

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS – CITY HALL
MONDAY, JULY 15, 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, Interim City Manager Janet Watson, Aldermanic Representative Richard Lintz, and Carolyn Gaidis answered roll call.

Ron Reim and Brian Maguire arrived after Minutes were approved.

Absent: William Liebermann

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Stephanie Karr, City Attorney
Susan M. Istenes, AIPC, Planning Director

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 July 1, 2019, were presented for approval

RICHARD LINTZ – MOTION TO APPROVE JULY 1, 2019 MINUTES.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – SECOND

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE BOARD. 4-0

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD NOTES THAT THIS IS FOR CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY AND SO THE APPLICANT MAY GET FEEDBACK FROM THE BOARD AND THE PUBLIC.

8015 – 8049 FORSYTH BOULEVARD – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW – NEW MIXED USE

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 56,951-square-foot site is located on the north side of Forsyth Boulevard between North Brentwood Boulevard and North Meramec Avenue. The properties located at 8015 - 8027 Forsyth Boulevard have a zoning designation of HDC High Density Commercial District and are within the Downtown Core Overlay District. The property located at 8049 Forsyth Boulevard has a zoning designation of Planned Unit Development. The site is currently made up of five parcels improved with two-story buildings and surface parking. Adjacent land uses include a Special Development District with office/commercial to the west and office/ retail uses to the north, east and south. On January 9, 2018, the Board of Aldermen granted the then applicant, Flaherty & Collins Development, Inc., a Planned Unit Development for the construction of a new 22 story mixed-use building to be known as Shaw Park Tower located at 8049 Forsyth Boulevard. That project has not been developed and this new project is proposed.

The new project consists of the demolition of the existing parking lot and structures and the construction of a 427,000-square-foot, 14-story mixed-use building containing 195,000 square feet of commercial office space and 245,000 square feet of structured parking providing 778 parking spaces for use by the tenants and the public. On the top of the east side of the parking structure, a roof top terrace garden is proposed. Ground floor retail fronting Brentwood Boulevard and portions of Forsyth Avenue is proposed; however, the applicant did not indicate the amount of ground floor retail in terms of area. The proposed building will be constructed of precast concrete panels and window walls. Access to the parking structure on site is proposed from the existing east-west alley off of Brentwood Boulevard.

The project will be developed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and will require public hearings before the Plan Commission and the Board of Aldermen. Portions of the property have a zoning designation of Downtown Core Overlay with a base zoning of High Density Commercial District. The Downtown Core Overlay seeks to maintain a retail center development pattern and foster a pedestrian friendly environment. The remainder of the property has a PUD zoning designation. A project in this zoning district is eligible for rezoning to a PUD when the development includes two of five listed use categories and exceeds the maximum height permitted or the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) permitted. This project qualifies by proposing retail and office along with a proposed height of 14-stories and a FAR of 7.94. The proposed commercial building also surpasses the minimum 50,000-square-foot building space requirement for a PUD.

The property is located in the Park View District as identified in the Downtown Clayton Master Plan. The vision of the Park View District is “high and mid-rise buildings along the eastern and northern edges of Shaw Park that capitalize on the exceptional views of and adjacency to the park.” The proposed development and design appears to create an active pedestrian oriented street environment along Forsyth and Brentwood Boulevards.

STAFF CONSIDERATIONS:

A project of this scale requires a thorough staff review prior to a public hearing. The project will be reviewed and is subject to comments by the Planning, Public Works, and Fire Departments, and also the City’s contracted consultants for landscaping, architecture, stormwater management, traffic and parking. Staff recommends that the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board consider the proposal and provide input. This is 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. Staff offers the following comments based on the conceptual plans presented:

Planning:

1. Explain if the roof top terrace garden on top of the parking garage will be accessible to the general public.
2. Consider providing areas for outdoor seating and dining for the first-floor retail tenants.
3. Explain the corner treatment at the ground level at the intersection of Forsyth and Brentwood

Building and Fire:

1. The proposed building will be classified as a high rise.
2. The exterior walls will need to meet fire ratings per Table 602 of the 2015 IBC and protected openings shall be per 705.8.2 of the 2015 IBC.

