

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, October 5, 2004, 5:00 p.m., Park View Room
As amended on October 19, 2004**

1. Roll call.

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

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

Absent: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Francois (excused), Mr. Oliveri (excused) and Mr. Sayas.

2A. Andy and Ronit Shuman, 1720 Highland Drive – Alteration

Mark Oberst of Oberst Carpentry presented the project to the Board. Mr. Oberst began by noting that the project included alterations to both the patio door and a window on the rear elevation. Photos of the impacted area were distributed to the Board members. Mr. Baesemann asked about the incorporation of a stoop for the patio door area. Mr. Oberst noted that there would be, along with additional landscaping for the area. Mr. Liechty asked what color would be used for the trim. Mr. Oberst pointed out that the trim color would match existing. Ms. Dunn asked about the stone to be used for the project. Mr. Oberst clarified that the stone removed from the area of the proposed patio doors would be reclaimed. Ms. Dunn moved to approve the project as presented. Ms. Dunn 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 5-0.

2B. Steven Kroening, 12500 W. Bluemound Road – Addition

Steven Kroening, on behalf of Aurora Health Care, presented the addition. Mr. Kroening noted that the addition would be 145 square feet in area and located on the west side of the structure for the purpose of housing fire protection equipment. It was noted that a full sprinkler system would be installed as a result of the project. It was clarified that the brick used for the addition would match the existing brick found on the building. Mr. Liechty moved to approve the addition, provided that materials for the project would match those of the existing structure. 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 the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

2C. Gregory Ratas, 1035 Highland Drive – Shed

Gregory Ratas, homeowner, presented the shed proposal to the Board. Mr. Ratas began by noting the extensive landscaping proposed, including an additional 14' spruce and several arborvitaes. Materials for the shed were displayed for the Board; it was clarified that the color of the shed would be the same as the house (the structure itself would be dark green, with a lighter green to be used for the trim). Mr. Liechty asked if the siding would be vertical. Mr. Ratas clarified that it would, noting that the cedar siding would have an embossed finish. Mr. Baesemann asked if neighbor approval had been received. Mr. Eich noted that approval had been received from all abutting property owners. Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the project, noting that materials and colors were to match those of the home.

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. Sobczak seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

2D. Tom and Jane Dwyer, 1440 Blue Ridge Boulevard – Alterations

Tom Dwyer, property owner, presented the alterations to the Board. Mr. Dwyer noted that the project would include replacement of both the roof and bay windows. Mr. Baesemann commented that the larger, draping windows would be an enhancement to the home. 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. Mr. Liechty seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

2E. David and Elizabeth Kenyon, 1520 Woodside Lane – Alterations

Dave and Betsy Kenyon, property owners, presented the alterations to the Board. It was noted that one of the alterations was between the living area and the garage (covered breezeway portion); that area would be brought up to the same level as the existing home. It was clarified that the project would not include the removal of the primary front door, as was indicated on the submitted drawings. Proposed trim color would match what exists on the home. Mr. Liechty asked about the vent located to the right of the breezeway area. It was explained that the vent, which is for a fireplace, would be removed as a result of the project. 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 the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

2F. Nancy Ghanayem, 1650 Blue Ridge Boulevard – Addition

Joe Meyer of Integrity Construction presented the addition to the Board. It was explained that the existing 3-season room (first floor) would be replaced with a 4-season room. Also, a second story addition would be constructed to provide a master bath for the home. Mr. Liechty asked if there would be room on the slab for the veneer. Mr. Meyer noted that there would be enough room. Mr. Baesemann expressed concern regarding the lack of a window on the north elevation, particularly as that elevation faced a public street. Shutters were suggested as a means to enhance the north elevation. Ms. Ghanayem informed the Board that all shutters currently on the home would be removed as a result of the project. Mr. Liechty asked why the stone band proposed for the first floor level of the addition did not line up with the existing stone band currently on the home. Mr. Meyer noted that such an approach would not be structurally feasible. Mr. Sobczak suggested using spandrel panel glass to enhance the north elevation. Joan Sweet, architect for the project, noted that a different type of glass, such as opaque, could be used instead of the spandrel glass. Mr. Baesemann noted that a window could possibly be placed in the area where the closet would be located. Discussion ensued regarding the placement of a window on the north elevation.

