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

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

Chairman Mark Campbell called the work session to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. 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.

Mr. Campbell asked if there were any comments for the August 16, 2021 meeting minutes. Pat Jones indicated there was an error on the minutes for Case 112-21R that should read “a cutsheet is required on the garage door.”

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve the August 16, 2021 minutes. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. **Sign Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Sign Review - New Business**
2. Case 29-21S – 1130 S Kirkwood Rd – B5
Simon Sign Erection Co, applicant
Wall Signage for Chili’s

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 29-21S. A representative for Simon Sign Erection Co addressed the Board and indicated the proposal is for a change in signage for the Kirkwood Chili’s location. Chili’s will be replacing the storefront signage with a new pepper and a new Chili’s letters set on the front elevation; a face replacement on the existing to-go sign to the right of the front elevation; and, a face replacement on the multi-tenant pylon sign in front of the building.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 29-21S as submitted. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. Case 30-21S – 10461 Manchester Rd – B4
Classic Sign Service, applicant
Wall Signage for Wine & Cheese Place

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 30-21S. A representative was not present to address the Board regarding the proposed sign.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 30-21S as submitted with the following requirements: 1) that the returns match the returns on the Burn Boot Camp signage; and, 2) that the raceways match the color of the material behind them. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. Case 31-21S – 320 S Kirkwood Rd, Ste 101 – B2
Austin Smith of Dale Sign Services, applicant
Projecting Sign for Gateway Cleaners

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 31-21S. Austin Smith of Dale Sign Services addressed the board. Mr. Smith indicated the owner of Gateway Cleaners liked what Jimmy John’s did with their projecting sign because it can be better seen by foot and car traffic than the sign over the business. The following items were discussed:

* Building Commissioner Jack Schenck indicated the new sign code does not allow internally lit projecting signs any longer and plans were submitted that show an overhead light will be mounted above the sign to provide illumination at night.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 31-21S as submitted. Seconded by Michael Chiodini. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. Case 32-21S – 421 S Kirkwood Rd – B4
Engraphix Architectural Signage, applicant
Wall Signage for Coldwell Banker Realty

Mr. Chiodini introduced Case 32-21S. A representative from Coldwell Banker Realty addressed the Board. She indicated the two signs will be the same and will be replacing existing signs.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 32-21S as submitted. Seconded by Michael Chiodini. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. **Residential Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Residential Review - New Business**
	1. Case 120-21R – 635 Pamela Ln – R3
	Luke Mansfield, applicant
	Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 120-21R. Luke Mansfield addressed the Board. Mr. Mansfield indicated the roof will be extended six feet higher from the larger gable roofline back to the ridge; the bump out that was erroneously omitted from the front and rear elevations. The following items were discussed:

* The left elevation bump out will project three feet, will be cantilevered, and sheered on two piers.
* Shake shingles will be added to the front and left elevation gables.
* There were many questions about what the basement will actually look like. Mr. Mansfield indicated there will be a series of sliding glass doors and windows that will include columns, footings, and beams that will support the upper structure. It was indicated that some sheer points will be needed that aren’t shown. A supplemental rear elevation indicating the specifications will be required.
* The whole house will be resided. The shutters on the front elevation triple double-hung window should be eliminated. The windows need to be trimmed out to match all around.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 120-21R with the following requirements: 1) that the rear lower level to be better defined with cursory review of the supplemental rear elevation; 2) that the windows on the whole house match; 3) that the shutters on the triple window be eliminated; 4) that the materials for the deck and deck railings be stated on the cursory drawing; and, 5) that the posts on the deck have a base. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 122-21R – 1259 Avery Ct – R4
	Jennie Erke, applicant
	Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 122-21R. Elizabeth Henke addressed the Board. Ms. Henke indicated they are proposing to build a small addition over a crawlspace on the back of the house to expand the kitchen and add a bedroom and a bathroom, and a deck, all covered by one large gabled roof. The Board discussed the following items:

