

VILLAGE OF GRAFTON

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 14, 2010

The Architectural Review Board meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m. by Chair Rieck.

Board members present: Tom Bartlein, Richard Rieck, Tom Richart, and Frank Lorbecki

Absent: Mark Paschke

Staff/Officials present: Director of Planning and Development Michael A. Rambousek and Administrative Secretary Deborah A. Brown

Staff excused: Building Inspector Tom Johnson

Others present: Jason Gundrum from Inland American Holdco Management, LLC and Bill and Sue Hass

MINUTES

Motion by Tom Bartlein, seconded by Frank Lorbecki, to approve the minutes of the August 5, 2010, Architectural Review Board Meeting as presented. Approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF JULY, AUGUST, AND SEPTEMBER 2010 INSPECTOR'S REPORT

The Architectural Review Board members reviewed the Inspector's Reports for July, August and September.

There were no comments or concerns regarding this report by the Architectural Review Board members.

Motion by Frank Lorbecki, seconded by Tom Bartlein, to approve the July, August, and September 2010 Inspector's Report, as presented. Approved unanimously.

HEAR PERSONS REQUESTING TO BE HEARD

None.

RESIDENTIAL PLAN REVIEW

Oberndorger Landscape Development-1982 Pawnee Drive-Attached deck

The members briefly reviewed the design plan and elevations for an attached deck to the residence located at 1982 Pawnee Drive, located in the Falls Crossing Subdivision.

There was minimal discussion regarding these plans by the Architectural Review Board members.

Motion by Tom Bartlein, seconded by Tom Richart, to approve the architectural plans submitted by Oberndorger Landscape Development for an attached deck to be located at 1982 Pawnee Drive, located on Lot 33 in the Falls Crossing Subdivision as presented. Approved unanimously.

Director Rambousek asked Chair Rieck if he could ask the board members if they would have any objection to immediately reviewing agenda item 8-Request by Grafton Commons owners to stain the arbors and other wood structures with beige colored stain, because this applicant will need to drive home to Illinois this evening.

The Architectural Review Board members had no objections to moving this agenda item up and taking it next.

COMMERCIAL PLAN REVIEW

REQUEST BY GRAFTON COMMONS OWNERS TO STAIN THE ARBORS AND OTHER WOOD STRUCTURES WITH A BEIGE COLORED STAIN

Director Rambousek explained that the Planning and Development Department has received a request from the owner of the Grafton Commons development, Inland Group, to coat all of the arbors/trellis' and other wood accent structures on the site with a beige colored stain.

He also informed the Commission members that the original plans and approval for Grafton Commons specify that all of the wood accent structures have a natural appearance with visible wood grain. The Planning and Development Staff recommends that this original specification continue to be upheld. For the sake of preserving these structures, the Planning and Development Staff applauds the new owners and also recommends that they be stained or sealed. However, it should be done with a product that is non-opaque and preserves the natural wood grain look.

Mr. Rambousek introduced Jason Gundrum of Inland American Holdco Management, LLC which manages the Grafton Commons development.

Mr. Gundrum thanked the Architectural Review Board for taking his item immediately and then spoke briefly to the members on a number of different options for the on-site wood structures. He stated that they are willing to do anything that the Architectural Review Board requests.

After a short discussion, the members suggested that Director Rambousek continue to work with Mr. Gundrum to find a color semi-translucent stain that would still bring out the natural wood grain look.

Motion by Tom Bartlein, seconded by Frank Lorbecki, to approve a color semi-translucent stain for the wood accent structures located at the Grafton Commons and have Director Rambousek oversee the choice of color by working with the management company. Approved unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CLINIC BUILDING TO BE LOCATED AT 2061 CHEYENNE COURT

The Architectural Review Board members reviewed proposed modification to the Columbia-St. Mary's Medical Clinic building located at 2061 Cheyenne Court.

Director Rambousek stated that as part of a routine site inspection the Planning and Development Department Staff recently reviewed the Columbia-St. Mary's Clinic currently under construction at 2061 Cheyenne Court and found at least two modifications not consistent with the approved plans. The first is a molding strip that runs across the top of the arched windows just below the roof line. Unfortunately, this molding strip covers up portions of the accent brick at the top of the arched windows on the south elevation. The original approved plan indicates a gap of at least one course of main brick between the strip and the accent brick.

Director Rambousek also added that the amount of vertical mullion lines in the transom portions of the arched windows has been changed from four to two. As a result, there are now only two windows in these transom areas instead of four.

The Planning and Development Staff is concerned that these modifications diminish the architectural value of the building plans that were approved by the Architectural Review Board. Therefore, the issue with the molding strip needs to be corrected as originally approved.

In addition, the full number of transom windows should also be returned to the building as approved by the Architectural Review Board. If the applicant can create another architectural element on the building that enhances its quality, the Architectural Review Board could consider alleviating this requirement.

Director Rambousek informed the members that the developer is open to anything short of tearing down the wall.

The Architectural Review Board members held a lengthy discussion on the different options that the contractors would have in correcting this matter.

Tom Bartlein discussed the option of framing out the windows in the brick area or the use of a decorative bracket along the south elevation wall.

Tom Richart concern was for the owner of the building. Specifically, the concern that whatever design solution is submitted for the next meeting the owner will buy off it and be willing to allow the change in the architectural design.

