

**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, September 12, 2019**

3930 N. Murray Avenue, Shorewood, WI



**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:19 p.m.

Members present: Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Chair Scott Kraehnke, and Mary Wright.  
Others present: Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director; Julie Banach

**2. Approval of August 22, 2019 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Brice motioned to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Chair Kraehnke requested that additional information regarding roof penetration be added. Mr. Brice and Mr. Koester were agreeable to the amendment and revised their motion and second accordingly. Vote 4-0.

**3. 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.**

Julie Banach presented the revised signage plan, noting that they reduced the size of the lettering and that the client added an accent bar underneath. As requested by the Design Review Board at their last consideration, one inch of room would be located both above and below the signage in the sign band.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 4-0.

**4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window and door modifications at residential property 4478 N. Frederick Avenue, property owners Tyler and Anna Olson.**

Michael Dindorf, builder, presented an overview of the project. He explained that the project involves the conversion of a duplex into a single-family home and that most of the renovation is occurring on the inside. He noted that two windows on the rear façade would be removed and replaced by an exterior door, that the existing exterior door would be removed for a new window and that another set of windows would be shortened to allow for the placement of the kitchen sink.

Mr. Koester questioned if the milk chute would be removed. Mr. Dindorf indicated that it was going to be removed, but that they could keep it, if desired. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the rear dormer was being removed, as it was not shown on the plans. Mr. Dindorf responded that it would be staying, as it is needed for attic access. Mr. Brice asked if any of the basement windows would be modified. After discussion, Mr. Dindorf confirmed that the set of windows underneath the proposed door would need to be removed, but that the others were staying. Chair Kraehnke asked if a new concrete stoop would be installed at the doorway and was

informed that it would just be a cedar landing. Mr. Brice questioned if the door would be a standard slider. Mr. Dindorf noted that it would be simulated to look like a French door featuring a thicker frame and sidelights. The style of the new window as also questioned, and the applicant indicated that windows had not yet been picked out, but that they were leaning towards Marvin Integrity or equivalent. Chair Kraehnke asked if the sill would be relocated underneath the new sink window opening, which the builder confirmed. The builder also confirmed that as much of the existing brick would be reused to patch in as possible.

Ms. Wright motioned to approve the plans, as submitted with the stipulation to keep the milk chute; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 4-0.

**5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a two-story rear addition and attached garage at residential property 4476 N. Morris Blvd., property owner Tony Reibel.**

Michael Dindorf, as the builder, presented the project, which would involve a two-story rear addition and attached garage. A new master suite and second story hall bathroom would be constructed above the proposed garage space. The first floor would remain largely the same.

Ms. Wright asked for details about the proposed siding, and Mr. Dindorf noted that new LP SmartSide siding would be installed on the entire house. He also mentioned that a new asphalt shingle roof would be installed. Chair Kraehnke questioned if new windows would be installed on the entire house, and was informed that new windows would only be installed in the addition. The builder noted that the existing garage door, which was somewhat recently purchased, would be repurposed. With the relocated garage, concrete would be eliminated and green space added. Mr. Koester questioned how far the garage would be from the alley and deducted from the site plan that it was approximately 25 feet. Ms. Wright confirmed that the carport would be going away.

Mr. Brice questioned the second story frieze board on the east, south and north elevations. He noted that it was only located on the addition and did not fit in with the rest of the property. He questioned if just window trim could be used. Chair Kraehnke noted that he did not have a problem with the frieze between the first and second story, but that he would prefer that it be moved down to the eave line. He noted that without it, there might be too much siding. Mr. Brice pointed out that historically there would not have been a frieze board on top and questioned if the homeowner would have an issue with removing it. Mr. Dindorf indicated that he thought the homeowner could be agreeable to revising it. Chair Kraehnke agreed that the upper frieze board did not match and concurred with Mr. Brice on the suggestion to remove it.

Ms. Wright questioned why the windows on the north elevation were located at different heights. Mr. Dindorf replied that one set of windows was in a bathroom and the other were in the master bedroom. Chair Kraehnke also questioned the different window elevations on the south side and was informed that those were most likely an error. Chair Kraehnke noted that if they were dropped lower more breathing room could be attained. Mr. Brice requested that window height on the existing house be explored with a goal of aligning them.

