



MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2023 - 6:15 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 6:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Mr. Falk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 11, 2023.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from the January 11, 2023. There being some, he asked for a motion. Mr. Voorhees moved approval of the minutes from January 22, 2023. Mr. Emert seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN PLANS FOR A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME WITH THREE CAR ATTACHED GARAGE
CODY LAUTERBACH, 827 WARWICK

Present: Christopher Fischer, Fischer and Frichtel, Architect
Cody and Lisa Lauterbach, Owner

Architectural aspect only:

Mr. Lauterbach introduced himself and asked that the Board offer as much feedback as possible before the architect finalizes the plans. Mr. Lauterbach stated that they were interested in building a third car garage, adding that he was a wood worker and needed space for a woodshop. Mr. Lauterbach stated that he planned a shorter pad of cement in front of the third door and added that he had been speaking with the neighbors who were agreeable about plans.

Mr. Lauterbach stated that the side yardage on each side was 12.5' and noted that he was trying not to bring the house forward and would follow the slope with the other houses on the block. Mr. Lauterbach stated that he had a 1.5 story frontage with mixed materials adding that houses nearby were sided with vinyl and noted that his home would use brick, board, some metal

roofing, and asphalt shingles. It was noted that the current proposal related to windows worked from the inside out with an interior view in mind. Mr. Lauterbach also noted that the neighboring house across the street had a recessed third garage. Mr. Fischer stated that layout followed two points, using geometry and topography, and added that the house sat nicely on the lot within the setback requirements. Mr. Fischer stated that he tried to design a side entry garage but noted that it was tight, did not improve the depth of the garage and made for an uncomfortable turning radius in addition to an abundance of concrete. Mr. Fischer stated that a front entry recessed garage accommodated the lot adding that there was a topographic issue noting that there was a retaining wall in the back. Mr. Fischer stated that to piggyback to what Mr. Lauterbach stated the house across the street set a precedent, there was less asphalt, and it was the best presentation for a front entry garage.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the lot across the street was a 75' wide lot, not deep, adding that every lot had different circumstances noting that small lots had different parameters.

Mr. Fischer stated that he did not agree, adding that they have defined why the family wanted to build a third front entry garage bay.

Mr. Voorhees asked if the family had looked at rear garage or rear entrance garage for the lot adding that it was not predominant as a pattern.

Mr. Fischer stated that the topography of that lot was conducive to what was designed.

Mr. Moran stated that the garage FAR clearly exceeded what the ordinance called for, noting that the Board was looking for a garage façade at 35% of the overall façade unless there were some extraordinary circumstance. Mr. Moran stated that his design was a garage forward plan which the Board did not like to see. Mr. Moran stated that he would push back against this design should it come to the ARB. Mr. Moran noted that there was no topographic study, adding that if there were no restrictions, the Board would like to see plans for a rear garage, adding that he was not saying that there was no chance for an alternative design. Mr. Moran noted that maybe there was a possibility of having a workshop but with a different orientation with the door. Mr. Moran stated that he would like to see other solutions in terms of the house as it appears on the street. Mr. Lauterbach stated that the back of the lot ran heavily down towards the left, adding that a garage would not be practical. Mr. Voorhees suggested that a review of the site should be considered instead of starting with the design. It was noted that topography was an issue. Mr. Moran stated that if a front entry garage was what the family was looking for, he would rather see the contour and site plan to discuss this plan adding that in looking at an extraordinary design, the Board wanted to see all the things that can or cannot be done. Mr. Moran suggested that when designing plans, asking questions about how the design could match the City's code would be useful. Mr. Moran stated that with that information, the ARB could get a sense of possibility. Mr. Lauterbach stated that he needed help to understand the topography, adding that he wanted a rear shop but noted that they would lose a portion of the lot to the driveway. Mr. Emert suggested a two-car garage with a side entry workshop, adding that working with more of the site and possibly bringing the living section farther forward could work. Mr. Weitekamp stated that he could see the shop being incorporated under the deck. Mr. Fischer stated that they did look under the deck adding that there was a high spot making it unworkable. Mr. Moran suggested looking for another solution such as a shop attached to the back of the garage with a tandem bay. Mr. Moran noted that he did not like the current design of the side facades, adding that there was an enormous blank wall. Mr. Moran stated that the design needed to incorporate what neighbors would see from the outside, adding that the composure and

windows mitigate scale and by breaking down the façade with multiple surfaces enhance the three-dimensional look of the house. Mr. Moran added that there was more freedom due to the size of the lot.

Mr. Emert stated that a garage on left was better for the neighbor. Mr. Lauterbach stated that they discussed a third stall connected to garages, making that door a different design from a garage door. Mr. Emert stated that designing the door to look like a house would be a good change.

