|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Members Present** |  | **Members Absent** |
| Michael Chiodini, Vice-Chairman |  | Mark Campbell, Chairman |
| Dick Gordon |  | Chris Burton |
| Don Anderson |  |  |
| Adam Edelbrock |  |  |
| Pat Jones (Alternate) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Call of Meeting to Order and Approval of Minutes**

Vice-Chair Michael Chiodini called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Chiodini stated for the record that Section 610.015 of the Missouri Sunshine Law provides that members of the Architectural Review Board who are not physically in the City Council Chambers can participate and vote on all matters when an emergency exists and the nature of the emergency is stated in the minutes.

The U.S. and the world is in a state of emergency due to the Coronavirus – COVID-19. Therefore, members of the Architectural Review Board have elected to participate in this meeting electronically for the public health and safety of each other and the general public.

Mr. Chiodini asked if there were any comments for the May 17, 2021 meeting minutes.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve the May 17, 2021 minutes. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Sign Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Sign Review - New Business**
   1. Case 14-21S – 1202 S Kirkwood Rd – B5  
      Jamie Bergmann, applicant  
      Changing Existing Wall Signage for Walmart

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 14-21S. Matthew Heatherly addressed the board. Mr. Heatherly indicated that Walmart is replacing brand signage and rolling out a nationwide brand repackaging that includes updates to the building’s exterior in addition to signage changes. The board discussed the following items:

* The proposed façade update and color change. They indicated that the current colors are earth tones and noted the proposed color scheme is gray tones with blue details. Detailed color samples and schematics are needed.
* They discussed color change application methods and materials. Mr. Heatherly explained that the masonry and metal caps would be painted and the panels will be wrapped in vinyl. They asked for specifications on the entry area, warranty details, and color fastness.

**Adam Edelbrock made a motion to approve Case 14-21S with the following requirement(s): 1) that the applicant provide additional information on how the vinyl entry area will be wrapped, including warranty and color fastness information for the material. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 15-21S – 1050 S Kirkwood Rd, Ste. A – B5

Dale Sign Service, Chris Smith, applicant

Wall Sign for New Business, Buff City Soap

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 15-21S. Chris Smith of Dale Sign Service addressed the board, indicating he would be installing the proposed new wall sign for Buff City Soap. He explained that the sign would be constructed out of two rows of raceway and the lettering was mint green with a white outline. The Board asked about the returns and backing. They indicated they would like to see white returns and white trim caps.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 15-21S with the following requirement(s): 1) that the returns on the signage be white. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 16-21S – 115 W Argonne Dr – B2  
     Mosby Building Arts, applicant

Marquee Sign & Wall Sign for New Mosby Building Arts Location

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 16-21S. Rebecca Lay, a representative from Mosby Building Arts, addressed the board. Ms. Lay indicated that the existing gooseneck lights will be replaced with new gooseneck fixtures; the “M” is their brand logo; and the marquee will be backlit. The board discussed the following items:

* The “M” logo and whether it was used in their branding.
* The placement and layout of the projecting sign. The board indicated that the needs to be bigger--noting it may not project more than three feet from the wall--and would like it to include “Mosby” in a vertical format.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 16-21S with the following requirement(s): 1) that the projecting sign be redesigned and submitted for cursory review. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 17-21S – 10465 Manchester Rd – B3

Excel Signs & Design, Lauren Peifer, applicant

Wall Sign for New Business, Archworks Capital LLC

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 17-21S. The applicant, Lauren Peifer of Excel Signs & Design, addressed the board. Ms. Peifer indicated that the proposal includes three sets of channel letters, one for Archworks Capital and two for Fusion Business Brokers. The board discussed the following items:

* Whether the proposed sign was going over the gutter. Ms. Peifer indicated that it was not.
* Whether the sign would be internally lit. Ms. Peifer indicated that the Arch will be internally lit and will glow white at night and is going to be individually installed as a channel letter like the rest of the sign lettering.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 17-21S as submitted. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Residential Review - Old Business**
   1. Case 26-21R – 145 Horseshoe Dr – R3

Fred Achard, applicant

One-Story Rear Porch Addition

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 26-21R. Mr. Chiodini asked if the applicant was present. Andrea Yancey, City Planner I, determined that the applicant, Fred Achard, did not appear to be present. She indicated she would contact the applicant to determine next steps.

