

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, March 20, 2018**

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Mr. Olson.

1. Roll Call.

Present: Mr. Olson, Mr. Matola, Mr. Domaszek, Mr. Janusz, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Collins, and Ms. Steindorf

Absent: Mr. Schoenecker and Mr. Koleski (all excused)

Also Present: Mr. Harrigan, Ms. Nelson, Applicants and members of the public

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated March 6, 2018.

Mr. Liechty stated on that page one, under item three, in the second sentence of the third paragraph, the word “currently” should be changed to “current.”

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to approve the meeting minutes as amended. Motioned carried 7-0.

3. Review and act on a request by Tim Steinle at 635 Vernon Place for a revision to a previously approved building addition and alteration.

Tim Steinle was present before the board.

Mr. Liechty stated that the new plans reflect what the board talked about last meeting and noted that the details have been added.

Mr. Liechty asked if the beam is solid. Mr. Steinle said yes and stated that corbels have been added. Mr. Steinle added that the height of the northwest corner of the garage dictated the height of the porch but that the roof was lowered per the board’s request. Mr. Liechty said that the lowered roof does address the board’s concerns.

Mr. Collins asked how far the roof was lowered. Mr. Liechty stated that it appears it was less than a foot and that it does line up with the house now.

Mr. Liechty motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

4. Review and act on a request by Tim and Mackenzie Johnson at 13140 Gremoor Drive for a fence.

Tim and Mackenzie Johnson were present before the board.

Mr. Olson asked what the reason was for enclosing the backyard. Applicant stated that they have dogs and young children. She stated that the neighbors have a chain link fence that they will be using as one side of their enclosure as it would look odd and be

difficult to maintain another fence right alongside the existing chain link fence on the neighbors' property.

Mr. Liechty agreed that it would be very difficult to maintain the two fences.

Mr. Harrigan stated that this fence only requires building board approval because they are proposing to use the neighbors' existing chain link fence.

Mr. Liechty asked why the fence goes up to the sunroom. Applicant stated that there are sliding doors that lead out to the yard and they would like that area to be included in the enclosure due to safety concerns with their dog and young children.

Mr. Matola asked if the fence was on the lot line. Applicant stated that it is 14-16 inches off the lot line except on the west side, where the fence will be farther off the lot line as they would like to put the fence on their side of the wall of shrubbery.

Mr. Domaszek asked if the proposal includes three different types of fencing. Applicant said no and stated that they planned on removing the existing split rail fence so it will just be the picket fence and the neighboring chain link fence.

Mr. Domaszek stated that he was concerned that the chain link fence will have to come down eventually and will be replaced by a different type of fence. Mr. Domaszek asked if the board can approve this fence on the condition that if the chain link fence is removed that they must install a compliant fence on their property. Applicant stated that if the pool and fence on the neighboring yard is removed in the future, they would be completing their fence in the same style as this proposed fence.

Ms. Steindorf stated that she was concerned that if the board approves this plan, they will be approving a chain link fence.

Applicant stated that the fence on their property will not attach to the neighboring fence.

Mr. Domaszek asked if the applicants would be willing to complete the fence if the neighboring fence was removed. Applicants stated that they would have no problem with that.

Ms. Steindorf stated that she was concerned that if the neighbors remove the chain link fence, the new fence that the neighbors install may not match this proposed fence. Mr. Matola stated that if the neighbors do want to replace the chain link pool fence in the future, that they need building board approval, so the board can handle that issue at that time.

Ms. Steindorf expressed concerns that this approval would be binding on possible future homeowners and the neighbors. Mr. Harrigan stated that the approval is not attached to the land, it is just approving this fence.

Mr. Matola motioned and Mr. Liechty seconded to approve the fence plans as submitted with the condition that if the pool fence on the neighboring property is removed and not replaced, then this fence needs to be completed within six months to match what is being installed. Motion carried 6-1.

5. Review and act on a request by Steve and Kim Wehse at 1960 Hawthorne Drive for an accessory structure.

Steve and Kim Wehse were present before the board.