* The crawlspace will be mechanically vented.
* The ventilation of the roof was discussed and it was indicated that a ridge vent will be used with ventilation on the underside of the porch ceiling.
* The ceiling of the porch will be clad in vinyl soffit panels with a centered ceiling fan and a light by the back door.
* Casement windows will be used where there are not double hung.
* Deck post should continue to the ground level and trim on all sides of the lattice.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 122-21R with the following requirements: 1) that the roof vents be put into the deck area with a ridge vent; 2) that lattice be framed completely around it; and, 3) that posts from the deck continue down to the ground level. Seconded by Chris Burton. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 123-21R – 741 N Taylor Ave – R3
	Bob Mosby, applicant
	Covered Porch Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 123-21R. Bob Mosby of Mosby Building Arts addressed the Board. Mr. Mosby indicated he is the contractor and the homeowner of this brick colonial with two bays with copper roofs. The proposal is to add a bit of texture to the front elevation with an ellipse roof that will be a copper roof and permacast columns. Mr. Mosby stated all the trim on the doors will remain and similar materials will be used on the fascia and soffits. The following items were discussed:

* The finishing methods for the copper standing seam roof were questioned. Mr. Mosby indicated the material will go left to right and will drain to both sides. The metal roofs on the existing bays are 80-year-old copper and will be staying.
* The material on the front of the ellipse roof was discussed because the plans specify a composite material will be used but the Board believed a PVC material would work better for the curve of the roof. A PVC material will be used and painted to match.
* The barrel ceiling will be clad in front-to-back tongue-and-groove paneling.
* There will be a black metal coach-style porch light hanging from the middle of the ceiling.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 123-21R as submitted. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 124-21R – 420 E Bodley Ave – R3
	Jennifer Chapman of Formwork Architecture, applicant
	Covered Front Porch Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 124-21R. Architect Tracy Collins addressed the Board. Ms. Collins indicated the proposal is for a simple shed roof to create a covered porch area to the existing home. Ms. Collins clarified that the comment by the Board about the span of the roof possibly requiring a third column was reasonable but the beam that will be specified will be chosen for its ability to support the span. Additionally, Ms. Collins specified the gutter location was kept simple.

* The gutter location should be determined by owner preference as the Board was split about the preferred location being to the side of the column or where it is depicted on the front of the column.
* It was indicated that the underside of the porch will be finished with a vinyl beadboard and will be flat.
* A graphical error was made with the base missing from the right column but both columns will be finished with a capital and a base.
* The existing front door will remain unchanged.
* French doors will open into the house, replacing an existing bay window. The French door trim will be wrapping the brick to hide the edge where the bay window is removed.

**Adam Edelbrock made a motion to approve Case 124-21R as submitted. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 125-21R – 717 S Ballas Rd – R3
	Joe Courtney of HSC Homes LLC, applicant
	New Single-Family Home

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 125-21R. Jake Kincaid addressed the Board and relayed comments from architect Joe Courtney to the Board. The following items were discussed:

* It appears that the left side elevation was omitted from the proposal drawings and should be sent in for cursory review.
* There were questions about the window placement at corners concerning the quality constructability to make sure there are no leaks in the future. Possible solutions were to pull in the windows to be closer to each other or to omit a window.
* The posts on the front and back porches need to be trimmed out more like columns with base and capital trim.
* Lattice needs to be added to enclose the space under the back deck.
* The underside of the front porch and back deck will be finished with vinyl soffit and they will be closed with no vents. There will be vents on the eaves and a ridge vent at the peak. It was indicated that the vents should be properly trimmed.
* Cultured stone is used on the porch base.
* It was asked if the chimney could be clad in the same stone because the chimney is so prominent. Due to budget constraints, it was determined the siding shown will be used on the chimney, however, the trim on the chimney will be blue to match the siding rather than the white shown. It will be capped with a metal cap.
* Garages are allowed only one blank elevation. Adding a man door to a side elevation would be a good solution to eliminating one of the two blank elevations depicted.
* Windows in the garage door are required along the top since it is visible from the street. Submit a cutsheet showing the chosen garage door.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 125-21R with the following requirements: 1) that the rear deck have framed lattice underneath it; 2) that either a window or a door be added on the side elevation of the garage; 3) that windows be added to garage door and a cutsheet be submitted with construction documents; 4) that the small windows in the bedroom be pulled in from the front corner or add a full-size window in the bedroom; 5) that base and capitals should be added to the rear deck columns; 6) that the gable vents be trimmed out to match the windows; 7) that the chimney corners are to match the siding color; and 8) a cursory review of the missing left elevation drawing. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 126-21R – 609 Angenette Ave – R4
	Keaton Jones, applicant
	Rear Home Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 126-21R. Keaton Jones addressed the Board. Mr. Jones indicated he is the contractor that will be completing the project that will be a room addition off the back of the house. Mr. Jones indicated the existing house is all brick with a basement but the addition will be over a crawlspace. The choice of siding is being made by the homeowner who is leaning toward a dark vinyl siding for the addition. The following items were discussed:

