



MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
December 10, 2025 – 6:13 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Glendale was held on Wednesday, December 10, 2025. Chairman Fernhoff presided and called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Members Absent

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Moran moved to approve the minutes from the October 8, 2025 meeting with two edits including adding the date for the minutes approval in the October meeting to be for September 10, 2025 and changing Mr. to Ms. in the last paragraph of page 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Voorhees and unanimously carried.

PROJECT POSTPONEMENT – Jason and Michelle Fank, 785 Bismark Ave.

Mr. Johnson explained that although the proposed new home at 785 Bismark Ave. received a variance for the home height and garage height from the Board of Adjustment at their meeting on November 18, 2025, a review of the plans by the city’s engineer noted that the building plans would violate the City of Glendale’s stream buffer requirements as outlined in chapter 462 of the City’s municipal code. For this reason, the project has been postponed.

He elaborated that there is a dotted blue line stream on the USGS (United States Geological Survey) map of the property. The City’s code stipulates that dotted-line streams shown on USGS maps require a 25-foot undisturbed vegetative buffer on each bank, plus an additional 25-foot setback where impervious surfaces are prohibited and grading is minimized.

Mr. Johnson explained that a variance may be granted by the Board of Adjustment only when property conditions create an unusual hardship or prevent reasonable use (especially for pre-platted lots), following a

public hearing and notice. Applications must include detailed site information, alternatives, hardship documentation, and proposed mitigation, and are evaluated based on site conditions, environmental impacts, and whether natural resources remain adequately protected.

Mr. Johnson and Ms. Neely explained that this issue has been explained to the applicant, who is considering their options and will let the city know how they want to proceed with the property.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A REAR ADDITION – Jonathan and Erin Ramirez, 808 Hawbrook Rd.

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 808 Hawbrook Rd. and invited the applicant to present the project. The project's architect, Katie Niesen Cook, presented the project to the ARB members. She explained that the project entails a two-story addition to the rear of the house and an interior remodel to the existing house. They will also be enclosing a screened-in porch on the first floor.

Drainage and Landscape

Mr. Falk noted that the civil plans need to include contours and all the downspouts. He also noted that the civil engineer needs to relook at the calculations—4.2 pi for roof loads and 3.45 pi for impervious areas like concrete and asphalt. Mr. Falk noted that this will make for bigger drywells.

Mr. Moran also noted that anytime a civil engineer can add spot elevations to major corners of the pavement, it allows the ARB to better understand how its minimizing pitching from place to place, which is beneficial to the ARB.

Mr. Falk also noted that the drawings need to clearly show how much of the roof area runoff is going to the drywell.

Mr. Weitekamp confirmed with the applicant that since nothing was submitted, no trees are being removed. He noted that tree preservation fencing should be used and shown in the plan.

Mr. Emert confirmed with Ms. Niesen Cook that the landscaping showed on the plan will not actually occur. The members instructed that if the landscaping will not occur, it should be removed from the plans.

Architecture

The ARB members discussed with Ms. Niesen Cook the patio shown on the drawings, the new driveway, wooden stairs, and other features shown on the plan and their timing of implementation for permitting purposes. The members stressed the need for a clearer distinction between work that will be done now and what will be done later in a different phase in the plans. The Board instructed Ms. Cook to base her

calculations for the drywell on the extra roof area to accommodate later phases of construction.

The ARB liked the overall design and asked for clarification on the materials used on the second story. Ms. Niesen Cook noted that they will use hardy panels with seams covered by trim.

Mr. Voorhees confirmed with Ms. Niesen Cook that the window on the west elevation on the ground floor is being bricked in. She explained that this was done because the windowsill is lower than the countertop and the view is of the driveway.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there was any public comment, but none was shared.

Mr. Emert asked if the project could receive conditional approval contingent upon all the civil engineering conditions being met. The ARB members said yes, but project elements that are part of later construction phases must go before the ARB for approval since the exact plan for roof structure, building materials, appearance, and size are not known at this time.

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

- All comments from the city engineer must be addressed in a revised civil design. The revised civil design shall indicate the following:
 - Proposed contours
 - Delineation between what's in the scope for the project and what is future scope
 - Present future scope in separate plans as needed to convey the intent of the BMP mitigation
 - Provide spot elevations on all exterior paving that's being replaced
- Clarify whether replacement of the asphalt driveway with concrete material is part of the project for the future phase.
- The location of tree protection fencing for trees on site and adjacent to property boundary.
- Show the location of downspouts in civil plans and diagram the roof areas that are being directed to the storm water mitigation.
- Correct the roof drainage calculations to use a pi of 4.2 as required by city ordinances.

In relation to the first condition, the ARB members clarified the city engineer's comment on the plans that the existing garage structure is too close to the house is not something that the homeowners need to address. The garage was built prior to the renovation, and no changes are being made to that structure, so the existing garage is grandfathered in.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Falk. The motion passed with a vote of 7 "Aye", 0 "Nay," and 0 Absent. The votes was as follows:

Reed Vorhees	"Aye"
John Falk	"Aye"
Mike Moran	"Aye"
Laura Switzer	"Aye"
Brad Weitekamp	"Aye"
Jon Emert	"Aye"
Jeff Fernhoff	"Aye"

MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Johnson noted that the permit portal, My Government Online (MGO), will be launched at the end of January. He clarified that due to Sunshine Law concerns, the City cannot provide access to ARB members and allow them to make comments on the submitted plan since it would legally constitute a meeting.

The ARB also discussed the basic requirements of submitted plans before they can be moved before the ARB for consideration. The basic requirements discussed by the ARB include proposed contours and a tree plan if trees are being removed. Additional comments include:

- The tree study does not satisfy the requirement for a landscape plan, particularly for the property area within the public domain.
- The tree study and the landscape plan must be in congruence.

Mr. Johnson and the Board invited Ms. Neely to create a list of additional basic plan requirements for ARB consideration.

ADJOURN

Mr. Moran motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:20 p.m.. The motion was seconded by Mr. Falk and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.