

**Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes
April 20, 2023**

Members Present:

Kirk Albinson, Chairman
Maggie Meiners
Katie Moor
Heather Niehoff

Members Absent:

Fritz Duda
Paul Konstant
Michael Ritter

Village Staff:

David Schoon, Director of Community Development
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community
Development
Davorka Kirincic, Building and Code Enforcement
Manager

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Albinson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and took roll call of the Board Members present.

Public Comments:

No comments were made at this time.

Approval of Minutes:

a. Approval of March 16, 2023, Meeting Minutes

Chairman Albinson asked for a motion to approve the March 16, 2023, meeting minutes. A motion was made by Ms. Moor and seconded by Ms. Niehoff. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

NAYS: None

Continued Applications:

a. **Case No. 23-04-SU: 564 Green Bay Road - New Mixed-Use Building: An amended application submitted by 564 Green Bay LLC, seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new four-story mixed-use building. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. This item was continued from the March 16, 2023, Board meeting.**

Ms. Klaassen referred to the complementary comments made by the DRB at the March meeting, related to the design while outlining their concerns in connection with the building materials and fourth floor setback. She explained the changes to the proposed design including the setback on the fourth floor, the mansard roof and replacement of the EIFS panels with brick. Ms. Klaassen then referred to illustrations comparing the originally proposed building elevations to the amended elevations. She noted the rear building elevation may change in order to comply with the minimum clearance requirements between powerlines and the proposed building. Ms. Klaassen also referred to the special use application to allow street level parking and zoning variations for the rear yard setback and the number of parking spaces provided. She informed the Board the ZBA voted 4 to 0 to recommend approval of the requested relief and the Plan Commission is scheduled to consider the special use at its next meeting on April 26. Ms.

1 Klaassen stated the Board is to make a recommendation to the Village Council as to whether the proposed
2 design complied with the Certificate of Appropriateness standards with a draft motion for the Board to
3 consider included on page 15. She then asked if there were any questions.
4

5 Chairman Albinson also asked if there were any questions and informed the audience as to how the
6 meeting would proceed in terms of order. No questions were raised at this time. He then asked for the
7 applicant's presentation.
8

9 Xander Jacobs introduced himself to the Board as the project architect and provided authentic limestone
10 samples to the Board for their review. He noted the other materials remained the same and identified the
11 new mansard standing seam metal roof materials. Mr. Jacobs stated they addressed all of the Board's
12 previous comments which he described as an improvement. He then asked if there were any questions.
13

14 Ms. Niehoff stated the revisions addressed the Board's concerns with the proposed project being a great
15 improvement. She asked if the area from the second floor elevation down contained all natural stone or
16 a material mix. Mr. Jacobs responded there would be no fiberglass and there would be an authentic stone
17 surface. Ms. Niehoff referred to the height of the wall sconces and clearance requirements. Mr. Jacobs
18 stated they would be installed at the standard height. No additional questions were raised at this time.
19

20 Chairman Albinson then asked if there were any comments from the audience. Carolina Polo, 558 Arbor
21 Vitae, questioned the number of building residents as well as parking and traffic concerns. Chairman
22 Albinson informed the audience of the items within the Board's purview. Paul Lazarre, 564 Green Bay LLC,
23 stated those concerns would be addressed at the appropriate meeting. No additional comments were
24 made at this time.
25

26 Chairman Albinson then called the matter in for discussion. The Board Members agreed the revised
27 proposal is an improvement. Chairman Albinson then asked for a motion and referred to the findings on
28 page 7. Ms. Meiners moved to recommend approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed
29 four story mixed-use building on the subject property. Ms. Moor seconded the motion. A vote was taken
30 and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

31 AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

32 NAYS: None
33

34 **Case No. 23-03-DR: 594 Green Bay Road - Baird & Warner: Sign Permit and Sign Code Variation to allow**
35 **window decal signs. This item was continued from the March 16, 2023, Board meeting. The Applicant**
36 **has withdrawn this application. The Board will not be taking action on this item.**

