



**MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2023 - 6:00 P.M.**

CHAIRMAN JEFFREY FERNHOFF
JOHN FALK
MIKE MORAN
REED VOORHEES
BRAD WEITEKAMP
JON EMERT

CITY ATTORNEY, ALEXANDRA SIEVERS
CITY ADMINISTRATOR, BEN DECLUE
DEPUTY CITY CLERK, JOANNE CARR

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Fernhoff at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Fernhoff, Mr. Falk, Mr. Moran, Mr. Voorhees, Mr. Emert, Mr. Weitekamp

Absent: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 9, 2022.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from the November 9, 2022. There being some, he asked for a motion. Mr. Moran moved approval of the amended minutes from November 9, 2022. Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME WITH A DETACHED GARAGE

KORUS PROPERTIES AND ROGER BETLACH, 993 GLENBROOK AVE

Present: Roger Bettlach, Korus Properties

It was noted that following the denial of an earlier submission, a new submission for 993 Glenbrook Avenue needed to have substantial changes in plans for inclusion on the meeting agenda. The City determined that the plans were substantially different from the previously denied submission and permitted a new submission for 993 Glenbrook Avenue.

Mr. Bettlach reported that the changes included the removal of the attached garage and the replacement of it with a detached garage. Mr. Bettlach stated that the design included a hip roof with a height of 27'8", below the maximum, moved the foundation back 70' from the street, added a peak which is not significantly tall and added a one car width driveway. Mr. Bettlach noted that the house was 30' wide adding significant space between the houses noting that the house to the west had added space with the driveway and greenspace approximately 20' from property line.

Mr. Bettlach stated that the eastern façade was located 27' from the neighbor. Mr. Bettlach noted that the Oak tree was removed from the rear yard that had been questioned during prior meetings, added brick to the first level so that it wrapped around the house and matched the houses on the street and similar to other homes with additions located on the street. Mr. Bettlach stated that he reduced the window sizes, making them less prominent with different variations on the front façade. Mr. Bettlach noted that he pushed out windows to make them attractive to buyers, added brick details with soldier course on headers and added a single front door system with side lights.

Drainage: Mr. Falk stated that there was proposed stone pit in the rear as well as the front yard but added that there were no calculations for the rear pit. Mr. Bettlach stated that it was put together then when the detached garage was added and noted that most water from the roof would be pitched to the front pit. Mr. Bettlach also noted that with the roof hipped, the gutters could be tipped forward and would push driveway water to the street.

Mr. Falk asked that the sizing of the pits be added based on correct calculations which should be included in engineered plans. Mr. Falk noted that typically the plans identify a cross section of a pit, so elevation is correct and water capture is accurate. Mr. Bettlach stated that he would follow through with the request. Mr. Falk noted that he did not want to see excess water cause problems for neighboring homes.

Mr. Bettlach stated that there would be a pit in the back and confirmed there was a pipe from garage downspouts adding that from east and west drainage would flow to pit. Mr. Falk asked if it would be possible to push that storm water further up the hill to the driveway up at a higher elevation, adding that would give water more time to soak into the ground. Mr. Bettlach stated that they could put the garage downspouts to the front. Mr. Falk stated that the grade at the garage falls off 2.5' back to forward. Mr. Weitekamp asked about the driveway that is on the west side, and which direction the driveway sloped. Mr. Bettlach stated that it sloped towards the garage, adding that the open porch area was where the crown was located and noted that the property ran out of elevation going north and south. Mr. Falk was concerned about the pitch of sidewalk, adding that water needed to be minimized on the neighbor's property, possibly with a curb on that side or swail on your property. Mr. Bettlach stated that there was a swail all the way down the left side, adding that he was concerned about adding water to the north. Mr. Falk stated that he preferred to see minimal water pushed to the north. Mr. Falk stated that the ARB needed to see the sizing of the pit, change of location of the pit more toward the north, and locating the pit higher on the property. Mr. Falk asked if any thought was given to adding impervious surface material to the driveway, adding that it would help mitigate storm water. Mr. Bettlach stated that the idea was discussed but noted that there would be maintenance issues. Mr. Falk stated that it was just a suggestion and added that the Board needed the water adequately captured in the two pits.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp noted that the rear Oak tree would be removed, and asked if was due to grading or a condition issue. Mr. Bettlach stated that with the turnaround and garage in the rear yard, the removal of the tree would be better for the homeowner. Mr. Moran noted that there had been both negative and positive comments about the tree during previous reviews. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the replacement tree should be a canopy tree positioned on the left-hand side of the lot in the front yard, adding that the planned understory tree should be planted in the backyard. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the utility service was located on the right side and that the left side of the front lot was clear. Mr. Weitekamp stated that he was concerned about the scale of the garage in relation to the northern property. It was noted that the roof peak would be

