|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 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 November 1, 2021 meeting minutes.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve the November 1, 2021 minutes. Seconded by Michael Chiodini. All ayes. Motion approved.**

1. **Sign Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Sign Review - New Business**
	1. 41-21S – 504 S Geyer Rd – R4

Dale Sign Services, applicant

Ground Sign for Geyer Road Baptist Church

Chris Smith from Dale Sign Services addressed the Board and indicated the proposal is for a ground sign for Geyer Road Baptist Church.

* The location of the stone cladding was questioned. Mr. Smith specified that it will be on all sides except on the rear middle section behind the electronic sign.
* Mr. Chiodini questioned why the rear of the electronic sign was not covered. Mr. Smith indicated that this could cause overheating.
* The top of the sign will be capped with a stone cap along the entire length of the sign.
* The construction method for mounting the sign was discussed. It was suggested that a true foundation would provide better structural integrity than the proposed two posts set in concrete footings.
* Approve with cursory review.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 41-21S with the requirement that a footing and foundation be utilized under the entire sign and cursory review of stone and reveals from the front are added to the sign. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. 42-21S – 132 W Monroe Ave – B2

Chris DeHeer, Horizon Sign Company, applicant

Marquee Sign for Teleo Coffee

David Greathouse from Horizon Sign Company addressed the Board and indicated the proposal is for a larger marquee sign for Teleo Coffee that will be made from stained and sealed hardwood and mounted with painted hardware.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 42-21S as submitted. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. **Residential Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Residential Review - New Business**
	1. Case 161-21R – 437 Rollingwood Ln – R3
	ST Evans, Inc, applicant
	Deck & Outdoor Bathroom

Amy Evers and Scott Evans addressed the Board. Ms. Evers indicated the pergola will be submitted by a different contractor and the roof will only be over the bathroom. Mr. Evans further specified this proposal is strictly for the deck and the outdoor bathroom structure. Mr. Evans continued explaining the bathroom will be open air and will be winterized. The following items were discussed:

* The bathroom portion needs to be detached from the house with a setback or a trim component that adds a reveal or an offset.
* The low slope of the bathroom roof is inconsistent with the pitch on the house and it was suggested that it could be changed to a flat roof. The gutter for the roof will tie into the downspout to the right of the bathroom.
* It was discussed that a better understanding of details and trims were needed. The method for capping the open shower and changing room was questioned as was the manner for finishing off the corners of the structure. Mr. Evans specified the walls will be capped with a deck board and the corners would be trimmed with deck boards as a corner board. There was debate about the possibility of using mitered corners and of the product withstanding weather exposure.
* The colorfastness of the composite material was questioned and it was specified that the material should stay the same color for its lifetime.
* The changing room portion of the outdoor bathroom structure will be entered through swinging doors and will provide access to the bathroom or the shower via pocket doors. It was suggested that the swinging doors cover more of the opening to provide a higher level of privacy.
* It was determined that there will be a small section of railing on raised portion of the deck and along the stairs.
* The planters in the shower will have vining plants in them that will grow up and cover the shower walls.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 161-21R with the following requirements for cursory review: 1) that more detail is shown on the structure and corners, how the structure transitions to the house, and at the changing room opening; 2) that a cut sheet of the double swinging doors is submitted; and, 3) that the pergola is submitted for approval at a later date. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 163-21R – 429 Miriam Ave – R3
	Paul Fendler, Fendler + Associates, Inc, applicant
	Lifting House to Replace Foundation & Adding a 2-Story Addition

Jennifer Taylor from Fendler + Associates addressed the Board and indicated the owners are want to raise the house to replace the deteriorating foundation and add an addition to the house. Ms. Taylor explained that the project has been seen by the Board of Adjustment where they were granted a variance and by the Landmarks Commission who requested a round window instead of the originally proposed diamond window as well as the window on the right side of the addition be two windows rather than the originally proposed single window. The Landmarks Commission requests additions be differentiated from the original landmark home. Marvin historic replica windows will be used to match the original windows. The following items were discussed:

* The color scheme for the house was questioned and Ms. Taylor specified the house trim and siding will be white and the shutters and windows will be black.
* It was indicated that the addition should pay better homage to the character of the original 140-year-old structure. It was discussed that the materials and color scheme proposed would give the impression of a farmhouse-style rather than the saltbox-style of the original home.
* There was discussion about using board-and-batten on the addition rather than the proposed shake shingle because it would relate to the siding on the historic garage.
* It was determined that a joint Landmarks Commission & ARB session is needed for this project.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to continue Case 163-21R. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 164-21R – 559 S Harrison Ave – R4
	Stanford Homes, applicant
	New Single Family Residence

Amir Kucic from Stanford Homes addressed the Board and indicated this proposal is for a two-story modern farmhouse-style new single family residence with a detached garage. Mr. Kucic clarified the siding on the front elevation will be vertical siding as shown on the elevation drawings rather than how it is shown conceptually in the provided rendering. The following items were discussed:

