

**BUILDING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, June 7, 2005, 5:00 p.m., Park View Room**

---

**1. Roll call.**

Present: Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Francois, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Oliveri, Mr. Rische and Mr. Sayas.

Also Present: Mr. Eich and applicants.

Absent: Mr. Sobczak and Ms. Torkelson (both excused).

**2. Approval of the May 17, 2005 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Francois motioned to approve the May 17, 2005 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Rische seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**3. Review and act on request by T.R. Rao at 14950 Del Prado Court for porch screening and skylight features to previously approved porch.**

Mr. Rao, homeowner, was present to discuss the application with the Building Board. Mr. Liechty commented that the location of the glaze band above the porch door was slightly higher than the existing band around the home.

At this time Mr. Rao requested that the agenda item be tabled until his architect arrived to address the concern of the Building Board. Mr. Francois motioned and Mr. Nelson seconded to table the agenda item until Mr. Rao's architect arrived. Motion carried unanimously.

**4. Review and act on request by Anthony Cafaro at 1240 Woodlawn Circle for a pool fence.**

Mr. Baesemann noted that at the last Building Board meeting the applicant had requested that the agenda item be tabled until the June 7 meeting to allow for additional review of the application by the Indian Hills Subdivision architectural review board. Mr. Eich noted that the nature of the pool fence request had not changed from the initial submittal.

Mr. Sayas motioned to approve the pool fence as submitted. 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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**5. Review and act on request by John Bley at 14825 Walters Court for an addition with deck component.**

Mr. Baesemann summarized the application, noting that since the initial review of the application by the Building Board two subcommittee meetings were held. As a result of those meetings, it was agreed to carry brick around on all elevations.

The builder for the project presented the application on behalf of the homeowner. The builder clarified that brick had been added to all sides of the addition (excepting the garage) per the recommendation of the Building Board subcommittee. Mr. Baesemann commented that the applicant was extremely cooperative with the subcommittee.

Mr. Francois motioned to approve the addition with deck component as submitted, with the understanding that the inclusion of additional shutters on the home would be considered after the addition was substantially completed and that the Building Inspector would review and approve the updated structural cost estimate.

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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

**6. Review and act on request by Chad and Molly Hegwood at 555 Terrace Drive for a fence.**

Chad and Molly Hegwood, property owners, were present to discuss the proposed fence. It was explained to the Building Board that additional evergreen trees were in the process of being planted in the rear yard. At this time Mr. Baesemann asked if there was any public comment concerning the application. Jim Jodie, of 15235 Watertown Plank Road, noted that his condominium is directly west of the Hegwood's lot and as such would be in direct view of the proposed fence. Mr. Jodie noted that the fence regulations suggest that applicants consider alternate means for fencing options. Mr. Jodie suggested that the Building Board consider shrubbery (in lieu of larger evergreen plantings) that would not create undue blockage of the Jodies' vista. Mr. Jodie commented that he was amenable to the reduced fence height of four feet.

Angie Jodie, also of 15235 Watertown Plank Road, provided comment on the proposed fence. Mrs. Jodie cited the preamble of the fence regulations, noting that alternate means of fencing should be considered. Mrs. Jodie expressed concern over the height that the proposed evergreens would grow to, noting that in some instances they may reach thirty feet (30') in height and as such would become a visual barrier. Mrs. Jodie suggested that vines be incorporated into the fence plan so as not to obliterate her view from the living room area; it was further suggested that small plantings were preferred by Mrs. Jodie as opposed to large evergreens. Mr. Sayas clarified that the proposed plantings, and not the fence, was the concern expressed by Mrs. Jodie.

Mr. Hegwood noted that several pine trees shown on the landscaping plan already existed. It was clarified that the dead trees on the lot would be replaced to provide for a consistent landscaping scheme. Mr. Hegwood further noted that concessions have already been made concerning the fence application (e.g. reduction in height from six feet to four feet) and that none of the other condominium residents expressed displeasure with the fence plan.

Mr. Liechty inquired as to the purpose of the fence. Mr. Hegwood noted that the fence was to protect his two dogs and future children. Further, Mr. Hegwood noted that the lot was in close proximity to Bluemound Road.

