



**MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2023 - 6:00 P.M.**

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

CITY ATTORNEY, ANDREW BRAMMAN
CITY ADMINISTRATOR, BEN DECLUE

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. Weitekamp, Mr. Emert

Absent: Mr. Falk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JULY 12, 2023.

Mr. Fernhoff asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from the July 12, 2023. There were corrections, he asked for a motion. Mr. Moran moved to postpone approval of the minutes from July 12, 2023. Chairman Fernhoff seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF NEW PLANS FOR A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
JOHN AND BROOKIE MOORE, 10 ARMSTRONG DRIVE

Present: Bill Cover, Architect
Scott Worley, Landscape Architect

Mr. Fernhoff opened discussion on 10 Armstrong Drive

Mr. Cover stated that the plans for 10 Armstrong have been changed and downsized due to budget changes. Mr. Cover stated that they have reduced scale and pitches, removed approximately 500 sq. ft. of first design, would use plaster for the majority of the front yard, will use Hardy board for the remainder of the home adding that design retained similar lines on the overall home. Mr. Cover stated that the site plan was similar to the first design, adding that the pea gravel drive would be changed to an asphalt drive.

Drainage: Mr. Cover stated that there were almost no drainage changes.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp stated that he did not see sod on the landscape plan which needed to be labelled, adding that the asphalt material also needed to be added to the plan.

Architecture: Mr. Voorhees stated that the circular drive and garage drive width needed to be reduced from 18' to 12' and needed to be noted on the plans, including the landscape plan.

Mr. Moran agreed, noting that the drop off area need not be a parking area. Mr. Emert also agreed. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the width should be removed from the street side and not the house side.

Mr. Moran stated that he liked the design noting that it added nice architectural style to the neighborhood and good scaling. The ARB members agreed.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment. none

Mr. Moran motioned approval of the plans with the following conditions:

- Reduce circle drive to 12' wide and reduce drive from street side rather than from the house;
- Change landscape plan notes to reflect the change to an asphalt drive and the addition of sod.

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A REAR ADDITION
NORMAN AND SHELLEY SIMON, 4 ARMSTRONG DRIVE

Present: Joe Roeser, Roeser Home Remodeling
Norman Simon, Owner

Mr. Fernhoff opened discussion on 4 Armstrong Drive stating that a rear addition was being proposed.

Drainage: Mr. Moran stated that there was no drainage plan adding that the ARB needed to see a plan and noted that the differential runoff needed to be caught in some sort of detention; dry well, below grade flow well or surface type basin, rain gardens etc., in the rear yard. Mr. Roeser stated that he would use Sterling Engineering and would submit the plans to the board and added that the lot was a fairly flat lot with a grade drop from the front of the house. Mr. Moran asked if the rear addition, patio, and rear landscape would be recreated. Mr. Roeser that there were no plans at this time adding that the front yard landscape would remain.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp asked if the tree on the NE corner would be saved. Mr. Roeser stated that it would remain. Mr. Roeser added that the screened porch would be removed, the rear flower beds would remain on the north side and the southeast corner flower bed near the garage would remain with no change in grade. Mr. Weitekamp stated that there were 4 steps coming out of rear entry. Mr. Roeser stated that the new plan changed the exit and would not be used. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the information should be listed on the final civil plan, including existing and proposed. Mr. Weitekamp stated that there seemed to be a 2' drop adding that elevations would be easier to review on one sheet.

Architecture: Mr. Voorhees stated that the roof plan was unusual and not clear. Mr. Moran asked what the relationship would be between the gable and the ridge. Mr. Roeser stated that there would be a 3.5/12 pitch with a valley coming down to the south and another valley on the

north side, adding that the flat side would have a slope with gutters on both sides. Mr. Moran asked about Ice and water shield on main roof.

