

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

---

**1. Roll call.**

Present: Mr. Francois, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Rische, Mr. Sobczak and Ms. Torkelson.

Also Present: Mr. Eich and applicants.

Absent: Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Oliveri and Mr. Sayas (all excused).

Mr. Eich informed the Building Board that Chairman Baesemann recommended that Mr. Liechty serve as temporary Chairman in his absence. Mr. Nelson moved and Mr. Francois seconded that Mr. Liechty serve as temporary Chairman for the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

**2. Approval of the August 16, 2005 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the August 16, 2005 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**3. Review and act on request by St. Mary's Church at 1260 Church Street for a sign.**

Mike George, Director of Administrative Services for St. Mary's Church, was present to discuss the sign with the Building Board. Mr. George handed out color photos of the proposed 3' x 3' sign, noting that it would be placed on the north side of the church on an existing grassed median strip. It was clarified that the sign would inform parishioners of the location of The Attic, a youth group that also includes members of St. Joe's parish. Further it was noted that the sign would not be visible from either Church Street or Crescent Drive. Mr. Sobczak clarified that there would be no additional illumination for the sign.

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the sign as submitted. Mr. Sobczak 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.

**4. Review and act on request by Sach Jogal at 1750 Legion Drive for revisions to a previously approved addition.**

Mr. Eich noted that the applicant had yet to arrive to the meeting. Mr. Nelson moved and Mr. Francois seconded that the agenda item be tabled until such time that the applicant was present. Motion carried unanimously.

**5. Review and act on request by Jo Gavin at 13420 Watertown Plank Road for signage.**

Jo Gavin, applicant and tenant of 13420 Watertown Plank Road, was present to review the proposed signage with the Building Board. Ms. Gavin noted that the signage would include an oval sign with white lettering, along with two awning features. Mr. Nelson inquired as to whether or not the smaller size of the awnings was by design. Ms. Gavin commented that it was by design, noting that emphasis was to be placed on the oval sign (which included the name of the business); it was clarified that the owner of the property had accepted the proposed signage design. Mr. Eich clarified that total square footage of proposed signage did not exceed the maximum amount allowed by the Zoning Code.

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the signage as submitted. Mr. Sobczak 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. Ms. Torkelson seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**6. Review and act on request by Guy and Ann Hanna at 1185 Upper Ridgeway for a pool cabana.**

Ann and Guy Hanna, property owners, were both present to review the submittal with the Building Board. Ms. Hanna clarified that the proposed cabana would replace the existing cabana, further noting that the proposed cabana would mirror the architecture of the home; a sample of the roofing material was shown to the Building Board.

At this time Mr. Eich explained that the cabana, as proposed, was in excess of the ten-foot maximum height limitation identified in Section 335-88 (D) (6) (c) of Village Code. Mr. Eich noted that, notwithstanding those provisions, Section 335-38 of Village Code exempts certain architectural projections, one such example being a gazebo roof. Due to the fact that the regulation makes use of the phrase "such as", Mr. Eich noted that it was staff's interpretation that such language would be analogous to "not limited to", hence an exemption (for roof height) could apply to the proposed cabana should the Building Board deem an exemption appropriate.

Mr. Liechty clarified that the roof pitch would in fact mirror the existing roof pitch of the home. Mr. Rische expressed concern that the structure would stick out like a turret when viewed from the east on Ridgeway, noting that such a view would be unattractive. Mr. Hanna noted the need for consistency, commenting that the addition approved by the Building Board back in March provided consistency that currently is not found on the home (e.g. the garage). It was explained that the proposed cabana would be in keeping with the consistency of architectural design.

Mr. Sobczak noted that the orientation of the elevation toward Juneau had no openings, inquiring as to whether or not the elevation could incorporate a window or some other point of visual interest. Jorgen Hansen, project architect, noted that a window feature could be incorporated on the structure. Mr. Sobczak also commented that the proposed landscaping would soften the look of the structure. Ms. Hanna clarified that fifteen hemlocks had been added near the rear lot line along Juneau Boulevard.

Mr. Hansen explained to the Building Board that, in order to tie the cabana into the architecture of the principal structure, a heightened roof would need to be constructed. A color rendering of the proposed cabana, along with photos of the existing home, were shown to the Building Board.

Mr. Liechty inquired as to whether or not stucco was included in the upper portion of the addition approved by the Building Board earlier in the year. Mr. Hansen noted that it was, illustrating its presence on the color rendering. Mr. Hansen elaborated, noting that the same timber configuration used in the addition was carried over to the cabana. For purpose of illustration, Mr. Hansen displayed samples of both the stone and stucco materials approved for the home's addition.

Mr. Sobczak motioned to approve the cabana as submitted, noting: 1) materials will match those on the principal dwelling; 2) roof pitch to match that of the principal dwelling and 3) a window is to be incorporated on the north elevation (facing Juneau Boulevard). Mr. Sobczak 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.

