**Members Present Members Absent**

Mark Campbell, Chairman Curt Rafferty

Michael Chiodini, Vice-chairman Dick Gordon

Adam Edelbrock

Don Anderson

Pat Jones (Alternate)

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

Chairman Mark Campbell called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Chairman Campbell 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.

Chairman Campbell asked if there were any comments for the April 5, 2021 meeting minutes.

Pat Jones indicated that Item (f) under Residential Old Business, Case 50-21R, should have noted that the board requested a cut sheet for the garage door, not the garage.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve the April 5, 2021 minutes with the correction to Case 50-21R, clarifying that the board requested a cut sheet for the garage door. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

Chairman Campbell asked if there were any comments for the April 19, 2021 meeting minutes.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve the April 5, 2021 minutes. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Sign Review - Old Business**
	1. **Case 08-21S – 1936 Dougherty Ferry Rd for High Meadow Subdivision – R1 (formerly listed as 1904 Grassy Ridge)**

**Applicant: Dan McNulty**

**Subdivision Ground Sign - 50” x 22”, 7.64 sq. ft.**

Chairman Mark Campbell introduced Case 08-21S, a sign application requesting to replace the existing High Meadow Subdivision sign, and asked if the applicant was available to address the board.

Dan McNulty addressed the board on Case 08-21S and asked if the board had any questions about the proposed sign.

Chairman Campbell stated. Mr. McNulty had addressed the board’s questions and comments about fasteners, and the backing, spacers, and the cuts and that he provided and illustration of the spacers to identify exactly how the panel was standing off the mounting face of the rock. Chairman Campbell asked if the photos were a general depiction of the types of stones being used, and Mr. McNulty indicated that they had moved to black granite for the type of stone and that the boulder in the photo was the potential selection for the mounting stone. Mr. McNulty stated that they spoke with the sign fabricator about the sign backing and that the photos illustrated their solution for achieving the desired look.

Vice-chairman Michael Chiodini indicated that he had questions about the cut stone and how the sign would sit on the face of the mounting boulder. Vice-chairman Chiodini indicated that his concerns about readability of the sign had been addressed with the newly-proposed black backing.

**Vice-chairman Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 08-21S as submitted. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Sign Review - New Business**
	1. **Case 12-21S – Hair Loss Solutions at 10801 Big Bend Blvd – B3**

**Applicant: Chrissy Stojan**

**Panel Change on Existing Ground Sign - 4.89 sq. ft.**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 12-21S, a sign application proposing to replace a tenant panel on an existing ground sign.

Chrissy Stojan addressed the board on Case 12-21S and stated that she was replacing the bottom left tenant panel in the provided photo. Chairman Campbell inquired whether the sign is two-sided, would be colored in the manner submitted in the application, and was the only signage being proposed by the applicant. Ms. Stojan indicated that that was correct.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 12-21S as submitted. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 13-21S – Kirkwood Rd Christian Church at 529 N Kirkwood Rd – R5**

**Applicant: Glenn Hart**

**Monument Sign with Electronic Message Panel - 50 sq. ft.**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 13-21S, a sign application proposing to replace an existing church sign with a monument sign containing an electronic message panel.

Glen Hart addressed the board on Case 13-21S. Mr. Hart indicated that the church is replacing the existing sign and wanted to go with a digital sign. Mr. Hart stated that the sign was 2-sided and that the sign structure was 5’x10’ and 1-foot in depth. Mr. Hart stated that the sign would be place on a concrete pad that would be 5’x2’ and 4 inches thick and that there would be a 5” pipe to function as a pier to help stabilize the concrete pad.