Mr. Voorhees asked about the stair near the southeast egress from the basement. Mr. Roeser stated that it would egress to a crawl space.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the two windows at the basement on the existing house are not on the plans, nor is the grade correct on the plans. Mr. Roeser noted that there was 18" of concrete on the south elevation.

Mr. Voorhees stated that there was not much going on at the east elevation and asked if there was a reason for the lack of windows. Mr. Simon stated that there were built in bookcases near the fireplace, adding that there was a window on the north side of the garage to be removed due to access to the house and it was located near the neighbor's garage. Mr. Simon also stated that there would be new siding.

Mr. Emert asked if there was a roof over the laundry room door, adding that the roof stopped short of the door adding that the plans need to clarify the roof all the way over. Mr. Moran noted that there was a downspout and eyebrow cover. Mr. Moran asked if the plan was out of step with the elevation. Mr. Simon stated that they wanted more light in the laundry room and did not extend the roof line.

Mr. Moran stated that the aesthetics of the addition was nice, adding that he liked the contrast in colors on the siding which would be harmonized. Mr. Voorhees asked that the window remain on the garage, adding that an 18" hopper window would work for security purposes. Mr. Simon stated that they could leave the window the same, adding that it would be fixed, which would be more secure. Mr. Voorhees stated that was a good idea and asked about the color. Mr. Simon stated that the color would be grey.

Meeting comments as follows:

- Add plans for detention of roof differential;
- Add contours to the site plans;
- Resolve the grading around the patio;
- Connect grade lines in the building elevations, especially on the south and east views;
- And Plan for covered patio as it does not agree with elevations-possibly 3-D;
- Add a window on the north elevation of the garage.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Fernhoff motioned to postpone the project based on the meeting notes.

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A SECOND-STORY ADDITION
1141 N. BERRY ROAD, REX AND JANET PEARL

Present: Rex & Janet Pearl, Pearl Construction, Builder and Owner

Mr. Fernhoff opened the discussion on 1141 N. Berry Road stating that the house was a modest home on Berry Rd. which would be a story and a half when complete.

Drainage: Mr. Pearl stated that they were adding 300 sq. ft. of impervious area with the addition and porch, adding that the lot drains to the left and downhill to the driveway, and noted that there was an area inlet on the driveway so no drainage would spill onto the neighbor's lot. Mrs. Pearl stated that the roof would drain to the inlet, and the right-side downspout would be pulled over to the south to flow around the front of house with popups and disperse on left side of property to inlet. Mr. Pearl added that if the water did hit the side street, there was an area inlet next to the driveway, adding that there was a storm inlet which drains to the north and behind property line and continues north.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that there were no contours. Mrs. Pearl stated that they were only adding onto the left side of the house which flows to the driveway, noting that the only thing changing is the roof which would have a smaller pitch. Mr. Voorhees stated that the new roof lines cleaned up the plan. Mr. Pearl stated that the front dormer would be false.

Mr. Moran stated that he had no problems with the site plan adding the popups would be an improvement.

Landscape: Mr. Moran stated that the Cedar trees in front of the house needed to come down and suggested that a shade tree replace the removal. The Pearls stated that there were new trees recently planted in the front of which one would grow into canopy tree. The Pearls stated that the planting beds in disrepair would be cleaned up as well. It was noted that trees F and G were already planted and would be preserved with tree protection. Mr. Weitekamp stated that tree G was a River Birch which was a good rear shade tree adding that the removal of the Cedar trees was an improvement and aesthetically fine.

Architecture: Mr. Moran stated that this was a nice project, adding that it was a clever design to change the nature of the roof to add living space. Mr. Pearl stated that there were no changes to the garage doors, adding that there would be a new deck on the back with a door added in place of the windows. Mr. Pearl added that there would be no steps planned. Mr. Voorhees commented that there was a retaining wall on the right side and asked what was happening with the fireplace. Mr. Pearl stated that the existing fireplace had a masonry veneer but would be replaced with siding to match the house and would be changed to a direct vent fireplace due to cost.