Public Works:

1. The developer will be responsible for submitting payment to the City for a Traffic Impact and Parking Study, to be managed by the Public Works Department.
 2. The developer shall relocate all adjacent overhead utilities to underground.
 3. The developer shall dedicate property to the City, increasing the width of the public alley to the east to meet the 24-foot width standard.
 4. The developer shall restore and update the streetscape frontage along Forsyth Boulevard per the City standards.
-

SCOTT HALEY (SH) – Applicant

GARY FADER (GF) – Attorney – Office address: 190 Carondelet Plaza, 63105

CHRIS CEDARGREEN (CG) – Designer of project

SH – This development is designed to be a 13+ story building that sits at a very prominent corner which embraces Shaw Park. Some of the notable components of our building is the square footage. The garden terrace is the roof of the parking structure that will be a functioning outdoor space for visitors, and the public at certain times of the year. The street level commercial space is roughly about 13,000sqft which will include an arts and entertainment venue that we have committed to the City on. During the last two months we have reached out to Maryland Walk residence and members of their HOA and they gave us an opportunity to speak to their residence and to the board and really to introduce ourselves, the project, and a chance to advance the redevelopment of this block.

GF – After this evening, our next step is to formally file an application for a PUD Rezoning and then hopefully getting a recommendation from you to move onto the BOA for a PUD to be put in place. The PUD ord, which is on your agenda tonight for revisions, we have assumed will be enacted so we have taken it into account with this project. Our slides will demonstrate, we have tried show that we are seeking to comply with your zoning ordinance as it relates to a PUD. This is appropriate because it combined office and retail and has more than the square footage required to apply for a PUD. In addition the existing zoning would impose requirements with height of the building, as well as the floor area ratio which we would not comply with without a PUD. We will demonstrate why we are deserving of a PUD. Part of rezoning to a PUD is the ability to provide public benefits. As we have indicted we will comply with the ordinance.

CG – I have been working on this project for a long time, this side of town and this location with fantastic view of Shaw Park is ideal. Explains PowerPoint presentation and the grade of the property which is something that really needed to be accommodated. We offer almost 800 parking spaces in the garage. As Gary and Scott mentioned earlier, the amount of retail that we have facing both Brentwood and Forsyth is substantial and really

dominates everything with the exception of the lobby and the entrance to the building. There is an element on the corner of Forsyth and Brentwood that compliments the park along the way. The parking you see is all at grade and is accessed off the alley. Much of that parking will be for public use and used by tenants in the building but we do have ample parking in the garage that would meet both the public requirement and the office space requirements. There is loading off the alley as well.

RICHARD LINTZ – you have the sidewalk as 13-6 on the drawing and that is wrong and it will be 16’?

CG – Yes, that is correct. It will be 16’. The 7th floor will be a meeting facilities floor and the access to the greenspace terrace area. It is 120x220 feet. The idea is that this building is active past business levels. Not only at the street level but the 7th floor meeting area and terrace access.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – So the green terrace level would be available to the public?

CG – It would be available to the public at certain times. It can be used but there are details to work out. There is an express lift that takes you right up to this floor. The idea is it is available to be used but we need to figure out the details.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – So it would be controlled public access?

CG – Yes. We’ll leave it at that. Explains more about the architecture of the building and the materials shown on the drawing and powerpoint.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – You have a one story semi-circular, very small related to the size of the building gesture to the chapman plaza and Shaw Park across the street. You get above that and there is no gesture at all to the green open space that is cattycorner. It doesn’t even relate to the gesture that the Shaw Park office building did where the entire corner is revealed all the way up. I would recommend that you consider addressing that corner more strongly where it would relate to Shaw Park. It is a very strong strong street wall and I think that in this area we do not have those very strong street walls, that you indicated are 16’ back from the curb. We like the wider sidewalks but if you go down Brentwood you’ll find a variety of street walls that move in and out and they are much more accommodating to people walking by than a flat street wall. Maybe what I’m getting at is you’ve come too far out to the building permitted line at that point. With that street wall, I’d like to see more relief and more potential for some public green or open area. Which I don’t really see at all at the street. When I walked the site walking up and down Brentwood and Forsyth, trying to picture this and then going across the street to the Plaza I felt that what were looking at is a garage on the currently most prominent piece of property in this city. I don’t think that is what our expectations are. Now granted I see a nice glassy office building above it. But when you are on the street, driving or walking or in the park you’re going to see a garage. So I am strongly questioning where that garage is. Typically we are seeing our garages go under ground or mid block but not taking a prominent corner where it would be so visible. When I look at the garage and I read there is 770 space in there with 700 to serve the tenants it seems like there are way to many spaces for the size of the building and the retail in there. If you could help me understand why and what the parking ratio is based on sqft of the occupied space I would appreciate it. Going back to the visual that this is a garage sitting on our corner and that we have very strong street walls I question the life of the street. I’m not sure that this would be anything more than a 9-5 use building. I don’t see much use for this project either before 8 or 9 in the morning or after 5 or 6 in the evening. Now we went through this with the previous one but there they had some retail but they also had people living in that building 24 hours a day. That tends to give a little more street life than does an office building. I am throwing the question back to you, how do you increase street life when most of the day, plus most of the weekend will have no occupied street life in the space. Public amenities – a garage that can be used by the public, yes. I’m not sure where the restaurant would be when I look at the retail

areas they seem somewhat narrow for restaurants and exceptionally narrow for any arts and entertainment venue. If you recall we had a jazz club several years ago that was crammed into a very narrow space. I see that problem here where it wasn't designed for an entertainment venue. The green and open space I have already commented on. I think the idea of arts and entertainment venue is a good one but I'm not sure it's really developed yet. I'll stop there and let other people talk.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – I have a question about parking