Ms. Torkelson inquired as to why stone was not included as a material for the cabana. Mr. Hansen noted that the structure was only 10' x 15' and as such wanted to maintain a softer look for the cabana.

**7. Review and act on request by Guy and Ann Hanna at 1185 Upper Ridgeway for a retaining wall and possible retaining wall variance.**

Jorgen Hansen, project architect, noted that the material for the retaining wall would be consistent with the wall material approved for the home addition. Mr. Liechty commented that the retaining wall beltline would tie in with the cabana feature.

Mr. Hansen explained that walls would flank the steps leading down to the lower level below the cabana; a mechanical room for the pool equipment would be provided in that location. Mr. Liechty clarified that the entrance to the room would be below the sight line of the grade elevation. Mr. Hansen referenced the Building Board to Sheet 3 of the cabana construction plans, commenting that the east elevation further illustrated the steps. Mr. Hansen also noted that the tallest portion of the wall would be visible only when standing at the lower level of the stairs leading to the mechanical room.

Mr. Nelson inquired as to whether or not the proposed wall could adequately support the surrounding earth. Mr. Hansen noted that it would, referring the Building Board to a cross-section drawing of the wall. Mr. Hansen called out a four-inch drain pipe that was a component of the wall's construction, noting that the feature would keep the earth behind the wall dry.

At this time Mr. Eich explained the request for a height variance. It was noted that the wall, at its highest point (at the top of the door to the mechanical room below the cabana), would measure eight feet; it was clarified that current guidelines allow for a maximum height of 6' 6". The purpose of the wall's height was to accommodate the placement of mechanical equipment within a separate storage room to be constructed below the pool cabana (reference was made to Sheets 2, 3 and 4 in the construction plans for purpose of additional detail).

Mr. Francois motioned to approve the retaining walls as submitted, noting that the walls would be identical to those previously approved with the home's addition. 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. Sobczak seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**4. Revisited.**

Mr. Sobczak moved and Mr. Francois seconded to reopen discussion on agenda item number four. Motion carried unanimously.

Sach Jogal, property owner, was present to discuss the proposed revisions with the Building Board. Mr. Jogal noted that there were three changes proposed. It was clarified that the base of the windows on the east and north elevations would need to be moved up by one foot in order to accommodate for dinette bench seating. Also, Mr. Jogal noted that the door feature on the west elevation was to be a single door with two side lights, as opposed to the initially approved double door feature.

Mr. Francois motioned to approve the revisions as submitted. 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. Sobczak seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

**8. Review and act on request by Cary and Megan Kohlenberg at 815 Morningside Lane for an addition.**

Chris Bartholf of Wisconsin Kitchen Mart was present to review the project with the Building Board. Mr. Bartholf noted that the existing garage would be torn down and would be reconstructed with a larger footprint. It was clarified that the entrance point for the garage would move from the side to the front.

Mr. Bartholf noted that the homeowner had proposed several modifications to the plans that were submitted to the Building Board. First it was noted that all brick proposed for the addition would be substituted with siding to match existing; it was clarified that the existing garage is of siding material. Next it was noted that the door feature on the rear elevation would be removed so as to clean up the roofline. Also, it was noted that the homeowner preferred one centered window as opposed to the two as shown on page 3 of the submittal. Mr. Liechty commented that the two windows, as shown on the submittal, provided more balance as opposed to a single window. It was clarified that a faux vent could be incorporated into the gabled portion of the east elevation. Mr. Bartholf noted that shutters would be added to the home where adequate space exists.

Mr. Bartholf clarified that the existing deck would be removed as a result of the proposed addition. Mr. Nelson confirmed that the garage door would be of the same color as the proposed siding. At this time Mr. Liechty requested input on the proposed removal of brick from the addition. Mr. Francois commented that changing the brick to siding would create massing issues, noting that dormers above the garage may be an appropriate method to break up the elevation. Mr. Bartholf commented that landscaping would be included to better break up the elevation. Mr. Francois further suggested that an offset be included near the western edge of the garage area, with a brick element to be added.

Mr. Liechty noted that, due to the substantial amount of changes proposed, the submittal should again be reviewed at the next Building Board meeting. At this time Mr. Bartholf requested that the Building Board table the agenda item. Mr. Francois moved and Mr. Sobczak seconded to table the agenda item for purpose of updating the submitted plans. Motion carried unanimously.

**9. Other Business.**

Mr. Eich noted that he had met with a subcommittee comprised of Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Liechty and Mr. Nelson to review a revised draft ordinance regulating retaining walls. It was noted that the revised draft attempted to provide more deference to the property owner in constructing retaining walls absent Village intervention (via regulation). Mr. Eich commented that the majority of the language was extracted from the City of Brookfield's current retaining wall regulation.

Mr. Eich stated that he would e-mail the draft ordinance to the entire Building Board membership for their review, commenting that discussion and possible recommendation on the draft ordinance would be forthcoming as early as the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**10. Adjournment.**

Mr. Nelson motioned for adjournment and was seconded by Mr. Rische. Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich  
Assistant Planner