* The roof extension will match the existing roof.
* The new windows will need the same configuration as the existing windows and will need to have sills and aprons that match the existing windows.
* The addition should be pulled in four inches where it meets the existing house to for the masonry return and the siding can be died off with trim Board.
* There will be a continuous ridge vent and the eave vent needs to be trimmed out like the windows.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 126-21R with the following requirements: 1) that the addition be recessed four inches on each side; 2) that the overhangs do not exceed the existing roof line more than necessary; 3) that the windows all have the same grid pattern and trim out the windows with sills and aprons on the addition; and, 4) that the gable vent also be trimmed to match the windows. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. 127-21R - 437 Clemens – R4
	Keith & Katheryn Goltschmann, applicants
	Two-Story Home Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 127-21R. Homeowner Keith Goltschmann addressed the Board. Mr. Goltschmann explained that conceptually the idea is to keep as much of the existing home as possible. The will include extending the shed dormer that was already there and the roofline will match the existing roof. Mr. Goltschmann indicated the brick will be carried over to the garage to tie the new to the existing. The following items were discussed:

* The Board limits the number of materials used on a house to three or less. The drawings indicate stone, brick, shake siding, and board-and-batten will be used. Simplify the materials used.
* Shed dormer needs further development to make more sense. Possible options were discussed.
* A possible solution would be to use horizontal clapboards in place of the shakes and board-and-batten as that is a traditional way of an addition to an existing brick house.
* There is an opportunity to carry the character of the existing house to the garage by adding the arching element to the garage doors. Mimicking the arches over the garage doors already existing at the front of the house. This would eliminate the need for the standing seam eyebrow awning over the garage doors. The arched garage door element could be constructed with horizontal siding rather than brick.
* Another option is to leave the standing seam roof over the entry portal but use traditional roofing everywhere else.

**Pat Jones made a motion to continue Case 127-21R to allow time for a more simplified design to be developed. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. 128-21R - 438 Lee Ave – R4
	MRM Manlin Development Group, applicant
	New Single-Car Garage Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 128-21R. Michelle Doering with MRM Manlin addressed the Board. Ms. Doering explained they are proposing new single family home for this location. Ms. Doering indicated that the right elevation could have windows added to the blank area of siding as it is the garage. The color scheme of the house will be the same dark Wedgewood blue as the existing house with white windows, white trim, and a white garage door. The following items were discussed.

