



**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, June 10, 2021**  
via tele/videoconference

**1. Call to order.**

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Larry Pachefsky (arrived during item #3), Mike Skauge.

Others present: Jerry Parker, Todd Hefner, Don Nummerdor, David Brust, Fran Assa, Brook Meier and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

**2. Approval of the May 27, 2021 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 4-0.

**3. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for the conversion of an existing attached garage into living space and window, door and exterior alterations at residential property 2611 E. Beverly Rd.**

Jerry Parker was present to discuss the modifications to this project. Planning Director Griepentrog reminded the Board that this project was previously approved in the fall of 2020, but the design had changed during construction. It was noted that the second story gable was removed from the plans and that a new covered entry way was being proposed. Mr. Parker noted that the gable was removed because the feature was seen as unnecessary on the back of the building and that the covered entry matched the existing house. He also noted that a brick beltline was added to the base of the rear extension to tie it to the old house and ease maintenance. Two windows on the east elevation were reduced in size on the second story behind the bathtub, and an additional window was added on the south elevation to maximize light into the bedroom.

Chair Kraehnke questioned what was determined to be screening at the rear of the extension, which was clarified would be drawn up and installed as part of a future deck project. Mr. Skauge questioned why three windows were being proposed on the second story rear elevation instead of two, and Mr. Parker noted a desire to maximize light into the bedroom. He noted that a window could not be installed in the fourth area due to the location of the shower.

Some additional changes were noted on the east elevation, which primarily related to panel detailing. Mr. Parker noted that the design was more streamlined and better in keeping with the

front of the house. Chair Kraehnke noted that he liked the new elevation better. He noted that he liked the brick belt course and the awning over the back door.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 5-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of roof signs and monument sign at commercial property 4301 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Todd Heffner was present to answer questions on the proposal. Planning Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the sign project, which included re-facing of the existing building-mounted signage, monument sign and fabric on the awnings. He noted that the existing signage was approved in 2016 and that the monument sign was installed with a special exception allowing for a slight increase in size. He further noted that exceptions were not on file for the size of the building-mounted signage along N. Oakland Ave. nor the second sign along E. Marion St. He suggested that if the Board were fine with those installations that exceptions should be on file for them. With respect to the monument sign, it was noted that the new face would feature push through lettering that allowed the sides of the push through to illuminate, but not that actual letter copy. Mr. Heffner noted that the current lettering lights up, so the new proposal would feature less illumination.

Chair Kraehnke stated that it seemed reasonable for the existing signage to be re-faced in its current size and quantity configurations. Mr. Skauge noted that the second sign on the E. Marion St. facade was allowed by the Board in recognition of the building's second entrance. He also noted that the larger sign on N. Oakland Ave. was allowed to be installed at its current size because the building lacked a traditional sign band. Mr. Koester had similar recollections from 2016 and stated that he was agreeable to the re-facing, as proposed.

No action was taken on this item, so that the corresponding special exception applications could be submitted for future consideration.

**5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of illuminated wall sign at commercial property 3569 N. Oakland Avenue.**

Planning Director Griepentrog noted that the sign, as proposed, met the technical requirements of the sign code. Don Nummerdor confirmed that the sign featured reverse illumination.

Mr. Skauge questioned the type and appearance of other signage on the building. Mr. Nummerdor noted that The Exercise Coach had a similar style sign, which was confirmed through a photo from the applicant.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 5-0.

**6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the reconstruction of second level deck at residential property 4151 N. Downer Avenue.**

David Brust and Fran Assa were present to discuss this item, which involved the reconstruction of a second story deck on the front of the house. They confirmed that the proposed deck would cantilever 2'6" from the existing front elevation. Mr. Brust noted that access to the existing deck involved a 15" step down from the current door and then surface sloped down an additional 3 inches over the 8'6" span. The newly reconstructed deck would only involve a 7"

step down and would feature a flat surface, which could be utilized more functionally. Mr. Brust noted that the railing material would be similar to the house directly to the south. Ms. Assa noted that the spindles would be slightly different to match interior black twisted wrought iron spindles within the house.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the deck is on the public facing street façade of the house. He noted that he was personally not a big fan of the cantilever on the front face of the house, but understood the desire for functionality. Mr. Brice agreed that the plans looked a little awkward and did not fit the character of the house, particularly on the front façade. Ms. Assa noted that there were bushes underneath the proposed cantilever and suggested that most people would not notice it. Mr. Brust also noted that the white roof membrane would be replaced with a black rubber decking, so that the roofline would better blend into the design and not draw your eye to it.

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 4-1. (Mr. Brice voting naye.)

**7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a rear one-story addition at residential property 1222 E. Olive Street.**

Brook Meier provided an overview of the project, which involved a rear addition. He noted a few details had changed from the previous approval in 2019, so it was being brought back for reconsideration. He noted that the attic renovation from the previous approval had been completed. He stated that the window on the east side was slightly relocated from the gasket connection of the buildings. He pointed out that the addition would feature a dark wood siding and a custom mahogany wood door. He suggested that they were looking to create a contrast of old vs new on the addition, since the existing materials could not be replicated.

Chair Kraehnke questioned the roof materials, which was confirmed to be an asphalt shingle, although a standing-seam metal would also be priced out as a preferred option. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the applicant had installed an asphalt shingle at a 2/12 pitch before, and Mr. Meier confirmed that he had. Mr. Skauge questioned if the installation would involve a 3” exposure, and Mr. Meier confirmed that would be his recommendation. Mr. Skauge also questioned how the roof would be treated at the connection to the existing house. Mr. Meier noted that the gasket connection would be below both proposed roofs, which would be trained by gutters. Mr. Skauge questioned if a sheet metal pan would be installed. Mr. Meier noted it would be a rubber roof sloped towards the east to a gutter. Mr. Skauge asked if the applicant would consider TPO roofing in the gasket area, and the applicant said he was open to that.

Chair Kraehnke noted that he had no issues with the addition departing from the existing architecture. He stated that the materials and scale seemed appropriate. He also stated that he liked to see some modernism being installed in Shorewood. Mr. Koester also noted that he appreciated the design, which was very similar to the previously approved proposal.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 5-0.

## 8. Adjournment

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:45 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 5-0.

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