



Village of River Hills
7650 N Pheasant Ln
River Hills, WI 53217

Village Hall: 352-8213
Public Works: 352-0080
Police: 247-2302

BUILDING BOARD MINUTES

Wednesday, May 27, 2020 @ 5:00 pm

This meeting was a virtual meeting through GoToMeeting – Meeting code 558-037-557

Members present: Tony Enea (chairman), Victor Harding, Steve Simon, Susan Muggli, Walt Nielsen, Ray Juehring, Simon Bundy, Harvey Meisel, and Chris Meisel. Also present: Building Inspector Tod Doebler, Village Manager Tammy LaBorde and Village Deputy Clerk Stephanie Waala.

1. Discussion/action on the replacement and installations of the items listed below at the Indian Hill School, 1101 W. Brown Deer Rd

- a. Replacement & installation of exterior light fixtures**
- b. Construction of boardwalk**
- c. Landscaping plan**
- d. Teardown and reconstruction of the monument sign**
- e. Replacement of windows**
- f. Replacement of doors**
- g. Installation of mechanical screening**

Robin Savola of EUA presented

Item a – Lighting – the current proposal for the light fixtures currently meet the village ordinance. Clarification was made on what light fixtures are existing and what will be replaced. The new light fixtures will be on timers so that they are not on all night. Concerned that as previous suggested the light poles to be shorter that then there would need to be more light fixtures and dark spots on the site.

Chairman Enea asks for clarification on bleed over to adjacent properties.

- Architect Robin Savola draws attention to the site plan photometric plan where it shows 0.0 on all borders of the property except by the boardwalk and driveway.
- School representative Mike Weaver expresses his concern about additional cost additional lights may be.

Item b – Boardwalk – currently there is a chain-link fence running along the eastside of the property. There would be a gate and boardwalk installed to bridge a swale. They have received approval from DOT to use a gate to access their parking lot during emergencies at the school in order to get further away from the building.

Board member Simon ask for clarification on the material of the posts and the finish.

- Page C202 was referenced where it shows the post were made of stainless steel with a galvanized finish.

Item c – Landscaping – the main landscaping is being used to screen a generator on the west side of the building. The other two areas would only be grass seeding to replace disturbed soil when the boardwalk and light fixtures are installed.

Board member Nielsen expressed concern that there is nothing to mask the dumpster.

- Architect Robin Savola stated that was not part of the project.
- School representative Mike Weaver informs the board that this project is not part of the referendum budget, but they are looking to relocate the dumpster with the shed in the future.

Item d – Teardown/Reconstruct Monument Sign – Sign to be located in same location. Metal cream background with medium bronze writing and posts of metal in medium bronze metal or composite wood – no lighting for the sign.

Item e & f – Window and door replacements. All windows to be replaced one for one. Proposing medium bronze anodized window, double pane. Front entrance door and other doors will be medium bronze anodized frames, other doors will be fiberglass doors in taupe.

Board member H Meisel now available to give comments on **Item a** lighting.

- The current poles in the parking lot are 20’ in height, some with three fixtures and others with four fixtures. He recommends poles should not exceed 15’ in height. Fixtures mounted change to increase lumene output.

Board member Bundy asks for clarification on all the new fixates are 5,000 calvin and does that match with the old fixtures.

- Architect Robin Savola clarifies that all fixtures will be replaced so there will not be any mismatching of output.

Item g – Mechanical screening – roof top mechanical screen with vertical panels in cream color – putty. It covers the front and sides of the rooftop unit. Air conditioning is being added to the school. Just adding screening for new unit.

Board member Simon asks for clarification on height of the screening.

- Architect Robin Savola informs the board the screening will come up about a foot off the top of the air conditioner unit.

Motions

Item A – Replacement & Installation of Exterior Light Fixtures –

Motion by Simon and seconded by Harding to approve as submitted with a change in the light poles from 20’ to 15’. Motion carried unanimously.

