



**MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 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, Mr. Falk

Absent:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 8, 2023.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from the February 8, 2023. There being some, he asked for a motion. Mr. Moran moved approval of the minutes from February 8, 2023. Mr. Emert seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEWLY DESIGNED SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
KORUS PROPERTIES, ROGER BETLACH, 993 GLENBROOK AVENUE

Present: Roger Bettlach, Korus Properties, Owner

Chairman Fernhoff stated that Mr. Bettlach had made an effort to integrate the look of the house consistent with the neighborhood with the brick the projection of the front wall of the first floor keeping the porch and mimic the houses on the block but not as wide as the other houses due to the driveway and the garage in the rear.

Mr. Bettlach stated that the main improvements included incorporating brick on all three sides of the façade, making the brick visible from the street, with full size brick similar to the brick at Glendale City Hall. Mr. Bettlach stated that they reduced the size of the windows to make them less large, they worked on drainage, adding a significant 8 x 10 infiltration chamber in the back yard, draining all downspouts in back yard except for the left side of the garage and all other downspouts on the house to the pit in the front yard. Mr. Bettlach stated that this house was close to what the neighborhood looked like but not as wide by 15 to 20 feet, removed the oak tree at the rear of the yard, added windows to garage to help with the neighbor on Nancy Carol and reduced the height of the garage.

Drainage: Mr. Falk noted that there was a soak away pit in the rear and asked if Mr. Bettlach was planning to drain the garage to pit. Mr. Bettlach stated that he would be doing that and added that the west side will be drained to the ground. Mr. Moran stated that both downspouts on the graphic shows both downspouts draining to the pit.

Mr. Falk stated that there was a problem with the soak away pit, adding that there were no elevations or cross sections. Mr. Bettlach stated that typically he puts a grid in the pit with the holes facing down adding that the pit would be 3' deep and 2' under the grass, with 5' ft deep mirafi with heavy mesh and clean Meramec rock added and a rectangle pipe grid with a cross along the middle of it like a figure 8. Mr. Falk stated that the ARB needed detail and would also be needed for St. Louis County.

Mr. Moran pointed out that the key #28 on A1.1, there was a discrepancy and asked that it be corrected related to drainage description. It was also noted that there was a hydraulic study added to the earlier submissions but not included today. Mr. Moran asked that it be added. Mr. Bettlach stated that it would be added.

Mr. Weitekamp noted that on the site design, there was a void of concrete on southeast corner of garage adding that it was odd to have an opening without a pad at the sidewalk and main door. Mr. Weitekamp also noted that where the driveway hammer head reaches sidewalk there was a void at the corner of the driveway. Mr. Bettlach stated that it would be filled in with concrete, adding that it would be easy to clarify. There was some discussion about curbing on the west side of driveway and the need for clarification about whether the back of proposed property flattens out. Mr. Moran noted that the west edge of the driveway sloped west to east, but that the plans looked flat. Mr. Falk stated that it would be better to pitch the driveway. Mr. Moran noted that there were no downspouts splashing towards the driveway and that at the end of the hammerhead the driveway could slope west to east.

There were no changes to the landscape plan from earlier submittals and no comments offered at this time.

Mr. Moran stated that he thought that the synthesis from the May meeting and the design with the front garage was a good idea, adding that the second story coming out behind the first story works. Mr. Moran stated that a one-story house with a second story addition recessed away was good and centered the mass more and separated the house from the neighbor's property line better. Mr. Moran stated that he appreciated the entry, L shaped recess and thought the design aligned with the neighboring homes. Mr. Moran stated that with the design change, he felt that the 9' ceiling was acceptable but noted that he would prefer a few courses of brick at the eave. Mr. Moran stated that overall, the improvements were substantial compared to earlier designs.

Mr. Voorhees agreed with Mr. Moran and stated that the two-story home designed for this lot did a good job relative to the neighborhood, adding that the design brought back the front façade as a step back was a good change. Mr. Voorhees stated that he was struggling with the eave height, adding that the truss could be lowered to bring the eave line down. Mr. Bettlach stated that it was doable to lower the eave 2" to 3". Mr. Moran stated that bringing it further out would create a step down for the neighbor to the west adding that it would be better than a raised heel on the front. Mr. Bettlach stated that they could make the change.

