



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Thursday, May 12, 2022

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Lybra Loest (arrived during item 3), Daryl Melzer, Mike Skauge and Mary Wright (left after item 4).

Others present: Joe Shea, Duane Rice, Joe Eisman, Paul Hackbarth, Kris Bilty, Jody Ryg, Laura Arnow, Abraham Elizondo and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director.

2. Approval of the April 28, 2022 meeting minutes.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 4-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window/door alterations and the construction of a breezeway at residential property 4453 N. Cramer Street.

Joe Shea provided an overview of the item. Duane Rice and Joe Eisman were also present. Mr. Shea noted that the property was originally built as a duplex with a common stairway in the rear servicing both units, but is currently lived-in as a single-family home, which it has been for some time. It was noted that the west elevation had two entries and that this renovation would remove the lower entry, which had provided direct access to the lower unit. Two new double-hung windows would be installed in replacement of that doorway. New windows would also be installed on both the first and second floors of the south elevation near the rear of the property. Finally, it was noted that a breezeway addition would be constructed to connect the house directly to the garage, which is sunken below grade, with a new gabled roof section featuring a shed roof for required head room on its south side.

Mr. Skauge stated that the connection would be an improvement but could be a nightmare for a contractor to build. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the new window and door trim would match that of the existing house and that all patchwork would be in-filled with salvaged brick. Mr. Shea noted that the breezeway addition would feature cedar shingles to match the second floor.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he liked the idea of connecting the house to the garage but was not sure he liked how it manifested in this plan, particularly with respect to the differing roofs. He noted that he would prefer to see brick on the breezeway. He questioned the material on the shed roof and was informed it would be a membrane roof underneath a newly rebuilt porch. He also questioned any improvements on the north side of the house and was informed that an existing double-hung window would be reduced to an awning window with the lower portion

re-bricked. Mr. Shea stated that the sidewalls of the addition would be really low and would be clad in cedar shingles.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted, but with the added detail clarifications of cedar shingles on the addition, flat roof rubber membrane and reduced awning window on north elevation; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 4-1 with Chair Kraehnke voting nay. Chair Kraehnke noted that he did not like the massing of the proposed breezeway and stated he would rather see it as an extension of the house as opposed to the garage.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of an attached two-car garage with second floor living space above it at residential property 3901 N. Lake Drive.

Kris Bilty, Jody Ryg and Paul Hackbarth were present to discuss the item.

Ms. Bilty noted the age of the home and referenced the inadequate size of the garage end number of existing bedrooms. She noted that the addition would add an attached two-car garage with two bedrooms and a bathroom above it. She stated that the existing garage footprint would be turned into a mudroom and extra storage.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the proposed addition would be built over the existing concrete driveway and that the garage would be turned to face the street.

Mr. Hackbarth noted that the house is unique in that it is on a corner lot and that it is set back on the lot line.

Mr. Ryg stated that the existing house has distinct architecture that featured a symmetrical design and bold materials. He noted that the design of the proposed addition would complement, but not compete with the existing house. He noted that the addition was attached to the house with a corridor that had a smaller roofline that gradually built up to a larger ridge, which was still less tall than the house. This was accomplished by stepping down four steps from the house. He noted that the addition maintained symmetry with windows that echoed the main house. He also noted that the second floor was setback from the first floor to reduce its mass, which also enabled small roof structures to differentiate the floors. He pointed out that three timber corbels and exposed rafter tails would be installed under that roof at the garage level, mimicking neighboring architecture. He noted that the three round-top windows were designed to replicate the windows in the existing house, but also contained the required egress window in the center. He stated that the materials on the addition would match the house by using multi-colored brick and multi-colored clay roof tiles. Lead tape will be used on the new windows. The east elevation was shown to illustrate how the addition steps back from the primary façade. Photos of the existing house were shown to evidence the existing home's multiple roof types. Mr. Ryg noted that the roof pitch of the addition would match the main gable of the house.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if there was any public comment on the item. Laura Arnow of 3966 N. Lake Dr. requested that the item be postponed until the next meeting. She noted that letter noticing the project was dated May 5, 2022, but was not received until Tuesday evening [May 10, 2022]. She stated that the owners to the north were unable to attend the meeting and the house to the west was being sold in two weeks and she thought they should have the opportunity to know about the addition. She stated that both neighbors were going to be

looking at a great big wall. She noted that there was a tree on the neighboring property that would need to be removed or trimmed. She questioned if the property would satisfy the Village's 30% green space requirement. Director Griepentrog noted that the lot coverage still needed to be confirmed in relation to the expanded driveway. He also noted that the Design Review Board does not review lot coverage. Mr. Ryg stated that they calculated that they met the green space requirement by over 1,000 sq. ft. Chair Kraehnke stated that would need to be confirmed by the building inspector prior to permitting.

