VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
February 20, 2020

Acting Chairperson: Jason Stuewe - Board Members present: Charles Buscher, James Hoffman, Susy Azcuetta & David Domres. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:33 p.m.

The first item on the agenda is 5226 N. Santa Monica Blvd. This is a resubmittal of approved plans from the July 11, 2019 meeting. It makes minor modifications to approximately 4 windows by adding divided light grills to all windows. No other material changes are of note. Robert Gamperl, the homeowner, was present to explain the change on the approved plans while the Board reviewed them and the video. Discussion key: One window on North side of house is vertical; all other windows are horizontal-explain why. No neighbors in attendance. After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the plans. Charles Buscher seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

The second item on the agenda is 2110 E. Glendale Ave. – The proposed project at the front elevation, would be to relocate the existing garage door to align with the exterior wall framing of the south/front elevation of the residence. The purpose of which is to allow access from the garage immediately into the house. The new segmented raised panel garage door would be made of white prefinished, insulated steel. Also, three punched openings at the west elevation near the front, shall be infilled with new white window sashes, the glass shall be obscure/frosted glass. At the rear elevation, two double hung windows will be replaced by casement units and the bottom sill will be approximately 8 inches lower. A bathroom at the rear of the residence, will have the double hung window replaced in tempered glass within the same frame configuration. Karl Holtermann, the architect, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Divided light window in the kitchen doesn’t match other windows. No neighbors in attendance.
After further discussion, David Domres made a motion to approve the submitted plans with the following condition: Remove the divided light from kitchen windows. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

The third item on the agenda is 5160 N. Lydell Ave. – The proposed project is to construct a one-story addition off the East elevation of the house. The addition exterior will stay true to the current architectural style of the existing house. Paul Koepnick, the homeowner, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Roof pitch. No neighbors in attendance. After further discussion, Charles Buscher made a motion to table the submitted plans. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and passed. (5-0)

The ARC minutes from the February 6, 2020 meeting were reviewed. James Hoffman made a motion to approve them as submitted. Suzy Azcueta seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)

With no other matters on the agenda, James Hoffman made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:20 P.M. Charles Buscher seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)
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 YES NO
  Between 30.1’ – 35’ addition requirements met per RDG YES NO

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 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 YES NO
    Roofing material is on approved list YES NO
    Roof slopes are compatible YES NO
    Window styles/size/proportions are compatible 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 YES NO

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

Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?
  Front YES NO
  Side YES NO
  Rear NO CHANGE YES NO

Height
  Most Design areas limited to 25’ YES NO
  Between 25.1’ – 30’ design area must have a pattern of this height NO CHANGE 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 NO CHANGE 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 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 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 YES NO
    Roofing material is on approved list YES NO
    Roof slopes are compatible YES NO
    Window styles/size/proportions are compatible 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 YES NO

Misc.
  Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185) YES NO
  Site Plan
    Project does not impair lot’s beauty 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)
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 YES NO  
Between 30.1’ – 35’ addition requirements met per RDG YES NO

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 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: YES NO  
Siding material is consistent with style of house YES NO  
Roofing material is on approved list YES NO  
Roof slopes are compatible YES NO  
Window styles/size/proportions are compatible 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 YES NO

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