

**CITY OF NEW BERLIN
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
June 28, 2006
MINUTES**

The Architectural Review Sub-Committee of the Plan Commission was called to order by Mr. Barnes at 1:35 P.M.

In attendance were Doug Barnes and Lee Sisson. Also present were Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development; Nikki Jones, Planning Services Manager and Amy Bennett, Associate Planner. Mr. Felda is excused.

Motion by Mr. Sisson to approve the minutes of May 25, 2006. Seconded by Mr. Barnes. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

1. (3) AB U-38-06 W. S. Machine & Tool – 2500 S. 162 St. – Job Shop Providing Machining and Grinding Services.

Three dock doors and an entrance are proposed to be added on the East side of the building. The Architectural Review Committee felt the proposed changes complimented the building and met the architectural approval of the Committee.

2. (7) AB U-37-06 Dr. Tab Products, LLC – 17100 W. Ryerson Rd. – Formulate, Blend, and Package a Variety of Environmentally Friendly Liquid Cleaners.

Mr. Dick Snodgrass was present representing this project. He explained that the previous owners were not in need of the docks and now they are planned to be returned to service. Paint will be consistent with the rest of the building. These plans met the architectural approval of the Committee.

3. (4) NJ U-36-06 Peace Lutheran Church – 17651 W. Small Rd. – Install a New Entry Door.

A new entry door is planned to be added in place of two windows in conjunction with some internal modifications. The Architectural Review Committee felt the plans met their architectural approval.

4. (4) NJ U-28-06 Living Word Church – 21400 W. National Ave. – New Church.

David Meyer, Tony Meyer and Bill Matthews, representatives for the project showed elevations and explained the building materials and colors to be used. They also indicated the location of the building on the site plan and gave insight as to future expansion plans.

Some concern was expressed from the Committee members that the main roofs intersect at the center, but it was concluded that the pitch was correct. Mr. Barnes commented that he felt the steeple looks cape cod, while the rest of the building looks ranch and prairie style.

Committee members asked the applicants to resubmit any new or different plans brought along today when all plan revisions were re-submitted. The applicants submitted a letter requesting the project to be tabled until the August 14, 2006 Plan Commission Meeting.

5. (7) NJ U-32-06 J. W. Winco – 17301 W. Cleveland Ave. – Building Addition.

Ms. Jones introduced the project and said there has been positive comments on the architecture at Plan Commission. The Architectural Review Committee felt it is consistent with materials and meets the guidelines of the zoning code.

6. (3) TK U-30-06 X Mark LLC – 16100 Overland Dr. – Building Addition.

Ms. Jones explained that this project will be on the Community Development Authority Agenda on July 6, 2006. The request consists of an approximately 20,000 sq. ft. building addition, as well as removing some parking and adding green space and creating a better storm water plan on the site. A loading dock will be added in the rear. The brick will be similar as to what is there. Mr. Barnes felt there was a long section of elevation and wondered if it exceeded the stipulation as to how far an elevation can go before some type of relief is needed. Ms. Jones said she would check into that. Other than the possible problem with the long elevation, the Committee felt the plan met their expectations.

7. (5) NJ U-26-04 New Berlin City Center Bldg. D – 15180 W. Library Ln. – Retail Stores.

See item #8.

8. (5) NJ U-49-05 New Berlin City Center – Bldg. C – 15100 W. Library Ln. – Retail Building.

Item #7 & 8 were discussed together.

Ms. Jones said today we are looking at revised plans for Buildings D and C. Comparison will be made between the old plans and the revised plans and comments from staff and Planning Design Institute will be discussed.

Mr. Kessler had some concern with the type of block used for the retaining wall to the east. He did not feel the appropriate plant material has been chosen for around the foundation area and planters without further information.

Mr. Barnes said the planters are concrete block as opposed to the Renaissance Stone that is the base of the building, therefore they seem to be in conflict with each other. The representative for the project said the planters are out of the same material as the patio area to the east. It is the same as the block at the library, except it is a running pattern rather than a random pattern. The block by the dumpster toward National Avenue is the same also. Mr. Barnes asked if the material and color of the block are the same as at the library? The project's representative said the block is similar in texture and probably the same material but in a different color and pattern. Mr. Barnes said the easiest thing would be to visit the site to actually see the brick.

Canopies were recommended by PDI (Planning and Design Institute). The project's representative said that PDI recommended lowering some of the canopies over the door along the store front. Instead of seeing glass above the door, the canopy can be put in the middle of the glass over the door to create a shelter over the door.

Mr. Barnes said lights are above the canopies on the east, west and partial north elevations, and lights are on the piers on the south elevation. Mr. Barnes commented on the inconsistencies of the lights on different elevations. Ms. Jones said the lights should not be in the way of signage. Ms. Bennett did not favor lights over the canopies.

The representative for the project said the decorative features of the fixtures will be hidden if the lights are under the canopies. He said originally the comments were to have the lights above the awnings to make a decorative statement. Using this logic, we are going against how it was originally designed. Mr. Sisson said lighting above the canopies doesn't look bad, but has no functional value.

Mr. Kessler said he liked how the lights come down and have functional value on the South elevation. Mr. Barnes favored having the entire north elevation with lights above the canopies. The representative of the project said if you are in the courtyard between the buildings, you need to look at the context of the courtyard and you will see how the buildings match. If you go on a different side of Bldgs. C & D, there is a different context. You won't be able to relate the difference in the façades because you can't see them all at once. The street concept vs. the courtyard concept will not be a problem.

Mr. Kessler asked the Committee if they would accept lights that were decorative, not functional. Mr. Barnes said the least source of complaints is the position of the lights.

Mr. Barnes said there needs to be a significant difference at the ends of the buildings. The height needs variation. The representative of the project said it is not economical to completely redesign the building. Rooftop elevations were compared to the elevation of National Avenue to calculate visible rooftop units.

Mr. Kessler said those who have originally invested in the City Center Design Planning Process have a vision and from what I have heard from those individuals, that vision is not coming forth. We need to make sure that we work hard to keep the standards in mind.

Colored concrete mix rather than stain was preferred by the Architectural Review Committee. This was an original condition from Bldg. B.

Mr. Barnes then summarized comments and concerns for Bldg. C – landscaping, south tower, lighting is Ok as shown, railing detail, planters on plaza, raise building ends to provide relief, cornice on top, base material along building. A revised letter of credit needs to be submitted swapping the stained concrete for the poured colored concrete. The representative of the project suggested the colored concrete be isolated to sitting areas and patios where people are spending time.

Discussion continued concerning Building D. The Committee felt the corner of Michelle Wittmer Drive and Library Lane looks nice. A suggestion was made as soon as you turn the corner, raising the roof up without giving a tower effect, but rather the illusion of depth. A single door that was shown on the elevation was confirmed. Entry points need dressing up. Whatever treatment is being done on the other building on the matching book entrance, should be done here. Additional lighting is needed on the South elevation using perhaps a wall sconce on either side of the door. The building code should be consulted for lighting requirements.

Going back to the awning covering the glass of the window, a change was decided to lower the window so none of it would be above the canopy, which would also make more room for signage. Applicant to submit samples of canvas awnings. Each building will be typical in color, however the awnings can be different colors as approved by Dept. of Community Development staff.

Revised plans should be submitted and staff will determine if this project needs to return to the Architectural Review Committee.

ADJOURN

Motion by Mr. Sisson to adjourn the Architectural Review Meeting at 3:45 P.M.
Seconded by Mr. Barnes. Motion carried unanimously.

