

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, October 7, 2003
4:30 PM – On site at 1055 San Jose
5:00 PM – Village Hall Parkview Room**

1. Roll Call

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

Excused Absence: Mr. Francois

Also Present: Applicants, Mr. Mikolajewski

2A. Thomas and Michelle Nelson – 1055 San Jose – Pergola

The Board met at 1055 San Jose to discuss the Nelson's proposed pergola. The legs of the proposed pergola will be reclaimed 8 X 8 barn beams. The slats across the top will be 2 X 6.

Ms. Dunn questioned if Mr. Nelson had shared the proposal with his surrounding neighbors, and he indicated that he did.

Several Board members questioned why the pergola was not centered on the west garage façade, noting that the height of the pergola will look awkward relative to the garage's gutter line if the pergola is not centered.

Mr. Valentin noted that the proposed pergola looks like a cube of beams that does not fit with the rest of the home. Mr. Campbell echoed these comments, noting that the beams look excessive for a relatively small structure.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to recess the meeting so that the Board could travel back to Village Hall to continue the discussion. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

All members present at 1055 San Jose returned to Village Hall. Meeting was called to order at 5:06 PM.

Mr. Liechty questioned if it was possible to include materials, etc. that could relate more to the existing home.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the proposed pergola already compliments the home.

Mr. Liechty questioned if Mr. Nelson would be opposed to using flagstone beneath the pergola to match the flagstone on the home. Mr. Nelson stated that he would be opposed to this because he is appearing before the Board for the pergola, and not the patio below.

Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the proposed pergola, noting that the overall height does not exceed the gutter line and that stone similar to that used on the home be used on the patio. Mr. Liechty 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. Sobczak seconded.

Discussion. Mr. Oliveri noted that the Code of Ordinance states that accessory structures should be constructed using materials similar to the home.

Motion denied, with Mr. Liechty and Mr. Sobczak voting yes, and Mr. Campbell, Ms. Dunn, Mr. Oliveri, Mr. Sayas, and Mr. Valentin voting no.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to deny the proposed pergola, 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 be so at variance with the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of structures under construction or existing in the immediate neighborhood, as to be likely to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values in the immediate neighborhood. In addition, 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 be 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. Specifically, the proposed structure is at variance with Code of Ordinance Section 335-88 D6(i)[1], which states “accessory structures ... shall be designed to be harmonious with the architectural character, concept and style of the primary structure. Materials shall be compatible with respect to size, proportion, materials, and colors of the principal structure.”

Mr. Valentin seconded. Motion carried with Mr. Campbell, Ms. Dunn, Mr. Oliveri, Mr. Sayas, and Mr. Valentin voting yes, and Mr. Liechty and Mr. Sobczak voting no.

2B. Paul Pagel and Judy May – 13360 Nicolet Avenue – Landscaping (Playhouse)

Mr. Pagel presented the final landscaping plan for his new home under construction at 13360 Nicolet Avenue. The landscaping plan includes the berm along the west side of the property as recommended by the Village Engineer.

Mr. Pagel also requested to relocate the playhouse at their current home at 13365 Nicolet Avenue to the backyard of their new home. Mr. Pagel indicated that the playhouse would be painted cream with a maroon trim to match the new home.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the submitted landscaping plan and relocation of the playhouse, noting that the landscaping plan meets the stormwater drainage recommendations of the Village Engineer, and the playhouse will be painted cream with a maroon trim to match the new home. Mr. Oliveri 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. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2C. John and Andrea Hicks – 955 North 124th Street – Addition

Mr. & Mrs. Hicks presented a proposed addition to an addition that was previously approved by the Building Board. Mr. Mikolajewski informed the Board that the previously approved split-level garage could not be constructed in a manner to insure effective stormwater drainage. The split-level garage will be abandoned in favor of an at grade garage north of the family room addition. Mr. Mikolajewski indicated that the home is a legal non-conforming structure and that the new addition would be in excess of the 50% assessed value cap. Mr. Mikolajewski indicated that the Village would support the pouring of footings for the new garage, as these are required to stabilize the addition that had already been constructed. Mr. Mikolajewski indicated that the Hicks' will not be able to construct the actual garage until the Village-wide reevaluation is completed in 2004, assuming that the new home value would meet the 50% standard.

Mr. Liechty questioned when the new deck would be constructed, and Ms. Hicks indicated that it would be spring at the earliest.

Mr. Oliveri expressed some remaining concerns about the drainage of water around the addition. Mr. Liechty echoed these concerns, noting that a swale may be needed to carry water around the additions.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the proposed addition, noting that only the footings of the garage can be installed at this time, and that construction of the actual garage can occur, without further Building Board action, after staff determines that the reevaluation of the home permits the construction relative to requirements for legal nonconforming structures. Mr. Oliveri further noted that stormwater drainage must be reviewed and approved by the Village Engineer prior to issuance of a permit. Finally, Mr. Oliveri 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.

