

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, Mr. Falk

Absent: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JULY 12, 2023 AND AUGUST 9, 2023.

Mr. Fernhoff asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from the July 12 and August 9, 2023. There being some, he asked for a motion. Chairman moved approval of the minutes from July 12, 2023 and August 9, 2023. Mr. Moran 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

Mr. Roeser stated that per requests made at the last meeting, Sterling Engineering did a topographical survey for runoff calculations, adding that changes were made per the findings. Changes from last week, sterling did the topographical for run off, made changes per the request,

Drainage: Mr. Falk stated that he did not see any volume calculations, adding that the 1,030 impervious area needed to be mitigated in some way. Mr. Falk added that two pop-up emitters were acceptable. Mr. Roeser stated that there was small rock in the pit. Mr. Falk stated that he was generally okay with a granular bed which was only 2x2x2, adding that he was concerned that the calculations were not adequate to be approved as listed. Mr. Falk stated that numbers should be submitted to the administrative staff who will forward them to him for approval. Mr. Falk stated that the pit may need to increase in size adding that whatever is suggested by the engineer per calculations should be added. Mr. Falk stated that the plans needed to show the area of roof that

will go to down spouts and need to match the impervious difference adding that another downspout may need to be added.

Landscape: It was noted that the plan was good, and there were no comments.

Architecture: Mr. Voorhees asked if the covered patio was fixed, adding that the roof line was still unclear on page A1 at existing house. Mr. Roeser stated that there were valleys on the roof at the addition adding that the garage had a gable roof which was not changing. Mr. Voorhees stated that the roof of the porch in front of the gable had a line or two missing. Mr. Roeser stated that the elevation could be found on page A5, adding that there would be a flat roof line in front of the gable which was staying as is. Mr. Roeser noted that the roof sets back and the patio was covered. Mr. Voorhees asked that a line be added on the addition noting that the gable should cut into the roof coming off the patio on the existing. Mr. Roeser stated that he would extend two lines adding that there was rubber membrane on the roof near patio due to the low pitch.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment. There were none.

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

- Need to submit a drainage volume calculation for differential storm volume and substantiate the detention volume at the pop-up emitters.

Mr. Falk seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR AN ADDITION AND NEW ATTACHED GARAGE BRENT AND HEATHER DALRYMPLE, 1 ARMSTRONG

Present: Jon Murphy, Studio Lark
Aaron Senne, Studio Lark

Chairman Fernhoff opened discussion on 1 Armstrong.

Mr. Murphy stated that they were designing an addition to replace the rear entry garage, which was not functional, adding space to the ranch with a second story addition, and noted that the existing ranch is compartmentalized in lower level with a need for extra square footage. Mr. Murphy stated that the design would change the orientation of the garage to a front entry garage, adding that the lot was a double frontage lot with a nice rear patio which would remain.

Mr. Murphy stated that the design would give connection to the back patio, would add volume with vaulted space and would respect the existing house by retaining the hip roof style. Mr. Moran stated that there were advantages to the addition of the building and added that it was important to hear the design approach.

Drainage: Mr. Murphy stated that all the water would be brought forward and captured by the drywell. Mr. Moran stated that the westerly portion of the gutter downspout did not show underground piping. Mr. Senne stated that all the piping will be captured into the drywell and will make it clear on the final report. Mr. Moran stated that there were three downspouts on the existing house and asked that the other downspouts on the Southarm side be piped to the flow-well as it would help to collect all the roof water. Mr. Senne noted that the property sloped south and not to the west. Mr. Moran stated that removing as much roof water and storing it in the

flow-well will alleviate the concerns from the neighbor. Mr. Senne stated that if they needed to capture more water, they could do that.

Mr. Falk stated that he did not see contours or a topographic study on the site plan and noted that it would be hard to tell how the water will flow. It was noted that there were 2' contours on the plans without labels. Mr. Falk asked if it would be their intention to capture all the new water into the drywell. Mr. Moran stated that all the downspouts and piping needed to be clearly labeled to show that the water was not flowing into the yard but to a pop up on Southarm drive. Mr. Falk stated that the stormwater infiltration structure looks fine but concerned about the profile. Mr. Falk also stated that he needed to see the driveway pitch, adding that new contours will help show the direction of the flow. Mr. Emert noted that a line was existing to show the northeast corner. It was noted that there was a 1/4 inch per foot drop down to Armstrong shown. Mr. Emert added that the new downspout at the back was a problem, noting that information was missing but the conditions were improved. Mr. Senne stated that the asphalt drive was being demolished, adding that the green space would accept water from the west, with a slope that runs easterly toward Armstrong. It was noted that water flows southeast. Mr. Moran noted that there was a sewer easement on the west boundary, sanitary or stormwater adding that there was a possibility of leaks over time which should be checked. Mr. Moran stated that they could talk to MSD about cabling to prevent a future sinkhole. It was noted that there was nothing reported indicating that the concrete patio was causing the neighbor's property, but it was a good time to move all the water elsewhere.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp stated three trees would be removed, which wasn't a good thing, but understandable in light of the type of trees but added that a water loving tree needed to be added in the rear yard, planted outside of the easement.