Mr. Emert asked if everything left blank would be siding. Mrs. Pearl stated that it would, adding that the front bump out would be covered in siding and the brick would be painted. The Board agreed that it was a nice project.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment.

Brian and Mary Connor-Warberton, 1145 N. Berry Rd.

Mr. and Mrs. Connor-Warberton stated that they lived next door and were glad to hear that there would be no water coming into their yard, adding that they had just completed a renovation of their basement floor. Mr. and Mrs. Connor Warberton added that they wanted a construction schedule so that they could plan their workday around the added noise.

Mr. Moran motioned approval of the plans as designed.

Mr. Voorhees seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
MIKE AND SARAH REEDY, 26 HILLARD ROAD

Present: Barbara Boxx, Architect
Mike and Sarah Reedy, Owners

Mr. Fernhoff opened discussion on 26 Hillard and gave the floor to Mr. Reedy who read the following statement:

Good evening members of the ARB and Mr. DeClue of the City of Glendale. Thank you for allowing my wife Sarah and I to present the plans for our proposed new home for full review and consideration. I apologize for any redundancy from our prior meeting for the preliminary review last month. We have lived in Glendale for nearly nine years, having purchased our home in November, 2014. We both grew up nearby – Sarah at the intersection of Ladue/Warson Woods/Rock Hill and myself in Webster Groves, so we were both drawn to the family friendly community of Glendale to start our life together. Since then, we have only become more enamored with this community, as we have two young children attending school within the Glendale boundary – Mikey will start 1st grade at NG in two weeks, and Teagan starting another year of preschool at Glendale Lutheran. Our home was originally built as a ranch home in the 40's and added onto sometime around 2003-2005, with a great room, porch and second car garage being added to the rear of the home. We quickly found out after moving when we tried to pull a past plumbing permit that the newer portion had been built very poorly – and without any permits to show. We have continually repaired some items where feasible, including a rotted-out support beam, an uninsulated pipe leading to a pipe burst and highly questionable wiring and HVAC setups. In the past week alone, we have encountered leaking water through the added-on great room ceiling. Despite these issues, one thing is abundantly clear: Glendale is where we want our family to stay for the next 30 years, where we want our children to grow up, make lifelong friends and memories, play sports, ride their bikes, host family holidays, the list goes on. We want to do so in a house that we can call our own, that we have designed and without the many flaws we inherited, that is reflective and respectful of the character of this great community. We have worked on these plans for over a year and are excited to share them – on behalf of our design and building team – with you all.

I also am keenly aware that a few of our neighbors are in attendance this evening and plan to take exception to these plans. I anticipate they will bring to your attention the following five elements: height, setback, incomplete submission-rendering, fireplace location and Floor Area Ratio.

Each of the first three items meets the requirements as laid out by your submission guidelines as you can see in our plans, with the fireplace location largely subjective. The height of the proposed home obviously is higher than many of our neighbors. While we respect their opinions, precedent has been set nearby with the construction of 6 Hillard Rd. in 2019 and 1125 Hillard Rd. in 2005. Further to the west on Dwyer Ave, there are no less than 7 two-story homes, many of which having been built since we purchased in 2014. In driving the area surrounding us, using the border of Berry, Kirkham, Sappington, and Essex/Algonquin Estates, I could only find two areas without a 2-story home – Clif Side, directly to the south of our plot,

which enacts its own covenant restricting two story homes; and the northern section of Elm/Parkland whereby my research no new homes have been construction in over sixty years.

Our setback is five feet beyond our current dwelling, and unless the packet posted online on the ARB section of the Glendale website is incorrect, there is indeed a rendering included. Regarding the fireplace location, as you can see in the rendering, it is located at the front of the house. If anything, this is an aesthetic that most closely aligns with our neighborhood block, as seven of the twenty-six homes on our block have a fireplace located in the front, including 24 Hillard next to us and 25 Hillard directly across the street.

