

Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 20, 2019
3930 N. Murray Avenue, Shorewood, WI



1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Wesley Brice, Kevin Greene, Kathryn Kamm (acting Chair), Brian Koester, Scott Kraehnke, John Rizzo, Mike Skauge and Mary Wright. Others present: Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director; Village Attorney Nathan Bayer, Tr. Michael Maher, Carolyn Sellers, Bob Dean, Max Wippich, Joan Gorman, Mark Porreca, John Harris and Kevin Kysely.

2. Annual election of Design Review Board Chair.

Mr. Rizzo motioned to defer this matter until other members were present; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 8-0

3. Approval of May 23, 2019 meeting minutes.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Mr. Brice. Vote 8-0.

4. Village Attorney to review the standards by which the Design Review Board shall make their determinations.

Attorney Bayer reviewed the Design Review Board's authority, which typically deals with new construction or additions. However, he also noted that code section 225-12E specifies that no permit shall be issued for "exterior alterations" without referral to the Design Review Board. Exterior alterations have been interpreted to include demolition. He explained that the review authority with those alterations relates to the final state of the lot after demolition. More specifically, he noted that the Board should look at a site restoration plan to ensure that things like errant debris or materials are not left on site and that landscaping and topography are restored to an acceptable state. Ms. Kamm questioned if there was anything controlling how long a site could remain vacant, and was informed that there was not.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the site restoration at residential property 3534 N. Lake Drive, property owner Chris Abele.

Ronny Barenz, contractor for the project, presented the site restoration plan for review. He noted that the plans involve the demolition of the existing home and detached garage. A new home is expected to be constructed in its place; however, plans for that aspect of the project are not yet available. An erosion control plan was also submitted with the application for the demolition permit. The existing driveway and perimeter fencing are proposed to remain to help minimize construction impacts. After demolition, the excavation will be filled flat so that no

visible hole would remain. The plans indicate that top soil and seed would be installed by November 15, if construction of the new home has not commenced. Ms. Kamm confirmed that the lot is fenced on three sides. Mr. Rizzo questioned if the subgrade basement would be removed and back-filled. The contractor confirmed that the full foundation would be removed. He noted that it would be filled with gravel, which is stable and can be removed, if necessary. Ms. Wright confirmed that the retaining wall on the bluff would remain. Mr. Barenz noted that during the new construction, more work would be done with the wall, but for now, it was staying to maintain stability. Ms. Kamm questioned how long the silt fence would be in place and was informed that it was hoped to be in place throughout the new construction. It may also require relocation, based on the new plans. Mr. Rizzo noted that several trees were to be removed, but no new landscaping was proposed in their stead. The contractor confirmed that a new landscape plan would be submitted as part of the new construction. Ms. Kamm confirmed that materials would be trucked off site immediately. Ms. Wright questioned how asbestos and lead were being handled, and the contractor noted that they were working with the DNR on those issues. All materials are being trucked to a certified asbestos landfill. Mr. Kraehnke asked how long demolition would take and was informed that 2-3 weeks were projected. Mr. Greene asked when work would start. The contractor was unable to provide a firm date, but suggested that it would take place sooner rather than later. He noted that they would not wait until new construction was approved. Mr. Skauge asked if bluff inspections were performed. Mr. Barenz informed that soil engineering has been performed and the results are being evaluated. The analysis has somewhat delayed the plans for new construction. Ms. Kamm asked Village Attorney Bayer to confirm that the scope of review did not include demolition, just the site restoration, and whether or not another governing body would be involved with the review. Village Attorney Bayer confirmed and noted that the house is not designated on any restricted list, and even if it were, it would only require a 30-day delay for documentation. Ms. Wright confirmed that no public sidewalk disruption was expected. Mr. Skauge asked the contractor to describe the fencing on the north and south lot lines. He was informed that it was a wood painted fence on the north. Mr. Skauge questioned if it was adequate to secure the site. Ms. Kamm also questioned if the front gate was operable, and Ms. Wright asked whether or not it would be closed at night. Director Griepentrog noted that site security was a condition of the demolition permit to be issued and confirmed by the Building Inspector, but not necessarily part of the site restoration plan under review.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; with a note to remove the silt fence at the completion of the demolition and that any gravel footprint be topsoiled and seeded by November 15, in the scenario that new plans for construction are not yet approved; seconded by Mr. Rizzo.

