

**Glendale Planning and Historic Preservation Commission**  
**Monday, October 3, 2022**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Pursuant to notice, the Glendale Planning & Historic Preservation Commission met at 5:30 pm on Monday 3 October 2022 at the Glendale Town Hall.

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

Unless otherwise indicated, it should be assumed that Mayor Lofty has abstained on all Commission votes, either because they involved Certificates of Appropriateness or because they involved matters which are likely to come before Council where he presides.

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 1 August 2022 and 12 September 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes.**

Ms. Sullebarger moved to approve the both sets of minutes as submitted. Vice Chairman Kerr seconded the motion and it passed via unanimous Planning Commission voice vote.

**II. Old Business**

1. **349 Cleveland Ave., Bonita Fulton, Fence (Deferred from September meeting). Mr. Randy Roebuck**, contractor was present to represent the application requesting the chain link be replaced with 3' high white vinyl fence including 3 gates. Chairman Breidenstein asked the distance from Willow Ave to the fence and if the existing fence goes to the sidewalk. Mr. Roebuck said that the existing fence is 3' off the sidewalk and the new fence will be installed in the same location. Ms. Sullebarger stated the proposed fence is attractive and an upgrade from the current chain link fence. Mr. Mayzum asked about the gates and Mr. Roebuck said 2 – 6' gates of the same material are at the driveway in the rear. Mr. Kooris motioned to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Mayzum seconded the motion and it passed via unanimous Planning Commission voice vote.

### III. New Business

#### Appropriateness Review of Official Applications

1. **1140 Congress Ave., Rob Weber, Commercial Signage.** Mr. Weber, building owner (former Meritage) was present to represent the application requesting a sign of similar size that include the address; 3 signs total with 2 flat against the wall and a bracketed hanging sign on the west corner. The material is 3mil aluminum for the flat sign and the hanging sign is 6mil aluminum with vinyl laminate copy. Mr. Kooris asked the height of the hanging sign and Village Administrator Lumsden stated that the zoning code requires a minimum height of 8' from the sidewalk and the submitted sign size meets zoning requirements. Ms. Sullebarger stated the code requires material and design to be materials cohesive with the design and suggested a matte finish instead of a gloss finish. Mr. Kooris asked if lighting will be included and Mr. Weber said the existing lights will be utilized. Mr. Mayzum asked where additional signage will be installed if a commercial entity requires sign installed. Mr. Beaugrand asked if all 3 signs have the same address even though the signs are on 2 facades facing 2 different streets [the building itself has 1 address even though on a corner lot]. Ms. Sullebarger moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Kooris seconded the motion and the motion passed via unanimous Planning Commission voice-vote.
2. **23 E. Sharon Ave., Matt Niehaus, Garage.** Mr. Niehaus, homeowner was present to represent the application stating the existing single car garage has a structural issue and a dirt floor. The existing garage is a frame construction and the request is to replace the garage with a 2-car garage and concrete floor. Village Administrator Lumsden stated that the application meets all zoning codes. Ms. Sullebarger stated the zoning code 154.46(C) requires a new structure over 300 square feet utilize the same design and materials as the primary building and suggested the garage could be reconstructed as it exists. Mr. Niehaus stated that a single car garage is not of interest. Chairman Breidenstein asked if the demolition would also have to be reviewed and referenced 154.46(G) Demolition of Buildings and Accessory Buildings which covers the accessory demolition requirements. Chairman Breidenstein asked if there would be windows installed [yes]. Mr. Mayzum asked if there were exterior lights installed [yes, would be reinstalled]. From the audience, Mr. Beaugrand stated that St. Gabes demolished their garage and rebuilt a larger one and asked if a wood exterior w/2x footprint could go forward and Chairman Breidenstein stated that if this is a reconstruction of an accessory building then it would need to be in a wood/wood-like

material. Mr. Kooris asked if the proposed garage would encompass the existing footprint [yes]. Ms. Sullebarger motioned to defer action on the application until the November meeting. Mr. Mayzum seconded and the motion passed via unanimous Commission voice vote.

3. **925 Congress Ave., Byron Williamson and Sandra Hendrix, Garage Addition and Window Replacement.** Mr. Ron Yobey, architect was present to represent the application stating the request is for a sunroom addition, garage addition and extending the front sunroom gable and replace the windows. The additions would have matching wood siding and roof pitches to the existing home. Mr. Kooris asked what windows are being reviewed [Anderson with divided light]. Village Administrator Lumsden stated that the sunroom requires a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals and it is unclear if the existing drive encroaches upon the neighbor's yard [A survey will be required to address the question]. The driveways also require a 5' setback from the property line. Mr. Mayzum asked about the 9 over 9 window in the north gable [Ms. Hendrix said it is a casement replacement], and Mr. Kooris said the windows have to have a simulated divided light grid as required per code. Ms. Sullebarger said the house is contributing and built in 1950; stylistically it is a Minimal Traditional style house. The 6 over 6 windows are integral to the house style and the 2 over 2 windows are a 19th century style of window. The guidelines state replacing windows should be the last resort and the style used should not be of an earlier design. Ms. Hendrix said the windows are leaking, and Ms. Sullebarger asked if they would match the 9 over 9 windows. Vice Chairman Kerr concurred with the 9 over 9 window statements. Ms. Sullebarger stated the design requirements for additions require the addition be smaller in every way including height. The ridge/peak of the new garage addition is higher than the existing house roof, and Mr. Yobey said to match the existing roof pitch the roof has to be higher which results in the roof ridge looking continuous. Vice Chairman Kerr asked if there was usage for the upper portion of the garage and offered two ideas including a low pitch hip roof so the garage roof is not visible from Congress or gabling the garage roof so it would appear behind the existing roof facing Congress and reflect the existing front facade gable design at north end of Congress facade. Mr. Rod Sidley, architect, brought up the issue of the driveway and provided a copy of the survey with the encroachment marked. Chairman Breidenstein said the driveway encroachment is a private matter but the extension of the driveway is the issue of the Planning Commission. Chairman Breidenstein asked if the survey shows an adjustment to the south property line that could negate the need for the

sunroom zoning variance. Village Administrator Lumsden stated a setback of 10' is required and based on application, the widest possible setback is 7 ½' and gets narrower. It is likely the survey will solidify the need for a variance but anything is possible. Vice Chairman Kerr moved to approve the front porch extension as submitted and approve the window replacement with same simulated divided light layout and defer action indefinitely on the sunroom, garage and driveway applications should the timing of a survey exceed the 45-day window. Ms. Sullebarger seconded the motion, and the motion passed via unanimous Commission voice vote.

**IV. Public Comment & Other Business –**

There were no public comments and no Other Business discussed

- V. Adjournment:** At 6:39 p.m. Mayor Lofty motioned to adjourn the meeting Vice Chairman Kerr seconded the motion and it passed unanimously via Planning Commission voice vote.

**Next regular meeting – Monday November 7, 2022 at 5:30 pm in Council Chambers**

Submitted by Secretary Leslie Cooper

As assisted by Clerk Becky Terrell