Chairman Campbell asked if the pipe was an internal support, and Mr. Hart stated that it was. Chairman Campbell stated that the sign height must also include accommodation for the sign base, and Mr. Hart stated that the baes would be flush with the ground. Chairman Campbell inquired what the plan was for the top of the sign, and Mr. Hart stated that he was open to the board’s work session recommendation of capping the top of the sign. Chairman Campbell asked about the adornments and whether they were on both sides. Mr. Hart stated that the adornments were not essential and that he was open to removing them. Mr. Hart stated that the purpose of the sign dimensions was to maximize the electronic message board. Mr. Hart discussed the proposed placards and indicated that they were to be plastic.

Chairman Campbell inquired about the lettering on the sign indicating that the board would rather see individual, raised letters on the sign than the proposed white placards, explaining that it would be more fitting with the existing church and neighborhood character. Chairman Campbell asked if any additional lighting was being proposed for the sign, and Mr. Hart stated that if they kept the placards on the sign they planned to use LED yard lights to illuminate that portion of the sign.

Pat Jones inquired about the font utilized on the signage, Mr. Hart stated that if they were to go with the individual, raised lettering that would address the font issue. Ms. Jones asked about the support pipe asking if it would be visible, and Mr. Hart indicated that the pipe would not be visible and that it would serve as a support beam for the concrete and mounting for the LED signs. Vice-chairman Chiodini and Adam Edelbrock expressed concerns over the width of the sign, and Mr. Hart indicated that he needed to check that measurement with his contractor.

**Vice-chairman Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 13-21S with a cursory review of the following items: 1. Lettering to be used on the upper area of monument sign – “Kirkwood Road Christian Church”; 2. Review the width (thickness) of monument sign with equipment represented; 3. Stone cap on monument and how overall monument relates to the base. Pat Jones seconded motion. All ayes. Motion Approved.**

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

**Applicant: Fred Achard**

**Covered Porch Addition**

Chairman Campbell indicated that Case 26-21R would need to be continued at the request of the applicant.

**Don Anderson made a motion to continue Case 26-21R as requested by the applicant. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 27-21R – 516 E Jefferson Ave – R3**

**Applicants: Eric & Mika Ross**

**Two-Story Home Addition & Detached Garage**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 27-21R.

Eric and Mika Ross addressed the board on Case 27-21R. Chairman Campbell indicated that the board’s comments and concerns had been addressed and that everything had come together nicely. Pat Jones inquired whether the corners were able to be softened per Dick Gordon’s comments at the April 2, 2021 meeting. Ms. Ross indicated that the corners on the addition will be the same as they are on the existing dwelling. Ms. Jones asked about the windows on the rear of the dwelling and whether they were fixed; Ms. Ross indicated that the windows were casements.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 27-21R as submitted. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 47-21R – 427 Heman Dr – R4**

**Applicant: Tony Duncan**
**Home Addition**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 47-21R.

Sean Finley addressed the board on behalf of Case 47-21R. Mr. Finley sated that they had tried to address the board’s comments from the previous meeting, including the garage door and window trim.

**Adam Edelbrock made motion to approve Case 47-21R as submitted. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 55-21R – 816 Nirk Ave – R4**

**Applicant: Michael Jacezko of AMJ Development**

**New Single-Family Home**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 55-21R stating that it was a new home application.

Dennis Tacchi addressed the board on Case 55-21R; Mr. Tacchi indicated that he was not able to see Chairman Campbell’s screen on his zoom meeting. Mr. Tacchi stated that the home was a craftsman style home and that they had axial design issues and massing issues they had worked through in the design process. Mr. Tacchi addressed comments made in the work session pertaining to the roof cricket, indicating that it directed water to a proposed downspout. Chairman Campbell asked about the symmetry of the front of the home and the spacing of the porch columns. Mr. Tacchi stated that the double columns were common in this style of home and that it came down to personal aesthetics. The applicant and the board discussed the possibility of having double columns on a single pedestal to address the column spacing and the extended front porch roofing edge. Mr. Tacchi stated that they could bring it in, but that the final roofing detail would be similar.

