



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 27, 2022
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Bryan Koester, Lybra Loest, Daryl Melzer, Ryan O'Connor, Larry Pachefsky (arrived during item 3) and Mike Skauge.

Others present: Eric Brandt, Chris Braun, Becky Freer, Joe Stanton, Tom Baade, and Planning & Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

2. Approval of the January 13, 2022 meeting minutes.

Mr. Koester moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Ms. Loest. Vote 6-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window alterations at residential property 4054 N. Stowell Avenue.

Eric Brandt was present to discuss this item, which involved the elimination of a window on the south elevation and the addition of a window on the east elevation to accommodate a kitchen remodel.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the eliminated window on the south elevation would be re-sided to match the house. Mr. Brandt noted that the whole house was going to be resided. Chair Kraehnke noted that the new window would be 30" x 32" per the plans. He also confirmed that the trim around it would match the rest of the house. Chair Kraehnke questioned the style of the new window asking if it was fixed. Mr. Brandt noted that it would be a double hung window like the one on the deck.

Mr. Melzer stated that the improvements looked straightforward. Mr. O'Connor agreed and stated that the window looked nice on the bump out wall.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 7-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window and door alterations at residential property 3821 N. Murray Avenue.

Chris Braun, the project's designer, presented this item. He noted that a double French door would be added to the rear elevation connecting to a new deck. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that

the rear deck was not under review. Mr. Braun also mentioned that a group of four windows would be added on the south elevation replacing a single window and set of two windows.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the bank of four windows would be double hung. He believed the new windows would look better than the existing windows. Mr. Braun confirmed that existing siding would be salvaged and reused to cover any new areas or new siding would be installed to match. He confirmed that the window trim would also match.

Mr. Melzer stated that the proposed changes appeared to be improvements.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans, as submitted. Mr. Pachefsky questioned if the designer had considered installing a larger window in the center flanked by two double hung windows, similar to the pattern on the front elevation. He believed it would look better than having eight in a row. Mr. Braun stated that he was hesitant to do that from a design standpoint. He noted that the four windows were a different scale and would be broken up from the dining room windows that are bumped out. He also noted the floor plan worked well with this plan. Mr. O'Connor agreed that they would read separate based on the plane change and different size. Mr. Koester agreed and seconded the motion. Vote 7-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the proposed multi-family redevelopment at commercial properties 2418, 2420 and 2428 E. Capitol Drive.

Joe Stanton and Tom Baade of Three Leaf Partners were present and provided an overview for this item. Mr. Stanton provided a brief overview of the development team and project history. He noted that various changes have been implemented in the proposed design based on feedback from the neighborhood at other meetings. Mr. Baade noted that this project had initially been researched for more affordable and supportive housing with a partnership with Bethesda, but that financial model did not work. He noted that once they knew what they were able to develop that they applied for and obtained a parking special exception to meet the former code, which has since been updated to a one space per unit ratio.

Mr. Baade stated that the current design was a balance of needs between the neighborhood, planning, zoning and construction codes, economics and aesthetics. Regarding neighborhood comments, he noted that affordability, parking, density, traffic, safety, noise and rental rates were issues. Mr. Baade stated that Tax Incremental Financing did not seem preferable to the Village for various reasons, but that they still desired to make the project align with the Village's affordability goals. He believed those goals were aimed at keeping Shorewood residents in Shorewood or allowing persons who worked in Shorewood to live in Shorewood. He referenced that offering 10% of the building's units within WHEDA – CMI 80% income limits was considered. Those limits would equate to \$1,265 in monthly rent for a one-bedroom unit. He was unaware of any other developments in Milwaukee County that attempted to make affordable units without assistance. He shared their projected monthly rental rates, which included three units at \$1,371 and stated that just under half of the building's units would be under \$1,600 per month. He stated that he has made it clear to the Village that he is willing to consider the conversation on offering affordable units within the building.

Mr. Baade shared an overview of how the current parking design was developed. He stated that putting the parking underground would require a ramp eliminating spaces on the first floor and add approximately \$2.2 million in project costs (or \$50,000 - \$60,000 per unit). He utilized the provided first-floor floor plan to describe the proposed layout, which included two

entrances/exits from N. Stowell Ave. He noted that the design would allow drivers to maneuver within the garage and drive out front facing, not backing out. He shared other options for the parking layout and noted that they did not prefer to enter/exit from E. Capitol Dr. for both traffic and aesthetic reasons.

Mr. Baade discussed the location of the proposed refuse room. He stated a desire to keep it off of the alley. He noted that the refuse will be kept within the garage and that the trash haulers would need to pull into the garage to pick it up.

