



Agenda  
Village of Glen Ellyn  
Architectural Appearance Commission Meeting  
Tuesday, October 28, 2025  
7:00 PM  
Glen Ellyn Civic Center, Galligan Board Room

---

*Visitors are most welcome to attend all public meetings and can find copies of the Agenda online at [www.glenellyn.org](http://www.glenellyn.org) prior to the meeting. Any individual with a disability requiring reasonable accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should contact the Village of Glen Ellyn ADA Coordinator, 630-469-5000, at least five (5) business days in advance of the next scheduled meeting.*

- A. Call to Order**
- B. Old Business**
- C. New Business**
  - 1) Review and Approval of the May 14, 2025, Architectural Appearance Commission Meeting Minutes
  - 2) Exterior Appearance Review — 486 Pennsylvania Avenue, Maplewood Brewery & Distillery
- D. Chairman's Report**
- E. Trustee Liaison's Report**
- F. Staff Report**

---

Civility Pledge - In the interest of civility, I pledge to promote civility by listening, being respectful of others, acknowledging that we are striving to support and improve our community, and understanding that we each may have different ideas for achieving that objective.



**Glen Ellyn**  
535 Duane Street  
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Meeting 10/28/2025 7:00 PM  
Department: Community Development  
Department Head: Jennifer Henaghan  
Category: Minutes  
Prepared By: Daniel Harper

**AGENDA ITEM**  
(ID # 2025-899)

**DOC ID: 2025-899**

## **Review and Approval of the May 14, 2025, Architectural Apperance Commission Meeting Minutes**

### **Statement of the Issue:**

Review and Approval of the May 14, 2025, Architectural Apperance Commission Meeting Minutes

### **Analysis:**

Review and Approval of the May 14, 2025, Architectural Apperance Commission Meeting Minutes

### **Budget Impact:**

### **Contribution to Strategic Plan**

### **Action Requested:**

Review and Approval of the May 14, 2025, Architectural Apperance Commission Meeting Minutes

### **Attachments:**

1. May 14, 2025 AAC Meeting Minutes

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**Glen Ellyn Architectural Appearance Commission**  
**Wednesday, May 14, 2025 at 7:00 PM**  
Glen Ellyn Civic Center  
Galligan Board Room  
535 Duane Street, Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

**A. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Chairperson Jacobson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and explained the Architectural Appearance Commission's function and procedures as an advisory body.

Roll was called.

Present: Chairperson Jacobson and Commissioners Albrecht, Goranov, Mees, Schlembach, and Smith  
Absent: Commissioner Rahn

Also in attendance: Anabel Pederson, Associate Planner, and Adriana Ohl Zamora, Recording Secretary.

**B. Approval of the Minutes**

**Commissioner Smith made a motion to approve the draft minutes of the March 12, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Goranov seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.**

**C. Old Business**

None to report.

**D. New Business**

1. 515 Crescent Blvd. - Exterior Appearance Review for Walk-Up Automated Teller Machine

**Staff Presentation**

Sworn In, Anabel Pederson, Associate Planner presented on 515 Crescent Blvd, explained that although this is a new application, the item has been seen previously; it is for an exterior faced alteration for a proposed walk up ATM on the north facing section of the building. Located on corner of Crescent Boulevard and North Main Street, zoned C5A with a square footage of 5,227.22, currently special use permitted real estate office that was granted in 2022.

Associate Planner Pederson moved on to explain that this project previously came before the Commission as a separate application, and it was denied by Village Board on January 13, 2025. The design which was rejected includes the following:

- Removal of right most window to be replaced with:
- NCR SelfServ 64 Automated Teller Machine
- Matching Brick Fill-In
- Straight Hem Black Awning
- Aluminum Sconce, Black Finish

The new proposed design was presented to Commissioners, which includes the following:

- Removal of right most window to be replaced with:
- NCR SelfServ 64 Automated Teller Machine
- Side Panel Windows
- Matching Brick Fill-In
- Straight Hem Black Awning
- Aluminum Sconce, Black Finish

Associate Planner Pederson showed a slide of the building's current condition to Commissioners. Proposed materials, lighting and the cutsheet of ATM was also shown. Commission action is to consider the proposed exterior appearance and provide a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees approval, approval with conditions, or denial.

Commissioner Mees asked if the Village Trustees had voted on this design and rejected it.