Ms. Kamm allowed questions from those in attendance, noting that they must be relevant to the scope of review under consideration. Barbara Kiely Miller, 4051 N. Downer Ave., questioned if asbestos and lead paint were a big enough reason to warrant demolition of the property. Mr. Rizzo noted that issue was not pertinent to DRB's scope. Tr. Michael Maher, 2100 E. Menlo Blvd questioned if the materials under review were available on the Village's website. Director Griepentrog noted that DRB materials are not put on the website as part of their normal routine, but are always available in the Planning and Development Office for review.

Vote 8-0.

(Attorney Bayer leaves the meeting.)

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the window alteration (south elevation) at residential property 4049 N. Prospect Avenue, property owner K. Max Wippich.

The applicants introduced their item noting that both windows are being modified as part of a kitchen remodeling project. The western window would be the same height, but narrowed for cabinetry. The eastern window would be widened and replaced by a bay window unit to be centered over the sink.

Ms. Kamm questioned the roof condition of the bay window. The applicant indicated that it would be pitched and planned on utilizing shingles to match the house. Ms. Kamm noted that the plans do not show any roof details. Mr. Rizzo questioned if the window needed to be a bay unit, and the applicant indicated a preference to add more light. Ms. Kamm asked if siding under the window would match, and the applicant indicated that excess siding was available to patch it. Mr. Rizzo confirmed that the current siding was vinyl. Mr. Koester asked how far the window projected, and the applicant noted that it was 12 inches, which is less than the dining room bay. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the proposed window was a bay, not bow, window. It was noted that two double-hung windows were on either side of the picture window in the center. Mr. Kraehnke questioned the width of the narrow window, and was informed that it was 18 inches.

Ms. Kamm expressed that the plans looked aesthetically nice, as shown, but noted that a roof structure would be necessary. Mr. Rizzo confirmed and requested to see plans showing the roof structure, he suggested that no action be taken until revised plans were provided. Mr. Kraehnke noted that trim details should be shown. Ms. Kamm added that depth, flashing, pitch and shingle details should also be included.

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a front yard patio at residential property 2617 E. Capitol Drive, property owner Donald Sherman.

Donald Sherman explained the project, which involves a flagstone patio in front of the existing porch within the front yard. He noted that the current porch gets crowded and desired more space. He also noted that the on-grade patio would extend 7 feet from the 6-foot porch, and that the existing landscaping would need to be removed. Boxwood plantings would screen the new patio along the E. Capitol Dr. frontage. Mr. Rizzo questioned if the plantings would also be planted on the sides of the patio and was informed that they would only be in the front.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 8-0.

8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a two tiered terrace at commercial property 1225 E. Olive Street, property owner Kingo Lutheran Church.

The contractor presented the item and explained that the stairway in front would be removed and that a new double terrace with more plantings and a railing system would be installed. Ms. Kamm questioned if the sign would be removed, and was informed that it would not. The applicant requested that the Board members reference the last page of the plan set for clarity. It was noted that the cement had failed and needed to be replaced. Mr. Rizzo questioned if the proposed quantity of plantings was accurate. He also questioned if drainage would be an issue. The contractor noted that there is a massive dry well, which would also alleviate any ice

concerns. Mr. Kraehnke questioned if the top terrace level would be concrete, which was confirmed. Mr. Rizzo confirmed that handrails would remain.

Mr. Rizzo motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Kraehnke. Vote 8-0.

9. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the alteration of a front porch at residential property 1829 E. Jarvis Street, property owners Colin Cunningham and Holly Spackman.

