



**MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 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. Moran, Mr. Voorhees, Mr. Emert, Mr. Weitekamp

Absent: Mr. Falk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 8, 2023.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from the March 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 TWO-STORY ADDITION AND BASEMENT
ADAM AND GABRIELLE SPENO, 912 S. MORELAND AVENUE

Present: Ken Burns, Architect
Adam Speno, Owner

Chairman Fernhoff stated that the family was planning a two-story addition.

It was noted that the garage on the side was set to the limit of the lot setbacks.

Drainage: Mr. Weitekamp asked about the two downspouts on left side of house, noting that one would be piped to trough drain. Mr. Burns stated that both downspouts would be drained to the trough drain, then to the surface drain which would then be piped to the east into the rain garden. Mr. Burns stated that they would grade the concrete so that the water would overflow to the center of property when necessary. Mr. Weitekamp noted that there were no trees showing on the rain garden plans. Mr. Burns stated that the rain garden area was already built, adding that the added water from the garage and rear addition were included when sizing the rain garden noting that there were no trees.

Mr. Moran stated that it would be beneficial for everyone if the site plan would include the sidewalk, the road on the frontage and the location of the neighbors' homes in relation to the home. Mr. Moran questioned the driveway and wondered if it was shared. Mr. Burns stated that

it was not shared but added that the family was trying to obtain agreement for a shared driveway noting that they would make the sharing concept work. It was noted that it would be beneficial if there was additional information added to the submittal. Mr. Moran asked about spot elevations. It was noted that there were spot elevations on the south end at the corner of the garage and on the southeast and southwest corner of the driveway. Mr. Moran stated that there was a swale located on the plans but added that it would help to clarify what was going on regarding drainage.

Mr. Voorhees asked if the contours noted were existing. Mr. Burns stated that they were adding that the property had natural low spots. Mr. Burns noted that contours 94 and 96 would be reset to come around the addition. Mr. Voorhees noted that there was a large part of the foundation evident on the east side of the addition.

It was noted that the drainage plan A 5 was confusing due to the gravel patch. That is an existing condition and would be removed for county review.

Mr. Burns stated that there would be no tree removal and added that the rain garden would remain. It was noted that the plans should show the rain garden in place. Mr. Weitekamp asked if plants would be located in front of the new addition and if so, noted that plants should be indicated on the plans. Mr. Burns stated that he would do that.

Architecture: Mr. Burns stated that LP siding would match the existing siding including the shaker style. It was noted that the amount of concrete showing on the addition was excessive. Mr. Burns stated that the 6' high concrete foundation would be rubbed and colorized. Mr. Speno stated that it would replicate with the stone foundation, as a cement wash. Mr. Voorhees stated that the topography needed to be raised at the foundation grade and add bushes on the garage side if possible. Mr. Moran stated that as a suggestion, it might be a nice idea to convert the narrow grass area with garden area, bringing it around the corner. Mr. Burns stated that there was a vent in the front, and it would remain the same.

Mr. Emert stated that the front elevation and rear were complimentary adding that the east elevation was also nice with projecting bay windows. Mr. Emert stated that it would be nice to see a projected bay on the lower level of the east elevation and asked if there were any considerations for that idea. Mr. Speno stated that it would not work due to the family room in the area. Mr. Emert noted that the east elevation was flat. Mr. Moran stated that overall, he liked the composition and liked how it blended with the house that was originally built.

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:

1. Add spot elevations to driveway east and west corners adjacent to garage;
2. Selection of shrubs add existing tree locations to site plan;
3. Minimize the concrete foundation height of foundation wall with field grading.

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

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

Nays: None

Not Present: Mr. Falk

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
PEARL CONSTRUCTION, 20 EDWIN AVENUE

Present: Rex and Janet Pearl, Pearl Construction and Owner

Mr. Pearl stated that care was taken in designing this house using a four-square design and with high finishes. Mr. Pearl stated that the porch would be slate with a brick front, with 8" hardy board siding on the taller profile. Mr. Pearl stated that there would be a bracket under the eaves, a metal roof on front and dormer and a fireplace to make a nice home and fit into neighborhood.

