

**CITY OF NEW BERLIN
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
October 26, 2006
MINUTES**

The Architectural Review Sub-Committee of the Plan Commission was called to order by Mr. Barnes at 9:00 A.M.

In attendance were Mr. Barnes and Mr. Sisson. Also present were Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development; Mark Blum, City Attorney; Nikki Jones, Planning Services Manager; Amy Bennett, Associate Planner, and Anthony Kim, Associate Planner. Mr. Felda was excused.

Motion by Mr. Sisson to approve the September 20, 2006 Architectural Review minutes. Seconded by Mr. Barnes. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

1. (7)TK U-71-05 Crestview Commercial – 16850 W. Observatory Rd. – Commercial Building.

Mr. Kim said the changes recommended at a previous Architectural Review Meeting were to incorporate lighting with the canopy and change the copper roofs to an alternative option. The change to the roofs has been made, but we are still looking for canopy details from the applicant.

The Committee felt the elimination of the copper roofs was acceptable. Applicant needs to confirm if they intend to use full brick or brick veneer sheets.

Motion by Mr. Sisson to forward these comments to the Plan Commission. Seconded by Mr. Barnes. Motion carried unanimously.

2. (2)TK U-21-04 National Regency III – 13750 W. National Ave. - Senior Building– Modification to Original Plans.

Mr. Kim explained that these plans are for an addition to the existing building on the National Regency site. They intend to use the same building materials, colors, and architectural scheme as the existing buildings.

Mr. Barnes warned that when doing phased construction, the brick may have a slight variation even though it may be called out as the same color. To verify that the brick matches, a mock up panel is recommended.

3. (2)AB U-8-06 Sunny Slope Retail – 3333 S. Sunny Slope Rd. – New Retail Building.

Mr. Bradley Knab from Landscape Architects was present representing this project. Natural cedar siding and cultured stone will be used.

The variation of door treatments above the doors and the pitch of the roof were discussed, but were determined to be satisfactory.

The Committee agreed that the architectural look of the building was acceptable, but asked that material and color samples be submitted for all building materials to be used including stained wood, rolex, aggregate material, coping, and stone.

4. (3)AB CU-5-06 Pump Station #3 Filter Building Addition – 16100 Rogers Dr. – Building Addition.

Ms. Bennett showed pictures of the existing building. The materials of the addition will match the existing building. The applicant plans to ask the Plan Commission for a waiver since they do not plan to add windows to the addition for safety concerns.

Mr. Barnes said the existing building has glass block windows and it would seem that glass block windows on the addition would satisfy safety concerns.

Mr. Gregory Bolin from Ruckert & Mielke, representative for the project explained that the plan is to re-brick the entire structure except for the North side. The completed building will have the recessed relief minus any openings. Mr. Barnes said with that explanation, no windows would be needed.

5. (3)TK U-73-06 Storage Master II – 2601 S. Moorland Rd. – After-the-Fact Sign Architectural Enhancement.

The after-the-fact sign is architecturally acceptable. However, only two signs are allowed per the Zoning Code. The Architectural Review Committee recommends that the self storage sign be removed if this sign/architectural enhancement is to stay.

6. (7)TK U-72-06 Wendy Demler/Dennis Clough – 4300 S. Rose Ct. – 24' x 24' Detached Garage.

Mr. Kim explained the applicant is requesting a detached garage which will architecturally match the two-family condominiums on the property. The garage will have the same style brick and cedar siding. The garage door will match the existing garage.

The Committee recommended architectural approval of this project.

7. (7)AB CU-6-06 Pump Station No. 7 – 16450 W. National Ave. – Building Addition.

Ms. Bennett explained that this is a separate building, not an addition. It is a free standing building.

Mr. Gregory Bolin from Ruckert & Mielke explained that the building will be all masonry, and again as in Pump Station #3 discussed above, we are not proposing any windows. There will be face brick with architectural block relief patterns.

The Architectural Review Committee requested a revised colored elevation to be kept on file to accurately reflect the colors being used.

8. (7)NJ U-65-06 Sts. Constantine & Helen Greek Orthodox Church – 17955 W. Cleveland Ave. – New Church.

Constantine Pappas, Architect for the project; John Demetropoulos, Parish Council President of the Church; Peter Agnos, Vice President of the Church; Tim Lovitt, Schober, Schober & Mitchell were present to represent the project.

Mr. Barnes questioned what the walls involved in future phasing would be built with initially. Mr. Pappas gave a presentation using the drawings and plans to indicate that the first phase will be left as a finished building. A material pallet was presented. The scale of the massing is broken down with pin striping. A copper roof is planned.

Mr. Barnes asked if the copper will have some type of coating that will keep it the copper color? Mr. Pappas said no coating would be used. Mr. Barnes agreed that if the coating is not used on a continued basis, it gets a very uneven look.

Mr. Pappas continued to explain that the pin striping used in the church will continue into the community center and articulate some of the lighter colors around the window. Mr. Barnes asked if the squares and rectangles on the recreation center were brick in the color shown? Mr. Pappas said it will either be brick or perhaps glass block. Mr. Barnes agreed that would be a great way to tie in the other buildings since the pin striping might get very busy and monotonous and the emphasis of the church would be lost.

Ms. Jones asked what the specific glass color would be? Mr. Pappas said they were thinking of light green with champagne colored frames which is a very close match to the brick.

The Architectural Review Committee agreed that incorporating the glass would look nice. They requested the applicant submit a glass sample.

Ms. Jones asked if the applicant had any further information to offer about the height of the bell tower and the dome. We have a 45' height limit and there is an exemption for the domes and bell towers.

Mr. Pappas said a head-on elevation will make it look high, however, with the proportion of the size of the church, your eye will make it look the appropriate height relative to the footprint. Mr. Barnes said in the type of architecture they are representing, the height of the dome is appropriate, high but not overly done.

Mr. Sisson asked if the bell tower would actually house a bell. Mr. Pappas said it would. Mr. Sisson asked if any of the mechanics on the roof top would be in view. Mr. Pappas explained that they would all be hidden.

Mr. Kessler had concerns with the South elevation. There is at least a 100' building mass. Mr. Pappas said even though it looks flat, it is not. The floor plans will show you that the buildings are not flat. They are not on the same plane. Mr. Barnes asked if some of the brick or glass block squares could be added along that wall for visual interest. Mr. Kessler commented that the dumpster enclosure on the South elevation is built into the wall, therefore, should match the surrounding wall.

With these comments, the Architectural Review Committee felt this will be a very beautiful building.

Motion by Mr. Sisson to adjourn the Architectural Review meeting at 10:15 A.M. Seconded by Mr. Barnes. Motion carried unanimously.