Associate Planner Pederson clarified that per the Commission's recommendation for denial on November 13, 2024, the previously proposed design was denied via ordinance. That design included the brick infill, the wood trim, and awning. Currently there is nothing in the code that prevents an applicant from re-applying, so the client and Petitioner chose to modify the petition based on comments from the Commission on September 11, 2024, and reappear before the commission for consideration.

Commissioner Mees asked if the Trustees had comments as to why they rejected it so the Commission can make sure that they address all concerns that were previously reviewed and were on the same page as the Trustees.

Associate Planner Pederson said that the previous recommendation for denial from this Commission was unanimous and was therefore put on the consent agenda. The Trustees did not pull the item from the consent agenda to discuss separately, and it was passed on the Commission's recommendation.

The Petitioner, Taylor Hall with PM Design on behalf of US Bank, presented the design. He stated that they are revisiting the project based on the comments from the September 11, 2024, review that he was unable to attend, and the project was not properly represented at that time.

The Petitioner said they had taken feedback from the notes to more adequately conform with the façade of building. He also stated that US Bank always used the highest technology and standards. With those regards, they have been evaluating this location in particular for quite a while and have been researching since 2022. He stated that the bank likes the location, as it is not directly on the main road but is still easy to identify. He stated that they are familiar with the noise and other lighting ordinances as well as appearance ordinances, and it's in their interest to align with the community and the Commission's requirements.

The Petitioner stated that they are presenting a proposed ATM and façade at the location which is currently zoned C5A. They are proposing a new design in alignment with remarks and rebuttals that were made and found in the notes and meeting minutes. The design is proposing removal of the window for the ATM kiosk, some level of demolition and infill at the lower portion for the work that be necessary to set ATM kiosk, custom fabricated window wood frame unit that matches the current architecture, and the colonial style brick molding as well as a black awning for weather protection for customers.

It was discussed whether it would be necessary to provide that canopy, Mr. Hall stated that he would have to defer to the Commission's recommendation there and make note accordingly. He showed existing conditions photos taken during wintertime, along with the elevation and the proposed flanking custom windows. Mr. Hall also showed an updated plan sheet indicating the limited scope removal extraction of window unit in its entirety, if possible, for reclamation and reuse, infill with the atm and new custom units, the fabric canopy for the canopy and the brick match. Petitioner stated that brick match was not the correct image with the closer match which was recommended by local mason after visiting site. Provided photometric to ensure security at the site.

Commissioner Goranov stated that it appeared the Petitioner had disregarded the alcove design recommendation of the Commission, and that it looks worse than the previously presented option. He inquired as to why the Petitioner did not present the alcove option that was given to them last time.

Chairperson Jacobson noted that it appeared they explored the option.

Mr. Hall stated that they did work administratively with the jurisdiction regarding the alcove design, it was found to be in non-compliance with accessibility and the Bank did not want to pursue the design.

Commissioner Goranov asked to clarify which jurisdiction. Petitioner Hall stated that it was discussed with the Planning Department. Commissioner Goranov inquired as to why it is not in compliance, he stated it seemed like it would comply with all the ADA requirements. The Petitioner stated that they surveyed and found that it does not; in fact, currently it does not meet forward approach compliance.

Commissioner Schlembach asked for an elaboration on the non-compliance.

Petitioner Taylor Hall stated that currently that alcove has a grade which is 6% from the curb line/sidewalk line up to the threshold of the door. For a forward approach it must be at 5%, so it is already out of compliance. They would also have to meet cross slope so it would have to be 2% in both directions. In fact, to do that they would have to form a curb as well as install a railing and the bank was not at all in favor of this design.

Commissioner Schlembach clarified that it is the exterior sidewalk approach that is in current non-compliance. Petitioner Hall replied that no, it is within the property, building line.

Commissioner Goranov requested a picture to be pulled up of the area.

Chairperson Jacobson remarked that it looks like by the time they would install a curb and raised the alcove piece up they would be conflicting with the door.

Commissioner Goranov stated that would not be required because the ATM would be close to the sidewalk.

Chairperson Jacobson commented that they would have to pour that concrete to make the cross slope so a person would not be sitting sideways if they were in a wheelchair and then they would be restricting the door.

Commissioner Goranov said that this could easily be done, while Chairperson Jacobson stated she didn't think they could do it from the front door straight to the sidewalk. He stated that all they would have to do is the little rectangle by the door which can be altered very easily. He remarked that the Village is building a whole new train station because of the ADA requirements, all this would require is to change the rectangle.