Mr. Voorhees stated that it seemed like the first floor was above the grade on the front and asked if it could be lowered. Mr. Bettlach stated that it was 1' 10" above grade surrounding grade line 582. Mr. Voorhees asked if he could lower the floor. Mr. Bettlach stated that it would affect the foundation, adding that the water situation comes into play and would be tight to the ground,

slope in the back, and noted that the back needed to be low enough to bring water forward. Mr. Voorhees stated that it was almost 2' taller. Mr. Bettlach stated that if he dropped the soffits down, he could get the first-floor brick minimized and get 4 or 5". Mr. Moran stated that he could get a whole foot by making that change. Mr. Voorhees stated that he did not want the overhang too big. Mr. Moran stated that by adding trim board may work it out at the brick header adding that both things can work to bring it down.

Mr. Falk stated that if the notes are correct on page A4, detail 1, there are three risers listed to get to the door, and asked if a step could be taken away there to lower the house 6" and then incorporate a grade change as a way to lower the house as much as possible. Mr. Bettlach stated that he could take a step out. Mr. Voorhees stated that he did not need to have concrete showing on the front wall and could have brick on the outside. Mr. Emert stated that it would be helpful on the east façade as well. Mr. Bettlach stated that he did not see a benefit. Mr. Bettlach stated that they would like a 10" foundation and a brick ledge adding that there was a need for 4" of brick ledge. Mr. Voorhees stated that they could lower the foundation down 6 to 7" adding that with the eaves dropped, there would be no change to the roof lines. Mr. Voorhees stated that the change would make a remarkable difference. Mr. Bettlach stated that they could adjust the eaves and work on the top of the foundation but would make sure with the engineer that the foundation does not get too low.

Mr. Falk noted that there was 582 contour at the front, and 581 mid-ways down the house on the west side, adding that the east side was down already. Mr. Falk noted that the corner towards the garage was pitched back and should make it all around the house with the top of the foundation to drop 6".

Mr. Emert stated that he agreed that there was a significant change in the porch design, the addition of brick and the rear entry garage, adding that he liked all the changes.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there was anyone present who wanted to make a comment,

Bill Miller, 1000 Nancy Carol

Mr. Miller stated that he noted the discrepancy with the sizing of the stone pit and hoped the final pit would be the larger size. It would be noted that the pit was moved farther away from the rear line. Mr. Miller stated that he appreciated that rear entry garage with windows, adding that he would rather it not be built. Mr. Miller also commented that he was not sure what happened to the rear contour lines and hoped that there would be no water added to his backyard. It was noted that the garage downspouts would be flowing into the pit. Mr. Miller stated that he was concerned about impervious areas and overall drainage that will end up on his yard adding that the hydraulic calculations should have been reviewed. Mr. Miller also noted that asked earlier about the deck, the closure at the peak and consideration about lighting not directed towards his house.

Jennifer Grimmer, 1017 Glenbrook

Ms. Grimmer stated that over the past 17 months concerns have been raised regarding the mass of the house, the cohesiveness to the neighborhood and the large amount of impervious surface area being added. Ms. Grimmer noted that at the last ARB meeting the new design, which included reducing the mass, was not appropriate. Ms. Grimmer stated that this home design was just as deep, the footprint was unchanged and added that recent changes were not proportional. Ms. Grimmer stated that unfortunately, this house is larger than the previous proposal with a larger FAR. Ms. Grimmer noted that there has never been issue with selling a smaller house that she had experienced in the last 24 years, regardless of style adding that she was extremely concerned about water and the 51% increase of impervious surface area.

Lauri Harper, 1018 Glenbrook

Ms. Harper stated that after looking over the minutes dating back 17 months, the FAR was almost at 35, just 1.5 below. Ms. Harper that compared to the other homes, the FAR was 40% larger than the two other homes but contended that this house was comparable. Ms. Harper stated that the impervious area had increased and added that the Lochmueller Group had been looking at the east end of Glenbrook when earlier water problems erupted. Ms. Harper stated that the added water would be a liability for the City and would exacerbate the known problem already on the street.