Chair Kraehnke questioned what range of properties were notified of the application. Director Griepentrog showed a map that included properties within 100 ft. that were notified. Director Griepentrog stated that notices are sent the same day that the agenda is set and that he could not control the speed at which they are delivered in the mail. He also pointed out that comments provided by the Johnstone's (3911 N. Lake Dr.) were provided to the Board within their plan review materials.

Ms. Arnow questioned where the current condensers would be relocated.

Mr. Hackbarth stated that he spent 45 minutes talking with Dr. Johnstone the night prior to this meeting. He said that he felt Dr. Johnstone understood his need for more space. He said that he informed Dr. Johnstone that as a neighbor he would do everything that he could to make them happy. He stated that it was his understanding that the Design Review Board was to look at the design of the home not the objection of an addition. He noted that he had multiple meetings with staff to confirm that the project met the requirements and the code.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the property owner had a right to apply for the addition and the Board's review dealt with a matter of aesthetics. He asked if the Board had any questions.

Ms. Wright stated that she liked this proposed transition better than the prior item. Chair Kraehnke agreed. Ms. Wright stated that she liked the windows and proposed cornice above them in how they match the existing house.

Mr. Melzer questioned the view of a photo that was provided within the materials. Director Griepentrog noted that was submitted along with comments from the neighbor. Ms. Wright questioned if the current condensers would be turned into the garage. Chair Kraehnke noted that the portion of the building and condenser units were proposed to stay. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the homeowners were not planning on walking out onto that portion of the flat roof.

Chair Kraehnke reiterated that he thought it was a really nice addition to the house that will transform the space. He stated that they've done a nice job of complementing the house. He liked the details of the windows that were being added. He noted that was likely pricey, but in order to do it right, you have to pay the price. He also stated that he liked the addition of the wood timbers by the garage noting that it added human scale to the project making it more approachable and charming. Ms. Loest noted that she liked how the addition was pushed back from the front façade. Chair Kraehnke stated that he liked the cleverness of the stepping of the roof and how it telescoped to meet the house. He said it provided a nice scale with enough break to it to say that the addition is different but also part of the house. He was glad to see that they were proposing to use a matching clay tile roof. He also liked the pediments on the front of the addition that would match the vocabulary of the existing house. He confirmed that the addition would feature matching brick.

Mr. Skauge noted that he agreed with everything Chair Kraehnke stated, but said he was concerned with the two compressors. He stated that once the addition was built that the noise could be funneled. He stated that they would be located next to the neighbor's driveway. Ms. Arnow stated that the neighbors have a patio in the back yard and that their bedrooms are on the second floor. Director Griepentrog showed the two videos that were submitted by the neighbor to clarify what is in their rear yard. Ms. Arnow stated that there would no longer be light in their rear yard. Mr. Skauge disagreed and said that in the summer there would be light. Mr. Skauge questioned if there was anything that could be done to prevent the sound from being projected. Chair Kraehnke suggested that there would be an option to build a wall on that side, but that he was not sure he would like that. Mr. Skauge noted that he was not sure how best to do it but that he was concerned that the addition would force any noise to go directly north. He wondered if some sort of baffle or wooden fence could be considered. Mr. Hackbarth stated that he was not sure how that would look and pointed out that his bedroom currently looks at the neighbor's two condensers, so the condition would not be any different than what he deals with. He pointed out that their condensers were located in an alcove along the side of the house. Director Griepentrog showed an aerial image of the area for reference.