The topic of FAR is a valid one. I admit that our proposed home exceeds the current guidelines. There is no shying away from that. It bears noting that the footprint of our proposed home is in fact smaller than the footprint of our existing dwelling, with the additional story seemingly overshadowing that fact. With the setback increased and the dwelling limited in depth by the easement to the rear, we have designed a home, not just a house to last our family a lifetime. As this is now our third meeting with a least some of you – second with most, we have shown a willingness to work with you amicably; you may note we have made the changes suggested following the last meeting. We are submitting this directly to you. We are not a builder, we are not a new resident, we are not building a spec home. We have lived in this neighborhood for nine years. Our children attend school here. We're invested in Glendale, and we do not want to uproot our family and move. We want to build a home for the future of Glendale, to reflect many of the same qualities of the myriad of new homes constructed in Glendale over the past twenty years, without a cookie cutter feel. We are proud of our design and think it will be well received by the community as Glendale continues to forge a new path forward in terms of its unique and distinctive architecture.

As you mentioned in the meeting last month, exceptions have been made to FAR and we politely ask that you consider the same for us. We are excited to firmly plant our roots in Glendale for the long haul and hope that you will allow us to proceed with the plans presented. Thank you for this opportunity and we welcome your feedback.

Ms. Boxx stated that there were photos showing the new design superimposed over the existing home, adding that the side elevation showed the difference more clearly. Ms. Boxx stated that the garage door will be custom and located down further adding because of the grades of the street, they balanced in the back versus the front.

Mr. Moran stated that the view from Elmwood was helpful to understand scale as opposed to the front elevation, adding that there could be some fine tuning on the chimney at the front. Mr. Moran stated that the Board liked to see studies of other homes within the neighborhood, but other homes noted earlier are not a part of the context of this neighborhood, adding that there were some large homes within this neighborhood.

Drainage: It was noted that the drainage had been improved.

Mr. Voorhees questioned the excessive FAR in relation to a smaller footprint, the basement grade for the garage which was usually considered at 50% but zero FAR for basements, adding that there were unique challenges with this property. It was noted that the building area represented in the FAR only reflected the first and second floor. Mr. Voorhees stated that it was a logical place to locate the garage in the basement. Mr. Emert stated that the garage was not adding to the bulk of the space, adding that there had been discussion about removing the basement in from the FAR.

Mr. Moran stated that it would be a mistake if the size of the house is not trimmed down to conform with the FAR, adding that large rooms could be paired down, reducing the width of the basement, noting that the upper level would be more challenging. Mr. Voorhees stated that the ground floor was large, adding there could be a reduction made in its width and noted that a reduction would give the design a better proportion.

Mr. Emert agreed that reducing the width of the house could be an improvement in relation to the neighbors and the proportion of the house. Mr. Emert stated that he agreed with Mr. Moran about taking 2' out of the width of the basement, adding that many homes on Hillard dropped in the back and had 2 stories rears.

Ms. Boxx stated that they could consider reducing the width, possibly taking 2' on one side and 1' on the other to reduce the FAR and give the neighbors better setback. Mr. Moran stated that he liked the architecture and how it exhibited unity around the entire house, adding that the details and transitions were all uniform, notwithstanding the scale. Mr. Moran stated that changing the mass, fine tuning the materials and the fireplace, would be appropriate for the neighborhood. Mr. Voorhees stated that he liked the design and the integration of the site for the grade of the lot but struggled with the FAR adding that by bringing the FAR down it would be more in line with the neighborhood and location on the street. Mr. Voorhees stated that removing attic space improved the design, adding that he appreciated the solid project.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that he would like a landscape plan that shows the good intentions found on the renderings, adding that there might be room for screening with landscape. Mr. Moran stated that it was important to include a well-developed landscape plan.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment.