Wendy Haffner, 1009 Glenbrook

Ms. Haffner stated that the sizing down of this home has been requested, yet the house is bigger, and too large for the lot and the street. Ms. Haffner noted that a really nice house could be built that would be cohesive with neighborhood, with 8' ceiling and 4 bedrooms on the second story adding that a .25 FAR does not dwarf the neighboring homes. Ms. Haffner asked about the legal definition regarding impervious surfaces, noting that there would be an additional 1,742 sq. ft. home once built and noted that pervious material could be used. Ms. Haffner stated that a house this large with all the flat surface area added would be a problem adding that there was an unbelievable disregard for the neighborhood.

Carol Bader, 1001 Glenbrook

Ms. Bader stated that she lived to the west of 993 Glenbrook, and first wanted to thank the ARB for all the work the Board has done on the revision of the guidelines, adding that she attended the workshop on Monday night and was impressed. Ms. Bader stated that the changes were detailed, and the reasoning was well presented, and she appreciated the thought and all the work that went into the changes. Ms. Bader stated that her fellow neighbors have spoken and all agree and are exhausted by this project and extremely disappointed. Ms. Bader stated that she has lived in her home for 19 months and spent 17 months at City Hall. Ms. Bader stated this house will tower over her house, adding that she was fortunate that there were no water issues during the last year as she planted trees, shrubs and flowers in her yard that will try to soak up the water that may develop from the new house and hoped there would not be a big hole in the ground indefinitely.

Marge DeLeo, 1023 Glenbrook

Ms. DeLeo thanked the Board for all the work they do and are doing with the new ordinances and apologized if the neighborhood's conversation bothered the Board added that the neighborhood did not mean to be disrespectful. Ms. DeLeo stated that she was in attendance today to support of the very obvious and legitimate concerns these people have regarding potential hazards if the submittal is approved and how it will affect our properties. Ms. DeLeo stated that she did not know where the neighborhood will go from here and asked if the City would take care of issues if there were any problems. Ms. DeLeo stated that regardless of the soak-away pits, the drainage will go down hill and it will affect our lots. Ms. DeLeo again thanked the Board.

Pam Harris, 917 Glenbrook

Ms. Harris stated that she had lived in the neighborhood for 11 years, agreed with what has been said by the neighbors and supported it all. Ms. Harris stated that she moved from Webster Groves, adding that this block had smaller midcentury homes, and did not see how this design fit in with the street.

Amy Clark, 937 Glenbrook

Ms. Clark stated that water was the biggest concern, adding that the city and neighborhood had an outdated infrastructure, adding that the pipes were small and could not handle all the new water. Ms. Clark stated that with construction, the future spring floods will be awful, noting that the earlier spring floods were already causing problems. Ms. Clark stated that a new storm sewer was being requested all because of the additional water. Ms. Clark stated that she had a hole in her yard big enough for a car and added that the yard was dug up twice due to emergency water issues, noting that the water in her house was terrible.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the Board appreciated the input from the community adding that there are a few other two-story homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Voorhees stated that the following positive changes in this submittal included the removal of the front entry two-car garage, which reduced the driveway to a one lane (width) drive and added more green space. Mr. Voorhees stated that this design will set a nice precedent for your neighborhood, the façade will be gentle and pushed back. Lastly, this proposal is totally different from what was submitted last year, adding that the builder has gone back to find the best elements of the best plan and removed the front garage. Mr. Voorhees stated that he personally thinks that this design will be valued in your neighborhood in the future adding that the FAR limit is what is written and noted that the builder cut the massing and scaled back the home within the rules of the current guidelines. Mr. Voorhees stated that it would be a nice project.

