

**CITY OF NEW BERLIN
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
November 22, 2006
MINUTES**

The Architectural Review Sub-Committee of the Plan Commission was called to order by Mr. Sisson at 1:32 P.M.

In attendance were Mr. Felda and Mr. Sisson. Also present were Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development; Nikki Jones, Planning Services Manager and Anthony Kim, Associate Planner. Mr. Barnes has resigned.

Approval of October 26, 2006 minutes deferred to the next scheduled meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

1. (5)NJ U-26-04 New Berlin City Center – Building D – 15180 W. Library Ln. – Awning Color Modification Request.

Mr. Steve Gartman and Mr. Steve Stewart were present to represent the project.

Ms. Jones said the applicants are proposing to use black as an awning color on Buildings C and D. Building B has a seafoam green color awning. The Architecture Review Committee specifically said that the all the awnings shall be same color, which was the seafoam green. Black does seem to work well and was a preferred color if the awning color were ever to be changed. Mr. Kessler has asked if the City Center logo could be added to the awnings. Mr. Gartman said that could be easily accomplished on the non-tenant ones. It would be up to the tenant to add that logo on their awning.

Mr. Felda questioned how fade resistant the black awnings would be. It's a difficult color to keep looking good over the years. Mr. Sisson said the black looks classy. It matches the lamps. Mr. Gartman said the new stain resistant fabrics are designed to be washed down to keep dust, film and grit off. The normal life span of an awning is five or ten years.

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the black color awnings. Seconded by Mr. Sisson. Motion carried unanimously.

2. (5)NJ U-49-05 New Berlin City Center – Building C – 15100 W. Library Ln. – Awning Color Modification Request.

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the black color awnings. Seconded by Mr. Sisson. Motion carried unanimously.

3. (5)AB CU-8-06 Pump Station No. 5 Filter Building Addition – 3900 S. Moorland Rd. – Building Addition.

Mr. Kim introduced the project and then turned it over to Rick Johnson for further clarification and to answer questions. Mr. Johnson explained that the whole building will be taken down and rebricked and there will be an underground tank in front of it.

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the project as proposed. Seconded by Mr. Sisson. Motion carried unanimously.

4. (7)JS U-75-06 Jeff Zaremba – 17001 W. Observatory Rd. – Single-Family Home With Detached Garage.

Ms. Jones explained that the applicant is turning their existing attached garage into a living room and wishes to have a detached garage. The new garage will match their existing home

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the detached garage as proposed. Seconded by Mr. Sisson. Motion carried unanimously.

5. (5)AB U-76-06 Hickory Hills – 14602 W. Beloit Rd. – Subdivision Entrance.

Mr. Kim said Hickory Hills is proposing a monument sign at the entrance of the subdivision on Beloit Road. The color and material is here for discussion.

The Architectural Review Committee requested the applicant submit a colored drawing and material samples. A sign similar to what is proposed at Poplar Creek would be desirable. The Committee was opposed to stick on letters. Stone or wood would be permitted.

Motion by Mr. Sisson to approve the monument sign per the above discussion. Seconded by Mr. Felda. Motion carried unanimously.

6. (3)AB U-74-06 ABB – 16250 W. Glendale Dr. – Three Dock Doors.

Harl Forston, Luterbach Construction Co. was present representing the project. He explained that the existing doors are inset into the building to the left and the three new doors will be flush with the face of the building. Now there will be three shipping and three receiving docks on that side of the building. Green space requirements are being worked out with City Engineering staff.

Mr. Kim said that staff had no problems with this project as long as building materials match what is presently there

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the architecture of this project. Seconded by Mr. Sisson. Motion carried unanimously.

7. ()NJ PG-830 City Center Design Guidelines.

Steve Stewart, Developer; Steve Gartman, Architect; and Mark Smith, PDI were present to discuss current issues with the City Center Design Guidelines.

In January potential revisions will be formally discussed at Plan Commission. At that time Mark Smith will be giving a presentation.

Mark Smith went over how the City Center Design Guidelines originated . It's intention is to guide the developers and the reviewers and the Plan Commission on some of the important issues such as street activation, landscaping, light fixtures, benches, and other things that help the City Center feel right that might otherwise have been neglected. Developing the City Center Guidelines will put all of these things that are agreed upon into one spot for easy reference.

Also of importance is building flexibility into the overall design process while preserving the desired results.

Streetscape issues may still need some discussion, such as terraces along the areas in front of the parking areas where we put in the stamped asphalt, however, there is no vegetation. We have talked about the idea of adding planters, or perhaps a few street trees where they fit. These are suggestions about how the other side of Library Lane could get developed and some of the other street areas.

Mr. Kessler discussed some of the original ideas of what the City Center was envisioned to look like from the power point presented at the August 8, 2000 Council Meeting. He showed a picture of what he said a lot of people have in their minds as the magical picture of the City Center. All of us need to talk about why this was not achievable then and why it isn't achievable today. We can get there to some extent with material types, plaza areas, brick inlays, stamped asphalt, stamped crosswalks, etc. That is why we did these Design Guidelines, to further refine the original set of plans and the PUD based upon lessons learned and mistakes made and where we want to go to get toward this.

