



**Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 14, 2022**

1. Call to order.

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

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

Others present: Alice Wycklendt, Russ LaFrombois, Joel Agacki, Christopher Adams, and Bart Griepentrog, Planning & Development Director.

2. Approval of the March 24, 2022 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 6-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the alteration/expansion of a dormer at residential property 4521-23 N. Marlborough Drive.

Alice Wycklendt provided an overview of the plans. She noted that plans related to this renovation were previously approved on December 16, 2021, but in the process of construction it was realized that additional roof modifications would be required. She noted that the dormer on both the north and south elevations has been extended to the rear of the house on these revised plans. Director Griepentrog showed the proposed plans in conjunction with the previously approved plans for reference.

Chair Kraehnke noted that additional windows were being incorporated into the extended dormers.

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

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the raising of the 2nd floor wall height, roof modification and window/door modifications at residential property 1908 E. Elmdale Court.

Russ LaFrombois was present to discuss this item. He noted that the roof was being raised to accommodate better living space for three bedrooms on the second floor. He acknowledged that the character of the house was changing but would not be out of line with the neighborhood. The renovation included all new siding and windows.

Mr. Melzer confirmed that the footprint of the house was not changing. Chair Kraehnke questioned if any window or door openings were changing on the first floor. Mr. LaFrombois noted that one window within the bank on the front façade would be eliminated to accommodate needed structural support.

Mr. O'Connor moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 7-0.

5. Consideration of the application and plans on file for window/door modifications and front porch addition at residential property 4530 N. Marlborough Drive.

Joel Agacki was present to discuss this item. He noted that new windows would be installed throughout the entire house. He also pointed out that several window and door openings were being modified. He noted that a new front door would be installed and a new porch with a flat roof and concrete patio would be added. Material samples were shared with the Board.

Ms. Wright confirmed that all windows would be updated, so the change in style was acceptable. Chair Kraehnke asked what material the porch would be constructed with and was informed it would either be painted or dark stained wood.

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

6. Consideration of the application and plans on file for site and landscaping modifications at commercial property 3970 N. Oakland Avenue.

Christopher Adams provided an overview of the proposed plans, which represent phase 3 of the project. He noted that the plans involved the reconfiguration of the parking lot and landscaping improvements. With the removal of the former drive through, perpendicular parking stalls were being added to the base of the east façade and within the lot itself. He noted that no improvements were proposed within the parking lot from the vacated Cramer St. east, as that area is being contemplated for future redevelopment. He pointed out that a corner landscape area was being added to the southeast corner of the building, which he hoped would soften the building and lessen the dominance of the parking lot. He noted that most of the proposed landscaping was native Wisconsin plants.

Director Griepentrog discussed the presence of a pocket park easement on the west and north sides of the building, which currently required the Village to maintain the area. He noted that future discussion was planned between the property owner and Village to modify that agreement to allow for these modifications.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 6-0. (Ms. Wright was absent for the vote.)

7. Further consideration of the application and site/landscaping plans on file associated with the expansion of the gas station's convenience store at commercial property 2521 E. Capitol Drive.

No one was present to represent the item, so no action was taken. Director Griepentrog pointed the Board to the Central District Design Guidelines which state that "Existing gas station sites shall be improved by adding planting and low, decorative fencing along perimeters and by reducing driveway widths." The plans provided only detailed current conditions.

In conjunction with the Design Guidelines, the Board expressed a desire to see increased landscaping and fencing in the front corner of the property the same width as what is featured on the N. Downer Ave. frontage with some sort of element, such as a poured in place curb, that would protect the new improvements.

8. Discussion of the Design Review Board's review process and jurisdiction.

Chair Kraehnke led a discussion about the Board's thoughts on the recent review of the project at 2418-20-28 E. Capitol Dr. He stated a desire for Board members to express the reasons why they decided to vote no within the discussion prior to voting. He also noted an understanding that not everyone liked the project, but the Board's role is to review the project within the allowable zoning. Mr. Pachefsky agreed that the project conformed to the pre-existing commercial zoning and did not feel like the Board had a right to reject the plans, particularly after the developer responded to the early suggestions for changes.

Mr. Skauge noted a desire for greater pre-communication with the adjacent neighborhood. Director Griepentrog noted that other recent redevelopments may have had greater public engagement because they required rezonings or financial assistance, but this development was proposed without needing those components.

Chair Kraehnke brought up the issue of "green space" requirements in the commercial district, which was raised within the consideration. He noted that the zero setback/build-to line negated the possibility of that requirement in the B-3 district. He also questioned the language that required driveways lead to a garage, noting that would also not be feasible within the commercial district. Director Griepentrog noted that the Plan Commission would be reviewing this section at their upcoming meeting and stated that when discrepancies are identified in the code that it was his preference to fix them, like the DRB did with patios last year. Chair Kraehnke questioned if the DRB agreed with his interpretation that these requirements were intended for residential properties, and the Board offered their consensus. Alternatively, Chair Kraehnke suggested that a green roof could qualify to satisfy the requirement. Ms. Loest agreed and noted that defining what qualified as green space and what objective was trying to be achieved (ground cover / accessible space vs permeable space / stormwater management, etc.) would be helpful. Director Griepentrog stated that he hoped the Commercial Zoning Update would include that conversation.

Mr. Pachefsky questioned whether it would be good to require developers to host community meetings about their proposals prior to seeking approvals. Director Griepentrog noted that the Village could ask but is not currently able to require it. He noted that he has provided that advice to developers and businesses, some of whom have followed suite. He also noted that the process to request financial assistance, such as TIF, does now require it. Mr. Pachefsky noted that Milwaukee seems to have a process that requires it. Ms. Wright noted that the requirement would need to be codified. Chair Kraehnke suggested that certain projects, such as lot consolidations or redevelopments of a certain size, could be considered in the new code. Ms. Wright also stated that giving people an opportunity to voice their opinion needs to be balanced with an education of what the code allows so that expectations are clear.

Chair Kraehnke raised the issue of precedence in the Board's review process and noted that in his opinion as a member of a review board that precedence should not matter, as all reviews are unique and have their own context. He also stated that it is unknown under what parameters

those past projects were reviewed or approved. Mr. Melzer agreed that it should not be weighted. Mr. Pachefsky said that the Board should not be required to replicate past mistakes and should look forward, without needing to conform to precedence. Ms. Loest also stated that the Board should not be asked to design or fix people's designs. Chair Kraehnke said there was a delicate balance between providing advice and rejecting multiple plans over multiple meetings.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Pachefsky moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:14 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 7-0.

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