37 Chairman Albinson noted the application was withdrawn by the applicant.
38

39 **New Applications:**

40 a. **Case No. 21-03-DR: 818 Elm Street – Bliss Salon: Sign Permit and Sign Code Variation to allow**
41 **two existing window signs on storefront windows.**

42 Chairman Albinson stated the sign was installed during the pandemic without permit approval. He then
43 summarized the application noting the sign did not comply and required a variance. Chairman Albinson
44 commented in the spirit of the new design guidelines and amount of void space in the logo, he had no
45 issue with the sign and described it as aesthetically pleasing. He stated he would be in favor of approving
46 the variance request. The Board Members agreed with Chairman Albinson's comments.
47

Chairman Albinson then asked for a motion. Ms. Niehoff moved to approve the signage design for Bliss Salon as presented. Ms. Meiners seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

NAYS: None

b. Case No. 23-02-DR: 557 Chestnut Street – Bunny & Babe: Sign Permit to allow window decal signs and Awning permit to allow awning.

Peyton Merrill, the owner, informed the Board this is their third space and the Board approved awnings and logos at their other two locations which are similar for this application. Chairman Albinson asked if there were any comments from the audience. No comments were made at this time.

Chairman Albinson then asked for a motion. Ms. Moor moved to approve the request as presented. Ms. Niehoff seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

NAYS: None

c. Case No. 23-07-DR: 1010 Green Bay Road – Bank of America: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow installation of new exterior building lighting.

Mark Francis of Continental Electrical Construction stated he represented the applicant and they are installing replacement fixtures as well as several new fixtures. He noted the overall lighting on the property would not increase but would be improved. Chairman Albinson asked if there were any questions. Mr. Francis explained where the light fixtures would be located which is where the columns meet the roof.

Ms. Meiners stated several fixtures would be installed at 18 feet 9 inches and questioned their location on the building elevation. Chairman Albinson identified the Board's concerns relating to the fixture location. Ms. Moor asked for a description of the current illumination compared to the proposal. Mr. Francis responded he did not have the photometric information and identified the fixtures to be replaced and described the current lighting's illumination. Ms. Moor suggested the fixtures not be easily visible. Ms. Meiners suggested alternative locations and asked the applicant to provide additional information.

Chairman Albinson stated the Board can either vote on the request or continue the application to a future meeting with the applicant to present alterations based on the Board's comments. Mr. Francis asked the Board to continue the matter.

Chairman Albinson then asked for a motion to continue the application to the May 18, 2023, meeting. Ms. Moor noted the Board's preference for the lighting to be concealed as well as for additional information to be provided. Ms. Meiners then moved to continue the application to the May 18, 2023, meeting. Ms. Moor seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

NAYS: None

d. Case No. 23-08-DR: 64 Green Bay Road – Aboyer: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow an existing temporary pergola to become a permanent structure.

Michael Lachowicz, the owner, stated they received the Village's permission to erect a temporary pergola at the rear of the property, during the pandemic, to allow for the placement of propane heaters and he would like to make the pergola a permanent structure. Chairman Albinson asked if there were any

1 questions. Ms. Niehoff commented it is fine and asked for it to be painted white. Mr. Lachowicz agreed
2 with Ms. Niehoff's suggestion.

3
4 Ms. Meiners moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition the pergola be
5 painted white. Ms. Niehoff seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed,
6 4 to 0:

7 AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

8 NAYS: None
9

10 e. **Case No. 23-09-DR: 962-964 Green Bay Road – Fence: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow**
11 **installation of a backyard fence on a commercial property that is visible from a public street.**

12 Kathy Sanchez, the building owner's wife, stated the request is to install a fence to delineate the backyard
13 and install a perennial garden for the tenants since there is an empty lot next door. Chairman Albinson
14 asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. Ms. Niehoff asked if there is
15 parking and Ms. Sanchez described the area.

