

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD WORK SESSIONS

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.

Zoom webinar

When: February 07, 2022 06:00 PM Central Time (US and Canada)

Topic: Work Session of the Architectural Review Board

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87802237415

Or One tap mobile:

US: +13126266799,,87802237415# or +16468769923,,87802237415#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 876 9923 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248

7799 or +1 408 638 0968 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 878 0223 7415

International numbers available: https://us06web.zoom.us/u/kdWTkk7I7T



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

WORK SESSION AGENDA

February 07, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. VIA ZOOM (electronic meeting)

- I. Approval of Minutes January 18, 2022
- II. Sign Review Old Business

None

- III. Sign Review New Business
 - a. 01-22S 10357 Manchester Rd B4
 Sue Winter, Warren Sign Co, applicant
 Signage for First Community Credit Union
- IV. Residential Review Old Business

None

- V. Residential Review New Business
 - a. <u>08-22R 221 Midway Ave R4</u>
 Derek Onstott, Trinity Investments, applicant New Single Family Residence
 - b. 09-22R 437 Rollingwood Ln R3
 C.J. Moss, applicant
 Pergola Addition
 - c. 10-22R 328 Electric St R4 FM Design Build, applicant New Single Family Residence
 - d. 11-22R 435 E Gill Ave R3 Joseph Davidson, Dadoworks, applicant Covered Front Porch Addition
 - e. 12-22R 604 Essex Ct R3
 Dan Stauder, Stauder Architecture, applicant
 New Single Family Residence
 - f. 13-22R 1543 Southlin Dr R4 Chad Kersick, applicant Rear Addition
 - g. <u>14-22R 839 Lockett Rd R3</u> Jeff & Rachel Klaus, applicants Rear Covered Porch Addition



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

WORK SESSION AGENDA February 07, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.

VIA ZOOM (electronic meeting)

- h. <u>15-22R 48 W Glenwood Ln R3</u> Steve Anton, Anton Architecture, applicant Kitchen Addition
- i. 16-22R 345 E Argonne Dr R3
 Darryl LaBruyere, DL Design, applicant Two-Story Addition
- VI. Commercial Review Old Business

None

VII. Commercial Review - New Business

None



CITY OF KIRKWOOD ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

January 18, 2022 - Draft Work Session Minutes

Members Present

Members Absent

Mark Campbell, Chairman Michael Chiodini, Vice-Chairman Dick Gordon Don Anderson Chris Burton Adam Edelbrock

I. Call of Meeting to Order and Approval of Minutes

Chair Mark Campbell called the work session to order at 6:00 pm.

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.

The Cursory Review process was discussed. City Planner I Christie Voelker requested that the Board specify their requirements for whether requirements need to go for Cursory Review to the Board Chairs or if the changes can be approved by staff.

Mr. Campbell asked if there were any comments for the January 3, 2022 meeting minutes.

Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve the January 3, 2022 minutes. Seconded by Chris Burton. Motion approved unanimously.

- II. Sign Review Old Business
 None
- III. Sign Review New Business
 None
- IV. Residential Review Old Business
 - a. Case 177-21R 308 N Van Buren Ave R4 Mike Lewis, Lewis Homes, applicant New Single-Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

- It was indicated that the original design struggled with the story-and-a-half concept.
- The organization of the second level of the structure and the roof components were addressed and cleaned up.
- It was suggested that the peak window be removed because it throws off the alignment below.
- It was suggested that the right side of the second story is not appropriate and is in the wrong place. It was further expressed that if all the roof pitches were the same the issues would not exist. It was believed that the time to explore all options had not been taken.
- There might be a minor bit of foundation exposure to the right of the railing on the front porch that needs to be addressed.

