

**Design Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, January 23, 2020**



3930 N. Murray Avenue, Shorewood, WI

**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:08 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Wesley Brice, Brian Koester and Mike Skauge.

Others present: Paul Giesen, Richard Powers, Suzanne Powers, Vashti Lozier, Stephanie Zeiler, Jaime Dieman, Julie Carpetner and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director

**2. Approval of January 9, 2020 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Brice motioned to approve the minutes as drafted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 4-0.

**3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the construction of a new single-family residence at residential property 2521 E. Lake Bluff, property owners Richard and Suzanne Powers.**

Mr. Giesen presented an overview of the project, noting that the existing house would be demolished for a new house, which would be one story and a half. The house is being designed to allow the new residents to “age in place.” The first floor would include the master suite and feature accessible doors and hallways. An additional bedroom would be located upstairs with room left for a potential third bedroom as well. The exterior materials would include limestone, LP Smartside with a smooth finish on siding and trim. Aluminum clad Marvin windows would be installed. Accent standing seam metal roofs would be installed on the front of the house with asphalt shingles on the remainder.

Mr. Skauge questioned where the standing seam roofs would be located and was informed that they would be installed over the garage and the box bay window. Mr. Giesen noted that the lot would remain 50% permeable surfacing. Mr. Skauge asked what year the current house was built, and Mr. Giesen and Mr. Powers surmised it was from the late 1950s. They noted it was a single story ranch house of 1,500 sq. ft. Ms. Lozier provided that the neighborhood currently had three ranch homes. Mr. Skauge asked how many square feet would be in the new house and was informed that the floor plan included 3,800 sq. ft. Mr. Skauge confirmed that the kitchen and sunroom would feature vaulted ceilings.

Chair Kraehnke questioned where the new garage would be located in comparison to the existing. Mr. Giesen noted that they would be almost the same, which is in line with the neighboring houses. It was noted that the front of the garage would be 31’3” from the lot line.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the front elevation looks proportional as a whole, but that the garage seemed more prominent than the front door. He also questioned why the pitch of the roof was 11/12 rather than 12/12. Mr. Giesen responded that the 12/12 roof pitch would have

added more mass to the design. Chair Kraehnke noted that the massing will read less in reality than it does in the 2D rendering. Mr. Giesen also added that the steep roof pitch will blend in with the neighborhood.

Samples were provided for the limestone, siding and roofing, along with color chips.

Mr. Skauge questioned if the windows would all be casements, and Mr. Giesen replied that a mix of double-hung and casement windows would be utilized. He also noted that zinc coming would be used on all of the windows to provide divided lights.

Chair Kraehnke opened up discussion for questions from the audience. Vashti Lozier, 2535 E. Lake Bluff, mentioned that she had looked at all of the plans and wondered if the existing line of arbor vitae would remain. The applicants noted that they would, but there was also question as to whose property those bushes were located on. Either way, it was hoped that as many could remain as possible, but that it would ultimately depend on the digging of the foundation. If any were damaged, they would be replaced. Ms. Lozier also questioned the timing of the project and was informed that demolition would happen in the next couple of weeks with a goal to be in the finished house by Christmas 2020. The basement would be poured in mid-February. She also added that it was great that the new residents were planning the house for “aging in place.”

Mr. Skauge motioned to approve the plans as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 4-0.

**4. Consideration by Special Exception of the application and plans on file for the installation of an illuminated wall sign at commercial property 4161 N. Oakland Avenue, business occupant The Lash Lounge.**

Ms. Dieman provided an overview of the request for Special Exception and indicated that the request only relates to two letters the L and the h. The remainder of the lettering is under the 18” maximum. Mr. Griepentrog informed the Board that they had two options in front of them, the first was the sign with the Special Exception, the second is what the sign could look like if the exception were not granted. He also provided information on the size of signage on neighboring tenants, noting that several other signs were above the 18” maximum.

Mr. Skauge indicated that he would utilize the backer of other signage to compare with this request. Chair Kraehnke indicated that the building had a large sign band and proportionally could accept larger signage.

The applicants indicated that they would prefer to have a front facing (i.e. “standard”) illuminated channel letter rather than the halo lettering proposed in their application. Mr. Griepentrog noted that standard channel lettering is prohibited in the Village and read the corresponding code section.

