

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

Tuesday March 16, 2021

Meeting was called to order at 5:33 PM by Chairman Olson.

1. Roll Call.

Present in person: Chairman Olson, Mr. Thedford, Mr. Koleski, Mr. Matola, Trustee Domaszek, Mr. Falsetti, and Mr. Roge.

Present via Video Conference: Ms. Steindorf, Mr. Janusz
Absent: none

Also present: Mr. Harrigan, Ms. Walters, Phil Aiello and Dan Romnek of Mandel Group, Eric Ponto and Michael Duncan of Engberg Anderson, Mr. Harrigan, Ms. Walters and applicants

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated 03/02/2021.

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Matola seconded to approve the March 2nd, 2021 minutes as amended. Mr. Roge abstains. Motion carried 8-0.

3. Review and act on a request by Robert and Kathy Lauer, 1060 Longwood Ave for a home alteration.

Karl Holterman, of Karl Holterman Design Build was present before the board.

This alteration adds Marvin clad white aluminum windows on the east elevation which will drop the window sill.

Mr. Matola asked on page A1 on the window to the left of the bay he notes the three panel upper and open lower conflicts with the interior view. It was noted there would be brick infill below as well. Mr. Matola asked how many total panels?

Mr. Holterman explained it will be a three wide top panel. There will only be three divides.

Mr. Matola asked if the bottom windows will need to be treated glass.

Mr. Holterman stated the windows will be treated tempered glass.

Mr. Matola motioned to approve on condition the plan set be amended and submitted to the Village, and Ms. Steindorf seconded to approve the plan. Motion carried 9-0

4. Review and act on a request by Andrew Levy 13680 W Bluemound Rd for a new deck

Andrew Levy was present before the board.

Chairman Olson asked if the new deck will be in the same location where the existing deck is placed.

Mr. Levy explained the lower part of the deck will be slightly expanded to the west. The railings will be powder coated aluminum in bronze color.

Mr. Matola asked if there will be any screening below the deck. Screening is recommended to keep animals out from underneath the structure, but not required.

Mr. Levy noted the pressure treated wood used for the footings of the deck will not be visible. Also, the deck is changing from three to two steps.

Mr. Matola motioned and Mr. Koleski seconded to approve the plan as submitted. Motion carried 9-0

5. Review and act on a request by Cate Heerey, 12800 Wrayburn Rd, for a swimming pool and pool fence.

Cate Heerey was present before the board.

The shed is not a part of this submission although it is drawn into the plans as the accessory structure application will be completed at a later date.

The pool will be west of the house in the rear yard of the property. The fence will go on the south side along a line of bushes as noted on the plans. There will be a separate permit later for the shed which is planned to be constructed at the same time as the pool.

The aluminum black fence will have four gates, one being a double gate. The fence will terminate on the south and north side of the shed.

The Plat of Survey needs to be amended to reflect the footprint of the shed at 150 square feet.

Mr. Matola motioned and Mr. Domaszek seconded to approve contingent upon a stamped survey noting that the impervious surface content of the property is equal or less than 30% of the property area. Motion carried 9-0

6. Review, discussion and possible action on the redevelopment proposal for the School Sisters of Notre Dame Campus, 13105 Watertown Plank Rd

Philip Aiello and Dan Romnek of the Mandel Group, and Eric Ponto and Michael Duncan of Engberg Anderson were present before the board.

Mr. Roge recused himself and left the meeting at 6:08 PM

Mr. Aiello stated the architectural plan have been refined in response to the comments provided by the Building Board at the March 2nd meeting. Additional context of design and intent may be warranted before any changes are made to the plans.

Eric Ponto reviewed new static image slides and pointed out the updates that reflect comments from the March 2nd Building Board meeting:

1. Building Two is approximately 37' to the edge of Watertown Plank Road and Building One is approximately 100' – 110' to Watertown Plank Road (See slide one of 3/16 presentation).
2. The use of wood has been increased, specifically around and within the screened-in porches.
3. Context Massing Study (Slide two of 3/16 presentation) – Verticality taking place at the “ends” of Building One and Two are intended to play off the horizontality of Maria Hall, treating Notre Dame and Maria Hall as center to the bookends.
4. Origin of the use of wood (Slide three of 3/16 presentation) – The existing use of wood on the Watermark Condominium development is used as a reference point and carries the materiality over to the SSND property.

Mr. Ponto walked through the remainder of the presentation which demonstrated the changes made to the architecture of the buildings.

The Building Board noted at the March 2nd meeting that the white gabled end of Building one seemed out of place. Mr. Ponto noted the intention was to use stone as the base material of the building, but the white took over at the corner. The intention was for the white clap board to “turn the corner” of the building toward the interior of the development.

The revised rendering (Slide five of 3/16 presentation) demonstrates stone being used as a mass that works in tandem with the other stone on Building One, as well as Notre Dame and Maria Hall. The stone helps bookend and create the flow. Now, the stone on the gabled end of Building One creates a gateway as you enter the interior of the development. The window sills on Building One are accented with a lighter stone.

