

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, July 6, 2004, 5:00 p.m., Park View Room**

1. Roll call.

Present: Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Campbell, Ms. Dunn, Mr. Francois, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Rische and Mr. Sayas.

Also Present: Ms. Finn, Mr. Eich and applicants.

Absent: Mr. Oliveri (excused) and Mr. Sobczak (excused).

2A. Bill and Joan Boehm, 14455 Andrew Jackson Court – Bedroom Extension/Kitchen Remodeling

Mr. Walmer of S.J. Janis Company noted that minor changes had been made to the plans that were originally submitted to the Board. In particular, Mr. Walmer noted two alterations: the size of the windows in the addition and removal of the chimney. Brick for the addition would match the existing brick surrounding the home. All roofing would be replaced to provide a seamless look. Mr. Baesemann inquired as to setbacks for the proposed addition. Mr. Eich noted that the addition meets all applicable setback requirements.

Motion by Mr. Sayas to approve the addition per those changes submitted by the applicant. Mr. Sayas 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2B. T.R. Rao, 14975 Del Prado Court – Screening Fence

Mr. Zimmerman of Lied's explained that the property owner is proposing placement of a screening fence around the generator and AC units of his home. Also noted by Mr. Zimmerman was the fact that two variances were being requested; one for the height of the fence (the proposed fence was nine inches above regulation) and the other for the fifty percent open space requirement (the fence gate was solid). The height violation was deemed necessary to better capture the architectural features of the home, while the open space violation was necessary for purpose of structural integrity of the fence. The Board was informed that western red cedar would be the material used for the fence. The lattice design would facilitate the growth of vines on and around the fence. It was noted that the neighbor to the east has a raised porch and hence the fence may be visible from that property. At this time Mr. Baesemann requested a reduction of the height from the proposed height (7' 3") to the maximum allowed by the Code (6' 6"); this height would be measured up to the gable. The applicant agreed to the request. Mr. Liechty then asked Mr. Zimmerman why the gate was designed as solid. Mr. Zimmerman commented that if the gate were not solid, it would sag and not provide the necessary support. Mr. Rao, owner of the property, then explained to the Board the nature of the generator, including height. Mr. Rao was concerned that a nine-inch reduction in the height of the fence may eliminate the effectiveness of the fence. Motion by Sayas to approve the fence with the understanding that two variances were to be granted: one for height (nine inches above regulation) and the other for open space (the gate would be solid). The open space variance was due to the hardship of structural integrity for the fence; the height variation was to enhance the architectural features of the home. Mr. Sayas 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Rische seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2C. Rodney Willoughby, 14400 Juneau Boulevard – Fence

Dr. Willoughby began by recapping a series of past conversations with his neighbors Dr. Haskell and Mr. Olson, noting that his revised fence plan was met with a favorable response by both neighbors. Dr. Willoughby noted that both Dr. Haskell and Mr. Olson opposed the initial fence plan approved by the Board in June, which necessitated his presence in front of the Board for proposal of a revised plan. Dr. Willoughby noted that the new fence would be split rail in design, three feet tall, set back ten feet from the north and east property lines and would require a variance for the inclusion of wire mesh material (of neutral color). The wire mesh material would ensure that Dr. Willoughby's children and beagles were not able to access a culvert located in the northwest portion of the property; it was made clear that Mr. Haskell and Mr. Olson did not object to the inclusion of wire mesh material with the fence. Mr. Baesemann requested information regarding the attachment of the wire mesh to the fence. Dr. Willoughby responded by noting that it would be stapled on the interior of the wood. Mr. Baesemann informed the Board that a copy of the fence regulations had been made for each member; he noted the ability of the Board to grant a variance. Ms. Dunn then requested to view the proposed wire mesh material. Dr. Willoughby provided a handout that depicted the wire mesh material; he noted the material was green so as to be visually neutral. Mr. Baesemann suggested a sunset provision be placed on the fence, essentially placing a limit on the life of the fence. Ms. Finn commented that tracking of such a provision might be difficult. Mr. Baesemann then summarized the issue at hand, noting the following facts: 1) the purpose of the fence was for safety and 2) the fence and associated materials (e.g. wire mesh) were agreed upon by the applicant and his neighbors Dr. Haskell and Mr. Olson. Mr. Baesemann suggested that a brown color for the wire mesh be looked into prior to installing green wire mesh. Mr. Olson stepped then forward to address the Board. He suggested reverting to the original proposal (white picket fence) as approved by the Board in June of 2004, primarily due to the concern that the wire mesh would not suit the property and would have a relatively short life span. At this time, Dr. Willoughby withdrew his petition. It was noted that the Building Board's June 1, 2004 approval of the white picket fence would still be valid.

2D. Marnee and Robert Behrens, 2280 Arrowhead Court – Fence

Ms. Behrens, owner of the property, introduced herself to the Board. Ms. Behrens noted that the home was built in the 1970s for her parents; however, she and her husband have moved in to the home. The need for the fence was for two dogs on the premises. It was noted that the house would eventually be repainted to match the natural color of the fence. Mr. Francois made a motion to approve the fence as presented. Mr. Francois 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2E. Randy and Jennifer Safranek, 1405 Victoria Circle (N) – Conversion of Screen Porch to Sunroom

Mr. Walmer of S.J. Janis Company provided an overview of the project. It was noted that the materials for the project would match those of the home and that the floor would be even with the existing home. Mr. Francois made a motion to approve the project as presented. Mr. Francois 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Ms. Dunn seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