Drainage:

Mr. Pearl stated that there would be downspouts at the back of the house which will flow to yard popups in the back adding that the grade was higher in back left and highest in the front right. Mr. Pearl stated that the south side would have basement windows. Mr. Weitekamp asked about the finished floor and its relationship to lines 627 and 628. Due to 10 Edwin and general contours, it was noted that water should popup further down the yard, so water did not flow backward toward the house. Mr. Pearl stated that the front downspout would drain to the pit in the front yard and was 10 X 15 of extra volume for future flow. It was noted that there were no calculations for impervious surface area.

A Board member stated that in comparing the two site plans it seemed that the circular driveway wasn't included, that the garage driveway was the same but added that there seemed to be more surface area. It was also noted that there were no stormwater calculations but only impervious surface calculations. The Board will need before and after calculations to determine the proper pit size. Mr. Pearl stated that they would verify that and would check the driveway as well.

Mr. Moran noted that the lot was large and could tell a story with the front porch but added that there were no examples of a circle drive on Edwin. Mr. Moran stated that he would like to hear other opinions. Mr. Pearl stated that the homeowners did a lot of entertaining and due to the elevation of the house, wanted to keep parked vehicles close. Mr. Pearl stated that they had thought about a hammerhead but designed the circle drive. Mr. Voorhees stated that the greenspace was this issue. Mr. Pearl stated it would only be 10-12' wide with exposed aggregate concrete, stamped and stained, as material used, adding that it would be similar to the porch.

Mr. Moran asked if the house would be pushed back noting that it was difficult to tell without a photo showing the neighboring home elevations in comparison to this design adding that there are no dimensions of the house. Mr. Moran stated that the submitted civil plan should be complete and should show setbacks etc. Mr. Pearl noted that the home to the north shown was pushed back 15'.

Mr. Voorhees questioned the circular drive, adding that the hammerhead with parking for 2 cars could look nice. Mr. Moran and Mr. Emert stated that the two parking spots in front instead of the circular drive would work. Mr. Pearl was asked to submit the plans with that design and send them to Mr. Weitekamp for approval. Mr. Moran asked if the remaining driveway would be aggregated. Mr. Pearl stated that the driveway would be aggregated and noted that he would recalculate and email the measurements.

Mr. Pearl stated that the contours were not going to change, and they would keep them flowing around the house. Mr. Moran stated that there would be some changes, adding that there needed to be proposed contours solved for grading noting that a civil engineer needed to show the changes. Mr. Moran asked if there would be a swale so that the water can move around the property with an effort to alter the grade, so the water did not backflow towards the garage.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the elevations were confusing, south elevation showed a low grade, the front elevation does not show a drop off in grade and added that there was a retaining wall on A5 but did not include wall in plans. Mr. Moran stated that the rear elevation showing a small porch grade dropping down was more confusing adding that the rear elevation on the east side had a low corner, but according to south grading was flat with the porch suddenly 6 to 7' taller.

Mrs. Pearl stated that the architect along with engineer will look at the issues adding that they will clarify the plans regarding the retaining wall.

Landscape:

Mr. Weitekamp stated as follows:

Wants to start off by saying I am speaking purely of my own opinion as one member of this board. It does not necessarily reflect this board in its entirety, but I do have some concerns about this project. Traditionally, I think you have put together some nice projects and have been receptive to the asks of the Board. I think it is a reflection of the mutual respect for the design and build process and what is necessary to ensure that a quality end project gets built in our community. I specifically say our community because I know you are Glendale residents as well.

I have looked through your plans for 20 Edwin and I cannot say I have a strong opinion for or against the home on its own merits. What I definitely have a problem with is the fact that you made a conscious decision to take down virtually every mature tree on the property before even coming before this Board. As a licensed landscape architect and resident of this community, I find that to be a slap in the face to the members of this Board and the residents of this community.

The entire purpose of this board is to discuss projects and how they relate to the surrounding neighborhood. The laziest thing a builder can do is to tear down everything onsite to remove all obstacles and challenges. In 8 years of sitting on this Board I cannot recall a builder destroying a mature tree canopy before ever sitting before this Board to explain the reasoning behind their design approach. And let me add, large trees being in the way of a large home you like to build, is not a good reason to remove all the trees.

