

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

Tuesday, October 1st, 2019

Meeting was called to order at 5:31 by Chairman Olson

1. Roll Call.

Present: Chairman Olson, Mr. Liechty, Mr. Matola, Mr. Collins, Mr. Schoenecker, Ms. Steindorf, and Mr. Koleski.

Absent: Mr. Domaszek and Mr. Janusz

Also present: Mr. Harrigan, Ms. Vlach, and applicants.

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated September 17, 2019.

Mr. Matola motioned and Mr. Schoenecker seconded to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried 7-0

Item 3. Review and act on a request by Richard and Molly Berens, 13450 Brook Avenue, for approval of two front entrance monument piers.

Mr. Harrigan said that he spoke with Dr. Berens who said that he plans to proceed with the design as previously submitted; Dr. Berens feels that the piers do compliment the home and wants the Building Board to proceed with an action; Dr. Berens respectfully denied the offer of a subcommittee.

Mr. Matola pointed out how the monument pier materials are inconsistent with the material of the house or something that faces the street and that the Berens' monument piers submission continues to not change in design.

Discussion followed about the next steps if the Building Board voted to deny the application.

Mr. Olson said that he did not mind the location of the piers, just the look of the piers.

Mr. Liechty added that the scale of the monument pier materials does not match the house; the white beige of the monument piers is inconsistent with the white of the house as is the red tone of the brick.

Mr. Matola motioned to deny the application. Mr. Koleski seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Item 4. Review and act on a request by Christian Walters, 1300 Victoria Circle South, for a new Yard Maintenance Building (shed).

Christian Walters was present before the board.

Mr. Walters stated that he was very keen to have an aesthetically pleasing accessory to his house and has worked hard to achieve that goal.

Mr. Liechty confirmed the height and width of all windows.

Mr. Olson asked if the roof will be metal and if it will match the house's roof.

Mr. Walters stated that the metal roof color of the shed will be as close as possible to the shingle color of the house.

Mr. Koleski asked if the shed will be constructed on a concrete pad.

Mr. Walters confirmed that the shed will be on a concrete pad and added that the home does not exceed its allowed permeable area for the lot.

Mr. Schoenecker asked about the material used for the side of the shed.

Mr. Walters said that the material is cut to look like tongue and groove.

Mr. Liechty asked for clarification on the landscaping plan.

Mr. Walters stated that he hadn't committed yet to the size of the trees; said he imagined something about half the height of the building but definitely not gallon trees.

Discussion followed about the light that would reach the side of the garage and how that may impact the ability of plantings to grow.

Mr. Walters suggested that the landscape plan be amended to just indicate that an evergreen species would be planted on the east side of the shed.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned to accept the plans as submitted. Ms. Steindorf seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Item 5. Review and act on a request by John and Julie Bonfilio, 1655 Shady Lane, for a revised new home plan set.

Discussion occurred regarding what the difference(s) between what was previously submitted and what was currently submitted.

Mr. Harrigan noted the change on the right elevation, second story, to include a third window when previously there had been two.

Discussion occurred about the windows matching the other windows.

Mr. Matola stated that he thinks that the addition of the third window fills the space in better.

Mr. Schoenecker motioned to accept the plans as submitted. Mr. Matola seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Item 6. Review and act on a request by, Daniel Butz and Megan Troy, 1005 San Jose Drive, for a home addition.

Rob Miller and Lisa Krusick were present before the board.

Mr. Koleski asked if an engineering report was conducted.

Mr. Harrigan stated that there was not an engineering report but that the board can request one.

Mr. Liechty questioned on whether the short wall extension is being considered as an addition.

Mr. Matola stated that roofs have to appear to touch otherwise long walls leading to a complete second structure would be possible as they would be considered additions.

Mr. Liechty stated that the proposed addition seemed more like a large accessory structure.

Mr. Koleski asked what the common wall was.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if the area open to yard in View B was some sort of attachment.

Mr. Matola stated that fascia was behind the area open to yard in View B.

Mr. Liechty asked again if this was an addition. Stated that additions typically require a roof connecting the two structures; referenced garage additions with regard to how roofs are required to connect.

Mr. Harrigan asked if this would be classified as a common wall. He then showed the ordinance on the screen for permitted accessory uses within the Rs-1 Single-Family Residential District.

Mr. Matola stated that everything else visually about the proposal looked really nice.

Mr. Koleski stated he wanted to understand the material choices.

Mr. Liechty noted that the house was cream city brick but the addition was primarily stone

Discussion occurred regarding the approval of larger sized structures but only on a case-by-case basis and depending on the lot size.

Mr. Matola stated that the roof lines appear to visually tie in and match but was curious if the stone will match.

Mr. Liechty stated that the change of material, from brick to stone, would be in the same plane.

Mr. Olson noted that the board had done one of these in a different yard that was limited to a 10 foot height.

Mr. Matola stated that the case to which Mr. Olson was referring to involved an accessory structured and, unless they could classify the proposal as an addition, the same could not be applied. Asked if the transition to the house would make it an addition.

Mr. Miller stated that the addition will match the color scheme of the cream city bricks used on the home and stated that the owner thought that, if the addition was also made out of cream city bricks, there would be too much brick; noted that some cream city brick was used throughout addition as an accent.

Ms. Steindorf stated that she would like to see something in the addition that would tie it more closely to the home from the street view.

Ms. Krusick stated that the cap of the chimney is cream city brick.

Mr. Matola stated the base of the pillars would be stone.

Mr. Miller said that they wanted something to compliment the brick and were trying to tie the old to the new.

Mr. Matola stated that the bigger issue is if the proposal classified as an addition; asked if there are height restrictions on a garage.