 Pat Jones stated that having the columns closer together would be more effective at emphasizing the entry. Chairman Campbell indicated that there were conditions on the exposed front of the porch and that there were standards on exposed foundations. Don Anderson asked if there would be a void under the porch, and Mr. Tacchi indicated that there would be a void. The board indicated that any gap between the grade and the porch would need to be screened with lattice work. Chairman Chiodini asked if the roof cricket would be shingled and inquired about the slope.

Pat Jones asked about the windows, and Mr. Tacchi indicated that the windows were casements. Chairman Campbell asked about the garage man door, and Mr. Tacchi indicated that there was a man door but that it was not shown due to a drafting error. Chairman Campbell inquired about the stone fireplace, and Mr. Tacchi stated that the intention was to hand-lay the stone. Pat Jones asked about the shake siding and column bases and the trim around the windows. Mr. Tacchi responded indicating that they were using cedar shake siding and that the windows were to have trim and sills.

**Don Anderson made motion to approve Case 55-21R with a cursory review of the following items: 1. Address the front columns per the discussion; 2. The front porch roof be brought back to the gables, even with the main structure; 3. The windows are to have sills and aprons; 4. Submit elevation illustrating the man door to garage. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion Approved.**

1. **Residential Review - New Business**
	1. **Case 01-21R – 128 E. Jewel Ave – R3**

**Applicants: Ian and Amanda Banks**

**New Single-Family Home (Approved by Landmarks Commission)**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 01-21R.

Ian Banks and Rob Ruh addressed the board on behalf of Case 01-21R. Mr. Banks indicated that the door was being moved over and should align with the dormer. Pat Jones asked about sills on the second floor windows and Mr. Ruh indicated that they would have sills. Chairman Campbell asked if there would be brick accents on all the vents, Mr. Ruh stated that all vents would be trimmed would brick. The board verified with Mr. Ruh that the chimney meets chimney height requirements. Vice-chairman Chiodini asked if the vents in the shake areas needed to be trimmed with brick and it was decided that the vents in the shake areas would be trimmed with wood. The board and Mr. Ruh discussed which areas of the proposed home were to be brick and which areas were to be shake and discussed band boarding.

**Don Anderson made motion to approve Case 01-21R with cursory review on the following items: 1. The front door and front upper dormer relationship be addressed by moving the door; 2. All windows not in brick shall have sills and aprons; 3. A band board be put on the west elevation gable; 4. The vents are to be trimmed out to match the window trims. Seconded by Pat Jones. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 63-21R – 574 Drury Ln – R6**

**Applicant: Patriot Sunrooms**

**Sunroom Addition**

Chairman Campbell introduced 63-21R. There was no applicant present to address the board on the case. Having no comments on the case, the board moved for approval.

**Vice-chairman Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 63-21R as submitted. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 64-21R – 229 E Woodbine Ave – R6
	Applicant: Bree Wambach of Roeser Home Remodeling**

**Home Addition**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 64-21R.

Joe Roeser addressed the board on case 64-21R describing the layout and truss design of the proposed addition. explaining that the application was for a rear home addition with crawl space and a new patio. Chairman Campbell inquired about the materiality on the edge condition. Mr. Roeser stated that they are taking the old siding off the back and side of the house and putting new siding in those areas so that it’s all blended. Mr. Roeser stated that the shingles, window trim, gutters and downspouts would also match the existing conditions. Mr. Roeser indicated that the foundation would also match existing conditions with a crawl space.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 64-21R as submitted. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 65-21R – 510 S Ballas Rd – R3
	Applicant: Cori Hinterser of Killeen Studio Architects**

**Screened Porch Addition**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 65-21R, a rear screened porch addition.

Mike from Killeen Studios Architects addressed the board on Case 65-21R, indicated that they had gone with a more shed-like approach to the design of the porch to maximize the natural lighting and have a fun approach to the deck.