So, let's take a closer look at these trees based on the plans you have provided, none of which include a tree study performed by an arborist like we typically see on projects where tree removals are occurring. Let's make the assumption all tree-survey information is accurate on your plans, so here are some statistics:

- Roughly 220 caliper inches proposed to be removed onsite (over the course of April 227 and 28);
- 2018 Purdue University study discussed ways to estimate the age of a tree by current caliper inch: the average tree you contracted out to be cut down was roughly 84 years old, so in two days, you were able to cut down what had comprised of the mature tree

canopy on 20 Edwin for the better part of the past century. It is not unreasonable to assume that some of the trees you cut down once lined the gravel driveway leading to the home William McPhearson built at what is now 115 Edwin in 1859. (There is a column still standing at the bend in Sappington Rd. that served as the entrance to the residence 's drive.) What I think builders never take into account is the history that is continually erased when large trees, old homes, get torn down.

- So, when I look at your landscape plan submitted showing a smattering of trees that add up to 18” caliper in total, I find it extremely difficult to approve this project.
- In the past, we often have a list that says well you are really close if you would do this and this, and we can conditionally approve it.
- The unfortunate part is that you made the decision to move forward before ever having a discussion with the ARB, so I can even give you a list of items to check off that will make this right.
- All I can really do is ask that you go back and take a hard look at the plans and the destruction that you have already caused onsite and come up with the best holistic plan you possibly can because what I am seeing right here is honestly a pretty weak effort.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that this project is what the Board is fighting against adding that 75% of the canopy is gone but noted that a 10” caliper tree was saved. Mr. Weitekamp noted that without a tree study, he could only assume that the landscape plan was accurate.

Mrs. Pearl stated that they were very sorry that Mr. Weitekamp felt the way he did adding that Pearl Construction had a good working relationship with the City and noted that in a public forum, it was unfair to say they were taking advantage of the City or the Board which was never their goal. Mrs. Pearl stated that she believed that in all projects, they save as much tree coverage as they can, would have good communication throughout the project and was very sorry for this outcome.

Mr. Pearl stated that they did not mean to offend the Board, adding that they talked to the City about taking trees down, noting that the goal was to hit the ground running. Mr. Pearl stated that the City knew about the removal of the tree, adding that he was sorry if the Board did not know about the removal. Mr. Pearl stated that there were 6 trees removed related to house and garage, 1 tree was removed due to gall and noted that they would start over with new trees. Mr. Pearl stated that the home buyers were not opposed to make up for the loss through landscaping. Mr. Pearl stated that he apologized if it appeared that they were “pulling a fast one” noting that it was not their intent. Mr. Pearl stated that he assumed that the Board would be okay with the removal due to the placement of the new house. Mr. Weitekamp stated that was not a good reason to remove a tree, adding that there could have been design features added related to the trees.

Mr. DeClue stated that he was asked about the removal of trees but asked that the Pearls wait until after the Board meeting, but also noted to the Pearls that there was nothing written in the code which precluded them from removing the trees.

Mr. Moran stated that some trees were lost that could have been approved but noted that new trees would need to be added. Mr. Pearl again apologized.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that he would like to hear the neighbors' opinion. Mrs. Pearl asked about the caliper and variety of trees should be added. Mr. Moran stated that if the Board could have talked about the positioning of the trees, some trees may have been preserved. It was noted that there was no arborist's plan or report, and the Board did not know details about removed trees.

Mr. Pearl stated that the buyers were excited about a landscape plan and noted that there was room for improvement.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the Board liked working with Pearl Construction, adding that it was a good home design but noted that design was holistic and could be designed with trees and buildings in mind. Architects could design a home, taking into account a 48" caliper tree which could dictate design and noted that the design should work with the environment it is to be built upon.

Mrs. Pearl stated that it was never their goal to remove trees in advance of the ARB meeting, adding that the current requirements and the style of home pointed to the removal and added that they did speak with the City but appreciate all the feedback. It was noted that the new owners were good community members and plans relate architecturally and ecologically. Mr. Weitekamp stated that he wanted a good landscape plan presented to the Board.