Mr. Falk stated that Mr. Bettlach was addressing the water, taking every downspout into soak away pits, based on calculations for a normal, average storm. The driveway and patio will be the only areas that flow freely to the yard. Mr. Falk stated that the water going onto neighbors' properties will be less compared to original house adding that Mr. Bettlach has gone above and beyond what is necessary and addressed the water adequately adding that it was best for the design proposed. Mr. Falk stated that he agreed with Mr. Voorhees, adding that the process was prolonged and wished changes could have happened faster and more efficiently, and added that other builders would have walked away with the loss of design dollars. It was noted that the back-and-forth process was appreciated. Mr. Falk stated that Mr. Voorhees articulated the evaluation of architecture adding that there was significant respect for context and setbacks and presented the architecture for entry like the homes on the street. Mr. Moran stated that regarding the massing the design is better than the two existing two story homes adding that their architectural style is different than the houses on the street and did not carry out the features that do appear up and down the street. Mr. Moran stated that he agreed with Mr. Falk, the engineering was simply a matter of volume of water on the roof which would be captured and delayed, the hydraulics will be reinserted adding that there would be a significant reduction of surface area from old to new noting that fear was fear, but engineering was done well. Mr. Moran stated that the builder did much more than most builders in taking further steps to mitigating all roof areas of project. Mr. Moran stated that the decision to use masonry was positive, adding that all aspects of the facades were visible for the public to see. The eave will be softened and reduced, which shows that the builder was not ignoring suggestions. Mr. Moran stated that Mr. Bettlach was working the best he could to complete a project that would be as good as can be agreed upon, that would set a good precedent for a home for other streets in Glendale as well as Glenbrook. Mr. Moran stated that this was a design that showed how it could work.

Mr. Emert agreed concerning the frustration with the process adding that by requiring a detached garage, at the end of the day the applicant was meeting the ARB guidelines that the ARB bound by, and the design does meet the spirit from a qualitative and quantitative perspective as well.

Chairman Fernhoff stated that the Board had worked over a period of time, received neighborhood input, adding that the builder designed a good compromise for a street with 1950's architectural styles. Chairman Fernhoff stated that he agreed with Mr. Moran in that elements from this design could be used on other two-story houses in Glendale adding that houses will change in Glendale in time, noting that looking at the whole picture, after 17 months, a good compromise was reached.

Mr. Moran made a motion approve design with conditions:

- Add details of soak away pit;
- 6 x 28 sized bmp;
- Add hydraulic calculations to drawings;
- Lower eave soffit by changing detail of roof trusses;
- Lower finished floor level 6";
- Lower eave and soffit and extend overhang as needed to align soffit trim board with brick header;

Mr. Vorhees seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Chairman Fernhoff called for vote from the Board.

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

Nays: None

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

Present: Meghan Cotner

Chairman Fernhoff stated that the home was a beautiful brick home on a 14,000 sq. ft. lot.

Drainage: Mr. Falk noted that there was a flow well system, storm water calculations were present, and it was noted that there was a proposed grading plan with contours on the first page.

Mr. Moran questioned the disposition of the downspouts which were not shown on the plans and noted that there was a strategy to slope the gutter but asked if there was a downspout missing on the south and west of the fireplace. It was also noted that the downspouts present at the eastern corners were not clear and added that the downspouts needed to be shown on the drawings. Mr. Moran stated that there seemed to be a problem with the covered porch and wondered how the water would drain to the ground from the porch. Mr. Falk stated that there was a problem with the overflow for flow well in the yard adding that the popup was interesting but that there was a problem with that. Ms. Cotner noted there was an MSD easement where the structure was located. Mr. Falk stated that a permit would be needed from MSD to work in the area. Mr. Falk suggested that the pop-up emitter be placed 5' away. Ms. Cotner stated that she would update that change.

Mr. Weitekamp asked if the courtyard space by the pool in the backyard, between porch and siding would be grass, adding that the landscape plan should show the scale of project.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that a few trees were going to be removed but added that there were no tree replacements, noting that he would suggest a crape myrtle on the left side and another canopy tree on the right side of the house. Mr. Weitekamp stated that it was nice to restore trees that have been removed. Ms. Cotner stated that the family would be willing to replace the trees.

Mr. Falk stated that he did not understand the Flow well detail, adding that the new pipe coming in was high at the outlet adding that the outlet needed to be equal or lower and was currently drawn incorrectly. Mr. Falk stated that there needed to be volume retention for it to work right. Ms. Cotner noted that she was not involved with the design of the pool. Mr. Falk stated that the plans for the pool should be identified on the plans.

Mr. Moran stated that assuming there is no pool, will the flagstone surface go with the porch. Ms. Cotner stated that for site coverage, they did not want to create any problems adding that steps will go down to the grass. Mr. Moran stated that was a good choice suggesting that the walk pad end at the drive. Mr. Moran stated that the Board does look at pools withing the parameters of the guidelines as well as the addition.

