

Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 22, 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, Bryan Koester, Chair Scott Kraehnke, Mike Oates (arrived during item 3), Mike Skauge and Mary Wright. Others present: Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director; Andrew Shacklady, Angela Shacklady, Leah Perez, Dimitri Dimitropoulos, Myriam Migrditchian, Chris Housley, Stephanie Engelking

2. Approval of August 8, 2019 meeting minutes.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 5-0.

3. Further 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 revised plans, including details, as requested from the August 8 meeting. He noted that a few modifications were made, including the elimination of the door on the side of house. He also provided material samples for the proposed siding and windows. He noted that cedar balustrades and bead board would be utilized on the front porch.

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

4. Further 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.

The applicant asked that this item be deferred to a future meeting.

5. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a façade sign at commercial property 3510 N. Oakland Avenue, property owner 3510 Oakland LLC.

Director Griepentrog presented an overview of the project via information within the memo. Mr. Dimitropoulos, building owner, informed that the sign would fill in the open spot within the decorative sign band, and would allow the second floor tenant an opportunity to be more visible. He further noted that the same fabricator was going to be making the sign.

Mr. Koester confirmed that the proposal included relocating the address marker above the new sign. Mr. Skauge questioned if they had considered relocating the address marker to the south of the door, noting that he felt like it was too cluttered above. Chair. Kraehnke questioned if

they also considered just using the numbers without the medallion. Mr. Skauge indicated that he was fine with the allowance and design of the proposed wall sign.

Mr. Oates motioned to approve the sign, as submitted, via Special Exception to exceed the maximum height and allow a wall sign to a second story tenant, subject to the relocation of the address marker to be on the first floor near the directory board; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 6-0.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a new single family residence at residential property 3534 N. Lake Drive, property owner Chris Abele.

Ms. Migrditchian and Mr. Housley presented the project on behalf of the applicant. They detailed the construction of a new 2-story home with a walk out basement. They noted that the front yard had a 277 ft. front yard setback with 26 ft. side yard setbacks on both sides. Stabilization of the bluff would be provided through new concrete retaining walls and plantings. An underground garage would be constructed in the front yard, which would not be visible from the street. Two terraces would be featured at the rear of the property. Engineered fill would be located in the middle of the house, which has a u-shaped floor plan on the first and second levels.

The architects went through a slide-show presentation that featured elevations and renderings of the project. They pointed out that the house fit-in with the context of the neighborhood in terms of height. They described the architecture as clean and symmetrical with French country estate inspirations. They noted that the chimneys were a focal point of the aesthetic and that the cornice, corner and window trim would provide subtle shadows. Metal clad windows would be installed featuring trim work to match. The house would have a slate roof and metal ornamentation.

The architects showed inspiration photos from both European and American houses. They noted hipped roofs with slate shingles and stone veneer facades. They pointed out the balance of fenestration and symmetry. They discussed the contrast of material featuring dark and light elements and noted that the stone veneer would be light gray with blended mortar joints. Neighboring properties were also shown for reference and similar fenestration and chimneys were highlighted.

Site improvements relating to the front yard and driveway were discussed. A row of trees would be planted on either side of the driveway with an open lawn and landscape buffer to the neighboring properties. The driveway would be 270 ft. long and feature a 2% slope, which was described as not dramatic.

Lastly, it was noted that the windows, doors and downspouts provided consistency on the front façade, along with the cornice. A belt course was noted to feature a slight projection. The restraint of detail was highlighted as a design feature.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if different color stone would be featured. The architects noted that different cuts would be used that provided a slight difference.

The architects noted that the renderings shown were created from birds-eye views from actual drone photos. The screening elements detailed were real buffers. The drone photo shot from the lake detailed how the bluff builds itself out already and how the house sits in the site's contours going from home to lawn to pool. They also noted on the birds-eye rendering of the pool area that the glazing shown was more modern than would be installed.

Chair Kraehnke questioned the gutter and downspout material, and was informed that it would be a slate color from zinc-coated copper that would look matte gray. Chair Kraehnke also asked if the only roof penetrations would be the chimney. The architect indicated that chimneys, fans, vents and utilities would penetrate the roof, but other than the chimneys, penetrations would be kept on the lake side as best as possible. The chimneys were detailed as cut stone. Ms. Wright questioned if the driveway would be laid with red pavers, as shown. The architects noted that the pavers would be gray and of a cobbled type. Ms. Wright asked if the bluff was secure and the architects noted that preliminary geotechnical reports were done and that quite a bit of stabilization was required. Ms. Wright confirmed that the front gate would be closed throughout construction. Mr. Kraehnke followed-up questioning if the gate would remain, and the architects noted that it would.

Mr. Skauge noted that the project looked magnificent. Mr. Oates differed and stated that street façade was lacking and that the design was neither modern nor old. The applicants referenced precedent photos to show that restraint was ok. They also noted that the renderings were not capable of showing quality. They further referenced the downspouts, doors and materials would be of high quality. They discussed how the profile around the windows and doors were hard to see and that the belt course would be double stepped. Chair Kraehnke requested details of the windows on the front façade and was informed that large French doors would be used on the first floor with casement windows above. He noted that he appreciated the restrained effort, but suggested that additional details like quoins could have been considered. Ms. Wright noted that the design looked naked without shutters. Chair Kraehnke mentioned that the materials are impressive and time will help them look better.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 5-1 (Mr. Oates voting nay.)

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a new single family residence at residential property 4450 N. Lake Drive, property owners Kris and Anna Baritt.

Stephanie Engelking presented the project. She noted that a new single family home is being proposed to replace the existing one. She referenced the site plans, floor plans and elevations that were provided, and noted that she had brought renderings to the meeting, if helpful. The house would be located in approximately the same location. She referenced the photo of the

existing house, which was provided within the application. Mr. Oates noted that the existing house was not that old, perhaps from the 70s.

The architecture of the new home would be defined by board and baton with areas of stone. Casement windows would be utilized. Mr. Oates questioned if smart siding would be cased around the windows. The applicant confirmed, noting that it would take paint well. He also questioned what the vertical material would be and was informed that it would be an LP Smartside material. Chair Kraehnke questioned what material would be utilized on the roof. The applicant noted that it would predominately be asphalt shingles, but that an area of metal standing seam would be used on one location. Mr. Oates noted that he liked the proportion and design of the house and indicated that appropriate materials were proposed. Ms. Wright asked if the bluff was studied, and the applicant noted that they were currently looking into it. Director Griepentrog noted that the zoning district required confirmation of bluff stability prior to the issuance of any permits. Mr. Oates questioned what type of materials comprised a rear portion of the house and was informed that it was all doors for a cohesive look, but some were operable and others fixed. Chair Kraehnke noted that stone steps were in the front, but asked what other elements were used around the foundation. The applicant indicated that a trim board water table was proposed. Mr. Skauge asked if there was any reason why standing seam was not proposed for the entire roof. Ms. Engelking mentioned that it was studied, but asphalt shingles were the preference of the client. Chair Kraehnke asked what was planned above the garage and was informed that was a potential future build out.

Mr. Oates motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 6-0.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:51 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Oates. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director