

Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 26, 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, Kathryn Kamm, Bryan Koester, Chair Scott Kraehnke, Mike Oates (arrived during item 4), John Rizzo and Mike Skauge. Others present: Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director; Mike Dindorf, Kevin Sannes, Robert Ollman, Bob Morris, Teresa Wadzinski, Bryan Davis, Tim Kenney

2. Approval of September 12, 2019 meeting minutes.

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

3. Further 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.

Mike Dindorf presented updated plans that were modified based on discussion at the September 12th meeting. Chair Kraehnke summarized that conversation centered on the removal of the frieze board and confirmation of window locations and details. Mr. Dindorf noted that the windows were fixed on the southern elevation and that the trim on the garage windows was drawn to match. Mr. Brice noted that the overall concerns from last meeting had been addressed.

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

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a front yard patio at residential property 1829 E. Jarvis Street, property owners Colin Cunningham and Holly Spackman.

Kevin Sannes, contractor, presented the item, noting that the existing walkway would be removed and replaced with pavers and a front paver patio. Planning Director Griepentrog informed the Board that the code section relevant to patio requirements was provided with their materials. He specifically noted the section that requires one entire side of a patio must be directly adjacent to the principle structure of the lot. Mr. Koester provided that the patio as designed looked appropriate. Ms. Kamm mentioned that the landscaping softens the look of the patio and provides buffer on all sides. Mr. Skauge questioned if the design would have water problems, but mentioned that he was ok with the look of it. Mr. Rizzo asked for clarification on the plantings and was provided with the detail sheet.

Ms. Kamm motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, Mr. Koester seconded and noted that the adjacency was appropriate. Vote 7-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a front façade and porch restoration at commercial property 2316 E. Beverly Road, property owner Slava Tuzhilkov.

Robert Ollman, contractor, presented the project on behalf of the property owner. He noted that the work was being performed because a sewer line was crushed and needed to be replaced. In order to do that the vestibule and part of the deck had been removed. He mentioned that the vestibule was not proposed to be replaced. Trim would be mimicked over the doorway. The existing masonry structure enclosing the deck would be lowered and the deck enlarged. Hard plaster or stucco would be installed on the exterior and painted to match.

Ms. Kamm questioned if the sliding door was to remain. The contractor noted that the door was replaced at a prior time. Mr. Rizzo questioned if the doorway had changed openings and if the masonry would be cleaned up around the new door. Ms. Kamm also questioned if any additional trim would be added. Mr. Oates agreed that the sliding door did not fit the opening.

Mr. Oates questioned if new trim would be rebuilt around the main entry door, which the contractor confirmed. Ms. Kamm questioned how far the new canopy would project and was informed it would be anywhere from ¾” to 1 ½” applied to the face of the building.

Planning Director Griepentrog showed old images of the property via Google street view to better show the previous conditions.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the applicant had any interest in providing rain shelter for tenants or if corbels could be utilized within the design, noting that they would be better than just trim. Ms. Kamm agreed that the vestibule did not need to be replaced but wanted to keep some sort of projection over the doorway.

Mr. Brice questioned the decking material and was informed that it would be wood. Ms. Kamm questioned if it would be treated or composite. The contractor noted that the owner wanted to use treated. Mr. Skauge suggested that green treated would not match, but brown treated could. He also questioned if the handrails would be painted and was informed that they would be the same treated material.

Mr. Skauge questioned if the collapsed concrete floor affected the walls as well. The contractor noted that a structural engineer looked at it and did not think that it did. Ms. Kamm questioned the bearing depth of the walls and was informed that it was similar to the foundation wall of 6 ft. Chair Kraehnke asked if the old materials would be removed and was informed that they would rather be encapsulated. Mr. Skauge questioned if the deck would be level or feature a step down. The contractor noted that a step down of 3 to 4 inches would likely be installed.

Mr. Oates moved to approve the plans as submitted with the condition that the entry canopy eyebrow project from the building similar to the existing condition with corbels and that real stucco not stucco board be utilized. (He also suggested that the Village should enforce the modified door as a work without permits issue that would need to come back, if modified, but not if replaced with a door that fit.) Ms. Kamm seconded the motion. Vote 6-1. Mr. Brice voting nay.

9. Consideration of the application and plans on file for two-story addition at 1701 E. Capitol Drive (High School), property owner Shorewood School District.

