

**Oak Park Historic Preservation Commission  
Architectural Review Committee  
September 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes  
Oak Park Village Hall, Room 215 – 7:30 pm**

**A. ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Garret Eakin, Rosanne McGrath, Tom Sundling  
ABSENT: Greg Battaglia, Frank Heitzman  
STAFF: Douglas Kaarre, Urban Planner/Historic Preservation

**B. MINUTES**

- C. 702 N. Elmwood Avenue (Kiker): Provide feedback on revisions to south bay addition (forwarded from the September 12 HPC meeting)**

Amias Turman and Greg Sutton, Airoom Architects, were present on behalf of the applicants.

Mr. Turman provided an overview of the three options that are being presented based on comments from the September 12 HPC meeting.

- Option A: Equal sided bay like the existing bay, with lower eaves on the dormer and flat roof.
- Option B: Square bay with lower eaves on the dormers.
- Option C: Smaller bay similar to existing with a square roof and modified roof line with hip roof dormers.

Commissioner McGrath stated that the shape of the bay in Option C helps break down the scale of the addition. The dormer peak appears taller. The way the porch roof interacts with the bay works well in Option A.

The Committee discussed the porch connection with the bay, the porch design and depth.

Mr. Sutton noted that Option C raised the roof eave line of the house in order to raise the ridge line, although there is no change in pitch. He explained that new codes would require thicker floor and roof dimensions, reducing available height in the attic.

Following discussion by the Committee on the issue of rebuilding the roof, Commissioner McGrath suggested reorganizing the attic space to eliminate the need for a south-facing dormer. It was noted that the proposal creates many roofs on the property.

Mr. Sutton stated that many corner houses have four dormers – one on each side.

The Committee discussed ways to minimize the appearance of a raised roof line, such as adding height in the frieze band. Although the measurement of additional height is unknown at this time, it would be less than 12 inches.

Commissioner Eakin stated that he would not support raising it 12 inches.

Commissioner McGrath stated that the impact of the roof alteration will depend on its appearance. She suggested they consider looking at ways to keep the eave line the same in relation to the second floor windows.

The Committee suggested looking at a new option based on variations on Options A and C.

Commissioner Sundling stated that the rectangular shape of Option B works if it is not as deep.

Commissioner Eakin agreed that it would differentiate it as new construction.

The Committee provided the following direction:

- a) Consider reorganizing the attic floor plan to eliminate the need for a south-facing dormer
- b) Consider using the bay design as shown in Options A and C
- c) Making the roof of the bay the same slope as the roof on the house would preclude the need for a dormer (assuming interior reorganization)
- d) They requested more information on changes to the eave line/ridge height. Show how this alteration will appear.
- e) Either the octagon or square bay shape could be supported depending on meeting the suggested eave configuration
- f) The smaller square bay with no south-facing dormer would be the most appropriate solution.
- g) Resolve how the porch and bay interact through the use of a square or octagonal bay.

**ADJOURN**

*Motion by Eakin to adjourn. Second by Sundling. Motion approved: 3-0.*

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m. Minutes prepared by Douglas Kaarre, Urban Planner.

U:\CPD\_Strategic\Community Planning\HISTORIC PRESERVATION\HPC Agendas and Minutes\2013\2013 Minutes\2013-09-25-historic-preservation-commission-architectural-review-committee-minutes.doc