

Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 10, 2019



3930 N. Murray Avenue, Shorewood, WI

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m.

Members present: Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Chair Scott Kraehnke, Mike Oates (arrived during item 3), and Mike Skauge. Others present: Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director; Alyson Lippman, Spencer Stewart, Melissa Schrot, Brook Meier and Nicholas Plummer

2. Approval of September 26, 2019 meeting minutes.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 4-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for modifications of the front yard patio at residential property 1616 E. Olive Street, property owner Alyson Lippman.

Alyson Lippman presented her project, noting that it was approved earlier in the spring with a planter box. However, they were unable to buy or build the planters as proposed, so has requested that smaller planters and pots be allowed.

Mr. Griepentrog read DRB Member John Rizzo's opposition to the revision into the record: "I'm not in favor of the current appearance of the patio as currently 'constructed.' Unless they are coming in with an alternate plan than what is currently in place, my comments to the board would be: Plantings are not appropriate for screening all year long. Thicker larger and possibly taller plantings would be more desirable. Plantings are placed in movable pots as opposed to permanent plantings in ground. Should be permanent."

Ms. Lippman responded that the proposed boxwoods in planters would be kept in place year round. Mr. Skauge questioned how many boxwoods were in the planters, and was told there were eight. Mr. Oates confirmed that the plans approved in April were not going to be installed. Mr. Skauge suggested that the plants should be placed directly in the soil instead of planters. Ms. Lippman noted that her landscaper did not due his due diligence before installing the patio and as a result did not leave enough room for a landscape perimeter. Her preference would be to not lose any more front yard. Mr. Skauge questioned if the boxwoods would even survive the winter in the planters. Chair Kraehnke noted that the previous plans provided a more permanent screen. The current version with pots was less permanent and subject to more enforcement and potential citation. Mr. Skauge noted that he would be willing to approve the plans if the boxwoods were planted in the soil. Ms. Lippman noted that she could not find a planter of the previously proposed size and did not have the ability to build one. Mr. Koester noted that he would be willing to approve the plans as submitted. Mr. Oates noted that he would not be willing to vote for it.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, with the boxwoods planted in the soil along the southern edge of patio; seconded by Mr. Oates. Vote 5-0.

Mr. Griepentrog was requested to bring a discussion of patio landscaping requirements back to a future Design Review Board meeting, so that the language could be clarified for future use.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for an illuminated façade sign at commercial property 4518 N. Oakland Avenue, business owner Bonobo American Bistro.

Melissa Scrot and Spencer Stewart provided a brief overview of their proposed sign. They noted that they were simply changing out the restaurant name with new halo-lit lettering. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the current sign lit up and was informed that it did not. Mr. Oates confirmed that the new lettering would be the same size as the existing lettering. He also confirmed that they would be off-set from the building.

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Oates. Vote 5-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for a window alteration (south elevation) and a one-story rear addition at residential property 1222 E. Olive Street, property owners Sweta and Brook Meier.

Brook Meier presented a brief overview of his project, which he noted in the short term included a larger window on the second floor of the front of the house. A future phase of improvements was proposed at the rear of the property as an addition.

Mr. Oates questioned if the new window was a casement window. Mr. Meier confirmed that it was. Mr. Skauge questioned if the current bank of three windows on the first story front façade was French windows. Mr. Meier confirmed that they were. Mr. Skauge asked if the new window was the same size as the one on the west façade and was informed that it was not. Mr. Meier provided that the new window would be 18” from the floor and ceiling. Chair Kraehnke further questioned the size of the window and was informed that it was 30” x 5’. Mr. Skauge questioned if a safety rail would be needed, but was told it would not because it was raised off of the floor. Chair Kraehnke questioned if it was drawn to scale, since it appeared to be approximately the same size as the first floor entry door. Mr. Meier noted that he would confirm. Chair Kraehnke noted that it seemed too tall for the proportion of the façade. Mr. Oates questioned if it could be the same size as one of the double-hung windows on the first floor. Mr. Oates also questioned what material the window would be and was informed it would be metal clad with wood interior.

The Board questioned the horizontal element at the rear of the property on the plans and was informed that it was a proposed deck. They also questioned what siding material was proposed, which was confirmed to be cedar. Mr. Skauge further questioned if it was board and baton. Mr. Meier informed that it was not, but rather vertical siding with interior furring.

Chair Kraehnke asked if the skylights were new and whether or not those would be under review. Mr. Meier confirmed that they were new, and Mr. Griepentrog noted that they would be under review, since they represented an exterior change to the building. It was noted that they were not shown in the elevation. The Board asked for details on their size, and was informed that they were 14” x 4’.

Mr. Oates asked the applicant if he was concerned at all with the roof slope. Mr. Meier indicated that he was not. Mr. Oates questioned the windows on the addition and was informed that they were custom wood sliding doors made of mahogany. Mr. Skauge noted that the casing needed details. Chair Kraehnke suggested that if details were simply noted on the plans, it could satisfy requirements. Mr. Skauge questioned if four windows were proposed on the west elevation, and Mr. Meier noted that it was three windows and a door. This door would not be a slider. Mr. Skauge noted it looked like four windows, and Mr. Meier noted that was the design intent. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the manufacturer for the door was already picked out, and Mr. Meier answered that it was, as these doors were already built for a different project.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the front window was already purchased, noting that it would be his preference to keep it limited to the size of a double hung unit because he was concerned with proportion. Mr. Oates agreed, as did Mr. Skauge; however, Mr. Skauge also had issues with the use of a casement in this location. Mr. Meier noted that the current proportion was utilized for ventilation and lighting requirements. Mr. Oates noted that an additional skylight could be installed.

Chair Kraehnke questioned the asphalt shingles because the plan looked like a standing seam metal roof. Mr. Oates noted that he liked the materials of the addition, but would prefer a standing seam roof, although he acknowledged the increased cost.

Mr. Oates motioned to approve the window modification on the front façade to be in proportion to one of the double hung units below; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 5-0. The remainder of the plans would need to be re-reviewed by the Board at a future meeting.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for revisions to two façade wall signs at commercial property 4114 N. Oakland Avenue, business owner Casa de Corazon.

Nicholas Plummer introduced himself as the representative for this item on behalf of his sign contractor, but noted he was unsure why the proposal had changed. Mr. Griepentrog informed the Board that there was potential difficulty with installing the sign as previously approved, so the contractor was proposing to install a pan within the entire sign band to aid with the required electrical hookup.

Mr. Oates noted that it would be easier to patch the drywall on the ceiling than modify the previous approval. Chair Kraehnke agreed and provided that the pan material was different from the other sign bands and would age and discolor differently. The Board opted to not take action on this item, noting that the applicant had the option to install the sign as previously proposed or bring back a different version.

7. Adjournment.

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:53 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 5-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director