

PROPOSAL FOR NEW HOUSE AT 2381 NORTH TERRACE AVENUE

DESIGN MEETING AUGUST 19, 2019

PER MOTION MADE AT HPC MEETING OF JULY 8, 2019

Meeting Attendees:

Chris Kloth cmk@themklaw.com

Nairn Olker nolker@kaa-arch.com

Jason Korb [jkorbb@kaa-arch.com](mailto:jkorb@kaa-arch.com)

Tim Gokhman tim@newlandmke.com

Marion Clendenen-Acosta mclendenen-acosta@kahlerslater.com

Ann Pieper Eisenbrown ann@pieperproperties.com

Carlen Hatala carlen.hatala@milwaukee.gov

Tim Askin taskin@milwaukee.gov

Jason Korb—summarized changes made to the prior submission, mentioned correct lot size and that they would need to go to BOZA for some dimensional matters. There was a brief discussion about fencing.

He presented a power point with the following versions of the design:

Version 1—flat roof, solid mass at center—skylight—open above entry area, first draft of proposal eventually shown to HPC in July

Version 2—experiment with hip roofs

Version 2b—hip roof—fireplace—piers

Version 3—“farmhouse” combined with modern—solid at left—glass at right

Version 4— staff saw this at earlier meeting, peaked/gabled roofs, floors plans same as Version 5, has tall vertical chimney, glass see-through hyphen between two wings, cantilever grounded with wall

Version 4b—peaked/gabled roofs, different materials and colors

Version 5—similar to prior submittal to HPC—low profile, brick texture changed to avoid big blank wall

Discussion followed

Commissioners/staff thought Version 4 was best solution, best scale and form for district

Applicants' Comments

Applicants explained their preference for Version 5, enhancements of design shown at July 8, 2019 HPC meeting. Rationale for the design included using hospital buildings/parking ramp to inform design, viewing their proposal as a transition from the hospital/ramp to the residential historic district. Design cues were not taken literally from the hospital/ramp. Choice was to ignore hospital/ramp or ignore houses. Work on design of floor plan began before the property was added to the historic district back on September 15, 2018. Original concept was to have more traditional house at north lot closest to the existing historic house, become more contemporary in the two lots to the south. Questioned why the new house at 2131 North Terrace (Robert Schmidt House) was approved when in their opinion it did not meet all guidelines. Feel they are being asked to supply more context drawings than 2131 North Terrace submittal had to. Future homeowner of this proposal did not like Version 4 but preferred the clean lines of Version 5. Thought Version 4 too suburban, like Elm Grove. Did not like exterior of Version 4. Disputed that context of the historic district included views of both sides of Terrace Avenue. Thought the guidelines were too vague. Thought guidelines open to opinion. Questioned if there could be exceptions to the criteria. Thought they were getting too many multiple directions. Questioned compatible vs. compliant. Questioned portions of the guidelines.

Commissioners Comments

Commissioner comments included preference for gabled/pitched roof Version 4 of designs shown. It speaks to the neighborhood. Don't need to bring hospital/ramp closer to the historic houses through the flat roof Version 5. Do not need a transition to the district; the new house will be in the district. Look at context. Hospital is not the context, the historic district is. Version 5 negates the historic district. Houses across street are in the historic district and part of context. The commission will look at modern designs and determine if they meet criteria. The HPC did review 2131 North Terrace and found it compatible with the district. The applicants need to make the case that their submittal meets guidelines. Massing and pitched roof are important, buildings in district have solid mass. Direction on design should come from this committee not from one on one meetings with other HPC members. No issue with materials. Touched on precedent for future new construction. HPC staff would not support Version 5. Questioned validity of "porte cochere" or overhang of second story and its relocation elsewhere. Emphasized that form and mass of Version 5 do not meet criteria. As mentioned in the July HPC meeting, the building needs to read steeper (vertical) as do the houses in the district. Design still reads horizontally.

Jason Korb Summary

Thought they met suggestions from July HPC meeting.

- Siting—covered, per code, now have berm, living space at front, garage at rear
- Proposed house now taller—by 3-4 feet by raising ceiling heights and setting on concrete base. Basement added. [Note: basement was shown in plans submitted for July HPC meeting] Somewhat taller than house directly across street [2380 N. Terrace built 1949] Beefed up planting beds.
- Added ABA rhythm to façade by adding narrow vertical windows flanked by wider ‘picture windows’
- Verticality—added vertical windows at front
- Added concrete base —so now has base, middle and top
- Materials—traditional brick and wood, changed brick pattern

Change—addition of solar arrays on rooftop not shown before at HPC meeting, added August 19, 2019 per future owner’s request

Narrow house down—can’t make house narrower since zoning requires houses be a certain width

Combining July submittal with a pitched roof does not work visually

Commissioners' Summary

- Pitched roof house better meets character of the historic district
- Form [shape] needs to be compatible with other houses in historic district
- Massing needs to be compatible with other houses in historic district
- The buildings within the district inform the design of the house not the hospital / ramp behind and outside the historic district
- Fencing can be possible if it meets design criteria, standard city permitting requirements and the conditions of the open space buffer easement.
- July submittal and modifications still too squat
- The HPC will review the next submission and also hear what the community has to say.

If applicant continues with modifications to the original submission then:

- Garage cannot have flat metal doors. Metal doors need some form of fenestration and panels
- Rooftop solar arrays need to be screened or relocated —taller parapet most likely way to achieve this or relocation to roof of garage
- Cantilevered second story needs some form of support, possible masonry wall or relocate above garage
- Materials of wood and brick are ok
- Fenestration needs to be consistent with placement of windows in historic district
- Consider combining flat roof design with pitched roof
- Consider adding horizontal banding from Version 5 to Version 4 [pitched roof version].

Applicant needs to make case for their submittal by citing how design meets each of the criteria. Guidelines below.

A. Guidelines for New Construction North Point North Historic District

There has been very little new construction in North Point North. Only twelve buildings have been constructed since 1940. These were small apartment buildings, rowhouses or single-family residences. Only five original residences had to be demolished to accommodate these structures. It is important that additional new construction be designed so as to harmonize with the character of the district.

1. Siting

New construction must reflect the traditional siting of buildings in North Point North. This includes setback, spacing between buildings, the orientation of openings to the street and neighboring structures, and the relationship between the main building and accessory buildings.

2. Scale

Overall building height and bulk; the expression of major building divisions including foundation, body and roof; and, individual building components such as porches, overhangs and fenestration must be compatible with the surrounding structures.

3. Form

The massing of new construction must be compatible with the surrounding buildings. The profiles of roofs and building elements that project and recede from the main block must express the same continuity established by the historic structures.

4. Materials

The building materials that are visible from the public right-of-way should be consistent with the colors, textures, proportions, and combinations of cladding materials traditionally used in North Point North. The physical composition of the materials may be different from that of the historic materials, but the same appearance should be maintained.