Mr. Domaszek asked if the proposed pergola falls within the allowable height per the Village code. Applicant stated that it will be nine feet at the crown. Mr. Harrigan added that the maximum height allowed is ten feet.

Mr. Liechty asked if the pergola is arched. Applicant said yes.

Mr. Liechty asked if the wood would be left natural. Applicant said yes, but that it will be sealed.

Mr. Liechty asked if the pergola would include lattice or just the cross members. Applicant said there will be no lattice.

Mr. Matola asked if there would be any electricity or lighting. Applicant said yes, they plan to put four low voltage lights on the beams. Mr. Matola asked if the lights would be downward facing. Applicant said yes.

Mr. Matola motioned and Mr. Collins seconded to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

6. Review and act on a request by John Schilfske at 1500 Greenway Terrace for a new pool fence and landscape plan.

Joe Kujawa of Kujawa Enterprises represented the applicant before the board.

Mr. Kujawa stated that they will be replacing the existing aluminum pool fence with a metal wrought iron fence and adding extensive landscaping to hide the pool equipment and to shelter the seating area.

Mr. Matola asked if the board was approving the landscaping or just the fence. Mr. Harrigan stated just the fence.

Mr. Liechty asked if the proposed fence will be closer to the street than the existing fence. Mr. Kujawa said yes, but only in the northwest corner.

Mr. Liechty asked about the piers in the submitted photos. Mr. Kujawa stated that the piers will only be for the fence gate.

Mr. Olson asked what type of landscaping will be used to hide the pool equipment. Mr. Kujawa stated that yews will be planted to block the view from the north and from the west they will plant vernal witch hazel. They will also be planting Canadian hemlock to further block the view of the pool equipment.

Mr. Liechty asked about the height of the yews that will be blocking the pool equipment. Mr. Kujawa stated that when planted they will be 36 inches and they can grow to be six feet.

Mr. Kujawa stated that the iron fence will be dark gray in color.

Mr. Liechty asked about the stone piers. Mr. Kujawa stated that they will be the same stone as the existing piers on the property and they will be one and a half foot square.

Mr. Liechty motioned and Ms. Steindorf seconded to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

7. Review and act on a request by Bert and Erica Perrizo at 1105 Lower Ridgeway for an addition and alteration.

Bert Perrizo and Matt Retzak from Bartelt Remodeling were present before the board.

Mr. Retzak stated that the front door and foyer is being relocated and that is why they are adding the new covered front porch. The shed roof addition will match the existing upper roof on the home. There will be a single cedar wrapped column and a cream city brick pillar with railing details to match the details on the existing home. There are also a few window alterations including replacing one set of windows with French doors and eliminating one window on the east side of the kitchen wall.

Mr. Liechty asked if the finish underneath the shed roof will be exposed wood. Mr. Retzak stated that it will be tongue and groove cedar.

Mr. Liechty asked about lighting. Mr. Retzak stated that there will be a light fixture suspended from the ceiling of the porch.

Mr. Matola asked why the window on the addition is not centered. Mr. Retzak stated that because of the setback requirements the porch needed to be tucked in and that is why the window is off center now. Mr. Liechty added that since the window is really only visible from a straight on view, he feels that the off center window will not be obvious.

Mr. Liechty motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

8. Review and act on a request by Dan Zierath at 13425 Watertown Plank Road for a building alteration, patio/landscape plan, and a new business sign.

Dan Zierath was present before the board. Christina Korkos, the property owner, was also present.

~Review of Building Alterations~

Mr. Liechty asked if the existing awning on the building will be removed. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Liechty asked if the overhead doors will be openable. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Liechty asked if the overhead doors are 6 feet down to the sill. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Liechty asked for confirmation that these are not passage ways. Mr. Zierath said yes, that they are more like garage windows than garage doors.

Mr. Liechty asked where the traffic path will be to service the patio. Mr. Zierath said that there will be a door in the back corner of the patio.

