



MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING
JUNE 10, 2026 – 6:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Glendale was held on Wednesday, June 10, 2026. Chairman Fernhoff presided and called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Members Absent

Chairman Fernhoff
Brad Weitekamp
Mike Moran
Reed Voorhees
Jon Emert

Laura Switzer
John Falk

Also present were Frank Johnson, City Administrator; Kori Neely, City Engineer; Gabby Wesche, Community Engagement Officer; and Kate Henry, City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Moran moved to approve the minutes from the May 13, 2026, meeting with one change:

- The phrase “is allowed” should be “could be acceptable” in the last sentence of paragraph two in the Architecture section.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Weitekamp and unanimously carried.

**REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A
GARAGE ADDITION – Chris
and Tracy Lawhorn, 17 Edwin
Ave.**

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 17 Edwin Ave. and invited the applicant to present. The project was presented by the homeowners, Chris and Tracy Lawhorn, and their builder, Kevin Franklin.

Drainage

Mr. Johnson noted that there were several rounds of revisions for the drainage plans and that there is an existing stormwater inlet located at the rear of the property.

The applicant noted that the downspouts would be directed to drain directly into the drywell and piped mostly under the driveway. The ARB asked the applicant to consider relocating the downspout on the northwest corner of the garage to the southwest corner of the garage and piping it into the drywell.

Ms. Neely reviewed the capacity of the drywell and noted that it was acceptable.

Mr. Moran directed the applicant to have their engineer review the size of the area drain to ensure it is appropriately sized for the anticipated water volume.

Mr. Moran confirmed with the applicants that the drywell would receive sheet flow from the concrete area and that the roof drainage would be conveyed by pipe directly to the stormwater inlet.

Mr. Weitekamp noted that the drainage plans need a clearer outlet pipe label. He recommended that the observation well serve as an area drain rather than a pop-up emitter because the pop-up outlet would likely never activate, as it is at a higher elevation than the outlet pipe.

Ms. Neely thought that Mr. Weitekamp's recommendation made sense.

Mr. Weitekamp suggested that the engineer verify the elevations of the drywell inlet and outlet pipes to ensure the outlet pipe is lower than the inlet pipe.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Neely whether MSD would require a permit if the applicants chose to connect directly to the stormwater inlet.

Mr. Johnson outlined the process to the applicant. He said that after the ARB's conditions are met, the applicant would then apply for municipal zoning approval through the City of Glendale before applying for building permits through St. Louis County.

Mr. Johnson noted that if the applicant intends to connect directly to the MSD storm inlet for drainage, the City would need documentation showing that the plans had been submitted to MSD and that MSD had approved the connection.

Mr. Moran clarified that obtaining MSD approval was a procedural matter if the applicants chose to connect directly to the storm inlet and was not a condition of the ARB approval.

Landscaping

Mr. Weitekamp said he doesn't see any details other than the term tree cluster on the plans. He asked whether the tree cluster included any mature trees.

The applicant responded that it did not. They clarified that no trees would be removed or impacted and described the vegetation as more of a large weed cluster than mature trees.

Mr. Weitekamp said that based on this information and his visual assessment of the property, he would not require an arborist report.

Mr. Moran asked whether there was a paved area between the driveway and the stairs. The applicants confirmed that the pavement was existing. Ms. Neely asked whether there was a ditch along the west side of the property. The applicants confirmed that there is a ditch. Ms. Neely wanted to ensure that the applicants were not planning to fill the ditch.

The applicants explained that the existing garage regularly takes on water, which is why the new garage would be constructed at a slightly higher elevation.

Mr. Johnson stressed that the goal is to not displace water onto neighboring properties and create a flooding issue.

Architecture

Mr. Moran noted that he liked the design, but he would like to see windows or other compositional features to break up the wall of vinyl on the west facade.

The applicant explained that the house located behind the property has been vacant and there are trees behind the west façade. They also expressed safety concerns with having windows in an area that's not very visible or well-traveled.

Mr. Moran acknowledged that there are trees there now, but in the future trees may be cut down and the house may be occupied. He noted that the windows could be located high up on the wall to address the safety concerns. He also said that some compositional detail other than windows could be put in place to break up the façade.

Mr. Voorhees confirmed that the siding will match the siding on the house. He also supported adding compositional details to the west façade to make the wall look more residential and less commercial.

