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: September 20, 2021 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/87239569868

Or One tap mobile :

US: +13126266799,,87239569868# or +16468769923,,87239569868#

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 +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 408 638 0968 or +1 669 900 6833

Webinar ID: 872 3956 9868

International numbers available: https://us06web.zoom.us/u/keDsN1JxI8

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORK SESSION AGENDA
September 20, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.
VIA ZOOM (electronic meeting)

I. Approval of Work Session Minutes – September 7, 2021

II. Sign Review - Old Business

None

III. Sign Review - New Business

a. 34-21S – 10831 Manchester Rd – B3
Dale Sign Services, applicant
Wall Signage for Mirage Spa & Recreation

IV. Residential Review - Old Business

a. Case 127-21R – 437 Clemens Ave – R4
Keith & Katheryn Goltschman, applicants
Two-Story Home Addition

V. Residential Review - New Business

a. Case 133-21R – 120 W Mermod Pl – R3
Courtney & Garrett Jackson, applicant
Two-Story Remodel & Addition

b. Case 134-21R – 443 Seekamp Ave – R4
Tom McGraw, Link Architecture, applicant
One-Story Addition & Covered Deck

c. Case 135-21R – 920 Poinsetta Ln – R4
Patriot Sunrooms, applicant
Patio Cover

d. Case 136-21R – 621 E Monroe Ave – R1
Michael E Blaes, AIA, applicant
New Front Porch

e. Case 137-21R – 729 Delchester Ln – R3
Michael E Blaes, AIA, applicant
New Front Porch

f. Case 138-21R – 651 W Adams Ave – R4
Prestige Custom Homes, applicant
New Single-Family Home

g. Case 140-21R – 815 Poinsetta Ln – R4
MRM Manlin Custom Homes, applicants
New Single-Family Home

h. Case 141-21R – 590 Andrews Ave – R4
Joe Page, Srote & Co Architects, applicant
New Single-Family Home

i. Case 142-21R – 527 Goethe Ave – R4
Denise Eisele, applicant
New Deck & Shed Dormer Addition

j. Case 143-21R – 1024 N Geyer Rd – R4
Jerry Hamilton, applicant
3' Rear Extension for Kitchen Remodel

k. Case 144-21R – 2434 St. Giles Rd – R3
Arthur Merdinian, Mosby Building Arts, applicant
Detached Art Studio

VI. Commercial Review - Old Business

None

VII. Commercial Review - New Business

None

Kirkwood Architectural Review Board Members: Chairman Mark Campbell; Vice-Chairman Michael Chiodini, Members Don Anderson, Chris Burton, Dick Gordon, Adam Edelbrock and Pat Jones. Council Liaison Kara Wurtz

Contact Information: For full Architectural Review Board contact information, please call Planning and Development Services at 314-822-5823. To contact the Building Commissioner, call Jack Schenck at 314-822-5814.

Accommodation: The City of Kirkwood is interested in effective communication for all persons. Persons requiring an accommodation to attend and participate in the meeting should contact the City Clerk at 314-822-5802 at least 48 hours before the meeting. With advance notice of seven calendar days, the City of Kirkwood will provide interpreter services at public meetings for languages other than English and for the hearing impaired.

C: Bill Bensing, Director of Public Services
Laurie Asche, City Clerk
Kim Sansegraw, Deputy City Clerk
Tim Griffin, Mayor
Kara Wurtz, Council Liaison
Donna Poe, SBD
Freddy Doss, Public Information Officer
Jonathan Raiche, Director of Planning and Development Services
Amy Lowry, Planner II

CITY OF KIRKWOOD
WORK SESSION OF THE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
September 7, 2021 – Draft Work Session Minutes

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

Members Absent

I. Call of Meeting to Order and Approval of Minutes

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

II. Approval of WS Minutes – August 16, 2021

Mr. Campbell asked if there were any comments or questions about the Work Session Minutes from the August 16, 2021 Work Session Meeting.

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

III. Sign Review - Old Business

None

IV. Sign Review - New Business

a. 29-21S – 1130 S Kirkwood Rd – B5
Simon Sign Erection Co, applicant
Wall Signage for Chili's

The proposal was discussed as being a change of the sign background being changed from white to black.

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

The following items were discussed:

- Two layers of signage on raceways
- Make sure raceways match up with other raceways in that development
- The readability of the colors was questioned.

c. 31-21S – 320 S Kirkwood Rd, Ste 101 – B2

Austin Smith of Dale Sign Services, applicant
Projecting Sign for Gateway Cleaners

The following items were discussed:

- Matching up with other signage on the building.
- The proposed projecting sign is an additional sign for the business.
- The eighteen-inch distance requirement for the sign location is unfortunate due to the canopy obstructing its visibility.
- Character enhancement trying to tie-into the downtown.