School District Board Representative Chris Soyke would like clarification on why the lighting was changed and all the additional work that would need to be done for a resubmittal so he can inform the school board.

- Board member C Meisel replies that the saved cost of shorter poles will make up for the cost of redesign, lower lights will hep to control the light distribution, help the lights seem less industrial and warm, and a better look of the short building to a tall pole.
- Board member Muggli reminds the board the village ordinance allows a 20’ tall light fixture.

The original motion and second were rescinded.

Motion by Simon and seconded by Harding to amend the prior motion to approve as submitted; motion carried unanimously.

Materials and further information that was included in the packet that was approved

- WDGE1 LED architectural wall sconce – color dark bronze
- WDGE2 LED architectural wall sconce – color dark bronze
- Blade wall mount mullion LED – color dark bronze
- Lithonia Lighting steel pole with RSX2 LED Area Luminaire fixtures on top – color dark bronze
- CNY LED canopy/ceiling luminaire – color dark bronze
- D Series size 1 LED flood luminaire – color dark bronze
- KBR8 LED specification bollard – color dark bronze
- Light poles 18' high on a 2' concrete base

Item B – Construction of Boardwalk-

Motion by Simon and seconded by Juehring to approve as submitted with the posts in a milled aluminum finish; motion carried unanimously.

Materials and further information that was included in the packet that was approved

- 6 foot high by 8 foot wide double gate chain link fence
- Wickcraft boardwalk HDPE planks on walk and top of railing – color mink
- 8 - 3/8" round cable runs

Item C – Landscaping plan-

Motion by Harding and seconded by Juehring to approve as submitted; motion carried with one nay (Nielsen).

Materials and further information that was included in the packet that was approved

- 9 Red twig dogwood 3' tall that will grow to 8'tall

Item D – Teardown and Reconstruction of the Monument Sign-

Motion by Simon and seconded by Harding to approve as submitted with the stipulation that the posts are a bronze metal to match the windows; motion carried unanimously.

Materials and further information that was included in the packet that was approved

- Double sided 6 square foot metal sign – color cream
 - o Raised medium lettering – color bronze
- Steel post on each side – color medium bronze

Item E & F – Replacement of Windows and Doors-Combined

Motion by Simon and seconded by Juehring to approve as submitted; motion carried unanimously.

Materials and further information that was included in the packet that was approved

- Kawneer Thermal windows – color medium bronze
- Special-Lite FRP/Aluminum hybrid door with glass insert – color dark gray
- Special-Lite Pebble Grain FRP SpecLite 3 solid door – color dark gray

Item G – Installation of Mechanical Screening-

Motion by Harding and seconded by C. Meisel to approve as submitted; motion carried unanimously.

- Materials and further information that was included in the packet that was approved
- Envisor innovative rooftop screens in the vertical pattern with louvers – color putty

2. Discussion/action on the construction of a chicken coop and garden fencing at the Knafllic residence, 7815 N. River Rd.

Homeowner Randy Knafllic presented

- Has made changes to the design of the chicken coop. A large white tent was used in the proposed location to show visibility from River Rd. The reasoning behind the proposal of the blue contemporary look of the chicken coop was to model surrounding properties in the area. Prefers approval of color scheme #1 blue, but has provided an alternative.

Chairman Enea ask for clarification that the resubmittal is for the same proposed location.

- Homeowner Knafllic replies yes
 - o Chairman Enea states the Building Board will address the aesthetics and the Board of Appeals will address the location.

Chairman Enea informs the board that the normal process of approval of an item if there is a setback issue the first step would be an appeal to the board of appeals and then approval from the building board. The reason this item is not being done this way is because if the aesthetics of the cook is approved today and the homeowner wishes to appeal then they can do the setback and color appeal at the same time.

Landscaping Contractor Peter Kudlata questions there are other buildings in the village the same color so is unsure as to why there is such a hold up on the color.