16
17 Chairman Albinson then asked for a motion. Ms. Moor moved to approve the Certificate of
18 Appropriateness to allow the proposed fence as presented. Ms. Meiners seconded the motion. A vote
19 was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

20 AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

21 NAYS: None
22

23 f. **Case No. 22-25-PD: 714-16, 718-732, 736 & 740 Elm Street and 511 & 515 Lincoln Avenue - One-**
24 **Winnetka Preliminary Planned Development: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow construction of**
25 **new four-story mixed-use building as part of a planned development. The Village Council has final**
26 **jurisdiction on this request.**

27 Chairman Albinson explained how the matter would proceed. Mr. Schoon stated he would outline the
28 planned development process, the Village Council's comments during the concept plan stage, the zoning
29 relief being requested and summarize the changes made since the concept plan review. He stated the
30 applicant would then provide a detailed presentation.

31
32 Mr. Schoon explained the planned development process and the steps it contained beginning with the
33 preliminary concept plan review. He identified the Village Council's comments and concerns made relating
34 to the preliminary concept plan. Mr. Schoon stated following the Board's review and deliberation, the
35 application would be presented to the Planned Development Commission to review the zoning and
36 subdivision relief with the matter then being presented to the Village Council for consideration. He stated
37 if the Village Council approved the preliminary plan, the applicant would need to submit all documents
38 necessary for final plan approval noting that the Board only participated in the preliminary plan review
39 stage, provided the final plan represents the approved preliminary plan.
40

41 Mr. Schoon then described the One Winnetka site which did not include the Village owned parking lot on
42 Elm Street. He noted the new Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the Village Council on Tuesday and
43 identified the various land use classifications for the site, and he noted the proposed project is consistent
44 with the Comprehensive Plan and current zoning. He referred to a summary of the project which includes
45 residential rental units, ground floor commercial space and lower level parking. Mr. Schoon then identified
46 the changes made to the plan as a result of the Village Council's comments. He noted the Village staff
47 completed their first review of the plan and provided comments in terms of design, zoning and code
48 compliance issues which the applicant is planning to address after receiving the Board's comments.

1 Mr. Schoon stated in terms of zoning relief, he identified the relief needed which included a plat of
2 consolidation, a planned development and zoning special uses. He then identified the exceptions needed
3 for the project. Mr. Schoon stated language from the code is included in the packet for a Certificate of
4 Appropriateness along with excerpts from the design guidelines. He stated following the applicant's
5 presentation and public comment, they would like to receive the Board's initial comments on the project
6 and a motion to continue the application to a date certain.

7
8 Chairman Albinson asked for the applicant's presentation. John Talty, Chairman of OKW Architects,
9 introduced himself to the Board and identified his involvement with the project from its inception. He also
10 introduced the team who would speak to the project. Mr. Talty then referred to the PowerPoint
11 presentation and stated he would first provide a project overview including the planning effort, the
12 architecture and elevations, the streetscape, and storm water issues. He described the building's
13 components which would contain residential units on three floors and ground floor commercial space and
14 identified its access. Mr. Talty stated covered ground floor parking and underground parking would be
15 provided. He discussed the driveway vehicular access which was relocated from Elm to Lincoln to address
16 concerns with regard to underground parking which would have 116 parking spaces for the residential
17 units. He then identified the site's high and low elevation points and grade changes.

18
19 Mr. Talty stated they are cognizant of how the tenants would interact with the surrounding context with
20 the plaza being an important part of it. He described the parking and mechanical elements on the lower
21 level which would include electric vehicle charging stations. Mr. Talty also identified the residential uses
22 and access with drop-off at the front door. He described the second floor residential uses and amenity
23 spaces as well as the setbacks at upper levels to help reduce massing. Mr. Talty then described the third
24 floor residential elements noting the balconies were eliminated on the building periphery on the second
25 and third floors to address the neighbors' privacy concerns. He stated the fourth floor would be pulled
26 back even further and would include terrace space and additional views. Mr. Talty then referred to the
27 green roof strategy incorporated in the project.