It was the consensus of the Architectural Review Board members that the developer and architect come back in November, so the Board can further review and give consideration to new architectural plans and then take formal action on those plans.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF BASIC ARCHITECTURAL PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES TO BE UTILIZED BY THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Director Rambousek provided background information on the architectural principles and guidelines. He stated that the Planning and Development Department has created some basic architectural design guidelines that can be applied to the review of buildings throughout the Village of Grafton, but specifically in areas that do not have existing design guidelines. Currently the South Commercial District and the Downtown have their own set of design guidelines that are utilized for new construction, redevelopment and facade improvements in those districts. Each of those documents was included in the Architectural Review Boards meeting packet for reference purposes.

Director Rambousek further explained that the Planning and Development Department is always searching for mechanisms to ensure quality and uphold the standards that make the Village of Grafton special. The 10 basic architectural principals provided in this report aim to serve that purpose by providing a baseline of standards the Planning and Development Department, Plan Commission and the Architectural Review Board can utilize in reviewing projects. It is important to note that these principles are guidelines and will not be used as absolutes.

The Plan Commission previously reviewed these standards and found them acceptable subject to the final review and approval by the Architectural Review Board.

Director Rambousek also informed the Architectural Review Board members that Mark Paschke contacted him to let him know he would not be present at this meeting and wanted a chance to review these guidelines and run through the final draft one more time before the Architectural Review Board approves it.

Tom Richart had several comments and questions. He questioned if these principles and guidelines were to include the residential districts as well as commercial and industrial districts. He also stated that he had a preference for a visual guide. He also questioned if there was a numerical scoring with these 10 principles? He then asked if the intent was to use the new guidelines throughout the Village.

Director Rambousek responded that these guidelines would be primarily used in areas that do not have current guidelines, but could certainly be applied if needed for other areas. He added that as the Architectural Review Board knows, the Downtown and the South Commercial District already have guidelines that are currently used and will be used in the future. The east side commercial district has a visual preference survey, but these are not guidelines. So these new guidelines could be used in that area in addition to areas such as Washington Avenue (WIS 60), the Village's western border (WIS 60), industrial and business park districts, and future areas that maybe annexed into the Village of Grafton.

Director Rambousek further stated that the principles and guidelines are not intended for residential areas but could certainly be applied to large multi-family structures. The intent is not to score projects. The guidelines are to be used as an aid for developers and architects and as a tool to assist the Staff in the development process.

Following a short discussion, it was the consensus of the Architectural Review Board members to re-examine these guidelines at the next meeting and take action at that time, giving Mark Paschke a chance to review the draft one last time as well.

Tom Richart also asked Director Rambousek to re-look at the design policy criteria under scale, proportion and articulation to make certain they are easy for the reader to understand. He asked Director Rambousek to explain these areas in detail at the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Update on roof improvements at 1971 Washington Street

Director Rambousek gave a brief background summary regarding a minor modification to the 1971 Washington Street building, the former Village Hall building. Previously, the Architectural Review Board approved architectural plans for this project on August 5, 2010, that included the addition of a decorative false dormer with a hip style roof added to the front of the building, new shingles for the entire roof and an adjustment of the existing roof lines that initiate from each of the four corner eaves at a typical pitch, but then rise almost vertically at the roofs' center and terminate into a rectangular parallelepiped that gave the building an unconventional appearance.

Director Rambousek stated that the proposed adjustment was intended to eliminate the rectangular parallelepiped by maintaining a continuation of the corner roof lines at the same pitch until they meet the other roof lines created by the new dormer and the roof's centerline. Unfortunately, when the construction phase started and the tear-off of the existing roof materials began it revealed that the rectangular parallelepiped actually had a functional purpose. The rectangular parallelepiped provided screening for mechanical equipment and ventilation components that protruded from the roof. Since the project was in the middle of construction, a response was requested immediately by the building owner. As a result, Director Rambousek indicated that he met with Chair Rieck on the matter and they determined that there were two solutions available to the project. The first option would be for the owners not to install the false dormer and simply re-shingle the roof as planned, which meant the roof would look like it always did. The second option would be for the false dormer to be installed as proposed with no changes being made to the corner roof lines, roof pitch or the rectangular parallelepiped.

Director Rambousek then requested a new front building elevation plan that placed the proposed false dormer on the existing roof. He stated that he then shared the drawing with Chair Rieck and they both decided that the false dormer looked very nice on the existing roof and as a result, they decided to let the project continue with this minor refinement to the approved plans.

Director Rambousek stated that for good measure he also showed the proposed modification to Tom Richart and he also felt the refinement looked appropriate on the building.

Director Rambousek continued by stating he then contacted the building owner and architect, Bruno Franceschi, and told him that the project could continue with the caveat that if the Architectural Review Board had an issue with this minor refinement at its October 14, 2010, meeting Mr. Franceschi would need to make any requested modifications, including the possible removal of the false dormer.

Director Rambousek then asked the Architectural Review Board if they had any additional issues with the project and specifically any concerns with the minor refinement to the plans.

Tom Richart mentioned that he is very pleased that even with the rectangular piece remaining the false dormer still ties into the main roof line almost perfectly.

It was the consensus of the Architectural Review Board that the minor refinement to the approved architectural plans was acceptable.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

Motion by Tom Richart, seconded by Tom Bartlein, to adjourn the meeting at 5:47 p.m. Approved unanimously.