- Chairman Enea replies that some members are opposed to the color and the style. Asks for clarification from the village on if a property owner were to repaint a chicken coop would they need to get a permit.
 - o Deputy Clerk Waala responds that according to the permit application if a change of more then 10% of the structures look is being altered then yes, they would need a permit and need approval from the building board.

Board member Steve Simon expresses his concern that the chicken coop is a contemporary building on a traditional historic estate and the architectural elements don't work together.

- Landscaping contractor Peter Kudlata disagrees with these comments and feels the shed is what a traditional chicken coup would look like. They are not trying to match the house.
- Homeowner Randy Knafllic informs the board that when designing the coop they took into consideration that the village prefers to see like materials on all structures on the property and that is why they matched the style of the windows and the roofing materials.
 - o Board members Simon replies that his approach to design is rooted in tradition or historic nature and this coop has more of a traditional vibe.

Board member C Meisel questions if the coop would be viewable from the road alongside the garage.

- Landscape contractor Peter Kudlata informs the board that yes you would be able to see it from the road.
- Homeowner Randy Knafllic references a photo in the presentation where a tent is placed in the proposed location showing the visibility of the possible coop from the road.

Landscaping contractor Peter Kudlata informs the board that last year 14' spruce trees were planted to block the Kimmel's view of the chicken coop.

Chairman Enea reminds the board that last month the board approved the construction of a new home that were not the same styles. Hopes the board can be consistent when it comes to whether or not all buildings should match or if they can be different styles.

Board member Muggli asks on the new proposal have windows been added to the back and sides.

- Landscape contractor Peter Kudlata replies that no new windows have been added the new proposal has added beams to pick up on the tudor style that is on the home.

Board member Harding has no objection to the coop because he feels no one will be able to see it.

Board member C Meisel doesn't see the relevance of the matching of color to a property 2 miles down the road. Feels the coop should match the home to blend it in with the rest of the property. In reference to a neighbor who has built a detached garage where the style did not match the house the garage was setback into the woods so it was not visible.

Board member Juehring understands the argument that you may not be able to see it from the road but is concerned because some of his neighbors had ash trees that died and now you can see all of their property. Is and is not opposed to the proposal either way.

Board member Nielsen feels the procedure of the approval of this project is relevant and doesn't think aesthetics should control vicinity. Does not agree with the notion that if you can't see it we should care. Agrees with board member Simon on the notion about architecture and feels that may not been an issue if a color scheme were consistent with the current home.

Board member Bundy approves of the concept of different colors and it is a personal preference of the homeowner.

Board member H Meisel agrees with board member Juehring's comments about when trees are removed then structures are visible.

- Homeowner Randy Knafllic does not feel removal of trees would make the coop any more or less visible.

Motion by Harding and seconded by Bundy to approve as submitted with the color scheme to match the house or the blue as presented and the owner would determine which color. Motion failed 4 aye (Enea, Harding, Juehring, Bundy) and 5 nay (C. Meisel, Simon, Muggli, H. Meisel, Nielsen) Board member C. Meisel stated that the denial of the motion is due to the color choices and that it doesn't connect the chicken coop with the color of the main property and detached garage. After the vote board member Muggli decided she no longer had an issue with the color and wished to change her vote. It was determined that a change could not be done and that a second motion would need to be made to make the votes official.

Motion by C. Meisel and seconded by Bundy to approve chicken coop with Color Scheme #2. Motion carried with 7 aye (Enea, Harding, C. Meisel, Muggli, H. Meisel, Bundy) and 2 nay (Simon, Nielsen).

Motion by Harding and seconded by Muggli to approve the chicken coop with Color Scheme #1 blue. Motion failed with 4 aye (Enea, Harding, Muggli, Bundy) and 5 nay (Simon, C. Meisel, H. Meisel, Juehring, Nielsen).

3. Comments on items not listed on the agenda

None

4. Adjourn

Motion by Juehring and seconded by Harding to adjourn meeting at 7:14 p.m.; motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by Stephanie Waala, Deputy Clerk, on June 5, 2020.