

**BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, May 22, 2018**

Meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Mr. Harrigan.

1. Roll Call.

Present: Mr. Schoenecker, Mr. Koleski, Ms. Steindorf, Mr. Domaszek, and Mr. Matola

Absent: Mr. Olson, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Collins, and Mr. Janusz

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

Mr. Schoenecker motioned and Mr. Koleski seconded to appoint Mr. Matola as chair pro-tem in the absence of Mr. Olson. Motion carried 5-0.

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated May 1, 2018.

Mr. Schoenecker stated that on page four in the second sentence of the first paragraph, the word "black" should be changed to "block."

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Schoenecker seconded to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried 5-0.

3. Consideration, public hearing, and action on a fence variance request by Robert Dusek at 15055 Cascade Drive.

Applicant was present before the board.

Mr. Matola opened the public hearing at 5:36 p.m.

Mr. Ingo Valentin of 14900 Westover Road expressed opposition to the solid fence and stated he felt it would be an eyesore and would have a negative effect on the neighborhood.

Mr. Matola read aloud a letter from the adjacent property owners Wally and Joan Fosnight of 15000 Westover Road, who are in favor of this fence request and stressed the need for privacy between their property and Mr. Dusek's house.

Ms. Fosnight also stated that she did not believe the neighbors at 14900 Westover would be able to see the fence clearly as there are several large trees on his property blocking the view.

Mr. Koleski asked about the fence variance requirements. Mr. Matola stated that this fence needs a variance because it is a six foot fence that is outside of the setback. Mr. Matola stated that if the fence was inside the setback then it would not need to be approved. Mr. Domaszek added that if the fence was four feet and 50% open then it would also not need to be approved.

Mr. Jim Skiba of 15065 Cascade Drive stated that he was not opposed to this fence variance request.

Mr. Matola closed the public hearing at 5:43 p.m.

Mr. Matola stated that the applicant is proposing two options for the 48 foot fence and stated that it will be located four feet from the property line. Mr. Dusek stated that was correct and that "Plan A" is a Simtek composite material that is a good sound barrier, fades slowly, withstands high winds, and is less maintenance than a wooden fence.

Mr. Matola asked if the color in the submitted picture was accurate. Mr. Dusek said yes.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if the fence will be all the same height across the entire length. Mr. Dusek said yes but that the top caps will be an inch or two above the top rail of the fence.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if the caps are metal. Mr. Dusek said no, they are the same composite material as the rest of the fence.

Mr. Domaszek asked if the fence panels come in a five foot height option. Mr. Dusek said no, the choices are four or six feet tall.

Mr. Matola asked the applicant to explain "Plan B." Mr. Dusek stated that the fence will be the same size and in the same location, just a different material. Plan B would be red cedar wood with overlapping boards.

Mr. Matola asked if it would be an open fence. Mr. Harrigan stated that he did not believe this style of fence could be considered 50% open.

Mr. Dusek stated that the "Plan B" fence is the same as "Plan A" in terms of number of panels and height, it is just a different material with considerably more maintenance.

Mr. Domaszek asked if "Plan B" could be five feet tall. Mr. Dusek said yes that was possible but it might not provide the same privacy that he and his neighbors are hoping for.

Mr. Domaszek stated that he felt six feet is too high and he is concerned about setting a precedent since the building board has never approved a fence of this type. He stated that the board usually only approves six foot fences along major roadways.

Ms. Steindorf asked if there had been any additional efforts to create a privacy barrier using natural plantings. Ms. Fosnight stated that she had made several attempts at considerable expense and even brought in an arborist who advised that there is too much shade in that area to grow anything successfully.

Mr. Matola stated that it seems the board is split on this decision and that if the proposal does not pass, the applicant would need to come back with a new submission.

Mr. Schoenecker stated that he was not sure what else the board could recommend that would accomplish the applicant's and the neighbor's goal of privacy. Mr. Schoenecker stated that he felt the fence would blend into the landscape and he was not against approving the variance.

Mr. Domaszek stated that he did not have any concerns with the style of fence, but he is worried that six feet is too high and approving this variance may be inconsistent with previous board decisions.

Mr. Domaszek asked about the cost difference between the two options. Mr. Dusek stated that short term, the wood material is less expensive but over time they will spend considerably more time and money on maintenance for a wooden fence versus the composite material.

