

Architectural Review Committee

April 01, 2015
Meeting Minutes

Minutes of The Architectural Review Committee ("ARC") of the Prairie Crossing Homeowners Association, which held a meeting on Wednesday, April 01, 2015 at 7:00 pm at the Yellow Farmhouse, 32400 N. Harris Road, Grayslake, IL.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Natarajan called the meeting to order at approximately 7:03p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon a call of the roll, the following persons were:

Present: Members David Husemoller, Dave Carpenter and Sandi Morris; Klaus Wisiol (PCHOA Board Liaison); Colleen Liberacki, recording secretary.

Absent: Joe Marencik

Homeowner Forum

Jeremiah and Kimberly presented their request for a replacement door with transoms; Brian Colon presented his request for a screened-in porch and window/door replacement; Jim Curran presented his request for a replacement sidewalk with pavers and buried rain downspouts; all details can be found under New Review Requests.

Minutes

A motion was made by Carpenter to approve the February 04, 2015 meeting minutes, and seconded by Morris; the motion was carried unanimously. The meeting notes from March 04, 2015 were taken and formally received, as there was no quorum for the March meeting.

Old Business

Previously Discussed Review Requests

- A. R15-004, Rebecca & Andrew Van De Weghe, 1546 Lupine Ct, Lot# 248, dated 3/4/2015. The homeowner submitted an application along with neighbor comments and plat of survey requesting removal of one sickly maple tree, one lilac bush, replacement of pavers with flagstone path, replacement of existing fire pit, installation of two arbors/pergolas, various landscaping and one water feature.

The homeowner did initially contact the ARC via email and gave a chance for ARC members to review the request and pose questions. Joe Marencik and David Husemoller had questions that were relayed and posed by Chairwoman Natarajan. There was a concern how tall would the arbors be and a picture, specs and a sample of the material used were requested. There was a question how tall the raised plant beds would be and a request for more definition and image of the proposed water feature. Chairwoman Natarajan requested input from the neighbors directly behind the homeowner, since they

would have full view of all of the improvements. Wisiol noted that the land was flat and not elevated in any way as to cause a more obvious view of the suggested improvements. Andrew Van De Weghe noted the committee's concerns, and advised the group that he would confer with his landscape architect, Tim Garland and would address all questions satisfactorily. **Chairwoman Natarajan noted that Husemoller would be following up with homeowner to guide them towards a successful project application and address concerns/questions that were posed.**

04/01/15 Husemoller reported that lattice must be horizontal or vertical, per the guidelines and believed the structure to be more like a portico rather than an arbor. He had a picture of the proposed 18"H raised garden bed and corresponding guideline 4.05, item#3 stated that approval was only required for said structure, should it exceed 18" in height. Regarding the patio, Morris consulted guideline 2.07, which did not specify the color of stone, but stated patio size must be in proportion to the house size. Husemoller advised that natural stain is preferable to white for the portico, especially after the vines would become established around the structure. He still needed to inquire about the details of the water structure and patio size. Chairwoman Natarajan solicited additional questions from those present, however, none were offered. **Chairwoman Natarajan requested that an approval letter be sent to the homeowner, pending receipt of water feature details and patio sizes.**

Previously Discussed Violations

None.

New Business

New Review Requests

- A. R15-005, Kenton Longenecker, 1371 Osage Orange Road, Lot# 27, dated 4/1/2015. The homeowner submitted an application along with sample color and window design to replace three second floor windows in the front and one window on the side of the house with Anderson windows; "Canvas" color exterior trim. He further stated that the windows were not an exact replacement, but very close, and the installation cost was driving the decision not to replace all the windows at the same time.

Carpenter consulted guideline 2.06, item#4, which stated that windows must be architecturally appropriate for each style of house. Husemoller replied that this was the Olmsted style house, with blue siding. Chairwoman Natarajan questioned what the window model/style name was, other than double-hung window insert frame and which windows were being replaced, since there were total of 7 front windows. Morris wanted a more detailed picture of the existing windows for a match comparison. Chairwoman Natarajan polled other members and all agreed that pending receipt of aforementioned information, a letter acknowledging exact replacement could be sent. **Chairwoman Natarajan requested that a letter be sent to the homeowner, pending receipt of window style/model name and comparison picture of existing windows.**

