

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

Thursday, April 8th, 2021

Meeting was called to order at 5:35 PM by Chairman Olson.

1. Roll Call.

Present in person: Chairman Olson, Mr. Koleski, Mr. Janusz, and Mr. Falsetti.

Present via Video Conference: Mr. Roge, Mr. Domaszek, Mr. Thedford

Absent: Mr. Matola, Ms. Steindorf

Also present: Mr. Harrigan, and applicants

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated 03/16/2021.

Mr. Koleski motioned and Mr. Falsetti seconded to approve the March 16th, 2021 minutes as amended. Motion carried 7-0.

3. Review and act on a request by Sarah and Steve Miracle, 14250 Creekwood Court, for a modification to a previously approved new home.

Sarah Miracle was present before the Board.

Chairman Olson stated that he likes the proposed new colors for the home, as the colors will not stand out as the previously approved bright white.

Mr. Koleski motioned to approve the proposed change in colors for the new home. Mr. Falsetti seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

4. Review and act on a request by Mark and Julie Nilsen, 1725 Notre Dame Blvd, for a new shed.

Julia Nilsen was present before the Board.

Mrs. Nilsen stated the proposed shed will be the same color as the home and the shed's roof will match the home.

Chairman Olson asked if the shed will be located in a 45 degree position to the lot lines.

Mrs. Nilsen confirmed.

Mr. Koleski asked if there will be power brought to the shed.

Mrs. Nilsen stated there will be no power in the shed.

Mr. Koleski asked what landscaping exists in the rear of the property.

Mrs. Nilsen stated there are multiple trees and bushes in the location where the shed will be placed.

Chairman Olson asked if the image of the shed is an exact depiction of how the shed will look.

Mrs. Nilsen stated the single door with the windows will face the house, and the double doors will be on the side. If the doors are interchangeable, the preference would be to have the double doors on the north side of the shed.

Mr. Koleski asked if the trim will match the home.

Mrs. Nilsen confirmed.

Mr. Thedford asked of the shutters will match the home.

Mrs. Nilsen confirmed.

Mr. Thedford motioned to approve the shed as submitted. Mr. Koleski seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

5. Review and act on a request by Jesse Niederbaumer, Owner Operator of Vantage Financial located at 13230 Watertown Plank Road, for a building addition.

Jesse Niederbaumer, of Vantage Financial, and Brad Kropp, of PDI Architecture, were present before the Board.

Mr. Kropp explained the proposed garage addition on the rear of the building will allow for more commercial tenant storage space. The proposed materials will match the other materials on the building (after renovation).

Mr. Koleski asked if there will be any brick on the proposed garage addition, or if it would be hardy plank siding.

Mr. Kropp all three sides of the addition would have hardy plank siding in a cedar color.

Mr. Koleski asked if the garage addition would be visible from Watertown Plank Road.

Mr. Kropp stated it would not.

Mr. Koleski stated the proposed garage addition resembles an appendage which sticks out from the rest of the building.

Mr. Olson stated the new garage addition should belong with the rest of the new building. Right now, it appears to be an afterthought. More sensitivity needs to be taken to make it appear that it belongs. On a relatively small building, we have three roof styles that look nothing like each other. Perhaps this element on the back needs to do something that brings in the same aesthetic from the front of the building. Currently, nothing ties the addition to the other parts of the building, other than the hardy plank siding.

Mr. Kropp commented that perhaps a wainscoting could help in this regard.

Mr. Olson suggested the applicant consider requesting a sub-committee of the Building Board convene to discuss this item in greater detail.

Mr. Niederbaumer requested the item be tabled and a sub-committee of the Building Board convene to discuss this item in greater detail.

Mr. Koleski motioned to table the item at the applicant's request. Mr. Roge seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

6. Review and act on a request by John DenBoer, 825 Lone Tree Rd, for a building addition.

Rob Mohr, general contractor, was present before the Board.

Mr. Domaszek asked Mr. Mohr if he constructed the proposed building addition which was done without a Building Permit.

Mr. Mohr stated that he did not construct the building addition, and he has been hired by Mr. DenBoer to rectify the situation.

Mr. Roge commented that the existing addition is unsightly.

Mr. Domaszek noted the wire material used in the construction appears to have a chain link quality to it.

Mr. Mohr noted the siding on the north side of the structure matches the home.

Chairman Olson asked why the structure does not have a straight top, or roofline.

Mr. Mohr again stated that he did not construct the structure, and therefore cannot comment as to why it was built in this manner. Mr. Mohr is aware the structure meets the code for the national organization on falconry.

