

DRAFT

Glendale Planning and Historic Preservation Commission

Monday, January 9th, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Pursuant to notice the Glendale Planning & Historic Preservation Commission met at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, January 9th 2012, at 80 East Sharon Avenue.

In Attendance: Chairman Tom Breidenstein, Vice Chairman Tom Kerr, Secretary Beth Sullebarger and members Sam Allen, Bob Kooris and Rachel Schmid. Mayor-Elect Ralph Hoop, Village Administrator Loretta Rokey, Assistant Solicitor Laura Abrams, and prospective Commissioner Scott Thurman 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 the December 5th, 2011 meeting minutes. Ms. Schmid moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Vice Chairman Kerr seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

II. Nomination and Election of Officers Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary. Acknowledge New Appointment to the Commission. Mr. Scott Thurman was announced as the prospective new Commission member, subject to Council approval later in the evening. Mr. Allen moved to nominate Tom Breidenstein as Chairman, Tom Kerr as Vice Chairman and Scott Thurman as Secretary, (subject to Council approval), then moved the nominations be closed. Ms. Schmid seconded the nominations, and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Pending Business/Persons Addressing the GPHP Commission.

Nobody wished to address the Commission.

IV. Old Business

A. Drees/Zaring, 2 Matthews Court, new single family home appearance review, modifications to windows, addition of chimney, shutters removed. A representative of Drees/Zaring was present to represent the application and indicated that changes had been made to the plans reflecting the feedback from the prior review. Included in the changes were adding the hip roof to balance, moving the chimney to the front, showing the screened porch, adding a window on the right side elevation and removing the shutters. Ms. Schmid moved to approve the revised the plan. Mr. Kooris seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V. Appropriateness Review of Official Applications:

A. Bahan, Karen, 800 Woodbine, Screened Porch, prior reviews in 2008 and April 2011 (roof repair/replacement and repair siding to match original materials). Nobody was present to represent the application, so discussion was deferred until the February meeting.

B. Wilson, Dr. Ruth, 315 E. Willow Ave., replacement windows and storm door. Dr. Wilson was present to represent the application indicating that the window manufacturer had changed from the

submission due to a different contractor selected. Dr. Wilson provided the revised door and window examples to the Commission. Mr. Allen asked if the windows were 100% vinyl or vinyl-clad wood [100% vinyl]. Mr. Kooris asked for clarification regarding the number of lights in the existing windows [old windows are 6 over 6, new windows will match]. Chairman Breidenstein requested that a copy of the revised materials remain with the application and that the final design be marked in the documentation for reference [ok to both]. Ms. Sullebarger noted that the guidelines generally speak against vinyl siding and windows, but the house has been significantly altered over time, so she moved to approve the application reflecting the revised windows/doors as presented this evening. Mr. Allen seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

C. Christ Church; 965 Forest Ave – removal of old addition and new addition proposed. Reverend Foote and City Studio Architects were present to represent the application. In addition, members of the Church's building committee were present. The latest review was in March 2011, when Reverend Foote opened the discussion outlining six years of strategic planning work regarding expansion and upgrades, and the need to make changes to the 1959 addition known as 'All Saints Hall', as it is very expensive to maintain. The proposal is to have a new worship area, fellowship hall, offices and gardens. **Chantelle Noble, founder of City Studio Architects**, indicated that the plan was to add 21st century architecture that complemented and highlighted the historic building without attempting to mimic the current design. The review started with Helen Sedwick, Senior Warden of Christ Church, providing a brief narrative of the need, similar to the previous discussion from Reverend Foote. Ms. Noble walked through the modified design that incorporates previous feedback from the Commission. Of note are changes to the windows on the southwest façade (choir room) to provide more privacy to the neighbors; the west façade broken up with a stairwell and contrasting materials; roof modifications to the new chapel to add height, and arched openings to pick up on Gothic elements of the old church. The outdoor areas will be open to the public. Vice Chairman Kerr noted that a rose window on the rear elevation of Olivia House will not be visible from the west, as the new wing obstructs the view. Ms. Schmid noted that the west façade entrance with double-hung windows and a small cross is not visually appealing or appropriate because of the asymmetry and the need for more attention to this focal area of the building. Mr. Kooris suggested using a stained glass window incorporating a cross and adding visual appeal and a reference to the original structure. Vice Chairman Kerr likened the break in the west elevation to a stairwell in an apartment building. Ms. Noble said that the change to a higher strip of windows in the choir room was made in response to the Zoning Board review, to provide privacy to the neighbors. Ms. Schmid asked if the roof peak was 28' [yes, classrooms are depressed into landscape to match Olivia House floor level, resulting in a floor level 4' below grade]. Mr. Allen suggested repurposing the existing stone material from the Garber addition to the light brown areas indicated in the conceptual drawings [talking to contractor about that, not sure if there is enough existing stone material there to do that, but looking to repurpose the stonework. Another option is to use stone for the wall at the property line]. Chairman Breidenstein asked if the final materials list was available [no, still under review; need to review on-site in appropriate light due to color variations]. Mr. Allen noted that the design change opened up the view to the Victory window (main building) while obstructing the view of the rose window (Olivia House). Ms. Sullebarger noted that while the view of the rose window may be obstructed, it is important that it is being retained and will remain visible from the courtyard. Ms. Schmid asked about the opening on the north façade of the Olivia House, connecting to the new addition and what changes that would create [hope to find the arches that were in the original design and restore at least two. Current plaster cracking indicates that the arches are covered and not eliminated.] Chairman Breidenstein clarified that the windows are covered today [yes, the church's intent is to restore if viable]. Ms. Sullebarger noted that the north façade of the Olivia House is the least visible and hoped to retain as much of the original structure as possible during the project [the intent is to restore it to original, taking away modifications to the arches from the 1950s remodel]. Ms. Sullebarger also asked if the new chapel roof slope corresponds to the original structure [as steep as possible, pitched the visible side higher to get closer match]. Ms. Schmid noted that this design is much better as it does not overwhelm the original buildings, but that