Mr. Koester made a motion to approve the Special Exception for the increased height; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Mr. Brice requested that the height of the bottom of the sign align with the signage at Wisconsin Vision and Orange Theory. Mr. Koester and Mr. Brice accepted the comment as a friendly amendment. Vote 4-0.

**5. Discussion and possible consideration of CDA/Village Board strategic goals and priorities survey on economic development and housing.**

Chair Kraehnke led the Board on a discussion of their previous answers, and Mr. Griepentrog pointed out areas where clarification was still needed. Based on discussion, the Board came to consensus on the answers as included in Exhibit 1. Mr. Griepentrog noted that he would provide the final responses to Chair Kraehnke to submit prior to the January 30<sup>th</sup> deadline.

**6. Adjournment.**

Mr. Koester motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:17 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 4-0.

Recorded by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog".

Bart Griepentrog, AICP  
Planning & Development Director

**VILLAGE OF SHOREWOOD, WISCONSIN**  
**Online Survey Questions**  
**Economic Development and Housing Strategic Goals & Priorities**

**Economic Development Programs**

**1. Would you like to give feedback on the Village's economic development activities and priorities?**

1. Yes - x
2. No

**2. Economic Development – Strengths**

What do you think are the Village's greatest strengths when it comes to economic development? In the spaces below, please provide a brief description of up to three of your ideas and observations.

1. Strength #1
  - Character, quality and architectural diversity of community
2. Strength #2
  - Walkable development pattern
3. Strength #3
  - Variety of uses in close proximity to each other

**3. Economic Development – Issues and Challenges**

What do you think are the biggest issues or challenges facing the Village when it comes to economic development? In the spaces below, please provide a brief description of up to three of your ideas and observations.

1. Issue/Challenge #1
  - Lack of vacant land for new construction
2. Issue/Challenge #2
  - Limitation of uses within existing stock

3. Issue/Challenge #3

- Aging structures

**4. Economic Development – Actions**

1. What is the most important thing the Village should start doing as relates to economic development?

- Identify, market and pro-actively design redevelopment opportunities

2. What is one thing the Village does related to economic development, which it needs to do better?

- Utilize the Design Review Board more extensively within redevelopment actions, park improvements, streetscaping and other public infrastructure

3. What is one thing the Village does related to economic development which it should stop doing?

- Reducing code enforcement activities

**5. Economic Development – Outcomes**

1. What is the most important economic development outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 1-3 years?

- Fill vacant spaces by attracting new businesses – particularly on Capitol Drive

2. What is the most important economic development outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 4-10 years?

- Increased variety of commercial tenant spaces/opportunities

**Housing Programs**

**6. Would you like to give feedback on the Village's housing activities and priorities?**

1. Yes - x
2. No

## **7. Housing – Strengths**

What do you think are the Village's greatest strengths when it comes to housing? In the spaces below, please provide a brief description of up to three of your ideas and observations.

### 1. Strength #1

- Diversity of housing stock – size, style and type

### 2. Strength #2

- Level of quality control – manageable geographic scale with DRB review

### 3. Strength #3

- Code enforcement/compliance to maintain minimum standards

## **8. Housing – Issues and Challenges**

What do you think are the biggest issues or challenges facing the Village when it comes to housing? In the spaces below, please provide a brief description of up to three of your ideas and observations.

### 1. Issue/Challenge #1

- Lack of residential architectural guidelines and review submittal standards

### 2. Issue/Challenge #2

- Lack of historical definitions and requirements

### 3. Issue/Challenge #3

- Reduction of duplex units

## **9. Housing – Actions**

### 1. What is the most important thing the Village should start doing as relates to housing?

- Require architectural review for window and siding replacement, structural landscaping, and porch materials (skirting and floor) - i.e. material changes

2. What is one thing the Village does related to housing which it needs to do better?
  - Code enforcement
3. What is one thing the Village does related to housing which it should stop doing?
  - Stop incentive programs that reducing housing stock (duplex conversion) or don't require owner occupancy

## **10. Housing – Outcomes**

1. What is the most important housing outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 1-3 years?
  - Implementation of an income-based housing maintenance/improvement program that targets funds towards blighted properties and increases owner-occupancy
2. What is the most important housing outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 4-10 years?
  - Increased options for multi-family living through new construction that allow people to age in place within Shorewood

## **11. Communications**

1. How can the CDA communicate most effectively with you and your stakeholder group?
  - Staff liaison
2. How would you prefer to provide comments and feedback to the CDA going forward?
  - Staff liaison