

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
Conducted on-line
September 3, 2020

Chairperson: Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Susy Azcueta, 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 **6375 N. Lake Dr. (*Lauren Triebenbach recused herself from this case.*)** The proposed project for review is to demolish the existing 3 season room at the east elevation (Lake Dr.) and to construct an office addition on the existing foundation. The exterior will feature wood composite lap siding, double hung windows with transom lights and 2' tall brick veneer in running bond with a stone cap. Joseph Arcara, the homeowner, and Matt Tollefson, the designer, were present to explain the project while the Board discussed the plans and video. No discussion keys. An email from the following neighbors: **Lauren & Jeremy Triebenbach-6367 Lake Dr.**-was received stating their support.

After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Susy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (4-0)

The **second** item on the agenda is **5029 N. Shoreland Ave. – (*Lauren Triebenbach returned to the Board.*)** The proposed project is to review tabled plans for the proposed two-story addition on the rear of the house. The additional square footage on the second floor is accomplished via a cantilever that will be supported by a beam and posts in the rear of the house. Amy Koch, the homeowner, & Nick Grizwald, the contractor, were present to explain the amended plans, while the Board reviewed them and the video. Discussion keys: Rear set back and massing. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted, amended plans. Susy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and motion denied (2-3)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **810 E. Glen Ave.** (*Lauren Triebenbach recused herself from this case.*) The proposed project is to review tabled plans for the razing of 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, amended plans and video. Discussion keys: Better design; like the addition of stone. An email from the neighbors-**Brenda & Mark Szumski-806 Glen**-stated concern about the structure being closer to their house and rear setback. **After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve the submitted, amended plans. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-0)**

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **5516 N. Bay Ridge Ave.** – (*Lauren Triebenbach returned to the Board.*) The proposed project is to review plans for a new two-story addition. Matt Krier, the designer/builder, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Size and F.A.R. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Susy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (5-0)**

The **fifth** item on the agenda is **4753 N. Newhall St.** – The proposed project is to review plans for a new, two-story home with a gable roof and a new, detached two-car garage on the existing vacant lot. Michael Welman, the architect, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Rear setback compatibility, height, foundation height. E-mails from the neighbors-**Peter & Kim Christenson-1566 Blackthorn**-stated their concerns about height and storm runoff; neighbors-**Lisa O'Brien-4759 Newhall**-stated concerns with how close the structure is to her property and about the fence coming down. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and motion denied. (0-5)**

The ARC minutes from the August 20, 2020 meeting were reviewed. Heather Goetsch 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, Susy Azcueta made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:16 P.M. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

6375 N. Lake Dr.

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 I. A.?

- Front
- Side
- Rear

YES NO
 Variance YES NO
 obtained YES NO

Height

- Most Design areas limited to 25'
- Between 25.1' - 30' design area must have a pattern of this height > N/A
- 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 N/A
- 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
 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
 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)

5024 N. Shoreland
ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 I. 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
 new porch YES NO
 porch YES NO

Garages and Parking Areas - N/A

Special approval

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
 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
 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)

~~near setback not compatible~~
~~scale & massing~~

80 E. Eton
ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

Front
Side
Rear

~~YES~~ NO
~~discuss~~ YES NO
~~discuss~~ 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' additional requirements met per RDG

~~YES~~ NO
N/A 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 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
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

new YES NO
~~YES~~ NO
~~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)

side & rear setbacks

55146 N. Bay Ridge

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 I. A.?

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

Height

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

Entries and Porches

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

Garages and Parking Areas - N/A

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

Scale and Massing

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

Misc.

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

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

Significantly - discussion

seems compatible w/ rear setback

4753 N. Newhall

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 I. 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
N/A 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
N/A 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

new YES NO
YES NO
last with YES NO
D. A. 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
YES NO

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

Foundation height rear setback
scale & massing height