Ms. Wright questioned if it would be best for the application to come back to the Board with revisions. Chair Kraehnke agreed and noted that he would like to see revised plans with confirmed and aligned window locations. Mr. Koester noted that the windows should be lowered and trimmed to match the rest of the house, and the upper frieze board should be

removed. Mr. Brice requested that the trim on the three transoms in the garage match the rest of the proposed trim. Chair Kraehnke noted that common sills should be used throughout the design. Chair Kraehnke asked the Board if they were ok with the proposed roof, and Mr. Brice noted that there were other examples of the Dutch gable on the house. Ms. Wright noted that the middle trim board should be lowered. Mr. Brice also requested that a water table board be explored on the whole house, noting that it might fluctuate on different parts of the house.

No action was taken and the applicant was requested to come back to a future meeting with revised plans responding to the discussion.

**6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a front yard patio at residential property 4321 N. Newhall Street, property owners Jackie and Joe LeSage.**

Leslie Spencer and Ashley Hoffman, the proposed patio installers, presented the item for consideration. They noted that the property owner wanted a seating area in the front that would not take up the entire front lawn.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the sidewalk was existing. He also questioned the size of the planting beds, which were detailed as one ft. on the sides and two feet on the front. Chair Kraehnke asked if the planting beds were at grade. The installers confirmed and indicated that the patio was at grade, with a slight slope of approximately one inch for drainage. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the proposed landscaping would be approximately 24 inches in height at maturity. Ms. Wright noted that the patio looked nice. The installers showed an example of the proposed unilock paver. Chair Kraehnke asked if any trim would be needed, and the installers noted it would be needed to configure the curve. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that it would be the same color. Chair Kraehnke asked if the planting bed would be finished with mulch, and the installers noted that top soil dressed with mulch was planned. Ms. Wright questioned if there was direct access to the patio or if the front stairs needed to be used. The installers noted that the front stairs would need to be used, but that there were also stepping stones to access the patio directly from the driveway.

Ms. Wright motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 4-0.

**7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window alteration at residential property 3520 N. Hackett Avenue, property owner Edward and Allison Madell.**

Jackson Leverenz of Design Group 3 presented the project. He indicated that 99% of the project was interior for a master suite and bathroom remodel. He noted that an existing window in a small dormer would be removed and essentially doubled-up with two new awning windows. The existing stucco and wood detail would remain where available and be replicated and painted to match, where needed.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the dormer would remain the same. Mr. Brice questioned why awning windows were proposed, and the designer noted that the rest of the home featured casement windows but that the manufacturer does not carry casements of this size. He noted that the awning windows would be grilled like the rest of the windows. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the current windows were push-out. He also noted that the project looked good.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 4-0.

**8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a front entryway modification at residential property 4441 N. Frederick Avenue, property owner Gregory Anderson.**

Gregory Anderson, property owner, presented the project with his architect on the phone. He noted that a duplex was being converted into a single-family home and that one of the front doors was being removed. He updated the Board that his plans would be modified to include a sidelight next to the doorway.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the sidelight would be full height and 12 inches in width. The remainder of the front entryway, including the sidewall on the house, would be clad in horizontal siding. Ms. Wright questioned what kind of siding would be used, and the property owner informed that it would be v-channel horizontal shiplap. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the door and window would be trimmed like the second story shake. The property owner confirmed that the same front door would be kept. Mr. Koester questioned if the applicant considered using stucco. He confirmed that he did think about it, but ultimately wanted an accent wall. Chair Kraehnke questioned how the siding would terminate, and the owner noted it would terminate into the corner and continue on the inside wall. Chair Kraehnke questioned if there was any other horizontal siding on the house, and the owner informed there was not. Mr. Koester confirmed that the left door would be removed and the right door would be kept. The owner noted that the color shown on the rendering would not be used, but rather that a monochromatic look would be sought with some subtle color at the entryway. Ms. Wright indicated that she was ok with the siding. Chair Kraehnke agreed and noted that he does not mind the entryway being its own thing. Mr. Brice concurred.

Mr. Brice motioned to approve the plans, as described with the sidelight by the door; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 4-0.

**9. Adjournment.**

Ms. Wright motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:16 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 4-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director