Mr. Baade described the proposed location of the lobby in the interior of the building. He noted that it would typically be located on the corner, but the current design was chosen in response to neighborhood concerns over traffic at the intersection for deliveries. He also stated that they would like to talk with the Village about installing a loading zone.

With respect to the building design, Mr. Baade noted that additional glazing was added to the first floor of the parking garage along E. Capitol Dr. to appear more like a storefront. He noted that the mechanical room would be accessed from N. Stowell Ave., and the electric and gas meters would be on the rear façade adjacent to the alley to minimize the aesthetic impact. He noted that the entrance to the building was cut back to accommodate a canopy and ADA ramp. He also described the location of the two proposed driveways into the building, which he believed were back far enough to allow drivers to exit the ramp and stop at the existing stop sign.

Mr. Baade noted that the development would have 39 units, which is less than originally proposed, based on parking, density, and economics. He showed a site plan that detailed how the upper floors would be setback from the ground floor to reduce density, accommodate hanging balconies on the east and west facades, and allow for a greater amount of non-fire tempered glazing, as would be required per construction codes. He also described that the building was designed to accommodate the required 10 ft. setback from the residential property at its northwest corner.

Mr. Baade provided an overview of the building's proposed aesthetics through a review of the elevations. He noted that the material at the ground level was a Lannon stone and the dark areas shown on the elevation was a black brick. At the highest level a synthetic stucco was proposed, and a ship lapped siding would be utilized at various insets. He stated that glazing was maximized at the lobby. He noted the presence of a structure in the middle of the south façade that would be utilized to grow vegetation, such as vines. He mentioned that the courtyard feature was flipped within the design phase to face south in response to neighborhood comments opposed to a monolithic façade. He also noted that ceiling heights were reduced to accommodate costs and meet a stated neighborhood desire to not be too tall. He pointed out that the building was proposed to be 47-49 ft. in height, whereas the zoning code would allow up to 60 ft.

Mr. Baade noted that the north façade is setback 5 ft. from the alley and would feature similar materials to the street-facing facades. He stated that the black brick is a similar product to what was utilized on the Milwaukee Ballet Academy building in the Third Ward. He noted that a medium gray mortar would be used to minimize contrast.

On the west façade, Mr. Baade pointed out an air louvre within the solid stone wall, which faces the interior of the block and would presumably be hidden by future development. He

noted that much of the solid first-floor design was driven by code. On the upper floors he pointed out the six hung balconies on the corner units.

Mr. Baade pointed out the garage and service doors on the east façade, as well as another ventilation louvre on the ground floor. It was noted that this façade also featured six hanging balconies.

Within the courtyard elevations ship-lapped siding was proposed on the east and west elevations, as it would be more difficult to see from the public frontage. Mr. Baade also pointed out the details of the proposed structure that is hoped to grow vegetation.

Mr. Baade noted that the aesthetic was driven by a desire to fit into Shorewood. He pointed out the varied color of brick along the corridor. He believed the design balanced traditional and conservative features, such as the top cornice and black balconies, while appealing to a more modern palette.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that no other applications or actions were outstanding from other boards or committees. Chair Kraehnke noted that there were several people on the call that he presumed were in attendance for this item and opened up the floor for public comment. He requested that comments be related to items under the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board.

Lisa Castagnozzi, 4472 N. Morris Blvd., questioned the proposed affordability within the project, particularly the duration of the proposed rent structure. She noted that other developers have provided that within Shorewood. Mr. Baade pointed out that there is no affordable housing assistance with this project but remains eager to have more conversations with the Village about it.

Barbara Kiely Miller, 4051 N. Downer Ave., questioned the distance of the south driveway to the intersection. Mr. Baade noted that a car exiting that driveway would be cleared of the sidewalk, but the rear portion of the vehicle may still be located in the drive apron when stopped at the stop sign.

Chair Kraehnke noted that a complete site/landscaping plan was not provided within the submission and would need to be provided for review and approval. He also stated that the Village Engineer had reviewed the plans and did not note any required changes to the proposed driveways.

Ms. Loest requested that the Design Review Board be reminded about their role in the review process. Director Griepentrog read the applicable portions of the Village Code noted in the Building Construction Chapter, more specifically [225-12B](#) Intent and Purpose and H Design Criteria.