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

The following items were discussed:

- Dark returns are being utilized like the Board likes for the Woodbine Center

V. Residential Review - Old Business

None

VI. Residential Review - New Business

a. Case 120-21R – 635 Pamela Ln – R3
Luke Mansfield, applicant
Addition

The following items were discussed:

- Addition to rear of existing home bumping out a couple levels toward the back.
- The plans were sparse with few notes or specifications indicated.
- There were questions about the rear elevation as there was uncertainty about whether windows or sheer walls were shown in the drawing.
- The proportioning is good and there is nice balance of fenestrations on the sides.
- The existing foundation exposure is beyond the maximum allowable, but it has precedence and the conditions would be grandfathered.

- There were questions about the right elevation projection not being shown on the front elevation drawing. The projection appears to be supported by one pier toward the front of the structure. More clarification is needed on the projection.
- It was questioned whether the siding would be replaced on the whole structure as that would dictate the shutters' placement or removal.
- The new windows need to match the way the others are trimmed out.

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

The following items were discussed:

- The design is pretty straightforward and simple, but there was uncertainty about if there was going to be a change in material use.
- The new windows need to match the existing windows and any fixed windows should be changed to double-hung.
- The foundation exposure would be grandfathered.
- Lattice under the porch needs to be trimmed out.
- Downspouts are needed somewhere.
- There were questions about how the roof will be vented.

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

The following items were discussed:

- The drawing was described as being underdrawn and simple, but it was clear enough to see there will be a projecting roof covering a portion of the large front porch.
- There were questions about the specifications of the metal roof material used on the arched roof, about if the arched roof will match the existing bay roofs, and whether the bay roofs would be updated at the same time.

d. Case 124-21R – 420 E Bodley Ave – R3
Jennifer Chapman of LU Design Build, applicant
Covered Front Porch Addition

The following items were discussed:

- There were questions about the porch potentially needing another column to support the twenty-foot span of the roof, but there was uncertainty about keeping the open look as it is drawn given proper structural support.

- The location of the gutter was discussed as being moved from the front of the column to the side, but the gutter draining onto the driveway was considered undesirable.
- Caps and bases need to match on both columns.
- There was question about whether the casing around the French door should match the trim at the front door, but it was discussed that this would draw away the focus from the front door.

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

The following items were discussed:

- The location of the windows on the upper right on the right elevation could potentially cause water damming issues with their proximity to trim. Moving their location inward may be ideal.
- The left elevation appears to be a copy of the right elevation. A cursory review of the left elevation was requested.
- Questions about having the chimney cased in stone rather than the siding depicted were asked.
- It was questioned if a bandboard could be hung at the gutter line of the gable on the rear elevation of the detached garage. Adding a man door to the left elevation of the garage would break up the expanse of siding.
- The main garage door will require windows if it can be seen from the road.
- The rear deck will need lattice added below.

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

The following items were discussed:

- The window trim and door frames need to be trimmed appropriately for the siding surrounding them.
- The addition should be brought in four inches to allow for the material change and would take away some of the overhang that extends beyond the existing roof.
- The windows in the rear need to be 6 over 6 to match the existing windows.

g. Case 127-21R – 437 Clemens Ave – R4
Keith & Katheryn Goltschman, applicants
Two-Story Home Addition

The following items were discussed:

- The design was described as a Cape Cod, but it was difficult for the board to get their bearings with the assortment of materials indicated.
- Further design development is needed.

h. Case 128-21R – 438 Lee Ave – R4
MRM Manlin Development Group, applicant
New Single-Family Home

The following items were discussed:

- The design or pattern of the windows and doors need to be carried from the front all the way around the house.
- Bigger boards are needed at the bottoms of the gables.
- The front door and the garage door need to resemble each other better.
- The shutters shown beside paired windows will need to be eliminated.

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

The following items were discussed:

- Lattice needs to be trimmed.
- The flat porch roof is the only solution for this project and will be hidden behind other roof lines.

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

The following items were discussed:

- There was a question about whether the existing garage door will be replaced. If it will be replaced, garage doors containing windows will be needed.

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

The following items were discussed:

- The design of the windows and doors need to be carried from the front all the way around the house.
- The tapered porch columns are too big or the base is too small. The proportions of the columns need to be modified.
- The garage door window design needs to better match the windows of the front door.
- Articulation is needed on the rear gable on the front elevation to indicate ending points.

- Larger or more windows are needed on the left elevation.

VII. Commercial Review - Old Business

None

VIII. Commercial Review - New Business

a. Case 14-21C – 426 N Kirkwood Rd – B2
Chris Nickola
Exterior Design Review of Mixed-Use Multi-Family Building

The following items were discussed:

- The preliminary architectural plans submitted for Planning & Zoning approval were prepared by HOK, but not formally reviewed by the ARB. With the final plans, a new architect has submitted a revised building shape and style. The Board felt the new design lacks the elegance and quality of the previous design. It does not have a Kirkwood feel.
- This building will set a precedent for new multi-family developments in the Downtown.
- The protruding balcony design detracts from the overall look of the building.
- The design needs to make a statement. While it should not be compared to the HOK design, there are elements of that design that are preferred. There will need to be more collaboration and work done between the developers and the Board to create the right design.

The work session was adjourned at 6:56 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.