V. Residential Review - New Business

a. <u>03-22R - 560 Meadowridge Dr - R4</u>
 Mike Lewis of Lewis Homes, applicant
 New Single-Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

- The fake windows were discussed and it was suggested that the fake window in the nested gable on the front elevation should be eliminated. The fake window on the back could be eliminated as there are enough windows.
- The shutters violate width requirements and they are not on all windows. It was suggested that there be fewer shutters.
- The size of the gable was discussed and it was suggested the size of the gable fits the size of the front porch below it.
- It was suggested that the bathroom could be reworked to move the bathtub so that a real window can be added.

b. <u>04-22R – 660 E Argonne Dr – R3</u>

Mike Lewis of Lewis Homes, applicant New Single-Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

- The front porch gable is a flat panel.
- The alignment of the gable and the front porch were discussed. It was suggested
 that the gable and the front porch could be reworked so the front porch roof only
 meets the sides of the house.
- The window arrangement on the left elevation needs continuity.
- It was suggested that the rear elevation needs a physical break in plane to the right side.

There were no comments or concerns for the garage.

c. 05-22R – 681 Mariedale Dr – R4

Joe Page of Srote & Co Architects, applicant New Single-Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

- The placement and purpose of the tower element on the east and north elevations was discussed. It was suggested that it should be incorporated into the gable.
- The front porch column dimension was discussed as being potentially too small.
- The garage door needs glazing.

d. 06-22R – 317 Rose Ln – R4

MK Custom Homes, applicant New Single-Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

- The shape of the side was discussed. It was suggested that it could be made into a real gable and have the back portion look like a dormer.
- The column dimension was discussed. It was suggested that the columns should be no larger than 12x12 and a fourth column should be added.
- The garage door needs glazing.
- The dog house gutter line needs to match the gutter line of the house.

e. 07-22R – 413 Crest Ave – R4

Max Bemberg of Bemberg Architects, applicant New Single-Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

- The window grids are not consistent.
- Additional windows are needed in the garage.
- A half column is needed on the right side of the front porch at the garage wall.
- It was suggested that the front and rear elevations may need handrails.
- Shakes were suggested in the gables on the side elevations.
- Adding a band board on the south elevation would break up the expanse.
- It was mentioned that there is no overhang on the lower section.

VI. Commercial Review - Old Business

a. <u>22-21C – 144 W Adams Ave – B2</u>

Tim Hollerbach of Tim Hollerbach Design, LLC, applicant New Four-Apartment Building

The Board discussed the following items:

- It was recommended that the lighter brick vertical on the left protrude the roof like the others.
- It was mentioned that it appears that there is an angled roof line on the west elevation.
- It was mentioned that confirmation is needed to verify that the rooftop deck is eliminated.
- The top looks somewhat unfinished.
- The massing is more contemporary.
- The color scheme and materials need to be clarified.

VII. Commercial Review - New Business

a. 01-22C – 10921 Manchester Rd – B3

RS Land Development, LLC, applicant Interior & Exterior Renovations for Namaste Yoga Studio

The Board discussed the following items:

- It was noted that the design is a simple, contemporary approach.
- There is a living green wall on the exterior and it was questioned whether plants there will live in the winter.
- It was recommended to have the entry door go all the way up, eliminating the transom, or to lower the other windows to the height of the entry door.

b. <u>02-22C – 150 W Argonne Dr – B2</u>

Drew Lesinski of Savoy Properties, applicant Exterior Renovations to Down by the Station

The Board discussed the following items:

- There is no signage being reviewed for this meeting.
- The proposed retaining wall will not be included in the plan any longer.
- The existing building will be cleaned up.
- The breezeway connecting the caboose to the building will be removed.
- It was suggested that a vertical blade sign be used on the Clay side rather than a mural.
- It was suggested that the trash enclosure needs to have more connection to the main building and be made out of either masonry or wood.

Mr. Campbell asked if there was any other business that needed to be addressed and upon hearing there was not, adjourned the meeting at 7:01 pm.

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, then click on City Clerk, Boards & Commissions, Architectural Review Board.