Mr. Koleski asked how the structure relates to the home.

Mr. Mohr noted it has the same cedar shake on the north elevation.

Mr. Roge suggested the applicant start over.

Mr. Mohr agreed that may be the best pathway forward. Mr. Mohr asked the Board if there are any suggestions for the next iteration of the plan.

Mr. Domaszek asked if the structure is located on top of a concrete slab.

Mr. Mohr stated the structure is not on a slab and is positioned next to the garage.

Chairman Olson agreed with Mr. Roge that the structure is unsightly.

Mr. Thedford stated the application materials need to present documents that are architectural in nature. Structural plans, elevations and proposed materials with an explanation as to how the structure relates to the home.

Chairman Olson opined that based on the materials submitted, this item will need to start over with the application process and return to the Board at a future date.

Mr. Falsetti motioned to deny the building addition application based on the findings the structure is architecturally unsightly, does not compliment the architectural style of the existing home, detracts from the neighborhood and as-built, the structure is non-conforming with the side yard setback requirement of the Rs-1 single-family residential zoning district. Mr. Janusz seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

7. Review and act on a request by Terence and Ann Welch, 725 Park Lane, for a new home.

Ann & Terence Welch, property owners, Lisa Pellegrini and Jim Marriott, of Miller Marriott homes were present before the Board.

Architectural Review

Chairman Olson stated that it would be helpful to have physical samples of the proposed materials in person for review.

Ms. Pellegrini stated physical samples could be brought back to the Board at a later date for consideration.

Mr. Marriott provided an overview of the proposed architecture and layout of the home.

Mr. Koleski asked what is taking place on the front elevation. Specifically, above the front doorway at the roof line.

Mr. Marriott explained the windows on the second floor are stepped back, and there are asphalt singles on the overhang above the front entrance.

Chairman Olson stated this front entrance has a very similar look to the new home Miller Marriott just constructed on Watertown Plank Road.

Mr. Koleski asked about the proposed window color.

Ms. Pellegrini stated the windows would be white in a simulated divided lights style with window mullions on top.

Chairman Olson noted the proposed garage door is the one that is shown on the materials sheet, not on the rendering of the home.

Ms. Pellegrini stated that is correct.

Chairman Olson stated that he prefers the garage doors on the renderings rather than the cross-bow style proposed because it complements some of the panels on the staircase.

Ms. Pellegrini stated there are finishes on the interior of the home that complement the garage doors, in an attempt to “bring the outside in”.

Mr. Falsetti asked what is taking place with the electrical plan inside the kitchen.

Mr. Marriott explained the plan set the Board has received contains an anomaly produced by the drawing program. This has nothing to do with the electrical plan in the kitchen.

Mr. Thedford asked if the door leading to the pool area on the rear elevation is simply a "flat" door as shown.

Ms. Pellegrini stated this can be made into a panel door.

Chairman Olson asked if selections have been made for the exterior light fixtures on the home.

Ms. Pellegrini stated those selections have not yet been made.

Chairman Olson asked if the windows and the trim will be white.

Ms. Pellegrini confirmed.

Chairman Olson asked if the siding of the home will be a cedar finish.

Ms. Pellegrini stated the color is a white birch, meant to bring out the natural beauty of the cedar. This will require maintenance over time to preserve the color.

Mr. Thedford motioned to approve the architectural plan as submitted, contingent upon the applicant presenting physical samples of the proposed materials at a future meeting for approval. Mr. Domaszek seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Civil Site Plan/Grading Plan

Chairman Olson noted the proposed first floor elevation is shown at 815.77 feet.

Chairman Olson asked if the driveway will be asphalt or concrete.

Mrs. Welch stated it will be concrete.

Mr. Janusz asked if the intention is to direct stormwater to the ditch line at Park Lane. As the property owner of the home immediately to the North, Mr. Janusz noted the existing grading of the property in question collects stormwater and pools it on the northern property boundary beginning in May of every year.

Mr. Marriott stated the intention is to direct stormwater to the ditch line at Park Lane by utilizing swales on the western and eastern side yards.

Chairman Olson suggested it would make more sense to relocate the sump pump to the eastern side of the home, and have it discharge into the proposed swale on the eastern side yard. This would be a more direct pathway for sump pump discharge to make it to the ditch at the street.