Mr. Liechty asked if there is a pathway to the other businesses in the back of the building. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Liechty asked if this will be smoking meats on site. Mr. Zierath stated that they are still developing the menu but if they do have smoked meats they have an electric smoker.

Mr. Liechty asked about lighting. Mr. Zierath stated that they will have string lights with conventional light bulbs on the patio.

Mr. Liechty asked if the lights will be strung from poles and if the poles would be made of wood. Mr. Zierath said yes and that the poles will be cedar.

Mr. Liechty asked if the poles will be separate from the fence. Mr. Zierath said that they will be separate.

Mr. Liechty asked what the fence would look like. Mr. Zierath stated that every six feet there will be a fence post of treated wood wrapped in cedar with airplane cables strung between the posts as railings.

Ms. Steindorf asked if the service door off the patio will be for customers to use as well as staff. Mr. Zierath said that customers can use the patio door but the hostess will walk them back out through the front door to be seated on the patio.

Mr. Liechty asked if the service door to the restaurant will be the same door used for accessing the upper units of the building. Applicant said yes. Mr. Liechty added that this will increase the amount of traffic through that door.

Mr. Matola asked if the garage windows will be of similar material to the existing windows on the building. Mr. Zierath said yes, they will have aluminum frames.

Mr. Matola asked how many sections the garage windows will have as the picture and drawings show two different amounts. Mr. Zierath said they will have six individual sections.

Mr. Matola asked if any changes will be made to the current entryway. Mr. Zierath said no.

Mr. Liechty asked how about the height of the lighting posts. Mr. Zierath said they will be 9-10 feet tall.

Mr. Domaszek asked if there was any issue with the amount of light. Mr. Harrigan stated that was something the Plan Commission would review. Mr. Harrigan also added that the Plan Commission would also be reviewing the site plan and the changing location of parking spots and the pervious paver system will need to go under engineering review.

Mr. Matola asked if there will be electrical outlets on the posts. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Liechty stated that there is a tree currently in the corner of the proposed patio location and asked if it will removed. Mr. Zierath stated that they hope to remove it if the property owners allow it.

Mr. Liechty asked if the existing stone planter would stay. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Matola asked if they would be running a gas line underground for the fire pit. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Liechty asked if this proposal would cause any problems with snow removal. Ms. Korkos stated that snow removal should not be affected.

Mr. Olson asked for confirmation that there was only parking in front of the building itself and not in front of the sidewalk. Mr. Zierath stated that this was correct.

Mr. Liechty motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to approve the proposed building alterations as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

~Review of Business Sign~

Mr. Liechty asked if the business signs would have raised letters. Mr. Zierath said yes, they will be raised about an inch and a half and they will be cut out of metal and would be gold in color.

Mr. Matola asked if the signs will have any illumination other than the gooseneck lights on the building. Mr. Zierath said no.

Mr. Olson asked if there were two signs. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Harrigan stated that the board needs to approve an amendment to the uniform sign format.

Mr. Matola asked if the signs conform to Village ordinances. Mr. Harrigan said yes.

Mr. Matola stated that this proposed restaurant feels separate from the rest of the building and felt that it does warrant a separate sign. Mr. Olson stated that he agreed.

Mr. Matola asked if the applicant was concerned that the gold lettering may not stand out against the wood sign. Mr. Zierath stated that the wood will be a dark walnut so he was not concerned about that at all.

Mr. Liechty asked if the wood would be sealed. Mr. Zierath said yes.

Mr. Matola asked if the property owners approve of the signage. Ms. Korkos said yes.

Mr. Matola motioned and Ms. Steindorf seconded to approve the business signs as an amendment to the uniform sign format. Motion carried 7-0.

~Review of Patio and Landscaping~

Mr. Olson asked if they will plant tall grasses along the north edge of the patio to block the road. Mr. Zierath said that was correct.

Mr. Matola asked if the patio will end at the sidewalk along Watertown Plank. Mr. Harrigan stated that as far as he can tell from reviewing the plans, the patio is outside of the Village's right of way and if it is inside the right of way, they would need to inquire with the Public Works Committee if this would be allowed.