the key determinant is the materials choice. Vice Chairman Kerr asked if the windows on the classroom south elevation match the window design on the Olivia House, as it doesn't appear to carry Olivia House details across visually [Olivia House has double-hung with transoms, but the new building will have different type of windows]. Chairman Breidenstein asked what changes requested by the Bauers had been included [changed choir room windows, adding a no-build easement to the south side of the property, and updating Olivia House fire escape]. Ms. Schmid asked if there was no need for the fire escape, would they exclude it [yes, but plan to modify vs. eliminate]. Chairman Breidenstein asked if the footprint or height changed based on the Bauers' concerns [no changes]; and if there were any discussion with the Bauers relative to tonight's plans [yes, ongoing dialogue]. Ms. Schmid inquired to the placement of the dumpster [first option is south side on easement, followed by other parking lot accessible from Sharon Ave] and Ms. Schmid voiced concern over putting the dumpster in the easement area. Ms. Noble noted that the materials in consideration are stone with mixed colors of similar palette; copper siding, metal roof, dark grey areas in rendering are TBD but want another material for variety. Chairman Breidenstein asked to see the materials [suggested a site visit for context and lighting]. Ms. Sullebarger read the revised wording of §154.4(C)(2) (Appendix 1), and indicated that in her opinion the revised design met the intent of the code and the revised design has included previous feedback. She reiterated the need to document the Woodie Garber addition, as it is an architecturally important building but clearly doesn't meet the needs of the Church. Ms. Schmid also noted that the application cannot be fully approved without material selections, but it can be approved contingent on materials. Overall she thought the changes are positive but still suggested revisiting the west façade entrance. Vice Chairman Kerr also voiced concerns about the south and west façades of the addition, which looks too much like a 'Motel 6' and doesn't pick up any interest from the existing buildings.

Chairman Breidenstein asked to have attendees in opposition of the application speak first, followed by attendees in favor. **Mr. Alex Brockmeier**, 35 Erie Avenue, read written remarks (Appendix 2). **Mr. Phil Bauer**, 46 Erie Ave, followed (prepared comments in Appendix 3.)

At 7:05 pm, the meeting was temporarily adjourned to relocate to Christ Church, 965 Forest Avenue, to continue the discussion due to Council meeting and an event was already taking place upstairs at Town Hall. Mr. Bob Kooris had to leave, so was not present for the further discussion. The meeting resumed at Christ Church at 7:25 pm.