Mr. Koleski motioned to approve the civil site plan as submitted with notation the sump pump will be relocated to the eastern side of the home and discharge into the swale in the eastern side yard. Mr. Janusz seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Landscaping Plan

Mr. Koleski asked if the property owners have reviewed the letter submitted to the Building Board from the property owner to the south of the subject property.

Mr. Welch stated they have received the letter and asked why that property owners does not plant screening on their property if they are concerned about privacy.

Chairman Olson noted that Mr. Welch has applied for approval of the new home, the Board will start with review of the proposed Landscaping plan first.

Mr. Welch stated he would be open to planting additional arborvitae screening on the southern property boundary if needed.

Chairman Olson stated if they would be open to planting additional screening on the southern property boundary which is similar to what is being proposed on the eastern property boundary, that would be preferred.

Mr. Koleski asked if there will be any gates in the pool fence for access into the rear yard of the property.

Mrs. Welch stated there would be no gates.

Mr. Thedford noted that if there are no gates, the pool maintenance person would need to access the pool through the home.

Mr. Welch stated they would have gates in the fence.

Mr. Koleski motioned to approve the landscaping plan with the notation additional arborvitae plantings will be located along the southern property boundary. Mr. Falsetti seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

8. Continued review, discussion on the redevelopment proposal for the School Sisters of Notre Dame Campus, 13105 Watertown Plank Road.

Chairman Olson stated the goal for this discussion is provide additional feedback to the Mandel Group and Enberg Anderson related to the materials that were presented at the March 16th, 2021 Building Board meeting.

Mr. Koleski stated there was discussion related to the backside of Building One and Two. What is going to be done with the porches and how do they blend into the overall structure. Also, not being able to see the size of the proposed stone in comparison to the existing stone on Maria Hall is a challenge to understand visually. Is there an opportunity to scale the stone to demonstrate what will be done on site?

Mr. Koleski noted a rendering of nighttime conditions was discussed. Specifically, how will the development appear in the evening with the internal outdoor lighting illuminated?

Mr. Thedford noted that the landscaping plan has not been discussed at length. Greater focus will need to be given in order to determine how the landscaping plan engages with the site plan.

Mr. Falsetti noted there are overhead utility lines on Watertown Plank Road, will these be buried as part of the development?

Chairman Olson commented there needs to be a discussion on how snow removal will operate, where will it go? This needs to be addressed from a functional standpoint.

Mr. Thedford stated a discussion needs to be had as it related to the memorialization of the School Sisters. Will this be taking place as elements of the landscaping plan?

Mr. Koleski stated that public comment should be taken at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Harrigan noted that a public comment session is being planned for an upcoming Plan Commission meeting. All Building Board members will be encouraged to participate in this listening session and advanced notice will be provided once the date and time has been set.

Chairman Olson opined there have been improvements to the architectural plans, specifically where stone has been incorporated at the corner elements of the front building façade on Watertown Plank Road (Building One). Prior to this improvement, the white siding was very stark and dominant. From this perspective, it is a major improvement.

Mr. Thedford noted the scale of the lap siding is absolutely appropriate for a development of this size. Also, the proposed stone has a warm tone which compliments the existing stone on Maria Hall.

Chairman Olson questioned if the use of stone on the interior elevations of Building One and Two should be made at the base of the buildings, and if so, how high up does the stone rise?

Mr. Thedford cautioned, if the use of stone becomes too heavy, it will lose its special quality and use within the development. It should be approached as a material that ties all the elevations of the buildings together in a special way.

Mr. Falsetti noted the approach of Building Two, heading westbound on Watertown Plank Road deserves additional study.

Chairman Olson commented the new single family homes proposed on the single-family lots need to be unique and high quality.

Mr. Thedford stated the board needs to begin addressing the topic of screening and the solidarity of the landscaping as it bridges into the building as you approach from the east to the west.

Mr. Koleski opined that he feels it would be appropriate for the Building Board to schedule special meetings as needed as a development proposal of this scale deserves individual review and investment of time.

Mr. Thedford suggested the public comment session not be scheduled until all four elevations of the proposed new buildings can be reviewed and comment provided by the Board.

Mr. Thedford also stated it would be helpful to have new renderings of the proposed building from new vantage points.

Mr. Thedford noted, if there are any improvements proposed for Notre Dame and Maria Hall, it would be beneficial for the Board to begin reviewing those proposed modifications.

9. Other Business

None

10. Adjournment

Mr. Falsetti motioned to adjourn and Mr. Thedford seconded. Motion carried 7-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Harrigan
Zoning and Planning Administrator/
Assistant to the Village Manager