



MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
August 13, 2025 –6:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Plan Commission of the City of Glendale was held on Wednesday, August 13, 2025. Chairman Jeffrey Fernhoff presided and called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Members Absent

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

John Falk

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Mr. Moran, seconded by Ms. Switzer and unanimously carried, to approve the minutes from the April 9, 2025 meeting as submitted.

**PRELIMINARY PLAT
REVIEW – Westborough
Country Club, 720 W.
Lockwood Ave.**

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the preliminary plat review request from Westborough Country Club located at 720 W. Lockwood Ave. Mr. Jim Capek attended the meeting, representing Westborough.

Mr. Emert clarified that the Plan Commission is only being asked to consider the approval of lot consolidation. If they approve it, they would be recommending approval to the Board of Aldermen. Mr. Johnson confirmed.

Mr. Weitekamp asked if the consolidation changed any relationship with how the property falls within the cities of Oakland, Glendale, and Webster Groves. Mr. Capek explained that it did not change that aspect of the property, but that it would allow all parcels comprising the Country Club to be under the same ownership name, which is the Glenoak Investment Company. This company is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Westborough Country Club.

There was no public comment made regarding this project.

Mr. Moran made a motion to approve the applicant’s plat as submitted. 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”

**FINAL DEVELOPMENT
PLAN REVIEW – Dwell
Coffee House, 415 Sappington
Rd.**

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the final development plan review for the proposed coffee shop located at 415 N. Sappington Rd.

Mr. Johnson reminded the Plan Commission that the applicants, Lisa and Jamie Houston, presented their preliminary development plan to the Plan Commission in January 2025. This preliminary draft was recommended for approval by the Plan Commission to the Board of Aldermen. The Board of Aldermen approved the preliminary plan on March 3, 2025.

Mr. Johnson noted that the final development must include the following:

1. The existing and proposed contours.
2. The landscape plan with the specific location of all plant material specifying size, species and location (Both as to buffer area around the perimeter as well as that in the parking lots).
3. All proposed uses.
4. All structures, present and future.
5. Sidewalks.
6. Parking spaces and moving traffic lanes.
7. Loading and delivery zones.
8. Ingress and egress facilities.
9. Plan for the provision of water sanitary and storm drainage facilities.
10. All easements and dedications.
11. Signs.
12. Details of lighting of parking lots and outside of buildings, including location, type and intensity.
13. All other information which the Plan Commission or Board of Aldermen may designate.

Mr. Johnson also noted that the regulations require that no building permit can be issued until MSD has approved the sanitary and storm sewers and drainage. The applicants’ plans are currently under review by the agency.

Mr. Johnson reminded the Plan Commission of the conditions they placed upon the applicant at their January meeting. These included, but are not limited to obtaining a traffic study and photometric plan.

Chairman Fernhoff listed off all the conditions enumerated in the January meeting by the Plan Commission. Mr. Moran suggested that a round table style discussion to evaluate if the final plan addresses the all the conditions and code requirements.

Mr. Moran felt that the applicant addressed all the conditions outlined by the Plan Commission. He appreciated the thoroughness of the traffic study and safer alignment of the parking area.

Mr. Emert noted that there are no lights on the exterior of the back or south side of the building. He asked if that was accurate and if there would be lighting on the back covered patio. He noted that the applicant needs to include all exterior lighting on the plans.

Mr. Emert noted that there is no fence noted on the plans. Ms. Houston said the fence would enclose the children's play area. The Plan Commission instructed the applicant to add the fence location and style details to the plans.

Mr. Voorhees asked about the selfie wall, which would consist of a mural. Ms. Houston confirmed that the mural would be facing inward toward the backyard.

Mr. Emert also asked if the traffic study noted the need for additional signage noting the emergency vehicle entry and exit across the street from the coffee shop. Mr. Smith said no, but that it could be a condition of the Plan Commission.