Mr. Fred Pfirrmann, 45 Erie Avenue, a 45-plus-year Glendale resident and neighbor to Christ Church, said he supported the statements of Mr. Brockmeier and Mr. Bauer and reiterated the rules and regulations. He felt that the proposed plans would need a 'large shoehorn' to fit all the expressed needs/wants for 540 current members into the existing lot. He said that every church had a right to worship in the manner congregants see fit, but the rules of Glendale require restraint. He attended the church's 22 December 2011 meeting and heard the various points of view. He noted previous applications before the Commission (140 Magnolia and the Lyceum) he was a part of that required strict adherence to maintain the historic integrity of the area related to additions or changes made to existing properties, and this should be kept in mind. He added that the footprint proposed leaves very little green space and will have a huge impact on the neighborhood. He said the proposed facility is very large for 540 members and expressed concern about parking requirements and the ability to get safety equipment to the homes in the area during a service. Chairman Breidenstein noted that parking was reviewed separately by the Zoning Administrator Ms. Rokey and not this Commission, and is being actively reviewed.

Mr. Allen Bowen, 945 Forest Avenue, also spoke in opposition, and urged that the plans needed to be discussed as neighbors and friends. Mr. Bowen read prepared comments to the Commission, noting that he appreciated the review looking at the expansion in context of the site and existing buildings. He and his wife have lived at 945 Forest for 15+ years, have enjoyed having the Church as a neighbor

and have done their best to maintain and improve his home in character with Glendale, inviting Bill Carruthers, a prior homeowner, to review modifications to maintain its integrity. He observed that property owners in the historic district give up some rights for long-term preservation of the Village. His opinion is that Christ Church is not living up to this responsibility, as evidenced by hiring an attorney to have the definition of a front/side/back yards clarified. He questioned the church's commitment to safety and said there was no compelling argument for the square footage requested. If housing homeless is part of the plan, he is opposed. He agrees to razing the Garber structure and supports the plan for the Chapel structure, but the facade facing the Bauers looks like low-income housing and is not appropriate. If a megachurch is the intent, the church should consider other sites.

Mr. Mike Beaugrand, 44 East Sharon Avenue, a 26+ year resident, noted the excellence of the previous speeches, and thinks the expansion can be a win/win. He accepts that the Church needs to expand but agrees that the office area lacks a historic "feel." He expressed disappointment in the Zoning appeal regarding the front/back/side year definitions. He stated that the placement of the buildings needed to be reconsidered and suggested the buildings be built along Sharon instead of behind the Olivia House. He does not agree that this plan is appropriate per the guidelines despite what Commission members expressed earlier. He concluded that the decision is about Glendale's quality of life and the Church's role in the community and agreed that the expansion was needed, but not as proposed.

Mr. & Mrs. Mike & Nancy O'Connor, 56 East Sharon Avenue, expressed agreement with Mr. Beaugrand's position. They also asked if the historic guidelines and rules were different between residential and non-residential applications. Chairman Breidenstein noted that the regulations were the same for all types of additions, but the wording had changed recently as Glendale's code was out of step with the standards of the US Department of the Interior. Our regulations were updated to better reflect current thinking. Vice Chairman Kerr noted that the key difference is that the addition has to be compatible but not identical. Ms. Schmid read the new regulation (Appendix 1). Mr. O'Connor asked if that determination was a matter of taste, and Chairman Breidenstein noted that there is a range of interpretation, but there are appeal rights as needed. Mr. O'Connor said he is opposed not to the expansion, but to the expansiveness of the footprint. Chairman Breidenstein noted that the Commission can only review applications and not design new buildings or additions; the door remains open for the neighbors to provide feedback and opinions to the Church. Mr. O'Connor stated that compatibility is subjective, but most of the presentation was from the internal point-of-view and not from a neighborhood perspective. Ms. Schmid noted that very few people think the Woodie Garber addition was compatible, but time was spent to match the materials. Mr. Allen cited a recent Commission decision on a lot split into 3 lots (Navarro, 125 E. Fountain), which was overruled by the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas despite the Commission's vote to deny the split.

Mr. Greg Pilch, 36 Erie Ave, noted concern about the appropriateness of size, commenting that the previously approved removal of the Deacon's House on Sharon Avenue and replacement with a parking lot was not visually appealing. He added that the new church would be massive in scale and the visual improvement is more centered on the members while they are in the church vs. the neighbors who have the exterior view. **Mr. Phil Bauer** suggested that the church build a 2-story addition on the existing footprint instead of expanding the footprint.

At this point, Chairman Breidenstein asked to hear from those in favor of the proposed addition.

