



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 22, 2021
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Lybra Loest, Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky and Mike Skauge.

Others present: Andy Lehn, James Lucas, Meg Baniukiewicz, Matthew Krier, Melissa Cataldo, Kelly Hanaway, Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

2. Approval of the July 8, 2021 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

3. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for the expansion of an existing dormer (north elevation) at residential property 4406-08 N. Murray Avenue.

Andy Lehn and James Lucas were present to discuss their updated plans. It was noted that the roof design on the proposed dormer had been modified to include a hip on all sides. An additional window was added on the east side of the dormer lining up with the windows below it, and additional wood trim was added to the bank of three windows to space them out to match other window banks on the house. Lastly, it was noted that the proposed shake material (CertainTeed Cedar Impressions Perfection) was able to be installed with a mitered corner.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the proposed shake was synthetic or real wood. Mr. Lehn informed that it was synthetic.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the revised drawings were helpful and that the changes made sense.

Mr. Brice questioned the exposure of the proposed vinyl shake in relation to the existing cedar shake. Mr. Lehn noted that the existing vertical reveal was 6-7 inches, and the new product would be similar. He also noted that the color would match. Mr. Brice noted that he was still not in favor of mixing the vinyl shake with the existing cedar shake. Mr. Brice also questioned the proposed sill nosing and head and jam casing on the new windows. Mr. Lucas stated that these new dormer windows were designed to match the other third floor windows on the south side of the house. Mr. Brice noted a preference to match the windows in the wood trimmed portion on the same elevation. Mr. Lucas noted that could be done. Chair Kraehnke and Mr.

Koester agreed with that direction. Mr. Koester also expressed concern over the addition of a third material.

Ms. Loest questioned if the new windows would align with each other. Mr. Lucas stated that the windows were all identical and would line up.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the intent was to hold the dormer framing back from the existing hip or to line up directly with it. Mr. Lucas stated that he did not want to involve the existing hip ridge. Chair Kraehnke stated his preference would be to hold back the new framing from the main hip. Mr. Lucas agreed and confirmed that is what would take place. Mr. O'Connor agreed with that direction, as did Mr. Skauge.

Mr. Koester reiterated his concern over the introduction of a third material and noted potential color differences. Chair Kraehnke believed the roof provided a break so that the shake materials would not touch. He also noted that the new shakes would be high on the house and hard to see. Mr. Brice noted that he was not in favor of the vinyl. Mr. Pachefsky stated that he would rather see a cedar shake be used.

Mr. Lehn noted that the shape, color, texture, and color of the new material would match the existing, that the corners would be mitered and that the roof provided an interruption. He stated that the photos don't give a great impression of reality and that it will be quite hard to even see the dormer from the street. He also noted that maintenance of the new material would be easier, particularly at this height.

Mr. Pachefsky noted that the other dormer was clad in cedar shake and believed this new one should be as well for consistency. Mr. Brice noted that vinyl does not age well, and the difference will become more noticeable in the future. Chair Kraehnke asked Director Griepentrog to confirm whether material selection was under the DRB's review authority, and Director Griepentrog noted that the review should confirm that the addition matches or complements the existing house and that materials could be part of that discussion. An informal poll was taken, which revealed that the members were split on whether or not that vinyl material was acceptable, with one member undecided. Mr. Lehn stated that the cost of cedar shake would be approximately an additional \$1,000.

Mr. O'Connor motioned to approve the plans, as drawn (with the CertainTeed Cedar Impressions Perfection vinyl shakes), but with the windows aligned and trimmed to match the house; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 4-3 (Mr. Pachefsky, Mr. Koester and Mr. Brice voting no).

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the conversion of an existing attached garage into living space and the installation of French doors (west elevation) at residential property 4471 N. Prospect Avenue.

Meg Baniukiewicz, the project architect, provided an overview of the plans, which involved the conversion of an existing one-car attached garage into living space. She noted that a set of three sliding French doors with the center panel active and a bank of four casement style windows that match the existing house would be added to the west elevation. The west elevation would also have a new stucco finish applied to its entirety, matching the other three sides which were recently recoated. She noted that the existing garage door on the south elevation would be infilled with stucco to match, and two casement windows would be added.

Director Griepentrog confirmed that a new detached garage would also eventually be constructed. Ms. Baniukiewicz also noted that a window would be infilled on the north façade to accommodate a new kitchen range.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the new windows in the existing garage would be added at the same head and sill height. Mr. O'Connor stated that the improvements made sense and fit the style of the house. Mr. Skauge agreed and noted that the improvements enhance the house.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as drawn; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a dormer (west elevation) at residential property 4467 N. Ardmore Avenue.