Public Comment

Chairman Fernhoff asked for public comment. The applicant's neighbor, Jon Tchen of 21 Edwin Ave., noted that he would like to see the existing ditch regraded or deepened because sediment had accumulated in the ditch over the years. He said that the ditch was deeper when MSD put it in 20 years ago and it was more effective for stormwater mitigation. Mr. Tchen said that it would be a great favor if MSD or the applicant could dig the ditch deeper.

Chairman Fernhoff asked if MSD would be okay with doing that.

Mr. Moran noted that the excavation for the garage footings could provide an opportunity to address the ditch regrading.

Mr. Tchen asked if the ARB knew when the MSD work would happen. Mr. Johnson clarified that MSD does not have the ditch regrading planned. Mr. Moran clarified that the contractor would have an opportunity to do the work.

Mr. Moran moved to approve the applicant's design with the following conditions:

- Relocate the northwest corner downspout to the southwest corner to the southwest and direct to drywell.
- Clarify the capacity of the 12-inch inlet to receive the volume of surface water off the driveway.
- Include windows or some compositional details on the west wall of the garage.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Voorhees. The motion passed with a vote of 5 "Aye," 0 "Nay," and 2 Absent. The vote was as follows:

Reed Voorhees	"Aye"
Brad Weitekamp	"Aye"
Mike Moran	"Aye"
Jeff Fernhoff	"Aye"
Jon Emert	"Aye"
John Falk	Absent
Laura Switzer	Absent

**REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A
NEW HOME – D&R Building
Group, 814 Alexandra Ave.**

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 814 Alexandra Ave. and invited the applicant to present. The project was presented by architect Joe Schlag with Srote and Co., contractor Leonard Adewunmi with D&R Building Group, and project manager Austin Bosecker with Srote and Co.

Mr. Schlag explained that the proposed new home features two stories with a detached 2-car garage and square footage of 2,700.

Drainage

The applicant noted that every downspout is being piped into the drywell.

Mr. Emert asked if there's an existing fence on the east side of the driveway as the plans indicate. The applicant said yes.

Because the plans call for the driveway with a concrete curb to be located up to the eastern property boundary, thereby causing a conflict of location with the existing fence, the ARB discussed with the applicant the need communicate with the neighboring property owner.

Mr. Johnson asked the applicant if they spoke with the property's rear neighbor located at 799 Glenway Dr. The applicant said that they had not spoken with her. Mr. Johnson explained that the neighbor stopped by City Hall to express concerns about her fence and property lines. She said that the survey flag was in her garden, so she believes that this portion of the property belongs to her and is concerned about her fence. The ARB encouraged the applicant to communicate with the rear neighbor to clarify property boundaries and fences to avoid issues for the future owner.

Ms. Henry stressed that the ARB is not providing the applicant legal advice, but she recommended that they speak to their attorney about any property boundary issues.

Mr. Moran advised the applicant to not put the air conditioner units in the side yard. He advised that it be located at the rear of the home as a matter of design even if it's not a violation of the setback rules.

Mr. Voorhees asked why the finished floor of the proposed house is a foot higher than the finished floors of the neighboring houses. Mr. Schlag thought it was because the proposed house extends further back on the property than the neighbors and with the incline of the property elevation, there wouldn't be enough room for the finished floor if the front of the house were a foot lower. Mr. Schlag said he would check with the project's civil engineer.

Landscaping

Mr. Weitekamp said he thought the ideas reflected in the landscape information are good, but they need to be formalized and incorporated into a drawing set. The tree study can't serve as the landscape plan. He encouraged the applicant to go through the landscaping checklist in the Community Design Guidelines.

Mr. Weitekamp advised that the applicant reconsider tree locations as some are too close to the utility lines and stormwater infrastructure. For example, Tree 2 is too close to the gas line and Tree 1 is close to a pop-up emitter and isn't a tree species that can handle constant water on it.

Mr. Voorhees returned to the discussion of the finished floor elevations. After looking more closely at the property, he questioned whether the proposed finished floor was one foot higher than the neighboring homes simply because the house extends farther back on the lot. The applicant said he would check with his civil engineer. Mr. Weitekamp suggested that the higher elevation might be intended to prevent water from infiltrating the home.

Mr. Weitekamp said he's curious to know how water behaves on the property, especially during very heavy rain.

Mr. Moran asked how the applicant is going to treat the south end of the driveway to allow the surface water to come onto it and continue flowing to the street. The applicant said that the concrete curb on the east side will encourage water to drain to street.

The applicant said that he's using the driveway as a swale. Mr. Moran stressed the importance of grading the driveway so that it functions this way.

