

**BUILDING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, January 4, 2005, 5:00 p.m., Park View Room**

---

**1. Roll call.**

Present: Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Francois, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Rische, Mr. Sayas and Mr. Sobczak.

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

Absent: Mr. Campbell, Ms. Dunn (excused) and Mr. Oliveri (excused).

**2A. John Kannall, 1045 Highland Drive – Addition**

Mr. Baesemann noted that the addition was a previously approved project, further noting that the applicant was requesting approval of a minor revision to the south elevation. Mr. Kannall noted that the middle window would be removed and the pillar originally to the left of it would be relocated to the left of the furthest window to the right. It was noted that this alteration would provide more symmetry with respect to the pillars. Mr. Kannall explained that a park bench would be included in the area where the window and pillar were removed. Mr. Baesemann suggested that the brickwork be modified to provide for an additional feature along the elevation; Mr. Kannall expressed his wishes to not alter the revision. Mr. Liechty noted that the furniture would add to the open area.

Mr. Sayas moved to approve the project as submitted. Mr. Sayas 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 6-0.

**2B. Carla Wynter, 12400 Elmhurst Parkway – Addition**

Mr. Baesemann provided an overview of the project, noting that at the December 21, 2004 meeting it was requested of the applicant to revise all drawings to reflect an eave overhang of no more than one foot for the proposed addition. Mr. Baesemann noted that the revised drawings were deficient in that the eave overhangs at the corners of the addition protruded beyond the allowed one-foot extension into the required setback area. David Pekel, of Pekel Construction & Remodeling, noted that a double hip could be incorporated into the project to ensure that the eave overhang at the corners would not exceed one foot beyond the setback line.

Mr. Sayas moved to approve the project as modified at its second appearance before the Building Board. Mr. Sayas noted that final approval would be conditioned upon the applicant providing updated drawings to the Building Board (at its January 18, 2005 meeting) that reflected the agreed upon change, yet the applicant could proceed with the project as amended. Mr. Sayas 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 6-0.

Mr. Sobczak commented that it was unfortunate that an invisible line was forcing contortion of the applicant's roof style. At this time discussion ensued concerning a special exception for the project. Mr. Pekel did note that he wished to have the foundation excavated prior to the onset of inclement weather.

### **2C. Roger and Patti Schuneman, 13895 Garfield Avenue – New Construction**

Mr. Schuneman began by thanking the Building Board subcommittee for further discussing the new home application at a special meeting on December 28. Mr. Schuneman noted that numerous exterior changes were agreed upon at the December 28 meeting, including: an increase in roof pitch; incorporation of a focal point in the courtyard area; a sunburst window on the front elevation; clipped peaks; the addition of dimensional shingles and the addition of cedar wrap. At this time Mr. Baesemann requested comments from the Board concerning the architectural merits of the new home.

Mr. Liechty noted that the stone feature, as agreed upon at the December 28 meeting, provided more uniformity throughout the exterior of the home. Mr. Rische agreed, further noting that the property was significantly enhanced. Mr. Sobczak noted that cedar trim was used around the windows on the front and side elevations, yet none was included with the rear elevation. Mr. Schuneman noted that the reason cedar wrap was used around the windows was due to the fact that the original proposal included shutters, which had since been removed from the drawings. Mr. Schuneman further noted that he didn't feel it was necessary to add cedar on the rear elevation due to the fact that it would not be visible. Mr. Sobczak suggested that the cedar wrap feature (around the windows) be carried through onto the rear elevation. Mr. Schuneman questioned how the cedar wrap could physically fit onto the sunroom portion of the rear elevation. Mr. Baesemann noted that those areas that could not accommodate the cedar wrap feature could incorporate solid stock material in lieu of the cedar. Mr. Schuneman was amenable to Mr. Baesemann's recommendation.

At this time Mr. Baesemann called for a vote on the architectural merits of the home. Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the architecture of the home as submitted, with the understanding that additional cedar wrap would be incorporated on the rear elevation as recommended by Mr. Baesemann. 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 6-0.

Discussion then turned to the grading/drainage plan for the lot. It was noted that the Village Engineer had confirmed approval of the plan per a previously submitted letter. Mr. Baesemann commented that the plan was appropriate when compared to the neighbor's (to the west) lot. Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the grading/drainage plan as submitted. Mr. Liechty seconded. It was clarified that the letter from the Village Engineer would act as an exhibit of the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The next item for review was the landscaping plan. Mrs. Schuneman provided a brief overview of the landscaping plan, noting that the plan had been revised since originally submitted last month. Mr. Baesemann then asked about the material for the patio. Mr. Schuneman noted that the patio would be concrete. Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the landscaping plan as submitted. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Baesemann noted that the materials and colors of the home were also to be approved by the Board. Mr. Schuneman noted that the shingles were to be charcoal, the siding would be silver, the soffit and fascia would be white, the cedar wrap would be either white or gray and the cultured stone would be Lakeshore River Rock with gray mortar. Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the materials and colors as submitted. Mr. Rische seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Maciejczak of Miracle Homes noted that a recertification of the survey would be provided to Village staff to ensure that all setback requirements were met.

**3. Approval of December 21, 2004 minutes.**

It was noted that the December 21, 2004 minutes were to identify Mr. Rische as excused from the meeting. Mr. Francois motioned to approve the December 21, 2004 minutes as modified. Mr. Sobczak seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

**4. Old Business.**

None.

**5. New Business.**

*Request for feedback concerning suggested revisions to existing fence regulations.*

Mr. Eich noted that suggested fence code revisions, accompanied by a memorandum highlighting significant changes to the fence code, had been sent to all Building Board members late the previous week. It was requested of the Board that a recommendation be provided as to the acceptability of the suggested revisions.

Discussion focused on three distinct areas of the suggested revision. The first area of discussion related to the height of berms and including them when calculating the overall height of a proposed fence. It was suggested that the last sentence of subparagraph [d] under paragraph [2] read, "In the event that a fence is constructed on a hill or berm *where the berm has been installed so as to not circumvent the intent of this section*, it shall be reduced in height to compensate for the height of the berm or hill to avoid exceeding the overall fence height."

The second area of discussion related to the height of the fence, with particular emphasis on ornamental features. It was suggested that subsection [i] of subparagraph [e] under paragraph [2] be revised to read "Structural ornamental posts protruding no more than six inches above the measured average height of a fence may be permitted."

The third and final area of discussion pertained to the regulation of retaining walls. Although all Board members agreed that retaining walls ought to be regulated, it was determined that the fence regulations were not an appropriate location for such language. It was suggested that a separate code reference be prepared concerning structural retaining walls and related features (entry monuments were identified as an example). All present were in agreement that any structural retaining wall three feet in height or less could be approved administratively and thus without Building Board review/approval. It was further agreed that staff would retain the opportunity to send any application to the Building Board if they felt the project as submitted was questionable as it related to those regulations governing structural retaining walls.

It was agreed that an updated revision, consistent with the suggested changes, would be submitted to all Building Board members at the January 18 meeting. It was clarified that regulations concerning structural retaining walls would not be included in the fence regulations.

**6. Adjournment.**

Mr. Sobczak motioned for adjournment and was seconded by Mr. Francois. Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich  
Assistant Planner