmoor Terrace – Deck

Bill Wolters, property owner, presented the deck application to the Board. Mr. Wolters noted that the area where the deck would be placed is well screened from adjacent properties. Further, Mr. Wolters commented that the deck would be of cedar material, with the bottom perimeter being enclosed by a lattice screening (also of cedar material). Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the deck as presented. Mr. Liechty noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Rische seconded. Motion carried 8-0.

2C. Nancy Lorenz, 1140 Woodland Avenue – Alterations

Mr. Baesemann noted that both agenda items "C" and "D" concerned the same applicant. Mr. Baesemann reviewed the proposed alterations as illustrated in the elevations provided by the applicant. It was clarified that the shingles to be placed on the arched porch covering would match those shingles currently on the roof. Mr. Sayas asked about removal of the chimney. It was clarified that after the chimney was removed, siding would be installed to be consistent with the colors of the home. Mr. Oliveri clarified that all siding would match. Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the project as presented. Mr. Sobczak noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

2D. Nancy Lorenz, 1140 Woodland Avenue – Garage Addition

Photos of the existing garage (with markings indicating where the proposed garage addition would be located) were reviewed by the Board. Mr. Baesemann noted that per the applicant's property survey, the side-yard setback would be met. Mr. Baesemann further clarified that the materials for the garage addition would match those used in the alterations. Mr. Oliveri expressed concern over having too many peaks on one elevation; he preferred removal of the saddle and inclusion of a window on the garage addition front elevation, with access to the addition from the side. Mr. Lorenz noted that the addition was for storage of his tractor, and access via the side (north) would prove to be difficult. Mr. Baesemann noted that increasing the wall height so as to make the eaves of the addition and garage in line with one another would be appropriate. Mrs. Lorenz clarified that the addition would be well screened from the right-of-way due to the structure's orientation and the presence of landscaping. Ms. Dunn asked the applicant if it would be acceptable to incorporate a door for the addition that matches the garage door. The applicant agreed with the request. Mr. Oliveri moved to approve the garage addition with the following conditions: the gable for the new storage addition is to run linear, with the saddle roof feature eliminated; the front door of the addition is to match the garage door; the eave heights are to match and the materials are to match those used in the alterations. Mr. Oliveri noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded the motion. Prior to a vote of the Board, Mr. Liechty wished to amend his second by clarifying that the gable was to be moved to the north side of the addition, with the ridge running in a north/south direction. Mr. Oliveri agreed to amend his motion to reflect Mr. Liechty's comments. Motion carried 8-0.

2E. Laura Zanella, 725 Brinsmere Drive – Alteration

Laura Zanella, property owner, presented the application for an alteration. It was noted that the area to be enclosed by the alteration was formerly used as dressing rooms for a swimming pool. The alteration would provide additional space for the family room. Mr. Liechty asked if matching materials would be used. It was noted that the materials to be used for the alteration would match the existing materials of the home. It was further clarified that the posts shown on the elevation would remain after completion of the project. Mr. Sobczak moved to approve the alteration as presented. Mr. Sobczak noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property value in the immediate neighborhood. Ms. Dunn seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

2F. Carol Jilek, 13300 Watertown Plank Road – Uniform Sign Format

Carol Jilek with Plank Road Development presented the application for a uniform sign format. Ms. Jilek referred the Board to the relevant information included in their packets. It was noted that the application included a coordinated site/signage plan for future tenants of the building. An ivory/green/maroon building color scheme was noted, with signage colors to match. Ms. Jilek illustrated the proposed location for the Emerald Moon Healing Arts (a tenant of the building) sign, noting that it would be flush-mounted on the wall facing Watertown Plank Road. She further described the other signs proposed for the uniform sign format, including a roster board (directory sign) and up to four individual tenant signs that would be mounted to the various posts fronting Elm Grove Street. It was clarified that the directory sign would be flush-mount on the wall facing Elm Grove Street, located at the most southern and eastern location nearest to Watertown Plank Road. It was noted that the gables illustrated on the concept drawing would not be included in the final design of the building. At this time Mr. Baesemann clarified those items to be approved by the Board, which included the Emerald Moon Healing Arts sign, the directory sign and the future signage for individual businesses. It was clarified by Ms. Jilek that no more than four individual business signs would be present on the various posts; based on a particular business's need for square footage, the total number of tenants (not to exceed four) could be reduced.