Mr. Liechty and Mr. Matola stated that they would like to see details on the fence and that the Village will need detailed plans for the file.

Mr. Liechty asked for details on the patio and fence posts and if there will be a curb. Mr. Zierath said that the posts will be in the ground and the patio will go around the posts.

Mr. Matola asked if the border will be concrete and Mr. Olson asked if there will be a curb. Mr. Zierath stated that he was not sure.

Mr. Harrigan stated that the permeable paver system details were sent to the Village engineer for review today and that we have not heard back yet.

Mr. Matola stated that the board would like to see more details on how the fence will attach to the ground.

Ms. Steindorf suggested that it may be best to table the discussion of the landscaping and fence until more details are available. Mr. Olson agreed and informed the applicant that they should submit renderings that show the design of the fence accurately as well.

Mr. Zierath requested that the board table the review of the patio/landscape plan to a future meeting.

Mr. Matola motioned and Ms. Steindorf seconded to table the item per the applicant's request. Motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Steindorf left the meeting at 6:34 p.m.

9. Review and act on the revised plan sets reflecting as built conditions of the property located at 14980 Juneau Boulevard, submitted by John Bonfilio and Julie Mick-Bonfilio.

John Bonfilio and Rob Miller of Rob Miller Homes were present before the board.

Mr. Bonfilio stated that they have addressed the drainage issues by installing long extenders on the downspouts that will be trenched in and will direct the water to the back corner of the property. He stated that they are aware that there was an initial flooding issue on the neighboring property and stated that this was before the landscaping had been completed and was partly caused by bad weather and a tree falling down. Mr. Bonfilio stated that they have built a berm to direct the flow of water to the back corner of the property as well.

Mr. Liechty stated that the picture submitted to the Village of the downspout extenders looks different than when he was at the property and he would like to know their exact location. Mr. Bonfilio stated that the downspouts previously went to the west and now they curve around to the north.

Mirjana Stejic, owner of the neighboring property at 1190 Terrace Drive, presented a photograph of the flooding on her property. There was disagreement between Mr. Bonfilio and Ms. Stejic as to the date the photo was taken and whether this particular flooding occurred before or after the landscaping had been completed. Ms. Stejic stated that before construction of this new home began, she did not have any problems with flooding on her property.

Mr. Bonfilio stated that he believes that they have done work to redirect water and correct the drainage issues and that flooding should not be a problem now. Ms. Stejic stated that she disagrees and feels that more should be done to prevent future flooding.

Mr. Olson asked if the landscaping was completed. Mr. Harrigan stated that the landscaping is done but was not completed per the landscaping plans the board approved.

Mr. Liechty asked where the sump pump discharge was located. Mr. Miller stated in front of the home. Mr. Bonfilio stated that he has not heard the sump pump run at all.

Mr. Olson asked why the retaining walls were eliminated. Mr. Miller stated that the homeowners had safety concerns with young children so they decided to just slope the property to have a more gradual drop off than a wall.

Mr. Liechty noted that a steeply pitched yard speeds up the flow of water and it becomes much harder to change the direction of the water. Mr. Liechty suggested that the homeowners could create a berm in the back corner of their property so that water could pool in that area and prevent or slow down the flow of water to the north. Mr. Liechty stated that he has something similar on his property and the water usually pools for a day or so but that this has prevented any runoff onto his neighbor's lawn. He stated this was essentially a "dishing" effect.

Mr. Miller and Mr. Bonfilio stated that they would be open to that idea.

Mr. Domaszek stated that the expansion of the deck was one of the biggest changes from what was approved. Mr. Miller stated that he takes responsibility for that and he should have come back to the board for approval for that change. He stated it was not his intention to bypass the board or the Village's procedures.

Mr. Miller also took responsibility for removing the brackets that were originally approved.

Mr. Olson stated that the board spends a significant amount of time reviewing and approving new homes and if the approved plans are not followed, this wastes a lot of time.

Mr. Matola left the meeting but continued via telephone.