Ms. Bilty questioned if building another wall was preferred. Mr. Skauge did not believe that the Board could require it, but suggested they should consider it. Ms. Bilty noted that the neighbors would be looking at it. Chair Kraehnke suggested that building a wall could worsen access to light. Mr. Hackbarth noted that he told the neighbor that he would ask his contractor if the condensers could be moved, but noted that he did not want them located in his front yard. Chair Kraehnke noted that the Design Review Board does not review the placement of condensers. Director Griepentrog noted that excessively loud condensers could be dealt with as a code enforcement issue. He noted that if enforcement became an issue a dampener could be looked at, although he suggested that is usually more of an issue with commercial units. Mr. Hackbarth noted that the condensers are fairly new units. Chair Kraehnke pointed out that the cross section on page A4 showed the location of the condensers.

Mr. Hackbarth noted that he offered to pick up the cost of removing the tree, if it needed to come down, but also said that he was confused because there was discussion over a lack of sunlight in the backyard and a desire for the tree to provide shade. It was noted that the tree is already leaning and that a limb may need to be removed just to build the addition.

Ms. Wright moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Loest. Mr. Melzer stated that the proposed addition was beautiful and that his only concern was the neighbor who wished to have some input. Vote 5-0.

5. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of a wall sign at 4166 N. Oakland Ave.

Mr. Elizondo was present for this item. He noted that the sign DRB approved last year was not able to be manufactured. He noted that the new sign design was simpler, not illuminated and protruded less than the prior design. The new sign would be routed out of high-density urethane. He noted that a special exception was required to exceed the maximum size allowed based on the tenant frontage.

Mr. Skauge questioned if the size of the Wisconsin logo contributed to the need for a special exception. Director Griepentrog noted that the previous review did not obtain a special

exception because the “backer” of the sign was excluded from the measurement of the open-faced channel letters. With the sign being one material, the entirety of the sign was included in the size measurement, which pushed it above the maximum amount. Mr. Melzer questioned if the previously approved sign had similarly sized letters. Director Griepentrog was not able to confirm exact measurements, but the lettering appeared to generally be the same size. It was noted that the size of the Wisconsin logo was only 20.25 inches in the previous approval. Chair Kraehnke questioned the width of the sign in relation to the storefront, and it was noted that the storefront is 17 ft. wide, whereas the sign was proposed to be 10 ft. wide.

Chair Kraehnke stated that he did not mind the design of the sign but felt like the Wisconsin logo could be smaller. He noted that at 25 inches, it was 11 inches taller than the sign, which was 14 inches. He questioned if it was also protruding from the sign beneath it, and Mr. Elizondo stated that it would be an additional piece of high-density urethane on top, but he believed it would be flush with the sign beneath it. Chair Kraehnke reiterated his opinion that the Wisconsin logo was too prominent in the design. Mr. Skauge agreed and said that it could be smaller while still projecting the same image. Chair Kraehnke clarified his point by saying that it was ok to have the Wisconsin logo larger than the yellow sign, but that it just did not need to be that large. Mr. Melzer agreed that reducing the sign of the logo, while letting it protrude from the main sign, was his preference.

Director Griepentrog also clarified that any sign above the roofline also required a special exception.

Ms. Loest moved to approve the plans, via special exception, with the Wisconsin logo reduced to 17 inches in height; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 4-0.

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the installation of a wall sign at 3840 N. Oakland Ave.

Director Griepentrog noted that no one was present to discuss this application, so it was up to the Board as to whether they wanted to consider it. He noted that the cover memo describing the sign confirmed that the proposed sign was compliant with the size regulations in the code. He noted that the previously installed sign was larger, but that the code required any new sign to comply with the current requirements, unless a special exception was granted.

Mr. Melzer noted that even if the applicant had been present, he would simply just approve this sign. Director Griepentrog clarified that the applicant did not need to be present for DRB to consider the proposal. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the sign was made with a piece of aluminum.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Loest Vote 4-0.

7. Future agenda items.

Chair Kraehnke questioned if the appeal to the DRB’s approval of the Capitol and Stowell project had been scheduled. Director Griepentrog noted that it had not, but it was likely to take place on June 14th, if a quorum could be confirmed. He stated that DRB members did not need to attend unless they wanted to.

8. Adjournment.

Mr. Skauge moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:26 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 4-0.

Recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director