Mr. David Vandergarten, a member of the church's design committee, expressed dismay over the quality of life statements and noted that non-residents have an appreciation of Glendale as they choose to worship here and to enjoy the Glendale ambiance. **Mr. Dennis Theobald**, a current West Chester and former Forest Park resident, who has been a Christ Church member for 38+ years, a warden during planning and chairman of fundraising, spoke to the words, 'massive and inappropriate' used to

describe the proposal. 'Quaint' is often used to describe the Village, but the existing buildings are large (Rectory is 6,000 sq ft) and the Church wants to build an 18,000-square-foot addition in place of the existing 10,000 square foot addition, but in terms of volume, the addition would increase volume 10-12%. The footprint of existing buildings currently occupies 25% of the land and the new addition would use just 3% more. If you include the space in the building razed 3 years ago at 45 East Sharon Avenue, the new addition would equal the square footage of what existed. The reference to a megachurch is not accurate, as they typically have a 200,000-square-foot auditorium. Additionally, parking would adhere to current code. Ms. Helen Sedwick, Senior Warden, noted that home is where the heart is – she is not a Glendale resident and it is very difficult to see the neighbors so upset over what she believes is an enhancement to the neighborhood. She also voiced the need is to keep the church vibrant and growing, as the Diocese has been closing churches down and if the membership gets too small, this church would be at risk and the church and property would revert to the Diocese ownership. While Glendale residents have been supportive, 75% of the fundraising comes from non-Glendale residents.

Ms. Noble clarified that the occupancy limits would not allow both the new chapel and old church to be full simultaneously, thus there is no need for additional parking. **Father Foote** spoke, indicating that this church is seen as home by many parishioners, and that feeling is rooted in a deep respect for the physical presence of the building and place. He presented a letter from a parishioner who had moved away decades ago, but continues to support the church in spirit and contribution.

Ms. Schmid noted that the primary concern is for the 3 existing significant structures, and their continued preservation depends on the viability of the Church overall. Chairman Breidenstein asked if other building footprints have been considered, particularly expansion on the new parking lot area as opposed to expansion as presented [have considered, but more expensive and would require an easement or purchase of part of the neighbor's back yard for setback. Also want to maintain the Olivia House connection and moving the building would lose the connection]. Ms. Schmid asked if the segment of the office building nearest the Bauers be narrowed or moved to the other end [the proposed building meets setback requirements, so no code reason to move as the Bauers' house is only 8' setback]. Mr. Bauer commented that this is a continued conversation about what is neighborly vs. what is legal and again asked to consider building on the existing footprint vs. expanding the footprint and taking a hard look at what is needed vs. what is wanted, including considering what can be used at the Rectory to increase usable space in the current buildings.

At this point, Chairman Breidenstein asked the Commission for their current thoughts/feedback.

Vice Chairman Kerr said the setbacks were legally met. He urged that the scale/mass should be more similar to the existing structures and suggested review of the classroom section that looks like a "Motel 6." He also noted disappointment about the loss of visibility to the rose window of Olivia House from Erie. He could not vote for this as submitted tonight.

Ms. Sullebarger believes that a more modern design can be compatible with the existing structures in terms of size, scale, massing, and materials. The west elevation of the new addition appears to be very long and needs to be distinguished more and the west entrance needs to be treated more as a focal point, but the design basically meets the code.

Mr. Allen noted that the current additions and the proposed additions represent only about a 10% increase, and the Commission in the past has approved additions that add 30%+ to a site. What he sees as the problem is the southwest corner at the choir room. The materials should not look like a "Motel 6'." He could approve the size of the addition, but not the southwest corner due to materials.

Ms. Schmid agreed about the southwest façade needing work; she cannot vote yes due to lack of material information. Square footage and volume are OK, but the materials are so important to the addition and the west side is the issue.

Chairman Breidenstein noted that this is not a designing commission, but a reviewing commission. What has been presented has been an appropriate design, but it needs work with the façade and materials. The Commission cannot act with finality for those reasons and he urges that the dialogue with the neighbors continue.

Representatives of the church agreed that the comments heard this evening have provided them with enough feedback to approach the Commission in the future with a completed application, including materials for the exterior of the proposed construction.

V. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

At 8:35 pm, Mr. Allen moved to adjourn, Ms. Sullebarger seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

The next meeting will be held Monday February 6th, 2012.

Submitted by Beth Sullebarger

Prepared by Rebecca Fenner–Terrell

To view the above mentioned Appendixes, visit the Glendale Planning and Historic Preservation Commission meeting minutes archive under January 2012:

<http://www.glendaleohio.org/sitendxP.html>