Architecture: Mr. Moran stated that he liked the design, like the quality and its indoor /outdoor design and noted that the hip roof choice in front was good. Mr. Moran stated that removing the asphalt in the front was an improvement and pushing water to street is good. Mr. Moran stated that in terms of design details, he had no question about materials or composition but noted that it would be nice if it could be added to addition like the original home. Mr. Moran stated that the window proportions were narrower than existing house, adding that there was some informality that supports what is shown. Mr. Moran stated that he might like to see the two windows in front carry the same shape as existing house. Mr. Murphy stated that the windows had the same proportion. Mr. Moran stated that the windows on the left side of the door would show a stronger design if there was sameness to them, adding that it was not a condition but would be a better design.

Mr. Voorhees stated that he liked vertical windows, adding that many different windows created a nice rhythm.

Mr. Murphy stated that there would be panels on garage door and added three windows on the side instead of front windows. Mr. Moran stated that a row of windows at the top of the garage door was required and was an important design addition. Mr. Voorhees stated that the plans showed the deck above the basement, and asked if the egress would be covered. Mr. Murphy stated that there was no egress just and was just covering a window. Mr. Voorhees stated that this was a wonderful plan, the concept was good and had an interesting roof line, adding that very few projects come to the Board with a contemporary flare. Mr. Emert stated that as long as the neighbor can be sure that there is a goal to get the water moving in the other direction he agreed as well that the project looked good.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment.

Nancy Thompson, 3 Armstrong,

Ms. Thompsons stated that Sterling Engineering did her survey in 1979 and asked if the corner lot needed to have a setback of 12' from her property line. The garage setback is 10;/Question garage being built Nancy due to setbacks. Andy,

Katherine Spencer, on behalf of Cynthia Doria, 2 Hill Drive

Ms. Spencer asked about the placement of the AC unit, adding that Ms. Doria wanted to continue the enjoyment of her backyard. Mr. Moran stated that it was located next to the homeowner's garage at the front corner. Mr. Falk stated that screening should be added to cut down on the sound with landscaping. Mr. Murphy stated that the AC unit could be covered.

Mr. Falk motioned to postpone the plans for next meeting given the comments and requested the following conditions:

- Include site plan documentation with revised graphics to show drainage from the north side eave is collected and piped to the flow well;
- Show contours/topographical details;
- Mark pop up emitter location on site plan;
- Downspouts and piping must be labeled and list utility locations;
- Add a backyard tree that is acceptable for water uptake;
- Add landscape or fencing around AC unit;
- Add contemporary glass panels on garage door.

Mr. Weitekamp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR AN REAR TWO STORY ADDITION
ANDREW WENDELL, 242 EDWIN

Present: Peter Uetrecht
Tony Camacho

Mr. Fernhoff opened discussion on 242 Edwin Ave.

Mr. Falk stated that he would recuse himself due to his employer designing the drainage plans.

Drainage: Mr. Moran stated that the property drains to the rear, with the south eave piped to the flow-well with a pop-up emitter located at the middle of rear yard and would dissipate in the middle of the yard which was a good initial strategy. Mr. Camacho stated that the intent was not to disrupt the patio, and water will continue to flow as it does but not on the north side. Mr. Moran asked if the northeast corner of the new roof would be piped or discharged somewhere. Mr. Camacho stated that it would drain openly as it did currently. Mr. Moran asked that they be collected via pipe to flow-well and pop-up to the rear yard, which would be a better solution for the water.

It was noted that the civil did not stipulate piping. Mr. Moran stated that the notes indicate piping but added that it needed to be physically shown. Mr. Camacho stated that they would show the piping.

Mr. Camacho stated that they kept things as tight as possible and would keep the exterior scale down in proportion to the house, give the house depth as well, breaking it up and reduced the scale and this was the result. Mr. Camacho stated that they took the liberty of raising the ceiling on the first floor with a step up to master bedroom. Mr. Camacho stated that they were obsessed with keeping the scale down in designing the addition and broke up the exterior facades for interest.