Project architects Bob Morris and Teresa Wadzinski presented this item. They began by providing a summary of the community design sessions that led to this proposal. They noted that the school buildings are prominent in the community and desired to respect their history while providing new safe spaces. Through the community design sessions, they were charged with designing elements in relation to the existing buildings without being wed to match them exactly. They were free to contrast and speak to the modernity and new era of the buildings.

The new administration element to the high school campus would feature a two-story entry piece that would provide a defined and known entry point. It features a modern, streamlined design with vertical brick columns. The entry would be framed by darker bands of monarch brick, which is larger in size. Metal panels would be located within the window segments, the color of which would be matte gray while the overhang would be a lighter gray. The materials were described as different, but respectful.

Mr. Skauge asked how the interior would be utilized and was referenced to the floor plan.

The architects reviewed the site plan to highlight improvements, including a repaved parking lot with storm water management features. Three colors of concrete would be utilized to highlight the entryway. A photometric plan was presented to detail site lighting with an assumption of new LED fixtures.

Planning Director Griepentrog read a comment from John Mann into the public record. Mr. Mann noted that his concern is specifically with regards to the administration building. While he appreciates the blending of the new addition on the rear of the building, he noted a preference for the spandrels to match the brick and not be grey as proposed. More importantly, he did not believe the roof of the addition echoed the architecture of the building. He believed the roof should be in keeping with the cornice of the building. Mike Oates disagreed with the statement and noted that the spandrels helped emphasize the verticality of the brick piers.

Ms. Kamm questioned if the sign band was made of the same material, which was confirmed. She also noted that two patterns of brick were proposed, running bond and stacked bond. She confirmed that the entry doors would be aluminum storefront doors and questioned if the area above the doorway was spandrel or clerestory windows. The architects replied that clerestory windows were being proposed.

Mike Oates questioned what was happening at the top of the piers. The architects noted that a transition to metal was planned, providing an homage to the steel structure. Those features would be pulled back slightly from the limestone cap.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if any exterior lighting was proposed. The architects noted that lighting would be in the soffit, but that the area was primarily lit from the parking lot. Chair Kraehnke noted that the soffit rakes up and questioned if the fascia was made of the same materials. The architects confirmed it was. Mr. Rizzo confirmed that the seams wrap up the face.

Ms. Kamm questioned if the walls within the parking lot were existing or new. She was informed that they would be slightly modified from the existing. Ms. Kamm asked if vehicular

traffic would be restricted near the entryway, and it was clarified that a 24' fire lane would be reserved in that area. Landscaping in front at the base of the building was questioned, and it was noted that the specifics were not yet known, but that landscaping was hoped to soften the edge and provide a buffer. Mr. Rizzo requested that details be provided for review when developed.

Mr. Koester noted that the plans looked sharp.

Mr. Kamm questioned why the site plan included the maintenance building. The architects believed that represented the extent of parking lot improvements.

Mr. Brice questioned the spacing of the piers on the southern elevation noting that they did not line up with the existing windows. The architects noted that the elevations were deceiving and that it would be difficult to see both at the same time. They further provided that the spacing was based on the rhythm of the windows rather than the existing structure.

Ms. Kamm inquired of a green roof was contemplated. The architects responded that was being costed out, but that solar panels were also be considered.

Ms. Kamm noted that the lighting temperature within the parking lot seemed cold and wondered if something warmer could be proposed. She expressed a preference for 3,000k or 2,700k, if possible. Mr. Rizzo agreed.

Chair Kraehnke complimented the restrained use of red within the design. Mr. Skauge agreed that it was appropriate.

Mr. Rizzo motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, on the condition that the color temperature of the site lighting be adjusted to 3,000k and that the site/landscaping plan be tabled and resubmitted for review when complete; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window modifications and the installation of exterior ramps at 2100 E. Capitol Drive (Atwater), property owner Shorewood School District.

Planning Director Griepentrog clarified that this item included review of the window replacements, because unlike residential window replacements, this is a commercial property subject to more strict permitting standards.

The project architects summarized that in addition to the window replacements, two accessible ramps were being proposed. One on the south side by the main entrance and one on the east side near the service entrance. They noted that within the community design sessions they were directed to not call attention to them and honor the history of the building. As a result, the ramp in the front was designed to be tucked behind the existing columns. The ramp would create a secure entryway into the front office, as a new door would be placed behind the column. It was noted that it was easiest to see the proposal on the plan view.

Mr. Rizzo questioned if the dumpsters could be relocated on the east side of the building and was informed that the District was looking into it.

