

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY  
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission  
Conducted on-line  
May 6, 2021

Acting Chairperson: Jason Stuewe - Board Members present: James Hoffman, Heather Goetsch, David Domres, Susy Azcueta, and Kyle Alvarez. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

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

**Prior to any cases being heard, there was discussion recognizing Peter Quehl and Charles Buscher for their years of service on the ARC.**

The **first** item on the agenda is **4520 N Cramer St.** The tabled project for review is to construct a two-story addition, including removal of current detached garage and adding a new attached two-car garage. Brandon Helleson, the homeowner and Jared Johnson, the contractor, were present to explain the resubmitted plans while the Board reviewed them. **Discussion Keys:** Scale and massing – looks reduced. Setbacks on garage side- canyon effect.

**Neighbors input:** We received a letter of communication from: Lyssa Olker, the homeowner of 4521 N Cramer St.

**After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the submitted plans. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **4901 N Berkeley Blvd.** The tabled project for review includes a shed-roof dormer addition on the front and rear of the home. The existing roof ridge will not be exceeded by either of the dormer additions. Additional alterations include reconstructing the front entrance portico, location and extents to remain the same as existing. Mike Dindorf the contractor, and Keith Barnes, the designer were present to explain the resubmitted plans while the Board reviewed them. **Discussion keys:** Roof slopes, drainage - gutters and downspouts. Center windows on east elevation.

**After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following condition: East elevation align upper left window with window below and gable to change proportionally to center over window below. Window 207 to align over window 13 - upper windows to be same side. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **4365 N Wildwood Ave.** The proposed project for review includes a two-story rear addition. Alex and Danielle Beer, the homeowners, Mike Dindorf, the contractor, and Keith Barnes, the designer were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans. **Discussion Key:** Materials, scale and massing, rear setback. Roof lines are inconsistent, architectural style is inconsistent.

**Neighbors input:** We received letters of communication from: Josh Turim, the homeowner of 1111 E Courtland Pl., Ryan and Leslie Beilman, the homeowners of 4627 N Wildwood Ave., and Bryan Smith, the homeowner of 4611 N Wildwood Ave.

**After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to table the submitted plans. David Domres seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)**

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **4631 N Newhall St.** The tabled project for review is to extend the shed dormers on the front (east) and rear (west) of the home and alignment of windows on the second story in the front of the house and shed covering above front entry door. Peter Wells, the designer was present to explain the resubmitted plans while the Board reviewed them. **Discussion keys:** Hip roof on front porch.

**After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following conditions: light at rear patio door. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)**

The **fifth** item on the agenda is **4854 N Diversey Blvd.** The proposed project for review is to construct a first floor addition. Ron O'Shima, the homeowner, and Matt Jones, the designer and builder, were present to explain the submitted plans. **Discussion Keys:** Window sizes.

**After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Susy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)**

**The ARC minutes from the April 15, 2021 meeting were reviewed. Heather Goetsch made a motion to approve them as submitted. James Hoffman 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 7:00 P.M. Heater Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. (6-0)**

Jared Johnson - contractor

Brandon - owner

**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	YES	NO
Between 30.1' – 35' addition requirements met per RDG	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	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	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)	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)**


---

 1.5 story addition to help with scale and massing
 

---

4901 Berkeley

mike dindorf  
keith barnes  
betsy creekmur

# 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
Between 30.1' – 35' addition requirements met per RDG	<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

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

## 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	<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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
<del>Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style</del>	<del>YES</del>	<del>NO</del>

## 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"/>	NO
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)**

---

improved roof pitch to be more consistent with the design, practical constructibility concerns from first submittal were addressed.

mike dindorf  
keith barnes

## ARC Checklist

### Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

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

### Height

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

### Entries and Porches

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

### Garages and Parking Areas

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

### Scale and Massing

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

### Misc.

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

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

---

tabled.

4631 Newhall

Peter Wells

# 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  YES  NO
- Between 30.1' – 35' addition requirements met per RDG  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~~  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 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)  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)**

front entrance canopy hip roof is the only acceptable solution as explained by the architect, and is a welcome enhancement to the house.

# 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  YES  NO
- Between 30.1' – 35' addition requirements met per RDG  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~~  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 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)  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)

rear setback acceptable compared to 4826, 4820, and 4858.