Matthew Krier from Design Group Three was present to discuss the project. He noted that the project would allow the owners to add a bathroom on the second floor to their master suite. The exterior siding on the dormer is proposed to match the siding of the garage, which is a 3-inch exposure cedar. He noted that the roof will be completely replaced.

Mr. O'Connor asked how the new dormer materials would meet the existing brick. Mr. Krier noted that there is a slight offset. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the new windows would match the existing. Ms. Loest noted that there was no siding on the front of the house. Mr. Krier noted that the garage featured the same cedar siding.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as drawn; seconded by Mr. O'Connor. Vote 7-0.

7. Consideration of the application and plans of file for the installation of an illuminated monument sign at commercial property 4201 N. Oakland Avenue.

Melissa Cataldo from Innovative Signs was present to discuss the proposed plans. Director Griepentrog noted that revised plans were received in the morning that met the Village's code with respect to size and that his memo had been updated to reflect that. He noted that a night view had been provided to confirm the illumination methodology of the routed out lettering, which has been previously allowed by the Board. Ms. Cataldo provided that the proposed illumination was 6500K, and Director Griepentrog noted that the Board has previously expressed a desire to keep signs at or below 3500k.

Mr. Brice confirmed that the new sign would be shorter than the existing sign. Ms. Cataldo noted that the current sign is 8 ft. tall and the new sign would only be 5 feet 5 inches. Mr. Brice was also informed that the base of the sign would be the same height, but wider. Mr. Brice stated that the proposed sign would look better with the shorter design. Ms. Loest questioned the suggested illumination limitation. Director Griepentrog noted that the Board had desired to provide consistency throughout the district and has historically requested illumination at or below 3500k. Mr. O'Connor clarified that the specification related to the temperature as opposed to brightness. Mr. Skauge noted that he would like to see the color temperature reduced to 3500k. Ms. Loest, Mr. Pachefsky and Mr. Brice agreed.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as submitted, with the modification to a light temperature not to exceed 3500k; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 7-0.

8. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a blade sign at commercial property 4050 N. Oakland Avenue.

Kelly Hanaway from Milwaukee Sign Company represented this item. He noted that the proposed blade sign was a non-illuminated replacement of an existing structure. The blade sign, which is 9 sq. ft. (3 ft. x 3 ft.) is a metal panel with a vinyl application. He noted that the existing sign was previously approved by Special Exception. Director Griepentrog informed that the sign code requires any new sign to conform to the code or seek a corresponding Special Exception. He noted that since the previous sign was approved by Special Exception in the same size and location that he felt consideration was warranted, unless specifically determined otherwise.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, via Special Exception, citing the (5) appearance of the sign and (11) historical precedent; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a façade sign at commercial property 1518 E. Capitol Drive.

Director Griepentrog provided an overview of the proposed sign, noting that it would replace a previously approved sign in the same size and location. He noted that the height of the lettering totaled 14 inches and was thus conforming to code.

Mr. Skauge confirmed that the sign was not illuminated.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as drawn; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

9. Discussion and possible recommendation of modifications to front and street side yard patio requirements, as detailed in 535-9F(2).

Director Griepentrog provided an overview of this item, noting that a recent DRB approval had been appealed to the Board of Appeals with respect to screening requirements. The Board of Appeals ruled that the code was not written in a manner that required year-round screening. It also noted that as written, grass could technically qualify for the natural vegetation requirements.

In response to that appeal, Director Griepentrog presented a draft code update to the Design Review Board for consideration, with respect to his understanding of their intentions. He noted that staff would like to add a patio definition and clarify screening requirements to be year-round and continuous. He also suggested adding a minimum height standard and rewording the “directly adjacent” requirement to simply read “adjacent.”

Ms. Loest questioned the intention of “year-round,” specifically whether that would require evergreen plantings. Director Griepentrog noted that he believed the intent was to have some sort of year-round screening, but that it did not to be green leafed at all times. Chair Kraehnke suggested the intent of year-round related to something that would be present and not cut down or removed. Mr. O’Connor suggested separating the proposed wording into two sentence, one related to continuous screening of a minimum height and another clarifying the intention of year-round with provided examples. Ms. Loest noted that a shrub or something with structure seemed to be desired.

Ms. Loest also questioned the overall intention of the screening. Mr. O'Connor stated that the screening helps facilitate a transition between the areas and defines an edge. Ms. Loest wondered why non-vegetative materials, such as lannon stone seat wall, were not desired. Chair Kraehnke noted that low planters could also be an effective screen. Mr. Brice suggested there were other creative ways to do screening but cautioned on anything that provided too hard of an edge.

Director Griepentrog stated that he would incorporate these discussion points into a revised draft to be shared and considered at the next meeting. He encouraged Board members to submit their own thoughts directly to him.

10. Adjournment

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:16 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director