Mr. Liechty noted that the northeast segment of the fence would be visible from Froedtert Drive. It was Mr. Liechty's preference that the northern segment of the fence align with the northern edge of the dwelling and angle back to the rear lot line. Mr. Oliveri clarified that the fence would be installed approximately one foot (1') off of the north lot line.

Mr. Eich noted that Diane Purse, resident of the condominium to the west, could not be in attendance yet wished to inform the Building Board that she would prefer to see dense landscaping on the northern end of the western segment of fence. It was clarified that the Hegwoods and Mrs. Purse discussed the matter and as a result of that discussion there would be dense landscaping incorporated with the fencing at the northwest corner of the lot.

Mr. Sayas clarified that landscaping, as a standalone item, does not require formal review and approval from the Village. Mr. Eich noted that in any event all landscaping would need to be placed on the property owner's land. Mr. Nelson clarified that lawn maintenance would not be an issue as a result of the proposed fence.

Mrs. Jodie requested the Board's disposition concerning the plantings along the west lot line. Mr. Liechty noted that he preferred natural plantings and adequate screening of the proposed fence.

Ms. Hegwood clarified that the south lot line incorporates a natural hedge that exceeds the height of the fence and would adequately screen the fence from view. Mr. Hegwood noted that the fence along the north lot line will be less visually predominant because it is below the natural berm. It was clarified that the Hegwoods were amenable to the placement of additional plantings along the northeast segment of the fence.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the fence as resubmitted, provided that: 1) the fence would be four feet in height; 2) additional plantings would be incorporated along the western segment of fencing to naturally blend in the surroundings and 3) plantings (vines and/or bushes) would be incorporated along the northeast segment of fencing to shield view of the fence from Froedtert Drive. 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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Nelson seconded. Motion carried 5-1, with Mr. Liechty voting against the fence application.

### **3. 14950 Del Prado Court – Revisited.**

Jorgen Hansen, project architect, noted that the reason for the door screening being higher than the architectural band around the home was due to the fact that the screen runs to the bottom of the beam. Further it was noted that the underside of the beam increased the height of the screens and hence the architectural band. Mr. Hansen noted that because the porch area was located at the back of the home it would not be visible. Mr. Hansen requested that any motion of approval include the option to include storm panels for the screening feature.

Mr. Sayas motioned to approve the project as submitted, provided that: 1) all materials would match those existing on the home and 2) both the screening and removable storm panel features could be incorporated into the project. 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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

### **7. Review and act on request by David Hemmy at 830 Morningside Lane for a fence and possible fence variance.**

Dr. Hemmy was present to discuss the fence and possible fence variance with the Building Board. Also present was the fence contractor Mr. Bob Braley. Mr. Baesemann noted that the fence would replace a previously existing sixty year old fence, stating that the fence was a part of the history and design of the lot. Mr. Francois clarified that a nine-foot segment of the fence was located in Village right-of-way. Mr. Sayas commented that the Building Board had no authority to approve that segment of the fence within Village right-of-way. Dr. Hemmy noted that the fence would be reconfigured so that it would be located completely on private property.

At this time Mr. Baesemann clarified that there was no one from the public present to speak for or against the fence proposal.

Mr. Sayas motioned to approve the fence as submitted, noting that: 1) a variance is granted to allow for the projection of the northwest segment of fencing beyond the rear building line of the home, per the submitted application and 2) the segment of fencing currently on Village right-of-way would either be removed or otherwise permitted by the Village Board of Trustees.

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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**8. Review and act on request by Bill and Carolyn Davidson at 1915 Hawthorne Drive for an addition and alteration work.**

Bill Davidson, property owner, was present to discuss the application with the Building Board. Mr. Davidson noted that the project area would absorb the large overhangs found on the rear elevation. It was noted that matching materials would be used and that a cultured stone veneer would be incorporated on all elevations.

Mr. Nelson clarified that the roof connecting the home to the garage would be of the same pitch as that found on the home. Mr. Davidson informed the Building Board that the window and garage door features on the front elevation would be flat as opposed to arched (as shown on the submitted drawings). Mr. Liechty clarified that the stone veneer would wrap around to the inside walls of the rear elevation.

