

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS – CITY HALL
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 01, 2019
1730 (05:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld at 1730.

ROLL CALL

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative Richard Lintz, Ron Reim, Carolyn Gaidis answered roll call.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Stephanie Karr, Acting City Attorney
Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Planning Director
Anna Krane, Planner

CHAIRMAN REQUESTS

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phones be turned off and that conversations take place outside the meeting room.

Chairman Lichtenfeld also asks that anyone who speaks please spell out their last name.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 18, 2019 were presented for approval.

RICHARD LINTZ – MOTION TO APPROVE WITH CHANGE OF ADDRESS TO 233 NORTH FORSYTH ON PAGE 2 AND THE DATE TO MARCH 18, 2019, ON PAGE 1.

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE BOARD

OLD BUSINESS

233 NORTH FORSYTH BOULEVARD – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The approximately 10,435 square foot site is located at the southwest corner of North Forsyth Boulevard and Kingsbury Boulevard. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District and is located in the Clayton Gardens Urban Design District. The existing house was recently renovated by the owner.

The applicant is proposing to construct a front yard fence along Kingsbury Boulevard. The applicant has submitted two fence material choices. The applicant’s preferred option is a six-foot-tall solid wood fence and the second option is an aluminum fence. The proposed fence would only enclose a small portion of the front yard, just east of the driveway.

Section 405.1900 of the Zoning Regulations requires that all fences located in the front yard in single-family zoning districts be approved by the Architectural Review Board prior to installation.

“Front yard masonry garden walls, planting boxes, retaining walls, plantings or ornamental or decorative fences may be erected as part of new construction, up to four (4) feet above the grade level in the front yard, provided such structure is an integral part of the architectural feature of the principal structure, is in compliance with sight distance standards and is approved by the Architectural Review Board.”

Historically, the Architectural Review Board has considered requests for front yard fences that are not in conformance with the zoning requirements. For instance, 6-foot-tall ornamental or decorative fences (not solid wood, chain link or vinyl) have been approved on secondary front yards of corner lots when a sufficient landscape buffer is provided along the street and the fence style and location is consistent with neighborhood character.

The applicant is proposing to enclose a space measuring approximately 15 feet by 37 feet. Based on the proposed plan the fence is located approximately 15 feet from Kingsbury Boulevard. The Clayton Gardens neighborhood does not have many homes with fences located in the secondary front yards. Staff is of the opinion that the preferred six-foot-tall wood fence is not consistent with neighborhood character. The second material option of an aluminum fence is more consistent with the Architectural Review Board’s preference for ornamental or decorative front yard fences. In order to integrate the fence with neighborhood character, staff recommends that a four foot tall aluminum fence is used and that a landscape buffer is installed consisting of a mix of shrubs and perennials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE FENCE SHALL BE A MAXIMUM OF FOUR FEET TALL AND CONSTRUCTED OF THE ALUMINUM DESIGN OPTION.
 2. A LANDSCAPE AREA SHALL BE INSTALLED BETWEEN THE FENCE AND KINGSBURG BOULEVARD CONSISTING OF A MIXTURE OF SHRUBS AND PERENNIALS. THE LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY STAFF PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT.”
-

NARINDER MAKKER (NM) – APPLICANT AND OWNER

NM – Addresses board to answer questions and add to the staff report. He is proposing this fence due to the area being unsafe for children without a fence. Agrees to the conditions and to have landscape designed and showed to staff.

CHARIMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE WITH THE TWO CONDITIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT

CRAIG OWENS – MOTION TO APPROVE WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

RICHARD LINTZ – SECOND

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE BOARD.

PUBLIC HEARING

10 NORTH BEMISTON AVENUE – TEXT AMENDMENT – TEXT AMENDMENT

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “This is a public hearing to solicit input regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 410 (Overlay and Urban Design Zoning Districts) related to a new overlay district. The proposed overlay district is in response to a long-term initiative set by the Board of Aldermen to enhance the vibrancy of the Central Business District. During strategic planning discussions there was a re-occurring discussion about different types of destination and entertainment venues. A mixture of venues bringing people into the City at different times creates a vibrant and lively downtown area. The proposed overlay district was first presented to the Plan Commission at the March 5, 2019 public hearing. The Plan Commission and members of the public asked questions and made comments before the Plan Commission voted to continue the public hearing. Staff would like to provide responses and additional information based on the discussion of the previous Plan Commission meeting. The original staff report follows this response section.

The first major concern raised during the initial public hearing was regarding outside noise regulations. Staff is not proposing to modify the existing noise regulations through the overlay district. Currently, amplification of music outdoors is not permitted after 10:00 p.m. within 500 feet of residential areas (Section 215.765.A.2). Any entertainment uses that qualify under the proposed ordinance would also have to abide by the existing regulations and would be required to obtain an Outdoor Dining Permit to operate any outdoor seating area.

Questions about the proposed location of the district were also raised. The proposed location was chosen specifically for multiple reasons. After many discussions with the Board of Aldermen about creating vibrant downtown areas, staff determined that the proposed entertainment overlay district could address multiple aspects of a vibrant downtown. First, the proposed district targets entertainment businesses that are often a destination for residents and people from nearby communities. Second, the location of the district targets an area with vacant retail/restaurant spaces. The intent of the proposed overlay district is not to guide new construction projects or larger development. Staff wrote the proposed district regulations to have an immediate impact by targeting existing tenant spaces for the entertainment uses that may require renovations, but not larger development construction. Entertainment venues discussed by the Board of Aldermen as being desirable are small to medium scale businesses, not large venues. By locating the district in an area of Downtown that already has a fabric of smaller scale first floor tenant spaces, the target venue size of the Board of Aldermen is re-enforced. Having vacant storefronts along main pedestrian streets disrupts the environment. The proposed location for the overlay district encompasses part of

North Central Avenue, which many people see as the “mainstreet” of Clayton. This area is an existing restaurant node, which also has a series of spaces that have been vacant for many years. Staff would like to build on the existing node and fill the voids with a new layer of entertainment uses that will complement the existing restaurant uses. Staff understands comments raised about Maryland Avenue being an important boundary between the Downtown and northern residential neighborhoods. Staff has revised the proposed district regulations to prohibit entertainment venues from facing either side of Maryland Avenue.

The idea of moving the proposed district boundaries south was proposed at the meeting. While staff agrees that the block south of Forsyth Boulevard is more of the true geographic center of the Downtown area, this is not an existing restaurant/retail node. A large portion of the land around or within the box created by Forsyth Boulevard, South Bemiston Avenue, Bonhomme Avenue and South Meramec Avenue is owned and occupied by St. Louis County Government. The majority of the remaining land in that area is developed with office buildings that are occupied. Locating the targeted entertainment venues in this geographic center area would require larger redevelopment projects. Another element that helps create successful and vibrant nodes is complementary and dense uses. Even with larger redevelopment projects overtime, the area would still be broken up by the St. Louis County Government buildings.

The proposed entertainment overlay district will build on the existing uses. This area is still within walking distance of many residential areas and hotels. There are opportunity areas within the district boundaries that would allow the overlay district to have a more immediate impact upon implementation. Staff believes that the proposed location best addresses the intent of the overlay district and goals of the Board of Aldermen. Should the overlay district become successful, the boundary could be extended south in the future if desired.

The proposed Entertainment Overlay District will help the City work toward a long-term initiative to create a vibrant downtown. Staff recommends approval of the text amendment creating an Entertainment Overlay Zoning District to the Board of Aldermen as proposed.

