



MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
August 13, 2025 – 7:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Glendale was held on Wednesday, August 13, 2025. Chairman Fernhoff presided and called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Members Absent

Jon Emert
Chairman Fernhoff
Mike Moran
Reed Voorhees
Laura Switzer
Brad Weitekamp

John Falk

Also present were Frank Johnson, City Administrator; Gabby Macaluso, Community Engagement Officer; Allie Sievers, City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Voorhees moved to approve the minutes from the July 9, 2025 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Switzer and unanimously carried.

**REVIEW OF PLANS FOR
NEW HOME – Tom & Merilee
Curran, 725 E. Essex Ave.**

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 725 E. Essex Ave. and invited the applicant to present the project.

Lauren Strutman, the project’s architect, led the presentation of the proposed new home. Ms. Strutman was joined by two stormwater specialists and the homeowners, Tom and Merilee Curran.

Drainage

Mr. Weitekamp expressed concerns regarding the lot coverage with a large home that is right under the maximum floor area ratio of .30 (FAR measures .2997), a pool, and limited green space. Although the plans call for use of permeable pavers instead of traditional pavement, Mr. Weitekamp expressed concern and questioned if permeable pavers should be treated the same as grass in terms of absorption and impact. He confirmed the FAR calculation with the applicant and City Administrator Frank Johnson. Mr. Johnson clarified that the current ARB guidelines provide discretion to the ARB about treating permeable pavers.

Mr. Weitekamp asked the applicant to extend permeable pavers past the southeast corner of the house.

Mr. Emert asked the applicant if they have a particular product in mind for the permeable pavers. The applicant said no.

The ARB confirmed that the existing pergola would be removed.

The ARB discussed the retaining wall located in the back of the property and how the area will drain. They expressed concern that water would become trapped between the garage and the wall unless there's an area inlet/drain added. They also had concerns about the scale of the wall and the height of the fence.

Mr. Voorhees noted that he would like to see how the wall will look before approving it, including finishing material information.

Mr. Moran noted that landscaping maintenance would be easier if there was a wider strip of land between the wall and the fence.

Landscaping

Mr. Weitekamp thinks the proposed plan is nice. He noted that there is one landmark tree, a Shingle Oak, between the two properties. The property owner said he discussed the tree with their neighbor, and the neighbor would like the tree to be removed now.

Ms. Switzer noted that the condensing units for the HVAC system are not on the plans. She stated that the applicant should figure out where they should be located and then add them to the plans.

To address the scale of the wall, Mr. Weitekamp asked the applicant to consider the impact on the property's topography if the pool area was sunken down. Ms. Strutman noted that the homeowners are building this as their retirement home and are trying to minimize the number of steps on the property. They would not be in favor of sinking the pool and adding more steps.

Architectural

Mr. Emert noted that the home is well designed, but he's struggling with the neighboring homes and elevations. He notes that the neighbor to the left has a backyard patio that is approximately 10 feet from the new house. He explained that this is a scale exercise, not just appearance and wants to see more streetscape plans/renderings.

Mr. Voorhees noted that he likes the look of the house, but he also thinks it's important to look at the elevation of the new home relative to the neighboring homes. He also requested a street elevation.

Mr. Moran said he is not worried about the home's massing because the homes next to it are large.

Ms. Switzer confirmed with the applicant that the garage will not be conditioned space.

Mr. Emert expressed concerns about the house’s gable being so close to the neighbor’s patio on the west side (701 E. Essex). The neighbors living at 701 E. Essex, Todd Thrasher and Carla Erickson, also expressed concerns regarding this gable and stormwater run off from the property during construction flooding their home.

Mr. Moran asked if an erosion control plan could be required. The ARB were supportive of this requirement.

Mr. Weitekamp asked if the retaining wall and grading could go in first to address water issues before the rest of the project was started. The applicant said yes.

Mr. Weitekamp also requested that some tall columnar habit evergreens be planted to provide privacy screening and break up the scale of the facade in the dead space between the proposed new home and the home located at 701 E. Essex Ave. The owners of 701 E. Essex and the applicant were amenable to the evergreens.

Mr. Moran moved to approve the applicant’s project with the following conditions.