**Pat Jones made a motion to continue Case 26-21R until the following ARB meeting. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 42-21R – 821 Craig Dr – R3Grandon Brimley, applicant  
     Room Addition

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 42-21R. Applicant Grandon “Grady” Brimley addressed the board, indicating that his engineer had submitted drawings to verify the integrity of the existing foundation. The board discussed the following items:

* That the roof of the proposed addition will be increased to the existing ridgeline as shown in the hand drawing.
* The lack of windows on the side elevation. Mr. Brimley indicated that the blank wall of the side elevation is part of the existing structure.
* The finishing details of the proposed addition, including windows, must match the existing house.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 42-21R with the following requirement(s): 1) that all new windows be trimmed out to match the existing windows; 2) that the roof pitch be raised as shown in the hand drawing. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. Case 54-21R – 648 Linwood Blvd – R4

Gateway Home Builders, Applicant

New Single-Family Residence

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 54-21R. David Kraemer of Gateway Home Builders & Architect D. Villacis addressed the board. Mr. Kraemer stated that he would not like to install windows on the side or the back of the garage because it would ruin the storage capability and functionality of the garage. Mr. Kraemer indicated that he will not install a man door in the garage because he will be adding a patio with an outdoor kitchen in that space in the near future. The board discussed the following items:

* The windows must be trimmed out and include sills and aprons. The window muntins must be consistent throughout the house.
* A window is needed in the side elevation of the garage. Mr. Kraemer asked to cover the window with drywall and it was explained that the window could be shuttered.
* The basement windows may be eliminated and moved to the first floor office.
* A cursory review of the window placement on the side elevations was proposed.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 42-21R with the following requirement(s): 1) that a window (or shuttered window) be placed in the side elevation of the garage and submitted for cursory review; 2) that all the window muntins match; 3) that all windows have sills, aprons, and full trim; 4) that the side elevations of the home be resubmitted with additional window placement for cursory review. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Residential Review - New Business**
2. Case 69-21R – 345 Dickson St – R2  
   Mike Lewis of Lewis Homes, applicant  
   New Detached Garage

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 69-21R and applicant Mike Lewis of Lewis Homes addressed the board. He indicated that the proposed new detached garage was designed for high school drivers to park and to create a place to entertain. The board questioned the column spacing and Mr. Lewis explained that the area will house a TV and the columns are spaced so that the TV will be unobstructed.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 69-21R as submitted. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 75-21R – 658 N Harrison Ave – R3  
   Mike Lewis of Lewis Homes, applicant  
   New Single-Family Home

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 75-21R. Mike Lewis of Lewis Homes addressed the board. Mr. Lewis indicated he had attended the work session and addressed the board’s concerns about the roof design. He indicated that there was a damming issue and an over-framing issue in the corner. The board discussed the following items:

* The front elevation, small gable, and roof details were discussed. Mr. Lewis indicated that the gable over the front door created problems in the corner, which led to the proposed design.
* It was requested that the concrete stoop be clad in stone. Mr. Lewis said the foundation drawing did not clearly depict what is being proposed and that there was not as much foundation exposed as appeared in the drawing.
* The potential for larger windows on the front elevation.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 75-21R as submitted. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 76-21R – 2365 Maybrook Ln – R3  
   Tyson & Tanya Popp, applicant  
   Hearth Room & Screen Porch Addition

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 76-21R. Rhonda Loggia, architect, addressed the board on behalf of the applicants. She indicated that the siding will match the existing siding and the ceiling would be finished with tongue-and-groove. Ms. Loggia stated the fireplace is an insert and is to be clad in a faux stone. The board discussed the following items:

* The fireplace would need to be placed on a foundation per building code requirement. The chimney cladding needs to be consistent on all sides and finished with brick or stone.
* The proposed scissor truss design. Ms. Loggia indicated her contractor requested scissor trusses.
* The chimney should be moved to create an overhang consistent with the overhangs of the existing dwelling.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 76-21R with the following requirement(s): 1) that a concrete foundation be placed under the chimney; 2) that the composite on the finish of the framing be taken all the way down to ground level in some manner; 3) that the fireplace be moved out to create an overhang on the side elevation; and 4) that the chimney be finished with either brick or stone. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 77-21R – 1149 Woodgate Dr – R3  
   Chris Unland, applicant  
   New Single Family Residence

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 77-21R. Chris Unland addressed the board. Mr. Unland indicated he was building this home for his daughter.  The following items were discussed:

* The gables at the front and rear of the home. The front gable should either be supported by columns or brackets for visual support. The rear gable should be removed or moved to the left.
* The walk-in closet window should be hung vertically like the other windows.
* The garage door needs to resemble the front door and the straps and handles should be eliminated.
* Sills and aprons are needed on all the windows.
* The side gable vent design was discussed. Mr. Unland indicated he would use roof vents and eliminate the proposed gable vents.
* A vertical band board should be used on the side elevation gables to match the front.
* The space at the bottom of the interior stairs was discussed and it was indicated that a double-hung window should be added.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 77-21R with the following requirement(s): 1) that the gable on the front porch be extended out to 16” and have acorn decorations (or brackets) hanging from the bottom; 2) the rear gable on back of house be eliminated 3) that there be windows in garage doors; 4) that all windows have sills and aprons; 5) that the side gables have band boards with vertical siding above the band board; 6) that the vents on the rear side gables be eliminated and roof vents be used instead; 7) that the second floor walk-in-closet window (above front porch) be 2.5’ wide by 3’ tall; 8) that the walk-in-closet wall (above the front porch) be bumped out and the corresponding gable be enlarged; 9) that a double-hung window be installed at the bottom of the stairs on the left side elevation; 10) that the band board on the fireplace dog house match the band board on the front and side of the house. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 78-21R – 436 W Monroe Ave – R4  
   Becky Trent, applicant  
   Deck Extension