Previous staff report:

Gary Carter, the City’s Economic Development Director, was tasked with generating different ideas to attract businesses that will enhance the destination factor of downtown. Multiple presentations were made to the Board of Aldermen discussing approaches to fostering a vibrant area. Desired businesses that were discussed included small music venues, comedy clubs, small theaters, game rooms and other entertainment venues where food would likely be served, but would not be the primary revenue source. The discussion also covered potential noise impacts and locations throughout the Central Business District. Based on the priorities and desired outcomes voiced during the presentations, staff determined that an Entertainment Overlay District would provide the appropriate avenue for achieving the vibrant downtown goals.

A zoning overlay district creates a concentrated area for the desired businesses to focus and also allows for modifications of code requirements for specific areas. The proposed overlay boundary was chosen based on the existing fabric of the area and the concentration of businesses. The more general language of the overlay is important because the goal is to target a variety of businesses and not be overly-restrictive. Due to the range of possible business characteristics that could be proposed within the overlay, staff recommends that a Conditional Use Permit is required. Under regulations of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), additional impacts based on the details of the specific business and location can be mitigated on a case by case basis.

Staff consulted multiple resources when writing the proposed overlay regulations and definitions including similar codes in other cities and published planning guides. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)

is a comprehensive list of definitions for different industries that is commonly referenced by zoning ordinances as a source of business definitions. NAICS publishes multiple definitions that speak to the intent or primary goal of a venue or business. The goal of the overlay district is to attract a variety of entertainment venues, so staff wrote a proposed definition that includes aspects of NAICS definitions and definitions from other codes. The definition serves to outline business characteristics, but not to regulate business operations. Staff proposes to regulate the business operations through the CUP process.

See attached

The proposed overlay district boundaries encompass an area of Downtown that has a high concentration of restaurants and smaller commercial spaces at street level. This area is also mostly commercial, with the exception of the apartments on North Central Avenue completed last year. This location was chosen to minimize potential impacts to residential areas while capitalizing on the existing atmosphere. Property along the north side of Maryland Avenue is not included to protect the existing buffer.

The intent of the proposed overlay district is to attract new businesses that would otherwise have difficulty locating within the Central Business District. Most of the desired businesses discussed as contributing to a vibrant downtown would have less food revenue than restaurants and would likely still have a desire to serve alcohol. The proposed overlay would allow staff, the Plan Commission and the Board of Aldermen, through the CUP process, to evaluate the entertainment component of proposed businesses and approve a reduction in requirements of a liquor license. This would allow venues such as a jazz club, which would likely not get at least 50 percent of its revenue from food sales, to locate in Clayton. The proposed overlay district regulations require that businesses with an outdoor component follow the same regulations as restaurants with outdoor dining areas in terms of design and noise. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed regulations and the CUP process will provide sufficient mitigations of any potential negative impacts based on the specific business proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: THE PROPOSED ENTERTAINMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT WILL HELP THE CITY WORK TOWARD A LONG-TERM INITIATIVE TO CREATE A VIBRANT DOWNTOWN. STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE TEXT AMENDMENT CREATING AN ENTERTAINMENT OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT TO THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN AS PROPOSED.”

GARY CARTER (GC) – DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CITY OF CLAYTON

RICHARD LINTZ – Exclude arcades and game rooms from the entertainment district. Music should be the primary focus.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD - .870 Off-street parking and loading requirements. What if we were to get a series of smaller venues that add up to many many more people than we think, where does overflow parking go and do we have control over that in this overlay district?

SUSAN ISTENES – The focus on this is later evening use, after one would go out to dinner. With respect to parking, you will not have daytime users interfering with evening users. The same could be said for restaurants. Not all venues will be the same and will probably be operating at different times. Right now we don't think parking will be an issue.

RICHARD LINTZ – At the BOA level we have talked about parking and it isn't really an issue. There are hundreds of spots in the evening time that will be available for use.

William Liebermann – Agrees with Alderman Lintz.

SUSAN ISTENES – Notes that parking can be controlled by the CUP process, but most will meet the parking requirements set by code.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

PETER SMITH (PS) – 23 BRIGHTON WAY

PS – Not a fan of this. I asked before if any of the members lived close to this district and I would still like to know how many of you would be affected by this noise.

RICHARD LINTZ – I live in Ward One, does that discount my vote?

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS NOTE WHERE THEY LIVE IN RELATION TO THE PROPOSED DISTRICT AND OTHER AREAS OF CLAYTON WITH VIBRATE AREAS AND NOISE (DEMUN, WYDOWN, AND HANLEY AREAS)

CRAIG OWENS – I am about five blocks away and I can hear parties in the park from my driveway.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – I hear park parties, the art fair, occasional restaurant noise, etc. but they end at 10pm and I chose to live near the downtown for the vibrance.

PS – It is different to have music occasionally vs a couple times a week, 365 days a year. We are directly impacted by this. The Clayton Ord. for noise follows the County ordinance is that correct?

CRAIG OWENS – I don't know what the County says but we have our own ordinance that is enforced by the Clayton Police Officers.

STEPHANIE KARR – Our ordinance passed by the BOA stands alone and does not adopt the county ordinance by reference.

PS – County allows business owners that exceed the noise ordinance to apply for a variance to exceed the noise ordinance.

finds reference for the Draft proposal 410.865.c.* Reads this St. Louis County Noise Ordinance 625.

ANNA KRANE – Notes that the draft PS is reading from is an old draft

STEPHANIE KARR – Notes that the new draft says Chapter 215 Offenses and that is the Clayton Code and is what is enforced.

CLAUDE EVANS (CE) – 139 NORTH BEMISTON

CE – Agree that the 100 block of Central really needs redevelopment. As a restaurant center it was a really nice block and seeing that come back would be very good. With regard to parking, I would say experience tells me there will be a lot of parking on the 100 block of Central and Bemiston. We also see a lot of trash that have come from these blocks. We already feel this, hear, and see this. We have to go tell restaurants to calm down well after 10pm and I think having a “mini Grove” or “mini Loop” here would not be a good idea. General noise comment:

developments in the last years of restaurants that have music so loud inside that we walk out and this trend, if it starts bleeding out to the streets will be very disruptive to the neighborhoods that surround the area.

STEPHANIE KARR – Explains the general noise ordinance that is found in the Offenses Code so there is no way to provide a variance for this. It prohibits unreasonable noises and predetermines those offenses.

JANE MATOESIAN (JM) – 119 NORTH BEMISTON

JM – My Neighbor at 121 Charlie, had the same questions but was unable to attend. We are not sure what is covered by the 500 feet or not and is Café Napoli covered in the 500 feet.

ANNA KRANE – 500 ft. from Café Napoli does not meet the residential area so it is not included in the one section but still falls under the noise ordinance.

JM – Is it possible that there can still be music from the Shanley Building facing Bemiston within the 500 feet?

ANNA KRANE – It would be the same as our current regulations. They would be required to turn the music off at 10pm.

JM – Reads the ordinance. There is another section of the ordinance A.7. that discusses a 12 midnight to 8am noise limit. This doesn't address recorded music either. And we are concerned about the noise and parking and I came home last night and my driveway was partially blocked.

KATHY BEILIEN (KB) – 108 BEMISTON

KB – Thanks Staff for answering emails, questions, etc. Feels this should be a give and take situation. What do we as residents need to do to ensure there is no noise after 10pm and do you feel what you've written protects us from the noise? Also asks about punishments for those who do not comply with noise regulation.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Those who hear it will have to take action because the police will not likely be sitting out there waiting for noise to be too loud. Residents will have to call the authorities to enforce this.