Mr. Gartman gave his perspective on why we are not achieving what is expected. It was discussed having a 20,000 sq. ft. maximum and further on in the program it switched to a much more boutique type situation. Losing the acreage to the snakes made a significant difference.

Many of the people that come in for retail will pay only so much. The type of thing we are doing is becoming popular but is still in it's infancy, in the world of development. When dealing with regional or national firms and real estate agencies, many have their own design requirements.

This center was never contemplated to be a lifestyle type of center like Bayshore has evolved into and what is happening in Oconomowoc. The roadways compartmentalize the site to such a great extent that you do not have the flexibility to do some of the things that Mr. Kessler is talking about.

It was never looked at as a project as a whole. It was always looked at in different components, residential here, commercial here, library, here, etc. The whole topography of the site was not taken into account as to how it is meant to function and what brings tenants in for commercial. We lost probably a half dozen national tenants that would have put this area on the map but they said they didn't have access. Their traffic has to draw from a larger area than City Center. It is not enough to sustain that type of business drawing off of National Avenue. It was not cohesively put together in the very beginning. In the first phase there were six or seven very small buildings ranging from 3,000 to 5,000 sq. ft. each. The marketplace could not absorb that kind of cost per sq. ft. and get the Mom and Pop tenants. What pays the freight are the national guys that know what kind of market they are drawing from, know the income levels and the volume that they will have to do to sustain these kind of rents. The neighborhood dry cleaner or Mom or Pop card shop or café cannot sustain the quality architecture because they cannot pay for it.

The original architecture for the buildings and spaces were designed around tenants that walked away from the deal. Now there is a big block of space that is carved out into smaller areas leaving awkward spaces.

Mr. Stewart said that the site is great and can be a great development. It won't be what was envisioned in the beginning for various reasons, but in order to be a really great site, we have to continue on and be somewhat flexible in our guidelines. We have to be prepared to think a little bit like the retailers think because they drive the situation and seem to have a lot of places to go if they want to and it is their decision. We have to make them want to be there and provide the things they want.

We need to get that road going back around. The whole area was originally set up as a vehicular traffic system site. The key to that site was coming out to Moorland Road. There are 850 residences down by the post office that stub into that. I get calls from the retailers asking about it because they are counting on that road. That is a critical part to market these spaces.

Mr. Gartman said if you are looking at creating a denser, more cohesive development, you have to have a large block of space to create the environment that Mr. Kessler is speaking about. If you do it piece meal, you will again have small developments. Right now you are relying on the library as the draw. You need a big box, right now you have no anchor.

You need to find ways to adapt the architecture to the pallet and do other things to make the tenants work at a location. Every time you put restraints on a space, you start eliminating potential users. What Bayshore did was to create internal space. You may not have the access or pedestrian friendly nature of National Avenue because of the speed of the traffic and size of the street. What Bayshore did was put in some internal circulation.

Mr. Kessler spoke about the parking concept being a critical part also. Mr. Gartman. If you get some of these anchors, maybe there will be an opportunity to put in a parking structure that centralizes parking and create architecture and aesthetics with that as well. Much of that was precluded from the original design because the lifestyle center at that point was first getting it's feet wet. Now it has caught up to Wisconsin. Mr. Kessler said in terms of parking situations, we need to look at the mixed use concept.

Mr. Smith said we need to get an early jump on things early in the process. When you get a building proposal, lets sit down around the table with everybody and try to get the issues worked out using the guidelines. We are part of each others team.

Mr. Kessler said that if there are no questions or comments on these guidelines and it is the recommendation of this committee, we will forward this to Plan Commission.

Mr. Sisson said what we are looking for is to have the most thorough set of design standards. I have marked my copy up with draft corrections.

Mr. Gartman said that some of the landscape materials can be added also. Just so everyone understands that the next revision may include some additional things.

Motion by Mr. Sisson to endorse the draft copy of the City Center Design Guidelines with minor modifications. Seconded by Mr. Felda. Motion carried unanimously.

8. (7)NJ SG-56-06 Sanctuary at Poplar Creek – 3300 S. Calhoun Rd. – Entrance Sign.

Ms. Jones presented a picture of the proposed entrance sign and its location. It is to be done in brick. There will be two concrete pillars and a small gate that will angle off. It will be externally illuminated. The Committee was opposed to stick on letters.

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the sign at the Sanctuary at Poplar Creek. Seconded by Mr. Sisson. Motion carried unanimously.

9. (3)NJ U-71-06 Belfar Property Restoration – 16303 W. Lincoln Ave. – Dock Doors.

Ms. Jones said the applicant is proposing to add two new dock doors. They are using the same white paint for the doors and have agreed to use a gray paint to touch up areas along the back wall that have chipped and flaked off. It might be a consideration to request the whole elevation be painted, rather than just their area to avoid the fresh and clean look next to the old and drab look. The Committee felt this could be avoided. The final results can be evaluated for any dramatic contrasts, with staff making the ultimate decision.

Motion by Mr. Sisson to approve the dock doors as requested and refer the aesthetics to staff. Seconded by Mr. Felda. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURN

Motion by Mr. Sisson to adjourn the Architectural Review Meeting at 2:40 P.M. Seconded by Mr. Felda. Motion carried unanimously.