28
29 Mr. Talty referred to the building's materials which would consist of brick, cast stone and fiber cement,
30 or hardy-board, to create a timely and maintenance free building as well as the roof materials, fabric
31 awnings and trellises. He identified the Lincoln and Elm Street elevations and described them in
32 comparison to the former proposal, which included Tudor architecture. Mr. Talty stated while they
33 planned to respect Tudor architectural elements, it would be used in a more modern and graceful
34 application. He referred to the Elm Street elevation which would be broken up with vertical gable
35 elements and infill pieces to break up the elements and identified the materials to be used.

36
37 Mr. Talty stated on the Lincoln Avenue elevation, it would contain commercial and residential uses with
38 the primary residential access point to the south. He also identified the grade level parking access with a
39 ramp leading to below grade parking for the building residents. He identified the south elevation and
40 materials without balconies. Mr. Talty stated the east elevation would provide a view into the second
41 floor courtyard and noted the transformers would not be located where they are currently identified and
42 described the building materials, landscaping and parking. He also described the revised contemporary
43 courtyard and its materials as well as the walkway scale and residential entry. He noted some parking and
44 tenant signage has been addressed with tenant signage to come before the Board at a later date, noting
45 there would be a need for blade signage. Mr. Talty then referred to several elevations to provide a
46 streetscape view and their attempts to break up the building scale and massing along with 3D images of
47 the site. He also identified shadow studies and referred to additional renderings from various elevations
48 which would be respectful of streetscape element requirements on Lincoln and Elm. He described the

1 fourth floor element coloring and pedestrian views of the building along with parking and the ramp, the
2 courtyard elements and private terraces.

3
4 Katherine Talty, the landscape architect, informed the Board they are still working with the Village's
5 streetscape consultant to determine how to treat some of the streetscape while attempting to address
6 the standards. She referred to the Elm Street elevation which would contain standard landscape elements
7 used elsewhere in the Village and then referred to the Lincoln Avenue elevation where vehicular use was
8 reduced to expand the public sidewalk. Along Lincoln, Ms. Talty identified planters to be used and the
9 green area in front of the building as well as the residential entrance where emphasized plantings would
10 be used along with the possibility for a bench. Ms. Talty stated they plan to mirror the same elements
11 used across the street near Hometown on the widened sidewalk area which would contain standard
12 planters, light fixtures and furniture. She then described the plaza at the Elm and Lincoln corner and
13 material change to be incorporated for which they currently plan to create an overhead canopy of trees
14 and include sculptural furniture. She reiterated the landscape plans are a work in progress.

15
16 Ms. Talty then described the second floor landscape amenities which were divided into active and open
17 zones and can contain furniture, grills and planters. She described the open area to be used for communal
18 or intimate gatherings.

19
20 Mr. Talty stated with regard to lighting there would be public lighting along the streetscape, the
21 intersection, the covered pedestrian walkway and parking area, and for the retail locations on Elm and
22 Lincoln. He noted the photometrics were sensitively considered and that the parking garage needed to be
23 well lit for vehicular and pedestrian safety. Mr. Talty also identified sconces which would be mounted
24 outside the wall of the residential areas and referred to an illustration of the lighting sources for the
25 project. He then stated the project is very important to the Village and confirmed they are working hard
26 to get the project done which is needed in the community. Mr. Talty then asked if there were any
27 questions.

28
29 Chairman Albinson then asked for public comment to be limited to three minutes. Frank Petrek, 711 Oak
30 Street, stated Mr. Talty has been very responsive in working with them as the next door neighbors. He
31 then referred to an area on the illustration for the south end of the property which represented their
32 building and their view of the project and questioned the 3-foot setback and asked if there would be a
33 zero foot setback. He also referred to the second and third floor terraces on the south elevation and asked
34 for an explanation of them. Mr. Petrek then referred to another area on the illustration he described as a
35 bump out and asked if the terrace above it would be exaggerated.

