

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
Conducted on-line
April 9, 2020

Chairperson: Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Heather Goetsch, David Domres & Brian Medina. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:35 p.m.

The **first** item on the agenda is **4640 N. Lake Dr.** The proposed project is for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of this house. John Brodersen, the owner, Suzanne Powers, the realtor, Josh Levy & Jake Remington, attorneys, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted documents and video. Discussion keys: Discussed offers made for the property, average days on the market of lakeside properties. Several emails were received from interested parties. **After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve the submitted documents with the following conditions: Fifteen day extension, continue to take offers, don't have to accept offers; salvage and donate materials if not sold. Dave Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **417 E. Silver Spring Dr.** – The proposed project is for review to construct an addition is 13' back from Mansard roof, front street façade. The addition provides a new rear entry, a stairway and an office area. The existing front façade and signage remain unchanged and the existing Mansard roof creates a natural guardrail for the new roof terrace. The exterior on the new addition will be clad in plaster and dark metal windows to match the existing. Thomas Dixon, the owner, and James Dahlman, the architect, were present to explain the proposed project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Add more detail to the front, what are the materials and will they match the existing materials? **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **5160 N. Lydell Ave.** – The proposed project is for review of updated/revised plans that were submitted and tabled at the 2/20/2020 ARC meeting. The pitch of the proposed addition's roof has been revised to show 7"/12" that is consistent to the existing structure's architecture. The revised plans show the removal of one bathroom window and one bedroom window on the East elevation of the top floor of the existing structure. Paul Koepnick & Lynn Cook, the homeowners, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the re-submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Setbacks in rear of property. After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the re-submitted plans. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **4757 N. Cramer St.** – The proposed project is for review to construct a new 1.5 story addition to the South and a new attached garage addition in the rear (West). The addition will have a crawl space below. The roof pitches will be 14/12 to match the existing house's pitch. A breezeway will connect the new garage and existing house. The existing attached garage will be revised into habitable space. The proposed additions will tie into the existing architecture of the house. Laura Bush, the architect/designer, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Rear setbacks. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)**

The **fifth** item on the agenda is **809 E. Lake Forest Ave.** – The proposed project will include demolishing the existing home. A new two-story Craftsman style home will be constructed facing Danbury Avenue with a wraparound porch on both Danbury and Lake Forest sides. The exterior will feature LP smooth siding, stained shingles, Marvin Integrity windows and natural fieldstone accents/walls. Justin Machata, the homeowner, and Meg Baniukiewicz, the architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Height of house. An email was received from an interested party. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following condition: Approved, subject to final approval of the Board of Appeals on setbacks, in which ARC will then approve. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)**

The **sixth** item on the agenda is **4876 N. Berkeley Blvd.** – The proposed project is for review to construct additional square footage to the second floor. The footprint of the first floor will not change. Brad Rosenquist, the homeowner and Mike Dindorf, the builder, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Siding currently on house; what will be replacing it? **After further discussion, Brian Medina made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)**

The **seventh** item on the agenda is **6150 N. Berkeley Blvd.** – The proposed project is for review to construct a 4' x 12' addition off the kitchen with a flat roof that will tie into the existing flat roof over the sunroom. The addition will be flush with the sunroom. All existing exterior finishes will match the existing on the sunroom. Nicki Losinski and Sarah Offlinger, designers, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. No discussion keys. **After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)**

The ARC minutes from the March 5, 2020 meeting were reviewed. Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve them as submitted. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-0)

With no other matters on the agenda, Brian Medina made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 P.M. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-0)

5160 N. Lydell

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 *N/A* 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 *N/A* 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 1/2 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 *better* 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 *N/A* 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 I. A.?

- Front YES NO
- Side YES NO
- Rear *discuss* 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 *N/A* 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 1/2 the width of the structure YES NO
- Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 I D. iii. *N/A* 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 (cornices, rails, columns, etc.) YES NO
 - Chimneys (generally masonry) *N/A* YES NO
 - Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style YES NO

Misc.

- Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185) YES NO
- Site Plan YES NO
- 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 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

N/A
Renew

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

N/A

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 1/2 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

N/A

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 (cornices, rails, columns, etc.) YES NO
 - Chimneys (generally masonry) YES NO
 - Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style YES NO

New Home

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)

Victorian style home - characteristically tall
Craftsman
Already over 30' *Predominantly over 25'*
Not out of scale

4896 N. Berkeley

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

N/A

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 1/2 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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

6150 N. Berkeley

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

Front	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Side	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Rear	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO

Height

Most Design areas limited to 25'	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Between 25.1' - 30' design area must have a pattern of this height		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Between 30.1' - 35' addition requirements met per RDG		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO

Entries and Porches

Entries are consistent with the Design Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Entry is consistent with the style of the home	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Entries should be retained with remodels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO

Garages and Parking Areas

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

Scale and Massing

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

Misc.

Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Site Plan		
Project does not impair lot's beauty	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Drainage approved by ARC (if NO, the Village staff to review)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO

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