

DISCLAIMER – THE FOLLOWING ARE DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE BUILDING BOARD AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE UPON APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING BOARD

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, December 19, 2017**

Meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m. by Mr. Olson.

1. Roll Call.

Present: Mr. Schoenecker, Mr. Olson, Mr. Domaszek, Mr. Janusz, Mr. Matola, Mr. Collins, Mr. Liechty, and Mr. Koleski

Absent: Ms. Steindorf (excused)

Also Present: Mr. Harrigan, Ms. Nelson, Applicants

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated December 5, 2017.

Mr. Matola motioned and Mr. Schoenecker seconded to approve the meeting minutes as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

3. Review and act on a request by Charles and Sarah Lauber at 920 Madera Circle for an amendment to a previously approved accessory structure.

Mike Schierl from Breezy Hill Nursery was present before the board.

Mr. Koleski arrived at 5:32 pm.

Mr. Schierl provided a sample of the new proposed color. He stated the applicants plan to change the color of the house in the future and the original color the board approved for the pergola would not match the new house color.

Mr. Matola asked if the material is cedar. Mr. Schierl said yes, the color is dark oak and the material is cedar.

Mr. Matola asked if only the exposed side will be rough sawn. Mr. Schierl said yes.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned to approve the plans as submitted.

Mr. Liechty asked if there was any contrasting trim or if the pergola would all be the same color. Mr. Schierl stated that it will be all one color.

Mr. Liechty asked if there is any accent trim. Mr. Schierl said no.

Mr. Matola asked if the posts are six by six. Mr. Schierl said yes.

Mr. Matola seconded the motion to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 8-0.

4. Review and act on the revised plan set reflecting as built conditions submitted by Nicholas and Stephanie Butrym at 1905 Hollyhock Drive.

Nicholas Butrym appeared via telephone before the board.

Mr. Butrym stated that when they tried to match the originally approved asphalt shingles to the existing roof, the new shingle was a completely different color and did not match and that is the reason they changed to a copper roof. He apologized for changing the materials without resubmitting plans for approval to the board.

Mr. Liechty asked if they planned on replacing the rest of the existing roof with copper. Mr. Butrym said no, but they plan to reroof the rest of the home. He stated that they have future alterations/additions planned and will make sure the copper detail is carried through on those future changes.

Mr. Liechty stated that currently, the copper roof is at variance with everything else on the existing home. He stated the board looks for consistency in design and this is very inconsistent.

Mr. Olson stated that he agreed with Mr. Liechty and stated that a copper roof of this magnitude looks out of place.

Mr. Butrym stated that he respected the board's opinions but did not agree with that assessment.

Mr. Matola asked what the long term plan was for the copper. Mr. Butrym stated that it will weather over time and once the copper reaches a brown color it will be sealed as will the gutters.

Mr. Domaszek asked if a homeowner wanted to replace their asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam roof, would they need to come before the building board.

Mr. Harrigan stated that he did not think they had to get approval unless there was a structural change.

Mr. Olson stated that he thought they would need approval if it was a change in material and the overall appearance of the home.

Mr. Schoenecker stated that he was confused as to how the copper roof would be tied in with the future changes. Mr. Butrym stated that he could provide the board with a set of plans showing the planned future alterations.

Mr. Domaszek stated that he agreed that this roof was very inconsistent and would probably not have been approved by itself. He stated he would like to see the plans showing all the future changes.

Mr. Butrym stated that he can provide those plans and asked the board to table this item to a future meeting.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to table the item per the applicant's request. Motion carried 8-0.

Mr. Domaszek reviewed the code of ordinances section §335-88-C(1) listing the exemptions from site and building plan approval requirements. Exemptions include "... other repairs to the exterior of a structure that do not alter the color, size, shape, architectural character or illumination of the property..."

Mr. Olson stated that this roof significantly changed the character of the house so then it would need to be approved by the board. Mr. Harrigan agreed.

5. Review and act on the revised plan set reflecting as built conditions submitted by John and Julie Mick-Bonfilio at 14980 Juneau Boulevard.

Julie Mick-Bonfilio was present before the board.

Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that the changes from the originally approved plans include sizes of windows and the removal of a window. She stated some of the window changes were made due to the grading of the property and the window was removed from the peak of the garage as this was the exact spot on the inside of that wall where a basketball hoop was located.

Mr. Liechty stated that it is very uncharacteristic for a barn not to have a window or some opening at that spot. He feels that some kind of design element is needed there. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that she disagreed and felt that the siding detail was enough so that a window in that spot was not necessary.

Mr. Olson asked why all of the bracket details that were included in the original plans had been eliminated. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that there are brackets all along the front elevation.

Mr. Liechty stated that the deck has been extended from what was originally approved. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that was correct and they changed the windows to patio doors.

Mr. Olson stated that there are quite a few changes from what was originally approved and asked the applicant why the architect didn't inform her that they would need to get new approval from the building board. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that the architect did not mention that at all.

Mr. Domaszek asked why the architect was not present at the meeting. Mr. Harrigan stated that he did call Rob Miller Homes and spoke with Kristy who stated that they would allow the homeowner to appear herself and explain the changes.

Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that a lot of the changes to the deck and windows were due to the steep elevation and grading of the rear yard and the window in the center of the upper floor was changed to accommodate a built in desk to be located beneath it.

Mr. Harrigan provided photos of the finished home.

Mr. Domaszek asked if an engineer was consulted on the original plans for the retaining walls. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that the architect would have handled that consultation and that the retaining walls were eliminated due to cost concerns.

Mr. Domaszek asked why the brackets originally approved for the rear elevation were eliminated. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that she did not know and that she thought they were there still.

Mr. Matola stated that in the original approval, the board appreciated the details in the design, specifically the brackets, and that this is now missing from the home.

Mr. Olson stated that along with the brackets eliminated from the rear of the home, some of the brackets originally included on the front elevation are missing.

Mr. Liechty asked why the brackets were eliminated. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that she did not know.

Mr. Olson stated that the garage now has a different profile than what was in the original plans. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that it was not different. Mr. Olson said that it is a lower pitch. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that perhaps it was changed so that they did not have to incorporate steel beams into the garage roof.

Mr. Matola stated that the small eyebrow roof on the front of the garage is now much larger than what was originally approved.

Mr. Matola stated that overall, the as-built plans show something that is significantly different than what was approved by the building board.

Mr. Olson asked why the brackets were eliminated from the garages. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that she was not sure but maybe they couldn't fit them in because of the gutters and trim.

Mr. Domaszek asked why the garage doors changed. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that they did not change. Mr. Matola stated that the detail above the garage doors are missing. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that they removed that detail because they thought it looked too busy.

Mr. Domaszek stated that the Reukert Mielke letter states that they are over the impervious surface area limit and the applicant will need to come up with a plan to address that. Mr. Harrigan confirmed that they are over by 1.4%.

Mr. Domaszek stated that he doesn't remember seeing another property with this many after the fact changes made to the design and stated the board is likely going to ask the applicant to have additional work done on the home to make it more consistent with what was originally approved. He suggested that the item be tabled to a later meeting to give the board time to visit the property and come up with recommendations and to give the applicant time to address the impervious surface overage.

Mr. Domaszek strongly suggested to the applicant that they have their architect or a contractor with them at the next meeting to go over all the changes to be made.

Mr. Olson also stated that the board would like to know why all of these changes were made and why the applicant did not come back to the board for approval. Mr. Domaszek added that there are procedures in place for making these changes and he would also like to hear from the contractor as they should be aware of the village ordinances.

Mr. Harrigan stated that if the item is tabled he would like everyone to go out to look at the property and come up with a list of questions and items that need to be addressed at the next meeting.

Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that she was not interested in investing more money into this project.

Mr. Domaszek asked if the applicants had an occupancy permit. Mr. Harrigan stated that they had a temporary occupancy permit but that it has expired.

Mr. Olson asked the applicant if they had a set of plans from the builder and what did those plans reflect. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that the plans she has from her builder are the original approved plans. Mr. Matola asked if there are any change orders that she could provide. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that they did not have any formal change orders.

Mr. Olson stated that the home the board approved is not the home that was completed.

Mr. Matola asked the applicant who prepared the new as-built plans submitted to the board. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that it was the same architect. Mr. Matola asked why the plans do not accurately reflect what was built. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that she was not sure as she had not had a chance to fully review those plans.

Mr. Domaszek asked when the applicants' occupancy permit expired. Ms. Mick-Bonfilio stated that the temporary occupancy permit has already expired.

Ms. Mick-Bonfilio asked the board to table the item to a future meeting.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to table the item per the applicant's request. Motion carried 8-0.

Mr. Matola recused himself from the meeting at 6:22 p.m.

6. Review and act on a request by Andrew Matola at 675 Elm Grove Road for a window alteration to a previously approved building addition.

Andrew Matola was present before the board.

Mr. Matola stated that they made a minor change to the size on the fireplace and needed per fire code to extend that wall, so they had to move the windows on the back wall. The windows have moved in three to four inches on either side and are evenly spaced and centered. Mr. Matola stated that the north view egress window well is indicated on the plans and the two side windows on the north wall had to come closer together to fit on that wall.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if all the materials were the same. Mr. Matola said that was correct.

Mr. Liechty asked if the egress window was below grade. Mr. Matola said yes and added that there will be a cover on the window well.

Mr. Olson asked if they had considered one large bank of windows on the rear wall instead of separate windows. Mr. Matola said that they would need a much larger header for that and from the outside he feels there would be large blank spaces on each corner. He stated they also liked the look of the triangle of windows with the vaulted ceilings in that room.

Mr. Matola stated that where the addition meets the house that soffit will actually be six inches higher but will tie into the existing gutters. He stated the soffit and gutters will match and the overhang will be two feet.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned to approve the plans as submitted.

Mr. Liechty asked if the fascia size will stay the same. Mr. Matola said yes, just elevated six inches.

Mr. Schoenecker amended his motion and Mr. Domaszek seconded to approve the plans with the noted changes to the soffit height on the addition. Motion carried. 7-0.

Mr. Matola rejoined the meeting at 6:29 p.m.

7. Other business.

None

8. Adjournment

Mr. Liechty motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried 8-0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carey Nelson
Administrative Assistant

DRAFT