Vice-chairman Chiodini indicated that there were options with a gabled roof that could avoid a flat ceiling and that the proposed porch does not fit the character of the existing dwelling at all. Chairman Campbell indicated that per the architectural guidelines the porch needed to be consistent with the character of the existing home. Mike indicated that he would make revision and be back before the board soon.

**Vice-chairman Michael Chiodini made motion to continue Case 65-21R in order for the porch to be re-designed to coincide with the character of the main structure. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 66-21R – 109 Dickson St – R3
	Applicant: Riggs Construction, applicant**

**Existing Garage Demolition and Attached Garage & Deck Addition**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 66-21R, explaining that it was a new garage off of an existing mudroom and a deck addition.

Amy Riggs addressed the board on Case 66-21R. Ms. Riggs indicated that they would be removing the existing, side-entry, one-car garage and maintaining the existing roof line with a new attached, front-facing, two-car garage. Chairman Campbell indicated that the proposed deck would need lattice work. Ms. Riggs indicated that they would install lattice work in a manner that matches the lattice work on the front porch.

Ms. Jones commented on the proposed shutters. The board agreed that the proposed addition fit nicely with the existing house and agreed that the proposed deck needed lattice work around the crawl space. Ms. Jones inquired about the foundation between the house and the garage.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 66-21R as submitted with addition of lattice work under the deck. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Commercial Review - New Business**
	1. **Case 06-21C – 1034, 1040, 1046, 1052 Geyer Grove – R5
	Applicant: Consort Homes**

**New 4-Unit Multi-Family Building**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 06-21C, a 4-unit residential building.

Bill Wannstedt addressed the board on Case 06-21C. Chairman Campbell stated that the applicants had incorporated the elements the board has addressed with other buildings in the development and asked about the single-car garage. Mr. Wannstedt stated that three of the units had one-car garages. Pat Jones asked if there was a window in the garage, and Mr. Wannstedt indicated that there wasn’t one proposed but they could install one. Don Anderson inquired about windows on the second floor. The board discussed the building materials, windows, and sound proofing.

Ms. Jones inquired whether the windows had sills and aprons. Chairman Campbell indicated that the details on this structure would need to be consistent with the previously approved set. Mr. Raiche, Planning and development Services Director, indicated that the rendering was for building two, so it was not the exact rendering for the subject application so the board could address the applicant at the meeting for additional information.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 06-21C as submitted with the addition of a window on the south elevation of the garage. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. All ayes. Motion approved.**

* 1. **Case 07-21C – 10850 Manchester Rd – B3
	Applicant: Michael Goldman of Waterway Gas & Wash Co.**

**New Shade Canopy**

Chairman Campbell introduced Case 07-21C, an application by Waterway for a shade canopy.

Mike Goldman addressed the board on Case 07-21C. Chairman Campbell asked about the materials utilized for the shade structure, and Mr. Goldman indicated it was the same material that was used for the railing at the existing site. Chairman Campbell stated that the shade structure needed to pick up on some of the existing elements at the site and should better relate to existing structures. Mr. Goldman indicated that he and his architect had discussed that the structure related to the existing aluminum railing at the site, and that they had decided that there would be an awkward transition from the stone or brick base to the aluminum column.

Vice-chairman Chiodini recommended tying the shade structure to one of the other structures on site or the existing site signage. Pat Jones asked about the possibility of utilizing an aluminum cap and base. Chairman Campbell indicated that some of the primary building materials should be incorporated into the canopy.

pointed out the inconsistency of quality between the shade canopy and existing structures on the site and expressed concerns with drainage for the canopy. Mr. Raiche, Planning and development Services Director, pointed out that the roof of the canopy was partially open. The board discussed the functionality of the structure.

**Vice-chairman Michael Chiodini made a motion to continue Case 07-21C in order for the canopy to be re-designed so that there is a connection to the main structure or other site elements. Seconded by Don Anderson. All ayes. Motion approved.**

Having no other business, ARB Chairman Mark Campbell adjourned the meeting.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 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.