

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, April 6, 2005, 5:00 p.m., Park View Room**

1. Roll call.

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

Also Present: Mr. Eich and applicants.

Absent: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Francois (excused) and Mr. Sobczak (excused).

2. Approval of the March 15, 2005 and March 23, 2005 meeting minutes.

Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the March 15, 2005 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Oliveri seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Baesemann noted that, in the fourth line of the first paragraph under item 2A of the March 23, 2005 meeting minutes, the term "efis" should be spelled "EFIS". Mr. Sayas motioned to approve the March 23, 2005 minutes as amended. Mr. Rische seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

3. Review and act on request by Mike and Kira Elton at 13400 Juneau Boulevard for an alteration.

Mr. Baesemann began by noting that the current roofline design was inconsistent with what the Building Board had approved in July of 2004. Mr. Baesemann explained that a subcommittee of the Building Board had met with the project architect in March to review a suggested roofline revision for consideration by the Building Board. At this time Mr. Baesemann requested feedback from the Building Board concerning their thoughts on the roofline design as presently constructed on the addition. It was the consensus of the Building Board that the existing design was not acceptable.

Mr. Baesemann commented that the proposed revision to the roofline design created a more balanced gable, which corrected the concern of the existing offset design. Mr. Oliveri suggested that a soffit run underneath the gable, so as to create consistency and balance with the gable on the western half of the home and provide a more integrated look. Mr. Oliveri clarified that the soffit would in essence be a small brow feature protruding from the garage wall. Gene Eggert, project architect, stated that a brow feature would create too much dark space, further noting that his clients were of the same opinion.

At this time Mr. Baesemann presented to the Building Board a proposed revision to the roofline design; the revision was designated as Exhibit C. Discussion ensued concerning the revision proposed by Mr. Eggert. Mr. Rische felt that the gable was too large with the absence of a brow feature. Mr. Baesemann asked the homeowners if they would be willing to incorporate the brow feature into the addition. Mr. Elton responded that they would be willing to incorporate the brow feature.

At this time Mr. Liechty motioned to approve Exhibit C as presented, noting that the gable would be raised a new brow feature would be added. 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 5-0.

4. Review and act on request by Susan Bruk at 13160 Lee Court for construction of a pool and pool fence.

Ms. Susan Bruk, property owner, and Mr. Bob Gartzke, of Bob's Pool Builders, were both present for consideration of the application. Mr. Baesemann commented that the existing power lines were of a sufficient distance from the proposed pool area. Mr. Liechty inquired as to screening for the pump and filter features. Mr. Gartzke noted that landscaping would be used to screen the pump and filter.

Mr. Sayas moved to approve the pool/fence application as presented, noting that the fence would be four feet in height and bronze in color and that the pool pump and filter would be adequately screened. 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. Ms. Dunn seconded the modified motion. Motion carried 5-0.

5. Review and act on request by Pat Corragio at 815 Grandview Drive for an alteration.

Pat Corragio, property owner, presented the alteration to the Building Board. Mr. Corragio began by noting that proposed dormers atop the dwelling would allow for natural light to enter into those upstairs rooms facing the street. Both dormers on the dwelling would be functional, incorporating double hung windows and blinds.

Mr. Baesemann expressed concern regarding both sets of dormers, noting that the garage dormers appeared small in relation to the home while the dormers over the home appeared too large. Mr. Corragio explained that he wanted to incorporate as much natural light into the home as possible, also noting that the larger dormers would aid in better defining the home and breaking up the continuous roof.

Mr. Baesemann clarified that the entrance feature (porch overhang) proposed on the submitted plans required consideration by the Plan Commission for a special exception; however, construction on the dormers and garage alteration could begin upon a permit being issued from the Building Inspector.

Mr. Corragio explained that the columns for the entrance feature would be structural components. It was clarified that the caps of the proposed columns would be flush with the entrance feature, as opposed to how the features appeared on the submitted drawings. Discussion ensued concerning the diameter of the proposed columns. Mr. Corragio noted that the eight-inch columns were engineered to accommodate for the weight of the proposed entrance feature. Mr. Baesemann suggested that a ten-inch column be used; the Building Board concurred.

Mr. Oliveri moved to approve the project with the following conditions: the entrance feature would require Plan Commission review and approval; the columns for the entrance feature would be a minimum of ten inches in diameter and would be both round and fluted. 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

6. Review and act on request by U.S. Bank at 945 Elm Grove Road for an alteration.

Mike Piene, project architect, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Baesemann inquired as to the material for the project. Mr. Piene noted that the material would be clear anodized stainless steel. Mr. Oliveri suggested that the frame of the drive-thru window be bronze to better match the existing features of the building. The applicant agreed, noting that only the deal drawer would remain as anodized stainless steel (due to the fact that it was a separate component of the window feature). Mr. Baesemann inquired as to the durability of the material. Mr. Piene noted that the material would last approximately twenty-five to thirty years.

Mr. Oliveri moved to approve the project as submitted with the clarification that the frame would be bronze in color and the drawer would remain stainless steel. 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 value in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

7. Discussion concerning potential revisions to the recommended retaining wall ordinance.

Mr. Oliveri motioned that discussion on the proposed retaining wall ordinance be postponed to allow additional time for the Building Board to review the suggested language changes. Mr. Rische seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

8. Other Business.

There was no other business to come before the Building Board.

9. Adjournment.

Ms. Dunn motioned for adjournment and was seconded by Mr. Oliveri. Meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich
Assistant Planner