Mr. Weitekamp asked the applicant if they would consider extending the curb only to the back edge of the garage to keep the water flowing onto the driveway. He suggested that the applicant consider pulling the curb back until it dies into grade to encourage the water to flow down the driveway instead of flowing around and onto the neighbor's property.

Architecture

Mr. Emert confirmed with the applicant that they intend to use vinyl siding.

The ARB said they discourage the use of vinyl siding especially for new construction. The applicant said they would be willing to use Hardie board.

Mr. Voorhees stated that the north and south elevations are nicely articulated and feature nice materials; however, the details are lost on the side elevations with the west elevation being the plainest.

Mr. Moran liked the rear-facing facade, but recommended that they reflect the same board-and-batten design on the garage southside gable to break up the elevation and moderate scale.

Mr. Emert noted that the ARB requires glass in the garage doors.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Mr. Moran moved to approve the applicant's design with the following conditions:

- Provide landscape plan as described in the Community Design Guidelines and resolve utility conflicts with trees in the front yard.
- Investigate lowering the first-floor elevation by up to one foot if possible, with engineering.

- Extend the driveway curb south along the property line to the south corner of the garage (plus or minus).
- Propose high-quality material from the approved materials list for the house and garage siding.
- Revise the siding material to the board-and-batten design on the garage southside gable.
- Add glass to the top row of panels in the garage door.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Voorhees. The motion passed with a vote of 5 “Aye,” 0 “Nay,” and 2 Absent. The vote was as follows:

Reed Voorhees	“Aye”
Brad Weitekamp	“Aye”
Mike Moran	“Aye”
Jeff Fernhoff	“Aye”
Jon Emert	“Aye”
John Falk	Absent
Laura Switzer	Absent

**REVIEW OF PLANS FOR A
NEW HOME** – Jason and
Michelle Fank, 785 Bismark Ave.

Chairman Fernhoff introduced the project at 785 Bismark Ave. and invited the applicant to present. The project was presented by Nick Liuzza with NJL Custom Homes

Mr. Johnson explained that the property has received a total of four variances including:

1. Construction of a new residence with a height of up to 38.89’. This was granted by the Board of Adjustment in November of 2025.
2. Construction of a garage with a height of up to 29.3’. This was also granted at the November 2025 meeting.
3. Construction of a new residence and garage that would have a total encroachment not to exceed 990 square feet in the 25’ vegetative buffer required by the City’s Stream Buffer Protection ordinance and a total encroachment not to exceed 3,335 square feet in the 25’ impervious surface buffer. This was granted by the Board of Adjustment in May of 2026.
4. Construction of a new residence that would encroach into the front yard setback of 42.5 by not more than 3.35’. This was granted by the Board of Adjustment in conjunction with stream buffer variance, as moving the home forward allows for a lesser intrusion into the 50’ stream buffer area.

Drainage

The ARB asked if the detached garage is designed to house two or three cars. The applicant clarified two cars and noted that they would clarify that on the plans.

Mr. Liuzza explained that there are no gas lines marked on the plans because Spire won't provide maps to the public.

Landscaping

The applicant noted that they will be paying into the tree mitigation fund to offset the number of trees removed on the property.

Mr. Weitekamp noted that the tree species noted on the landscaping plan look good, but some are listed as evergreen trees and he would like clarification on the specific species that will be planted. He also advised the applicant to replace the American Elm with a different species.

Mr. Voorhees asked for more information about the berm on the west side of the property.

The applicant said the idea behind the berm is to keep water from flowing onto the neighboring property. When the house was dropped down, a swale was replaced by the berm. This would also make mowing the grass easier.

Architecture

Mr. Moran said he appreciated extending the stonework around to the side elevations. He liked the larger center mass and smaller mass on the sides.

Mr. Voorhees expressed concern about the design of the home and thought the home's design could have been worked more creatively into the topography.

Mr. Voorhees asked if the north side of the property is in the floodplain. Mr. Johnson explained that there is no flood plain because the elevation is so high. He noted that the stream buffer variance was needed because of the stream being on the USGS maps.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Mr. Moran moved to approve the applicant's design with the following conditions:

- Specify the evergreen tree species in the landscape plan and consider an alternative species to the American Elm.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Weitekamp. The motion passed with a vote of 5 "Aye," 0 "Nay," and 2 Absent. The vote was as follows:

Reed Voorhees "Aye"

Brad Weitekamp	“Aye”
Mike Moran	“Aye”
Jeff Fernhoff	“Aye”
Jon Emert	“Aye”
John Falk	Absent
Laura Switzer	Absent

ADJOURN

Mr. Moran moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Emert, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.