Mr. Harrigan stated that the staff were trying to take the approach that the proposal was an addition; stated that if the application changed to be an accessory structure, the property would need to address the fact that it already has a pool shed and the proposal would be a second accessory structure.

Mr. Liechty asked if there was a way to put a small roof over the pool heater and filter area to connect the roof of the proposed addition to the roof of the house.

Ms. Krusick asked if the roof needs to connect physically or visibly.

Mr. Liechty responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Krusick stated that a covering over the walkway, of the stairs going down, could be possible if the stairs were considered part of the house.

Mr. Matola stated that the roofs do not have to be touching but have to appear as such; if the roof lines tie in, it would make the addition seem more cohesive.

Ms. Krusick stated that the alcove for the outdoor storage is the window to the home's master bedroom; would rather shift the structure over so the grill is connecting to the corner.

Mr. Matola stated that the shift won't bring the addition that much closer to the spa; then the proposed addition would look more like an addition.

Mr. Liechty asked if the structure should be shifted or just extended.

Ms. Krusick stated that the property is exactly at their 30% for permeable surface and therefore they cannot extend the addition; Kyle from seasonal landscaping has discussed taking out a path and putting in permeable pavers.

Mr. Harrigan clarified that the property could go through a conditional use permit, which would require plan commission review, so the property could go up to 33% for their impervious surface.

Ms. Krusick stated that they would prefer to add the 3 feet to avoid a pinch point between the pool and the column.

Mr. Miller asked for clarification on if the proposal will need to have an extension.

Mr. Olson asked for clarification on if the columns have stone bases as that the drawing show columns with stone bases but the renderings do not.

Ms. Krusick stated that the floor plans call out all of the columns which have stone bases.

Mr. Olson asked how high the stone will go up the columns.

Ms. Krusick stated that the stone would go 36 inches up the column.

Mr. Olson asked if some of the pillars would not have stone.

Ms. Krusick stated that homeowners thought that, without the stone, the pillars were too plain; all of the stone on the front pillars go 24 inches up the column and the stone on the back wall is higher.

Mr. Liechty asked if the seat wall would need to be lower because of the grade and what was going to be done with the runoff from the roof.

Ms. Krusick stated that they will be burying the gutters and discharging to the south.

Mr. Liechty stated that water is currently sitting on the property and that the amount of water sitting on the property is likely to get worse.

Ms. Steindorf stated that she felt there was a disconnect between the brick house and the stone addition.

Mr. Olson agreed that the stone and the brick are so distinct; brick and stone together don't look good.

Mr. Matola asked if the fireplace could be a different material; does the seat wall material need to be brick?

Mr. Olson suggested to make one element different from the house material but then to match all else.

Mr. Harrigan stated that the staff was comfortable with the common wall.

Mr. Olson stated that, if it was a common wall, then it should also be brick.

Mr. Matola discussed the need to maintain symmetry; voiced concern with setting precedent.

Mr. Olson stated that in order for the proposed addition to be classified as an addition, it would need to have a common wall and roof.

Mr. Matola stated that he would want the rooflines to overlap, not just touch on a corner; asked if the roof can be tied in.

Mr. Koleski stated that he wants the 30% impervious surface confirmed and is requesting an engineering review be completed.

Mr. Matola asked if the stone pool deck would be expanding.

Ms. Krusick stated that it will end at the new structure.

Mr. Liechty asked the applicant if he would want the board to table the request.

Mr. Miller stated that he wanted to know exactly what the board would want to see changed.

Mr. Koleski asked if this application had come before the building board before; the feedback the applicant was receiving was feedback he had not heard before.

Mr. Olson stated that they could form a subcommittee.

Mr. Matola agreed saying that the subcommittee could even look at it on site.

Mr. Miller was agreeable to that proposal and requested that the application be tabled.

Mr. Liechty motioned to table the application per the applicant's request, Mr. Schoenecker seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Item 7. Review and act on a request by Rob Miller, 1185 Highland Drive, for a new home

Rob Miller and Lisa Krusick were present.

Mr. Schoenecker asked if the house currently faces the other street.

Mr. Miller confirmed that the proposed home would face the other street.

Mr. Olson asked what the thought process was with regard to the neighborhood aesthetics.

Mr. Miller stated that the goal of the home was to be both modern and traditional.

Mr. Olson stated that the scale of the front rendering seemed awkward and had a concern for why windows were on the front elevation but not on the rear; stated that the house looked like Swiss cheese; stated that he felt like the garage looked like a lean-to; stated that the home doesn't appear to be traditional for what is found in Elm Grove; noted that the left elevation that faces highland drive does not fit the style found in the neighborhood.

Mr. Miller noted that the house on Victoria Circle was being used as reference.

Mr. Olson explained how the house on Victoria Circle was very thought out and that he did not feel that the proposed home had the same richness that the house on Victoria Circle has; Stated that the proposed home felt like a conglomeration of a variety of the homeowners' favorite things that failed to become a cohesive home.

Mr. Miller stated that he felt the home had cohesiveness due to the consistency in stucco, the black and grey color palette; stated he does not want to make houses that look like Swiss cheese.

Mr. Olson asked if this level of feedback and discussion would be more appropriate for a subcommittee rather than Building Board.

Discussion followed on the height of the front door; door will go to the top of the windows.

Ms. Steindorf noted that she preferred the 9 foot door to give the doorway more presence. Mr. Miller asked that the application be tabled.

Mr. Liechty motioned to table the application per the request of the applicant. Mr. Schoenecker seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

8. Other business

None

9. Adjournment

Mr. Matola motioned to adjourn and Mr. Schoenecker seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:51 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gina Vlach
Administrative Intern