

**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, August 8, 2019**



3930 N. Murray Avenue, Shorewood, WI

**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m.

Members present: Wesley Brice, Kathryn Kamm, Scott Kraehnke (elected Chair in item 2), Kevin Greene, John Rizzo, Mike Skauge and Mary Wright (arrived during item 4). Others present: Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director; Andrew Shacklady, Ron Rozman, Nick Plummer, Ken Ebbot, Melissa Rudolph.

**2. Annual election of Design Review Board Chair.**

Scott Kraehnke volunteered to be Chair of the Design Review Board for the 2018-2019 term. Mr. Rizzo seconded the nomination. No other nominations were received. Vote 6-0.

**3. Approval of July 25, 2019 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Brice. Vote 6-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the modification of front door/façade at residential property 1510 E. Beverly Road, property owners Andrew and Angela Shacklady.**

Andrew Shacklady presented an overview of the project, noting that the improvements were being done to convert a duplex into a single family home. The left entrance would be removed and the roof extended.

Ms. Kamm questioned if the area between the existing stoops would be filled in. Mr. Shacklady confirmed and noted that a hipped roof would in-fill, as well. Ms. Kamm asked if windows would also be modified, and was informed that a group of windows with similar style would be installed. Mr. Rizzo questioned if anything was proposed on the second floor, and was informed that nothing was. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the windows were sliders on the second and third floor. He questioned if the same would be installed on the first floor, and was informed that they would be. Mr. Skauge questioned the exterior support columns and was informed that the new columns would be the same style as the existing. It was also noted that horizontal vinyl siding would be installed underneath the new windows.

Ms. Kamm questioned if the new windows on the side of the house would fit under the existing eave. She also noted that mullions were included on those windows and that the house currently had a mix of styles. She suggested that a style be consistently utilized moving forward.

Improvements on the rear of the house were detailed to include new doors and a deck. Mr. Griepentrog noted that per ordinance, the rear deck was exempt from review.

Mr. Rizzo questioned the handrails on the front of the porch. Mr. Shacklady noted that they would be installed to code with proper height and spacing. Ms. Wright confirmed that they would be painted white. Mr. Skauge questioned the material of the porch roof, and was informed that it would be asphalt shingles to match the house. Mr. Skauge also questioned the ceiling material under the roof, and was informed it would be timber bead board.

Mr. Skauge noted that dimensions and materials were not noted on the plans. Mr. Rizzo added that he had no issues with what was being proposed and discussed, but wanted more definition provided on the plans. Mr. Shacklady noted that the materials would match the existing house. Mr. Skauge suggested holding the item for further details and questioned if that would hold up the applicant's plans. Mr. Shacklady indicated that as long as no structural changes were expected, he could still bid out the work and come back with more detailed plans. Chair Kraehnke agreed with the suggestion and stated that notation of details is all that would be required.

No action was taken at this meeting, and the plans were expected to come back with further details.

**5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the window modifications at residential property 2635 E. Capitol Drive, property owners Chris and Amanda Buhrman.**

Mr. Rozman introduced the item noting that four new windows were proposed, three of which were in modified openings. Ms. Kamm confirmed that the current window opening in the middle would be replaced with two new windows. Mr. Skauge questioned if the window on the right would be enlarged and was informed that it would not be, but the window would increase to match the existing opening. Mr. Rizzo questioned how the new area would be infilled, and Mr. Rozman noted that it would be infilled with brick painted to match. Mr. Brice asked if the current sills would be removed and was informed that the sills would be modified to match the existing windows.

Ms. Kamm motioned to approve the plans as submitted; seconded by Mr. Greene. Vote 7-0.

**6. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for two façade wall signs that exceed the allowed height at commercial property 4114 N. Oakland Avenue, business owner Casa de Corazon.**

A representative from Poblocki presented the two proposed wall signs, detailing that the upper portion would be back-lit and the lower business description would not. Mr. Skauge questioned if both signs were over entrances, and it was clarified that the sign on Oakland Avenue was not. The applicant noted that the sign band was 24" and that the upper lettering was 15" without the accent over the o. Mr. Rizzo noted that the proposed sign would touch the brick on both the top and bottom. Ms. Kamm confirmed that the sign band was recessed from the brick. The Board expressed a concern of legibility with the sign occupying the entire sign band without space on either top or bottom. Ms. Wright questioned why this size was proposed, and the applicant indicated it was a design choice. Mr. Greene noted that he had no issues with allowing the second sign. Mr. Brice noted that he would prefer to see some

breathing room on both signs. Mr. Skauge agreed that the special exception for the second sign was acceptable, but the size needed to be reduced, so he suggested that the proposal should come back.