Ms. Dunn motioned to table the discussion to allow the applicant time to review possible changes to the north elevation while the Board continued with the agenda. Mr. Sobczak seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

3. Approval of the minutes from September 21, 2004.

Mr. Rische moved to approve the minutes from September 21, 2004, as presented. Ms. Dunn seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

4. Old Business.

The Board reviewed a proposed window for a previously approved project (new home construction) at 1700 Notre Dame Boulevard. The front elevation of the home, as approved by the Board in July, was laid out for review. Ms. Dunn asked about the type of window to be used. It was clarified that the window was clear and made by Marvin. Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the window; Mr. Rische seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Baesemann brought up for discussion the upcoming Legislative Committee meeting. Ms. Finn noted that the meeting, which was to be held on November 4th, was rescheduled for November 8th to accommodate a joint meeting of the Committee and the Plan Commission.

The Board then discussed uniform signage for the Park and Shop building. Ms. Finn updated the Board on this matter, noting that she had hand delivered a letter to Mr. Kurtz, property owner, concerning the need to bring into compliance the business center's signage format. Ms. Finn suggested to the Board a morning meeting with Mr. Kurtz to discuss the requirements of the uniform signage format ordinance. Ms. Finn suggested that she meet with Mr. Rische, Mr. Sobczak and Mr. Liechty after the meeting to set up a subcommittee that could meet with Mr. Kurtz in the near future.

5. New Business.

Mr. Baesemann noted that at the last Building Board meeting the issue of eave overhangs was addressed. With that in mind, Mr. Baesemann noted that the current code language allowed for a one-foot projection into any required yard. Mr. Baesemann felt that the word setback should be included after the word "yard", as written in section 335-39(B). It was further noted that a one-foot eave projection is standard in home construction; bay window projections can be up to several feet. Mr. Liechty was comfortable with the current language, noting that he would not be in favor of allowing anything over a two-foot projection. Mr. Baesemann noted that the issue could be revisited when more of the Building Board members were present for discussion.

2F. Revisited.

Ms. Ghanayem, homeowner, again noted that a window over the proposed tub in the master bath would be unreasonable and look forced. Ms. Sweet, project architect, felt that such a window would have a "floating" effect. It was clarified that the proposed arrangement of the tub in the floor plans would be very difficult to change. Mr. Baesemann suggested a mirror image interior layout to accommodate a window. Ms. Sweet noted that such an approach would not be feasible due to the location of the plumbing. After additional discussion it was suggested that modifications to the roof be made to "break up" the addition. Ms. Sweet felt that such an approach would be forced. Further discussion yielded an acceptable gable feature to be placed on the north elevation, which was drawn on the applicant's submitted plans.

Discussion then turned toward a conceptual review of the proposed landscaping wall. It was noted that the wall would be four feet away from the addition, with a height of approximately thirty-eight inches. It was clarified that the Board would need to be supplied with scaled drawings of the wall, and also that a formal hearing on the wall would need to be held in accordance with Village Code. It was also clarified that, so long as the wall did not exceed twenty-five feet in lineal length, it would be classified as a decorative fence for purpose of approval and processing. At this time the conceptual review of the landscaping wall was withdrawn.

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the project as modified on the submitted plans, provided that 1) final drawings illustrating the proposed modifications are submitted to Village staff and 2) roofing, siding and trim will match those existing on the structure.

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 5-0.

6. Adjournment.

Ms. Dunn motioned for adjournment and was seconded by Mr. Liechty. Meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich
Assistant Planner