Karen Desing, 3952 N. Stowell Ave., reiterated that Design Guidelines are adopted within the Zoning Code for this property. She questioned whether the Design Review Board has referenced those guidelines, specifically building design related to the requirement that at least 60% of the first-floor primary facades (facades facing streets, plazas, and parking lots) shall be clear, non-tinted windows or entrances. At least 25% of upper floors shall be windows or doors. At least 25% of first-floor facades facing rear parking areas or alleys used by pedestrians shall be windows or doors. Ms. Desing also referenced guidelines related to service and trash areas. She expressed concern that the trash hauler may block traffic in and out of the garage. She

questioned the existence of a traffic study and noted that she has not seen it to confirm that the curb cut is at a reasonable location. Aesthetically, she suggested that the developer may want to reconsider the color of brick, which she did not believe matched adjacent properties and was perhaps too stark or modern for the traditional, residential neighborhood.

Mr. Baade replied that a traffic study had not been performed with respect to the location of the proposed driveways, but a parking study was performed during the application for a special exception. He noted that they reviewed Shorewood code and found no requirements and that Shorewood's Engineer found no requirements within State code either. He also noted that similar conditions exist throughout Shorewood and the metro area. Director Griepentrog provided the Village Engineer's comments, as follows: "As we discussed I checked to see if WisDOT has any requirements for the setback distance of a driveway on a local road connecting to a State Highway (Capitol Drive) and they do not. They do have design guidance for the setback distance of a driveway from a State Highway, but it is not a requirement. I also checked the Village ordinance and did not see any requirements." Ms. Desing noted that the State has a best practice guide for pedestrians that does include information on curb cuts adjacent to State Highways. She questioned if the Village should reference those best practices even if they are not code.

Daniel Walsh, 4024 N. Stowell Ave., noted that he takes issue with almost everything the developer has said tonight. He stated that the developer has misrepresented the scope of this development to the Village over and over again throughout the past year. He said that their real goal is to get the project that they want done. He stated that the developers have never contacted the neighbors. He suggested that the Design Review Board was unable to approve the design because they did not have a full submission. He noted that the design has the highest color contrast that they could possibly think of. He said that the neighborhood was criticized last year for providing a massing study that is exactly what is being presented. He noted that the building is 90% lot coverage area and said that there are no other buildings in the village that are anywhere near that. He said general zoning requirements require 30% green space. He stated that the developer has made no attempt to fit in the neighborhood. He noted that zoning approvals are being litigated and suggested that additional lawsuits would be forthcoming. Mr. Walsh questioned if the DRB would require the developer to install a sprinkler system to maintain vegetation. He stated that there will be salt everywhere. He stated that the condition created by the garage doors on the east elevation does not exist anywhere within the village of Shorewood. Mr. Walsh noted that he is a commercial real estate broker who deals with developers all of the time. He said that just because the developer cannot [sic] make a project work that they want to build at a return that is acceptable to them does not mean that the village has to accept something that is grossly out of character with the area. Mr. Walsh stated that the idea that the developer is making any concessions in response to the neighborhood is all about building the biggest building they possibly can. He pointed out that there was no bike parking. He requested that the Design Review Board think about what they are being asked to review because it does not meet the Comprehensive Plan or main street requirements.

Mr. Baade noted that bike parking was not labeled on the plans but was included within the parking garage near the entrance to the lobby. He also noted that bike racks were noted on the revised furniture plan that had been provided as an update to the initial submission. He stated that the size of the building footprint has not changed. Mr. Baade said he was familiar with the lawsuit between the neighborhood and the Village but was unaware of any lawsuit involving Catalyst or Three Leaf. He noted that the development is within their understanding of the zoning setback and that it received confirmation from the Plan Commission. He was unaware

of any floor area ratio requirements, believed the building was designed within code and was happy to have that discussion if something was pointed out. He noted that the design had been updated to meet the 60% clear glazing component on the south façade and would defer to the Village on whether or not other façades had the same requirement but was going to re-read that requirement as well. Mr. Baade stated that he believed they picked traditional materials and colors. He also noted that other buildings in the area featured contrasting color patterns, including stucco on their tops.

Andrea Brandt, 4054 N. Stowell Ave., stated that she did not believe that the trash hauler would be able to pull into the building without obstructing traffic for a minimum of five to ten minutes. She believed it would create a lot of traffic back ups in a narrow intersection. She stated that this situation needed to be looked at. She also had concerns with deliveries and questioned where those trucks would park. Ms. Brandt stated that the area was already congested and encouraged people to try to make a turn north onto N. Stowell Ave. from E. Capitol Dr. She stated that the number of driveways in the area is unsafe and noted that this is the walking path of many children. She believed that less units with less parking spaces should be considered. She stated that larger units could attract more families for school enrollment.