* It was explained that the detail and articulation shown on the front of the house needs to carry over to the other three sides of the house.
* It was suggested that the gable ends on the side and rear elevations should have a band board with vertical siding above.
* It was discussed that large expanses of non-articulated areas on the sides and rear of the house are not allowable and windows are needed on the side and rear elevations. It was suggested that a band board could be added between the first and second floors and vertical siding could be added to articulated portions of the house such as the chimney.
* The columns on the rear porch should relate in trim detail to the front columns.
* Sills and aprons are needed on window trim.
* It was discussed that changing the gable vents to triangle vents would refine the front façade.
* It was suggested that the fixed window needs to be changed to a double-hung or casement window with a similar mutton pattern as the windows on the rest of the house.
* It was recommended that a more substantial corner board is needed at the corners of the front elevation.
* Using vertical siding in the garage gables or siding the entire garage in board-and-batten was suggested.
* The roof pitch of the garage should match the pitch of the house roof.
* It was recommended that the garage vents be eliminated.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 164-21R with the following requirements: 1) that the front elevation siding be incorporated into side and rear elevations with a band board on the side elevations, a band board with vertical siding in the rear gables, and vertical siding on the fireplace; 2) that the fixed window be changed to match the grids on whole house; 3) that all windows have the same grid patterns; 4) that all windows have sills, skirts, and aprons; 5) that the foundation exposure requirements are met; 6) that the rear patio posts match the columns on the front with trim on the top and bottom; 7) that the gable vents be replaced with triangle vents; 8) that the garage vents are eliminated; 9) that the garage roof pitch match that of the house roof; 10) that windows are added to the side elevations of the garage; 11) that a band board with board-and-batten are added to the garage gable; and, 12) that additional windows are added to the sides and rear elevations. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 165-21R – 125 N Woodlawn Ave – R3
	Lewis Homes, applicant
	Rear Addition

Mike Lewis from Lewis Homes & homeowner Dan Greco addressed the Board. Mr. Greco indicated the goal of this project is to preserve and restore the existing structure and to add onto the rear of the house. Mr. Lewis further explained that all of the windows except the front windows will be replaced and the whole house will be resided. The following items were discussed:

* All windows should be trimmed out to match the windows of the existing house.
* Shutters on the front windows need to match the dimension that would completely cover the window if closed.
* The columns in the rear should match the shape and detail of the round tapered columns in the front.
* The square vents on the side elevations were discussed and Mr. Lewis explained the shape is meant to mimic the shape of the third floor windows on the existing house.
* Mr. Lewis discussed that he will have to take the proposal for the garage to the Landmarks Commission for approval because the existing garage is historic and in such poor condition that it needs to be replaced. It was determined that the ARB could grant conditional approval of the garage design, pending approval by the Landmarks Commission.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 165-21R with the following requirements: 1) that the trim on the new windows match the existing window trim; 2) that the window grid patterns match the existing grid pattern; 3) that the columns on the rear are changed to round columns to match the front; and, 4) that the garage is approved as submitted. Seconded by Pat Jones. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 166-21R – 520 Coverdale Ln – R4
	Christopher Pike, applicant
	New Single Family Residence

The applicant nor a representative was present to address the Board.

**Chris Burton made a motion to continue Case 166-21R because no applicant nor representative was present. Seconded by Michael Chiodini. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 167-21R – 208 Frieda Ave – R3
	Jeff Day & Associates, applicant
	New Single Family Residence

Jeff Day from Jeff Day & Associates addressed the Board. Chair Campbell recused himself from the case and Vice-Chair Chiodini led the discussion. Mr. Day indicated the proposal is for a new custom home based on the design of a house previously approved by the ARB.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 167-21R with the requirement that the foundation exposure guidelines are met. Seconded by Dick Gordon. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 168-21R – 1737 Lynkirk Ln – R1
	Michael Blaes, AIA, applicant
	Sunroom & Deck Addition

Michael Blaes from Blaes Architects addressed the Board and indicated the project is for a sunroom and deck addition on the rear of a mid-century house. The following items were discussed:

* The prowl edge of the sunroom roof is capturing the midcentury character of the house.
* The windows are to be trimmed to match the house.

**Dick Gordon made a motion to approve Case 168-21R as submitted. Seconded by Chris Burton. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 169-21R – 704 Pearl Ave – R3
	Michael & Clara McIntosh, applicants
	Rear Addition & Covered Porch, New Detached Garage

Lauren Strutman addressed the Board and indicated the project will include the removal of an existing rear one-story addition with the replacement being a 635 square foot two-story addition, adding a one-story covered porch, as well as a detached garage. Ms. Strutman further specified all materials will match the existing house, all windows will have aprons and sills, and the brick on the front will be painted white to match the painted brick on the rear of the house.

**Pat Jones made a motion to approve Case 169-21R as submitted. Seconded by Chris Burton. Motion approved unanimously.**

* 1. Case 170-21R – 529 N Holmes Ave – R3
	Larry Rolwes, Homes by Rolwes, applicants
	New Single Family Residence

Larry Rolwes from Homes by Rolwes addressed the Board and indicated a new story-and-a-half home is proposed. Mr. Rolwes explained that the pergola is proposed to provide some coverage over the back porch because the coverage ratio would not allow a full covered porch there. A request for more information about the pergola design was made and it was recommended that some sort of base and cap would be needed on the pergola posts.

**Don Anderson made a motion to approve Case 170-21R as submitted with cursory review of the pergola design. Seconded by Chris Burton. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. **Commercial Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Commercial Review - New Business**
	1. Case 21-21C – 1280 Simmons Ave – R4
	Villa Di Maria, applicants
	New “Children’s House” Building at the Villa Di Maria Montessori School Campus

Helen Lee from Tao Lee addressed the Board and indicated this is the second phase to an expansion at Villa Di Maria. The proposed building will include three classrooms, a shared space, and a multi-purpose room that will act as a shelter. It was discussed that the sign that reads “Children’s House” is to be reviewed separately for Sign Review.

**Michael Chiodini made a motion to approve Case 21-21C as submitted. Seconded by Chris Burton. 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 8:39 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.