Mr. Koleski stated that he was concerned with the mass of the fence at 48 feet long and six feet high.

Mr. Domaszek stated that the length of the fence would be fine if it was only five feet tall, instead of six feet.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if the length of the fence could be shortened. Mr. Dusek stated that the next option would be 42 feet in length. Mr. Matola stated that shortening the fence may address the concerns of the neighbors at 14900 Westover.

Mr. Matola stated that it might be beneficial if the applicant looked into different types of material or they could schedule an on-site meeting with the building board.

Mr. Domaszek stated that there are other vinyl options available. Mr. Dusek stated that he would rather use wood than most types of vinyl but that he would prefer not to use wood.

Mr. Matola stated that it does sound like this proposal would be approved if a vote was taken now and asked if the applicant would like to table the item to look at other options.

Mr. Domaszek asked if the applicants would have to reapply if the request was denied at this meeting. Mr. Harrigan said yes, and pay another \$30 submission fee.

Ms. Fosnight asked what the board would like to see in terms of other options. Mr. Domaszek stated that everyone seems to like the style of the fence but the main concern was the six foot height. Mr. Domaszek stated that if they wished to stay at six feet, then they would maybe need to shorten the length of the fence.

Mr. Valentin stated that his concerns were more with the six foot height of the fence, rather than the length. Ms. Valentin agreed and stated that she also agreed with the board's concerns about setting a precedence with this approval.

Mr. Domaszek stated that a five foot tall fence would be more in line with what the board has previously approved.

Mr. Dusek stated that he understands the desire for open spaces in the village however, he does not understand the issue with this particular fence, since he and his neighbor are in agreement and you cannot see the fence from the road.

Ms. Fosnight added that the board would be more likely to approve the fence if they came to the property and could see the need for privacy between the two yards. Mr. Matola stated that the board does not disagree that there needs to be some type of barrier, there are just some concerns about this fence that need to be addressed.

Ms. Steindorf stated that she thinks there could still be some natural planting options that have not been explored and agreed that an on-site meeting would be helpful and stated that she was also concerned with setting a precedent for this type of fence.

Mr. Harrigan stated that the applicant can request to table the item and request an on-site meeting if they would like.

Mr. Dusek requested the item be tabled to a future meeting.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned and Mr. Domaszek seconded to table the item per the applicant's request. Motion carried 5-0.

4. Consideration, public hearing, and action on a shed proposal by John Ivans at 1620 Woodside Lane.

Applicant was present before the board.

Mr. Matola asked if there were any members of the public who would like to make a comment at this time. There were no public comments so Mr. Matola stated that the board had received letters from two neighbors in favor of the shed and closed the public hearing portion of the item.

Mr. Matola asked the applicant about changes made since the last meeting. Mr. Ivans stated that the board had concerns about the design of the shed so he will now be using vinyl siding to match the three season room on the back of the home. Mr. Ivans also stated that the board had concerns about constructing the shed on the uneven ground, so he has moved the shed location to a more level area of the yard.

Mr. Matola asked if the color will match the vinyl siding on the rear of the house and if it will be horizontal. Mr. Ivans said yes.

Mr. Matola asked about the windows on the shed. Mr. Ivans stated that there will be two windows with trim to match the siding.

Mr. Koleski asked if there is any landscaping planned for the area around the shed. Mr. Ivans stated that he did not have anything planned.

Mr. Domaszek asked why only two neighbors signed in favor of the shed. Mr. Ivans stated that they are not against the shed, he was just not able to contact them for their signatures.

Mr. Harrigan stated that all neighboring properties were notified of the shed proposal and the meeting.

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Schoenecker seconded to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Domaszek recused himself at 6:22 p.m.

5. Review and provide recommendation regarding the Elm Grove Heights conceptual development proposal located at 13040 Bluemound Road.

Will Rutherford of Horizon Development and Dale Streitenberger of JLA Architects were present before the board.

Horizon Development presented an overview of the design plans.

Mr. Koleski asked if the residents to the north of the property were aware of this project. Mr. Harrigan said yes. Mr. Rutherford stated that they have met with the Emerald Woods Condominiums and presented the plans to them as well.