STEPHANIE KARR – 2. Routes that are available 1. When police arrive, they can issue a summons. 2. The CUP can be revoked by this commission and the BOA. There would be suspension or revocation or cut hours of operation but if the violation is repeated after that then the CUP can be revoked. There are ramifications to violating the ordinance but certainly those can be pursued if need be.

CRAIG OWENS – Parking agreements in the edge neighborhoods are something we will continue to talk about because they keep popping up.

KB – This is something we are doing together.

RON REIM – Speaks to his neighborhood requiring parking permits and 2 hour limits. This might help your neighborhood.

CRAIG OWENS – We will be happy to work with you and please call with complaints and concerns, etc. so we can help address this.

PS – Parking enforcement ends at 5pm?

CRAIG OWENS – No that’s when our ambassadors end, police still enforce this.

PS – So what I’m hearing is if there is noise, parking problems, I have to call the police. I’m wondering who is in favor of this because I’m not hearing too many people that are saying this is a great idea. What you’re saying is we want to do it and so we are going to and if there are problems, call the police.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – We see tickets at all times of the day in my neighborhood which is south of the downtown and has restricted parking. I’m not sure if they are calls made or just police driving around but I think the enforcement is there and that it is a team effort also.

MARTA TOCZYLOWSKI – 303 NORTH MERAMEC

MT – Wants to say she supports the overlay to get more people here. Doesn’t think it will be wild, Clayton is an upper class area and will attract such. She also notes she has gotten a parking ticket in her own neighborhood for being parked longer than two hours so parking is being enforced.

JM – It appears that this is the second month in a row that is not complete. And the online draft says that we have to comply with the County and that we can be notified of the correct proposal and have time to consider it.

CE – We need more silence and not less.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Any further comments from the public or commission?

NONE

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THIS TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN AS PROPOSED.

RICHARD LINTZ – I WILL RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD BECAUSE IT IS THE BOARD THAT INITIATED THE WHOLE THING AND WE SHOULD KICK IT TO THEM AND LET THEM DEBATE IT.

RON REIM – STRIKING THE ST. LOUIS COUNTY REFERENCE.

RICHARD LINTZ – YES STRIKING THE ST. LOUIS COUNTY REFERENCE TO THE NOISE ORDINANCE.

RON REIM – SECOND

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE BOARD.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

7921-7927 FORSYTH BOULEVARD – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located on the north side of Forsyth Boulevard between North Meramec Avenue and North Central Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of HDC High Density Commercial District and is located in the CBD Core Downtown Overlay

District. The site currently contains a multi-tenant commercial building with two vacant restaurant spaces and an alterations business. Adjacent land uses include office, restaurant and government.

In 2016, the Architectural Review Board approved exterior alterations to the front façade of the subject property. The alterations were never constructed and the approval expired. The applicant is now re-considering the façade alterations and construction of a rooftop deck. The applicant has chosen to apply for conceptual review of the project because certain material details will be chosen based on tenant preferences. The applicant is looking for feedback from the Architectural Review Board regarding the proposed project to help guide conversations with potential tenants.

Matching the alterations approved in 2016, the applicant is proposing to straighten the storefront system, add stone façade accents at the building ends and main entrance and paint the existing brick. The applicant is proposing a rooftop deck with construction of two interior stair towers and a small bar area. The applicant has stated that the rooftop could be used by two tenants.

STAFF CONSIDERATIONS: THE PROPOSED ALTERATIONS WILL REQUIRE FORMAL REVIEW BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. ANY NEW RESTAURANT TENANT(S) WILL NEED TO OBTAIN A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE AND WILL NEED TO INCLUDE THE ROOFTOP DECK AREA AS PART OF THE PROPOSED BUSINESS AREA.

THE PROPOSED FAÇADE ALTERATIONS MATCH THE PREVIOUS APPROVAL AND ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA. ROOFTOP DECKS ARE BECOMING A POPULAR INQUIRY AND STAFF IS OF THE OPINION THAT THEY PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESTAURANTS TO MAXIMIZE OUTDOOR SPACE IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA. STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD CONSIDER THE PROPOSAL AND PROVIDE INPUT. THIS IS A CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY AND THEREFORE ANY COMMENTS MADE IN THIS REPORT OR AT THE MEETING, EITHER BY THE APPLICANT, STAFF, OR THE BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBERS, ARE NOT BINDING.

HARINDER SINGH (HS) – 7516 WELLINGTON WAY

HS – Addresses Board to answer questions and speak to the staff report. We didn't go through with the façade changes because we lost both tenants after approval and we would like to add the rooftop to appeal to tenants.

Chairman Lichtenfeld – Were you planning on making two major entrances?

HS – There are three entrances to the building. The restaurants have side entrances and the building has a main one.

Chairman Lichtenfeld – Would that cause the alterations business to leave?

HS – She plans on retiring within the next year or so. She loves the idea though.

Chairman Lichtenfeld – I think this would be nice. I am on the side of you perusing this.

Ron Reim – I think this is an ideal location and a great addition to your building.

Craig Owens – Loves it. Thinks it is awesome.

END

NEW BUSINESS

46 ABERDEEN PLACE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Aberdeen Place and DeMun Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The applicant is proposing to install 28 solar panels on the roof of the existing house and detached garage.

Section 405.3880 of the Zoning Regulations outlines requirements for design and construction of renewable energy systems. For building mounted solar energy systems in residential neighborhoods, the following criteria apply:

1. Building-mounted solar energy collectors installed in residential zoning districts shall be:
 - (a) Installed in the plane of the roof (flush mounted); or
 - (b) Made part of the roof design (capping or framing compatible with the color of the roof or structure);
or
 - (c) Building-integrated system. Mounting brackets shall be permitted to be placed parallel on the slope of a rear-facing roof if the applicant can demonstrate that the existing pitch of the roof would render the solar energy equipment ineffective or incapable of reasonable operation.
2. When located on a sloped roof, solar energy collectors shall be located on a rear- or side-facing roof, as viewed from a fronting street. In cases of corner lots or lots with more than one (1) street frontage, the side roof fronting a street shall be considered a front-facing roof.
3. Solar energy systems shall not project vertically above the peak of a sloped roof to which it is attached.
4. When located on a sloped roof, solar energy collectors shall be positioned in a symmetrical fashion and centered on the plane of the roof on which they are located.
5. When located on a sloped roof, solar energy collectors shall be set back at least two (2) feet from any outside edge, ridge, or valley of the roof.
6. Solar energy collectors installed on a flat roof must be screened by the use of a parapet or other architectural feature to screen the view from the street or from ground level on adjoining properties.
7. All exterior electrical or plumbing lines must be painted in a color scheme that matches as closely as possible the color of the structure and the materials adjacent to the lines when visible from the street.

Solar panels are proposed on the south slope of the primary structure roof, facing the rear yard and the east slope of the detached garage roof. The subject property is a corner lot, so the proposed panel locations are located in the rear yard as required by the code, but will likely be visible from DeMun Avenue. The proposed panel locations are also ideal for sun exposure. Staff is of the opinion that the design and location of panels proposed are in conformance with the renewable energy design criteria

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

CHARLES MANTLE (CM) – STRAIGHTUP SOLAR

CM – Would like to add the environment aspects of the projects. Speaks to how they are reducing the carbon footprint.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

CRAIG OWENS – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

77 ABERDEEN PLACE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located on the north side of Aberdeen Place between University Lane and DeMun Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The applicant is proposing to install 40 solar panels on the roof of the existing house.