36
37 Carolina Polo, 558 Arbor Vitae, described the presentation as great and agreed the Tudor façade went
38 great with the Village and the different materials break up the building's monotony. She also commented
39 favorably on the mirroring of the streetscape on Elm Street and the tree canopy. Ms. Polo then stated she
40 is concerned with the building height and commented the middle portion felt disjointed. She stated the
41 limited building heights in the Village is what made the Village and also stated she is concerned with the
42 pedestrian walkway to the west parking lot in terms of safety. Ms. Polo also stated she is concerned with
43 regard to the shadows generated by the building height as well as the difficulties of parking and the
44 possibility of noise generated by outdoor gathering spaces.

45
46 Elandro Romero, 558 Arbor Vitae, questioned the variation process in terms of the height request with
47 the request asking for 50% additional height. No additional comments were made at this time.
48

1 Chairman Albinson called the matter in for discussion. Ms. Meiners thanked the applicant for their
2 presentation and commented the proposal is great. She stated her two concerns related to the globe
3 lighting in the pedestrian walkway and the fourth floor height and suggested they work to keep the same
4 aesthetic with a lower height. Ms. Moor agreed with the comments made and referred to the Elm Street
5 façade and walkway entrance which she commented appeared unsymmetrical. She asked if they
6 considered a more symmetrical design. She also agreed with the fourth floor comments and questioned
7 the ceiling heights and pergolas on Elm Street and suggested they be lowered. Ms. Moor then stated she
8 is not in favor of the globe lighting and suggested a more traditional and contemporary fixture be used.
9 She then referred to the amount of awning colors on the Hoffman building and suggested the awning
10 color be blended more. Ms. Moor then concluded she liked the plan which would add a lot to the amount
11 of real estate in town.

12
13 Chairman Albinson asked for the applicant to respond to the issues raised. Mr. Talty stated there are other
14 four story buildings in town which are not modern in terms of function. He referred to the 5-foot grade
15 change which affected the height and noted floor to floor heights matter for the ground floor commercial
16 space and the residences. Mr. Talty stated the ground floor height is 15 feet and identified the residential
17 ceiling heights as 9 foot 6 inches with the fourth floor having a 10-foot high ceiling with the anticipation
18 of having discriminating tenants. He described the building as being very transparent with an elegant and
19 graceful residential experience which drove the height. Mr. Talty stated if the ceiling heights were
20 reduced, a 3-foot reduction of building height would be imperceptible and stated otherwise, a three-story
21 building would not work. He stated the street experience was lessened with the fourth floor being unseen
22 from the street. Mr. Talty added the building height is also a function of construction of a concrete base
23 which contained a ceiling structure containing 2 feet for mechanical ductwork, electrical, etc.

24
25 Chairman Albinson asked if the parapet height above the fourth floor can be lowered and Mr. Talty
26 responded there is a minimal parapet and noted the mechanical room is located there. He noted there
27 would be a large room on the fourth floor to house the mechanical equipment which would not generate
28 a lot of noise.

29
30 Mr. Talty then stated he understood the comments relating to the globe fixtures which would be revised
31 in the next iteration. He also stated in terms of security, there would be security and cameras installed for
32 the pedestrian walkway and parking lot. Mr. Talty stated with regard to the south wall, he referred to the
33 0-foot setback which is the parking lot wall and identified setbacks in several areas noting the building
34 would walk back as it extended upward. He then identified 116 dedicated parking spaces for the
35 residences, an additional 38 public parking spaces, Elm Street parking remaining unchanged and an
36 overall net loss of a few on-street parking spaces. Mr. Talty described the amount of parking as parking
37 neutral. He stated the parking area would be quiet and for medical or office ground floor uses, they would
38 not consume parking more than other uses would with the development being responsive to parking
39 concerns.

40
41 Ms. Moor questioned how the first floor ceiling heights compared to Hometown across the street. Mr.
42 Talty responded finished ceiling heights would be 12 feet and explained how ceiling heights could be used
43 to the tenant's advantage.