Architecture:

It was noted that there were no colors shown on the plans. Mr. Pearl stated that the roof will be charcoal grey with black trim with a red brick chimney on the porch with dark guttering. Mr. Voorhees stated that he liked the plans and liked the side driveway and the windows, which are good but preferred the old house better. Mr. Pearl stated that they were struggling to preserve the new with the old. Mr. Moran stated that the proportions were good, including the four-square style with the enter dormer. Mr. Moran stated that he appreciated that photos, and liked the symmetry of the front façade, the step down to the garage and the secondary mass. Mr. Moran stated that the design was composed well, including the breakdowns at the second biggest surface, and liked the informality of the brick chimney along with the generous side yard which the neighbors would appreciate. Mr. Moran stated that the house was very stabilizing with a softer, country feel with a nice, simple façade.

Mr. Emert stated that he appreciated the materials chosen including the slate, the brick, and the metal. Mr. Moran added that he liked the eave detail. Mr. Pearl stated that they tried to create symmetry with the doors and windows.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that he did not see a demo plan, and asked if the greenhouse was going to be removed from calculations. Mr. Pearl stated that it was going to be removed.

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

Robert Schuster, 26 Edwin

Mr. Schuster did not understand the grading, was curious about the foundation which appeared to be 2' above the existing and wondered if the water would flow to his property with increased grading. Mr. Pearl noted that the land would not be raised from the existing grading, adding that the top of the foundation would be lower than the existing house with the goal not to disrupt the topographical lines on the property to affect the water flow. Mr. Schuster stated that the trees that were cut down were old, adding that water flow would be affected by their removal.

Mr. Pearl stated that it was their intent to keep the movement of the land there now with the back corner of the property as the highest point, adding that the flow of the water would be towards the front of the property where there will be a swale between the two houses that will be managed to allow water to flow towards the front. Mr. Pearl stated that the 30' of driveway would have a 5' separation from the lot line for planting beds on the side. Mr. Schuster asked if a fence was planned. Mr. Pearl stated that one would eventually be built.

Lois Mahsman, 142 Edwin

Ms. Mahsman stated that she could not believe that the property was clear cut, did not agree with the current guidelines and added that there should be prior approval for the removal of trees.

John Williams, 265 Edwin.

Mr. Williams recommended and/or suggested that the contractor not operate on assumptions, adding that it was hard to believe clear cutting the lot was the right thing to do noting that he was aware of the things done to the house on Hawbrook. Mr. Williams stated that what was done was abysmal adding that you were now that builder who has a black mark. Mrs. Pearl stated that they were members of the community and had children living in the community as well.

Mr. Williams stated that Mr. DeClue advised you not to remove the trees a day before the meeting adding that the trees at this house were nice.

Mrs. Pearl stated that based on all our experiences, they had a good relationship with City, with the Board and neighbors, adding that with assumptions based on the current code, this house met the criteria adding that the assumptions were based on 27 years of experience as builders. Mr. Pearl stated that they were not trying to upset people.

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

Postpone submittal until the Board reviews the civil plan and landscape plan.

Mr. Weitekamp agreed with the motion. Mr. Emert also agreed, noting that there were too many unknowns without postponing. Mr. Voorhees stated that he agreed, noting that the Board had to hold to the standards which included noting all information on site plans. Chairman Fernhoff also agreed to postpone the submittal, noting that he looked forward to seeing a landscape plan.

Chairman Fernhoff motioned to postpone the submittal.