Mr. Baade noted that the refuse area is internal to the building and that the carts are the same size as residential carts that their hauler would be contracted to service. He also noted that they made a conscious decision to put the lobby in the center of the block to accommodate delivery vehicles away from the intersection. Ms. Brandt did not believe that trash pick-up would happen as Mr. Baade suggested it has been designed.

Vicki Herman, 4071 N. Stowell Ave., stated that a lot of what she was going to say was discussed by Ms. Brandt.

Chair Kraehnke confirmed that the applicant is not suggesting that a garbage truck, in its traditional sense, would be servicing the building. Mr. Baade noted that they will need to provide private trash service who will utilize a standard truck, not a garbage truck.

Ms. Herman noted that she had great concerns regarding the façade. She stated that a lot of homes in Shorewood have stucco. She noted that the apartment buildings at the corner of Prospect and Capitol and Farwell and Capitol are constructed with reddish brick. She stated that the black and the tan will stick out like a sore thumb. Chair Kraehnke confirmed that Ms. Herman was concerned with the colors, not the materials themselves. Ms. Herman suggested that this building looked like a “cookie cutter” building and she knew of one in Madison. Ms. Herman questioned if mirrors or a stop sign would be installed to control traffic out of the alley.

Ms. Kiely Miller revisited her comment related to the location of the southern driveway and the visibility of drivers looking east and west while trying to turn onto E. Capitol Dr. She stated that she’s heard neighbors discuss an electrical box at the intersection that already obstructs the view of drivers. She would like to confirm whether or not that box poses a visibility issue to the proposed plan.

Rosina Bloomingdale, 3958 N. Stowell Ave., wanted the Board to know that she agreed with the safety issues that had been shared and noted that she did not like the proposed colors of the building. She believed the contrast was too stark.

Bill Desing, 3952 N. Stowell Ave., believed that the root of these issues stemmed back to the parking exception and modifying the requirements from 1.75 per unit to 1 per unit. He suggested a simple fix would be to remove one story and then there would be less neighborhood opposition. He also stated that the color should be changed.

Chair Kraehnke acknowledged that the Design Review Board does not deal with economics, but design.

Ms. Brandt commented that there has been a lot of discussion about meeting requirements but suggested as Shorewood we need to strive beyond the requirement and do what is best practice and try to be a model community.

Chair Kraehnke closed public comments and requested discussion from the Board.

Ryan O'Connor stated that his issues were not related to the materials but rather the massing. He stated that Shorewood is a walking and biking community and this design puts cars first. He noted that parking is located on the corner and that curb cuts interrupt N. Stowell Ave. He referenced the proposal to enter and exit the parking garage eliminated four spaces and if that could not be made to work then this is not the location for this project. He said this looks like a building on top of a parking garage. He believed the lobby should be located on the corner. He did not believe the provided justification for locating it mid-block. He suggested that pushing the parking floor into the ground three to four feet would minimize the massing. He stated that the limestone walls present a cold surface to anyone walking on the sidewalk. He also did not like windows looking directly into a parking garage.

Ms. Loest requested to see the proposed rendering looking west. She agreed with Mr. O'Connor that she did not like the design of the ground floor at the corner. She stated it looked stark. She suggested that the east elevation looked like an alley condition, not a neighborhood street. She had questions with what vegetation could grow in these conditions but acknowledged that landscape plans were not provided. She summarized that this corner did not look inviting. She was also not a fan of the windows looking into the parking garage but understood why the entry was placed mid-block for deliveries. She questioned the details of the second-floor balcony on the west elevation and how that interacts with the entryway canopy. She stated that she was not a fan of the proposed colors.

Chair Kraehnke expressed concerns with the starkness of the ground floor; however, he noted that this is a commercial building that necessitates commercial design. He stated that the primary façade is on E. Capitol Dr., which is a commercial corridor, so it was understandable to have a commercial aspect. He also acknowledged that N. Stowell Ave. is a residential street and would be interested in seeing changes along N. Stowell Ave. He noted that he was not a big fan of bolted-on balconies. He suggested they looked like an afterthought and preferred the integrated balconies featured on the back side of the building. He noted that the current setback of the upper floors allowed room to incorporate the balconies on the east and west facades. Chair Kraehnke appreciated the courtyard style of the building that made it present as two buildings. He somewhat agreed with Mr. O'Connor's comments related to the primacy of the parking structure but understood its necessity. He suggested that the Board should consider deferring action so that the comments expressed at tonight's meeting could be incorporated or responded to.