Section 405.3880 of the Zoning Regulations outlines requirements for design and construction of renewable energy systems. For building mounted solar energy systems in residential neighborhoods, the following criteria apply:

1. Building-mounted solar energy collectors installed in residential zoning districts shall be:
 - (a) Installed in the plane of the roof (flush mounted); or
 - (b) Made part of the roof design (capping or framing compatible with the color of the roof or structure); or
 - (c) Building-integrated system. Mounting brackets shall be permitted to be placed parallel on the slope of a rear-facing roof if the applicant can demonstrate that the existing pitch of the roof would render the solar energy equipment ineffective or incapable of reasonable operation.
2. When located on a sloped roof, solar energy collectors shall be located on a rear- or side-facing roof, as viewed from a fronting street. In cases of corner lots or lots with more than one (1) street frontage, the side roof fronting a street shall be considered a front-facing roof.
3. Solar energy systems shall not project vertically above the peak of a sloped roof to which it is attached.
4. When located on a sloped roof, solar energy collectors shall be positioned in a symmetrical fashion and centered on the plane of the roof on which they are located.
5. When located on a sloped roof, solar energy collectors shall be set back at least two (2) feet from any outside edge, ridge, or valley of the roof.
6. Solar energy collectors installed on a flat roof must be screened by the use of a parapet or other architectural feature to screen the view from the street or from ground level on adjoining properties.
7. All exterior electrical or plumbing lines must be painted in a color scheme that matches as closely as possible the color of the structure and the materials adjacent to the lines when visible from the street.

Solar panels are proposed on the east and west slopes of the primary structure, facing the side yards. The proposed panel locations will not be highly visible from the street. Staff is of the opinion that the design and location of panels proposed are in conformance with the renewable energy design criteria.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

CHARLES MANTLE (CM) – STRAIGHTUP SOLAR

CM – Notes more statics in reduced carbon footprint.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

8025 BONHOMME AVENUE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Bonhomme Avenue and South Brentwood Boulevard. The property has a zoning designation of PUD Planned Unit Development and contains apartments and a public restaurant, Kingside Diner.

The applicant is proposing to construct a deck along South Brentwood Boulevard adjacent to the northern restaurant entrance. There is currently a sloped concrete walkway leading from the sidewalk to the entrance with landscape beds on both sides. The applicant is proposing to remove the concrete walkway and re-arrange the landscape beds to install the deck. The deck will be level with the restaurant entrance and will require stairs leading to the sidewalk.

The applicant is proposing a wood plank deck with a metal railing. The railing design will match the railing for the main restaurant entrance. North of the proposed wood deck is a wood accent wall that provides screening of mechanical equipment. The restaurant is located across the street from Shaw Park and currently does not have an outdoor dining area. The applicant will replant the landscape beds after construction of the deck. Staff is of the opinion that the outdoor dining area as designed is compatible with the existing building and neighborhood character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT

RON REIM – MOTION TO TABLE

WILLIAM LIEBERMANN – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

8028 CRESCENT DRIVE – SITE PLAN REVIEW – RESIDENTIAL

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 7,352-square-foot site is located on the south side of Crescent Drive, between Oleta Drive and Seminole Place. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District and the applicant recently completed construction of a 3,499-square-foot single-family residence.

This request was originally submitted by the applicant in March and listed on the March 4, 2019 Plan Commission meeting agenda. At the meeting, the applicant withdrew the request stating he was attempting to make site changes

and meet the code requirements. The applicant is now requesting a smaller increase in the allowed lot coverage than previously submitted.

During construction of the home, changes were made to the site plan that have resulted in more lot coverage than originally approved. Lots in the R-2 zoning district are limited to a maximum of 55 percent total lot coverage. The Plan Commission has the authority to grant an additional five percent of lot coverage per Section 405.1980.B:

In instances where an applicant can demonstrate just cause, the Plan Commission shall have the authority to approve a modification of up to an additional five percent (5%) over the impervious coverage requirement; that is up to fifty percent (50%) in the front yard and up to sixty percent (60%) overall lot coverage; unless the property is located within an urban design district, then the requirements found therein shall apply.

The purpose of the site plan review process is to provide a review of the following criteria listed below (only criteria related to the amendment request is included):

- 1. Provisions for storm surface drainage shall be in accordance with the City's design standards. Stormwater drainage shall be connected to a storm sewer whenever one is available as determined by the City. Disposal of storm or natural waters both on and off the site shall be provided in such a manner as not to have a detrimental effect on the property of others or the public right-of-way.*

Impervious Coverage

- >> In the R-2 Zoning District, impervious coverage is limited to 55 percent of the total lot area. The original plans allowed for a total lot impervious coverage of 54.3 percent. The site was constructed with a larger driveway, front walk and window well system. The applicant is requesting approval of an additional 1.4 percent lot coverage above the maximum for a total lot coverage of 56.4 percent.
- >> Front yard impervious coverage is limited to 45 percent. The proposed front yard coverage is 19.6 percent.

Stormwater Runoff

- >> The site was constructed per the original plans with a drywell system located in the rear yard. The drywell system is sized to handle the increased water runoff.

Beginning in 2018, as-built surveys became a submission requirement for final approval of a Building Permit for medium and large size building projects. The as-built survey completed for the subject property revealed that more lot coverage had been constructed than originally approved. Revisions made to the originally approved site plan include the installation of one larger window well, a rear deck instead of a patio, the shape of the driveway and the shape of the front walk.

Staff understands the revision to create the larger window well along the east side of the house. The window well revision was an administratively approved amendment under the Building Permit for the house. The revised pavement for the driveway and front walk were not administratively approved. Most of the new construction projects in the City maximize the impervious coverage allowed, which creates different drainage patterns in neighborhoods. Staff is of the opinion that the sites should be constructed per the approved plans in order to minimize potential drainage impacts to neighboring properties. Small increases of coverage may not make large differences on individual lots; however, as more construction takes place the small increases can add up to larger impacts on neighborhoods. After withdrawing the previous lot coverage request, the applicant removed the southwest corner of the driveway in the rear yard. Removal of the southwest corner of the driveway was a staff

recommendation for the withdrawn request. The applicant has decided not to modify any additional areas of the site and is therefore requesting approval for the 1.4 percent or 102.7 square feet of additional lot coverage.

In considering and acting upon site plans, landscape plans and other applicable plans, the Plan Commission shall take the following objectives into consideration:

1. Creation of a desirable environment.
2. Promotion of a creative approach to the use of land and related physical facilities resulting in better design and development, including aesthetic amenities.
3. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms and building relationships.
4. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features and the prevention of soil erosion.
5. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the City.
6. Use of design, landscape or architectural features to create a pleasing environment.
7. Inclusion of special features.
8. Elimination of deteriorated structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

BLAIR MEHLMAN (BM) – MEHLMAN BROTHERS DEVELOPMENT, LLC – OWNER

BM – Addressed Board to answer questions but has nothing to add to the staff report

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Comments on the shape and the trash enclosure

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

CRAIG OWNES – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

6338 SAN BONITA AVENUE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 6,065 square foot property is located on the south side of San Bonita Avenue between DeMun Avenue and Alamo Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The applicant is proposing to construct an 870.36 square foot rear addition with a patio.