Mr. Camacho stated that the skirt was tight, and the ridges were lowered so they would not compete with the existing house. Mr. Moran commented on the eyebrow on the left elevation which made up for no window on first floor and noted that the massing helped control the size. Mr. Moran stated that neighbor's view showed a smaller volume, and the design was sensitive to scale and well composed. Mr. Moran stated that the classification of the basement space was non-contributory to the FAR, adding that the house sits on grade with the addition above grade.

Mr. Moran stated that in that regard, the lower level was like a full story and not a basement which should contribute to FAR.

Mr. Camacho stated that the house was perched up, adding that the front part of basement was above 50% the line and most of basement will not make the 50% rule. Mr. Moran stated that it does not affect the perception of size and was a good mitigation for scale issues noting that this issue has come up before. Mr. Voorhees stated that this lot was a challenge. Mr. Camacho stated that he had not changed the grade and was not out of line with the neighboring homes.

Mr. Voorhees stated that he appreciated the articulation and the character and quality presented in the addition. Mr. Voorhees stated that the second-floor bedroom was projecting 2' from the lower level, added that it accentuated the height and looked top heavy but oddly looked good.

Mr. Moran stated that he liked the massing on the rear elevation, adding that the three-story space was not overpowering. Mr. Emert stated that the windows were centered on the elevation but were not centered on other side elevation. Mr. Camacho stated that he did not want to destroy a closet. Chairman Fernhoff stated that the design was a nice nod to the neighborhood.

It was noted that the demolition plans were not labeled properly.

Mr. Weitekamp asked about the walls surrounding the patio. Mr. Camacho stated that the wall was actually 3' high. Mr. Weitekamp asked if the wall curved. Mr. Camacho stated that the wall feathered and ended quickly as the grade lowered. Mr. Moran stated that a column was missing. Mr. Camacho stated that the wall on the southerly side was a design element and not actually a wall.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment.

Beverly Straub, 224 Edwin Ave.

Mrs. Straub, stated that she was thrilled that they will add on, would be staying in the neighborhood, and would have a similar home to others in the neighborhood. Ms. Straub added that the family were wonderful neighbors.

Jed Ellerbroek, 233 Elm Ave.

Mr. Ellerbroek stated that he lived behind and down a hill from the home, adding that there had been a tree that fell down at the property line. Mr. Ellerbroek stated that it would be good to take a close look at the drainage from that area which runs to 233 and 239 Elm due to the loss of pervious material. Mr. Ellerbroek asked about what would be done to mitigate the increase in impervious surface. Mr. Moran stated that the plans showed that the family would be capturing all the new drainage with extra space available in the flow-well that will be located in the backyard. Mr. Moran stated that it would release with a pop-up emitter which would slow down the overland water and allow it to slowly percolate on the pervious surface.

Joe Arndt, 239 Elm Ave.

Mr. Arndt stated that pop-ups do not do anything for runoff to the neighbors adding that the emitter is located only 10' from the lot line. Mr. Moran stated that the gutters on the north side are currently not directed to the well. Mr. Arndt stated that the water would flow all the time when it rains. It was noted that it will only collect a small percentage of the roof, the flow-well will collect more than the existing drainage, and there is a stormwater outlet to the north of the property. Mr. Senne stated that all downspouts could be piped to the flow-well adding that 43.49 CF will be stored in the pit.

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

- Full Civil Plans must be submitted for final approval.

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: Donna Boxx, Architect
Mike and Sarah Reedy, Owners

Mr. Fernhoff opened discussion on 26 Hillard Rd.

Ms. Boxx stated that they cut back the square footage, changed the FAR, reduced the size by two feet on the sides of house, reduced the house another foot at the front behind the porch, reduced the height slightly, and reduced the chimney cap and narrowed the fireplace.

Architecture: Mr. Moran stated that the inner side yard was not reduced, adding that the discussion last month related to reducing the side yard for the neighbor. Mr. Moran noted that the design kept the side yard line intact, increased the space on the street side and reduced the slope but otherwise the design remained the same. Mr. Moran stated that the windows appeared more vertically east of the fireplace. Mr. Emert and Mr. Voorhees liked the new proportions, adding that nothing was lost with the changes. Ms. Boxx stated that the FAR calculation was .33. Mr. Voorhees stated that the new design looked like a plan for this lot size, adding that it was a good compromise, adding although the house was not shifted the scale worked on the location.

Drainage: Mr. Falk stated that the footprint was reduced, and he had no issues with drainage.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp stated that he commended the landscape design noting that the rendering was equal to the actual plan, adding that the evergreen works much nicer, and the specific selection was good. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the choice would provide closure for the homeowners and nice screening approaching the house.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Moran motioned approval of the plans as designed.