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 78-21R. Mark Regna with Whalen Custom Homes addressed the board on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Regna indicated that there is an existing deck and pergola and the biggest driver for this project is relief from the sun. Mr. Regna stated that all materials used will match the existing materials. The board discussed the following items:

* The gable ends and roof slopes. The Board indicated that they should match existing conditions and not exceed the existing roof.
* The exposed foundation and that it should match existing conditions.
* The window sills and aprons should match the existing conditions.
* Lattice should be used to enclose the open portion under the porch.
* The gable should be extended to the left and right columns.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 78-21R with the following requirement(s): 1) that the gable be extended to the posts. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 79-21R – 307 W Essex Ave – R4  
   Rhonda Loggia, applicant  
   Rear Porch Roof Addition

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 79-21R. Rhonda Loggia was promoted to panelist and addressed the board. Ms. Loggia discussed the truncated design stating that it was due to zoning requirements. The Board discussed the following items:

* The design detailing of the proposed roof addition was discussed. The Board would like the detailing on the back porch to follow that of the front porch.
* The columns were discussed and it was explained that they should be boxed in at the base to show consistency from the front to back.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 79-21R with the following requirement(s): 1) that the proposed gable be closed to match the front gable; 2) that the proposed posts have some articulation on the bottom to simulate the front porch posts. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 80-21R – 1320 N Geyer Rd – R4  
   Adams Street Architectural Design, applicant  
   Replacing Portion of Roof to Change Pitch, Relocating Garage Doors

Don Anderson recused himself from this case. Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 80-21R. Justin Pfaff, a representative for Adams Street Architectural Design, was promoted to panelist. Mr. Pfaff addressed the Board on behalf of the applicant and described the proposal to replace a portion of the roof to change the pitch and relocating garage doors to make the design more aesthetically pleasing to the overall style of the house. He indicated the revised drawings would indicate the elimination of the top existing windows and the addition of windows of the location of the existing garage doors. Mr. Pfaff explained that the gables will match the existing by being clad in shake. He indicated the new front door will have sidelights and a transom window. Mr. Pfaff stated the concrete front porch will be extended out and the brickwork will match the existing brick.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 80-21R as submitted. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 81-21R – 603 Evans Ave – R4  
   Steve Burns, applicant  
   Addition to Existing Garage and Covered Porch & New Screened Porch Addition

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 81-21R. Troy Robertson, homeowner, was promoted to panelist to address the Board, indicating they are adding to the existing garage and covered porch and constructing a new screened porch addition. The Board discussed the following items:

* The open area of the new screened porch addition should be enclosed with Hardie Board panel like that of the fireplace porch.
* The chimney was discussed. It was found the fireplace will need a foundation and should match the plans and not the elevation.
* It was asked if a handrail was needed at the stairs and Jack Schenck, City of Kirkwood Building Commissioner, stated it would be reviewed.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 81-21R with the following requirement(s): 1) that the space under the porch be screened with the same panels as proposed on the screened porch; 2) that the 1’8” on the chimney plan be adhered to; 3) that the overhang be 1’14” as shown; 4) that the chimney have stones on all four (4) sides as shown. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. Case 82-21R – 2401 St. Giles Rd – R3  
   Dustin Bopp, applicant  
   Addition & New Detached Carport

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 82-21R. Dustin Bopp, applicant, addressed the board and discussed the proposal to include a one-story rear addition with basement below and a new detached carport and a screen wall to create privacy from neighbors. Mr. Bopp stated that the addition will be mostly wrapped in a vertical hardie board product with nine inch spacing and painted with Sherwin Williams exterior paint to match the color of the existing dwelling. The board discussed the roof pitch of the addition. Mr. Bopp indicated his client wanted to differentiate the roof pitches.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 82-21R as submitted. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Commercial Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Commercial Review - New Business**
2. Case 08-21C – 1130 S Kirkwood Rd – B5  
   Maggie Blakewood of CDS, applicant  
   Exterior Modification to Existing Chili’s Restaurant

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 08-21C. The applicant was present but because of technical difficulties was unable to address the board. The board and discussed the proposed exterior modifications to the existing Chili’s Restaurant including the use of a matte black standing seam metal roofing to replace the existing awnings.

**Adam Edelbrock made a motion to approve Case 08-21C as submitted. Seconded by Dick Gordon. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Election of Officers**

Due to the ARB Chairman Mark Campbell being absent from the meeting, the board postponed the election of officers until the following ARB meeting.

Mr. Chiodini adjourned the meeting at 9:23 p.m.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  | Mark Campbell, Chairman |
|  |  |
|  | Michael Chiodini, Vice-chairman |

Upon request, these minutes can be made available within three working days in an alternate format, such as a CD, by calling 314-822-5822. Minutes can also be downloaded from the City’s website at [www.kirkwoodmo.org](http://www.kirkwoodmo.org), then click on City Clerk, Boards & Commissions, Architectural Review Board.