

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY  
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission  
Conducted on-line  
August 6, 2020

Chairperson: Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Jason Stuewe, Susy Azcueta, Heather Goetsch & Tammy Herpel. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:32 p.m.

The **first** item on the agenda is **721 E. Silver Spring Dr.** The proposed project for review are plans for construction of a 7 home development in a PDD zoning district. Blair Williams, the developer & Gregg Prossen, the architect, were present to explain the submitted plans while the Board reviewed them and the video. Discussion keys: Material choices, orientation of the houses, transition of commercial to residential. Creates a long wall, roof pitch & chimney material, deck placement. Installation of stop signs and exit for traffic too close to day care. Elimination of parking.

**After further discussion, Jason Stuewe made a motion to recommend the plans to the CDA with the following conditions: Architectural site-show better plans; address the Silver Spring frontage (every other property along Silver Spring treats Silver Spring as their front door). Address materials on corners and have the property development handles corners on N. Marlborough and E. Glen in addition to the corner of E. Glen & N. Danbury. Windows should not align with adjacent properties with regard to privacy situations. Traffic study completed and consideration of adding stop signs at the intersection of E. Glen & N. Danbury. Chimney materials to be more natural and be consistent with exterior materials of proposed development. More natural materials incorporated on properties. Emphasis on E. Silver Spring, N. Danbury & N. Marlborough. Susy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and approved. (5-0)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **984 E. Circle Dr.** – The proposed project for review are tabled plans for a new addition consisting of a 2,391 square foot first floor, with an attached three-car garage, and a 1,990 square foot second floor. Venelin Kounev, the homeowner, and Owen Lawen, the architect, were present to explain the re-submitted plans while the Board reviewed them and the video. Discussion keys: Garage door on rear of house, windows not matching (grills). **After further discussion, Tammy Herpel made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following conditions: North elevation-windows to have grills added; transoms to have vertical grills separating into 3 windows; rear garage door be carriage door to mimic front entry door. Jason Stuewe seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **810 E. Glen Ave.** – (*Lauren Triebenbach recused herself from this case.*) The proposed project is to review plans for demolishing the existing single-family home and detached garage and replacing them with a new single-family home with an attached garage. Steve Kleist, the owner/builder, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Multiple roof pitches and eave heights; sidelight next to door; window placement-quirky-East elevation. Scale and massing – rear setback. **After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to table the submitted plans. Jason Stuewe seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)**

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **5029 N. Shoreland Ave.** (*Lauren returned to the Board*) The proposed project is to review plans for constructing a two-story addition on the rear of the house. As part of the project, the entire house will be re-sided and re-roofed. Amy Koch, the owner, and Nick Grauwald, the builder, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Rear setback-scale & massing-window alignment symmetry & window alignment. **After further discussion, Jason Stuewe made a motion to table the submitted plans. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)**

**The ARC minutes from the July 23, 2020 meeting were reviewed. Jason Stuewe made a motion to approve them as submitted. Susy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

**With no other matters on the agenda, Jason Stuewe made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 P.M. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)**

Bob E. Silver 984 E. Circle

# ARC Checklist 984 Circle

## Setbacks compatible per 16.31 I. 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 I 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 (cornices, rails, columns, etc.)  YES  NO
  - Chimneys (generally masonry)  YES  NO
  - Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style  YES  NO

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)

~~Door on rear - would like to see carriage door~~  
~~Drainage must be approved~~  
 Windows on north need gables consistent with other elevations

810 E Glen

# ARC Checklist

## Setbacks compatible per 16.31 I. A.?

810 E Glen

- 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

> N/A

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  
N/A  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 I 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  
N/A  YES NO  
N/A  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  
discuss  YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
N/A  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)

DKSUGLEN PAINT      side light next to door  
= roof pitches      Window placement  
scale & massing      rear setback

5029 N. Shoreland

# ARC Checklist

5029 Shoreland

## 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

N/A

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

N/A

- 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

## 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 (cornices, 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  
~~N/A~~ YES NO  
~~N/A~~ 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)

Window Location  
Scale & Massing