

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING OF  
THE VILLAGE OF KENILWORTH HELD AT THE VILLAGE HALL, 419 RICHMOND ROAD AT  
7:00 P.M. ON MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2005.

Chairman John McGinnis was present and called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Max Slankard acted as Secretary and called the roll as follows:

Present:	John McGinnis	Chairman
	Beth Baxter	Member
	Bob Smietana	Member
	Tim Dugan	Member
	Craig Miller	Member
Absent:	Bill Folland	Member
	Cristy Laier	Member
Other Village Officials Present:	Max Slankard	Village Manager
	Jackie Bossu	Village Trustee
	Robert Hastings	Village Clerk
Others Present:	Nefrette Halim	533 Roslyn Road
	Kim Thames	614 Wayland Avenue
	Mary Ann Feeney	503 Kenilworth Avenue
	John Mangel	205 Melrose Avenue
	Heidi Mangel	205 Melrose Avenue
	Kathy Barnett	626 Wayland Avenue
	Curtis Barnett	626 Wayland Avenue
	Bill Holland	342 Sterling Road
	R.F. Seebeck	523 Sheridan Road
	Manon Seebeck	523 Sheridan Road
	Sigrid Sola	243 Leicester Road
	Kenner Davis	716 Kent Road
	Ken Davis	716 Kent Road
	Sally Hagan	260 Oxford Road
	Avani Mehta	206 Cumberland Avenue
	Ann Dumler	645 Melrose Avenue
	John Roberts	521 Kenilworth Avenue
	Pat Babb	349 Ridge Road

Chairman McGinnis opened the meeting. The first item of business was the approval of the minutes of the July 14, 2005 meeting. Mr. Dugan made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Baxter seconded the motion which, upon voice vote, was unanimously approved.

Chairman McGinnis advised that the Committee would be taking a tour this evening, as indicated on the agenda. He distributed the route to the Committee and those in attendance, and the elements of focus for each particular street. The Committee then embarked on its tour at 7:15 p.m.

The Committee reconvened at Village Hall at 8:15 p.m. The Committee then commenced its discussion of design review. The Chairman noted that the Committee had, at its last meeting, agreed to about half of the design principles. There are some lingering issues and new elements to consider tonight. If the Committee

gets through the design principles discussion, he will then call for discussion on the balance of the text in the draft document.

Mr. Dugan reviewed changes to the design principles section of the document since the last meeting. He noted a question under principle #4, asking for consideration of whether rhythm and proportion of openings in a façade should be compatible with the neighborhood. The Chairman felt that there could be two issues being confused. One issue is the proportion of openings and its interior relationship to the design of the particular home; the other is how those rhythms relate to homes around it. He felt that the Committee all agreed on internal consistency of the design. Mr. Miller noted that he stood by his previous comments from the last meeting on this issue, that the survey results indicated that residents did not want the Village to concern itself with window and door placement. The Chairman asked if the Committee wants to consider the second part of the issue. Mr. Smietana noted that was why the tour route included Robsart Road. The homes on Robsart were designed during the same period, and while they are not all the same, there are character similarities that are consistent. He felt that if a predominant element existed in a neighborhood, then it should be considered. Ms. Baxter felt if there was such a pattern, she would agree. Mr. Smietana noted that we must be careful not to create a pattern where none exists. But where a pattern is strong, a design should respond to it.

Mrs. Mary Ann Feeney added that she wouldn't want homes that stick out like a sore thumb, but would not like to see cookie cutter design either. Mr. John Mangel asked if you have a neighborhood with Georgian, Victorian and Tudor designs, you can say something must fit without naming a style. The Chairman stated that what we are trying to say is that the builder must prove that they are meeting the design principles, while not being prescriptive on style. Mrs. Kathy Barnett commented that the recommendation is for design review by professionals, not residents, who should have the skill to make good decisions on fit. Mr. Smietana commented that architects can be just as picky. The Committee is trying not to dictate style, while providing a framework so that new designs fit in. Mr. Cameel Halim commented that he felt Roslyn Road had many different styles, but they fit well together. He feels the problem is more quality than style, quality of design and construction.

The Chairman asked for the sense of the Committee. Mr. Dugan stated that perhaps where a defined pattern exists, a new home should fit into that pattern. Mr. Miller clarified if it was a prominent pattern. The Committee agreed to a revised #4 as follows:

4. Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades: The relationship of solids to voids (punched openings) in the front façade shall be appropriate in rhythm and proportion with the selected architectural style and compatible with existing prominent neighborhood patterns where they exist.

Mr. Dugan then noted principle #7 relating to roof shapes, and an open question on whether roof shapes should be visually related to other homes in the area. The Chairman stated that he was more comfortable with considering how the roof shape relates to the home design, rather than considering how the roof shape relates to other homes. Mr. Smietana agreed it should be responsive to the structure. Mr. Miller agreed with a comment that looking at a roof shape versus the neighborhood may lead to a lack of creativity of design. Mr. Smietana agreed that he did not want to limit roof shapes, and felt Mr. Halim's earlier example of Roslyn Road was a good one, as there is a diversity of roof shapes there that relate well to the individual home designs. The Chairman commented that he still wanted to encourage eclectic nature of architecture in the Village. The Committee agreed to a revised #6 as follows:

6. Roof Shapes: The roof shape(s) of a structure shall be appropriate to the design of the building and should minimize the appearance of bulk.