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

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

Nays: None

Not Present: Mr. Falk

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A REAR ADDITION AND 2-CAR DETACHED GARAGE
JEFF AND LEANN ABBOTT, 256 EDWIN AVENUE

Present: Rex Pearl, Pearl Construction
Jeff and Leann Abbott, Owners

Mr. Pearl stated that he worked on a home on Halcyon a few years ago and this family is their parents who would like to develop this property as their second home. Mr. Pearl stated that the existing house has a poor addition on the back, that are defined with pictures enclosed in the submittal. Mr. Pearl stated that the subject property had a tuck under garage which has dropped approximately 1' and added that the entire house moves. Mr. Pearl stated that the would be removing the garage, adding some square footage, moving garage to backyard as detached and removing some trees due to the garage. It was noted that there is a 10' sewer easement at the back of the lot near driveway for storm water. Mr. Pearl noted that on the bottom right photo, the storm sewer can be seen based on how the driveway was cut. Mr. Pearl stated that he would tie house drains to collection site. Mr. Pearl noted that the 8' cantilevered addition was supported by 4' x 4' post, adding that the house was not settling. Mr. Moran noted that the construction was deficient and asked about the location of storm water drainage. Mr. Pearl stated that the resulting backyard would be small for a detention pit but would tie the new additional roof into the storm drain. Mr. Pearl stated that 6 trees were to be removed including 4 on the rear lot line, adding that Ameren wires run through the area. It was noted that the 15" caliper tree on the side yard labeled with tree protection only has tree limbs on one side and could be removed. It was noted that the 6th tree located in the rear yard should be removed due to lack of growth.

It was noted that there were new rear additions at 250 Edwin and 262 Edwin.

Mr. Weitekamp asked if turn radius and backup studies were done. Mr. Pearl stated that they did, adding that there would be an 18' wide garage doors making it available to swing into garage. Mr. Weitekamp asked if it would function better if it were closer to the house adding that there could be a hammerhead in the back to pull straight out.

It was noted that the goal for the second house was to have only a one car garage to maintain greenspace for the grandkids. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the driveway be narrowed for more greenspace and asked if the driveway would be overlaid with asphalt. Mr. Pearl stated that they were planning to tear into the existing driveway for footings and sewer and noted that a small deck was planned that would be brought up to the driveway.

It was noted that moving the garage would solve the setback, the greenspace, and the pullout of cars.

Landscape:

Mr. Weitekamp stated that it was a common practice to have tree removals documented. It was noted that trees in the front yard would be saved, and it was asked if there was room for another tree. Mr. Moran stated that a canopy tree needed to be added on the north side of the rear yard. Mr. Weitekamp noted that a tree would be nice for the deck.

Architecture: Mr. Emert stated that materials needed to match the existing materials as much as possible. Mr. Pearl stated that they would be replacing the windows on the entire house, and adding a covered front porch which would be consistent with the existing house.

Mr. Moran stated that the front elevation would be improved, adding that preserving the front of the house worked well compositionally and with the addition. It was noted that there were only two elevations presented for the garage. Mr. Pearl noted that the garage backed up to the neighbor's garage on the east side which precluded the addition of a window. It was noted that there would be windows on the north and west sides. Mr. Moran stated that he would be comfortable with that, adding that a window located towards the house would be good.

Mr. Emert asked if there would be a stoop at the door or a walk out to grass. Mr. Pearl stated that there would be a patio. It was noted that a window should be added facing the house on the door side of the garage.

Mr. Emert stated that siding needed to be carried down to grade on the north side with windows cut in so the basement could be occupied. Mr. Pearl stated that the foundations would be a 9' pour. It was noted that windows will be added on the three-story façade with a door for a walkout and with 6' of exposed concrete would be too much exposed concrete. Mr. Emert asked that the architect dash down the basement wall. Mr. Pearl stated that the family did not want a walkout door. Mr. Emert noted that it would not be seen. Chairman Fernhoff asked that windows be added to the top panel of the garage door.

It was noted that on the site plan, downspout locations should be shown with piping to storm drain. It was also noted that the inlet should be repositioned.

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

Joe Arndt, 239 Elm

Mr. Arndt stated that he lived behind house and to the south of this house and was concerned that the addition of the garage will increase drainage to his yard, wanted to know how the water would be collected and how the grading will exacerbate the drainage issues and added that rainwater was already a problem in the area. It was noted that there was a 10" wide storm sewer tied into basement entry area inlet. Mr. Moran asked if the water was directed to the southeast.