Mr. Nelson motioned to conditionally approve the addition and alteration work as revised, provided that: 1) brick for the chimney features would match; 2) the cultured stone veneer feature would wrap around to the inside walls on all elevations (including entryway) and 3) final plans would be submitted in advance for review by the Building Board at the June 21 meeting. Mr. Nelson 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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**9. Review and act on request by Steven Beck and Shannon Nameth at 2175 San Fernando Drive for a fence and possible fence variance.**

Mr. Baesemann began by noting the proximity of the applicant's property to commercial development along North Avenue, including a gas station and a dry cleaning service. Ms. Nameth, property owner, commented that her neighbors were in support of the fence proposal. Mr. Liechty clarified that the purpose of the fence was to create a safe play area for the applicant's children. Mr. Nelson noted that while conducting an onsite review it was clear to him that there was potential for safety hazards, particularly with respect to traffic. Mr. Eich noted that the applicant's request for a variance (to enable projection of the fence beyond the rear building line of the dwelling) was consistent with the Zoning Code parameters enabling the Building Board to grant variances under certain circumstances. Mr. Eich also noted that there would be no plantings on Village right-of-way as shown on the landscaping plan.

Mr. Liechty clarified that the fence would have a wood grain look to it. Mr. Baesemann suggested that a scallop-like fence be incorporated; Ms. Nameth noted that such a design would not provide an effective barrier. Mr. Baesemann then clarified that notice was sent to all impacted property owners, per the requirement of Village Code.

Mr. Sayas motioned to approve the fence and landscaping plan as submitted, noting that: 1) a variance is granted to allow for the projection of the fence beyond the rear building line of the home; 2) the proximity of commercial development and existing traffic conditions warrant approval of the fence variance and are consistent with the requirements of the zoning regulations and 3) no landscaping would be done on Village right-of-way.

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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Nelson seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**10. Review and act on request by Marjorie Takton at 1505 Greenway Terrace for a pool fence.**

Curt Trau and John Erdmann were present to discuss the pool fence application with the Building Board. It was clarified that the height of the existing cedar fence along the western property line was thirty-six inches (36") in height. Mr. Trau noted that an electric pool cover would be incorporated into the project. Mr. Oliveri clarified that the Indian Hills Subdivision Association had approved the pool fence plan.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the pool fence as submitted. 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 pose an adverse impact on aesthetic values in the immediate neighborhood. Mr. Liechty seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**11. Review, discussion and possible action concerning potential revisions to the proposed retaining wall ordinance.**

Discussion on this agenda item was deferred to a future Building Board meeting.

**12. Other Business.**

Mr. Eich referred the Building Board to an e-mail received from Mr. Gene Eggert, project architect for the addition under construction at 13400 Juneau Boulevard. Mr. Eich noted that the e-mail requested that the Building Board reconsider the existing roofline design on the south elevation, which had previously been denied by the Building Board at the February 1, 2005 meeting. It was clarified that the architect and homeowner had agreed to a revised roofline design at the April 6, 2005 meeting.

At this time Mr. Eich requested guidance from the Building Board concerning a preferred course of action. Mr. Liechty motioned to instruct staff to respond to the request, in writing, with the understanding that 1) the request for reconsideration of the roofline design is denied and 2) a timeline for completion of the revised roofline as approved by the Building Board on April 6 be submitted to the Village in a timely fashion. Motion carried unanimously, with Mr. Nelson recusing himself from the vote.

Mr. Baesemann commented that the Building Board ought to consider revisiting that language in the fence code related to berms and hills.

Mr. Eich informed the Building Board that Mr. Gene Esselman of 13960 Garfield Avenue registered a complaint with Village staff concerning new home construction at 13895 Garfield Avenue. Specifically, Mr. Esselman noted that the home lacked both quality and character. Further, Mr. Esselman noted that he did not want to see the lot to the east of 13895 Garfield Avenue (owned by the same person) redeveloped in a similar fashion.

**13. Adjournment.**

Mr. Oliveri motioned for adjournment and was seconded by Mr. Liechty. Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich  
Assistant Planner