

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
Conducted on-line
February 4, 2021

Chairperson: Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: James Hoffman, David Domres, Jason Stuewe, Kyle Alvarez & Tammy Herpel. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:31 p.m.

The **first** item on the agenda is **1570 E. Blackthorne Pl.** – The proposed project for review is for the tabled plans to construct a new, two-story addition on the rear of the property. The addition will match all existing building materials and details. This is being re-submitted without any changes for reconsideration. Robert Schafer, the owner/builder, and Rory Palubiski, the designer, were present to explain the re-submitted plans while the Board reviewed them and the video. **Discussion keys:** Discussed F.A.R. and how it relates to a project's scale & massing; too big for property. F.A.R.-doesn't fit into neighborhood pattern; not consistent with design area. These points were made at the first meeting also.

Neighbors input: A letter from **Peter & Kim Christenson-1566 Blackthorne**-concerned about size of addition and how far back it goes. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and denied. (1-5)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **4747 N. Woodruff Ave.** The proposed project for review is to construct a new, second floor addition over the existing room on the first floor. All windows and exterior finish materials to match the existing. Matt Jones, the builder, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. **Discussion keys:** Window alignment, floor heights, corners on addition and house should match, roof pitch should be steeper on addition.

After further discussion, Tammy Herpel made a motion to approve the submitted plans, with the following conditions: 4 inch casing around all windows and doors, 8/12 pitch on roof and mitered corners on addition. Jason Stuewe seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)

The **third** item on the agenda is **6232 N. Berkeley Blvd.** – The proposed project for review is to construct a new, one-story addition over a removed patio in the rear yard on the South side of the dwelling. The exterior finishes will match the existing house; the roof will be a dark, bronze metal. Jeff & Dara Sippel, the homeowners, and Irv Kaage, the architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. **Discussion keys:** Materials don't match the house; addition adds a new form of architecture. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following conditions: Roof material match the existing and color to match existing siding. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (6-0)**

The ARC minutes from the January 21, 2021 meeting were reviewed. David Domres made a motion to approve them as submitted. Tammy Herpel seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)

With no other matters on the agenda, David Domres made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:13 P.M. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (6-0)

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

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

Height

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

Entries and Porches

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

Garages and Parking Areas N/A

Garages location is consistent with Design area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Attached garage is NOT the dominant feature when viewed from the road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than ½ the width of the structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 1 D. iii.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Front facing attached garage single door can't exceed 30% of the combined width of structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Driveway pavement is minimized as per the RDG	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO

Scale and Massing

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

Misc.

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

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

Discussion point - rear setback; FAR

ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

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

Height

Most Design areas limited to 25'	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Entry is consistent with the style of the home	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Entries should be retained with remodels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO

Garages and Parking Areas Not applicable

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Foundation height is compatible with Design Area	<input checked="" 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"/>	NO
Roofing material is on approved list	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Roof slopes are compatible	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Window styles/size/proportions are compatible	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Chimneys (generally masonry)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style Not applicable	YES	NO

Misc.

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

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

Height

Most Design areas limited to 25'	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Entry is consistent with the style of the home	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Entries should be retained with remodels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO

Garages and Parking Areas Not applicable

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 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Foundation height is compatible with Design Area	<input checked="" 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	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Roofing material is on approved list	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Roof slopes are compatible	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Window styles/size/proportions are compatible	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Site Plan		
Project does not impair lot's beauty	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Drainage approved by ARC (if NO, the Village staff to review)	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Sunroom - not a match of siding and roofing material; handled in conditions to approval.