Mr. Rutherford noted that the fourth story on the western edge of the property is six to eight feet lower than the building directly to the west and the height of the building steps down to follow the grade of Bluemound Road. He stated that they also planned to widen the shared access drive to accommodate the increased density. Municipal water will be installed and will benefit both the Emerald Woods and Douglas Plaza condominiums.

Mr. Koleski asked about density. Mr. Rutherford stated that they will have 75 units in two acres.

Mr. Streitenberger presented an overview of the architectural design.

Mr. Koleski asked about the balconies on the building. Mr. Streitenberger stated that the balconies that face Bluemound and the building to the west will have nested

balconies and the north side of the building will have balconies that project out and they will have a metal roof as a canopy to protect the top floor.

Mr. Koleski asked if any public money will be used for this development. Mr. Harrigan said no.

Mr. Koleski asked if Mr. Harrigan could provide a history of density per acre in the village. Mr. Harrigan said he did not have those numbers tonight but could send them later. Mr. Harrigan added that density is an issue for Plan Commission to review. Mr. Koleski said he understood.

Ms. Steindorf asked if there was any concern that the balconies on the west side will have their sunlight blocked by the building to the west. Mr. Streitenberger stated that the buildings are 65 feet apart so there will be no issue with blocking light.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if the main entrance will be in the courtyard area. Mr. Streitenberger said yes and there will be a covered area for drop offs.

Mr. Schoenecker stated that he felt there may not be enough guest parking for this many units. Mr. Rutherford stated that the building will have .93 underground stalls per unit with an additional 18 surface stalls.

Mr. Schoenecker stated that he felt that was still not enough parking for guests. The representative from Horizon stated that in other senior residence buildings, they have a ratio of 1.2 total parking spaces per unit including guests, so they are comfortable that there will be adequate parking.

Mr. Matola asked if the planned storm water management would benefit the adjacent condominiums. Mr. Rutherford stated that Emerald Woods has had storm water issues in the past so the planned drainage management should help with those issues.

Mr. Koleski asked if the building will only have one ground level entrance. The representative from Horizon stated that residents want a secure environment so they tried to limit the points of access in all of their senior residences. The building will have one main controlled entrance plus an entrance through the underground parking. Mr. Streitenberger added that there will be a man door on the north elevation for fire access and for residents to use as they move into the building.

Mr. Matola thanked the applicants for their presentation.

Mr. Domaszek rejoined the meeting.

6. Review and act on a request by Daniel and Eva McCormack at 810 Kurtis Drive for a home alteration.

Applicant was present before the board.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if they plan to reclaim brick from under the bay window. Applicant said yes.

Mr. Koleski asked about the size of the step down from the patio door. Applicant stated that it will be the same as existing – about 6 inches.

Ms. Steindorf asked if there will be grids in glass patio door. Applicant said no.

Mr. Koleski asked about the box above the existing bay window. Applicant stated that is a vent and it will remain.

Mr. Matola asked if Ms. Steindorf would like them to add grids to the patio doors. Ms. Steindorf stated that for consistency she thought it would look better. Mr. Schoenecker stated that he didn't think they were needed as it is a back patio door that is not very visible.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned and Mr. Domaszek seconded to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 5-0.

7. Review and act on a request by Mike and Kersden Rozny at 1100 Lower Ridgeway for a home alteration and addition.

Mike Rozny and his architect were present before the board.

Mr. Matola stated that at the last meeting, the item was tabled as the board had concerns about the window designs and wanted more detail on the garage addition.

The architect stated that all of the windows are now squared off except the one angled window above the front door and that the rear garage stall will be wood with siding that will coordinate with the rest of the house.

Mr. Matola stated that the main concern with the height of the doors and windows not matching seems to have been addressed as well.

Mr. Matola asked if the garage extends into the back yard. Applicant said yes.

Mr. Matola asked if the balcony would be at the top of the new garage. Applicant said yes.

Mr. Matola asked if a site plan was available. Mr. Harrigan stated that one was not submitted, but that if the garage is approved, the applicants will need to provide a survey.

Mr. Domaszek stated that on the east elevation, the windows on the lowest floor and the second floor still do not line up and asked why the second floor window was not

centered. Mr. Rozny stated that there is a TV in the corner of that room so the window makes the most sense in that location.