24' or 25' from the contour at 581 which dropped off 7'. Mr. Moran stated that the garage roof was hipped with a lower eave adding that the height would be located somewhere in the middle. Mr. Weitekamp noted that the honeysuckle would be removed from the rear of the yard adding that the revised landscape plan showed a fairly bare front yard planting plan. Mr. Moran stated that there could be some type of planting on the front porch and asked if the home was a spec home. Mr. Bettlach stated that it was a spec home. Mr. Moran noted that a homeowner may want to do their own planting.

Architecture: Mr. Falk stated that in his opinion, the proportion between the first and second floor seemed off adding that there was a first floor bump out that could be removed, the parlor area on the first floor would become smaller, and the porch could wrap around the side of the house adding that the change would affect the basement but not the second floor. Mr. Falk added that by shrinking the porch, the house would move 6' away from the neighboring house, and the windows on the second floor would align.

Mr. Moran stated that the project was better for having the volume adding that it defeated the idea of a straight up box. Mr. Moran stated that a big porch carried the scale of the house, noting that if the 4' of interior space was removed it would be okay but would not reduce much space. Mr. Moran stated that he liked the massing that diffused the overall size, adding that the taller parts were recessed away from the neighbors. Mr. Voorhees stated that he appreciated that the garage was moved to the rear yard, adding that it was a good place to start and noted that the materials used were not terrible. Mr. Voorhees noted that if the porch was taken off, which was out of character, the house design would show a linear two-story flat elevation or long box.

Mr. Voorhees noted that the previous submission had an articulated design adding that the eave lines were a problem, and not trying to reduce the massing down to the street was a problem. Mr. Voorhees stated that this design matched the south alignment of the neighboring homes, but the porch foundation was pushed out beyond the neighboring homes. Mr. Voorhees noted that the current garage or accessory structure was located on the 5' setback line and needed to be located on the 6' setback line. Mr. Bettlach stated that the placement on the plans was in error, adding that the garage would be moved to the 6' setback line.

Mr. Moran stated that previous design had the garage designed into the front of the building and the second floor was more absorbed into roof of the garage noting that the design was no longer bigger on first floor and smaller on second floor which was previously the case. Mr. Moran stated that both floors were aligned, adding that the second floor was larger, and the massing had changed and noted that the change did not soften the second floor as well but was a substantial change without the attached garage. Mr. Moran stated that he appreciated that the house was quite narrow, which enhanced the side yards and would help any two-story design adding that the design was not pressuring the lot or the neighborhood. Mr. Moran noted that the east side was mainly the garage side and the site opened up as one goes back towards the neighboring property. Mr. Moran stated that it was a conventional design, which looked taller but was narrower. Mr. Moran stated that he liked the architectural features, liked the columns and liked the verticality of the siding on the second story. Mr. Moran asked about the dimensions at the eave from the slab of the garage, wondering about its dimensions and added that it seemed like the garage was top heavy. Mr. Bettlach stated that the roof elevation started at 14.8' above grade, the roof pitch was 5/12, the garage was 20' wide, and should have a height of 20'.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the front porch broke the design with only one column. Mr. Bettlach stated that it was the only way to feature the windows by adding that an extra structural beam was added and noted that he wanted the windows and door to show.

Mr. Emert asked if it was possible to move the house back so that the front porch aligns with the house on the west, adding that he was only talking about a 5' change. Mr. Bettlach stated that he would run up to the hammerhead and would run out of room. Mr. Moran stated that if some of the floor area was reduced, it might work. Mr. Emert stated that the hammerhead was wide. Mr. Bettlach stated that the primary bedroom was already 14' x 16' but would also lose the covered porch at the back of the house. Mr. Emert suggested that the hammerhead be shortened, as well as the porch. Mr. Bettlach stated that the open porch would be compromised.