Nicky Buettner, 24 Hillard

Ms. Buettner stated that the height of the east side of the house will take away her sunshine adding that the site plan did not show garage side of the house to the east will take all my sun site plan does not show her kitchen, deck and office which will be blocked but set back. Mr. Moran noted that there were some thermal advantages with the removal of the late afternoon sun. Mr. Moran asked Ms. Boxx about the placement of the AC unit. Ms. Boxx stated that it had not been planned yet but would be somewhere at the rear of the house.

Wendy Haffner, 1009 Glenbrook

Ms. Haffner stated that she worked under a similar situation, adding that this house was gorgeous, but in context with the rest of the street, she adding that it was not right comparing to other homes not in the neighborhood. Ms. Haffner stated that in her opinion work could be done to reduce the overpowering nature of the house on the proposed street.

Mike Tierney 23 Hillard

Mr. Tierney stated that the block was developed the size and character in harmony in the 1940's by the same developer adding that the addition to the home was not good. Mr. Tierney stated that the scale was not in keeping with anything around the neighborhood. Mr. Tierney stated that there was a two-story house down the street with an unobtrusive, nearly invisible roof, adding that he did not understand the rendering of the front of the house. Mr. Tierney stated that the chimney obscured the roof line adding that the Elmwood side of the house would be dramatically different from what exists today. Mr. Tierney agreed that pushing the elevation down the hill

would be better, adding that the chimney was obtrusive for the neighborhood and the house FAR was excessive. Mr. Tierney stated that he appreciated that there would be more discussions about reducing the size of the house adding that he had nothing against the neighbor and their desire for a bigger house in a wonderful place to live.

Jim Sheffield, 6 Hillard,

Mr. Sheffield stated that he designed a shallow roof to conform to the neighborhood adding that this design was barely over the .30 FAR adding that the family had a right to build a 3,500 sq. ft. home. Mr. Sheffield stated that their home would be gorgeous, adding that the homes in the neighborhood were 80-year-old homes and noted that times were changing, Glendale was changing. Mr. Sheffield stated that this home would improve the neighborhood enhance property values and supported the project.

Julie Tucker, 1196 Hillard Rd.

Ms. Tucker stated that she has lived on Elmwood for 34 years, can sympathize with wanting more space in a great neighborhood, adding that the was a beautiful project but did not belong on Hillard Rd. Ms. Tucker stated that the FAR was too big, should be .30 but was over the FAR by 600 sq. ft. Ms. Tucker stated that there were scale issues, noting that to the west of elmwood, the homes were 1.5 stories or 1 story, with single story homes to the east and due to the Clif Side covenant, 1.5 story homes to the north. Ms. Tuckers stated that she compiled a design packet showing renderings in comparison to neighboring properties, adding that the packet had been passed around to the Board members. Ms. Tucker stated that the renderings show the scale to the houses in the neighborhood adding that the roof line at 6/12 was very steep and the home with three floors and a roof on top of that was excessive. Mr. Moran noted that there would be no dormers on the top floor. Mr. Voorhees stated that the design softened the massing. Ms. Tucker stated that the code allowed for a .30 FAR with matching context.

Paul Roettger, 10 Clif Side

Mr. Roettger stated that he was a neighbor and an Alderman noting that his opinion about the design was in the middle. Alderman Roettger stated that he could speak to the same things such as the desire to stay in Glendale, that the design was not a spec home and that he appreciated the design which was good for Glendale. Alderman Roettger noted that in the opposite vein the city did not want to see people priced out of Glendale. Alderman Roettger stated that he appreciated that everyone was working together, added that tightening the size of this house would be good and looked forward to seeing how the design would work out per the current code.

Elliot and Amy Frische, 1156 Brownell

Mr. Frische stated that he supported the Reedy's, knowing what they have gone through with their house, adding that their new design will take some repurposing but will look nice. Mr. Elliot stated that it sounded like Reedy's wanted to work with the Board and noted that there was contention 9 years ago while building their home. Mr. Elliot stated that he was glad that there was someone supporting the community.