The applicant is proposing to replace a small one story portion of the house and the rear yard patio with a two story addition and porch. While the size of the addition does not require formal site plan review, some elements of site plan review are still relevant. A portion of the existing house extends beyond the east side yard setback; however, the proposed addition is located within the buildable area of the lot. Lot coverage is limited to 55 percent in the R-2 Zoning District. The existing lot coverage on site is 57.76 percent. The proposed total lot coverage is 54.91 percent, which is below the maximum amount allowed. The applicant is proposing to connect the new and existing

downspouts to a pop-up emitter in the front yard. Staff would like to note that by channeling the roof runoff to a pop-up emitter in the front yard, there is less pervious area between the discharge point of the water and the public right of way. Overall impervious coverage on site is decreasing with the proposed project, so the differential runoff calculations show a 0.008 CFS decrease in runoff from the disturbance area. Two rear yard trees will be removed, and the applicant has not proposed to replace the trees, but has stated a willingness to do so. Staff recommends that at least one tree of a similar species is planted. The applicant is also removing and replacing the two existing AC units. The new location has not been determined, but the units will have to be located at least five feet from property lines and screened.

The massing of the proposed addition and patio is very similar to the existing structure. The addition will be clad in brown brick and a hip roof clad in asphalt shingles is proposed. Wood siding is proposed for the bay window. Details of the existing structure will be replicated on the addition including the window style, window sills, roof bracket details, brick lintels and the porch railing. Staff is of the opinion that the design and materials of the proposed addition are compatible with the existing structure and neighborhood character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

1. THE APPLICANT SHALL PLANT ONE TREE OF SIMILAR SPECIES TO THE TREES BEING REMOVED.
 2. THE HVAC UNITS SHALL BE LOCATED IN THE SIDE OR REAR YARD, AT LEAST FIVE FEET FROM PROPERTY LINES AND SCREENED FROM THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY AND ADJACENT PROPERTIES.”
-

MARK CRITCHFIELD (MC) – MAINLINE GROUP ARCHITECTURE

MC – Addresses Board to answer questions and notes that they plan to comply with staff recommendations and presents samples and explains what they are and where they will go.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

606 EAST POLO DRIVE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 16,718 square foot property is located at the southwest corner of the intersection between East Polo Drive and South Hanley Road. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The applicant is proposing to construct an 841 square foot rear addition and additional site alterations. The existing attached garage is located on the east side of the house with a driveway directly connecting to South Hanley Road. The applicant is proposing to modify the existing garage for living space and construct a new attached garage at the southeast corner of the house with a driveway connecting to East Polo Drive.

The applicant is proposing an addition located at the southeast corner of the exiting house. The addition ranges in height from one story to two stories. The proposed scope of work also includes converting the existing tuck-under garage, which is exposed along the east elevation, into living space. While the size of the addition does not require formal site plan review, some elements of site plan review are still relevant. On February 7, 2019, the Board of

Adjustment approved a front yard and a rear yard setback variance. Based on the Zoning Regulations a front yard setback is required along the north, east and west property lines and a rear yard setback is required along the south property line. With the approved variances, the addition is eight feet closer to South Hanley Road and 27.3 feet closer to the south property line than allowed by the R-2 Zoning Regulations.

Lot coverage is limited to 55 percent in the R-2 Zoning District. The existing lot coverage on site is 38.1 percent. The proposed total lot coverage is 47.2 percent, which is below the maximum amount allowed. The proposed garage is located near existing trees at the southeast corner of the lot. Existing trees are also located along the south property line and along East Polo Drive. The applicant is not proposing to remove the trees, so tree protection fencing should be installed during construction.

The applicant is proposing to store trash containers in a room off of the north east corner of the new garage. This location is not directly accessible from the new driveway and East Polo Drive, as required by the Architectural Review Guidelines. Staff recommends that a trash enclosure constructed of a stucco clad wall or solid fence the height of the trash containers is located at the southwest corner of the garage, off of the driveway.

A wood fence with gates is proposed along South Hanley Road to close off the existing driveway. The proposed fence material and design will match the existing wood fence located on the top of the retaining wall along South Hanley Road. A versa-lok modular block wall is proposed along the north side of the new driveway to create a raised planter bed against the house. The specific block material was not submitted. Staff recommends that the block wall conforms to the Architectural Review Guidelines for retaining wall materials and contains at least three different size blocks, a varying color pattern and tumbled or rolled edges.

The massing and style of the proposed addition is compatible with the existing structure. The addition steps down in height from the middle of the lot toward the property lines. The primary building material of the addition is stucco, to match the existing structure. Dark grey asphalt shingles and double-hung glider windows that match the existing structure are also proposed. A ten foot wide, exposed aggregate driveway is proposed leading from East Polo Drive to the attached garage. Two, single car brown paneled garage doors are proposed. The attached garage faces East Polo Drive. The Polo Subdivision does feature multiple homes with garages facing the street. Staff is of the opinion that the design and materials of the proposed addition are compatible with the existing structure and neighborhood character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

1. TREE PROTECTION FENCING SHALL BE INSTALLED ALONG THE DRIPLINE OF THE EXISTING TREES LOCATED ADJACENT TO THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION. TREE PROTECTION FENCE LOCATIONS SHALL BE SHOWN ON THE SITE PLAN.
 2. A TRASH ENCLOSURE CONSTRUCTED OF A STUCCO CLAD WALL OR SOLID FENCE THE HEIGHT OF THE TRASH CONTAINERS SHALL BE LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE GARAGE
 3. THE DRIVEWAY RETAINING WALL SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED OF A MODULAR SYSTEM THAT CONTAINS AT LEAST THREE DIFFERENT SIZE BLOCKS, A VARYING COLOR PATTERN, AND TUMBLED ROLLED EDGES.”
-

CHARLIE VOELLINGER (CV) – OWNER

CV – Addresses Board and will comply with staff recommendations and would like to note that the retaining wall they will do is not visible at all to anyone but them.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE WITH THE THREE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE TO ALLOW FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF THE INTERIOR RETAINING WALL WITH THE LARGER 6 INCH BLOCKS AS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

15 NORTH CENTRAL – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – RESTAURANT CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located on the west side of North Central Avenue between Forsyth Boulevard and Maryland Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of HDC High Density Commercial. The restaurant space measures 4400 square feet and will have a maximum of 152 seats. The space has been vacant since the previous restaurant Wheelhouse closed in 2016. JP Fields currently operates across the street at 26 North Central Avenue in a building that was recently purchased as part of a larger potential development site. The owners of JP Fields are under contract to purchase the subject building and do not plan to substantially alter the existing business operation, other than occupying a larger restaurant space.

The restaurant will be open seven days a week from 10:30 a.m. until 1:30 a.m. The restaurant concept is the same as the existing restaurant, an upscale pub featuring food and beverage services. A liquor license will be required. Delivery service from the restaurant is not proposed.

The applicant is proposing deliveries to the restaurant will be made between 8:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. through the front door. Trash will be stored in dumpsters located in the rear of the building. The applicant does intend to participate in a recycling program.

Conditional uses are those types of uses that are considered to be desirable, necessary or convenient to the community but which by their nature can create additional traffic volume, parking demand beyond the development's capacity, and/or a detrimental impact on adjacent or neighboring properties due to noise, pollutants or other characteristics associated with that particular use. Restaurants are permitted in this zoning district subject to approval of a conditional use permit as per Article VII of this Chapter and the following criteria:

1) *The proposed use is compatible with surrounding uses and with the surrounding neighborhood;*

>> The proposed restaurant is located along a pedestrian oriented block. The surrounding land uses include restaurants, retail and multi-family residential. The proposed use appears to be compatible with surrounding uses.