Mr. Emert also stated that he wondered if there was an opportunity to return to the vertical siding treatment. Mr. Bettlach stated that there was a hardy panel near the stairwell, noting that vertical siding was what he would normally design but added that he wanted the design to blend into the neighborhood. Mr. Voorhees stated that the design was a box adding that there was nothing on the front elevation that aligns, noting that none of the windows, doors or overhangs aligns. Mr. Voorhees asked about the type of siding. Mr. Bettlach stated that the lap would be vinyl and the other areas would be hardy board.

Mr. Moran stated that he understood where the window projection was coming from noting that the neighboring home had a similar design, appreciated that the design worked with the volume and the mass, but did not disagree with Mr. Voorhees regarding localized symmetry or alignment in the elevations. Mr. Moran stated that in three dimensions it was not as obvious.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the design did not work either way. It was noted that a bigger overhang could lower the eave line, the eave was 1'4", but on the porch the eave was tight. Mr. Moran stated that a double column approach on the porch would work better, adding that it would be a refinement but would not change the mass or feel.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak.

Carol Bader, 1001 Glenbrook (written submission)

I am writing regarding the recent application by Korus Properties to build a home at 993 Glenbrook Avenue. As this matter has been fully discussed over many meetings and a hearing in front of the Board of Aldermen, I will keep my comments brief. I do not believe the most basic concerns of the homeowners of Glenbrook and other interested Glendale residents have yet to be addressed by the builder.

I appreciate that the builder has made the effort to relocate the garage to the rear of the property to avoid violating the city's ordinance regarding the relative size of the garage. Along with this change, it appears that the large oak tree in the back yard will be removed. This has been a personal concern of mine due to the tree's decline. However, several basic issues have not been addressed even though they were brought to the attention of the builder by both the ARB and the Board of Alderman.

Size of the Home—This home is considerably large that the two houses on either side of it and will tower over both houses. As planned, it will take up practically every inch of the property at 993 Glenbrook as it is a small lot in the first place. It appears that the house will still encroach into the setback in the front yard.

Impact of the Home—We have had a sad example of what a deluge of rain water can do to a house in the recent past. Though we cannot avoid all building of houses to avoid water issues, we can be smart about what is built. Based on the size of this house and the ability of any water capture system to stem a water deluge to downhill property is questionable. With a little less

house and a little more yard, managing the water would likely have better odds. On this topic I would refer also to Ms. Harper's letter to the Board regarding impervious surface area—a topic we have brought up many times.

Design of the House—This house has gone through many versions, none of which have come near to the charm of the houses on Glenbrook Avenue. If the builder cannot follow through with the suggestions of the ARB or the Board of Alderman regarding the study of the homes on this street, effort should be made to propose a house that will, at the very least, not overshadow the houses that were original to the street. The proposed house will not only be out of place but will be out of place in a big way. Several suggestions have been made by homeowners with expertise in design and I believe they have been excellent suggestions.

I am not a designer of houses or a builder, but I have purchased several houses and have rejected quite a few. I bought my house on Glenbrook a little over a year ago and was so happy to have finally found a neighborhood of friendly people, lovely houses and a great community. My hope is that the ARB will consider the beauty and history of Glenbrook and insist on the best use of the property in this neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Amy Clark, 937 Glenbrook Ave.

Ms. Clark stated that water was a concern, noted that the street was small, the yard was small, yet the house was too big and not proportional to the lot. Ms. Clark stated that a six-bedroom home was too large for the neighborhood noting that everyone lived so close to one another. She also compared the 6-bedroom home to the two bedroom home at her address.

Jennifer Grimmer, 1017 Glenbrook Ave.

Ms. Grimmer stated that the move of the garage to the back yard was a good thing but noted that the new home was more unappealing and was a gigantic rectangle adding that the depth of the house did not fit on our street and in general, did not fit in any way. Ms. Grimmer stated that a renovated 4 bedroom, 3 bath house could be put on Glenbrook without designing it so large, adding that there was no backyard for kids and wondered if that was a consideration. Ms. Grimmer stated that she was concerned about water drainage in light of the massive house with concrete patio, pads, etc., and noted that water would run downhill. Ms. Grimmer was concerned about how the storm sewer would handle the excess water, how basements might handle the excess water and if the overflow would cause basement flooding.

Cindy La, 977 Glenbrook Ave.

