

**CITY OF NEW BERLIN
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES
March 1, 2010**

The Architectural Review Sub-committee Meeting was called to order at 5:04 P.M.

In attendance were Mr. Sisson, Ms. Groeschel, and Mr. Felda. Also present was Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development; Nikki Jones, Planning Services Manager; Amy Bennett, Associate Planner, and Jessica Titel, Associate Planner.

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the February 1, 2010 Architectural Review Minutes. Seconded by Ms. Groeschel. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

1. (2)JT U-11-08 Lee's Cleveland Pub & Grill – 14000 W. Cleveland Ave. – Roof-Top Screening. Architectural Review Tabled 2-1-10.

Motion by Mr. Felda to remove this item from the table. Seconded by Mr. Kessler. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Titel displayed additional pictures of the roof top units that she has taken since the last Architectural Review meeting when this item was tabled. Those pictures show the roof top units that existed before the new construction are not screened.

The Zoning Code says all roof top mechanicals need to be screened, however when the previous business occupied the building it may not have been in the Code or screening just didn't happen. Ms. Titel said anything new we look to be screened which has been done. Committee members agreed that the applicant has made the investment to install the presently proposed new roof top screening, and to go back now to add more would involve much more to keep the building symmetrical.

Motion by Mr. Felda to approve the proposed roof top screening for Lee's Cleveland Pub & Grill located at 14000 W. Cleveland Avenue. Seconded by Ms. Groeschel. Motion carried unanimously.

2. (4)AB UA-10-07 Westridge East Building A – 5800 S. Moorland Rd. – Amendment to Original Use Approval – Revised Building Size.

Ms. Bennett explained this project will be returning to Plan Commission with a proposed amendment to the building size. The proposal is to increase the size of the multi-tenant office and industrial warehouse Building "A" of Westridge East from 106,102 square feet to 126,556 square feet.

Motion by Ms. Groeschel to approve the revised building size requested for Westridge East Building A located at 5800 S. Moorland Road. Seconded by Mr. Felda. Motion carried unanimously.

3. (5)NJ UA-10-03 New Berlin II – MSP Real Estate – 14901 Library Ln. – Conceptual Plan Review for an Apartment Project.

Mr. Schroeder, a representative from Knothe & Bruce Architects reported on the proposed architecture for the work force housing.

Mr. Sisson questioned where the parking will be for the work force housing. Mr. Schroeder indicated the parking lots will be in the back combined with parallel parking on the street and underground parking. It may not be possible to parallel park on the east side of the street because of issues with the wetlands. Ms. Groeschel questioned how this would affect the ratio of parking if the street parking was not available.

Mr. Sisson asked if the architecture is four-sided. Mr. Schroeder said the back elevations will be the same as the front. It is a little different in the center of the building, but the main wings are identical from side to side.

Mr. Kessler showed pictures of buildings he toured in Madison and asked if the town home, two story building would be similar to these? Mr. Schroeder indicated the pictures were more like the three story as far as the individual entries. The amount of brick is comparable, but the coloring is different. Mr. Sisson said the window placements and the walk-up entry ways are beginning to look like what we at first envisioned for the City Center.

The ratio of hardy plank to brick was discussed. The PUD specifies pretty much all brick. Some variation has been allowed with the ratio of brick. Ms. Groeschel favored the different types of materials.

Ms. Jones commented that the trellises and awnings added nice touches. She advised that the window sizes stay consistent.

Jerry Bourquin from Dimension IV was present to report on the architecture of the senior building. One of the big concerns with the senior building is that it should respect the street. There is now uniformity on the streetscape with a focal point for the entrance on the corner with a covered drop-off. Parking access is in the back of the building. The scale of the building is broken down by breaking up the materials used. There are parts of the building that pop out, so as you are driving down the street they will get the exposure. The bay window projected in the central area is one of those. The areas that get a lot of visibility need to get strong exposure. Two levels of brick are used for the base, a split stone and then bring masonry up. We also do two different colors of siding. On top we use a layered siding with a thinner 3-4" band. Once we get down past the top story, a wider siding is used in a different color. We try to break up the building horizontally as well as vertically. Stone headers and sills detail the windows. Every unit has an outside deck. Railings will be aluminum. Siding is all hardy plank. There is no mechanical equipments on the roof. In each of the elements for the air conditioning units there is a grill to match the siding. Mr. Bourquin said they are open to talk about other ways to activate the street.

The idea of having the work force and senior buildings reversed was discussed. The location of a possible future grocery store is the reason for the placement of the senior building. Library Lane is a more active street than Deer Creek which dictates the entries of the buildings. The topography slopes off to the south and generally the tallest building is on the highest elevation and the lowest building on the lowest elevation. A grading plan would be needed. Ms. Groeschel commented on the railings. Functionally they are needed, but they have a back of the building look from the road.

Ms. Jones commented that as the applicant further develops plans and makes a complete Use, Site & Architecture Application an exact location of the buildings, decks, patios, etc. will be established.

Mr. Klein felt that they were very close on the site plan.

Mr. Kessler said that architecturally we seem to be coming along very nicely, however there is no way to tell about how close we are with the site plan. I see something on a plan sheet that appears to reflect what we talked about, but will make no representations until we see a full submittal application.

Ms. Jones would like to require either using the applicant's Developer's Deposit to have PDI gather information from both architects and supply their input or the applicant can provide their own 3-D drive-thru model of the buildings to be included in the submittal of the formal application.

This is for conceptual review only, no formal recommendation was made by the Committee.

Motion by Mr. Kessler to adjourn the Architectural Meeting at 5:50 P.M. Seconded by Ms. Groeschel. Motion carried unanimously.