John Yacovelli, Builder

Mr. Yacovelli stated that unique circumstances were written into the guidelines noting that this design was extraordinary and added that the Reedy's deserve a shot. Mr. Yacovelli asked if the Board would vote on this tonight. Chairman Fernhoff stated that there would be a vote of some kind.

Mrs. Reedy stated that she was surprised at the comments by people who are against their design, adding that they had been working on this a long time, noting that their current house was falling apart. Mrs. Reedy stated that they were not trying to upset the neighborhood but thought that their design would be liked by the neighboring residents. Mrs. Reedy stated that it would be difficult to reduce the size of the bedrooms, adding that they wanted four bedrooms in their new home. Mrs. Reedy stated that they were trying to design for the neighborhood, wanted to keep the garage in the basement, wanted to stay in the neighborhood and added that the kids loved the neighborhood.

Ms. Boxx stated that architecturally they could bring the house in on the sides, in the long run, the reduction will not be noticeable and added that the sunlight will be lost no matter how the house is built.

Mr. Moran stated that the comments regarding the forward-facing chimney were off, adding that there were 6 or 7 front facing chimneys in the neighborhood and was not a deviation from design patterns. Mr. Moran stated that the style of architecture was unique, adding that Glendale had many styles and noted that this home was designed well, was a good style that had unity. Mr. Moran stated that he supported that aspect of architecture. Mr. Moran stated that the issue was how to trim down the design to find a square footage point that comes closer to the FAR, adding that he would warrant 1 or 2 percent over.

Mr. Voorhees stated that this was a two-story house noting that there were 2 two story homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Voorhees stated that while walking down Hillard with the rolling hills and trees in the neighborhood, he noticed that all the houses were diverse on Hillard adding that he saw this design as contextual for the neighborhood. Mr. Voorhees stated that there will be two story homes but noted that they needed to be designed well. Mr. Voorhees stated that he had no issues with aesthetics, adding that it would be an improvement. Mr. Voorhees stated that the current house needed to be replaced, adding that the issue is how to reduce the square footage to bring the FAR down. Mr. Voorhees noted that they were not counting the basement square footage and that was an issue.

Chairman Fernhoff stated that the Board needed to look closely at the numbers noting that there were many spec homes designed and brought to the ARB. Chairman Fernhoff stated that he did not consider this a spec home adding that the design followed a narrow footprint with a wider view to the back and fit the lot physically and aesthetically. Chairman Fernhoff stated that the bulk of the FAR is still contained within the house adding that if there was going to be an exception, it would be difficult. Chairman Fernhoff noted that the design fits the neighborhood architecturally adding that a .36 FAR would be an exception. Chairman Fernhoff stated that overall things in Glendale will change noting that this could be a bell weather for that change but added that there needed to be consideration for a good economic fit in Glendale.

Mr. Emert stated that from a site standpoint, the design checked every box for houses that exceed the FAR. Mr. Emert stated that with the kitchen and patio taken into consideration, the rear can't be seen, adding that verticality played into the design adding that architecturally, they worked hard on the design.

Mr. Weitekamp stated that the landscape plan was missing and with the underground utilities in front of the streetscape, noted that adding a canopy tree would be a good addition to break up the scale with a buffer and would enhance the Elmwood view. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the design was aesthetically pleasing, and looked great but added that the size needed to be reduced to bring

the FAR down and developing a landscape plan would resolve many of the issues. Mr. Weitekamp stated that he agreed with Chairman Fernhoff regarding a smaller footprint would add to the compactness of the design and added that stormwater would be less of an impact.

Mr. Moran summarized by asking if the house could be narrower to cut the FAR, to create space between this house and 24 Hillard and if they could the roof pitch be 4/12 to assist in accommodating the overall FAR overage it could work.