The applicant noted that the porch would maintain the same footprint, and that the existing concrete stairs would be removed for a new wood step along the entire frontage with side railings. He also noted that existing interior stucco would be replaced with matching siding. Mr. Kraehnke confirmed that the current porch is enclosed. Ms. Kamm questioned what the columns and beams would be wrapped in and was informed that smooth cedar would be used. Mr. Kraehnke asked what the porch floor and stairs would be constructed with and was informed it would be primed and painted wood (fir). Ms. Wright confirmed that the posts and railings would also be wood. Ms. Kamm confirmed that the new storm door would be installed in the existing opening and questioned if the new window would be operable. She was informed that it would be fixed. Mr. Greene questioned if there was a structural beam to prevent sagging, and was informed that there was. Mr. Koester asked for insight into the design rationale and was told that it was based on other porches seen in the village. Ms. Kamm questioned if they were required to install additional handrails and was informed that they were not. Mr. Kraehnke questioned if the sidewalk was new and confirmed that it was two feet in width. The applicant noted that the existing driveway featured 16-inch slabs and that the under-slats on the porch would match the neighbor's. Mr. Greene asked if there would be any new landscaping, and was informed that was not expected. Ms. Wright asked if the ceiling would feature bead-board, and was informed that it would.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 8-0.

10. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dormer and roof alteration at residential property 4337 N. Woodburn Street, property owner Joseph Aizen.

The contractor introduced the item, noting that the rear roof is currently strangely configured. This project would extend the pitch of the roof for more useable space in the attic. A new dormer would also be added for head clearance. Mr. Skauge asked if there were existing rooms in the attic, and was informed that there were, but the contractor did not know how those were used. Ms. Kamm questioned if the width of the dormer was accurate and asked what materials would clad the walls. She was informed that the walls would be clad in cedar shake and that the roof would match that of the house. Ms. Wright confirmed that the alteration would not be visible from the front of the house. Ms. Kamm questioned if the size of the window was adequate for egress and whether or not there were bedrooms upstairs. The contractor did not know. Mr. Skauge questioned if the dormer was simply for headspace. Ms. Kamm noted that the dormer is only 38 inches, less the wall thickness, and questioned if it would cover the width of the stairs. Mr. Koester asked if this was the only set of stairs to the attic. Mr. Brice noted that if the renovations are intended to obtain more useable rooms, the homeowner may want to consider making sure that the stairway is up to code now. Mr. Skauge and Ms. Kamm agreed that it was best to build it to code now while they are going through the effort. Mr. Rizzo noted

that might require a wider dormer. Ms. Kamm confirmed that the new window would be double-hung. Mr. Skauge noted that overall the project is an enhancement.

Ms. Kraehnke motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Greene. Mr. Skauge noted that the contractor should talk with the building inspector to confirm any code issues. Vote 8-0.

11. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a two-story rear addition at residential property 4064 N. Richland Court, property owners Mona Farez and Paul Trumble.

The architect presented the project, noting a desire to respect the neighborhood by updating a 1970s house in a 1920s block. He referenced Usonian and Craftsman inspirations. He noted that the slope of the front roof over the dormers would change to present a more horizontal feel. An addition would be added on the east façade for a new family room with two additional bedrooms on the second floor. Ms. Kamm asked for details on the exterior material choices. The architect noted that the first floor would feature brick to be painted in a pinkish hue because matching brick could not be found and that the second floor would feature true stucco in a cream or off-white color with vertical battens. He also referenced stucco piers supporting a new porch and wooden pergola. A horizontal wood band would also wrap around the house. The wood would be cedar, not pressure treated. However, the new garage door would simulate wood. A new center door underneath the second floor windows would be installed with sidelights. Ms. Kamm confirmed that the addition would be largely stucco and that the windows would be weather shield insulated with their exterior clad in aluminum and wood on the inside. Ms. Wright questioned how much square footage would be added and was informed that it was approximately 800 sq. ft. Ms. Kamm asked if the stucco veneer columns on the front would feature wood caps, which was confirmed. Ms. Wright noted that the work being proposed was quite extensive. She asked if the wood trim would be painted and was informed that it would have a redwood look. Mr. Rizzo confirmed that the exterior lighting would all be new. It was noted that the 24-inch tall landscaping wall in the front might not end up being part of the project. Ms. Kamm confirmed that hardscaping would be placed behind the proposed wall. She noted that if there was no wall, there should also be no hardscaping.