2) *The comparative size, floor area and mass of the proposed use and/or proposed structure are appropriate and reasonable in relation to adjacent structures and buildings on surrounding properties and in the surrounding neighborhood;*

>> The proposed size of the restaurant is 4,400 square feet and is larger than many other restaurant spaces along North Central Avenue; however, this is an existing space and building with a massing that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

- 3) *The proposed use will not adversely affect the general appearance of the neighborhood due to the location of the proposed use on the parcel of ground or due to the materials used in the construction of any proposed buildings being greatly dissimilar to surrounding appearances of buildings or due to the architecture of any proposed building being of such nature as to create visual disharmony within the neighborhood;*
- >> No exterior alterations are being proposed at this time. The applicant has stated an intent to apply for exterior alterations in the future.
- 4) *The proposed use will not adversely affect the neighborhood in terms of water runoff, noise transfer or heat generation due to significant amount of hard surfaced areas for buildings, sidewalk, drives, parking and service areas;*
- >> At this time, staff does not anticipate adverse effects with respect to water runoff, noise transfer or heat generation.
- 5) *The frequency and duration of various indoor and outdoor activities and special events associated with the proposed use will not have a deleterious impact on the surrounding area;*
- >> The applicant does intend to have an outdoor dining area. Outdoor dining for restaurants along North Central Avenue is common and encouraged to help establish the street life. The applicant will have to obtain an Outdoor Dining Permit prior to operation. Staff does not believe that operations associated with the proposed restaurant will have negative impacts on the surrounding area.
- 6) *The proposed use is likely to remain in existence for a reasonable length of time and not become vacant or unused and whether such use involves the presence of unusual, single-purpose structures or components of a temporary nature;*
- >> The proposed use does not involve single-purpose structures or temporary components.
- 7) *The proposed use complies with the standards of the Zoning Code and good planning practices;*
- >> Staff is of the opinion that the use complies with the Zoning Code.
- 8) *The landscape plan for premises to be occupied by the proposed use is adequate in regard to the creation and maintenance of landscaped areas and the use of buffers for screening of the use;*
- >> The structure is built to the sidewalk along North Central Avenue and no landscaping is proposed as part of this project.
- 9) *The impact of projected vehicular traffic volumes and site access is not detrimental with regard to the surrounding traffic flow, pedestrian safety and accessibility of emergency vehicles and equipment;*
- >> Existing site access is adequate and there are no proposed changes.
- >> Deliveries to the restaurant will be made using the front door. Staff is of the opinion that the delivery vehicles should use the parking area behind the building, located off of the east-west alley, for stopping to minimize traffic impacts along North Central Avenue.

10) *The proposed use complies with the parking requirements as set forth in the Zoning Code and does not add parking demand that cannot adequately be handled by on-site off-street parking;*

>> Because the restaurant is greater than 3,000 square feet, off-street parking for patrons is required. The applicant is in the process of securing a parking agreement similar to the agreement used by the previous tenant Wheelhouse. Based on the size and seating capacity of the restaurant, 29 off-street parking spaces are required. The applicant shall provide proof of a parking agreement prior to obtaining an Occupancy Permit.

11) *The number of transit movements on abutting streets and on minor streets in the neighborhood to be generated by or associated with the proposed use will not cause significant increases in hourly or daily traffic levels;*

>> The proposed use is not likely to affect transit movements.

12) *The proposed use will not significantly increase demands on fire and Police protection services in excess of the individual demands of adjacent land uses and whether the proposed use will not present any real or potential fire or public safety hazard;*

>> Staff is of the opinion that there will not be a significant increase in demand for fire and police protection services.

13) *Added noise levels generated by activities associated with the proposed use will not adversely impact the ambient noise level of the surrounding area and neighborhood;*

>> Outdoor dining on the street is popular and staff does not believe the proposed restaurant will adversely impact the ambient noise level of the surrounding area.

14) *The activities associated with the proposed use will not generate obnoxious odors to the detriment of the surrounding area;*

>> Staff does not anticipate that the restaurant will generate obnoxious odors.

15) *The intensity, duration or frequency of lighting associated with the proposed use will not adversely impact adjacent properties or significantly increase the ambient level of night light in the neighborhood;*

>> There is no additional exterior lighting proposed.

16) *Where a proposed use has the potential for adverse impacts, sufficient measures have been or will be taken by the applicant that would negate, to an acceptable level, such potentially adverse impacts. (Ord. No. 5814 §1(9.9), 4-27-04)*

>> At this time, there does not appear to be adverse impacts associated with the proposed use.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed restaurant meets the requirements contained in the regulations governing conditional uses. The proposed hours of operation and method of deliveries are consistent with other restaurants in this area. Based on the information regarding the operation of the restaurant as provided by the applicant, staff is of the opinion that the proposed restaurant will be compatible with surrounding uses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE APPLICANT SHALL SECURE AND MAINTAIN FOR THE LIFE OF THE RESTAURANT, AN AGREEMENT FOR 29 OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES LOCATED WITHIN 500 FEET OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AND SHALL SUBMIT PROOF OF SUCH AGREEMENT TO THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT PRIOR TO OBTAINING AN OCCUPANCY PERMIT.

2. DELIVERY VEHICLES SHALL PARK IN THE REAR OF THE BUILDING, OFF THE EAST-WEST ALLEY. DELIVERIES MAY BE MADE THROUGH THE FRONT DOOR.”

APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT

RON REIM – MOTION TO TABLE

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

15 CARRSWOLD DRIVE – SITE PLAN REVIEW – NEW SINGLE FAMILY

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 40,434 square foot site is located on the west side of Carrswold Drive. The property has a zoning designation of R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District. The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing house and construction of a 5,143 square foot single-family residence. The height of the proposed residence is 34 feet as measured from the average existing grade to the mean height of the roof.

The purpose of the site plan review process is to provide a review of the following criteria listed below:

2. *A project's compatibility with its environment and with other land uses and buildings existing in the surrounding area.*
 - >> The surrounding properties contain single-family homes. The project meets the setback, height, and impervious coverage requirements of the R-1 Zoning District.
3. *The location and screening of a project's air-conditioning units and other associated equipment.*
 - >> The plans show the HVAC units located along the southern elevation of the house with landscape screening located along the fence line. The City’s contracted landscape architect is of the opinion that the proposed landscape will not provide the screening required. A screen fence or additional landscape should be located adjacent to the equipment.
 - >> The pool equipment is shown along the west elevation of the pool house with screening provided by a wood shadowbox fence.
4. *The location, adequacy and screening for trash.*
 - >> Trash will be stored in a 77-square-foot trash enclosure located at the northeast corner of the attached garage with direct access from the driveway. The trash enclosure will be constructed of a stucco clad wall with a limestone cap and a black wood gate.
5. *Provisions for storm surface drainage shall be in accordance with the City’s design standards. Stormwater drainage shall be connected to a storm sewer whenever one is available as determined by the City.*

Disposal of storm or natural waters both on and off the site shall be provided in such a manner as not to have a detrimental effect on the property of others or the public right-of-way.

Impervious Coverage

- >> In the R-1 Zoning District, impervious coverage is limited to 55 percent of the total lot area. The existing impervious coverage on site is 15.2 percent. The proposed plans increase the impervious coverage to 40 percent.
- >> Front yard impervious coverage is limited to 45 percent. The proposed front yard coverage is 16 percent.

Stormwater Runoff

- >> The existing stormwater runoff, according to the MSD 15 year, 20 minute storm calculation is 1.84 cubic feet per second (CFS). The proposed runoff is 2.23 CFS, which represents a 0.39 CFS increase. Downspouts will be piped to an underground collection tank located near the southeast corner of the house. The stormwater plan has been reviewed and deemed acceptable.