Chairman Fernhoff made a motion to postpone the submission. Mr. Moran seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY HOME
SHARF LAND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, 705 W. LOCKWOOD AVE

Present: John Sharf, Sharf Land Development Co., Builder and Owner

Mr. Fernhoff opened discussion on 705 W. Lockwood noting that the lot was narrow and deep.

Drainage: Mr. Weitekamp asked if the water would be pushed towards the front yard except for one pop up in the back. Mr. Sharf stated that would be the case. Mr. Moran stated that it was a good strategy. Mr. Sharf stated that there would be 1 flow well in the front yard. Mr. Weitekamp noted that the popup in the front yard would run out to the street, adding that due to the utilities and gas line on the west side, he would prefer that the water bleed into the yard.

Mr. Moran asked about the strength of the swale on the west side, adding that the house was high with a taller grade and recommended that they consider adding one or two area drains into a pvc lateral on west side of the house. Mr. Sharf stated that the engineer talked about a yard drain in the rear and bringing it forward. Mr. DeClue stated that if there was an MSD tie it required a permit from MSD with detailed information including volume, etc. required.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp asked if the Post oak was coming out in the front yard. Mr. Sharf stated that he met with Craig and Andy Haskenhoff, Arborist with Frontenac Tree, who looked at the roots and canopy advising the tree looked weak. Mr. Sharf stated that he designed a front entry garage to save trees in the backyard and electricity on left side. Mr. Weitekamp asked why a rear entry garage was not considered. Mr. Sharf stated that he liked the wide-open backyard and wanted to save the trees. Mr. Moran stated that the garage was over the 35% front façade rule. Mr. Sharf stated that with the metal roof and front patterns, there were a lot of offsets, adding that the garage was not the focal point but instead the main house. Mr. Sharf stated that he included elements such as silvery wrought iron, brick under the wrap around porch, brick and smart siding with dark and lighter elements working together to enhance the look.

Mr. Weitekamp asked if there could be an east entry and could the Hemlock be swapped for another tree, adding that the hemlock in the rear yard was okay. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the Hemlock needed shade, did not like drought conditions and there was space for a nice canopy tree instead of an evergreen.

Architecture: Mr. Voorhees agreed with the color choice noting that he liked the contrast between crispness and softness but added that he did not like the front entry garage. Mr. Voorhees stated that he liked the articulations in the front but added that the house itself was a box and poorly proportioned. Mr. Voorhees stated that the windows were heavy on top and less so on the bottom, which added some front relief but noted that the side elevation had scattered

windows. Mr. Voorhees stated that the timber in front did not make sense, adding that the design looked off the shelf. Mr. Sharf asked if a side entry garage would be okay which could work with a 1.5 story house. Mr. Voorhees stated that a side entry garage would work.

Mr. Moran stated that the compliance issue would be removed, adding that the current garage was over the required 35% coverage rule. Mr. Moran stated that a side entry garage would give flexibility in creating massing, adding that the design was not completely out of character but scale-wise it was flat. Mr. Moran stated that the garage prevents the creativity of the side elevation. Mr. Sharf stated that the completed design would work once complete but added that he understood that the style was not desired and would bring back a 1.5 story bungalow. Mr. Weitekamp asked that the driveway width be reduced in the new design.

Mr. Emert stated that the right-side elevation was blank and adding that the Board was trying to move away from it and noted that the brick turn around looked applied. Mr. Emert agreed that a side entry garage should be considered with side elevations enhanced.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Moran motioned for approval of the submittal. Chairman Fernhoff seconded the motion and called for a vote.

Yea: None

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

Not Present: Mr. Falk

The submission was denied.

MISCELLANEOUS

It was noted that the Board of Alderman passed the .30 FAR across the board for all lot sizes and the guidelines were still under discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

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

These minutes approved as submitted this 13th day of September, 2023

Joanne Carr, Deputy City Clerk