Mr. Rizzo motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, but noted that if the garden wall is not constructed that the plans would need to come back to the DRB for approval; seconded by Mr. Kraehnke. Vote 8-0.

12. Consideration of the application and plans on file for windows and door alteration at residential property 4031 N. Downer Avenue, property owners Matthew and Mary Beth Stockton.

The contractor presented the project, which involves converting a duplex into a single-family home. The second entrance on the front façade would be removed, and a new door with sidelights would be installed. No changes to the stucco would be required. A new window would also be installed on the west elevation at the same head height of existing windows, but the sill would be higher to accommodate its location within a stairwell. This window will provide more light into the kitchen, as a porch currently limits the light. The appearance of the south elevation would be slightly modified by installing a new window within an original opening. The contractor explained that at some point in the 1980s a smaller window was installed within the existing opening and the new window would restore the original look. Ms.

Kamm confirmed that the original opening would not be modified. Mr. Rizzo summarized the proposed improvements and confirmed that the new front door and new window were within their scope of review.

Mr. Kraehnke motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 8-0.

13. Consideration of the application and plans on file for signage at TCF Bank, 4201 N. Oakland Avenue, property owners TCF Bank.

The sign contractor presented the plans and noted that the current look was outdated and that the new signage would incorporate a new logo. The 16 ft. double-pole sign would be replaced with a new monument sign 8 ft. in height with a solid base. Dimensional letters projecting 3/4 in beyond the face of the sign would be of clear plexi-glass and produce minimal light pollution. Director Griepentrog noted that only the monument sign was up for consideration, as the window and directional signs do not require permits but are enforced through the general code. H also noted that he had requested the submission of a landscape plan to accompany the application, but had never received one. Based on the location and design of the sign, the existing bushes on the south side of the present sign are expected to be removed. Ms. Kamm confirmed that landscaping on the west and north was not expected to change. Mr. Rizzo questioned if the sign met vision triangle requirements, and Director Griepentrog noted that this sign was exempted from those requirements because the intersection is controlled by stop signs. Mr. Koester suggested that smaller plants be installed around the base. Mr. Rizzo confirmed that the sign was not a prohibited internally illuminated box sign because the face of the sign did not light up. Mr. Brice questioned if there were any material requirements for the base of the sign, and was informed that the sign was to be made of aluminum and that no requirements are stated within the code.

Mr. Rizzo motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, with the requirement of landscaping at the base of the sign; seconded by Mr. Brice. Ms. Kamm noted that the applicant should talk to a landscaper on what types of plants to utilize. Vote 8-0.

14. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a roof structure over the rear patio at commercial property 4488 N. Oakland Avenue, business owner Cloud Red.

The business owners presented the plans and noted that a roof structure was being proposed to the rear patio to make it more of a three-season space. The material would be a corrugated plastic, similar to a greenhouse. It is not being installed for shade, but just for rain. Ms. Kamm confirmed that the patio would not be completely enclosed. Mr. Skauge questioned if an existing window was in the way, which was confirmed and clarified that the window was going to be in-filled below the roofline. Ms. Kamm questioned if the structure would match the existing finishing and was informed that it would with a cedar appearance. It was noted that the proposed columns would be 6'x6' not 4'x4'. Ms. Kamm asked if a gutter would be installed, and was noted that it would not. The rain is expected to sheet drain to the parking lot. Mr. Kraehnke questioned the six-foot spacing of the structure would hold snow, and was informed that purlin supports would be used in between. The applicant did also say that snow removal is expected to be required.

Mr. Kraehnke motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 8-0.

15. Adjournment.

Mr. Greene motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:08 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director