

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission
July 25, 2019

Acting Chairperson – Peter Quehl - Board Members present: Charles Buscher, James Hoffman, Jason Stuewe & Tammy Herpel. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

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

The **first** item on the agenda is **6251 N. Berkeley Blvd.** The proposed project is to construct a second floor addition over the existing first floor study. Steve Kleist, the Builder, contractor, was present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Picture window style and mullions in windows. No neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, James Hoffman made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. Charles Buscher seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-0)**

The **second** item on the agenda is **1531 E. Fairmount Ave.** –The proposed project is to construct a new sunroom addition. The design will complement the existing modern design elements of the home and will also include a covered grilling area. The homeowner and Rory from Fein Design were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion key: Siding material. No neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, Charles Buscher made a motion to approve the plans as submitted. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (4-0)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **4975 N. Woodruff Ave.** – (Jason Stuewe was present for the remainder of the meeting) The proposed project is to demolish the existing one-story addition at the rear of the house and to construct a new two-story addition on the existing foundation of the demolished family room. The homeowner and Chuck Florum, the Architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: No masonry on addition? Keep driveway or incorporate stone into the design. Scale & massing is OK. No

neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, Jason Stuewe made a motion to table the submitted plans. James Hoffman seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (5-0)**

The ARC minutes from the July 11, 2019 meeting were reviewed. Jason Stuewe made a motion to approve them as submitted. Charles Buscher 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 6:10 P.M. Jason Stuewe 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' < 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	MA	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	MA	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 1/2 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 (cornices, 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). Does it affect neighbor?	✓	YES	NO
Site Plan			
Project does not impair lot's beauty	✓	YES	NO
Drainage approved by ARC (if NO, the Village staff to review) Down spout location?	✓	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' $\leftarrow 25'$	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	NA	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	NA	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 1/2 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
<u>Drainage approved by ARC</u> (if NO, the Village staff to review)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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' - <i>Same as existing</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Entry is consistent with the style of the home	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Entries should be retained with remodels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 1/2 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	<i>N/A</i>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Foundation height is compatible with Design Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Roofing material is on approved list	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Roof slopes are compatible	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Window styles/size/proportions are compatible	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Decorative features are compatible (cornices, rails, columns, etc.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Chimneys (generally masonry)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO
Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	NO

Misc.

Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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)