Mr. Weitekamp noted that there's a bald cypress tree that is considered to be a heritage tree and would require a permit to remove. Mr. Johnson reminded him that heritage trees are part of the ARB guidelines, so it's not applicable to this assessment by the Plan Commission. Mr. Johnson explained that the Plan Commission could make it a condition that the tree be preserved or protected. Mr. Weitekamp determined that preservation of this tree as a condition of approval would not be required.

Mr. Weitekamp also expressed a desire to move the building closer the street to make it more part of the streetscape.

The applicant's architect noted that they are already lined up with the setback and other residential properties. The Plan Commission noticed that some of the setback lines are incorrectly noted on the landscape plan and instructed the applicant to update the plans.

Mr. Moran noted that he thought the new building being set back allowed for a better transition from commercial to residential properties, as well as enhanced public safety.

Mr. Voorhees appreciated the thoroughness of the traffic study. He also noted support of the building being setback to transition better with the streetscape.

Mr. Voorhees and Mr. Smith noted that the grade changes need to be addressed in their plans through grading work. The applicant must be careful with regrading, installing the fence, and replacing the retaining wall to address the grade changes. The Plan Commission requested that the existing retaining wall, which will be replaced, be added to all the drawings—noting its removal and replacement.

Mr. Smith noted that the traffic impacts from Dwell would be minimal to the traffic flow on Sappington Road.

Ms. Switzer asked if lighting was an issue along the walkway or patio because she didn't see any lights noted in the photometric plan. She noted that lights should be added along the ground to light the walkway.

Ms. Switzer expressed concerns about the trash enclosure gate materials, noting that they should look nice. She would like to see architectural elevations for the gates.

Ms. Switzer noted that there's a landscape area and not a walkway along the parking area on the plans. The applicant noted that the page was mislabeled. The Plan Commission instructed the applicant to update the drawings.

Ms. Switzer noted that none of the renderings show the dormer in the office area on the south side of the house facing the neighbor. She noted that this should be included in the drawings if still planned.

Ms. Switzer also expressed concerns regarding the two windows shown on the rear elevation on page A401. She asked the applicant to consider the view that these windows will have into the neighboring property on the south side since it's so close the property edge.

Mr. Voorhees and Mr. Weitekamp assessed the downspouts and determined they discharge into the detention basin.

Mr. Weitekamp asked about the plan for the downspouts to outlet into the detention basis and have any spillover discharge into the storm sewer. Mr. Smith noted that the applicant will need an agreement with MSD to tie into

the stormwater infrastructure. Mr. Smith explained that there needs to be clarification of the interworking of the drainage infrastructure on the plans.

Mr. Johnson and Mr. Smith noted that MSD is currently reviewing the plans and that the City's ordinance requires a signed agreement with MSD before the Board of Aldermen can approve the final development plan.

Mr. Moran suggested that a sign be placed on the end parking space by the trash enclosure to indicate where the applicant wants truck unloading to occur.

Public Comment

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there was any public comment regarding this project. The following individuals spoke:

Joseph Shannon, 934 E. Essex: Mr. Shannon asked if any public funds were being contributed toward the coffee shop.

Lois Mahsman, 142 Edwin Ave.: Ms. Mahsman confirmed that MSD has not yet approved the coffee shop's development plans. She questioned how the Plan Commission can approve the final development plan if the applicant hasn't received MSD approval yet. She also asked where the workers will park during construction and how school buses will get through on Sappington Road if trucks are parked on the street.

Sarah Vitale, 425 N. Sappington Rd.: Ms. Vitale asked if the detention area is a pond or just a water basin. She expressed concerns regarding stormwater since it flows toward their property from 415 N. Sappington Rd. She also expressed concerns that water ponded in the detention area would overflow onto her property. She questioned how the Plan Commission can approve the final development plan if the applicant hasn't received MSD approval yet.

Additionally, she said she's worried that trucks parked on the street will block emergency vehicles. Ms. Vitale also expressed opposition to Dwell customers parking in her property's parking lots and requested signage provided by the City and/or the Houstons.