Ms. La stated that the street currently looked so nice, adding that this porch design was too big, and the house was too big. Ms. La suggested that pavers be added in the back, noting that they were different to maintain than concrete, etc., but stated that the addition of pavers would help with the drainage problem.

Bill Miller, 1000 Nancy Carol Lane

Mr. Miller stated that the builder addressed drainage concerns, appreciated that the elevation was similar to what it was. Mr. Miller stated that he looked forward to information concerning the pit dimensions and overflow, adding that the comments on moving the drains farther south seemed to help the garage situation. Mr. Miller noted that the rear garage made everyone in the neighborhood happy but added that a fence would be better than a wall on the rear property line. Mr. Miller commented that there would be a 3' retaining wall in addition to the slope in the yard and wondered if anything additional could be done with that. Mr. Miller stated that he was especially concerned about drainage.

Wendy Haffner, 1009 Glenbrook Ave.

Ms. Haffner stated that a pervious driveway could be installed, noting that people know what they are doing and how to maintain them and added that there was currently a brick driveway on the block. Ms. Haffner stated that this design is generally the same oversized house with a different square and noted that the cohesiveness does not work. Ms. Haffner stated that the builder has yet to speak with anyone in the neighborhood about design adding that names were easily available noting that the neighborhood would love to engage. Ms. Haffner stated that at 1002 Glenbrook, a 4-bedroom addition was added to the original home which is nice and not overbearing. Ms. Haffner stated that a large attractive house that does not look too large or too much like a box could be designed for the 993 Glenbrook site, adding that our neighborhood would like to remain the special street that it is at this time.

Marjorie Delio, 1023 Glenbrook Ave.

Ms. Delio stated that she has lived on this street for 23 years, noting that it is an exceptional street. Ms. Delio stated that people have expanded, adding second floors, or decks with cohesive plans noting that the 993 Glenbrook design does not fit on the lot. Ms. Delio stated that the back porch was too big, adding that there was too much concrete overall but noted that she understood that the garage needed to be placed in the rear yard. Ms. Delio stated that she would like to see a design that fits into the neighborhood with a strong concern for the flooding that occurs in the neighborhood.

Amy Eversol, 1002 Glenbrook Ave.

Ms. Eversol stated that she had a beautiful home and noted that the 993 Glenbrook design was not an aesthetically pleasing design.

Mr. Falk agreed with all the comments but noted that the design fits with all of the City's guidelines; however, he added that there was something wrong with the façade not in keeping with the other homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Falk made a plea to Mr. Bettlach to come back to the ARB with a design that looked cohesive, adding that the design needed to be more aesthetic to what is in the neighborhood. Mr. Falk stated that the neighborhood was filled with single-story homes, noted that the new design could be a two-story home, but added that it had to bring the mass down to make it appropriately fit the neighborhood. Mr. Falk stated that the neighborhood residents want something built on this site but added that they wanted a viable project in relation to the size, number of stories, rooflines, and the size of the lot.

Mr. Voorhees stated that it was hard to define or dictate conceptualism, adding that the design did not need to match the homes exactly. Mr. Voorhees stated that the current design was missing the comments that had been offered during the last year, adding that the current style was not proportional. Mr. Voorhees stated that the design had used brick on the first floor but added that the design lacked articulation, detail and finesse and was not appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that his views were similar to Mr. Falk's, adding that it felt like the ARB was back to the beginning. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the design reads bigger than it was before, adding that some details were wiped out which added to the large presence. Mr. Weitekamp stated that something different would need to be designed to start the process over, adding that scale had to be reduced and noted that the relationship of the house to the east and west facades had been lost.

Mr. Moran stated that he did not need to repeat what has been said but added that he agreed with Mr. Weitekamp and Mr. Falk with regarding the nature of the massing of this proposal, rebalancing of the floors and diminishing the scale that had been worked out last year. Mr. Moran stated that the house was much narrower, which is an important consideration, and questioned whether there was a middle ground. Mr. Moran stated that it was difficult to grapple with size when the builder seems determined to use every square foot, adding that giving up 500 square feet could create compliance. Mr. Moran stated that every time something is said about making the design smaller, and it does not need to relate to the FAR because the basement is fully designed, there are other ways to provide space, and to align with the street. Mr. Moran stated that less square footage can be a good thing which would still command a good price and added that architecturally, the design has gone back in time.