Tom Schneiderhahn, 245 Elm,

Mr. Schneiderhahn stated that the trees provided shade and privacy for his house and yard and asked about a tree study tied to the removal of the trees. Mr. Pearl stated that the trees sit within the utility line and there were issues. Mr. Schneiderhahn stated that he lived at the home for 24 years and there were no issues. Mr. Schneiderhahn stated that the trees were not on his property but a foot from the property line and added that it seemed like a shared thing.

Mr. Schneiderhahn stated that they moved into the neighborhood for the trees adding that they had a two-car garage south of our lot, which added privacy on the northwest corner.

Mr. Schneiderhahn also stated that there were a lot of rain issues, lived through water in the basement adding that MSD came through with piping on our driveway. Mr. Schneiderhahn was very concerned about losing all the shade, erosion of soil with tree removal and the possibility that rain would shift north to south. Mr. Schneiderhahn stated that they had a berm near the garage, adding that when it rains the yard could be a swamp. Mr. Schneiderhahn stated that he appreciated that the downspouts would be shifted to the storm sewer but added that their house was located at the lowest point on the street. Mr. Schneiderhahn stated he was very concerned about water issues, adding that the discussion has been a huge learning curve and thanked the Board.

Mr. Emert stated that they talked about shifting the garage and obtaining a tree study, adding that it was possible some trees might remain and noted that a rain garden would be useful.

Mr. Moran stated that by reducing the width of the driveway curve at east end of driveway and sending water into pipe would make a difference. Mr. Moran asked that the civil engineer take a look and by adding a simple curve on the near the inlet area and directing the water down to the storm drain will make a difference. Mr. Pearl stated that it made sense and added that Ameren would continue to maintain the trees, noting that they will not get better if they do provide shade and value. Mr. Pearl stated that if the garage is pulled over, roots might be severed which could

cause the trees to fall. It was noted that the bigger trees could come down and the smaller trees should remain along with the addition of a rain garden and other plantings.

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

- Shift garage west, to create a hammerhead;
- Shift garage south 1' to ensure 6' setback;
- Add below ground drainage piping for house and garage downspouts, showing collection of area drain inlet;
- Investigate salvage of small trees and consider rain garden;
- Add back yard tree aligned with 8" tree at mid-yard;
- Add curb to east end and partially, to the south side end of driveway to be connected to storm sewer below drive;
- Window on door side of garage;
- Upper row of lights on garage door panel.

Mr. Voorhees seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

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

Nays:

Not Present: Mr. Falk

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
HOMES BY ROLWES, INC., 3 PARKLAND AVENUE

Present: Larry Rolwes, Contractor, and Buyer under Contract
John Odom, Architect

Mr. Rolwes stated that he was contacted by the contractor and owner who was going to abandon the property due to the foundation caving in, and agreed with the owner that he would buy the home, demolish it, and build Speculative home to replace it.

Mr. Odom stated that the design was playing off the traditional home up street with an elevated front porch. Mr. Rolwes stated that the home would be sided with board and baton and lap siding, asphalt shingles on roof, with traditional grids on windows. Mr. Rolwes stated that the house would be raised for the porch due to elevation, with 50% foundation but would keep décor of façade covering it. Mr. Rolwes also stated the retaining wall and the entry point off Lockwood would remain as well as the pedestrian entry off Lockwood.

Drainage:

Mr. Voorhees stated that this lot was unique because the lot was highly elevated already, the house that was there was small and quant and noted that he had a problem with scale. Mr. Odom stated that the finished floor was 3.5' above current home but added that it was the same as neighbor's house on the north. Mr. Voorhees stated that there was a decent slope and worried that it would exacerbate drainage. Mr. Voorhees also stated that the basement level was a foot higher than the garage and asked how it related to other homes, adding that the appearance of a home on a podium doesn't work. Mr. Odom stated that they would have needed to move one of the elevations to lower the grade 18" adding that the garage dictated the grading which is driving everything. The garage had a stepped down truss which would span the entire garage to

make it work. Mr. Moran stated that it would make more sense if there was an exhibit to show the relationship with the neighboring homes. Mr. Moran stated that he appreciated the grading, adding that a swale could be created at the boundary to help with drainage. Mr. Rolwes stated that they were raising the grade. Mr. Moran stated that the wrap-around porch helped to step the scale down.

