

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, July 15, 2003, 5:00 PM, Park View Room**

1. Roll Call

Present: Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Campbell, Ms. Dunn, Mr. Francois, Mr. Liechty,
Mr. Oliveri, Mr. Sayas, Mr. Valentin

Excused Absence: Mr. Sobczak

Also Present: Applicants, Mr. Mikolajewski

2A. Rebecca Guldán – 655 Meadow Lane – Revised landscaping plan

Ms. Rebecca Guldán presented plans for a revised driveway location and configuration to be installed with the home currently under construction. The original location and configuration of the driveway were approved on a previous occasion. Revised landscaping will accommodate the new location and configuration.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the revised plans as submitted noting Article I of Chapter 7 of the Code of Ordinance. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 7 -0.

2B. Chris & Anne Klann – 935 Verdant Drive – Revised Addition

Mr. Jim Perkins presented revised plans for an addition to the Klann home. The Building Board had approved plans for the addition previously; however, the applicant desired to make some changes to windows and doors.

Mr. Francois clarified that first floor windows on the west elevation will align with the basement windows below.

The Board also expressed concern about the location of a door above grade on the south elevation. Mr. Perkins noted that it is the intent of the homeowner to eventually construct a deck at this location. The Board indicated that a railing to match railing elsewhere on the home should be used in the interim.

Mr. Campbell motioned to approve the revised plans as presented, noting that revised plans for a deck on the south elevation will be presented to the Building Board in a reasonable amount of time. Mr. Campbell also noted that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded.

Discussion. The Board noted the need to align the first floor and basement windows on the west elevation.

Mr. Campbell motioned to amend the motion to require the alignment of the first floor and basement windows on the west elevation. Mr. Francois seconded the amended motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2C. Bob Mack – 13313 Watertown Plank Road – Sign

Mr. Mike Fischer and Mr. Bob Mack presented a sign proposal for Pastimes. Discussion began regarding the neon sign proposed for the store window. Mr. Mack assured the Board that the sign would not have a garish or bright light. The sign will be located about three feet away from the window. The sign will only be lit when the business is open.

Mr. Sayas verified that the sign would not have flashing light.

Discussion turned to the painted sign to be located above the front window. The sign will not be illuminated.

Mr. Valentin clarified that the sign will mirror the business sign on the eastern portion of the building.

Mr. Francois motioned to approve the proposal, noting that in accordance with Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4, when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Sayas seconded.

Mr. Francois amended the motion to note that the neon sign will only be lit when the business is open. Mr. Sayas seconded the amended motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2D. Stewart & Debra Clark – 1045 Terrace Drive – Deck

Mr. Stewart Clark presented plans to construct a deck over an existing patio. The deck will mirror the footprint of the existing patio. The deck will be natural cedar.

Mr. Liechty questioned the elevation of the deck, and Mr. Clark indicated that it would be about eight inches above grade. Mr. Clark indicated that planters and benches would be used around the outer edge of the deck.

Mr. Sayas motioned to approve the submitted deck plan, noting that when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2E. Ken & Pat Siberz – 1415 Woodside Lane – Deck and Shed

Ms. Siberz began by presenting plans for the deck. The deck will be cedar stained gray to harmonize with the colors of the home. Small lattice or shrubbery will be utilized around the base of the deck.

Mr. Sayas motioned to approve the plans as submitted with the understanding that small lattice or shrubbery will be used around the base of the structure. Mr. Sayas noted that when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Oliveri seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Discussion turned to the proposal for a shed. The shed will measure 8 feet by 10 feet. The shed will be painted taupe with cream trim, and it will have shingles to match those on the home. The Board discussed several elements of the proposal, including the style, pitch of the roof, overhang, and materials.

The Board asked Ms. Siberz if she would be willing to table the item to allow for an onsite visit. Ms. Siberz agreed.

Mr. Francois motioned to table the item pending on onsite review scheduled for Tuesday, August 14th at 4:30 PM. Ms. Dunn seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2F. Jim & Karen Heck – 14370 Wisconsin Avenue – Addition

Mr. Mark Walberg, contractor, presented plans for the Heck's home addition. Existing windows on the home will be reused. The pitch of the roof and roofing materials will be the same as found on the existing home. Brick to match existing on the home will be carried around through the addition.

Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the addition as proposed, noting that when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Oliveri seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2G. Elaine & Bill Wolters – 1900 Westmoor Terrace – Addition

Mr. Dwayne Gosseck, contractor, presented plans for a 24 feet by 24 feet addition to the rear of the garage. The roof pitch and overhangs will match those on other portions of the home. The siding and gutter system used will be similar to the rest of the home.

The Board thought that the information presented did not include sufficient detail to render a decision. The Board requested the applicant to table the item in favor of a

special Building Board meeting to discuss a set of more detailed plans. The applicant agreed.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to table the item pending a special Building Board meeting to be held on July 22nd at 7:30 AM. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2H. Teena Flanner – 820 Kurtis Drive – Addition

Mr. Francois was recused to allow him to present the proposed addition. Siding and windows will match the existing home. Several Board members questioned if it was possible to make the addition gable smaller.

Mr. Valentin expressed concern about the proportion of the addition to the existing home.

Mr. Baesemann questioned if there was a way to add architectural interest between the windows on the east elevation. Mr. Francois offered to include a box bay window for the master bedroom on the east elevation.

The Board also discussed, and Mr. Francois agreed, to add a gable window on the north elevation.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the submitted proposal, with the condition that a box bay window is added to the master bedroom of the east elevation and that a window is added to the north gable. Mr. Oliveri noted that when erected the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the proposed structure will not be so at variance or so similar to the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, or so at variance with the intended character of the applicable district as stated in Chapter 335, Zoning, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values in the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Mikolajewski noted the location of the home within the front setback, and expressed concern about the addition to a nonconforming structure. Mr. Mikolajewski reminded the Board that the total lifetime structural alterations to a nonconforming home can not exceed 50% of its assessed value.

The Board requested Mr. Mikolajewski to check the assessment record for the property. The improvement is valued at \$88,200. Mr. Francois indicated that the cost of the proposal would exceed 50% of that value.

The Board questioned if a special exception or variance could apply, noting other instances when special exceptions or variances had been granted. The Board requested that the Village Attorney review the proposal.

Mr. Oliveri withdrew the motion.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to table the item pending review by the Village Attorney regarding the nonconforming status of the structure. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

3. Approval of minutes from July 1, 2003

Item withdrawn.

4. Old Business

No report.

5. New Business

No report.

6. Adjournment

Mr. Sayas motioned for adjournment. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.
Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Matthew B. Mikolajewski
Assistant Planner