

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
Conducted on-line
March 18, 2021

Chairperson: Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: James Hoffman, Jason Stuewe, Brian Medina, David Domres, Tammy Herpel & Susy Azcueta. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

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

The **first** item on the agenda is **4753 N. Newhall St.** *Jason Stuewe recused himself from this case.* This project is being resubmitted to show buyers interest in relocating the proposed detached two-car garage to the opposite side of the lot to allow for a slightly larger backyard/greenspace. No other changes have been made to the proposed home or detached garage. Logan Harp from Fein Design was present to explain the resubmitted plans while the board reviewed them and the video. Discussion Key: Drainage – down spouts on south side of garage do not show on plan.

After further discussion, Tammy Herpel made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)

The **second** item on the agenda is **749 E. Lexington Blvd.** *Jason Stuewe returned to the rest of the meeting.* The proposed project for review is to construct a new, first floor addition on the back/south side of the home. The exterior finish will be lap siding pitched roof element to match the existing materials and style of the house. Scott Davis the designer, & contractor, Ryan from CGI Construction were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Was Masonry considered?

After further discussion, Jason Stuewe made a motion to approve the submitted plans. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (7-0)

The **third** item on the agenda is **4736 N. Idlewild Ave.** – The proposed project for review is to construct a new, first-floor addition off the rear of the house and a basement addition. Also, the current garage will be demolished, and a new, two-car detached garage will be built. Danin Jensen, the homeowner, and John Sablich, the builder, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. **Discussion keys:** Windows needed on North and South elevations. Roof line of addition does not match house or garage. Dog ear returns on garage do not match house. **After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to table the submitted plans. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (7-0)**

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **4901 N. Berkeley Blvd.** The proposed project for review includes a Shed-roof dormer addition on the front and rear of the home. The existing roof ridge height will not be exceeded by either of the former additions. Additional alterations include reconstructing the front entrance portico. Mike Dindorf the builder, and Keith Barnes the designer, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. **Discussion keys:** Roof pitches – gutter lines; inconsistencies in drawing with eaves, fascia and over hangs; four different materials – too many.

After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to table the submitted plans. Suzy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (7-0)

The ARC minutes from the March 4, 2021 meeting were reviewed. Comments made were to correct the wording “not too big FAR area” to “too big for area” for the Sheffield project. David Domres made a motion to approve them as submitted after correction. Jason Stuewe seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (7-0)

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 approved. (7-0)

ARC Checklist

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----|----|
| Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.? | | N/A | | |
| Front | | | YES | NO |
| Side | | | YES | NO |
| Rear | | | YES | NO |
| Height | | N/A | | |
| 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 |
| Entries and Porches | | N/A | | |
| 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 | N/A | | 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. | 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 | | N/A | | |
| 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 | | N/A | | |
| 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 |
| Misc. | | | | |
| Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185) | N/A | | 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)

moving garage location to match design area

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 N/A

| | | | |
|--|--|-----|----|
| 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)

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 N/A YES NO
- Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than 1/2 the width of the structure N/A 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)

Need windows on north and south of new addition; roof slopes are not consistent; roof details not consistent

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 N/A

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 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)

Concerns about roof pitch on gables; addition is sided vs existing brick home