Mr. Pachefsky stated that the massing was too much. He stated that there was something “off” about the siding on the top. He noted that the predominant material does not appear as the predominant material. He suggested the building looked chopped up and that there were multiple things going on that made it more confusing. He agreed with Chair Kraehnke that inset balconies were preferred. He noted that he spoke with the vet clinic next door who shared concerns over traffic and parking. Mr. Pachefsky questioned how landscaping would grow within the proposed small setback. He questioned if a community meeting was ever convened to discuss the proposal. Mr. Baade confirmed that there had not been one. Mr. Pachefsky suggested it would be helpful to have one.

Mr. Skauge stated that he agreed with the comments provided by the Board members. His biggest issue was the safety of the cars entering and exiting the parking structure. He stated that he was not fond of the colors and thought the building was too large for its proposed location.

Ms. Loest stated that safety was listed within the purpose of the Design Review Board’s review. She stated that the condition of the driveways continued to be a concern and that she would not want her child riding her bike passed an alley and two driveways. She understood there were no requirements and that this condition existed elsewhere but requested to know what the Village Engineer’s guidelines would be.

Mr. Koester noted that the DRB recently approved a similar project at N. Oakland Ave. and E. Lake Bluff Blvd. He questioned how parking was accessed in that development. Chair Kraehnke noted that it was provided from the alley. Ms. Loest questioned if there were two entrances or one and was informed there was only one. Mr. O’Connor also noted that the parking was depressed into the ground with a slightly raised first floor. He believed the massing was better on that proposal. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the alley was the ideal location, since people are suggesting that the area is already congested. He was also not in favor of a driveway on E. Capitol Dr. Ms. Loest said that her bigger problem was having two driveways, but one from N. Stowell Ave. could work, but not the one closest to the crosswalk. Mr. Pachefsky agreed and noted that with two driveways you lose more public parking. Chair Kraehnke noted that the proposal would close two driveways that currently are located on E. Capitol Dr.

Mr. Baade confirmed that he heard concern with how the commercial development meets the residential neighborhood, particularly the two driveways on the east elevation from a safety and an aesthetic perspective. He also heard suggestions for activating the corner rather than the center of the building. He acknowledged that the massing of the building was questioned. On that point, he reiterated that the height of the building is less than what is allowed by the area’s zoning. He noted that they would also look at the colors of the building, which he stated would be the easiest thing to change. He also stated that he heard some opinion on inset versus hung balconies and asked the Design Review Board members if they had any other thoughts for him to consider.

Chair Kraehnke stated that understanding the building is a multi-unit building, he did not have a problem with the proposed massing. He appreciated the efforts that were made to design the building and hoped that additional refinement could be proposed. He did not have issues with the proposed color but suggested that the materials could benefit from patterning or texturing, as opposed to their solid nature.

Mr. O’Connor agreed that additional moves could be made to reducing the massing of the building. He reiterated his concern that the building appeared to be a parking garage with a

building on top of it. He said there were no design attempts to make them look integrated. He suggested suppressing the ground floor and considering less setback of the residential stories. He wanted to see it look more like a continuous façade. He noted that he typically doesn't like bolt-on balconies and would prefer integrated ones but appreciated that these didn't hang over the sidewalk. Chair Kraehnke suggested that Mr. O'Connor's comments related to the human scale of the building, or in this case the lack thereof.

Ms. Brandt expressed displeasure with the layout of the courtyard in that residents would be looking into each other's windows. She also wished to see a more subdued color palette and suggested neighborhood input would be helpful.

Mr. Walsh stated that the project is simply too big for the site. He said he understood the economics of development these days but did not think the Village needed to accept the project.

Ms. Desing suggested that simplifying the number of materials would be helpful to improve the aesthetics. She also stated that the massing of the project did not fit in with the human scale of the area.

Ms. Kiely Miller stated that as one travels further east on E. Capitol Dr. the height of development is reduced, particularly beyond N. Prospect Ave. She stated that she did not believe people were against development at this corner but that they wanted it to be more thoughtful to fit into the residential neighborhood.

Chair Kraehnke noted that he took some issue with the idea that the project did not fit into the area. He referenced the four-story apartment building at the corner of N. Prospect and E. Capitol Dr. Ms. Herman noted that apartment building is red brick and is setback along N. Prospect Ave. with green space in front of it.

Chair Kraehnke moved to defer action until a future meeting; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

6. Adjournment

Mr. Koester moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:10 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

Recorded by,



Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director