

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
February 20, 2020

Acting Chairperson: Jason Stuewe - Board Members present: Charles Buscher, James Hoffman, Susy Azcueta & David Domres. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:33 p.m.

The **first** item on the agenda is **5226 N. Santa Monica Blvd.** This is a resubmittal of approved plans from the July 11, 2019 meeting. It makes minor modifications to approximately 4 windows by adding divided light grills to all windows. No other material changes are of note. Robert Gamperl, the homeowner, was present to explain the change on the approved plans while the Board reviewed them and the video. Discussion key: One window on North side of house is vertical; all other windows are horizontal-explain why. No neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the plans. Charles Buscher seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **2110 E. Glendale Ave.** – The proposed project at the front elevation, would be to relocate the existing garage door to align with the exterior wall framing of the south/front elevation of the residence. The purpose of which is to allow access from the garage immediately into the house. The new segmented raised panel garage door would be made of white prefinished, insulated steel. Also, three punched openings at the west elevation near the front, shall be infilled with new white window sashes, the glass shall be obscure/frosted glass. At the rear elevation, two double hung windows will be replaced by casement units and the bottom sill will be approximately 8 inches lower. A bathroom at the rear of the residence, will have the double hung window replaced in tempered glass within the same frame configuration. Karl Holtermann, the architect, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Divided light window in the kitchen doesn't match other windows. No neighbors in attendance.

After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following condition: Remove the divided light from kitchen windows. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

The **third** item on the agenda is **5160 N. Lydell Ave.** – The proposed project is to construct a one-story addition off the East elevation of the house. The addition exterior will stay true to the current architectural style of the existing house. Paul Koepnick, the homeowner, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Roof pitch. No neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, Charles Buscher made a motion to table the submitted plans. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and passed. (5-0)**

The ARC minutes from the February 6, 2020 meeting were reviewed. James Hoffman made a motion to approve them as submitted. Suzy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

With no other matters on the agenda, James Hoffman made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:20 P.M. Charles Buscher seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

Front	YES	NO
Side	YES	NO
Rear	YES	NO

Height

Most Design areas limited to 25'	YES	NO
Between 25.1' – 30' design area must have a pattern of this height	YES	NO
Between 30.1' – 35' addition requirements met per RDG	YES	NO

Entries and Porches

Entries are consistent with the Design Area	YES	NO
Entry is consistent with the style of the home	YES	NO
Entries should be retained with remodels	YES	NO
Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)	YES	NO

Garages and Parking Areas

Garages location is consistent with Design area	YES	NO
Attached garage is NOT the dominant feature when viewed from the road	YES	NO
Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than ½ the width of the structure	YES	NO
Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 1 D. iii.	YES	NO
Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner	YES	NO
Front facing attached garage single door can't exceed 30% of the combined width of structure	YES	NO
Driveway pavement is minimized as per the RDG	YES	NO

Scale and Massing

Compatible to the adjacent houses	YES	NO
Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area	YES	NO
Foundation height is compatible with Design Area	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	YES	NO
Roofing material is on approved list	YES	NO
Roof slopes are compatible	YES	NO
Window styles/size/proportions are compatible	YES	NO
Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)	YES	NO
Chimneys (generally masonry)	YES	NO
Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style	YES	NO

Misc.

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

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

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

Front		YES	NO
Side	NO CHANGE	YES	NO
Rear		YES	NO

Height

Most Design areas limited to 25'		YES	NO
Between 25.1' - 30' design area must have a pattern of this height	NO CHANGE	YES	NO
Between 30.1' - 35' addition requirements met per RDG		YES	NO

Entries and Porches

Entries are consistent with the Design Area		YES	NO
Entry is consistent with the style of the home	NO CHANGE	YES	NO
Entries should be retained with remodels		YES	NO
Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)		YES	NO

Garages and Parking Areas

Garages location is consistent with Design area		<u>YES</u>	NO
Attached garage is NOT the dominant feature when viewed from the road		<u>YES</u>	NO
Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than 1/2 the width of the structure		<u>YES</u>	NO
Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 1 D. iii.		YES	NO
Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner		YES	NO
Front facing attached garage single door can't exceed 30% of the combined width of structure		<u>YES</u>	NO
Driveway pavement is minimized as per the RDG		<u>YES</u>	NO

Scale and Massing

Compatible to the adjacent houses		YES	NO
Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area		YES	NO
Foundation height is compatible with Design Area		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		YES	NO
Roofing material is on approved list		YES	NO
Roof slopes are compatible		YES	NO
<u>Window styles/size/proportions are compatible</u>		<u>YES</u>	NO
Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)		YES	NO
Chimneys (generally masonry)		YES	NO
Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style		YES	NO

Misc.

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

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

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

- Front
- Side
- Rear

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

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

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

No CHANGE

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)

YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

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