

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

1. Roll call.

Present: Mr. Baesemann, Mr. Francois, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Oliveri and Ms. Torkelson.

Also Present: Mr. Eich and applicants.

Absent: Mr. Rische, Mr. Sayas and Mr. Sobczak (excused).

2. Approval of the November 15, 2005 meeting minutes.

Mr. Liechty noted that the second stipulation of the motion to approve the architecture for the project at 940 San Jose Drive (page 4) should read "the eave feature above the garage door is to extend another two feet toward the rear of the building". Mr. Liechty motioned to approve the November 15, 2005 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

3. Review and act on request by John and Kim Schlifske at 14465 Woodlawn Circle for an amendment to a previously approved new home construction project.

Jorgen Hansen, project architect, was present to review the project amendment with the Building Board. Mr. Hansen clarified that there were two components of the proposed amendment: 1) a garage addition and 2) first floor and garage floor elevation changes. Regarding the garage addition, it was noted that the space would be necessary for changing rooms for the pool, as the Indian Hills Subdivision regulations did not allow for out buildings such as cabanas (originally contemplated by the homeowners). It was clarified that the service door for the garage was relocated on the southwest elevation; a window had replaced the original service door on the west elevation.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the garage addition 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. Nelson seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Discussion turned toward the elevation changes. Mr. Hansen noted that the first floor elevation would be elevated from 244 to 244.5 and the garage floor elevation would be elevated from 240.5 to 241.5. It was clarified that the purpose for the elevation changes was to assist with drainage. Mr. Oliveri clarified that the site plan had been updated to reflect proposed floor elevation conditions.

Mr. Francois motioned to approve the grade changes as submitted. Mr. Oliveri seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Baesemann noted that his business was at one time involved with the new home project; however, no bid for construction was received.

4. Review and act on request by Quizno's at 12894 W. Bluemound Road for window signage.

Terri Rehorst, owner of Quizno's, was present to review the application with the Building Board. Ms. Rehorst noted that the window signage was standard for all Quizno's restaurants. Mr. Baesemann noted that neon signage had recently been approved by the Building Board for the Wisconsin Vision Center, located to the east of Quizno's within the Autumn Grove development. Mr. Oliveri commented that design similarity existed between the two Quizno's signs.

Ms. Torkelson motioned to approve the two neon window signs as submitted. Ms. Torkelson 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. Oliveri seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

5. Review and act on request by Casey Moriarty at 1341 Victoria Circle S for an amendment to a previously approved alteration project.

Mr. Eich noted that the application consisted of a minor revision to the south elevation. Specifically, an additional skylight was proposed for the elevation. Mr. Nelson commented that the rear roofline was well screened from adjacent properties.

Mr. Nelson motioned to approve the application as submitted, conditioned upon the applicant submitting accurate drawings to reflect a more precise rendition of the project (i.e. skylights to be shown as evenly spaced). Such drawings were to be supplied to the Building Board at the December 20 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. Ms. Torkelson seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

6. Review and act on request by Lee and Laura Pulsifer at 1500 Fairhaven Boulevard for an addition.

Mark Wollmer, project contractor with DBR Concepts, was present to review the application with the Building Board. Mr. Wollmer noted that during a subcommittee review of the application on November 23 three variations of the front elevation were reviewed. It was clarified that one variation was selected to bring forward to the entire Building Board. Mr. Wollmer noted that (on the preferred variation) the garage would remain gabled and would incorporate window features. Mr. Baesemann expressed his pleasure with retaining the gabled garage roof.

At this time Mr. Wollmer discussed colors and materials. It was noted that the siding would be pebblestone clay (vinyl material); fascia, soffits, trim and gutters would be desert sand in color; corner boards would be vinyl (4" exposure) and the shingles would be weatherwood.

Mr. Nelson motioned to approve the addition as resubmitted, conditioned upon the use of corner boards that were at least 4" in exposure. 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 5-0.

After project approval, Mr. Oliveri commented that the front elevation appeared awkward.

7. Review and act on request by Rodney Rayburn at 1235 Fairhaven Boulevard for alterations and a brick wall with fence component.

