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

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

Chair Mark Campbell called the work session to order at 6:01 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.

Mr. Campbell asked if there were any comments for the January 18, 2022 meeting minutes.

**Chris Burton made a motion to approve the January 18, 2022 minutes. Seconded by Adam Edelbrock. Motion approved unanimously.**

1. **Sign Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Sign Review - New Business**
   1. 01-22S – 10357 Manchester Rd – B4

Sue Winter, Warren Sign Co, applicant

Signage for First Community Credit Union

* The Board had no comments or concerns.

1. **Residential Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Residential Review - New Business**
   1. 08-22R – 221 Midway Ave – R4

Derek Onstott, Trinity Investments, applicant

New Single Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

* It was commented that the proportion was off.
* The gable over the front door needs to be shortened but they are not drawn on the side elevations.
* The right elevation does not have a break at the gable.
* The window well needs to be addressed.
* The stone from the front elevation needs to return on the side elevations.
* It was commented that the pitch of the gable does not look right. It was suggested that a change of the roof direction would make a difference and change the look of the house. The change would create a nested gable and address the street better.
* The dog house roof is too low and needs to be brought up to the gutter board.
* The awning material needs to be specified.
  1. 09-22R – 437 Rollingwood Ln – R3

C.J. Moss, applicant

Pergola Addition

The Board discussed the following items:

* It was mentioned that there was a previous application for this address of an outdoor bathroom addition. Additionally, it was mentioned that there is no roof over the bathroom due to impervious surface area.
* It was commented that mechanical pergola louvers could be kept closed to create more of a roof.
* The column size and proportion were discussed.
  1. 10-22R – 328 Electric St – R4

FM Design Build, applicant

New Single Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

* It was asked if the garage coverage was met because the garage is on the front of the house. It was verified by Planner I Christie Voelker that the exact percentage was 54.2% and the limit is 55%.
* It was suggested that the gable should be clad board-and-batten.
* A couple windows could be added to the garage side.
* The back steps will need a landing per building code as indicated by Building Commissioner Jack Schenck.
* The living room gable needs to have a break line or be shifted over 6 inches.
* The false rectangle window over garage door in the gable was discussed and it was suggested that it should be aligned to the siding. Another suggestion was made to omit the window or install a top vent in its place.
* A garage door cutsheet is need to show that the garage door matches the other doors.
  1. 11-22R – 435 E Gill Ave – R3

Joseph Davidson, Dadoworks, applicant

Covered Front Porch Addition

The Board discussed the following items:

* The transition point off to the right should be all the white trim board rather than infilling with siding.
* The column design seems characteristic of the house.
* The exposed corner will need to be addressed.
  1. 12-22R – 604 Essex Ct – R3

Dan Stauder, Stauder Architecture, applicant

New Single Family Residence

The Board discussed the following items:

* The left gable needs to be brought all the way through to the garage gable.
* The details of the retaining wall and the fence for the pool were questioned. It was noted that the pool would be a continuation of the home and needs continuity.
* The chimney is not tall enough based on the east elevation drawing and needs to be at least three feet taller.
* The garage header needs a soldier course or coins or stone component.
* Cutsheets on the doors are needed.
* The south elevation is lacking window. It was suggested that bedroom #5 and the sitting area would be good locations to repeat the three-window concept from walk-in closet.
  1. 13-22R – 1543 Southlin Dr – R4

Chad Kersick, applicant

Rear Addition

The Board discussed the following items:

* It was questioned where the roof of the addition would hit the window on the existing home above
* Replacing the existing window with a smaller window, so that the new roof does not overlap, was suggested
  1. 14-22R – 839 Lockett Rd – R3

Jeff & Rachel Klaus, applicants

Rear Covered Porch Addition

The Board discussed the following items:

* It was mentioned that the foundation is tall and should have siding to match the house. Foundation coverage should match the existing.
* The detail on the opening should match the existing.
* Corner boards are needed on the chimney and the porch to match the house.
* The location of the railings in relation to the screening was questioned. It was specified that the railing protects the outdoor screen.
* Trim improvements need to match the structure.
  1. 15-22R – 48 W Glenwood Ln – R3

Steve Anton, Anton Architecture, applicant

Kitchen Addition

The Board discussed the following items:

* It was noted that the existing stone foundation goes right up to the new concrete foundation of the addition on the west elevation. It was suggested that the new foundation should match the existing foundation as closely as possible through the use of an applied stone product.
  1. 16-22R – 345 E Argonne Dr – R3

Darryl LaBruyere, DL Design, applicant

Two-Story Addition

The Board discussed the following items:

* This has gone to the Landmarks Commission and the plans address the Landmarks Commission comments.
* The right elevation over the center door will have an awning. It was asked what shape it will be. It was commented that a fabric awning does not seem appropriate. A shed roof was suggested.
* It was noted that the garage is twelve feet away from the house with pavers in between.
* It was asked if the window sizes match the existing windows. It was noted that the Landmarks Commission requires elements of additions reference the existing structure but not match them.

1. **Commercial Review - Old Business**

None

1. **Commercial Review - New Business**

None

Mr. Campbell asked if there was any other business that needed to be addressed and upon hearing there was not, adjourned the meeting at 6:52 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](http://www.kirkwoodmo.org), then click on City Clerk, Boards & Commissions, Architectural Review Board.