Discussion ensued regarding the directory (roster board) sign. Mr. Baesemann asked if the proposed sign is compliant with regard to size; staff informed the Board that it was. Mr. Sayas asked if illumination would be used for the roster board sign. Ms. Jilek noted that a wall flooding light would be used to illuminate the sign and nothing else; it was further noted that an existing fixture would be used. The light would be timed to turn off at 11:00 p.m. each night. Mr. Campbell asked about the ramifications surrounding the approval of a sign format that is based upon an inaccurate elevation. Ms. Finn noted that the upgrades to the elevation would be considered routine maintenance. Mr. Baesemann felt that the concern was not germane to the issue at hand. Discussion then came back to the understanding that the motion was only related to the roster board sign. Mr. Sobczak moved to approve the roster board sign as submitted. Mr. Sobczak noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property value in the immediate neighborhood. Ms. Dunn seconded the motion. Mr. Oliveri clarified that the motion was to include illumination for the sign. Motion carried 8-0.

Discussion then turned toward the Emerald Moon Healing Arts sign. Mr. Baesemann reviewed the colors and dimensions of the sign. Mr. Sobczak then asked about the orientation of the sign. Ms. Jilek noted that the sign would be centered at the second floor level, fronting Watertown Plank Road. It was further clarified that there would be no illumination for the Emerald Moon Healing Arts sign. Mr. Campbell moved to approve the Emerald Moon Healing Arts sign as submitted. Mr. Campbell noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Sayas seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

Discussion then turned toward the proposed future signage (along Elm Grove Street) for individual tenants. It was noted that each tenant would have only one sign. It was reiterated that there would be up to four tenants (in addition to Emerald Moon Healing Arts) in the building, but no more. The colors of the individual tenant signs were to match those of the building/signage color scheme as previously addressed. Ms. Jilek noted that the steel pipes securing the signs to the pillars would be painted ivory so as to match. An on-site review was requested for 4:30 p.m. on September 7th. The Board unanimously agreed to table further discussion until the on-site review scheduled for September 7th. Mr. Oliveri noted that he would bring a placard (or some similar item) to determine the relationship of signage size to that of the structure.

3. Approval of the minutes from August 3, 2004.

Ms. Dunn moved to approve the minutes from August 3, 2004, as presented. Mr. Oliveri seconded. Motion carried 8-0.

4. Old Business.

Mr. Stoiber, property owner of 1255 Orchard Lane, noted that he had submitted a specific rendering of the pillars to be placed along side his driveway, as requested by the Board. It was clarified that the location of the two pillars would be within the property line and not in Village right-of-way. It was further clarified that only one pillar would have an address stone; there would be no illumination of the address stone. Brick to be used for the pillars would match that of the proposed home. Mr. Sobczak moved to approve the pillars as submitted. Mr. Oliveri seconded. Motion carried 8-0.

Ms. Finn noted that each Board member received in their packets past revisions made to Village Code sections 7-1, 7-4 and 335-88. Ms. Finn commented that the Plan Commission and Legislative Committee would also need to meet and review any changes made by the Board.

Mr. Baesemann suggested a subcommittee convene to review the Code revisions within the near future. Mr. Campbell felt that the entire Board should address the issue and then present their findings to the Plan Commission and Legislative Committee. The Board concurred with Mr. Campbell's suggestion. It was agreed that a special meeting of the Building Board would be held sometime the week of August 23rd beginning at 7:30 a.m.; August 24th was suggested. Ms. Finn noted that a reminder e-mail would be sent to ensure all could attend the special meeting.

5. New Business.

None.

6. Adjournment.

Ms. Dunn motioned for adjournment and was seconded by Mr. Rische. Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich
Assistant Planner