Commissioner Mees pointed out that the Petitioner would need to change the concrete leading up to the door, and slope up so that the highest point by the door is also the highest point by the ATM.

Chairperson Jacobson concurred and said that it's within four feet and the whole piece slopes so it's not going to be possible to create the slope without creating a curb because they have two existing points; the existing sidewalk and the existing threshold of the door. If the Petitioner was building a new building, then they could easily flatten it out but it is more difficult when you have two existing conditions.

Commissioner Goranov inquired about there being a hall upon entry of the building and asked about the floor elevation and the level of the sidewalk.

Commissioner Albrecht asked Commissioner Goranov if his idea was that if this portion were fixed, it would put into compliance the entrance to the building, as well as to the ATM and the Petitioner could solve both those situations.

Commissioner Mees asked if he meant the Petitioner would dig out the entire rectangle and then what would happen at the threshold of the door.

Commissioner Goranov stated that maybe it would require a whole new door, but he thinks it is worth it to keep the historic elevation. In the new design, the building looks totally different in terms of historic value.

Chairperson Jacobson asked if there were comments from any other Commissioners.

Commissioner Mees said that she thinks that the proposed design now takes into account what was asked for in September, the windows especially. Her only comment would be that above the ATM is brick. She would ask for the area above the ATM to be either another faux window or white panel and not red brick. Petitioner Hall asked if this meant to shorten window heights and/or add trim all the way across. Commissioner Mees clarified that she didn't mean shorten the window height, she would keep the height the same to match the other windows on the building. Instead, having the area above the ATM be a window to match the window size on the other side instead of having it be brick.

Commissioner Goranov agreed that an upside-down U-shaped window around ATM would be better.

Commissioner Albrecht said that there have been some good comments, but she feels like with the different entities involved in these discussions, the design is almost one step behind. She is not in disagreement with some of the changes that have been mentioned, like the windows, but they are still looking at a historic building with the opportunity to not change anything. Perhaps if the Petitioner's client could come back and smooth out the entrance, it would give us the opportunity to get the ATM in without changing the elevation and solve the problem of a non-compliant entrance.

Commissioner Schlembach said that he was thinking about downtown where sidewalk slabs have been changed in order to help storeowners meet the grade and he feels that even if they needed to encroach upon the Village sidewalk, as long as the encroachment is also in compliance, that solution could be implemented if there was an element of good faith wanting to implement it.

Chairperson Jacobson stated that unfortunately, the Village just re-did the sidewalks last summer.

Commissioner Goranov asked who the architect of this ATM project was. Mr. Hall stated that he was the Project Manager with PM Design, the architect of record. Commissioner Goranov asked to clarify that he is not the architect and inquired as to why the architect was not present to answer questions. Petitioner Taylor Hall stated that their goal was to take another look at the façade since the alcove design is not feasible. They sent out a surveyor and found the non-compliant area and discussed the options

including the modification of the interior of the building to achieve the drop and gradually accommodate that slope. The bank is not willing to submit the alcove as their preferred design as it is not in their best interest.

Commissioner Goranov added that the Petitioner also advised them that there is a non-conformance. Petitioner Taylor Hall agreed that it is not in compliance.

Commissioner Schlembach added that was the case unless they encroached on the village sidewalk. Petitioner Taylor Hall agreed that element could make a difference.

Commissioner Schlembach said that other businesses down the street have had the Village sidewalk changed.

Commissioner Smith said that her preference is to try to accommodate the alcove design and that she is concerned that this proposed design is not in line with what is existing. She agrees that continuing the windows on the top might help but is concerned about the infill of the brick since matching is going to be difficult. She mentions that her preference is for minimizing elements that are not part of the historic structure.

Commissioner Goranov says that the canopy makes the facade look like a different building that is imbedded into the building.

Commissioner Smith asked if the canopy is one of the bank's requirements.

Petitioner Taylor Hall responded that no, he believes it was something discussed in the design process to protect the client from the elements.

Commissioner Goranov said that could be avoided by putting the ATM in the alcove as it is already covered.

Commissioner Jacobson reiterated that the alcove design would be something that would require the applicant to go back to the Village and ask if it would be possible to adjust the sidewalk, and it would improve the accessibility for the rest of the building also.

Commissioner Goranov said it would also be an opportunity to save a historic building, one of the few left to be saved.