Mr. Brice asked if plantings were planned in front of the main entrance ramp. The architects noted that it was not currently in the plan. Ms. Kamm questioned if there were any other concrete walk improvements and was informed that there were not. Mr. Brice noted that he would prefer to see plantings in front of the ramp. Chair Kraehnke concurred. Mr. Skauge noted that the area would be too small and have issues with salt. Bryan Davis noted that plantings in front of the sidewalk area would screen the ramp from being visible from Capitol Dr.

Ms. Kamm questioned if any windows would be blocked by the ramp. The architects noted that the ramp would be held off of the façade for about 18 to 24 inches. One window at the landing would need to be removed, but the rest would stay. Ms. Kamm noted that there may be a maintenance issue with grass and leaves accumulating in the area.

Mr. Rizzo asked if new entryways would be installed. The architects confirmed and noted that new aluminum storefronts with glass were planned. They noted that both the windows and doors were currently a dark bronze but the replacements would be lighter, matching what was originally installed. Ms. Kamm confirmed that full light doorways would be installed. She questioned if all doors would be replaced and was informed that virtually all of them would be, but not the maintenance doors.

Ms. Kamm questioned why the proportion of the windows was changing. The architects noted that they were being changed to be more operationally friendly to the staff. The current double-hung windows are very large and heavy and hard to operate. The goal is to have windows that could be operable with two feet on the ground, so an awning style window is being proposed instead. Mr. Brice questioned if the current windows were original. The architects noted that they are likely the third or fourth iteration on the building. The earliest plans show double-hung windows, then fixed, storefront windows were installed with three lights, then this current version appeared, but with dark bronze frames. The new windows would be 1/3 and 2/3 in proportion with lighter frames. Mr. Brice asked if half and half awning windows were considered and was informed that they were too large to be operable.

Mr. Skauge questioned if the door detail on the east ramp would be removed as a result of the new ramp. He was informed it would not. The removal was simply an issue with rendering.

Ms. Kamm asked if the limestone band could be incorporated into the eastern ramp details. The architects noted that as a good point and indicated that they could incorporate that into both ramps. Ms. Kamm noted that it was more important on the east ramp. Mr. Brice questioned if the band could be designed at the same height of the landing.

Ms. Kamm questioned the details of the window glazing and was informed that they would be treated with a clear low e coating. No tint would be included, but it would be more reflective. It was noted that the beige trim on the windows would pull the building together nicely.

Mr. Koester motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, with a condition to include a limestone band on the rear portion of the south entry ramp; seconded by Mr. Rizzo. Vote 7-0.

7. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of new windows at 3830 N. Morris Blvd. (Intermediate), property owner Shorewood School District.

The architects introduced this item by explaining that it involved window replacements and the addition of new windows. The new windows would be added into the band room to provide natural light. Murals within the existing area would be removed and returned to the District. A clerestory window would be added above the existing door and three new windows would be installed on the west side of the door and four on the east.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the existing door was solid metal and was informed that it was solid FRP. Ms. Kamm questioned the metal grills on some of the windows and was informed that they would be removed. It was noted that the square addition to the building has dark bronze window frames and that a similar dark anodized style would be added to the circular portion to help reinforce the slotted nature of the design. Ms. Kamm agreed that dark windows would help. It was noted that a dark metal panel would also be replaced as well.

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

8. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of window modifications, exterior ramps and an addition at 1600 E. Lake Bluff Blvd. (Lake Bluff), property owner Shorewood School District.

The architects noted that this project was very similar to the Atwater school, but it also included a small kitchen addition. The interior layout of the building would be modified by moving the office to the front. Ramps on either side of the main entry would be installed in a mirrored fashion. A planter would be integrated into each. It was noted that these ramps involve less grade change, include a lighter railing and would be more transparent.

The rear ramp was presented as less historic and would feature exposed conduit. Ms. Kamm questioned if the guardrail was needed on the lower level and the architects noted that they could likely get away with just the handrail.

The Board asked if there were plans for landscaping in front of the ramp and was informed that asphalt would go up to the edge. While not shown on the rendering, the bluff would remain on the other side. A landscaped terrace would be planned for the north side.

Chair Kraehnke questioned the kitchen addition. The architects noted that it would be located on the parking lot side of the building next to the 1993 addition. Ms. Kamm pointed out that it was shown as the orange portion on the plan. She questioned if it was not connected internally and was informed that it would be.

Ms. Kamm confirmed that the windows would be the same as those proposed for Atwater. Chair Kraehnke further confirmed that they would be lighter in color, as well.

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

10. Adjournment.

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:56 p.m.; seconded by Ms. Kamm. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director