

**DISCLAIMER – THE FOLLOWING ARE DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE BUILDING BOARD
AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE UPON APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING BOARD**

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
BUILDING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, February 07, 2023

1. Roll Call.

Present: Ms. Steindorf, Mr. Falsetti, Mr. Thedford, Mr. Roge, Mr. Janusz, and Ms. Raysich

Absent: Chairman Olson, Mr. Koleski, and Mr. Matola

Also present: Ms. Gehl, Ms. Walters, applicant.

Noting the absence of Chairman Olson, Mr. Roge motioned to nominate Mr. Falsetti as pro-tem Chair. Ms. Steindorf seconded. Motion passed.

Mr. Falsetti called the meeting to order at 5:33 P.M.

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated January 3, 2023.

Mr. Thedford motioned to approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Raysich seconded. Motion passed.

3. Review and act on a request by Jilly's Car Wash, 15340 Bluemound Road, for an accessory structure.

Ms. Caitlin LaJoie was before the Board to represent the request.

Applicant, John Zimmerman, who is the business owner of Jilly's Car Wash, is requesting approval for an addition of an employee booth accessory structure proposed to be located to the northeast of the existing building at the entrance of the drive thru lane. The proposed accessory structure complies with B-1, Local Business District setback requirements. This proposal would require an amended Plan of Operation that is reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission. The applicant is going before the Plan Commission on Monday, February 6th so this request will be contingent on the decision made by the Plan Commission at that meeting.

Mr. Falsetti noted that due to his absence, Chairman Olson provided written comments for the Board to consider. Mr. Falsetti read those comments aloud:

"We spend a lot of time with residential accessory structures to make sure that they are complimentary to the existing structures on the lot. I feel that this should hold true with

this structure. The location of the accessory structure where it is placed is in a primary focal point on Watertown Plank Road. That being said it will be very visible. It appears that the materials will match the existing buildings on the site. Since the roof of the existing structures are gabled, I would prefer that this too have the gabled look in lieu of the gable that is being proposed. This may require dropping the eave height to the top of the window to get this to the overall height that is needed. My suggestion would be the gable ends be on the East and West ends of this structure.”

Ms. LaJoie noted that the Plan Commission approved the application for an amended Plan of Operation to allow an employee booth at their February 6th meeting.

Ms. LaJoie explained that the proposed plans include brick materials and colors and a black asphalt roof to match the existing building.

Ms. Raysich noted the existing roof is metal and did not feel that the proposed roof matched.

Mr. Thedford inquired if the door shown in the plans is a solid door or glass. Ms. LaJoie stated that it is metal door.

The Board was in agreement that a glass door or a door painted to match the soffits on the existing building would be preferred. The Board also agreed that darker brick color on the structure should extend to the ground and the gable should match the existing building.

The Board also felt that the window should be bronze rather than clear anodized to match the existing building.

Mr. Roge asked if windows will be able to be opened or if they will be fixed. Ms. LaJoie stated the windows will be fixed.

Mr. Janusz asked if there will be electricity to the structure. Ms. LaJoie stated there will be buried electricity to the structure.

Ms. LaJoie stated that there will be exterior lighting. Ms. LaJoie explained that this will be an extension of the current island 20 feet to the east and that the existing tree will remain.

Mr. Thedford stated the following changes that the Board would like to see:

Bronze windows rather than clear anodized windows to match existing building.

Extend darker brick color to the ground.

Gable on east and west elevation with soffit detail and color to match the existing building.

Incorporate tan row of brick above door and windows to match existing building.

Specify where exterior lighting will be.

Color of metal service door painted to match soffits of existing building.

Standing seam metal roof rather than black asphalt roof to match existing building.

Ms. LaJoie requested to table this discussion in order for the applicants to submit an updated proposal taking into consideration the Boards' comments.

Ms. Steindorf motioned to accept the request of the applicant to table the discussion. Ms. Raysich seconded. Motion passed.

4. Review and act on a request by Phil and Lori Dallman, 1025 Kurtis Drive, for a home addition.

The Applicant was not present at the meeting.

Applicant is requesting approval for an addition of a kitchen as part of full home renovation. The property is a legal non-conforming structure as a section of the garage is located within the 20' side yard setback area and the total impervious surface is 30.8%, which exceeds the 30% maximum allowable impervious surface in the Rs-1, Single-Family Residential District. The applicant is also proposing landscape improvements which would extend the front porch, eliminate the front walkway, and reconfigure the driveway. The proposal shows the removal of the section of garage that causes non-conformity, which will make this a legal structure. However, the proposal shows the total impervious surface percentage as 30.3% which exceeds the maximum allowable impervious surface.

Mr. Falsetti noted that due to his absence, Chairman Olson provided written comments for the Board to consider. Mr. Falsetti read those comments aloud:

"The one thing that I do not feel looks that great is the entry door under the arched entryway. There are two windows with a door alongside. Having the strong gesture of the arch and then not centering the door with a window on each side looks/feels off. I strongly recommend that this be looked at as I feel that it will always look out of place for years to come."

The Board stated their agreement with the written comments of Chairman Olson. The Board suggested a double door at the entrance of the home option with long sidelites on either side of the door.

The Board stated that they would like to see the colors and materials proposed for the home as well as a lighting plan.

The Board felt the rooflines on the east and west elevations are competing while there is more harmony between the rooflines on north and south elevations.

The Board stated that they would like to see the color of the metal roof.

The Board discussed where the stone terminates on the east elevation and proposed that it wrap along the entirety of the north elevation as well.

The Applicant should provide design of egress window for review.

Mr. Thedford stated the following changes that the Board would like to see:

Center the front door to the arch and add sidelites on either side of the door.

Match the rooflines on the east and west elevation.

Provide the proposed roof color.

Specify the proposed chimney material.

Specify the design, material, color of the proposed gables.

Specify the window finishes.

Extend stone along north elevation or propose landscaping along north elevation.

Provide design of egress window.

Provide exterior lighting plan.

Ms. Steindorff motioned to deny the request as presented as the applicant was not present. Mr. Thedford seconded. Motion passed.

5. Other Business.

Ms. Gehl stated that there is a scheduling conflict for the next scheduled Building Board meeting due to the election and staff will be reaching out to Building Board members to reschedule.

6. Adjournment.

Ms. Steindorf motioned to adjourn. Ms. Raysich seconded. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 6:33 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane Walters
Administrative Assistant

DRAFT