6. *The applicant is required to submit a separate landscape plan showing existing trees, trees to be removed and trees to be replaced by canopy cover, species and condition. Such plans must reflect City of Clayton preservation standards.*

- >> The proposed landscape plan provides an attractive planting design of trees, shrubs, perennials and groundcover. There are some outstanding tree and landscape comments from the City's contracted landscape architect that should be addressed under the Building Permit submission. Comments include screening of mechanical equipment, overuse of certain species and buffers at property lines. There is 79,193-square-feet of existing canopy coverage on site with 70,686-square-feet being removed. The proposed plan has a deficit of 246-square-feet of canopy coverage and does not meet the native tree requirement with only 17.3 percent native. The applicant shall make revisions to the proposed landscape plan to address comments and meet the native tree requirement. If additional canopy coverage is not provided, the applicant shall pay a fee into the City's Forestry Fund.

7. *The site plan must state that all driveways, sidewalks, curbs and gutters are to be installed in accordance with the standards prescribed by the Public Works Department.*

- >> The site plan states that all driveways, sidewalks, curbs and gutters are to be installed in accordance with the standards prescribed by the Public Works Department.

8. *Provision of hookups to public utilities connections shall be installed in accordance with the standards of the Public Works Department. All connections shall be shown on the site plan.*

- >> The new utility connections are located in the northern half of the front yard. The utilities plan has been reviewed and deemed acceptable.

9. *All developments shall provide adequate lighting to assure safety and security. Lighting installations shall not have an adverse impact on traffic safety or on the surrounding area. Light sources shall be shielded and there shall be no spillover onto adjacent properties*

- >> Exterior lighting is proposed at all exterior doors and at the garage. All exterior lights will be 75 watts or less.

In considering and acting upon site plans, landscape plans and other applicable plans, the Plan Commission shall take the following objectives into consideration:

1. Creation of a desirable environment.

2. Promotion of a creative approach to the use of land and related physical facilities resulting in better design and development, including aesthetic amenities.
3. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms and building relationships.
4. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features and the prevention of soil erosion.
5. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the City.
6. Use of design, landscape or architectural features to create a pleasing environment.
7. Inclusion of special features.
8. Elimination of deteriorated structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation.

The height, setbacks and impervious coverage as proposed are in conformance with the requirements of the R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District. Stormwater will be adequately managed on site and the landscape plan features plantings that are appropriate for the size of the site and character of the neighborhood. Staff is of the opinion that the project meets the criteria for site plan approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

1. THE APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS OUTSTANDING COMMENTS IN THE CITY’S CONTRACTED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT’S LETTER DATED MARCH 27, 2019 (ATTACHED).
 2. TO ENSURE THE FUTURE MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF THE UNDERGROUND STORMWATER COLLECTION TANK, THE APPLICANT SHALL RECORD THE APPROVED SITE PLAN WITH ST. LOUIS COUNTY, AND SUBMIT PROOF OF RECORDING TO THE CITY.”
-

PAUL FENDER (PF) – ARCHITECT

PF – Addresses Board but does not have anything to add to the staff report

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Is there a fence that will go around the pool?

PF – Yes, it is shown on the site plan. A1

CAROLYN GAIDIS – Isn’t most of the aggregate a Meramec why are you using a dark one? Black absorbs the heat, so lighter colors are better for the environment. The dark aggregate creates a heat island. Has this come up with Staff?

ANNA KRANE – No, we have not discussed the urban heat island.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE WITH THE TWO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS.

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

15 CARRSWOLD DRIVE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – NEW SINGLE FAMILY

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 40,434 square foot site is located on the west side of Carrswold Drive. The property has a zoning designation of R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District. The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing house and construction of a 5,143 square foot single-family residence. The height of the proposed residence is 34 feet as measured from the average existing grade to the mean height of the roof.

The basic massing of the proposed two-story home is articulated on all sides with windows, doors, and variations in roof lines. The proposed house has some more contemporary elements than other surrounding homes; however, the proposed design also has many elements that are similar to surrounding homes. The form includes variations in roof lines and massing, which break down the overall size of the house. This is a characteristic also found on many of the other houses in the Carrswold Subdivision. A detached pool house is proposed west of the attached garage. The pool house massing is similar to the proposed primary structure. Staff is of the opinion that the shape and height are compatible with neighborhood character.

The Carrswold Subdivision has many traditional homes dominated by the use of standard size brick in a variety of red tones and stone; however, there are also many homes with stucco accents. The primary building material for the proposed home is white/grey stucco with limestone accents. A slate roof is proposed with small areas of metal roof. Black casement windows are also proposed. The pool house materials are proposed to match the primary structure.

The Architectural Review Guidelines state that the primary building material of homes should be brick and/or stone and that the amount of stucco used on new construction should be consistent with the existing use of stucco in the neighborhood. The applicant is requesting approval of new house with a primary building material of stucco despite the existing use of stucco in the neighborhood being limited to an accent material. The proposed house has received trustee approval. Staff is of the opinion that stucco is a compatible building material with the existing neighborhood character.

A black pigmented, exposed aggregate driveway is proposed on the north side of the home that leads to an attached side entry garage with metal and glass paneled garage doors. A permeable sport court material is proposed in the northwest corner of the lot, extending from the driveway along the side of the pool house.

Stone clad retaining walls are proposed for the front porch and parking area at the northeast corner of the house. Stucco clad retaining walls are proposed along the north side of the driveway, west property line and the terraced lawn along the south property line. A black aluminum fence is proposed to enclose the rear yard. A cedar wood fence is proposed surrounding the pool equipment in the northwest corner of the lot. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed retaining walls and fence are compatible with the proposed house and surrounding character.

The project as proposed is in conformance with the requirements of the R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District and the Architectural Review Guidelines, with the exception of the primary stucco material. Staff is of the opinion that the plan is compatible in terms of mass, height, and design with existing nearby homes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

PAUL FENDER (PF) – ARCHITECT

PF – Addresses Board to answer questions and speaks about the project and the neighborhood outreach that was done and the Carrswold Trustees have also approved.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Feels it will fit in very nicely with the neighborhood. Can you drive on the sport court?

PF – Yes, it will be drivable

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

22 & 23 CARRSWOLD DRIVE – SITE PLAN REVIEW – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The proposed project is located on two adjacent lots under common ownership. The subject properties are located at the southern end of the Carrswold Subdivision, adjacent to the entrance from Wydown Boulevard. The southern lot, addressed 22 Carrswold Drive, is 48,004 square feet. The northern lot, addressed 23 Carrswold Drive, is 62,728 square feet. The properties have a zoning designation of R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District. The proposed project consists landscape renovations, retaining walls and a front circle driveway extension. Portions of the improvements proposed cross the property line; however, the applicant is not proposing to consolidate the lots at this time.

The applicant is proposing a significant new landscape plan for both properties. Based on the landscape and regrading proposed, a partial site plan review was required. The following staff report includes portions of site plan review that are applicable to the proposed project. Criteria of a full site plan review that are not within the scope of the proposed project have been omitted.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

The purpose of the site plan review process is to provide a review of the following criteria listed below:

1. *A project's compatibility with its environment and with other land uses and buildings existing in the surrounding area.*
 - >> The surrounding properties contain single-family homes. The project meets the setback and impervious coverage requirements of the R-1 Zoning District.
2. *The location and screening of a project's air-conditioning units and other associated equipment.*
 - >> The applicant is proposing to relocate the pool equipment into the basement of the existing pool house. The applicant is not proposing to relocate any other mechanical equipment.
3. *Provisions for storm surface drainage shall be in accordance with the City's design standards. Stormwater drainage shall be connected to a storm sewer whenever one is available as determined by the City. Disposal of storm or natural waters both on and off the site shall be provided in such a manner as not to have a detrimental effect on the property of others or the public right-of-way.*

Runoff

- >> There is an existing runoff swale located at the northwest corner of 22 Carrswold Drive and the southwest corner of 23 Carrswold Drive. The applicant is proposing to install a retaining wall in the

area of the existing swale and channel the runoff under the retaining wall. The proposed plan results in the point of daylight at the property line. Water will go directly onto the open subdivision land west of the subject properties. Some surface runoff will flow along the base of the retaining wall, following the existing runoff path. The existing runoff results in water reaching the open subdivision land as well; however, historically the City has required the point of daylight to be at least ten feet from the property lines. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed plan will not result in a significant increase in the amount of runoff reaching the open subdivision land and recommends approval of the proposed plan, with confirmation that the Subdivision Trustees understand and accept the plan.