- B.** R15-006, Aimee Reissenweber, 520 Switchgrass Lane, Lot# 12, dated 3/26/2015. The homeowner submitted an application along with plat of survey, picture of desired installation and examples in the neighborhood for erection of a split double rail fence backed with wire fencing located around the back of the house all the way to the perimeter of the lot; rails 35”H, posts 40”H. Chairwoman Natarajan stated that guideline 2.04, item#5 allowed picket fences, and some variations thereof; and guideline 2.04, item#7 stated the fence color must be the same as house trim, 36”H maximum. Husemoller noted that this was a meadow lot, to which Chairwoman Natarajan added that only a courtyard fence was allowed with this type of lot configuration. The courtyard fence was defined as an attachment to the house, either parallel or perpendicular to the exterior walls. Husemoller noted that another application for a split rail was denied last year, and Carpenter felt this was the same principle, citing non-conformity to the PC style and Pattern book. The two sample pictures furnished were from 1) the Wisiol residence, which was 18”H and considered landscaping, not fencing and 2) the other example on Hedgerow was presently in dispute with the guidelines. **Chairwoman Natarajan and all present determined that this application could not be approved and would like a letter sent to homeowner explaining the reasons.**
- C.** R15-007, Mike & Tracy Verciglio, 592 Bluestem Lane, Lot# 1, dated 3/30/2015. The homeowner submitted an application along with plat of survey, photo of desired installation, neighbor comments and Warren Edwards Builder proposal for a replacement of their front porch, which would be 1’ deeper and run the width of the house. The decking material will be the composite Timber Tech and the bare cedar wood would be stained white. They also stated that the existing brick paver walkway would be reconfigured to accommodate the new step width and location. All present agreed that this project application was complete and could be approved. **Chairwoman Natarajan requested that an approval letter be sent to the homeowner.**
- D.** R15-008, Jim & Tammy Curran, 1190 Prairie Trail, Lot# 57, dated 3/30/2015. The homeowner submitted an application along with plat of survey, photo brochure of desired installation, neighbor comments and Lester’s proposal for a sidewalk replacement with Town Hall 3 color blend of pavers and 2 pop-up emitters to handle the buried rain gutter downspouts and their drainage into the front swale. Husemoller suggested to the homeowner that perforation towards the end of the drainpipe would assist with better water distribution. They also attained assurances that the buried pipe would not be sticking out in the swale. All present agreed that this project application was complete and could be approved. **Chairwoman Natarajan requested that an approval letter be sent to the homeowner.**
- E.** R15-009, Jeremiah & Kimberly Husko, 1463 Sunflower Court, Lot# 226, dated 4/1/2015. The homeowner submitted an application along with photo brochure of a replacement front door: Reliabil manufacturer, Calista style (Eclipse color) that has top half beveled and deco glass along with top and side transoms with same features. They were lacking neighbor comments and Chairwoman Natarajan asked that they request and forward same to ARC via email. [Note: Neighbor Comment Received 4/2] Members were hesitant to embrace the style, however, nothing in the guidelines gave guidance, other than to say it must be architecturally appropriate for the house and neighborhood style. Husemoller volunteered to talk to the homeowners to explained that the curving lines were

inconsistent with the geometric patterns found throughout PC and perhaps they could select another design. Wisiol also thought that it did not fit the present style of house. Chairwoman Natarajan felt that a decision would be pending receipt of a report from Husemoller how the homeowner responded to their suggestion. **Chairwoman Natarajan directed that a decision would be delayed until Husemoller reported the results of conversation with homeowners.**

- F. R15-010, Brian & Elizabeth Conlon, 1236 Hedgerow Drive, Lot# 138, dated 4/1/2015. The homeowner submitted an application along with plat of survey, drawing of desired installation, specs and Warren Edwards Builder proposal for an installation of a screened-in porch 17' x 22', stained white, covering one half of his existing deck and also replacing 2 kitchen windows and a door with another matching 2 windows and door in a different order. They have renters on both sides, so neighbor comments were not necessary. The homeowner wanted the floor inside the screened-in porch to be either natural or stained a dark gray. It was noted that other homeowners have adopted a variation of gray for their stain or composite decking. Conlon indicated that he was rather anxious to start the project and wondered when he would hear from the ARC. Chairwoman Natarajan replied that the guidelines provide that the ARC must issue a decision upon receipt of a completed application within 7 – 30 days, however, she would do what she could to move this request along. Chairwoman Natarajan polled all members, who felt the application was complete and in compliance with PC guidelines, so it could be approved. **Chairwoman Natarajan requested that an approval letter be sent to the homeowner.**

New Violations

It was noted that 1493 Potawatomie (Waste Management house) had a fence that was deteriorating, and it has finally falling apart and needed a violation letter to communicate the disrepair. A house on lot# 130 located on the south side of Hedgerow and Harris had a cinderblock fire pit, a material that would never be permitted and no application for any fire pit received. Colleen Liberacki will advise Heather McArthur of both violations to follow up for correction.

Other Agenda Items

Carpenter noted that since his previous announcement of leaving the ARC, he would not likely attend any more meetings unless a quorum was needed. He also presented a list of all completed projects for which he was responsible, a product of his last efforts to wrap up loose ends. Chairwoman Natarajan asked Morris to take over the duties of writing a Meadow Mix article for the ARC.

There was a previous discussion about rescheduling the 7/1/15 ARC meeting, since it was taking place during the holiday week and many people would be departing. Other suggested dates were: 6/24, 7/8 or keeping 7/1. Chairwoman Natarajan polled all members, who felt the 6/24/15 date would be the most agreeable date for everyone's schedule. She requested that Colleen Liberacki advise Tom Herrera, webmaster of the date change to affect the PC website.

Chairwoman Natarajan stated she received an email request for information about raised beds and she would reply according to the guidelines. Chairwoman Natarajan also noted email discussions about the ARC receiving unsolicited questions from prospective home buyers or real

estate agents inquiring about rules and guidelines. She felt that all inquiries should be responded to by the Board and/or Premier Management. She felt that the ARC may provide input, but the official reply should be from the Board and/or Premier Management.

Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the ARC will be at the Yellow Farmhouse at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 6, 2015. The subsequent meetings of 2015 are as follows: June 3, June 24, August 5, September 2, October 7, November 4, and December 2.

Adjournment

Carpenter made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:15p.m, seconded by Husemoller. The motion was carried unanimously.

Colleen Liberacki, Recording Secretary

This document is subject to correction as noted on next meeting's minutes.