Mr. Emert asked about the reasoning behind the second entry at the courtyard area. Ms. Cotner stated that they would be adding a mud room. Ms. Cotner stated that the family had a breezeway, and sitting area, and enjoyed seeing the road and neighbors but wanted to keep the area as a sitting area. Ms. Cotner stated that they wanted to keep the feel of the current design with the path from front to back. Mr. Emert stated that he was struggling with the one-story laundry room and asked if it could be moved to the second floor. Ms. Cotner stated that if they changed it to a two-story, they would need to expand the FAR which didn't work.

Mr. Moran stated that the little addition needs to be sided with brick and did not mind the massing which was complex in that area but added that the current design was out of step and needed to be sided with brick. Mr. Moran stated that if it were a private domain, it would be fine, adding that it was a public façade which needed to match the existing façade.

It was noted that a similar eave and window detail could be added.

Mr. Voorhees stated that since the house was white, he did not have an issue with the difference in building material.

Mr. Emert stated that everything in the design worked so well except this extension did not work, adding that he agreed with the change in material.

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

Don Boyce, 6 Kings Pond

Mr. Boyce stated that parking on the street was a problem adding that emergency vehicles have trouble getting through and added that there was a sewer in front of the house and noted that the planned pool needed to drain into a sanitary line and not a storm water drain. Mr. Boyce stated that there was an existing water problem on Kings Pond and asked if a fence was required for a pool. It was noted that a fence was required for a pool. Mr. Boyce stated that with regard to the construction, the contractor needed to keep parking issues in mind, especially for emergency vehicles, and noted that construction vehicles should not park in front of fire plugs or on both sides of the street. Mr. DeClue stated that neighbors are encouraged to make contact if there were any problems during the construction phase. Mr. Moran noted that there was no contractor

assigned as yet. It was noted that contractors would be advised about construction rules. Mr. Boyce thanked the ARB for all the work that they did for the community.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that the project would be a nice addition to an already beautiful home but added that the squared off columns should be changed to round columns to replicate the existing round columns on the home.

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

There were none.

Mr. Moran motioned to approve the plans with the following conditions:

- Show all missing downspouts on site plan;
- Add a canopy tree on the east side of the front yard;
- Revise flow design with higher input from the output;
- Note rear hardscape as a future plan;
- Revise façade material on public side of addition to be brick;
- Change square column to round columns on plans to match existing columns.

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

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

Nays: None

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A FRONT ENTRY GARAGE ADDITION
CHRISTY WEBB, 20 WINGFIELD DRIVE

Present: Chris Delleart, Pastiche Design Build

Mr. Delleart stated that the addition would be 15' off the property line where the drop occurs but the remainder of the lot is flat. It was noted that the drainage plan did not grading but did show downspouts and calculations were on the cover page.

Mr. Delleart stated that the lot was triangular with a front yard and two side yards adding that the side yard setbacks ran the full depth of lot, and it was not a corner lot. Mr. Delleart stated that there would be no scope of work in the backyard, adding that the whole plan encompassed the of the garage extension 20' to the left and the paver would remain in the back.

Mr. Voorhees asked if there would be an addition on top of the existing driveway. Mr. Delleart stated that there would be a new slab over the car park. Mr. Falk stated that the rear downspout should be brought around the front to include the front downspout to be sent to a front pop up emitter which would flow to the storm drain on Wingfield adding that the water should not flow to the neighbor's property. Mr. Delleart stated that there was a large embankment on the east side. Mr. Moran stated that the underground piping was a good idea as a small addition to the project. Mr. Moran added that the water would daylight to the front to soak in the yard before it drained into the street.

Mr. Delleart stated that the driveway would be new, the curb would have a single cut.

Mr. Moran asked why there was a section of 3' pavement near the jam on the right adding that the driveway should be straightened out. Mr. Delleart stated he would straighten it out adding that he agreed it would be better to simplify the driveway with a straight line to the garage.

Mr. Weitekamp noted that there was not much landscape and asked if the trees listed were accurate to the property. It was noted that the tree near the garage door would remain, there were no trees to the east of the door and all three trees would remain. Mr. Weitekamp stated that tree protection should be shown on the plans, especially for the 30" caliper, if shrubs will be planted, bury the downspout so the mulch does not flow away.

