

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
September 19, 2019

Chairperson – Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Brian Medina, Peter Quehl, David Domres, Heather Goetsch, Aaron Hoffmans & Susy Azcueta. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

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

The **first** item on the agenda is **5949 Berkeley Blvd. (Brian Medina recused himself from this case)** The proposed project is to expand the existing house by adding a second story addition over the existing first floor; a two-story addition to the South side of the house and a two-story addition to the West side of the house connecting it to the existing garage. The homeowner and Jeff, the architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: The scaling back of the project as it looks too big; imposing structure impacts neighbors; design enhances the existing house.

Neighbors in attendance: **Nancy & Thomas Backes-5943 N. Berkeley**-is lowering F.A.R. by 3% is enough; will shed match the project? Is it compatible with the design area? Triple the size of the current house. **Suzy Van Cleave-5353 N. Berkeley**-step second floor back a few feet to reduce massing; big blank walls. **Carl Biancuzzo-5905 N. Berkeley**-in favor of addition as proposed. **After further discussion, Aaron Hoffmans made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. Peter Quehl seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-2)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **5862 N. Shore Dr. (Brian Medina returned to the meeting)** The proposed project is to remove the existing screened porch and add a one-story addition to the East with an open roof deck at the second floor and a two-story addition to the South. The existing front stoop and step will be replaced with new steps and a raised patio. At the garage, the doors will be made taller by digging out the existing floor slab and new/taller stained garage doors will be installed. The additions and existing home will be brick with a new stain color. The homeowner and

Meg Baniukiewicz, the architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Railing styles to be determined. No neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, Peter Quehl made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (7-0)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **5006 N. Woodburn St.** – The proposed project is to construct a second floor addition above the attached garage and breezeway as well as the addition of a family room on the ground floor to the south of the current structure. Also, the exterior façade of the existing house will be updated to provide a more continuous look for the entire project. The homeowner and Joe Pascola, the architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussions keys: East elevation has a smaller window; something needed at dead space on east and north elevations; blank walls; shake only on garage-should be elsewhere as well or not there at all; floor plans don't match elevations. No neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion a motion to table the plans as submitted. Peter Quehl seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (7-0)**

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **5412 N. Shoreland Ave.** – The proposed project is to construct a two-story addition on the back of the house. The addition will stay true to the current architectural style of the existing house. Mike Bailey, representing the owner, and John Baugnet, the designer, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: How far back does it go from existing structure? Scale and massing too big; railing on top of house enhances it; rear setback not comparable with design area.

Neighbors in attendance: **Dan Haworth-5406 Shoreland**-commends that it is all brick; sump pump goes out to the north side. **Sarah Patzer-5418 Shoreland**-concerned about size and impact on her property-where will sump pumps discharge? Worried about her fence. **Jason & Kristin Boudreau-5415 Santa Monica**-another really large house; changes landscape of neighborhood; don't need more McMansions. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to table the plans as submitted. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (7-0)**

The ARC minutes from the September 5, 2019 meeting were reviewed. Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve them as submitted. Aaron Hoffmans seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (7-0)

With no other matters on the agenda, Heather Goetsch made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:11 P.M. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (7-0)

349 N. Berkeley

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' *20' to peak 22.5 to mid span*
- 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 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 N/A
 YES NO N/A
 YES NO N/A
 YES NO N/A

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
Discussion

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)

need lights at exit doors
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

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

~3% reduction in FAR
~~Size/Scale & Massing~~
~~Neighborhood Landmark~~

Need Coaxial Lights

ARC Checklist

Blezn. Shore

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

- Front
- Side
- Rear

YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Height

- Most Design areas limited to 25' *< 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 NON/A
 YES NON/A

 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)

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

- Front
- Side
- Rear

BOA Approved } YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO

Height

- Most Design areas limited to 25' *< 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 *N/A*
 YES NO *N/A*
 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

except for shake
 YES NO
 YES NO
 YES NO
need to be shown
 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)

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

- Front
- Side
- Rear

YES NO
 YES NO
 discuss YES NO

Height

- Most Design areas limited to 25' < 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 N/A
 YES NO N/A
 YES NO N/A
 YES NO N/A
 YES NO N/A
 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
 discuss 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

YES NO

- Project does not impair lot's beauty
- Drainage approved by ARC (if NO, the Village staff to review)

discuss YES NO
 YES NO

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

near setback - inconsistent