Mr. Bettlach stated that the house was 30' wide adding that he heard things about reducing size. Mr. Bettlach stated that the house built on Fuhrman Terrace was just like this design and it was approved by the ARB. He added that he was trying to figure out how to build on this lot. Mr. Bettlach stated that the bump out and the porch were meant to be aesthetic, adding that they were trying to make the house blend into the neighborhood without changing material or color.

Mr. Emert stated that everything has been covered, adding that regardless of style, the design facades needed to be well proportioned. Mr. Emert suggested that the project start over, look at suggestions for a two-story front façade adding that the bump outs help.

Chairman Fernhoff stated that in his opinion the house did not make the cut.

Chairman Fernhoff moved that the submission be passed as presented with the following conditions:

- Need drainage calculation on differential to substantiate pit sizes;
- Need section detail of pit to check depths and pipe elevations;
- Show pit overflow design;
- Add canopy tree to front yard, east side and move understory (Dogwood) to rear yard;
- Reposition garage on 6' setback line and verify on plans;
- Clarify specific product for applied brick.

Mr. Moran seconded the motion.

Chairman Fernhoff called for a vote.

Ayes: Mr. Moran

Nays: Chairman Fernhoff, Mr. Voorhees, Mr. Falk, Mr. Weitekamp, Mr. Emert

The submittal was denied.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
ANDI ALIPERTI, 928 CHELSEA AVENUE

Present, Matt Moore, F M Design Build

Drainage: Mr. Falk noted while reviewing the drainage plans that he was familiar with the NDS units. Mr. Moore stated that they did not have a huge footprint and the system as designed stores more water. Mr. Weitekamp asked if there was a shared driveway. Mr. Moore stated that there was a narrow strip between the two driveways. Mr. Emert asked about what was happening on the east side regarding terrain. Mr. Moore stated that there would be gravel on the side yard. Mr. Moran asked about a cross slope. Mr. Moore stated that there was a 1' slope adding that it could be grass.

Mr. Weitekamp asked for an explanation of the northwest corner of the driveway drain and whether it would have a cleanout. Mr. Moore stated that the cleanout was on the downspout.

Mr. Falk asked about the grading plan on page C300 noting that on the south side of the site, at the back, there was a swail which comes around and ends in the middle portion of the east side of the house. Mr. Falk noted that there was not enough space to construct a swail if the plan was to take the water to the front of the house, adding that a swail would push the water to the neighbors. Mr. Moore stated that they were not planning to push the water to the neighbors.

Mr. Falk suggested that there be two storm pipes conveying drainage to the front of the house, with another one moving the other direction to the NDS structure. Mr. Falk also suggested that inlets be placed on the storm lines which would make the inlets flatter and along lines to the NDS system to capture water on that side of the house.

Mr. Moran asked about a possible retaining wall on the west boundary, engaging the driveway to the south. Mr. Moore stated that there would be a landscaped wall at the southeast corner of the house at the back of the driveway landscape block wall, back of driveway. Mr. Moran stated that the wall needed to be labeled on the design.

Mr. Falk asked if there was any detail for the Envirohood. Mr. Moore stated that it was basically a deeper drywell which would be used if the NDS backed up.

Mr. Moran asked if the Duraslope was a trench drain located below the tank system. Mr. Moore stated that it was an inlet for the drywell and explained that when the inlet filled, it would be directed to four chambers then popup when overflowing adding that the Nyloplast was a water quality control device or glorified baffle which would keep the ads system clean of silt.

Mr. Moran asked about utility lines in relation to the location of the new tree. Mr. Moore stated that there would be no utilities near the new tree.

Mr. Moran stated that the house towers over 924 Chelsea, adding that they will live in a shadow. Mr. Moore stated that the photo was not accurate.

Mr. Moore noted that the tree in the front yard and the two in back would be removed.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp stated that the landscape plan needed to show accurate utilities, proper plant scale, and instead planting an understory tree in the front yard, plant canopy tree in the front yard and move understory to back yard. Mr. Weitekamp suggested incorporating the tree to the left of the evergreens in the backyard and added that tree protection needed to be on the grading plan and demo plan.