Ms. Dunn seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2D. Mike and Mindy Dwinell – 12775 Meadow Drive – Fence

Mr. Mikolajewski informed the Board that the Dwinell's fence had burned in a brush fire, destroying more than 50% of the structure. The Dwinell's propose replacing the charred sections with identical fencing. The six feet tall stockade style fence had been granted a variance and approval by the Building Board when originally constructed, largely due to

the location of the property adjacent to railroad tracks and UPS. Due to the 50% destruction, the Dwinell's appeared before the Board for another variance and approval.

Mr. Baesemann opened the public hearing. No one in attendance wished to speak. Mr. Baesemann closed the public hearing.

Ms. Dunn motioned to grant a variance for a six feet tall stockade style fence to match existing fencing on the property. Ms. Dunn 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. Sayas seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2E. St. Edmund's Church – 14625 Watertown Plank Road – Sign

As a parishioner, Mr. Sayas recused himself for this item. St. Edmund's proposed a sign along Wisconsin Avenue similar to the sign located along Watertown Plank Road. The sign would be smaller, but would include the same brown, white, red, blue, and gold color pattern. There would be no lighting. The sign would be installed perpendicular to the building and both faces would be the same. The north "leg" of the sign would be placed as close to the parking lot pavement as possible. The south "leg" of the sign would be about eight feet from the Wisconsin Avenue pavement. Mr. Mikolajewski informed the Building Board that the sign would be located in the Village right-of-way, and as a result, the church would need to enter into a lease agreement with the Village.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the sign, noting that the Public Works Director must approve the final location, the colors will match those on the Watertown Plank Road sign, there will be no illumination, and the church will need to enter into a lease agreement with the Village. Mr. Oliveri noted that the sign meets the provisions of Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4.

Mr. Sobczak seconded. Motion carried 6-0, with Mr. Sayas recused.

2F. Loaf and Jug – 13408 Watertown Plank Road – Sign

Mr. Gordan Sloan, owner, presented plans for a new sign for his business within the Mill Place Shops. The sign will not be illuminated.

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the sign proposal, noting the provisions of Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4. Ms. Dunn seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2G. Al & Karen Rolandi – 13155 Oakhurst – Alteration

Ms. Rolandi presented a proposal for a new front door, skylights, rear patio doors, and rear and side windows. Ms. Rolandi noted that one home on the block already has skylights on the front elevation.

Mr. Liechty clarified that a deck will eventually be constructed across the rear elevation of the home.

Ms. Rolandi indicated that the new patio doors would be aluminum clad with an eggshell color. Ms. Rolandi indicated that she is now considering French doors and awning windows instead of the traditional patio doors found in the original proposal. It was the consensus of the Board that both styles would be appropriate.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the front door as submitted and the skylights as submitted. Regarding the new patio doors and windows on the west and south elevations, Mr. Oliveri motioned that either the original proposal (traditional patio door with picture windows) or French doors with awning windows would be permitted. The applicant must inform the Board of her decision at the October 21, 2003 meeting. Mr. Oliveri recognized that these doors and windows will be clad aluminum in an eggshell color and the applicant will return in the future with a proposal for the rear deck. Mr. Oliveri noted the provisions of Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4.

Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2H. Dr. & Mrs. George Chandy – 1380 Woodlawn Circle – Alteration

Mr. Tim Biermann, contractor, presented the Chandy's proposal for skylights and a new porch.

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the submitted proposal, noting that colors and materials are to match existing. Mr. Sobczak also noted the provisions of Code of Ordinance Section 7-1 & 7-4. Motion was seconded, but Mr. Mikolajewski forgot to record by whom. Motion carried 7-0.

2I. Robert & Maureen Patch – 13350 Braemar Drive – Addition

Mr. Doug Galas, architect, and Ms. Patch presented a proposal for an addition and replacement of the existing dormer windows. Cedar shake roofing and beveled cedar siding will be used to match the existing.

Mr. Baesemann noted that the addition looks much more refined and elegant when compared to the original home, and questioned if more could be done to tie the two together. For example, Mr. Liechty noted that there is dentil molding on the addition, but this appears nowhere else on the home.

Mr. Oliveri was excused.

Mr. Valentin expressed concern about the use of three different window styles on the building, noting that the home might look more harmonious with only two window styles.

Mr. Baesemann questioned if it is possible to construct half-circle windows above the garage windows. The use of a half circle decorative panel might also be effective. Several Building Board members also suggested adding dentil molding above the porch to match the molding used on the addition.

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the proposed addition, noting that dentil molding will be added above the front porch, the two garage windows will be replaced with casement windows similar to those on the addition, a half circle window or half circle panel will be installed above the garage windows, shutters will be added to the garage windows to match those on the addition, and all materials and colors will match those on the existing residence. Mr. Sobczak 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. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

3. Approval of minutes from September 16, 2003

Mr. Oliveri noted that his name was omitted from those listed as being present at the meeting.

Ms. Dunn motioned to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Sayas seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

4. Discuss joint meeting regarding Code of Ordinance amendments

The Board and staff discussed possible dates that the Committee could meet with the Legislative Committee and Plan Commission to review changes to approval and denial language found in the Code of Ordinance.

5. Adjournment

Mr. Sobczak motioned for adjournment. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0. Meeting adjourned 7:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Matthew B. Mikolajewski
Assistant Planner