Mr. Falk seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A 2 STORY TO 1.5 STORY ADDITION WITH GARAGES AND EXPANSION OF MAIN FLOOR
KEVIN AND CARLY KOKE, 801 HAWBROOK

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

Drainage: Mr. Pearl stated that this was a large lot for the area, adding that the south side of the lot has a drainage culvert which dumps out to the park. Mr. Pearl stated that the lot would have a swale to make sure drainage does not run off to 751 Hawbrook, adding that there would be detention in the front yard with a backyard pop-up. Mr. Weitekamp stated that many canopy trees will be removed but there is no tree study. Mr. Pearl stated that on tree was a propped up sweet gum that would be removed. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the plans made sense but added that they needed a tree study. Mr. Moran asked about the hammerhead and how close it would be to the root system of the Oak. Mr. Pearl stated that they were not moving the driveway but regrading due to the garage location, adding that they needed to build up the grade. Mr. Falk stated that he liked the flow-well in the front yard which takes advantage of the swale in front.

Mr. Falk stated that the location of the drywell system will be determined by the owner and the contractor, adding that the location is approximate and may be changed. Mr. Falk stated that the flow well is adequately sized for the drainage and clarify the numbers.

Mr. Falk stated that the new addition would be cutting off the front from the back flow well, adding that it would best if it was in the front yard, adding that it may be located closer to Hawbrook to save the tree. Mr. Pearl stated that there would be so many drainage pipes and a location of a pop-up emitter was needed, adding that no matter its location, the tree needed to be removed due to water runoff and overall limb breakage. Mr. Emert asked about the 4" PVC pipe and its direction. Mr. Pearl stated that there was an inlet in the backyard as its destination. Mr. Emert noted that there were two window wells on the east side and wanted to see inlets on that side of the house and agreed that it was time for the tree to be removed in the front yard. Mr. Weitekamp again noted that a tree study was required regardless of the outcome of tree removal.

It was noted that impervious surface would speed up the water flow on the west side back yard.

Mr. Pearl stated that he was maintaining the front swale, adding that the driveway acts as a dam and drops into the swale and culvert.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp stated that he wanted to see a tree study. Mr. Pearl stated that he was giving the Board a new landscape plan which was done by a relative and added that the original one submitted did not match back porch detail. Mr. Pearl stated that Sunset red maples

would be added along with other shrubs which will help with what will be removed. Mr. Pearl stated that there were no overhead utilities which would be aligned for the eventual streetscape. Mr. Weitekamp stated that the landscape plan was a good design.

Architecture: Mr. Emert stated that he did not understand the band portion, adding that it did not extend on the garage brick and was not carried through the addition and asked that they try to reinterpret the design. Mr. Emert stated that it was jarring that the addition did not pick up the horizontal brick line. Mr. Moran stated that maybe it was good that the addition was subservient to the original building, adding that the three windows should match other windows on the existing house on the second floor. Mr. Pearl stated that the existing older windows are wider, and the new windows were taller. Mr. Moran stated that he found the design discordant. Mr. Moran stated that he liked the differentiation of the design and liked the offset which brought a note of quality from the existing house to the addition added that he liked the rhythm but found the smaller windows tight compared to the other windows and should have breathing room. Mr. Pearl stated that he was driven by the bedroom and closet. Mr. Voorhees stated that he wasn't bothered by the double brick band and liked the position of the garage which capitalized on the use of the backyard. Mr. Voorhees stated that the house was cohesive and liked the variety. Mr. Voorhees stated that the garage doors should have lights. Mr. Voorhees asked if the garage vertical openings were the same.

Mr. Weitekamp asked if there was a railing planned for the rear elevation, adding that the plans showed the horizontal lines but nothing vertical. Mr. Voorhees asked if the pad would be concrete. Mr. Weitekamp stated that there was no landscaping shown in this area, adding that there should be some at porch to cover and soften the wall. Mr. Pearl stated that they would add it. Mr. Emert liked the distinction as well. Mr. Voorhees stated that the house would blend into the neighborhood well.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment. Ms. Carr read the following email:

Sent to the ARB members to be added to the minutes.

Thank you for your letter dated September 1, 2023, and our telephone conversation on September 11, 2023, regarding the 801 Hawbrook Rd (801) ARB and related water drainage issues. During our telephone conversation we discussed the site plan materials found on the City's website at "[Packet](#)" in the context of water drainage issues at 801. This email is in response to your letter and our telephone conversation.

