

Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 25, 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, Brian Koester (acting Chair), Scott Kraehnke, Kevin Greene, Mike Skauge and Mary Wright. Others present: Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director; Jeff Stowe, Scott Bickley, Mike Dindorf, Anne Leplae, Jon Wallenkamp, NSFD Fire Chief Robert Whitaker.

2. Annual election of Design Review Board Chair.

This item was deferred until next meeting.

3. Approval of July 11, 2019 meeting minutes.

Planning & Development Director Griepentrog asked for clarification within item 7. Mr. Kraehnke noted that the Board discussed acceptance of the sign because it enhanced and did not detract from the building. It was also noted that the sign was proportional to the area and was located on a commercial corridor. The Board unanimously agreed to include within the minutes.

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

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a rear addition (south elevation) and dormer expansion (north elevation) at residential property 4077 N. Prospect Avenue, property owners Scott and Liz Bickley.

Jeff Stowe introduced the project, noting that the southwest corner of the building would be filled in to accommodate a first floor kitchen addition with mudroom and sunroom. He indicated that the existing brick would be reused. He also noted that a similar roof and window type would be utilized, and that aluminum clad bi-fold doors with wood on the interior would be installed.

Mr. Skauge questioned the expanded dormer, and the applicant indicated that the shed dormer would be expanded by approximately 2.5 feet to accommodate an upstairs bathroom remodel. Ms. Wright questioned the proposed window infill on the south façade. The applicant indicated that it was being done to accommodate the new kitchen layout and noted that it was three feet from the property line, which faces the blank wall of a duplex. Mr. Kraehnke asked if the infill brick would be recessed, which was confirmed. Mr. Skauge noted that the infill would always be visible, if the brick didn't perfectly match and indicated that he was ok with the infill as proposed. Mr. Brice asked if the applicant had considered slightly stepping back the addition to avoid the joint of the new addition with the existing house. The applicant indicated that they

wanted as much floor area as possible and restated that they are reusing the brick, so that it should match. Mr. Skauge questioned if all other details would match, such as windows. The applicant indicated that some windows would be reused and others were new Marvin double-hung units. Mr. Skauge mentioned that no firm details were provided. The property owner, Mr. Bickley, noted that it is their intention to make this addition look like it was original.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as submitted, providing that all windows, doors and soffit trim match the existing features on the house; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 6-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window alterations at residential property 3526 N. Cramer Street, property owners Adam and Elisa Ziebell.

Mike Dindorf, the contractor for the project, introduced the item. He summarized that the exterior improvements are being proposed in conjunction with an interior kitchen remodel and new open-concept floor plan. He noted that the cabinet layout dictated the revised widened window on the east and the removed window on the north.

Mr. Koester questioned if there were cabinets on either side of the window. The contractor noted that there were cabinets on one side and floating shelves on the other, with the kitchen sink in the base cabinets in between. Mr. Skauge asked why the other window was being removed and was informed that it was due to the location of the refrigerator. It was also noted that the window was on the north façade, which did not let in much light. Mr. Skauge questioned if the house had its original wood siding, and the contractor noted that the siding was actually aluminum and would be patched in from the garage. It was also noted that a new door was being proposed that would feature more glass and a revised swing. Mr. Brice questioned the width of the window and wondered if two double-hung windows would look more proportional. It was noted that the framing required for two windows would limit glass area, and the newly proposed window was proportionate to the existing window on the second floor. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the new window was vinyl.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as submitted; seconded by Mr. Greene. Vote 6-0.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the modification of the awning at commercial property 1800 E. Capitol Drive, business owner Alliance Française de Milwaukee.

Ms. Leplae introduced her item, noting that the current awning was installed in 2006, just prior to the existing Sign Code's adoption. She informed that the building was being repainted, and that they needed to take down the existing awning to accommodate. She indicated that they are proposing to reuse the existing structure, but would replace the current plastic covering with a canvas fabric. She expressed a desire to maintain the phone number and add the website and logo.

Mr. Koester noted that he liked the layout on the color version, which featured the phone number on website on the bottom. Mr. Brice agreed and suggested that format appeared more anchored and that the proposed content was appropriate for the size of the awning.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as submitted, subject to the letters not exceeding 18" in height and that the layout of the color rendering be utilized; seconded by Mr. Kraehnke. Vote 6-0.

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for exterior modifications and site improvements at municipal property 3936 N. Murray Avenue, property occupant North Shore Fire Department.

Jon Wallenkamp of Kueny Architects introduced the project with a brief PowerPoint presentation. He summarized that an addition was being added to the northeast corner to accommodate apparatus needs. On the west/front elevation he pointed out that new bi-fold doors would be installed that were similar in style to the originals. He noted that the existing wrought iron would be restored and reinstalled, and that new light fixtures to match the existing would be added with LED components. He also noted that increased greenspace and a relocated sign were planned.

On the south façade he pointed out that the existing sally port would be filled in with brick to match as best as possible, along with two new windows to match the existing. He also noted that a new public entry door would be installed with wrought iron hinges to mimic the current/original door in that present location.

On the east façade he highlighted the new glass overhead door on the addition within two masonry piers, as well as the new man door with roman arch to match.

Site improvements were also summarized. It was noted that the garage at the northeast corner of the site would be removed and that dumpsters would be relocated in that location. Mr. Wallenkamp highlighted the proposed pedestrian way between the Fire Station and Village Hall. He noted that it was designed to accommodate maintenance vehicles, but would be blocked off with a planter.

Mr. Wallenkamp noted that the entire interior of the station would be renovated, using and reestablishing the original window locations. He pointed out that new aluminum-clad windows with muttuns to match the original details would be installed.

Planning & Development Director Griepentrog noted that three questions had been submitted to the Village specific to details on the plans. The applicant answered all of them, noting that the existing window sills on the east façade would be re-used in conjunction with the proposed window infills; that the window detail shown on A5.1 was accurate in terms of retaining the existing vent system alongside two new windows; and that aluminum soffits would be installed on all four facades in the flat areas, leaving all original detailing in place.

Mr. Greene expressed appreciation for the desire to match the detail of the existing doorway on the south façade, but suggested that it felt odd to have the wrought iron hinges on the side of the door that opened. Ms. Wright noted that detail mimicked the doors on the west façade, but agreed that hinges should only be installed on the east side of the man door.

Mr. Brice questioned the door on the west end of the south façade and whether or not it should match the proposed new main door. The applicant indicated that they could match the style. Mr. Brice questioned the material of the door, and was informed that it was solid wood.

Ms. Wright asked if the garage doors featured true divided lights and was informed that the look would be accomplished through inserts. Mr. Greene questioned if that same style of door was considered for the east façade, and was informed that cost was prohibitive.

The applicant pointed out that most of the building's mechanical units would be installed on the flat roof over the new apparatus addition, screened by a parapet wall.

It was noted that muttons were not proposed above the western door on the south façade, and the applicant indicated that they could be added.

Mr. Greene questioned the color temperature of the proposed lighting. The applicant was unsure of the technical detail, but noted that it would be a cool white light. Mr. Greene suggested that 3,000 should be utilized.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as submitted, subject to modifying the proposed entry door to feature hinges only on operable side, installing a new door at the west end of the south elevation to match other new door, installing muttons on transom over doorway on south facade and specifying a color temperature of 3,000 within the new lighting fixtures; seconded by Mr. Greene. Vote 6-0.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Skauge motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:13 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Greene. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director