44
45 Ms. Meiners asked if there could be a building design which would make the height appear less. Mr. Talty
46 responded the fourth floor roof was intentionally made flat and the color would make it disappear. He
47 referred to the materials which he described as intentional and stated it would not loom from the

1 pedestrian perspective. He noted height was their concern initially and they tried hard to lessen it. Mr.
2 Talty noted the window height is 8½ feet.

3
4 Chairman Albinson suggested different coloring be used for the fourth floor to reduce the visual impact
5 and suggested a color study be done. He also suggested the window head height on the fourth floor be
6 altered to underscore the tall ceiling height. Mr. Talty agreed to consider optional color permutations. He
7 also stated they have to consider head height relative to the fourth floor ceiling.

8
9 Ms. Niehoff disclosed she knew John Murphy and confirmed there would be no conflict of interest. She
10 then described the presentation as thorough and stated it is important for something to happen on the
11 site. Ms. Niehoff then stated she struggled with the design and what does the site mean to the Village.
12 She described buildings which are prominent three corner entries to the Village and the consideration of
13 what can be done for this site. Ms. Niehoff then stated she is not personally in favor of Tudor but if they
14 chose to go with Tudor, she described it as a challenge. She asked for more design clarity that takes more
15 ownership over an aesthetic. Ms. Niehoff stated with regard to the height, this is a big project and she
16 understood the floor heights being a requirement in terms of marketability. She also stated with regard
17 to the fourth floor, she referred to the Elm and Lincoln facades and commented the west (Lincoln) side is
18 the most successful. Ms. Niehoff also commented on the Lincoln Avenue façade and suggested the Elm
19 Street façade needed more of that type of treatment. She agreed with Chairman Albinson's comments
20 relating to the fourth floor coloring in terms of continuity.

21
22 Mr. Talty informed the Board that in a previous iteration, the fourth floor was waterfalled to the grade to
23 better integrate with the pedestrian experience. Ms. Niehoff commented she would like to see more
24 clarity in terms of the overall design. Chairman Albinson agreed with Ms. Niehoff's comments and referred
25 to the scale and repetition but stated it gets lost on Elm Street. He then suggested more study be done in
26 that it felt disjointed.

27
28 Ms. Meiners commented she is fine with the height on Lincoln Avenue's west side. Mr. Talty explained
29 the appearance of the height elevation and its view. Ms. Niehoff suggested the use of a more vertical and
30 larger fenestration on the Elm Street side. She also referred to fenestration issues relating to the windows
31 and suggested it be broken up compared to the Lincoln Avenue commercial side. The Board members
32 discussed the awning color. Mr. Talty suggested awnings not be used on every bay when they do not serve
33 a purpose. Ms. Niehoff agreed with the concerns relating to the walkway safety issues and suggested it
34 be softened with acoustics. Mr. Talty informed the Board they have engaged in discussions with regard to
35 using public art in certain areas.

36
37 Chairman Albinson then read new Board Member Fritz Duda's comments relating to the new application
38 into the record as follows: "One Winnetka PD: In general, I support staff's review comments on design of
39 building, signage, hardscape and landscape. Specifically: (a) I commend the applicant on the proposed
40 plaza at the corner of Elm and Lincoln and believe this proposed space will not only be useful, but a fitting
41 asset to the community; (b) Applicant's response to Village Council's initial comments appear both well
42 thought out and well executed; (c) It appears "Uses" fall within the Design Guidelines and thus subject to
43 DRB review. If so, I would consider medical and financial uses to fall within customary retail/commercial
44 uses today and are typical in Winnetka's downtown area. I would also note that due to (what I believe
45 are) permanent changes to the distribution channel, a higher level of flexibility should be afforded to
46 property owners; (d) staff's comment regarding the trellis elements along the east elevation should be
47 considered, as trellises on the northern portion of such elevation (near Elm Street sidewalk) would be
48 more important than trellises on the southern portion of such wall. After reviewing site conditions, I do