(Slide Ten of 3/16 presentation) A bumped up shed roof line becomes another bay element on Building One, which articulates the middle portion of the building on the East elevation (interior façade) of Building One.

Mr. Olson asked if there are stone walls at the ground level.

Mr. Ponto confirmed the stone walls are for the walk up patio areas.

(Slide Thirteen of 3/16 presentation) The previous rendering on March 2nd of the end condition of Building Three was too disconnected and seemed like three separate buildings. There were questions related to the use of the transom windows. The intent of the additional windows is to allow for a taller glass line that may expand the ceiling another few feet in that specific living space.

It was explored to see what would happen if the roofline was extended to create a sense of connectivity (Slide Fourteen of 3/16 presentation). It felt too oppressive and therefore cut it back to create a dynamic feel, as well as allow the living space to be the dynamic corner element (Slide Fifteen of 3/16 presentation).

(Slide Seventeen of 3/16 presentation) The entry way of Building Three has similar materials to Building one and Two, but the forms are clearly different.

On the backside of Building Three (Slide Nineteen of 3/16 presentation) There were questions related to the roof form and how the white siding is capped off. The bay windows are brought out for more connectivity to the natural area. There is also a sheltering roof which links the facades for all the living spaces which still emphasizes the curve of the building.

Mr. Duncan presented a 3D virtual fly through of the redevelopment to the Board.

Mr. Olson asked how far out the shed roof overhang pop out from the building.

Mr. Ponto stated the porches actually stand proud of the shed roof. It has been discussed the shed roof should extend ever farther from the building to add more sheltering for the porch areas.

Mr. Domaszek asked how wide the sidewalks are.

Mr. Ponto stated five feet in width.

Mr. Domaszek stated it may be appropriate to widen the sidewalks, especially on the interior courtyard side of the development for people to walk side-by-side.

Mr. Ponto stated the intention would be to construct the sidewalks at the Village's standard so the development becomes a walking neighborhood with all the paths linked together. However, there is still programming to be completed on the interior courtyard space.

Mr. Thedford commented that Building Three appears to be more digestible when reviewing with the 3D rendering.

Mr. Ponto highlighted that Building Three actually has a smaller linear footage of building frontage compared to Buildings One and Two.

Mr. Koleski asked if the transition at the corners of Building One and Building Three can be explained.

Mr. Ponto stated there is an implied weaving of the colors throughout the development. On Building One, the intention is for the white to stop and start to break up the mass. Some of the massing is also broken up in the roof form, as it is still somewhat continuous, yet not monolithic.

Mr. Olson asked if there has ever been consideration to bring the stone up to where it would be a band underneath the lower level windows.

Mr. Ponto stated this has been considered and deserves more study.

Mr. Falsetti stated he is not sure how the ramp into the underground parking area is being treated. There were also questions about snow plowing and garbage collection.

Mr. Ponto stated that every building has a trash room that has a shoot which drops down to the basement parking area for pick-up at a later date. Regarding snow removal, there is enough real estate in the development where the snow could be placed, it just needs to be discussed in greater detail.

Mr. Koleski asked if there has been any additional consideration of bringing more stone into the east elevation of Building one.

Mr. Ponto stated there are three separate area, and the architecture responds differently in each of those area. We are reluctant to use stone like is being done at the street side of Building one because this is not the same condition. The intention is to be purposeful of how the interior portion of the building responds to the materials.

Mr. Domaszek asked if there are numbers available for the existing impervious surface percentage on the property compared to what is being proposed.

Mr. Ponto stated he can provide that information, just not at this time.

Mr. Ponto also noted that the back side of Building One has not been fully rendered out to date and there will be more detail to come.

Mr. Olson commented that Building Three has come a long way from the original submittal, however there is no stone element represented on the back façade at this point.

Mr. Aiello stated that has been intentionally done as the development is implementing the residential technique of placing the more expensive materials on the front facing facades.

Mr. Thedford noted the proposed landscaping and trees will soften much of the detail on the backside of Building Three that is being discussed.

Mr. Koleski stated that some of the existing trees on the proposed single family lots may be damaged or removed during single-family home construction.

Mr. Falsetti asked how important is the proposed number of single-family lots on Red Barn Lane, of eleven total lots?

Mr. Aiello stated that originally, there were 17 side-by-side townhomes and total of 3 single-family lots. The compromise has been made for a total of 22 single-family lots off Red Barn lane and Green Meadow Place.

Mr. Matola requested for a rendered view of the end of Building Two facing the east side of Notre Dame Hall. It will be helpful for people to understand what the development will look like from this view.

Mr. Olson suggested this is a convenient point to adjourn for the evening.

7. Other Business

None

8. Adjournment

Mr. Kowalski motioned to adjourn and Mr. Thedford seconded. Motion carried 8-0.
Meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane Walters
Administrative Assistant