VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
February 6, 2020

Chairperson – Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Charles Buscher, James Hoffman, Susy Azcuesta & James Hoffman. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:30 p.m.

The first item on the agenda is 5966 N. Santa Monica Blvd. The proposed project is for a façade change. Justin Morales, associate of the project, and Rich Ramos, the contractor, were present to explain the submitted plans while the Board reviewed them and video. Discussion keys: Window style is inconsistent with architecture; presence of 2x4’s above windows; changing roof color. Proposed windows in white, calls out the size difference; bring drawing to scale that shows final, full design. No neighbors in attendance. After further discussion, Jason Stuewe made a motion to approve the plans. Jim Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed to deny. (0-5)

The second item on the agenda is 1020 E. Sylvan Ave. – The proposed project is to construct a two-story addition to the rear of the home. The style of the addition will be maintained with matching brick veneer, matching board & batten vertical siding, matching roof pitches, matching overhangs, gutters and window styles. Existing second floor dormer styles will be duplicated on the addition as well. Jim Ghere from Gabor Design (designer/builder) was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Siding material on chimney; presence of leaded and unleaded windows on home and addition. Neighbors in attendance: None, but a letter from the neighbors at 1017 E. Lexington was submitted regarding drainage concerns.

After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following condition: The new, proposed sided chimney must be masonry like the other chimney. Jason Stuewe seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)
The third item on the agenda is 5970 N. Bay Ridge Ave. – The proposed project is to construct a two-story addition with full basement on the rear of the home. Jeremy Niederjohn, the homeowner, and John Van Rooy, the architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Presence of 5 different volumes on back of house; the house has many different types of windows and discussed addition of freeze board. No neighbors in attendance. After further discussion, Charles Buscher made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following condition: Add freeze board on existing house to line-up with freeze board on addition. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and passed. (4-1)

The ARC minutes from the January 23, 2020 meeting were reviewed. James Hoffman made a motion to approve them as submitted. Jason Stuewe seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

With no other matters on the agenda, Charles Buscher made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 P.M. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)
ARC Checklist

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?
  - Front: YES
  - Side: YES
  - Rear: YES

Height
  - Most Design areas limited to 25’
  - Between 25.1’ – 30’ design area must have a pattern of this height
  - Between 30.1’ – 35’ addition requirements met per RDG

Entries and Porches
  - Entries are consistent with the Design Area: YES
  - Entry is consistent with the style of the home: NO
  - Entries should be retained with remodels: NO
  - Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern): NO

Garages and Parking Areas
  - Garages location is consistent with Design area: YES
  - Attached garage is NOT the dominant feature when viewed from the road: NO
  - Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than ½ the width of the structure: YES
  - Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 1 D. iii.:
  - Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner:
  - Front facing attached garage single door can’t exceed 30% of the combined width of structure: N/A
  - Driveway pavement is minimized as per the RDG: YES

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

Misc.
  - Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185): YES
  - Site Plan
    - Project does not impair lot’s beauty: NO
    - Drainage approved by ARC (if NO, the Village staff to review): NO

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

Discussion Points - Leaded Glass Windows; Chimney
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 N/A YES NO
Between 30.1' – 35' addition requirements met per RDG

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 1 D. iii. YES NO
Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner N/A 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 N/A YES NO
   Roofing material is on approved list YES NO
   Roof slopes are compatible YES NO
   Window styles/size/proportions are compatible N/A 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 N/A YES NO

Misc.  
Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185) YES NO
Site Plan  
   Project does not impair lot's beauty NO consistency 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)