1 not believe the trellises along the western portion of the southern wall are necessary, as the neighboring
2 property has a parallel access drive adjacent, with a landscaped island planned in-between.”
3

4 Chairman Albinson stated he agreed with the comments made and described the presentation and project
5 as well done. He then stated the project is not at a point where the Board can sign off on landscaping,
6 lighting ,signage, and awnings. Chairman Albinson stated with regard to materials and fixtures and tree
7 types, he stated as part of the Board’s recommendation to the Village Council for those items could be
8 specifically be omitted from the recommendation and the applicant come back before the Board to review
9 those items.
10

11 Chairman Albinson then stated he agreed with the Board Members’ comments in terms of the fourth floor
12 requiring further study with regard to coloring, the design being integral with the rest of the building,
13 rhythm and scale and if there is a way to make the solids appear less solid and less top heavy and maximize
14 glass use. He also stated he agreed with Ms. Niehoff’s comments relating to the design and Tudor use and
15 the suggestion that it be more authentic to modern sensibility. Chairman Albinson also encouraged the
16 applicant to reinterpret that style in a modern way if they decide to use it. He also referred to the tight
17 gables on the third floor dormers and suggested they be more consistently spaced and show more of the
18 sloped roofline. He suggested the use of a half-height railing over the residential entrance to make it feel
19 lighter. Chairman Albinson then referred to the walkway to the commercial parking area and agreed with
20 the comments made and suggested it be bricked and add a cast stone base with indirect light. He also
21 stated for the parking lot floor plan, he suggested the elimination of the block walls on the south and east
22 sides to allow for natural light and ventilation. Mr. Talty responded they cannot penetrate those walls
23 since it is 0-foot lot line.
24

25 Chairman Albinson also suggested the use of light wells in connection with landscaping for the pedestrian
26 walkway intersecting with the parking lot to make it feel more inviting. Mr. Talty informed the Board the
27 use of stone was intentionally used on one corner to make it more solid. He agreed the use of some of
28 the materials the Board mentioned can be investigated to make them more authentic. Chairman Albinson
29 described the site as the largest site to ever be developed in the community and challenged the applicant
30 to make it an award winning project. He also referred to the modern box residential entrance and
31 suggested in connection with the side elevation being a blank wall, to rethink it three-dimensionally.
32

33 Chairman Albinson then stated he appreciated the applicant’s initial pass and recommended the matter
34 be continued until the next meeting. Mr. Talty provided the material board to the Board for their review.
35 Ms. Niehoff suggested the proposed brick’s photo adjacent to the existing brick on the two buildings to
36 the north be provided to ensure a more accurate color comparison. The Board members commented on
37 several of the items on the material board. Ms. Meiners suggested the view of the proposed building from
38 the Elm Street bridge be considered. Mr. Talty suggested the use of more glass would provide
39 transparency. Chairman Albinson suggested a rendering from the Elm Street bridge’s high point be done,
40 and Mr. Talty agreed. Ms. Niehoff referred to the turret on the bank building at Green Bay and Elm and
41 noted that the proposed building could be a signature element such as that one. Mr. Talty stated balance
42 would be provided and they planned to take advantage of the corner.
43

44 Chairman Albinson asked for a motion to continue the matter to the May 18, 2023, meeting. Ms. Niehoff
45 moved to continue the matter to the May 18, 2023, meeting. Ms. Meiners seconded the motion. A vote
46 was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

47 AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

48 NAYS: None

1 **Other Business.**

2 a. May 18, 2023, Meeting – Quorum Check.

3 The Board Members discussed their availability.
4

5 **Adjournment:**

6 Chair Albinson asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Niehoff and seconded
7 by Ms. Moor. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

8 AYES: Albinson, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

9 NAYS: None

10 The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m.
11

12 Respectfully submitted,

13
14 Antionette Johnson

15 Recording Secretary