

BOARD OF APPEALS

April 1, 2004

The meeting was called to order at New Berlin City Hall, at 7:00 PM.

On roll call, Chairman McGrath, Messrs. Galke, Klappa, Loohauis, and Wallner. Also present was Inspection Services Manager Robert Sigrist.

Chairman McGrath reviewed the procedures for taking testimony for the pending petitions with the persons assembled for the meeting, noting, that if your case was approved, a building permit is required and it can be picked up at the Building Inspection Department. Mr. McGrath also noted that it takes 4 affirmative votes to approve any variance request.

The first petition called was that of Mark Schickowski, Case No. 2469. Mr. McGrath read the petition. It was noted that 20 addresses were notified by mail and that publication had been made on two occasions. Mr. Schickowski of 13395 W Wilbur Drive came forward to speak in favor of the petition. Mr. Schickowski stated that if the stairwell is built to code there will be very little head room for any body over 6 foot tall coming down into the proposed rec room. The height would be 6 foot, 1 inch from the top of the landing to the header, which, to Mr. Schickowski, is more of a safety concern then the landing itself. The house was built in 1977 and they are the fourth owners who moved in last June. Mr. Schickowski stated a City inspector previously inspected the house but nothing was ever said at that time which would have solved the case prior to June when they purchased the house.

At this point Mr. McGrath asked for clarification of why they were discussing headroom when he thought the variance request was for the landing. Mr. Sigrist replied that there would be a headroom issue if you were to take the stairs and actually push them back toward the head of the stairs in order to accomplish a deeper platform at the bottom of the stairs. You could go toward the treads and move the whole stairwell back but in doing so you end up creating a headroom problem. The header of the first floor would end up being closer to the actual path of travel. Hence the practical solution to solving the 30 versus 36 inch landing would be to create a headroom problem. Additionally there is no other practical solution that doesn't create a headroom problem without tearing the framework of first floor apart.

Mr. Klappa asked about putting a winding stair on the landing, and Mr. Loohauis asked if enough room could be gained by rebuilding the stair treads to change the rise and drop. Discussion followed and it was determined that neither one of those options would work.

There was no one further to speak in favor of the petition, and there was no one to speak in opposition to the petition. Case No. 2469 was declared closed.

Mr. McGrath declared the evidentiary portion of the meeting completed, and the Board made the following decisions.

The first petition considered by the Board was that of Mark Schickowski, Case No. 2469. Mr. Loohauis made a motion to approve the petition and, Mr. Wallner seconded the motion. The petition for a variance was approved by four to one vote, with Mr. Galke voting no.

There being no further matters to be discussed in front of the Board of Appeals, the said meeting was adjourned at 7:15 PM.

BOARD OF APPEALS
CITY OF NEW BERLIN

Brian McGrath, Chairman