* There will be a bandboard placed between the siding transition on both side elevations.
* The dimensions required for shutters on the windows would require the elimination of the shutters placed on the double windows. Ms. Doering indicated she will eliminate all shutters.
* The garage door and the front door should resemble each other for better continuity.
* The stone on the bottom front elevation needs to wrap around both sides a few feet.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 128-21R as submitted with the following requirements: 1) that windows are added to the garage side elevation; 2) that the shutters be removed from the house; 3) that the garage door and the front door have a similar panel pattern; and, 4) that the stone wrap around the corners of the garage and the left side of the house. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. 129-21R - 420 Par Ln – R4
	Roeser Home Remodeling, applicant
	Screened Porch & Deck Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 129-21R. Joe Roeser addressed the Board. Mr. Roeser indicated the project will include covering the porch area, enclosing the existing porch area, and adding a lower deck below it that will not be covered. Mr. Roeser specified there will be a hip roof that will have a flat ceiling. The following items were discussed:

* Trimmed lattice is needed under all sides of the deck.
* The cedar rail screen will need to be taken down to rail height.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 129-21R as submitted with the following requirements: 1) that the cedar rail wall height to be determined; and 2) that the latticework be trimmed out or continue the composite material down a couple inches above the ground. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. 130-21R - 705 Lavinia Pl – R3
	Tracy Collins, Formwork Architecture, applicant
	New Single-Car Garage Addition

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 130-21R. Tracy Collins addressed the Board. Ms. Collins indicated the proposal is for a single-car garage addition and to replace the existing garage door to have both garage doors match. Ms. Collins stated that she has spoken with the homeowner who is open to adding windows to the garage doors.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 130-21R as submitted with the requirement to submit a cutsheet on the new garage door. Seconded by Don Anderson. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. 132-21R - 623 McKinley Ave – R4
	Jeff Schindler, Schindler Homes LLC, applicant
	New Single-Family Home

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 132-21R. Jeff Schindler of Schindler Homes addressed the Board. Mr. Schindler indicated they will be building a new single family home. The following items were discussed:

* Any break in roof plane should be articulated and carried through to the elevation. A solution was suggested to bring the gable wall out with 2x8s so the wall protrudes out and make a big window sill.
* The side elevations should have similar design articulation and continuity as the front. Possible solutions were given such as adding a bandboard at the gutter line with shake above to both side elevations, or to identify the fireplace component as its own structure by having it be clad in stone, clad in a shake component, or having the chimney finished with dark gray or charcoal siding with corner boards to match the chimney.
* The left side elevation should have some of the small windows changed out to double-hung windows.
* The front post columns need to be better proportioned.
* The garage door and front door need to match better and a cutsheet for the garage door chosen needs to be submitted.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 132-21R as submitted with the following requirements: 1) that the tapered posts be sized to have the base be 16”, the stone base be 18”, and the cap to be 22”, and that the columns be appropriate on top of the bases; 2) that the second floor double rear gable have the wall be bumped out 4” and framed by 2x8s; 3) that there be a larger window in the second floor bedroom on the left elevation; 4) that band boards be added at the gables with shakes above them; and, 5) that the garage door match the front door a little closer. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. **Commercial Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Commercial Review - New Business**
2. Case 14-21C – 426 N Kirkwood Rd – B2
Chris Nickola, applicant
Exterior Design Review of Mixed-Use Multi-Family Building

Mr. Campbell introduced Case 12-20C. ESG representatives Lukas Van Sistine, Christopher Willette, & Meredith Wu gave a presentation of their vision and inspiration for the Mixed-Use Multi-Family Building. The following items were discussed:

* An overview of the Architectural Review Board was provided. Usually there are multiple in-session work hours between the ARB members and architects of large projects.
* This development will be setting a precedent for the City in the form, function, and design, and it needs to be representative of Kirkwood. This building will be the first step in remedying the urban failures of the past.
* The design should have a block-wide continuity without being monotonous. There is a rich brick history in St. Louis that can influence the building’s brick design work.
* The massing aspect looks like one large mass. It appears more as an applique on an extruded shape. There are more dynamic possibilities.
* The original HOK design developed for this project is subtly elegant and has inset balconies, varying heights, and massing of different materials with a grounded base.
* It was proposed that the design team and Mr. Campbell and Mr. Chiodini have a collaborative meeting to work through the ARB members’ concerns, desires, and requirements.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to continue Case 14-21C. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

Mr. Campbell asked if there was any other business that needed to be addressed and upon hearing there was not, adjourned the meeting at 9:40 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.