Chairperson Jacobson stated that this is an improvement over the last design in terms of the windows, and she thinks the alcove is a nicer way to keep the building façade looking the same, it solves the problem of the awning. She agreed that it will not work the way it is right now because of the matter of having to redo the concrete entrance to the building.

Commissioner Goranov made the motion:

After conducting a public meeting and deliberating on the request of the petitioner, Taylor Hall on behalf of PM Design and US Bank, for approval of an exterior appearance review for 515 Crescent Boulevard in the C5A Zoning District, the Architectural Appearance Commission recommends denial of this request based on the following findings of fact:

1. The proposal architectural style is not preserving the historic appearance of the building
2. There is an alternative option to be explored which will preserve exterior of the building and overall will improve the functioning of the entire building and functioning of the ATM machine

Commissioner Albrecht seconded the motion. The motion passed roll call with all Commissioners present voting "Yes".

Chairperson Jacobson suggested to the Petitioner working with the Village Engineer to see what could be done about the grading and the sidewalk.

Commissioner Albrecht said that she thinks it will make a nice space for the ATM and help keep the building in historic character and have an accessible entrance to the building.

Petitioner Taylor Hall stated that he will relay all the comments to the bank and thanked the Commission.

## **E. Chairman's Report**

Nothing to report

## **F. Trustee Liaison Report**

Nothing to report

## **G. Staff Report**

Anabel Pederson, Associate Planner presented the following updates from Staff:

1. New Village Trustees and Village President sworn in May 12, 2025. There will be a new Trustee Liaison for the Commission, and they will hopefully be present next meeting.
2. Metra and Union Pacific are still in negotiations regarding the Metra Station Project.
3. 534 Duane Street, Fuchsia Boutique exterior appearance was approved by Village Board on April 14, 2025. Building has commenced.
4. The new Village fee schedule in effect that took effect April 25, 2025, as well as the new permitting software; the staff side as well as customer facing portal so applicants will now submit and track comments and approvals online.

Commissioner Albrecht and Commissioner Goranov asked when the Commission would see the Metra Station Project again.

Commissioner Mees stated that she believes they saw it and approved it and so will not be seeing it again.

Associate Planner Pederson confirmed that the Commission had already approved the exterior appearance review.

Commissioner Schlembach asked how many funding agencies are involved in the project and asked about future funding outlook and the negotiations involved.

Associate Planner Pederson said that she believes recent negotiations in particular are about the rental or lease agreement with Metra and Union Pacific. From what she can tell, the Village Engineer has stated that there is still funding going on and money being allocated to the projects, but they are monitoring the funding situation as things develop. However, projects this far along in the planning phase still should have funding.

Commissioner Smith said that she noticed a store front on Main Street being painted a color that she doesn't believe the Commission would generally approve of and asked about guidelines for tenants regarding exterior painting.

Associate Planner Pederson stated that the Commission would only see things that are significant alterations, and that painting a building would not require a permit or be considered a significant alteration. She mentioned the Architectural Appearance Guidelines that outline earth tones as the advised colors for downtown.

Commissioner Schlembach added that, on historical building paint is a temporary material because ultimately it can be repainted.

## **I. Adjournment**

**Member Albrecht made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Goranov seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote at 7:40pm**

Respectfully submitted,

Adriana Ohl-Zamora  
Recording Secretary



Glen Ellyn  
535 Duane Street  
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Meeting 10/28/2025 7:00 PM  
Department: Community Development  
Department Head: Jennifer Henaghan  
Category: Public Hearing  
Prepared By: Daniel Harper

**AGENDA ITEM**  
**(ID # 2025-900)**

**DOC ID: 2025-900**

## **Exterior Appearance Review — 486 Pennsylvania Avenue, Maplewood Brewery & Distillery**

### **Statement of the Issue:**

The applicant is applying for an exterior appearance approval and is proposing an alteration to the exterior appearance of the property located at 486 Pennsylvania Avenue. The project includes enlarging the size of two existing windows on the western side of the building and modification to the east side of the building, including adding two new glass doors that will act as access to the existing outdoor patio area, adding a new glass sliding window that will serve as a bar window for the outdoor patio and two other additional windows.

