

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY  
Minutes of Architectural Review Commission  
August 8, 2019

Chairperson – Lauren Triebenbach - Board Members present: Charles Buscher, Tammy Herpel, Brian Medina, Heather Goetsch & Aaron Hoffmans. Village Inspector, Mike Belsha

The meeting came to order at 5:35 p.m.

The **first** item on the agenda is **4640 N. Lake Dr.** The proposed project is to request a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a house that is on the WFB Historic Registry. The homeowner, Josh Levy & Mike Reinfeld, attorneys, were present to explain the request while the Board reviewed the submitted documentation and video. Discussion keys: Was staging done? Had one offer at less than half of listing price. Has offer been countered? Neighbors in attendance: **Jeff Aikin-4955 Woodburn-Rule of Historic commission-house is only worth \$500,000. Suzy Van Cleave-5353 Berkeley-Not a typical house, it's a special house. Bob Herzog-Realtor-Representing the \$800,000 offer; buyer wants the house. After further discussion, Brian Medina made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Heather Goetsch seconded. A vote was taken and denied. (1-4) Aaron Hoffmans arrived during this case and did not vote.**

The **second** item on the agenda is **4706 N. Wilshire Rd.** –The proposed project is to extend the front of the existing garage out 6 feet and add a second floor exterior door out to the flat roof above the garage; will also rebuild the iron railings that go around the flat roof. The proposed addition will enclose two vehicles. Mike Sazama, contractor/designer, Kyle Bauer, designer & Dave North, roofer, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Could there be 9 ft. garage doors? Door needs to be more attractive; why does the garage move toward the front and not the back? Make it appear as two garage doors. No neighbors in attendance. **After further discussion, Heather Goetsch made a motion to table the plans as submitted. Charles Buscher seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (6-0)**

The **third** item on the agenda is **6203 N. Bay Ridge Ave.** - The proposed project is to add a breezeway connecting the existing attached garage to the kitchen. Currently there is no door between the house and the garage. The homeowners and Russ LaFrambois, the designer/architect, were present to explain the project while the Board reviewed the submitted plans and video. No discussion keys. Neighbors in attendance: **John Kannenberg-122 W. Devon**-It's great! **After further discussion, Tammy Herpel made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken and unanimously passed. (6-0)**

The **fourth** item on the agenda is **5949 N. Berkeley Blvd.** The proposed project is to construct a second floor addition over the existing first floor living space. The homeowners were present to explain the project while the Board members reviewed the submitted plans and video. Discussion keys: Why so few windows on the North elevation? Needs more. Too big, biggest house on the block; needs more architecture design.

Neighbors in attendance: **Tom Backes-5943 Berkeley**-chimney height-shed roof-siding-different directions. **Dr. Nancy Backes-5943 Berkeley**-radical revision of property; triples size; largest in area. **Suzy Van Cleave-5353 Berkeley**-Shadow plan for house to North? Garage too far back; why no materials brought to meeting; set back second story. **Terry Quantance-725 Lake View**-neighbors need to be put into consideration; houses shouldn't go from front set back to rear set back; trees should stay. **Rita Rojahn-837 Sylvan**-Complaining about the workers from the two houses on Sylvan being on her property; be close with your neighbor or builder; big houses block view.

**After further discussion, Aaron Hoffmans made a motion to approve the submitted plans. Brian Medina seconded. A vote was taken in a 3-3 decision. The building inspector explained that in a tie vote, the plans are denied as there needs to be a majority vote to pass them.**

**The ARC minutes from the July 25, 2019 meeting were reviewed. (Aaron Hoffmans left the meeting at this time) Tammy Herpel made a motion to approve them as submitted. Brian Medina 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 8:31 P.M. Tammy Herpel 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 *N/A*

## 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 1/2 the width of the structure  YES  NO
- Three garages meet RDG specs in 16.31 1 D. iii.  YES  NO *N/A*
- Attached garages on corner lots does not cause paving at or near the corner  YES  NO *N/A*
- 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 *N/A*
  - Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style  YES  NO

## Misc.

- Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185)  YES  NO *N/A*
- Site Plan  YES  NO
- 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
- Side
- Rear

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## Height

- Most Design areas limited to 25' *22.5' - 23'*
- Between 25.1' - 30' design area must have a pattern of this height
- Between 30.1' - 35' addition requirements met per RDG

YES NO  
 NA YES NO  
 YES NO

## Entries and Porches

- Entries are consistent with the Design Area
- Entry is consistent with the style of the home
- Entries should be retained with remodels
- Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## Garages and Parking Areas

- Garages location is consistent with Design area
- Attached garage is NOT the dominant feature when viewed from the road
- Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than 1/2 the width of the structure
- 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
- Driveway pavement is minimized as per the RDG

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO NA  
 YES NO NA  
 YES NO NA  
 YES NO NA  
 YES NO NA  
 YES NO

## Scale and Massing

- Compatible to the adjacent houses
- Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area
- Foundation height is compatible with Design Area

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
*confirm*

## 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
- Roofing material is on approved list
- Roof slopes are compatible
- Window styles/size/proportions are compatible
- Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)
- Chimneys (generally masonry)
- Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## Misc.

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

*need lights* YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

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

*concern about house size/financing*

# ARC Checklist

## Setbacks compatible per 16.31 1. A.?

- Front
- Side
- Rear

NA  YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## 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

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## Entries and Porches

- Entries are consistent with the Design Area
- Entry is consistent with the style of the home
- Entries should be retained with remodels
- Entry is prominent and oriented to the street (unless Design Area pattern)

NA  YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## Garages and Parking Areas

- Garages location is consistent with Design area
- Attached garage is NOT the dominant feature when viewed from the road
- Attached garages at the front or side are not wider than 1/2 the width of the structure
- 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
- Driveway pavement is minimized as per the RDG

NA  YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## Scale and Massing

- Compatible to the adjacent houses
- Scale and mass facing public street is compatible with Design Area
- Foundation height is compatible with Design Area

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 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
- Roofing material is on approved list
- Roof slopes are compatible
- Window styles/size/proportions are compatible
- Decorative features are compatible (corbels, rails, columns, etc.)
- Chimneys (generally masonry)
- Garages and Sheds are compatible with house style

YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO  
 YES NO

## Misc.

- Exterior lighting meets RDG (pg 185)
- Site Plan

YES NO

- Project does not impair lot's beauty
- Drainage approved by ARC (if NO, the Village staff to review).

YES  NO  
 YES  NO

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