



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 9, 2021
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

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

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Ryan O'Connor, Lybra Loest (arrived during item #3), Daryl Melzer, Larry Pachefsky and Mike Skauge.

Others present: Nicholas Blavat, Keith Barnes, Leslie Melo, Carla Melo and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

2. Approval of the August 26, 2021 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky motioned to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 5-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a garage with a second story addition and a walkway connection to the existing house at residential property 4424 N. Lake Drive.

Nicholas Blavat of Deep River Partners represented the project on behalf of the homeowner. He provided an overview, noting that the project would add a modern, three car garage to the property with a screened outdoor kitchen on the back of the garage and second floor living space above with a deck featuring views of Lake Michigan. The auto court would be expanded to the east of the garage using a similar concrete and brick border pattern. Sidewalks would connect the auto court to the rear yard through a breezeway.

Mr. Blavat noted that existing materials would be replicated on the front/west elevation. As the elevations transitioned to the lake side, the materials would be comprised of wood field panels with columns. It was noted that the columns would mimic columns on the existing rear elevation of the home. Arched windows would be introduced on the addition that are referenced from the tea house. The new garage doors would not be a direct match in style but are very similar. The roofing on the house is true slate, but the addition could feature simulated slate, depending on pricing. However, it was noted that the materials would never touch and would be separated by a copper roof atop the second story walkway.

Renderings of the project were presented. Mr. Blavat stated that the renderings best showed how the brick detailing and trim work would match the existing house. The renderings also showed the proposed second story deck railing, which would feature clear glass panels.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the white materials shown in the elevation were wood, not plaster. Mr. Blavat noted it would be painted more of a cream color to match the house. Chair Kraehnke noted that wood would be better than plaster because it could be trimmed out exactly how they wanted it. Mr. Blavat noted that they were trying to keep the material palette simple and respective of the current materials.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the position of the garage doors had been considered to be inward facing the other garage doors with a courtyard in the middle, as would be traditional to Georgian style homes. Mr. Blavat noted that there was not enough room to allow for that. He also stated that the addition needed a variance from the Board of Appeals to be located as close to the street as proposed. They did not want to push their request any further.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned the internal layout of the existing structure, with respect to how views from those rooms would be impacted by the addition. Chair Kraehnke noted that the primary view faced east. Mr. Melzer stated that the addition made the best use of the limited space available.

Mr. Pachefsky wondered why arched windows were proposed on the second level bridge connecting the addition to the house when there were no other arched windows on the front of the house. He noted that all of the windows were square and that the only rounded top was above the doorway. Mr. Blavat stated that his client was looking for ways to soften the rigidity of the design. He noted that windows within the paneled portions of the addition were primarily arched.

Mr. Melzer questioned the modified view of the neighbors to the south. Mr. Blavat referenced the site plan, which showed the location of the neighboring homes. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the entire property was fenced in.

Mr. Pachefsky requested detail of the proposed exterior wood paneling. Mr. Blavat informed that it would be a trimmed out flat panel with a style and rail. He also shared photo examples of a house on Richland Court in Shorewood where similar paneling was installed.

Chair Kraehnke noted that representation of the proposed paneling looked very elegant. He liked the change to arched windows in the panel-clad portions of the addition. He also appreciated that the separation of the addition from the main home was set off by the copper roof. Mr. O'Connor agreed and noted that the proposed addition looks more appropriate than the previous garage addition.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 6-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the enclosure of a porch on the rear elevation at residential property 4424 N. Maryland Avenue.

Keith Barnes, the architect for the project, presented on behalf of homeowners Carla and Leslie Melo, who were also in attendance. Mr. Barnes noted that the project involved the enclosure of an existing covered rear porch. The east and south walls would be enclosed to create a mudroom. The east wall would feature a set of sliding patio doors with a transom window, and the south wall would feature horizontal clapboard siding with two awning windows with divided lights.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the existing house was painted brick. Mr. Barnes noted that the bump out below the bay window and the gable had wood siding. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the enclosure would be at the deck level and that there would not be a step up into it. Mr. O'Connor questioned if the enclosure would be insulated, which was confirmed upon looking at the construction drawings. Mr. Barnes also noted that the space would be heated.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned if brick was ever considered instead of the wood siding. Mr. Barnes noted that brick had been considered, but that wood siding was the preferred material. Mr. O'Connor suggested that you wouldn't even know that the enclosure was new if brick were used. Leslie Melo noted that the wood siding would provide a modern touch and that it was their preferred material. They believed that white siding would lighten up the house. Carla Melo noted that a nearby home was recently renovated with this look. Mr. Barnes also noted a desire to keep the existing columns and beams. Chair Kraehnke agreed that the brick could not seamlessly integrated without removing parts of the structure. To that point, he did not mind the use of clapboard siding on this addition and noted that there are existing elements of that on the house. He stated that the siding would provide some modern character and allow the entry to stand out from the brick house. Mr. Skauge agreed. He also noted that DRB has approved several other brick houses with rear siding additions that would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the trim details of the doors and windows on the addition would match the trim details featured on the existing columns. Mr. Pachefsky if the panels under the bay window could be replicated in the addition. Mr. Barnes noted that the wood siding was the preference of the homeowners. Vote 6-0.

5. Adjournment

Mr. Melzer motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:49 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 6-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director