- Revise drawing C3 to turn off existing demolished features.
- Provide spot elevations between the garage and retaining wall to clarify drainage in the ground between the two structures.
- Extend permeable paving onto the driveway to the southeast corner of the house.
- Shorten length of retaining wall in the NE corner to minimize the amount of intrusion onto the tree # 8 root and canopy zone.
- Show condensing units on civil and landscape plans.
- Add/substitute some tall columnar habit shrubs in the west yard.
- Provide the street view composite drawing as required by the ARB guidelines.
- Provide an erosion control plan for construction phase.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Emert. The motion passed with a vote of 6 “Aye”, 0 “Nay,” and 1 Absent. The votes was as follows:

Chairman Fernhoff	“Aye”
Reed Vorhees	“Aye”
John Falk	Absent
Mike Moran	“Aye”
Laura Switzer	“Aye”
Jon Emert	“Aye”

REVIEW OF REVISED PLANS FOR ATTACHED COVERED PORCH ADDITION AND DETACHED CARPORT AND STORAGE SHED – Patrick Holleran, 112 Elm Ave.

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 112 Elm Ave. At their July 9, 2025 meeting, the ARB asked the applicant to address the following comments:

- The survey is illegible, so contours should appear on the new site plan.
- Clarify that there is a French drain collecting the 367 square feet of pervious paving base course drain.
- All existing and new or modified draining apparatus and locations should be noted on drawings (ex. Drywells, conveyance pipes, drains, etc.).
- Mitigate the .03 CFS.
- Check route of drainage line where it passes the tree in the front yard, and modify as needed to avoid damaging tree.
- Drawings do not agree from A to C; all drawings need to agree.
- Tree removal is not clear—All trees slated for removal should be noted on drawings and not included on new site plan. New or replacement trees should be accurately noted on new site plan and not located on the property line.
- Provide photos of existing house.
- Plans should note that the shed’s siding finish will match existing house.
- Please provide material samples when resubmitting, so the ARB can see finish stain colors, siding color and material, metal fascia color.
- Have civil engineers provide a cross section of pervious paving and detail the base course thickness.

The applicant, Patrick Holleran, presented the updated plans. He also presented samples of the permeable pavers and hardy board that he will be using.

Mr. Weitekamp asked for photos of the trees to be removed and requested that they be added to the photo array. He also asked for the calliper size to be noted on the demolition plan and that a schedule of plantings be provided.

The ARB felt that the conditions were addressed.

Mr. Moran moved to approve the applicant’s project with the following conditions.

- Photograph the oak tree to be removed and include pictures in the existing conditions photograph sheet, drawing A1.7. Note the calliper size of that tree on the demolition plan.

- Add a plant schedule with the categories of information as indicated in the ARB community design guidelines appendix.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Voorhees. The motion passed with a vote of 6 “Aye”, 0 “Nay,” and 1 Absent. The votes was as follows:

Chairman Fernhoff	“Aye”
Reed Vorhees	“Aye”
John Falk	Absent
Mike Moran	“Aye”
Laura Switzer	“Aye”
Jon Emert	“Aye”
Brad Weitekamp	“Aye”

PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF PLANS FOR NEW HOME – Michael and Kathleen Bannes, 20 Elm Ave.

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 20 Elm Ave. and invited the applicant to present the project.

The contractor, Mike Lewis with Lewis Homes, explained to the ARB that the property owners, Michael and Kathleen Bannes, will be tearing down the existing home and building a new home.

Mr. Moran confirmed with Mr. Lewis that the brick will all match.

Civil Plans

Mr. Lewis noted that he has a house fit plan right now, but the civil engineer is working on the civil plans. Mr. Lewis explained that the driveway will be on the left side of the property with the drainage and swale on the right side and going out toward Elm Ave. He noted that the swale will come from behind the property to help handle drainage when the detached structure (former carriage house/photography studio) is removed.

Mr. Moran said that when there’s a large, paved surface located close to the property boundary, the ARB will sometimes ask for some amount of curb to be placed on the edge of the pavement to keep the water from running off on the neighboring property. He asked Mr. Lewis to consider adding a curb to the northside of the driveway to direct the water down toward the street.

The neighbor residing at 22 Elm Ave., Denise Mullin, noted that she attended the meeting because she has concerns about the driveway and the shared planter area between her driveway and the driveway of 20 Elm Ave. She said she postponed redoing her own driveway when she found out about the plans for 20 Elm Ave. She said she would like to come up with a plan with the new owners and Mr. Lewis for removing the planter and replacing it with some attractive landscaping that’s

conducive to drainage. She wants the plan to consider the driveway needs for each property.