Architecture: Mr. Voorhees commented that this plan showed that the livable square footage was shows 2400 sq ft with a .35 FAR, not including attic space. Mr. Voorhees stated that the square footage needed to be included, adding that the FAR was not calculated properly and instead was closer to .39%. Mr. Moore stated that the space could be designed without trusses, making the space unusable. Mr. Voorhees stated that the plans should be presented as intended, adding that the roof area was huge. Mr. Moore stated that it could just be used for storage.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the massing was blurred and appropriate, noted that the west façade was not a problem but added that he was having a hard time with the front and side elevations. Mr. Voorhees stated that the stone veneer was odd, and the windows were out of proportion and overall, awkward with the sweeping roof lines and weak facades.

Mr. Moran stated that it seemed that with the height of the gable ends facing the property could be relieved with trim boards or other materials at the top end of the gable adding that he understood the design. Mr. Moran also stated that having the stone on the upper volume was strange and added a heavy visual look. Mr. Moran noted that siding would be better adding that it would not be out of step with the neighborhood.

Mr. Emert commented on the combination of siding configurations, stating that a different way to use the stone material would be to place it on the base of the façade or at the entry or along the side facades, adding that it would help. Mr. Moran stated that the change to the prominent gable facing Chelsea would make it relate better and it could be a cohesive design. Mr. Moran noted that the roofs were all 12's and the others were 9's and suggested that maybe the long gable should be adjusted to 9 adding that the scale was unusual. Mr. Moran noted that the low ends were going so steep, suggesting that lowering the pitch with alternate trusses and showing the Board more three-dimensional views. Mr. Moran stated that he agreed with Mr. Voorhees noting that the space could be organized so the pitch could be lowered.

Mr. Weitekamp asked why the driveway position changed. Mr. Moore stated that there would have been a need for a taller retaining wall if it had not been shifted. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the telephone pole is an issue, adding that he would rather see a wall. It was noted that there was a concrete wall on the house to the east as well.

Mr. Voorhees stated that a shed dormer off the front might look better, adding that the design had pot potential but was chopped up. Mr. Emert stated that he agreed with Mr. Voorhees noting that the scale of the gable projection was confusing, adding that everything worked accept the projecting gable and its proportion to the adjacent houses. It was noted that some windows on the east façade could be shifted and centered or just removed.

Mr. Moore stated that the client liked the gable front. Mr. Voorhees stated that if the scale were changed to make sense with the massing, and have the window relate and align, it could work. Mr. Voorhees added that the design had a contemporary feel and a metal roof.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there was anyone in the audience who wish to speak.

There were none.

Chairman Fernhoff motioned to postpone the submission.

Mr. Falk seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

MISCELLANEOUS

ARB Guidelines.

Mr. Falk stated that he would like to speak with Kirkwood, noting that they might have something like we are proposing with detention, an item similar to what we want to do adding that Kirkwood may have updated their stormwater engineering or a revised ordinance.

Mr. DeClue stated that Alderman Nauman spearheaded the idea of increasing standard impervious detention by keeping more water on the property. Mr. Emert stated that it would be unprecedented, adding that this idea would run the risk of affecting systems downstream. It was noted that Kirkwood was looking at hiring a specialized employee to review drainage based on MSD requirements. Mr. Falk stated that people have an interest in taking care of and control of their storm systems. Mr. Emert asked if there would be a code written to enforce this idea, noting that it would set a precedent. Mr. Falk stated that there was no code at present noting that in Ladue, if water increases, it must be mitigated. Mr. Emert noted that a project cannot make the drainage worse, adding that MSD has not taken the approach unless it is a distressed watershed. Mr. Falk stated that the plan reviewer looks at all the calls/complaints, adding that if things backup, it needs to be mitigated. Mr. Moran stated that a standard should be set to improve stormwater runoff, adding that effort to improve the stormwater on properties would be a valuable thing for the City and for the homeowner and noted that it should be done. Mr. Falk noted when answering the question about when this drainage code should take effect, that when a homeowner adds to the footprint, all water should be treated and mitigated adding that the roof area can be mitigated but a flat, impervious surface are cannot. Mr. Falk stated that the definitions could be worked into the code adding that any new roof area needed to be piped to a dry well and contained per the storm specks.

It was noted that everyone was in agreement with .25 FAR plus 5 points for lot sizes of 8,000 or less and .30 FAR for all others. Mr. Weitekamp would work on the definition of the 'heritage tree' prior to sending the new guidelines to the Board of Aldermen.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Moran moved adjournment of the meeting; Mr. Fernhoff seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

These minutes approved as submitted this 8th day of February, 2023.

Joanne Carr, Deputy City Clerk