### **Analysis:**

**Building:** The building is located downtown in the C5B Commercial Zoning District. The building is approximately 7,800 square feet in size and is currently occupied as Two-Hound Red Brewery and restaurant. The new property owner will be transitioning the building to be operated by Maplewood Brewery and Distillery. The property owner is proposing to modify the interior of the building for the new occupant and is also proposing exterior modifications to expand the functionality of the space for the new occupant. The building is currently composed of red brick with black tinted windows, red doors, and stucco and vertical wood paneling on the south side of the building facing Pennsylvania Avenue.

**Proposed Design:** The petitioner is proposing exterior alterations to the building to increase the functionality of the building as a brew pub with an existing outdoor patio. The applicant is proposing the addition of two new windows to the eastern wall of the building to add natural light to the proposed private party room labeled on the floor plan as "Barrel Room." Both of the proposed windows are 60" W X 18"H or 7.5 sq ft. The new window openings will be designed to match the existing conditions with black steel edges and the steel lintel having brick plating to match the existing brick.

As part of the remodel, the applicant wants to expand the functionality of the existing outdoor patio space by adding a new 91" W x 18"H or 11.4 square foot bar height "garage door" type window that will be able to be rolled up or down and allow for bar service to be conducted directly to the patio. The new window opening will be designed to match the existing conditions with black steel edges and the steel lintel having brick plating to match the existing brick.

Lastly, the applicant is proposing a new doorway to be located on the east side of the building that will access directly to the patio area and will be the primary ingress/egress point for patio patrons and restaurant staff.

The applicant is also replacing the two existing non-opening windows on the west side of the building with two taller non-opening windows. These windows face the parking lot of 478 Pennsylvania Ave and, as a minor alteration that does not require AAC and Village Board approval, will proceed under a separate building permit.

#### ARCHITECTURAL APPEARANCE GUIDELINES:

Village staff has excerpted the following sections of the Architectural Appearance Guidelines as they are relevant to the application request.

3.3.3 Windows and doors should be inset behind the plane of the wall, clearly defined by wood or masonry trim.

The ground floor should emphasize the window display area. Generally, shiny metal or obviously plastic window frames are inappropriate. Windows should be set into the face of the wall a sufficient distance to have a clear shadow line. Solid trim helps to define the openings and differentiate them from the surrounding wall surface. Trim adds a richness of detailing.

3.4 Original building materials should not be covered, and new construction should use the same or similar materials as on the original building in terms of type, texture, and color.

Particularly inappropriate are veneers of artificial stone, metal panels, vinyl siding, rough sawn wood and stucco applied over brick surfaces. If applied only in patches as accents, they break up the continuity of the wall surface and can serve as a trap for moisture, thereby creating deterioration of the original underlying surface.

3.11 Expansion, additions and remodeling of existing structures should emphasize compatibility with the original structure in terms of roof structure, materials, openings and detailing.

The Village desires to capture the historic character of these buildings with all of their rich detailing and attention to scale and proportion. These buildings exhibit the qualities Glen Ellyn seeks as an overall design image: quality, durability, attractiveness and compatibility.

#### **Budget Impact:**

#### **Contribution to Strategic Plan**

#### **Action Requested:**

The Architectural Appearance Commission is being asked to consider the petitioner's request for exterior appearance and make a recommendation to the Village Board for approval, approval with conditions, or denial. In reviewing the request, the Commission should consider how the proposed exterior appearance conforms to the Appearance Review Guidelines. In reviewing the project, the AAC may wish to inquire about/encourage the petitioner to:

1. Utilize design elements to create an alteration that is in harmony with the surrounding buildings.
2. Consider the proposed alteration in the context of the larger downtown area.

3. Incorporate Architectural Appearance Guidelines into feedback and review comments.

In the event that the AAC chooses to make a positive recommendation, Staff recommends the AAC consider the following conditions of approval:

1. The project shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the plans and drawings as submitted and the testimony presented at the
2. A building permit shall be required for the exterior alterations.

**Attachments:**

1. Application - Exterior Appearance Review
2. Aerial Map
3. Zoning Map
4. Proposed Building Elevations - East
5. Floor Plan



## VILLAGE OF GLEN ELLYN

---

### **Exterior Appearance Review Application Packet**

*Community Development Department  
535 Duane Street – Glen Ellyn, IL 60137 – Telephone 630.547.5250 – Fax 630.547.5370*

**APPLICATION FOR EXTERIOR APPEARANCE REVIEW**

Date Filed: 10/7/2025

Application No: 2025-0047

**Name of Applicant: Maplewood Brewery & Distillery**

Address of Applicant: 486 Pennsylvania Ave Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Property Interest of Applicant: Owner