Mr. Moran noted that with the new ARB guidelines, Mr. Lewis will need to mitigate water for the entire property, particularly the roof of the house and porch. He advised Mr. Lewis to consult the guidelines full details.

Ms. Mullin also expressed concern about water issues that may occur during the construction of 20 Elm Ave., especially if the building process takes some time to complete. She also asked about the coordination and timing of installing new driveways on 20 and 22 Elm Ave. Mr. Lewis said he would work with her on both matters. He said he thinks he can reconfigure the planned driveway for 20 Elm Ave. to add some additional green space to the area between the driveways.

Landscaping

Mr. Weitekamp and Mr. Moran noted the need for a tree replacement plan and detailed landscaping plan.

Architecture

Mr. Moran asked for street view rendering and noted that he likes the planned center massing with the upper story that steps down into the smaller mass. He said this makes the proposed new home fit in well with the existing houses near it.

Ms. Switzer expressed concern about the brick that's described as floating by itself on the upper story. She noted that since brick is usually loadbearing, it should be carried down into the porch or some sort of tie-in to the other brick.

Mr. Emert suggested a smoother transition from the brick to the siding. Mr. Lewis explained that the owner was trying to contain cost by limiting the use of brick. Mr. Lewis noted that he and the homeowners will consider removing the brick from the second story and using different material for that element of the building's façade.

Mr. Emert advised Mr. Lewis to make sure that the site plan matched the house's footprint.

Mr. Voorhees clarified with Mr. Lewis that the space of the garage will not be habitable space.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF PLANS FOR FIRST & SECOND STORY ADDITIONS

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 210 Parkland Ave. and invited the applicant to present the project.

– Emily and James Mcatee, 210 Parkland Ave.

Mr. Shaver, the architect of 210 Parkland Ave., presented the plans, which entail first and second story additions. He explained that the project includes no additional footprint of the house because the second floor addition will be added to the existing first floor in the rear of the home. The first-floor addition on the side of the property is replacing a portion of the existing structure.

Mr. Shaver asked the ARB if the draining and grading drawing requirements can be waived. The ARB said yes as long as he is not addressing grades and is staying within the existing house's footprint.

Mr. Emert ask if downspouts will be added or removed. Mr. Shaver confirmed that the existing downspouts noted on the plan will stay and any new downspouts will be tied into existing drainage.

Mr. Moran noted that the design matches and fits in with the properties near it.

Mr. Switzer confirmed that there is attic access from the sitting room on the second story. She also noted the importance of shutter consistency on the home's windows. She said it's not grounds for denial, but just a note for consideration.

The ARB reminded Mr. Shaver to make sure that all his elevations are noted accurately.

With regards to the exposed foundation wall for the first-floor rebuild, the ARB encouraged Mr. Shaver to read the ARB guidelines. Painted or textured concrete are suitable treatments for exposed foundation walls greater than 12" tall.

Mr. Moran noted that the ARB's preference is to bring the siding down on the wall or bring the grading up to limit exposed foundation wall height. The ARB clarified that this foundation wall treatment is only required on the new foundation walls related to the office addition on the first floor. Since this is an existing house, Mr. Shaver does not have to treat all foundation walls already existing.

Mr. Shaver confirmed with the ARB that he does not have to present grading and drainage plans, nor a landscaping plan since no grading or drainage changes will occur and no trees will be removed. Mr. Weitekamp did ask that the drawings have notes clarifying that the items shown—the wall, trees, etc.—will remain.

MISCELLANEOUS – Meeting Timing

The ARB members discussed how to schedule Plan Commission and ARB meetings when both meetings have large agendas. Mr. Moran expressed a preference to have the meetings on different nights if

agendas are long. Mr. Voorhees suggested that if staff think the Plan Commission meeting is going to take longer than 30 minutes, the meeting be held on a different night than the ARB meeting. Mr. Johnson said he would check with the code to clarify if the meetings can be held separately.

Mr. Johnson noted that the term impervious surface is not defined in the ARB guidelines. Mr. Weitekamp noted that there was additional language defining impervious surface and the percentage of acceptable permeability, but it was removed to limit the length of the guideline document.

The ARB discussed if permeable pavers should be treated the same as grass in terms of water absorption and run-off implications. Mr. Weitekamp felt they should not be treated the same because absorption is dependent upon paver system maintenance and it diminishes overtime without appropriate maintenance. Mr. Johnson said he would look up edits from the ARB guideline drafting process to determine if additional clarification can be added.

ADJOURN

Mr. Moran motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Switzer and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m.