Mr. Emert stated that he did not think that lowering the garage a foot will help anything. Mr. Rolwes stated that he did not have a detached garage. Mr. Emert stated that the walk to Parkland had a 23% slope and there should be steps for the 4' step down and refinement of grades which will need to be shown on the plans. Mr. Odom stated that there would be steps and drawings showing the changes.

It was noted that the drainage calculations were listed on the site plan with reductions in impervious areas shown. Mr. Rolwes stated that the downspout would splash to swale on the northside and would run down the hill on the westside and out the driveway on the southside similarly. Mr. Rolwes stated that they would be picking up roof water and piped to a popup emitter which drains in the yard on the Parkland side. Mr. Rolwes stated that the retaining wall will be staying. Mr. Moran asked if there were any thoughts about water damaging the retaining wall. It was noted that the popup should be moved 10' further. Mr. Rolwes stated that could be done, added that he would match the original retaining walls and noted that rocks will be removed when the house was demolished.

Landscape:

Mr. Weitekamp stated that he commended the submittal for the tree study and landscape plan which were included and appreciated the addition of the Yellow Wood tree, which is a great tree adding that it would enhance the street scape that currently exists. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the Japanese Maple needed to be shifted off the water line and add ground cover. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the plan addresses both the Parkland side and the Lockwood side very nicely. Mr. Weitekamp noted that it also made sense to move the popup away from the large tree.

Architecture:

Mr. Weitekamp stated that he was sad to see the old house go but understood the foundation issues.

Mr. Emert called out a window well. Mr. Odom stated that it was removed. Mr. Emert asked about the windows. Mr. Odom stated that the windows will be casements, bi-opening or a middle point opening. Mr. Emert stated that was good for ventilation and noted he wasn't sure about the warm tones color wise but added that the natural wood garage door was nice. Mr. Emert stated that he liked the direction of the plan, adding that the floor plan was good and worked well from the garage up to the house and the massing is good. Mr. Emert also stated that the south elevation was unsettling but added that it faced the golf house.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the view of house from the porch was good.

Mr. Moran stated that he liked the design, the complexity of massing, the manageable scale in relation to the Parkland homes and liked the wrap around porch and nice material in general. Mr. Moran stated that the design gave a high-quality gateway and good public exposure. Mr. Moran asked if cultured stone had been selected. Mr. Rolwes stated they had not made a selection. Mr. Moran stated that he encouraged cultured stone, and also stated that the two-tone siding will be nice and added that the project showed how to design to challenges on a lot. Mr. Voorhees stated that liked the windows, adding that they were designed in a creative way. Mr. Emert concurred and thought the design was well done.

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:

- Add steps to sidewalk to Parkland;
- Move popup emitter in west yard, north away from retaining walls to allow for more overland absorption;
- Move Japanese Maple off of water line in south yard adjacent to the driveway;

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

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

Nays:

Not Present: Mr. Falk

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
CODY AND LISA LAUTERBACH, 827 WARWICK LANE

Present: Cody and Lisa Lauterbach, Owners
Chris Fischer, Fischer & Frichtel, Architect

Mr. Fischer introduced the applicants again, noting that they came to the Board earlier with preliminary plans asking for comments and are now back with their design. Mr. Fischer stated that the Board did not like the 50' wide front entry garage, adding that the applicants could not come to an agreement related to the suggestions. Mr. Fischer stated that they designed a tandem garage, with a side entry garage, matching gables with a two-car bay at the back elevation on the side and rear wall.

Drainage:

Mr. Moran asked if it made sense to collect both downspouts on the east side and pipe them to popup in the backyard to keep water off the street. Mr. Lauterbach stated that the adjacent house had the same setback, and they take the water to the back. It was noted that the flow well could be moved south and bring the popup towards middle of the yard which would allow more distance to flow. Mr. Moran suggested giving the plans back to the engineer for planning adding that 10' flow from the neighboring yards was the minimum and improving the distance would be better. Mr. Fischer advised Mr. Weitekamp that at the west property line the proposed berm will reinforce the swale. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the swale will function but noted that the window well could block the flow and showed be noted. Mr. Fischer stated that it should be drained to the sump but would check it out and would be fixed. Mr. Fischer noted that the front door would be wood, and the shop door would be wide enough for a golf cart. Mr. Moran stated that the civil plan should show all downspouts Mr. Fischer stated that they were listed on the small plans. Mr. Fischer stated that the water on the east side will be brought to the popup emitter adding that the downspouts on the front gables will be piped under the sidewalk and will pop up on the lawn.