CG – So were looking at 4/1000 to be able to accommodate office users. Then we have retail to accommodate at 4-5/1000 as well then public parking. As we have been developing this building and the entire block, we thought about how the building can be a great neighbor in the future for future development because the site to the east where commerce is is a very small site so there could be shared parking and take advantage of a shared parking solution. I think that right now the parking that we have is very close to what we need to support the building and the users that are going to be there and so that's what has driven that number and we don't want to build anymore parking than what is required to support the building. Because it's a cost that makes no sense to invest in. So we are still in the conceptual phases and as we look at that parking it seems to make sense from a user demand and marketing view point as well.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – I really like the expression at the top I think it is beautiful and have zero issue with any of that. The garage itself in that corner, I had the same reaction as Steve, that slice that you have for the entry that goes all the way up, is there anyway to have that on the corner?

CG – We could definitely look at that.

RON REIM – When we looked at the last one we had some issues with them having to do everything off the alley and you all are having to do that same that must be the solution that works with the building. I don't know how you work it around it.

CG – If you take it onto the street you have these holes that interrupt the pedestrian area. I think having a wider alley and opening the corners definitely helps.

RICHARD LINTZ – As the Aldermen representative I think we like people to walk up and be impressed with building and not have their impression be oh my look at that garage. I think now that is what will happen and I hate to say that. There must be ways to deal with that, people do it all over the country somehow.

RON REIM – I think working with all that street frontage on Forsyth was a lot easier than when it was all split up between the F&C and other properties.

CG – We will take these comments and definitely try and address them all.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – You have a half block and I think we would like to see that other half when you come back.

NEW BUSINESS

73 CRESTWOOD DRIVE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – EXTERIOR ALTERATION/RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The approximately 17,634.2 square foot site is located at the northwest corner of the Crestwood Drive along Clayton Road in the Claverach Park Subdivision. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The proposed project consists of the construction of a 6-foot high wood privacy fence along the eastern property line extending to Clayton Road.

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 proposed design and materials of the fence are not consistent with the Architectural Review Board’s preference for ornamental or decorative fencing in front yards; however, the proposed fence is consistent with other fences along this area of Clayton Road. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed fence is compatible with neighborhood character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

RON REIM – Recuses himself, applicant is financial advisor

KERRY VETTER (KV) – 73 Crestwood

SI – explains dual frontage.

KV – I was approved to have the fence ½ across my backyard – in the middle of my yard. So my request is to have the fence go down to the tree line.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – How far north to Clayton road would the fence stop?

KV – About maybe 3 feet back from the sidewalk.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – Motion to approve as submitted

BRIAN MAGUIRE - Second

All – Aye

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 6,094 square foot site is located on the east side of North Brentwood Boulevard between Maryland Avenue and Westmoreland Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of R-4 Low Density Multi Family Dwelling District and is currently developed with the vacant building that formerly housed the YWCA. This is one of four lots which will be developed in this block for single family residential. The applicant is proposing a new, three-story single-family residence with 7,055 square feet of air-conditioned space, and an attached, front entry garage. The building height is proposed to be +/-40 feet 9 inches. The maximum allowable building height in the R-4 district is 3-stories or 45 feet, whichever is less.

The purpose of the site plan review process is to provide a review of the 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 immediately to the north and south are undeveloped but planned for future single-family structures. The property to the west is currently being developed with a single-family structure and the property to the west is developed with a parking lot. The project meets the setback and height requirements of the R-4 Zoning District.
2. *The location and screening of a project's air-conditioning units and other associated equipment.*
 - >> The proposed HVAC units are located along the northern elevation of the home and are inset into the structure and are screened by landscaping.
3. *The location, adequacy and screening for trash.*
 - >> Trash will be stored in a 64-square-foot trash enclosure within the lower level adjacent to the garage.
4. *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