Direction was provided to the applicant to revise the sign to show at least one inch of space on both the top and bottom.

- 7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the site restoration at residential property 1808 E. Marion Street, property owner 4300 Oak LLC.**
- 8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the site restoration at commercial property 4300 N. Oakland Avenue, property owner 4300 Oak LLC.**

Items 7 and 8 were discussed together.

Ken Ebbot of Sand Creek Consultants presented the projects together, noting that one application related to the commercial property and the other related to the residential property. Two applications were required because the parcels were separate. He noted that the primary objective is to remove the source material from the site. In order to do that, both buildings would be demolished and the utility poles would be relocated. The work was proposed to take place in two phases. The first phase would demolish the buildings to grade prior to September 14, so that the site could be cleared and secured prior to the Business Improvement District's street festival. The second phase would include removal of all asphalt, in order to excavate and remediate the soil. The concrete between the two buildings on Oakland Avenue would possibly need to stay, based on its impacts to the neighboring building.

Ms. Kamm confirmed that the demolition would include basements in the second phase. Mr. Ebbot noted that the building at 4300 Oakland Ave is believed to have a crawl space, which would be removed. Ms. Kamm confirmed that no holes would be left on either site. Mr. Ebbot noted that the basement of the house at 1808 E Marion St would be removed and backfilled immediately. Mr. Skauge questioned why the residential property was being demolished. The applicant indicated that his client owned both parcels. Mr. Griepentrog noted that both parcels were zoned for commercial use.

Ms. Kamm questioned if fencing would be provided around the perimeter during the demolition. Mr. Ebbot noted that a 6 ft. chain-link fence would be installed on both Oakland and Marion. He further clarified that the full site would be secured. He noted that a gate would be located on Marion St. Mr. Brice questioned why there was no fencing on the north and east sides. Ms. Kamm agreed that a perimeter fence would be better. The applicant indicated that fencing all four sides would be acceptable.

Ms. Kamm asked if there were any proposed changes to the curb cuts or public right-of-way. The applicant indicated that no changes to the curb cuts were proposed. He noted that perimeter landscaping would be extended on the Oakland Avenue frontage. Mr. Griepentrog noted that without driveways, the Village could possibly remove the curb cuts in the future, but would need to take on those costs. He also noted that discussion had taken place regarding the removal of the pole sign and remnant fencing on the site. Ms. Wright agreed that the abandoned dry cleaners sign and wood fencing should be removed, and that she would also like to see perimeter fencing around the site during demolition.

Mr. Rizzo noted that no true grading plan was submitted, but that the plan indicated a difference in the sites would remain with the residential property being higher. Mr. Skauge asked whether or not any new development was proposed, and the applicant noted that clean-up was the only current plan.

Neighbors to the site expressed concern over the relocation of the utility poles and wires. They preferred to see everything placed underground. The applicant noted that a revised utility relocation plan would be required because certain equipment would need to remain on the existing pole on Marion St. He expected that a second pole would need to be installed, which would result in two poles with lines going over the street. He also noted that the lines would be at least 7 ft. from the neighboring property. Neighbors also questioned if the site was tested for lead and if the gas tanks were ever removed. They also questioned why a grading plan and site survey were not required.

Ms. Kamm noted that the Board could hold approval for further details, if they felt anything was insufficient. Board members questioned what site maintenance was planned and was informed that routine mowing would be expected. Mr. Kamm questioned if the sites would be graded as separate, and the applicant confirmed that they would be blended together.

Mr. Griepentrog assured that no demolition permit would be issued until the Village was satisfied with the environmental clean-up requirements and that We Energies had provided approval of the proposed utility relocation to its safety standards.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans for 1808 E. Marion St., as submitted, providing that fencing on the north, east and south be tied into the neighboring property during demolition; seconded by Mr. Rizzo. Vote 7-0.

Mr. Rizzo motioned to approve the plans for 4300 N. Oakland Ave., conditioned upon fencing and security on all sides to be tied into 1808 E. Marion St., removal of the pole sign, and that the area identified as a purple square on the site plan include plantings; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

**9. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the façade alteration at commercial property 4027 N. Oakland Avenue, property owner Columbia St. Mary’s, Inc.**

Melissa Rudolph presented the project and noted that the original plans were based on a guesstimate of the wall construction. Once the awning was removed, it was discovered that the back-up block was on the same plane as the wall, not recessed as thought. As a result, they would’ve needed to reconstruct the wall to recess the metal panels, but would rather keep the panels proud of the wall, as constructed.

Mr. Rizzo motioned to approve the plans as submitted; seconded by Mr. Greene. Vote 7-0.

**10. Adjournment.**

Ms. Kamm motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:49 p.m.; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,

*Bart Griepentrog*

Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director