

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
January 9, 2020

Chairperson – Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Charles Buscher, Jason Stuewe & Tammy Herpel. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:30 p.m.

The **first** item on the agenda is **5135 N. Woodburn St.** The proposed project involves the design building off the symmetry of the existing original residence by adding matching bay windows on each side of the front entry foyer. The original windows in this portion of the home will be replaced to match the 2005 addition double hung windows with grills in the upper sash. Dillan Sincere, the project manager, was present to explain the submitted plans while the Board reviewed them and video. Discussion keys: Two double hung windows on front Bay windows seem too small, one would look better. North elevation casement windows look better as tall, skinny windows (unbalanced). New roof materials and overhangs not consistent with rest of the house.

Neighbor in attendance: **Jason Hernandez-5109 Woodburn**-thinks it looks great, supports what they are doing. **After further discussion, Jason Stuewe made a motion to approve the plans as submitted, with the following condition: coach lights at the front door should stay. Charles Buscher seconded. A vote was taken and passed. (4-0)**

The ARC minutes from the December 19, 2019 meeting were reviewed. Jason Stuewe made a motion to approve them as submitted. Tammy Herpel seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-0)

With no other matters on the agenda, Charles Buscher made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:46 P.M. Jason Stuewe seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-0)

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

- Front
- Side
- Rear

NA YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Height

- Most Design areas limited to 25'
- Between 25.1' - 30' design area must have a pattern of this height
- Between 30.1' - 35' addition requirements met per RDG

NA YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Entries and Porches

- Entries are consistent with the Design Area
- Entry is consistent with the style of the home
- Entries should be retained with remodels
- Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)

YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Garages and Parking Areas

- Garages location is consistent with Design area
- Attached garage is NOT the dominant feature when viewed from the road
- Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than 1/2 the width of the structure
- Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 1 D. iii.
- Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner
- Front facing attached garage single door can't exceed 30% of the combined width of structure
- Driveway pavement is minimized as per the RDG

NA YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Scale and Massing

- Compatible to the adjacent houses
- Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area
- Foundation height is compatible with Design Area

YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Specific Design Elements of Architectural Style

- Proposed project is architecturally consistent on all sides concerning the following:
 - Siding material is consistent with style of house
 - Roofing material is on approved list
 - Roof slopes are compatible
 - Window styles/size/proportions are compatible
 - Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)
 - Chimneys (generally masonry)
 - Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style

YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Misc.

- Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185)
- Site Plan
 - Project does not impair lot's beauty
 - Drainage approved by ARC (if NO, the Village staff to review)

add corner lights YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

If no to any of the above, mitigation measures are (16.31 III. B. 1-7)

Window sizes
Bay window roof