**Name of Owner: Jon With**

Address of Owner: 486 Pennsylvania Ave Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Type	Name	Address	Phone	Email
Petitioner	Maplewood Brewery & Distillery	486 Pennsylvania Ave Glen Ellyn, IL 60137		
	Maplewood Brewery & Distillery	486 Pennsylvania Ave Glen Ellyn, IL 60137		
Web Administrator	Jon With	486 Pennsylvania Ave Glen Ellyn, IL 60137		
Parcel Owner	Jon With	Ellyn, IL 60137		

**Property Address: 486 Pennsylvania Ave**

Project Name: Web Project

Project Description: We are renovating the existing Two Hound Red Brewpub which includes the following changes. Doubling the height of the existing two windows on the west wall. On the east wall: we are looking to add two glass doors leading out to the patio, add a 7'6" wide bar height glass garage door, and two windows in the party room. The rationale behind these changes are to improve lighting into the space. Additionally the doors leading to the patio will provide an additional emergency exit but also contain the patrons of the patio and reduce people walking through the parking lot.

Legal Description of Property:

Zoning: C5B, Central Business District (Service)

Lot Dimensions:

Lot Area:



: 05113100500000

**CONFORMANCE WITH APPEARANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES:**

1. Explain why the proposed architectural style was chosen:  
Only change is related to additional windows.
2. Provide information about the architectural style and exterior materials of the buildings in the surrounding area.  
Only change is related to additional windows.
3. Please explain how the project complies with the Appearance Review Guidelines.  
Only change is related to additional windows.
4. Please explain why any deviations from the Appearance Review Guidelines are proposed.  
NA




**Legend**



Print Date: 10/21/2025

**Notes**





Disclaimer: The GIS Consortium and MGP Inc. are not liable for any use, misuse, modification or disclosure of any map provided under applicable law. This map is for general information purposes only. Although the information is believed to be generally accurate, errors may exist and the user should independently confirm for accuracy. The map does not constitute a regulatory determination and is not a base for engineering design. A Registered Land Surveyor should be consulted to determine precise location boundaries on the ground.




### Legend

#### Zoning and Development

##### Zoning


-  C5A: Central Business District (Retail Core)
-  C5B: Central Business District (Service)



Print Date: 10/21/2025

### Notes

Disclaimer: The GIS Consortium and MGP Inc. are not liable for any use, misuse, modification or disclosure of any map provided under applicable law. This map is for general information purposes only. Although the information is believed to be generally accurate, errors may exist and the user should independently confirm for accuracy. The map does not constitute a regulatory determination and is not a base for engineering design. A Registered Land Surveyor should be consulted to determine precise location boundaries on the ground.



REV #	DATE	DESCRIPTION
0	09/03/2025	ISSUED FOR PERMIT

PROPOSED PLAN

S1

NOTE 1: COORDINATE ROUGH OPENING SIZES WITH DOOR MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS TO ALLOW FOR JAMB FRAMING.

NEW 5' WIDE WINDOW. PROVIDE A W8X18 STEEL LINTEL w/ STEEL BRICK OVER NEW OPENING. SEE 1/S2. (SEE NOTE 1).


NEW 8' WIDE WINDOW. PROVIDE A W8X18 STEEL LINTEL w/ STEEL BRICK OVER NEW OPENING. SEE 1/S2. (SEE NOTE 1).

NEW 6' WIDE DOOR. PROVIDE A W8X18 STEEL LINTEL w/ STEEL BRICK OVER NEW OPENING. SEE 1/S2. (SEE NOTE 1).

EXSTG. 56"WX25"H WINDOW TO BE INCREASED TO 56"WX48"H. PROVIDE A W8X18 STEEL LINTEL w/ STEEL BRICK OVER NEW OPENING. SEE 1/S2.

NOTE: SEE 1/A1.1 FOR UPDATED EGRESS PLAN FOR BUILDING.


REMOVE AND REPLACED NON-LOAD BEARING WALL TO NEW LOCATION AS SHOWN.  
FULLY GROUT CMU BETWEEN NEW OPENINGS FROM FOUNDATION TO BOTTOM OF LINTEL





*Antonio J. Domel*

09-03-2025

SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"



REV #	DATE	DESCRIPTION	RW	KKM
0	09/03/2025	ISSUED FOR PERMIT		



*Antonio Domel*

09-03-2025

DETAILS

S2