Mr. Halim commented that the zoning code provision allowing 3<sup>rd</sup> floor bonus space leads to roof shape issues. Mr. Miller replied that the Village had passed amendments limiting flat roof area. Mr. Halim mentioned the treatment of porch space as well. Ms. Baxter observed that zoning controls and design review go hand in hand. Mr. Smietana added that porch bonuses are part of the zoning incentives discussion that the Committee will hold later in its process.

Mr. Dugan noted principle #7 was revised as follows:

7. Scale and Massing of a Structure: The size and massing of a structure and the appearance of bulk shall be visually compatible with structures to which it is visually related.

Mr. Dugan noted a question on #8 relating to directional expression. It seemed to him that this must be considered, almost by definition, as relating to structures to which it is visually related. Ms. Baxter felt it was incredibly important in an area where there is a predominant direction of expression. Mr. Dugan advised that it doesn't say that now, but that is the issue. He felt the issue was to either take #8 out altogether or strengthening it. The Chairman stated that he hoped the Committee was not over-reacting to the house on Robsart. Mr. Smietana felt if there was an important pattern, a good designer should take that into consideration. Following discussion, Mr. Dugan advised that he would submit revised language.

Mr. Dugan noted principle #11 was new, and was drafted as follows:

11. Doors and windows of a new structure should be placed to respect the privacy of neighboring properties.

Mrs. Heidi Mangel asked when a neighbor would have input on the privacy issue. The Chairman replied that the Committee has not gotten there yet, but the design review would almost certainly entail a public hearing. With respect to the language, the Chairman indicated that he was concerned with the language, and questioned whether this would mean any second floor window that looks over a neighboring property would be an invasion of privacy. Mr. Smietana indicated concern as well. Mr. Bill Holland stated the concern should be windows that face other windows. The Chairman suggested that this be a parking lot issue for the time being, and asked for suggestions for wording revisions.

Mr. Dugan noted that principle #12 was new as well, and relates to materials. Ms. Baxter reported that she had found a number of examples of design review processes that include consideration of materials and its importance, and she read examples of their citations. The Chairman indicated a concern that requiring consistency of materials in a neighborhood this is getting close to regulation of style. Mr. Halim added his opinion that this is an important issue. Mr. Dugan noted that Lake Forest does look at materials and color palettes. Mr. Dugan commented that there should be some element of compatibility of materials. The Chairman asked what that means. Mr. Dugan replied that on Robsart Road, where the homes are consistently masonry with some stone and/or stucco, it might mean that a Victorian style would not work there. Mr. Miller felt if that meant a fine Victorian could not be built, then he does not get it. The Chairman stated concern about getting into style issues. Mr. Dugan stated that if we go into this issue, he is concerned about getting into styles too, if one of the ground rules was that the Committee was not going to go there. This is a fundamental question for the Committee. Mr. Dugan asked what the Committee could agree on. He suggested that use of high quality materials and consistency of materials with design style were elements all could agree on. He then noted consistency of a design with the predominant style in the neighborhood, if there is one. He added that he can think of only a few areas of the Village where such a style predominates. The Chairman advised he was unsettled on this issue.

Mr. Mangel noted that 80% of the survey respondents said compatibility is important. Mr. Holland observed that if it really only impacts two neighborhoods, he did not see the problem. Mr. Dugan

suggested that the Committee should think about this issue carefully. Ms. Baxter felt that if materials compatibility was not included, then the Committee would be missing an important element. Mr. Smietana observed the difficulty of evaluating a design without considering materials. Mr. Dugan noted the question of a Victorian on Robsart is important, and the Committee needs to answer that. Mr. Smietana commented that where there is a prominent, repeatable characteristic, it should be met. The Chairman suggested adding language regarding prominent repeatable characteristics and leave it at that for the time being.

Mr. Dugan noted the last new principle, #13, on front entries. He suggested that, if the entry pattern was not totally incompatible, nothing else needed to be said. The Chairman questioned whether this was already covered in principles #3 and #4. He suggested that, unless someone feels strongly otherwise, he feels it is adequately covered in #3 and #4. Mr. Dugan agreed.

The Chairman summarized that as he sees it, the Committee is in agreement on everything except #12, and a rewrite of #11. As far as materials, he felt language needed to be included that reflects the discussion.

For the next meeting on August 15, 2005, he suggested starting with a review of the balance of comments on the text and survey comments, followed by a re-visit of the principles discussion, and a review and finalization of the balance of the text. Hopefully, if time permits, discussion can begin on the process steps.

There being no further comments, Mr. Miller made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Ms. Baxter and unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Max Slankard  
Village Manager