Mr. Matola asked if the applicant could provide more detail on the materials. Architect provided sample materials and colors. He stated that the goal was to make the exterior of the home maintenance free and added that the roof will be asphalt shingles.

Mr. Koleski asked why some siding was vertical and some was horizontal. Applicant stated that they did not want a monotonous look and that this design is consistent with the style of the house.

Mr. Schoenecker stated that in the zoning code, it indicates that structures should not be out of character with respect to neighboring properties and he is concerned that this probably may not fit in with the rest of the neighborhood. Applicant stated that the beauty of Elm Grove is that not every house looks exactly the same and that there have been other modern style houses recently built in the village.

Mr. Domaszek stated that even if a house does not look exactly like the neighboring properties, if it is well done, then the board should take that into consideration.

Mr. Matola stated that the applicant may want to consider reducing the width of the hallway on the upper level to give more room for the bedroom. The architect stated that they plan to use that space as a playroom loft area and not a bedroom.

Mr. Matola asked if the applicant had considered adding any different material or details to the front area that is all siding on the western portion of the home. He stated that currently it looks like a large box of siding. Applicant stated that design was chosen to highlight the front entryway as a focal point.

Mr. Rozny provided a drawing of what the possible landscape design would look like in the front of the home.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if they will be using the existing foundation. The architect said yes and stated that they are aware it needs some repairs.

Mr. Koleski asked why there was just a wall with high windows on the west elevation. Applicant stated that there is a pantry and closet in that location on the interior.

Mr. Matola asked if the board needed to see a landscape plan. Mr. Harrigan stated that if the garage addition was approved then a survey will be required and the board could request a landscaping plan.

Mr. Matola stated that he would like to look at the site plan and grading to review the drainage and Mr. Schoenecker noted that there are no gutters or downspouts drawn on the plans.

Applicant stated that the home will have gutters and downspouts and that they plan to add drain tile to the front of the home. The downspouts will drain to the back side of the home.

Mr. Matola asked if the man door next to the garage has been eliminated. Architect stated that the door has been moved to the rear of the home.

Mr. Matola asked if there would be a stone façade on the garage. Architect stated that the material will be hardy panel.

Ms. Steindorf stated that she still felt the area to the right of the front door is still too plain with all the same type of siding and she would like to see a different type of material or other details brought in on that section. Applicant stated again that this was done to create a focal point at the front entry way and that the area in question is below the roadway and will not be very visible.

Ms. Steindorf stated that she still felt it was too plain compared to the level of detail on the back and sides of the home. Mr. Koleski and Mr. Matola both shared this concern.

Mr. Matola asked if the color of the solid panels and siding is accurately represented in the renderings. Applicant said yes.

The architect stated that this will be a quality structure that is architecturally interesting and stated that there is no uniform architecture style in Elm Grove.

Mr. Schoenecker and Mr. Koleski both stated that they would like to see a landscaping plan.

Mr. Domaszek stated that the roof pitch has changed on the property so he would also like to see a drainage plan but stated that the board can perhaps conditionally approve the item so that a drainage plan and landscaping can be submitted at a later date. The applicant indicated that they would like this item to move forward as soon as possible and that they can come back with a drainage and landscaping plan.

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Schoenecker seconded to approve the plans as submitted with the condition that a landscaping plan that addresses the concerns raised regarding lack of detail on the west elevation and also a grading plan that addresses drainage and location of downspouts and sump discharge will be submitted to the board for approval at a later meeting. Motion carried 5-0.

8. Review and act on a request by Paul Twardy at 13000 Bluemound Road for a revised hardy plank coloration proposal.

Applicant was not present before the board.

Mr. Harrigan presented color samples to the board.

Mr. Domaszek and Mr. Matola both stated that the new color addresses the board's previous concerns.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned and Mr. Domaszek seconded to approve the revised color as submitted. Motion carried 5-0.

11. Other business

Ms. Steindorf asked if the building board regulated zip lines in front yards. Mr. Harrigan said no, but that residents are not allowed to attach the line to a village asset so the village will address any property in violation of that rule. Ms. Steindorf stated that she feels zip lines in front yards are eye sores.

12. Adjournment

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Schonecker seconded to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carey Nelson
Administrative Assistant