VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
Conducted on-line
April 23, 2020

Chairperson: Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Heather Goetsch, James Hoffman, Brian Medina & Peter Quehl. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

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

The **first** item on the agenda is **4868 N. Woodruff Ave.** The proposed project is for review to demolish an existing two-story addition at the east side of the home. A new, larger, two-story addition will be constructed in brick & LP smooth siding to match the existing home. A new, detached two-car garage will be constructed in the southeast corner of the lot. All finishes to match the existing. Greg Ramirez, the owner, and Meg Baniukiewicz, the owner/architect, 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 submitted plans. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **1109 E. Circle Dr**. – The proposed project is for review to convert the attached garage into a family room on the first floor. The garage door will be replaced with Marvin windows and a built-in stone planter to match the stone accents on the home. The existing driveway and curb cut will be removed. At the south side of the home, the three season room will be converted into a mudroom. New Marvin windows and doors will replace the existing sliding door, the existing triangular windows will remain. All finishes to match the existing. Dave Osswald, the homeowner, and Meg Baniukiewicz, the architect, were present to explain the proposed project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Discussed adding shake siding. **After further discussion, Peter Quehl made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **740 E. Day Ave.** – The proposed project is for review to remove the existing rubber roof and railing at the second floor and constructing a second floor addition over the existing first floor. All finishes to match the existing. Meg Baniukiewicz, the architect, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Overhangs. **After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **130 E. Lexington Blvd.** – The proposed project is for review to construct a new second floor addition to the existing home. The roof structure will be removed for the area involved. First floor siding will be removed and new siding installed on the entire house. All finishes to match existing. Ryan & Kathleen Wittmann, the homeowners, and Jeremy Jones, the builder & designer, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Window style and lining up of windows vertically on rear of the house. Different sizes of windows, multiple roof pitches, different size overhangs.

After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following conditions: 1. Gables as shown on sides are built as drawn, rooflines on 2nd floor shed dormers be inset to allow the 12/12 Gables to be flush from top to bottom and run through. 2. Remove double transom window and replace with double hung window moved slightly to rear with grids to match. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)

The **fifth** item on the agenda is **824 E. Chateau Pl.** – The proposed project is for review to construct a first floor addition to the existing home. The addition will have a full basement foundation. All windows and exterior finish materials to match, including brick. Jeremy Jones, the builder and designer, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. No discussion key. **After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve the submitted plans. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

The **sixth** item on the agenda is **934 E. Colfax Pl.** – The proposed project is for review of re-submitted plans from a previous ARC meeting, to construct a new garage addition. Rick Stalle, the homeowner, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. No discussion key. **After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. Peter Quehl seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

The ARC minutes from the April 9, 2020 meeting were reviewed. Add neighbor comments from emails for 4640 N. Lake Dr. & 4757 N. Cramer. Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve them as submitted. Brian Medina 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 7:00 P.M. Peter Quehl seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

4868 N. Woodruff

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

Front	YES	NO
Side	YES	NO
Rear	YES	NO

discuss

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 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

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)

_____

_____

_____

ARC Checklist

1109 E. Circle Dr.

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	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 – tube removed

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	N/A 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 (on roof and gables)	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)	N/A 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)

shake siding - new, but roof is cedar shake
Concerns about no garage or driveway - plan to build new garage before November

740 E. Day

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' No change	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 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 No change

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) No change	YES	NO
Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style No change	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)

_____

_____

130 E. Lexington

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 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 No change

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 ~~change~~ made in approval	YES	~~NO~~
Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)	YES	NO
Chimneys (generally masonry) ~~N/A~~	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)

~~Roof slopes are not compatible; roof slope is being increased. New windows not compatible with existing windows; placement of windows on second story.~~

824 E. Chateau

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 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 No change

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) N/A	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)

_____

_____

934 E. Colfax

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 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 ½ the width of the structure	YES	NO
Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 1 D. iii. N/A	YES	NO
Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner N/A	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) 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		
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)

_____

_____