

Glendale Planning and Historic Preservation Commission
Monday, August 30, 2021
Meeting Minutes

Pursuant to notice, the Glendale Planning & Historic Preservation Commission met at 5:30 pm on Monday 30 August 2021 at the Glendale Town Hall.

In Attendance: Chairman Tom Breidenstein, Vice Chairman Tom Kerr, Secretary Leslie Cooper and members Bob Kooris, Beth Sullebarger, Randy Green, Dan Mayzum and Mayor Don Lofty. Village Administrator David Lumsden and Village Clerk Becky Terrell were also present.

Chairman Tom Breidenstein called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and declared a quorum present

Agenda Items

I. Review and approval of 2 August 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Kooris moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Green seconded the motion and it passed via unanimous Planning Commission voice vote.

II. Old Business – no old business was discussed

III. New Business

Appropriateness Review of Official Applications

1. **785 Congress, Brien & Rochelle Dickson, addition.** The Dicksons were present to represent the application stating their plan to have an addition built including a first-floor master bedroom suite, kitchen expansion and screened in porch that will be straight out the back. Same/similar wood siding will be used, simulated divided light windows of similar size, a metal roof and original shutters will be installed. Mr. Mayzum noted that there were no shutters on the drawings, and Mrs. Dickson noted that drawing changes had been made including adjustments to the window height and shutters were added. Vice Chairman Kerr asked about a window appearing on drawing C as a “single” width window while on the plan view the window appears as a “double wide” window. The applicant clarified the window is to be double width as indicated on the plan view. Mr. Kerr requested clarification about a

structure that appears on the CAGIS system drawing, asked if the structure still exists, and how far from the addition would the structure be? Mr. Dickson stated that a garage does exist and the addition will be 8' from the existing garage. Mr. Mayzum asked for details regarding the screened in porch, and it was discussed the new railing will match the front porch railing. Mr. Kooris asked if the box gutters will be removed, and the homeowners stated the back box gutters will be removed and the rest will remain. Mr. Mayzum asked the type and color of the metal roof [black, standing seam]. Ms. Sullebarger stated that there are historic images showing 6/6 window layout but current windows are 2/2 and the homeowners stated that the new windows will be 2/2. Mr. Green moved to accept the application with the windows 2/ 2 with choice of wood or fiberglass and matching railing design. Mr. Kooris seconded the motion, and the motion passed via unanimous Planning Commission voice vote.

2. **30 W. Fountain Ave., Steve Thomas, porch railing replacement.** Mr. Thomas was present to represent the application requesting the removal of 13'+ of white siding at the porch and installing vertical posts. Mr. Kooris asked the overall height of the railing and Mr. Mayzum stated that the height on the drawing is 36" – 37 ½". Ms. Sullebarger noted that the new steps look very nice and clarified her suggestion regarding removing the porch siding was to confirm if the house is shingle style. Ms. Sullebarger suggested that GHP museum may have an historic house photo showing some details not visible currently and further suggested looking at the shingle style house at Ivy and Floral Park to see how the railing looks. Ms. Sullebarger stated that the balustrade is attractive but she believes the current railing may be historically accurate and if original solid railing is found during the work that he consider maintaining the original structure. Mr. Kooris moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Mayzum seconded the motion and the motion passed via unanimous Planning Commission voice vote.

IV. **Persons Addressing the GPHP Commission/Other Business**

Public Hearing: To discuss proposed amendments to the Village of Glendale Zoning Code relating to signage, as initiated by the Glendale Planning and Historic Preservation Commission.

Chairman Breidenstein introduced the topic and Public Hearing stating that the sign code needed to be revised to reflect the 2015 Supreme Court decision that requires sign codes to be content neutral. An ad-hoc committee including Chairman Breidenstein, Ms. Sullebarger and Mr.

Mayzum with support from Village Administrator Lumsden and Solicitor Ryan was formed to review current verbiage and draft revised consolidated verbiage considering the Supreme Court ruling. The purpose of this Public Hearing is to gather public input regarding the proposed verbiage followed by Commission discussion that will result in a motion/action by the Commission.

Public Comment

1. **Mr. Kevin Parrish**, resident. Asked if sign ordinances were in effect currently, and Chairman Breidenstein stated that current sign ordinances are in place and vary based on public and private signage placement as different regulations are in place for different sign locations. Vice Chairman Kerr referenced the sign ordinance that prohibits erection of a sign in a public place (ordinance 95.12) including the maximum \$100/day fines for violation (ordinance 95.99).

Commission Discussion

Vice Chairman Kerr asked about the definition on page 4, #36 and if the verbiage should also consider wall signs that might be painted directly on the sides of buildings or houses. Chairman Breidenstein said he did not recall specific discussion regarding that specific issue, and Village Administrator Lumsden said painted wall signs were not part of original discussion. Ms. Sullebarger supported clarifying painted wall signs and, in her mind, a painted sign should meet the same dimension requirements. Chairman Breidenstein stated that a painted sign should equate to a wall-mounted sign in his point of view. Mr. Mayzum asked when the new code is adopted, would these new regulations be enforceable and if existing signage would be grandfathered. Chairman Breidenstein stated that existing signs would be grandfathered but any change would require compliance to the new code. This is standard practice for zoning code changes.

Mr. Parrish asked if anything painted on the wall like a portrait/school logos/sports logo is considered art or a sign. Chairman Breidenstein said he would have to see an example and the answer may be based on conditions and specifics to the signs when encountered. Ms. Sullebarger stated that the new ordinance can only regulate size, placement and materials; content cannot be regulated based on the Supreme Court ruling.

Mr. Kooris moved and recommend the verbiage to Council with the addition of “, or painted on” following “A sign that is attached to or erected against” on page 4 #36. Ms. Sullebarger seconded the motion, and the motion passed via unanimous voice vote. Mayor Lofty recused himself from discussion/voting as this will be coming before Council.

V. Public Addressing the GPHPC & Other Business

1. **Mr. Kevin Parrish**, resident. He requested clarification regarding the role of the Planning Commission in the recent discussion regarding green space development. Chairman Breidenstein stated that green spaces are public property under control of Council, like streets. If Council proposes changes, they would be reviewed by Planning Commission. Mayor Lofty stated that the GCIC reviews each parcel considered for development and a conclusion is made based on research conducted. Mr. Parrish asked if the Planning Commission acted as a research arm for Council and it was clarified that they do not act in that capacity.

IV. Other Business - No other business was discussed

- V. Adjournment:** At 6:20 p.m. Mayor Lofty motioned to adjourn the meeting Mr. Mayzum seconded the motion and it passed unanimously via Planning Commission voice vote.

Next regular meeting – Monday October 4, 2021 at 5:30 pm

Submitted by Secretary Leslie Cooper

As assisted by Clerk Becky Terrell