Landscape:

Mr. Weitekamp stated that the removal of the dogwood was okay, as well as the White Pines and understood the removal of the Black Gum identified in the tree study. Mr. Weitekamp stated that there were no canopy trees added to the plan and noted that a new Black Gum would go well in the front yard as a street tree, located in between the sewer connection and the water connection.

Architecture:

Mr. Emert commented on the brick wainscot noting that something odd was happening in front on the left elevation. Mr. Fischer asked if Mr. Emert was proposing a revision to the grade by carrying the wainscot all the way down to grade. Mr. Emert stated that where the brick wants to turn the corner at the jam of the door, it should turn the corner in a purposeful way and did not want it to look tacked on to the wall. Mr. Fischer stated that it was an odd material condition. Mr. Emert stated that it should be considered.

Mr. Voorhees stated that there was much concrete on this house. Mr. Lauterbach stated that they did not have a definitive plan adding that they could paint it noting that they had longer term landscaping for this foundation area which was the next budget item. Mr. Emert stated that when you return the brick it will be returned to grade and not floating.

Mr. Moran stated that he had questions about the second-floor plan, south elevation which steps from east to west, noting that the elevation did not align and that there was a stacking of things and there was an odd corner. Mr. Moran asked if the front wall of the loft space was brought back, would that work better with the same overhang position.

Mr. Voorhees stated that he did not like the symmetry of the roof, noting that the resulting eave details and roof line didn't look good and would appear as a mistake.

Mr. Moran was also concerned about flatness of west façade, noted that the windows did not align, but added that he liked the other planes. Mr. Fischer stated that the transom could be shorter, and they could move the other window over. Mr. Moran stated that the bedroom window doesn't center and was bothersome. Mr. Emert stated that he wanted the wainscot addressed.

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

Ryan and Jessica Blackburn, 832 Warwick

Mr. and Mrs. Blackburn stated that the plans looked fantastic and would be a great addition to street and added that they wanted the family to remain in the neighborhood.

Charles and Melissa Vaughn, 826 Warwick

Mr. and Mrs. Vaughn seconded the comment noting that they also wanted the family to stay, are very supportive of their plan and excited for them, adding that they have been very open with the project.

Missy and Adam Peters, 821 Warwick

Mr. and Mrs. Peters stated that he appreciated that the applicant attended an earlier board meeting with concepts and requested our opinions, adding that it turned into a nice progression. It was noted that Mr. Nauman made the suggestion that the family attend the meeting earlier on a preliminary basis and it worked.

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

- Collect downspouts on the east side of the garage to the rear yard popup emitter;
- Suggest that the flow well be moved south, away from the north property line and popup;
- Show downspout drain at southeast corner of shop space and piping below sidewalk;
- Add Black Gum canopy tree to the front yard as a street tree;
- Improve brick wainscoting, brick to grade on the south elevation.

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

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

Nays:

Not Present: Mr. Falk

MISCELANEOUS

Mr. DeClue stated that there would be no other Town Hall meetings planned in answer to Mr. Moran's questions. It was noted that there could be a better FAR to incentivize additions, but nothing too generous. It was noted that the board appreciated the lady who spoke about the preservation effect of keeping a .25 FAR which would help first time homebuyers move into Glendale. It was noted that the incentives were good but would be best to add a .30 FAR across the board adding that there could be a legal issue related to separation. It was noted that the guidelines were mainly diagrams. Mr. Moran stated that he liked the proponents and appreciated the applause received by Mr. Weitekamp.

ADJOURNMENT

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

These minutes approved with changes this 14th day of June, 2023.

Joanne Carr, Deputy City Clerk