Leslie Drewel, 821 E. Essex Ave.: Ms. Drewel asked what the hours of operation will be. She expressed opposition to hours of operation after 4:00 p.m., so she can enjoy peace and quiet in her backyard on weekends and in the evening hours. She also requested a game plan for opening day traffic.

Plan Commission Response to Public Comment

Mr. Johnson stated the project is entirely privately funded and that no public tax dollars were being contributed.

Chairman Fernhoff stated that the City can require the applicant to provide a more detailed traffic plan that's formalized for construction and coordinated with the Glendale Police Department. The applicant can work with the police department to manage opening day traffic. Additionally, business-specific parking signs can be placed on surrounding properties.

Mr. Moran and Mr. Weitekamp assessed the stormwater plan for the 415 N. Sappington Rd. to address the related concerns. Mr. Moran doesn't think the Plan Commission would be acting irresponsibly if it recommends approval of the plan to the Board of Aldermen before the project receives MSD approval because 1) the Commission has the civil plans and drainage calculations to determine how the water will move and flow on and across the property, and 2) the knowledge that the plan won't go before the Board of Aldermen for approval if MSD does not grant their approval.

- They explained that according to the plans, the basin is a grassy area that sits a little lower as to collect water, but it's not a watery area like a pond. The basin could be a grassy depression with MSD determined plantings.
- Mr. Smith noted that MSD is not requiring a basin, but the applicant and contractor are putting one in to help meter out stormwater on the property.
- They noted that the plan is not to discharge any water onto the property located to the north, 425 N. Sappington Rd. Any overflow water would be discharged to the MSD storm sewer, provided MSD approves the plan and an agreement is signed. If the agreement is not met/signed, then the City won't approve the final development plan and an alternative stormwater solution would need to be determined.
- They noted that the curb planned along the entire northern edge of the property will keep water from flowing/draining onto the north property and will guide it to the basin. They explained that the parking lot is graded to drain water to the middle of the lot and then taken to the basin.

Mr. Voorhees noted that the City requires construction fencing and approves the materials used and location before installation. Mr. Moran noted that the City does not allow sidewalks to be blocked for construction except for approved, short duration of time to accomplish certain aspects of the project. Mr. Moran also noted that there are 4 parking spaces on the property labeled on the plans for construction parking.

Chairman Fernhoff asked Ms. Houson about the hours of operation, and she explained that they are planned to be 6:00 a.m to 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Moran asked if the backyard patio/play area can be closed after 4:00 p.m. to respect the neighbors. Ms. Houston expressed flexibility on that matter and said that no speaker system or late night concerts are planned.

Mr. Weitekamp suggested that more evergreens be planted along the western perimeter to provide additional screening.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there were any other public comment. Ms. Vitale thanked the Commission for answering her questions and welcomed the Houstons as her neighbors.

Mr. Moran made a motion to recommend approval of the applicant's final development plan to the Board of Aldermen with the following conditions:

- Clarify contribution of covered patio and deck ceiling lighting to the lighting photometric plan.
- Show accurately the extent to any fencing not currently shown on the drawings.
- Include a traffic sign indicating the Glendale Fire Department's emergency vehicle operation area to left turning patrons exiting the site.
- Provide a corrected landscape plan showing the correct setback line.
- Show the retaining wall described as required in the southeast corner on all civil, site plan, and landscape drawings.
- Provide an architectural elevation of the trash enclosure gates.
- Correct drawing C200 to show concrete sidewalk at the center mass of the building on the north side of the building adjoining the parking area.
- Add a traffic sign in the parking area indicating the designated loading space.
- Secure MSD approval prior to submittal to the Board of Aldermen and implement all recommendations related to the detention basin and the storm utility piping entering and exiting the basin.
- Consider evergreen plants in place of the trees noted on the landscaping plan along the west boundary in the lawn.
- Provide indicated corrections written by the Lochmueller Group in their review of the project documents.
- Include a detailed construction phasing and operations plan coordinated with drawing C600 in the provisions shown therein.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Weitekamp. 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”

ADJOURN

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