Mr. Moran stated that the garage door should have glass lites on the top of the door, aim to add a closure to the soffit, look at the eave detail and bring the brick around the corner of the garage to the side façade. Mr. Delleart stated that he could put a soffit on the gable and bring the brick around.

Mr. Voorhees asked that a window be added on the side wall of the new garage and at the back of addition. Mr. Delleart noted that the lot was flat, adding that the grade was not high on the back of the lot and there were only plans for landscape to be added to the front.

Mr. Delleart stated that there were plans for shelving on the wall but could be added on the back wall adding that there was brick above the door with the current windows tucked under the roof line.

Mr. Emert noted that there were no contours.

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

Stephen Ballweg, 26 Wingfield

Mr. Ballweg was concerned about drainage, noting that they had issues in the past with basement water, adding that a sump pump had been added to solve the problem. Mr. Ballweg stated that he was okay with the front drainage pop-up emitter. Mr. Ballweg also stated that because the road curves up and down from Berry Road, there is a concern that construction vehicles will not be seen and wondered how that would be addressed to keep everyone safe. Mr. Delleart stated that he would coordinate with the builder per the suggestion by Chairman Fernhoff.

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

- Pipe the downspout from rear to front and connect front downspout and pup up emitter 10' from house;
- Straighten out drive;
- Add brick eave around side of façade;
- Add glass windows on garage doors.

Mr. Falk seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

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

Nays: None

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A REAR TWO-STORY ADDITION
KATURA KLAUS, 205 PARKLAND AVENUE

Present: Jeff Day, Day and Associates
Axton McCormack,
Katura Klaus, Homeowner

Drainage:

Mr. Day stated that they would be thorough by adding two flowwell units and hoped that was okay as long as they follow the detail and noted that the pipes were high. Mr. Moran stated that the differential chart showed only one unit and the plan needed to be corrected along with the mitigation calculations which need to be accurate. Mr. Day would double check and make sure they were accurate.

Mr. Moran asked if the driveway came in and engaged with addition adding that page 3 showed that the landscape would run all the way up. Mr. Moran suggested that some of the asphalt be removed, and Mr. Emert suggested that the area be planted.

Clarification of demolition of wall and stairs: drawing 1 of 3 should note that the demolition of the wall and stairs would take place with the transition point shown. It was noted that on page 1, the existing stop will remain.

Mr. Weitekamp asked if all the utilities existing and was concerned for the tree. Mr. Day stated that he would make sure the tree was protected. Mr. Weitekamp noted that nothing needed to be added following the removal of the Japanese maple which was a small tree.

Mr. Moran stated that the existing to be removed should be listed on the demolition site plan and additions on the landscape plan.

Architecture:

Mr. Moran stated that he liked the addition, that the siding was not vinyl and would look good but added that the FAR should be listed on the drawing.

Mr. Day stated that the ice and water shield is required, Mr. Moran stated that what was listed was preferable.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the rear elevation showed a step back at the side. Mr. Day stated that they were cutting through the grade at that point. Mr. Voorhees asked if there would be a step up at that point. Mr. Day stated that there would be two risers going up and added that currently, there was a pathway and a patio which sits below the driveway. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the water looks to be moving from the driveway to the addition. Mr. Moran noted that slot drains in the pavement could be added to move water out and around the house such as sheet flow. Mr. Weitekamp stated that it looked like a bowl in the back due to the grades, adding that water would just sit.

Mr. Falk noted that the grade at the back was 621 list on 6.1 and on the bump out it was 619 adding that the water will get trapped on the patio paver but needed to be drained and pitched away from the house pitch. Mr. Falk noted that a slot drain could be added in the middle of patio, connect it on the south side and bring it to the flow well. Mr. Day stated that the downspouts were going to do that anyway.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there were any neighbors present.

There were none.

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

- Revise differential run off to two flow wells;
- Revise north side plant bed at corner of house;
- Add FAR to page one;
- Add a patio drain.

Chairman Fernhoff seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

MISCELANEOUS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Falk moved the adjournment of the meeting; Mr. Voorhees seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

These minutes approved as submitted this 10th day of May, 2023.

Joanne Carr, Deputy City Clerk