

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, February 2, 2010, 5:00 p.m., Park View Room**

1. Roll call.

Present: Mr. Francois, Ms. Godfrey, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Marks, Mr. Olson, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Sayas, Ms. Schoenecker

Absent: Mr. Rische

Also Present: Ms. Balcom and applicants

2. Approval of the January 19, 2010 meeting minutes.

Mr. Liechty stated that the date of the minutes should be amended to January 19, 2010.

Mr. Sayas motioned to approve as amended. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

3. Review and act on a request by Joseph Lewis at 1225 Woodlawn Circle for an addition.

David Rinka of the Winters Group appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Rinka explained that the first floor master suite addition was necessary due to health issues requiring handicap accessibility. The stone and brick will match existing materials. The cedar shake roof will not match initially due to weathering of the current roof. Indian Hills previously approved the addition. There will also be landscape done to make access to the room ADA compliant.

Mr. Liechty commented that he liked the materials and architecture being carried through on the addition. He asked if the skylights would remain. The applicant explained that the skylights would remain. Mr. Liechty further inquired as to whether there would be divided lights in the barrel vault. The applicant stated there will be clear glass. Mr. Liechty asked if the barrel vault would have faux shutters. The applicant said there would be faux shutters.

Mr. Liechty asked if the extending corner stone would be toothed in. The applicant said it would be toothed in. Mr. Liechty asked if the trim board would match existing. The applicant said it will match. Mr. Liechty asked why the trim rafter detail was lost when dropped down. The applicant explained that there was a problem with the dentil molding because it exists only on one elevation and they are trying to create a secondary feel that is not incorporated on the rest of the house.

Mr. Liechty asked what color the garage doors would be. The applicant explained there will be grey door to match the trim, as they do not want them to jump out.

Mr. Liechty asked if there will be exterior lighting. The applicant stated yes.

Mr. Liechty asked if the extension bump out by the barrel vault is wood. The applicant stated yes.

The applicant stated that the landscaping will not incorporate the outdoor fire place as indicated on the plan.

Ms. Schoenecker asked if any significant trees would need to come down for the landscaping. The applicant explained no significant trees would be removed.

Mr. Liechty motioned to approve as submitted. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

4. Review and act on a request by Thomas and Judy Mackenzie at 1045 Grandview Drive for an addition.

Bob Sebastian of Brillo Home Improvements appeared on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Sebastian explained that the addition includes a rear bump out to the kitchen and a garage addition to the east with all materials to match the existing home.

Mr. Pearson arrived at 5:14PM.

Mr. Liechty asked if consideration had been given to siding the garage due to the prominence of the addition. The applicant explained that the break in the materials adds interest and keeps a clean consistency to the home.

Mr. Liechty pointed out that there is trim around the windows on the front and side of the home. The applicant stated that shutters could be added to the windows on the garage to dress it up. Ms. Schoenecker agreed that the shutters would help to make the structure look less institutional.

Mr. Francois explained that the difference in pitches on the garage (approximately 4/12) and home (approximately 10/12) make it look lopsided. The applicant explained that the 4.5 pitch on the garage is due to the windows and existing shed roof.

Mr. Francois stated that block was inappropriate for the garage because it is on the prominent side of the home. Mr. Pearson agreed that the materials should be uniform as the roof pitches break up the structure and if different materials are used it will look like two homes.

Mr. Liechty asked if the backside furnace venting was being extended. The applicant said it is being extended with a crawl space.

The applicant stated that they can do the addition framed with 8 inch aluminum. He then asked how the rear of the home should be treated. The rear is to be treated with 8 in aluminum as well.

Mr. Olson explained that a shadow line could be created as there is a change in planes.

Mr. Francois stated that they could have a flat roof over the garage. He also asked about the large overhang over the rear addition. The applicant explained that they are extending the existing overhang from a previous addition.

Mr. Liechty asked if they were planning lighting in the soffit. The applicant explained that there is a floodlight there now.

Mr. Pearson stated that if the roof was slightly heightened to match the existing it could solve the problem. The applicant explained that due to the setting of the roof that may not be possible.

Mr. Olson asked if they considered bringing the roof out over the garage doors and bringing the pieces together. The applicant stated that there is a small overhang, but that probably could be done. Mr. Liechty asked if the windows were required. The applicant explained that they are required for egress and light.

Mr. Olson explained that the applicant could request that the board table the item to allow for further review at the next meeting or the board could vote on the addition as submitted. The applicant stated that he would like to hear if any other members had any thoughts on the roof.

Mr. Liechty explained that the right side becomes very prominent because of how you approach the house. Mr. Francois explained that if the eave line were raised up it wouldn't be as depressed, but there is still a window problem.

Mr. Liechty suggested that the applicant could meet with a subcommittee if he would like.

The applicant requested that the item be tabled.

Mr. Olson explained that meeting with a subcommittee may be very helpful. Mr. Liechty stated that the roof seems to be the sticking point and the subcommittee may have ideas to make it all come together.

Mr. Liechty motioned to table the item per the request of the applicant. Ms. Godfrey seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Olson explained that the applicant could contact staff if he would like to set up a subcommittee meeting.

5. Discussion and possible action regarding changing Building Board meeting time.

Board members came to consensus to continue with the current meeting time of 5PM.

6. Discussion and possible recommendation regarding possible amendment to Zoning Code §335-88.

Ms. Schoenecker referred to section §335-88C1 and explained that colors are part of the code. Mr. Liechty agreed that the code does seem to give the Board some latitude in regards to color. Ms. Godfrey explained that the color of a home can impact its resale.

Ms. Schoenecker asked Mr. Sayas's opinion as to the enforceability of the Zoning Code. Mr. Sayas explained that anytime the code is not all or nothing it is difficult.

Mr. Liechty asked that §335-88C1 be cleaned up and clarified.

Mr. Francois explained difficulties in passing the responsibility of ensuring plans are followed as approved to the building inspector.

Ms. Godfrey asked if neighbors are notified of addition applications and explained that it should be common courtesy to share your plans with your neighbors. Staff explained that the only application for which neighbors are notified are fences. In the case of demolitions, neighbors are notified.

Mr. Pearson explained that it is important that the Village is consistent in enforcement. Ms. Schoenecker asked if the board could assist in checking to make sure plans are followed.

Ms. Schoenecker asked that staff explain to applicants that the Zoning Code is strict and requires Building Board review of submittals. Staff explained that applicants are told that the Building Board takes its duty to uphold the aesthetic character of the Village very seriously and they are looking for consistency in addition plans so that the addition looks like it belongs on the home. Staff further explained that anytime the code is changed in regards to the role of the Building Board there will be those who will not be happy with the decision. Most applicants are very happy with their plans following Building Board review, as often times some wonderful suggestions have been incorporated into the plans, improving them. However, not everyone leaves the Board having had a positive experience. As people are very attached to their homes and may not want to hear that their plan for their home is not perfect. The Board has a difficult job in balancing the need to maintain the aesthetic character of the Village and take into account the rights and feelings of the individual property owner.

Staff will look into the history, intent and meaning of §335-88C1.

7. Other business.

None.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Sayas motioned to adjourn. Mr. Francois seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jessi Balcom
Zoning and Planning Administrator / Assistant to the Village Manager