Mr. Liechty asked why the brackets were eliminated. Mr. Miller stated that he believes they decided those were not necessary to the design. Mr. Liechty stated that the board really appreciated the original design and the details on the home.

Mr. Liechty stated that on the rear elevation he would still like to see some design element to replace the window on the garage that was removed. He suggested putting in a faux door or shutters and stated that the look of that area of the home drastically changed when that window was eliminated.

Mr. Bonfilio stated that they added the trim pieces to the side of the garage to add a design element.

Mr. Olson stated that he still felt it looked out of scale with the rest of the house. Mr. Liechty agreed that it looked blank.

Mr. Miller asked if adding some shutters to the area would be an option. Mr. Bonfilio stated that he did not think shutters made sense in that space.

Mr. Domaszek stated that the house would not have been approved like this so the board would like to see a change made to that section of the house. Mr. Harrigan suggested that Mr. Bonfilio and Mr. Miller come back with a few options and present them to the board. Mr. Liechty suggested perhaps something that relates to the garage door design would look nice in that area. Mr. Bonfilio stated that they will come back with different options.

Mr. Bonfilio stated that the impervious surface calculations included the slate sidewalk and he believes that area is actually permeable and should not have been included. Mr. Domaszek stated that there is a review process to determine if an area is pervious or not.

Mr. Bonfilio stated that one of the reasons the impervious surface area may be over the limit is because they added a turnaround spot in the driveway for safety reasons to avoid having to back out onto Juneau Boulevard.

Mr. Bonfilio also stated that he was suspicious of the numbers listed as the impervious surface area as they are even numbers. He stated that they appear to be approximate and that he did some measurement and came to different totals. Mr. Harrigan stated that the Bonfilio's could provide different numbers if they did not believe these were accurate.

Mr. Matola asked if the revised numbers would need to be in a formal survey. Mr. Domaszek stated that they would need to be certified numbers and that we generally get the calculations from a survey.

Mr. Harrigan stated that to address the concerns about drainage the homeowner should supply a revised surface water drainage plan and make sure to indicate the locations of the downspouts. Mr. Liechty added that the revised site plan should show the water flow directed towards the northwest and include the berm suggested earlier.

Mr. Harrigan asked the building board if they would require the applicants to add any of the missing brackets. Mr. Liechty stated his main concern is the blank wall on the garage and he would like to see the shutters or faux door added.

Mr. Olson stated that he would like to see brackets on the overhang on the garage on the front elevation of the home. Mr. Liechty agreed that this would bring some design consistency to the look of the home.

Ms. Stejic stated that there is a concrete patio on the northwest side of the property and she believe this is adding to the drainage issues. Mr. Domaszek asked if that patio was included in the original approval. Mr. Harrigan said it was not. Mr. Domaszek noted that the original permeability calculation would not have included the concrete.

Mr. Olson stated that he would like to see the same bracket detail on the back of the home that exists on the front peaks. Mr. Bonfilio stated that could cost a significant amount of money to add. Mr. Olson replied that they should have been included originally as they were on the approved plans originally submitted to the board.

Mr. Bonfilio complained that he felt the board was not being fair. Mr. Olson stated that the board does not have to approve any of the as built changes that were made and added that all municipalities have rules and procedures for building a home and no one will let a homeowner have plans approved that are not followed.

Mr. Domaszek stated that if the homeowners felt they needed further guidance on options for the garage area, they can coordinate with Mr. Harrigan to set up a subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Liechty added that if the homeowners are contesting the impervious surface overage, they will need to provide new certified numbers.

Mr. Miller stated that he and the homeowners will come up with a plan to address all of these concerns and will present to the board at a future meeting.

5. Other business

Mr. Harrigan stated that due to the Spring Election on April 3, the building board meeting scheduled for that evening will need to be rescheduled and suggested April 4 as an alternative. The board agreed to reschedule the meeting to April 4, 2018.

8. Adjournment

Mr. Liechty motioned and Mr. Collins seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carey Nelson
Administrative Assistant