1. **Backyard flooding** - Currently, heavy rain results in significant flooding in the backyard of 801. It was not clear from our discussion if the site plan addresses this issue and/or whether the proposed construction could spread the flood area effecting my property?
2. **Front drainage swale back-up** - Currently, heavy rain leaves water back-up in the drainage swale in front of 801. We discussed that the site plan appears to leave the swale as is, but it was not clear whether the proposed construction could extend the back-up to my property?

Sincerely,
Mark Hoffman
807 Hawbrook Rd
314-965-8304

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

- Produce a Tree study;
- Strike notes 1 on civil plans and construction note on page A1;
- Add 1200 to flow well;
- Add yard drain on east side;
- Clarify the inlet and mark on plans;
- Add lights to the garage door.

Mr. Falk 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

Chairman Fernhoff opened discussion on 705 W. Lockwood stating that the lot is narrow and deep, with the new home designed with substantial cedar shingle vinyl siding.

Mr. Sharf stated that it was more of a cottage or cape cod design, to include a stone wrap around.

Drainage: It was noted that the emitter would run straight out from the basin to the south and angled towards the water line near the driveway. Mr. Moran asked if there was a storm drain in the east yard. Mr. Falk stated that there were area inlets there. Mr. Sharf stated that the area drained into the side yard to storm drain. Mr. Falk stated that the impervious area was increased from 3,000 to 3,313 and they were taking the drainage to the flo-well. Mr. Sharf stated that the main house was draining to the flo-well but not the garage. Mr. Falk asked if there was a way a curb could be added to the west side of the driveway to get the water moving and prevent the garage water going into the neighbor's property. Mr. Sharf stated that the northwest corner of the driveway had an inlet across from the curb line which would bring the water to the flo-well. Mr. Falk stated that he wanted all the water to be piped to the flo-well. Mr. Sharf stated that he could add a trench drain. Mr. Falk stated that a trench drain aligned with cleanout should be added along with two area drains added to the storm piping on the east side yard. Mr. Falk stated that the concrete driveway was good, and the curb stops at building setback line at front after trench drain or 5 to 10 feet from trench drain.

Landscape: Mr. Weitekamp stated that the landscape plan was robust and liked that the tree study was submitted. Mr. Weitekamp asked about the tree between the post oaks and asked if contour line 607 could be regraded to save the tree. Mr. Sharf stated that they could not find any way to save the tree. Mr. Weitekamp commented that it did look like the grading to the north was the main reason for removal. Mr. Sharf stated that the foundation would not be a factor. Mr. Weitekamp asked that the site be monitored, with the tree removal being the last thing they do. Mr. Sharf stated that they analyzed every which way and did know what to do.

Mr. Sharf stated that the yard was small with not much area to utilize, adding that a functional rear yard was necessary. Mr. Voorhees stated that it was a nice sized lot and in character with our community, adding that the landscape plan was good. Mr. Voorhees stated that short of building a retaining wall, he did not see how the grading would work to save that tree.

Architecture: It was noted that there was a lot of shake siding on the house, with a nice garage. Mr. Falk asked if there was a vinyl fence behind garage. There was. Mr. Falk and Mr. Moran stated that they both liked the gable end, and overall, the house. Mr. Falk asked if there should be a door on the garage, facing the house. Mr. Sharf stated that he wanted to keep that area of the yard functional. Mr. Moran stated that he liked the architecture, liked the Arts and Craft style but noted that this is equally interesting with the secondary massing in the back keeping it from a saltbox. Mr. Moran suggested tying the stone around porch and have a stone sill.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the siding looked like a typical flat shadowless siding on the elevations but added that the material shown at the meeting defined its realism which was good noted that a dark color would be classier. Mr. Voorhees stated that it was a nice design, and he liked the home. Mr. Sharf stated that the roof would have a driftwood coloring. Mr. Weitekamp commented about the outdoor fireplace, stated that covered patio was nice, and added that the second patio in the back yard should be shifted closer to the driveway and joined to the west with an added landscape bed to buffer it.

Chairman Fernhoff called for public comment. There were none.

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

- Add curb to west side of driveway;
- Trench drain aligned with cleanout ;
- Curb may stop 5 to 10 feet from trench;
- Add two drains on east side;
- Add swing door to garage.

Mr. Emert seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

MISCELLANEOUS

The Board talked about the action of the board related to changing the FAR to .30, as part of the zoning ordinance which Mr. Moran supports. It was noted that Mr. DeClue was working on editing the guidelines for final review.

ADJOURNMENT

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

These minutes approved as submitted this 11th day of October, 2023.

Joanne Carr, Deputy City Clerk