Linda Williams of Sazama Design Build was present to review the application with the Building Board. Ms. Williams noted that the existing sunroom on the rear elevation would be removed, along with the concrete pads underneath. It was clarified that the material and color of the current walls in front of the home would be mimicked on the new walls proposed for the rear yard. Ms. Williams stated that the home was to be re-shingled and the existing dormer on the front elevation would become gabled (as opposed to its current hip style). Material for the front gable would be changed out from vinyl siding to hardi-shingle. All windows (except the rear picture window) would be replaced as a result of the project.

Mr. Liechty noted that the doors of the home were prairie style and inquired as to whether or not the new windows would be divided light. Ms. Williams noted that they would not be divided light yet would match the existing design.

Ms. Williams clarified that all shutters were to be replaced and that the only additional shutters were to be incorporated with the dormer feature on the front elevation. Ms. Williams also clarified that the entrance column features at the base of the driveway would be removed and reclaimed (for the rear patio) as a component of the project.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the aesthetic improvements (alterations) of the project 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 5-0.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the wall and gate/fencing component of the project 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. Nelson seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

8. Review and act on request by Dennis Linnell at 13000 Bluemound Road for amendment to an existing uniform sign format.

Dennis Linnell, owner of the building at 13000 Bluemound Road, was present to review the uniform sign format amendment with the Building Board. Mr. Eich clarified that the existing uniform sign format consisted of a monument sign to the south of the building and perpendicular to Bluemound Road. Mr. Linnell explained that the proposed uniform sign format, in addition to the existing monument sign, would include three signs: one to be centered on the east elevation, one to be centered on the south elevation and one to be centered on the west elevation of the mansard roof.

Mr. Baesemann noted that the regulations governing uniform sign formats require a common theme to tie the signage together (examples provided included color, shape and style). Mr. Linnell noted that he was amenable to incorporating the color scheme of the proposed Houses.com sign (red/white) into the uniform sign format for the building. Mr. Oliveri commented that the red and white colors would blend in with the existing structure.

Mr. Eich clarified that he would send draft meeting minutes to Mr. Linnell and coordinate a final uniform sign format, the content of which would be enumerated on the building owner's letterhead and subsequently filed at Village Hall.

At this time Mr. Eich made reference to the December 6 meeting memorandum. Specifically, Mr. Eich noted that Village Code did not contemplate the specific use of remaining allocable sign square footage for a business center. It was requested that a determination be made by the Building Board as to whether such remaining square footage could be used collectively at the discretion of the building owner or whether each individual office space would retain the remaining square footage after subtracting the proportionate amount required for the center identification sign.

Mr. Baesemann commented that it was reasonable for the Building Board to provide the owner with discretion as to how remaining square footage/allocable sign area is distributed.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve an amendment to the uniform sign format at 13000 Bluemound Road, which applied to the mansard roof area. A total of three signs (not to exceed a total of 36.33 square feet in area) would be allowed, with one sign allowed on the south elevation, one sign allowed on the east elevation and one sign allowed on the west elevation; all signs would be centered on their respective elevation. Signage for the mansard roof area would reflect red and white lettering, with the script design left to the building owner's discretion. The building owner would retain discretion over remaining allocable square footage for sign area. Mr. Francois seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

9. Review and act on request by Houses.com at 13000 Bluemound Road for a sign.

Don Moore, owner of Houses.com, was present to review the application with the Building Board. Mr. Moore noted that the sign would be channel lit in design and would be centered in the middle of the southern portion of the mansard roof. Mr. Moore commented that the channel lit sign would be more expensive and suggested as an alternative up-lighting the sign. Mr. Liechty noted that up-lighting the sign would create shadows and would not look as good as an internally lit sign.

Mr. Oliveri motioned to approve the sign as submitted, noting: 1) the sign would be internally lit and 2) the dimensions and location of the sign would be as identified on the submitted plans. 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 5-0.

10. Other Business.

Mr. Eich provided an update concerning the draft retaining wall ordinance. Mr. Eich noted that, per the recommendation of the Village Attorney's office, additional revisions to the ordinance would be required. In particular, it was clarified that the updated ordinance would reflect that any proposed wall over four feet in height would require construction plans approved by a professional engineer licensed in the State of Wisconsin. The purpose of the revision was to ensure that objective and uniform standards were in place when requiring additional approval measures such as engineering review.

Members of the Building Board were in agreement with the proposed revision. Mr. Eich clarified that he would coordinate all changes with the Village Attorney's office and from there the document would be reviewed by the Legislative Committee.

11. Adjournment.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Austin J. Eich
Assistant Planner