2F. Alfonso M. Martinez and Elizabeth A. Montavon, 1655 Highland Drive – Sunroom/Kitchen Remodeling

Ms. Montavon informed the Board that no changes had been made to the originally submitted plans. It was noted that both the brick and siding used in the project would match those found on the existing structure. Additionally, those windows under the gable facing the rear of the home would be changed out. Motion by Mr. Sayas to approve as presented, conditioned upon there being no removal of brick and that the materials for the project match the existing structure as much as possible. Mr. Sayas 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2G. Curt and Nancy Waddell, 13906 Watertown Plank Road – Garage and Family Room Modifications

Mr. Waddell provided the Board with an overview of the project. Mr. Baesemann then requested information regarding the variance granted in June by the Board of Appeals. Mr. Waddell explained that the dwelling was built in 1926, prior to the implementation of any setback regulations. He noted that it took several months to receive the variance. It was made clear that, prior to construction, the three-foot setback (as approved by the Board of Appeals) would be staked to ensure that the decision of the Board of Appeals was enforced. Mr. Liechty motioned to approve, conditioned upon materials to match the existing structure, including shingles. 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2H. Jim and Judy Nortman, 1700 Notre Dame Boulevard – New Home

Due to the absence of the property owner, it was motioned by Mr. Sayas and seconded by Mr. Liechty to move to agenda item I. Motion carried 7-0.

2I. Mike and Kira Elton, 13400 Juneau Boulevard – Home Addition and Attached Garage Expansion

Gene Eggert of Architectural Designs Inc. explained the project, noting four areas of proposed improvements (bedroom, kitchen, entryway and garage) for the home. Mr. Eggert informed the Board that like materials are to be used for the project; however, the roof color was changed to rust brown as opposed to the existing lighter color. It was noted that brick would wrap around onto the master bedroom addition; however, both the sunroom and garage would stay as siding. Mr. Francois motioned to approve, conditioned upon the submittal of an updated survey showing that the addition conforms to all required setbacks. Mr. Francois 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Campbell seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

2H. Jim and Judy Nortman, 1700 Notre Dame Boulevard – New Home

With Mr. Nortman present, Ms. Dunn motioned to consider item H. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0. Mr. Baesemann began by noting that aesthetics would be reviewed first. Mr. Nortman provided an overview of the exterior of the home, noting the following: queen size brick would surround the home; autumn wheat stucco plaster would be used on the upper level of the home, with fascia and window cladding to match; and 40 year dimensional shingles (black) would be placed on the roof. Mr. Liechty motioned approval on the aesthetic component of the new home proposal, with colors as presented. 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Ms. Dunn seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Discussion then turned toward grading of the lot. The grading plan indicated a yard grade of 202.7 and a garage grade of 203.00. Mr. Nortman requested that the Board consider an eight-inch grade increase. Mr. Francois motioned to accept the grades as shown on the plans and allow Mr. Nortman the latitude to increase the garage/yard grade as much as eight inches, conditioned upon written concurrence (e-mail was deemed acceptable) from the Village Engineer. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Landscaping plans for the lot were discussed. Mr. Campbell asked what was to become of the existing trees. Mr. Nortman noted that several trees would more than likely be taken down during construction. Mr. Steinhaufer, neighboring property owner to the east, requested to address the Board in regards to the drainage and landscaping plans as well as the driveway (off of Walnut Road) of the proposed new home at 1700 Notre Dame Boulevard. In particular, Mr. Steinhaufer expressed concern over the northeast corner of the lot; he noted that the area was one which remains wet much of the year, receives substantial drainage and often floods out adjoining lots to the north. Mr. Rische motioned to accept the landscaping plan as presented. Mr. Rische 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

The Board next discussed the drainage plan. Mr. Baesemann asked about runoff on the property. Ms. Finn responded that proposed new home would not increase the amount of runoff generated from the property. Ms. Finn further noted that the Village Engineer could provide additional comments as a result of reviewing the requested eight-inch grade increase. Mr. Baesemann noted that water from the downspouts would be directed toward Notre Dame whenever feasible. Mr. Nortman noted that he would have the drainage plan redrawn, with review from the Village Engineer to follow. The Building Board would consider approval of a final drainage plan at the July 20th meeting. Mr. Liechty motioned to table the drainage and grading plans until the Village Engineer has had an opportunity to review both sets of updated plans. Mr. Francois seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

3. Approval of the minutes from June 15, 2004.

It was noted that the June 15 minutes were to reflect that Mr. Rische was present and that Mr. Liechty was absent. Any motion or second credited to Mr. Liechty was to be revised to reflect that Mr. Rische made such motion or second. Ms. Dunn moved to approve the minutes from June 15, 2004, as revised. Mr. Campbell seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

4. Old Business.

Discussion was held regarding a shed located on 13050 Walnut Road. Mr. Nortman, abutting property owner to the west, questioned the location of the shed as approved by the Board. Mr. Nortman noted the need for the Board to have vision regarding the future impact of accessory structures on adjacent properties.

Mr. Steinhaufer, owner of 13050 Walnut Road, noted that (prior to the Building Board approving the shed in 1999) all adjacent property owners approved of the shed being placed in his rear yard. Mr. Nortman recommended that the Building Board obtain and review surveys for all future shed and related accessory use proposals to ensure they are properly located.

Mr. Eich updated the Board on a previously approved project at 15175 Marilyn Drive. In particular, Mr. Eich noted that the color of the stain to be used for the four decks would be redwood. The Board reviewed a brochure illustrating the stain color.

5. New Business.

None.

6. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich
Assistant Planner