



MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
MAY 14, 2025 – 6:01 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Glendale was held on Wednesday, May 14, 2025. Mr. Voorhees presided and called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. in place of Chairman Fernhoff who was absent.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Members Absent

Laura Switzer
Mike Moran
Reed Voorhees
John Emert
Brad Weitekamp

Chairman Fernhoff
John Falk

Also present were Frank Johnson, City Administrator; Gabby Macaluso, Deputy City Clerk; Allie Sievers, City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR ONE-STORY POOL HOUSE ADDITION – Craig and Aimee Billingsley, 18 Berry Road Park

Mr. Reed introduced the project at 18 Berry Road Park and invited the applicant to present the project.

Tim Dangos, the project’s contractor with Dangos Builders Group, presented the plans, which entail the construction of a detached one-story wood framed pool house in the rear yard of the existing home.

Mr. Dangos noted that there will be a drain line that will terminate into a drywell in the rear of the yard with a pop-up emitter.

Mr. Johnson noted that the City received an email from Don and Jane Doherty of 20 Berry Road Park expressing their concern regarding the draining of the proposed new hot tub.

Mr. Dangos explained that the Billingsleys have two options for draining their hot tub. They can drain back into the pool or they can drain down the driveway past the front of their house where it goes into a MSD sewer about 80 feet away. He noted that this water does go past the Doherty property.

Mr. Moran advised that the pop-up be located as far into the interior of the yard (i.e. distanced from the property boundaries) as it makes sense. Mr. Dangos stated that he would do that.

Mr. Voorhees clarified with Mr. Dangos that the hot tub will sit on a concrete pad, and that the pad has been calculated into the yard plan and impervious surfaces calculation.

Mr. Weitekamp noted that the caliper inches would not need to be replaced related to the two dead trees being removed because there are so many trees on the site.

Mr. Weitekamp requested that a label be added to page A0.0 for a tree protection fence to prevent damage to the trees' roots from construction traffic.

Mr. Voorhees asked about the wooden privacy fence and the metal fence noted on the site plan. Mr. Dangos clarified that the wooden fence is located behind the pool and belongs to the neighbor. He also noted that the metal fence is being moved back away from the pool, but the plan is to reuse it.

The ARB members confirmed with Mr. Dangos that the material cladding the exterior of the pool house will match the house's materials and colors.

Mr. Moran asked Mr. Dangos if the pool house will feature a swinging door or sliding door with a breakaway panel feature for egress. Mr. Dangos confirmed that breakaway-style sliding doors would be installed.

Mr. Voorhees asked for public comment, but there was none.

Mr. Moran moved to approve the applicant's project design for 18 Berry Road Park subject to the following conditions:

1. Move the pop-up emitter as far as practical from the property line on the east.
2. Add a graphic to page A0.0 showing tree protection fence to keep construction traffic out of root zone.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Emert. The motion passed with a vote of 5 "Aye", 0 "Nay," and 2 Absent. The votes was as follows:

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

**REVIEW OF PLANS FOR
ONE-STORY HOME
ADDITION** – Justin and Tara
Wilkinson, 406 Venneman Ave.

Mr. Reed introduced the project at 406 Venneman Ave. and invited the applicant to present the project.

Ms. Wilkinson, the owner of 406 Venneman Ave. and a civil engineer, presented the plans, which entail the construction of a 404 square-foot, one-story addition to the existing home to include a new bedroom and bathroom, and relocation of the existing half bathroom.

ARB members discussed with Ms. Wilkinson the drainage of water runoff from the small, low roof section between the existing house and the addition. They requested that Ms. Wilkinson add a roof plan to the drawings and add downspouts to the building elevations of the mudroom section. Overall, the ARB requested clarification on the water drainage in the north swale.

Mr. Weitekamp and Mr. Johnson explained to Ms. Wilkinson that MSD has a grant program to assist homeowners with rain garden projects, and suggested that she apply if she's interested in offsetting some of those costs.

Mr. Weitekamp requested that Ms. Wilkinson note on the site plan where the replacement tree will be located.

Mr. Moran noted that the architectural design is good and matches the rest of the home. ARB members agreed that because the section of the exposed foundation wall over four feet tall is located on the back of the home, it could be painted to match the exterior wall color.

Mr. Voorhees asked for public comment, but there was none.

Mr. Moran moved to approve the applicant's project design for 406 Venneman Ave. subject to the following conditions:

1. Add a roof plan to the drawings indicating gutter and downspout locations.
2. Add downspouts to the building elevations of the mudroom section.
3. Note where the replacement tree will be located on the site.
4. Clarify the drainage in the north swale adjacent to the addition.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Emert. The motion passed with a vote of 5 "Aye", 0 "Nay," and 2 Absent. The votes was as follows:

Chairman Fernhoff	Absent
Reed Vorhees	"Aye"
John Falk	Absent
Brad Weitekamp	"Aye"

Jon Emert "Aye"
Laura Switzer "Aye"
Mike Moran "Aye"

DISCUSSION – ARB Guidelines and Definitions

Mr. Johnson asked for clarification from the ARB on a few matters regarding the implementation of the ARB guidelines and definitions.

Size of Additions for Review – Section 535.050 of the code stipulates that additions are excluded from ARB review if they are less than 750 square feet or 20 percent of the area of the primary structure.

Mr. Johnson explained that he's been interpreting "area of the primary structure" to mean the footprint of the building and asked if his interpretation was correct.

ARB members determined that "area of primary structure" should mean all the livable area of the structure, which would be the same area calculated in the floor area ratio (FAR).

Mr. Moran noted that he would be in favor of lowering the square footage threshold requiring an ARB review from 750 to 450 since this number represents a more reasonable ratio for the smaller homes in Glendale.

The other ARB members agreed that this new and lower threshold of 450 square feet, as well as the retention of the clause "or 20 percent of the area of the primary structure" should be recommended to the Board of Aldermen for their approval.

Submittal Requirements for Additions – Mr. Johnson explained that he's been receiving requests from applicants to waive requirements some submittals for additions. He understands that he has some discretion, but he asked for guidance on executing that discretion.

Mr. Weitekamp explained that if a tree is being removed, even in the rear of the home, the applicant needs to submit a site plan that shows the tree replacement plan and locations. He noted that while a full landscaping plan wouldn't be needed, a dedicated page in the application that's the same scale as the plans and notes locations for trees and plantings is needed.

Mr. Weitekamp noted that an arborist report doesn't count as a landscaping plan. In the case that there is no tree removal in the rear of the home, existing trees noted on a civil plan would suffice.

The ARB determined that if the public domain is impacted by something in the rear, a landscape plan would be needed.

Mr. Johnson asked if material samples are required. The ARB determined that samples would be required for new construction and for additions that have an exterior that is a significant departure from the existing structure.

The ARB advised that the applicant must provide justification as to why the material sample or document submittal is not included in the application.

Breezeways – Mr. Johnson asked for clarification on whether enclosed breezeways that connect garages to a residence be included in the FAR.

The ARB members determined that if the breezeway is enclosed, it ceases to be considered a breezeway and is counted toward the FAR.

Accessory Structures – Mr. Johnson and the ARB members discussed accessory structures and the lack of clear definition in the existing code. Currently, the code does not discern between fully enclosed accessory structures and open-air/non-enclosed accessory structures. Mr. Johnson explained that accessory structures are being addressed in the update of the City's zoning code.

ADJOURN

Mr. Moran motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Switzer and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:29 p.m.