Impervious Coverage

>> The applicant is not consolidating the two lots, so each separate lot needs to conform to the coverage regulations. In the R-1 Zoning District, impervious coverage is limited to 55 percent of the total lot area. The proposed lot coverage on 22 Carrswold Drive is 30.6 percent. The proposed lot coverage on 23 Carrswold Drive is 48.8 percent. Front yard impervious coverage is less than 45 percent on both lots.

4. *The applicant is required to submit a separate landscape plan showing existing trees, trees to be removed and trees to be replaced by canopy cover, species and condition. Such plans must reflect City of Clayton preservation standards.*

>> The proposed landscape plan provides an attractive arrangement of trees, shrubs, perennials and groundcover; however, the planting plan is conceptual and will require more review once it is finalized. There are minor outstanding comments in the City's contracted landscape architect's letter dated March 28, 2019, which should be addressed by the applicant during permit review. The combined sites provide 122,826 square feet of canopy coverage with 36,982 square feet being removed. The proposed plan provides a surplus of 48,019 square feet of canopy coverage.

5. *All developments shall provide adequate lighting to assure safety and security. Lighting installations shall not have an adverse impact on traffic safety or on the surrounding area. Light sources shall be shielded and there shall be no spillover onto adjacent properties*

>> Sconce lights are proposed on the stone pillars in the front and rear yards.

In considering and acting upon site plans, landscape plans and other applicable plans, the Plan Commission shall take the following objectives into consideration:

1. Creation of a desirable environment.
2. Promotion of a creative approach to the use of land and related physical facilities resulting in better design and development, including aesthetic amenities.
3. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms and building relationships.
4. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features and the prevention of soil erosion.
5. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the City.
6. Use of design, landscape or architectural features to create a pleasing environment.
7. Inclusion of special features.
8. Elimination of deteriorated structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation.

The proposed project is in conformance with the requirements of the R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District, with the exception of the proposed drainage line. The landscape plan features plantings that are

appropriate for the size of the site and character of the neighborhood. Staff is of the opinion that the project meets the criteria for site plan approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

1. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A STATEMENT FROM THE SUBDIVISION TRUSTEES REGARDING APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED DRAINAGE PLAN.

2. THE APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS OUTSTANDING COMMENTS CONTAINED IN THE CITY’S CONTRACTED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT’S LETTER DATED MARCH 28, 2019.”

TED SPAID (TS) – ARCHITECT

TS – Addresses Board to answer questions and indicates that they accept the conditions and that they are working with an engineer to work on the storm water and will work with the trustees to ensure that it is properly mitigated.

STEVE BURROWS (SB) – CARRSWOLD TRUSTEES ASSOCIATION – 16 CARRSWOLD

SB – Wants to thank Ted for the engagement with the trustees. There may not be more water, the design calls for high concentration through a pipe with will increase velocity of the water and we are concerned with erosion in our common ground. We want to make sure the excess water is managed and we protect the trees from the excess water and additional saturation. We would like to see the specific drainage plan so we can be more comfortable with it. We haven’t seen the contract landscape architect’s letter and we would like to see it. Support the plan and hope to work to get the runoff under control.

TS – We are bringing in a civil engineer and will work with trustees. With the rain garden we will deal with a lot of the water issues but we do want the civil engineer to come in and let us know how much water will be coming out of that pipe.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE WITH THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

CAROLYN GAIDIS – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

22 & 23 CARRSWOLD DRIVE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – ALTERATION/EXTERIOR RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The proposed project is located on two adjacent lots under common ownership. The subject properties are located at the southern end of the Carrswold Subdivision, adjacent to the entrance from Wydown Boulevard. The southern lot, addressed 22 Carrswold Drive, is 48,004 square feet. The northern lot, addressed 23 Carrswold Drive, is 62,728 square feet. The properties have a zoning designation of R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District. The proposed project consists landscape renovations, retaining walls and a front circle driveway extension. Portions of the improvements proposed cross the property line; however, the applicant is not proposing to consolidate the lots at this time.

23 Carrswold Drive currently has a front yard circle driveway. The applicant is proposing to remove the southern portion of the existing drive and extend the driveway across the front yard of 22 Carrswold Drive to the southeast

corner of the lot. The applicant is also proposing a small driveway extension in the northwest corner of the 23 Carrswold Drive lot. The existing driveway is asphalt lined with a granite curb and concrete paver aprons. The applicant is proposing to match the existing materials for all driveway extensions. The applicant is proposing to repair the existing asphalt drive along the west property line of 22 Carrswold Drive.

Section 405.1730.A.1.i of the Zoning Regulations states that, “Lots in excess of fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet and having one hundred (100) lineal feet of frontage or more may install two (2) drive approaches to accommodate a turnaround, with the written approval from the Director of Public Works and subject to Architectural Review Board approval (all other lots shall be limited to one (1) drive approach).” The subject lots are both greater than 15,000 square feet in area and have 150 feet of frontage. The subject property is located in a private subdivision and therefore, the Director of Public Works does not need to approve the second curb cut.

The Carrswold Neighborhood contains many front circle driveways and many asphalt driveways. The Architectural Review Guidelines state that asphalt is not an approved driveway material; however, the applicant is only proposing a driveway extension and staff is of the opinion that having only part of the driveway constructed of a preferred material would not result in an appealing or cohesive appearance. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed driveway material, location and design are consistent with neighborhood character.

The applicant is proposing stone columns and a gate at both entries to the circle drive. The stone columns will measure seven feet five inches tall and will feature a sconce on the top. The southern drive entry will also feature short stone retaining walls on either side that vary in height with a maximum height of 30 inches. A custom black aluminum gate is proposed across the driveway. The proposed walls and gates do not enclose the entire property and will act as an accent feature at the property entrances. Landscape is proposed around the base of the walls. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed material, location and scale of the entry features are compatible with the existing structures and neighborhood character.

The applicant is proposing to relocate the existing flagpole to the middle of the two properties. A short stone retaining wall is proposed to create the flagpole area. The applicant is proposing a new limestone paver patio adjacent to the entrance of 22 Carrswold Drive. The existing stone retaining wall adjacent to the proposed patio will be extended. A new stone clad retaining wall is also proposed in the rear yard to extend the yard area around the existing pool and pool house. The proposed wall will match the existing walls and primary structure materials. A metal pool fence with stone columns is proposed on top of the wall. Landscape is also proposed around the wall area. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed wall design and materials are compatible with the existing structures and neighborhood character.

The project as proposed is in conformance with the requirements of the R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District and the Architectural Review Guidelines, with the exception of the asphalt driveway material. Staff is of the opinion that the design is compatible in terms of mass, height, and design with existing nearby homes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

TED SPAID (TS) – ARCHITECT

TS – Nothing to add to the staff report.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

CAROLYN GAIDIS – SECOND

BOARD – UNANIMOUS YAY

HAVING NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE COMMISSION, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 1940

Recording Secretary