Mr. Voorhees stated that it was important that the design fits the site and utilized the site. Mr. Voorhees noted that the house across the street was a two-story home, adding that the garage was a minimal piece of the façade and noted that this design projected a stronger garage. Mr. Moran stated that the design could include some added wood detail, low maintenance siding that is not vinyl. Mr. Moran also noted that if the design included the creation of a side entry element with the garage pushed back that could work, adding that architecture would need to be balanced. Mr. Lauterbach stated that adding something like that with a deeper garage would make space for the workshop, adding that he would need to need to move a car and make the budget work. Mr. Fischer stated that they would bring in their proposal next month, define our thought process and explain how we will break up the garage door.

Mr. Emert commented that there should be a montage of the two adjacent homes.

Hugh Davidson, 835 Warwick

Mr. Davidson stated that he was grateful for the addition of his recessed third garage and did not have an issue with the neighbor's garage.

Laurie Harper, 1015 Glenbrook thanked the neighbors for asking questions and thanked the ARB for offering this opportunity for a preliminary evaluation.

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

Present: Matt Moore, FM Design

Mr. Moore presented the design stating that the architectural changes included the removal of the heavy stone gable, shallowing out of the roof lines, incorporated the stone on the lower section of the house, changed the siding profile, added board and batten to create a different plane which tied the design all the way around. Mr. Moore stated that there were minor changes including the addition of a retaining wall, new storm water intakes and landscaping changes.

Mr. Moran stated that with regard to drainage, it seemed that Mr. Falk wanted area drains in the east yard. Mr. Moore stated that on page C300 there were three inlets adding that there was a written note with an arrow. Mr. Moran stated that it needed to be shown graphically on civil plans. Mr. Weitekamp and Mr. Moran commented about the border around landscape bed in front adding that it read like a wall and noted that the edging needed to be labeled on the plans. It was also noted that Tree protection was indicated on page C1 but not on other plans. Mr. Weitekamp asked if the Mulberry tree was being removed, adding that it would help if the information was on the demolition plans. Mr. Moore stated that on C300 there should be a note stating that the tree was to be removed. Mr. Moran stated that the information should not be on that page of the plans but needed to be included in drawing 1. Mr. Emert stated that the previous

plan did not have it noted. Take spot elevation on site plan and put it on the other plan. Mr. Moore stated that C200 is clean so it could be added. Mr. Moran stated that if C1 showed the existing conditions and demo, it should have the notes adding that on all other plans, the trees to be removed should be erased. Mr. Moore stated that the FAR was adjusted and the trusses from the upper story were redesigned. Mr. Moran stated that the FAR numbers were wrong and should be corrected; 2552 sq. ft. instead of 2416 sq. ft. which would put the design in the .33% range.

Mr. Voorhees stated that given the elevation line, he was not worried about the façade width adding that it fits between them adding that the warm tones with whites and greys along with the metal roof accent on the front with natural stone looked good. Mr. Emert stated that he appreciated that the stone was wrapping around the building, adding that it was a nice quality on the side elevations. Mr. Emert stated that overall, the house had a contemporary feel following all the corrections including the change to vertical board and batten which was a good improvement.

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

There were none.

Mr. Moran made a motion to approve the plans with the following conditions:

- Show the 3 area drains graphically at east side yard;
- Clarify the tree removal on drawing and do not add trees to other plans once noted as ‘to be removed’ or removed;
- On application, clarify square footage for the Floor Area Ration – correct 2,552 sq. ft. and not 2, 416 sq. ft. and lot size of 7,507 sq. ft.

Mr. Voorhees seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Chairman Fernhoff called for a vote.

Ayes: Chairman Fernhoff, Mr. Voorhees, Mr. Weitekamp, Mr. Emert, Mr. Moran

Nays: None

Not Present: Mr. Falk

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A TWO-STORY ADDITION, AND COVERED PATIO,
MIKE AND JULIE MARGIOTTA, 1 KINGS POND RD

There was no one present to represent 1 Kings Pond Rd. ARB submission.

Chairman motioned the postponement of the 1 Kings Pond Rd. submission. Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

MISCELANEOUS

Mr. DeClue stated that the moratorium was passed by the Board of Aldermen adding that there would be no new submission except pending applications. Mr. DeClue stated that there were plans currently being discussed in a substantive manner which have been allowed to move forward. It was noted that two Board members met with Mr. Bettlach and talked to him about his project, and it was also added that he was receptive to some ideas. Mr. DeClue noted that Mr. Bettlach was very receptive to a new design, worked through some ideas, and compromised on design features which may be met with positive results.

Mr. Moran stated that with regard to Guidelines, he would send final sections to the office on Monday. Mr. Weitekamp stated that he would finish up with the Heritage tree section and will look to Mr. Falk for the drainage section. Alderman Lane stated that everyone worked very hard on these guidelines adding that the moratorium is scheduled to be lifted on April 4, 2023. It was noted that Section 9 would be used to set up a check list for ARB submissions. Mr. Moran stated that Section 9 should be used directly, adding that a checklist should not be used. Mr. DeClue stated that there may be a Plan Commission meeting on March 8th to finalize the guidelines if necessary.

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 March, 2023.

Joanne Carr, Deputy City Clerk