- >> The existing total lot impervious coverage on site is 54.02 percent (lot 2). The new plans increase the total lot impervious coverage to 57.56 percent (a 3.54 percent increase), which is above the maximum allowed impervious coverage of 55 percent by 2.56 percent. The proposed plans have a front yard coverage of 49.59 percent, which is above the 45 percent maximum by 4.59 percent. The applicant is requesting the Plan Commission approve a modification of up to an additional five percent (5%) over the impervious coverage requirement. In instances where an applicant can demonstrate just cause, the Plan Commission has the authority to approve a modification of up to fifty percent (50%) in the front yard and up to sixty percent (60%) overall. For the front yard, the applicant requests the additional area in order to ensure there is sufficient room for vehicular movement in the driveway and for the total yard, the additional area is requested so that the house can have a desired rear patio size.

Stormwater Runoff

- >> The existing stormwater runoff, according to the MSD 15-year, 20-minute calculation, is 0.404 cubic feet per second (CFS). The proposed runoff is 0.454 CFS, which represents a 0.05 CFS increase. Downspouts from the home will be piped to the drywell system in the front yard. The stormwater management plan has been reviewed and deemed acceptable.

5. *The applicant is required to submit a separate landscape plan showing existing trees, trees to be removed and trees to be replaced by caliper, species and condition. Such plans must reflect City of Clayton preservation standards.*
 - >> The landscape plan provides an attractive planting design of trees, shrubs, perennials and groundcover. The existing canopy coverage on site is 8,836 square-feet and will be removed. The proposed plan provides a surplus of 1,972 square feet of canopy coverage and exceeds the native tree requirement with 50 percent native. One existing street tree is to remain and the second will be removed and replaced for the proposed driveway.
6. *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.
7. *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.*
 - >> All connections to public utilities are shown on the plans to be installed in accordance with the standards of the Public Works Department.
8. *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 doors and 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 proposed home is compatible with surrounding homes in the neighborhood. Stormwater will be adequately managed on site and the landscape plan provides for an attractive design with a variety of trees, shrubs and perennials that are suitable for the area. The applicant is requesting that the Plan Commission approve a modification to the stormwater coverage to accommodate the driveway and patio, should the Plan Commission determine the applicant has provided just cause. Staff is of the opinion that the project meets the criteria for site plan approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. To ensure the future maintenance and operation of the dry wells, the applicant shall record the approved site plan with St. Louis County, and submit proof of recording to the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 2. The developer and Engineer of Record are responsible for mitigating sump pump discharge if a future nuisance is created.
 3. The Developer shall pay \$8,562.85 to the City of Clayton, prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, for removal of the street tree, a Pin Oak identified on the plans as EX 1.
 4. The Air Conditioning units shall be completely screened at the time of planting, by the proposed vegetative screening.
 5. The permanent ornamental fence to be installed along the east (rear) property line may serve as a construction fence and shall comply with adopted City Building Codes for Fences.
 6. Tree protection fencing shall be installed and maintained pursuant to the notes listed on sheet L2 of the approved site plan.
 7. To ensure the future maintenance and operation of the dry wells, the applicant shall record the approved site plan with St. Louis County, and submit proof of recording to the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.
-

DOUGLAS LEIPZIGER – CIVIL DESIGN INC. – CIVIL ENGINEER
Chris Pike

DL – We are requesting an addition 5%. The owner is very concerned with vehicle maneuverability so the owner can get in and out easily. Of all four lots, this lot has the smallest front yard. So it is difficult to fit the driveway with all the green space without going over a little bit with the total impervious coverage. Also from a safety stand point, the road it is off is highly trafficked, and we thought it would be beneficial for a somewhat larger driveway to maneuver in and out if they need to when leaving or entering the home. We have also heard from a neighbor up the street and one of the walls juts into the area of the driveway and they have hit it a few times from what we've heard. So a wider driveway is a big concern for us. The total we could be under if we had no rear patio. So that is why we want the extra on the total lot coverage. In regards to storm water, right now it is a big building with a parking lot and this lot by itself will have a drywell. All of the stormwater for all the properties are going east to west. So it is not going to any neighboring properties. We will be doing all 4 lots so we will be doing the same process for all lots. Taking the existing proposed and then calculating the proposed to mitigate it property.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – On C7 could you help me understand, there is four areas on this lot.

DL – We are putting a new public storm sewer on the lot so they wont be draining directly to the street. Any thing from the building or the driveway will be going to a storm sewer in the front yard that goes north and ties into an inlet in Westmoreland. It's been submitted to MSD and they haven't had a comment.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – You have one drywell?

DL – That's correct and if it overflows it goes into the new storm sewer which is VERY unlikely.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – Take out the Vinca – it's bad stuff and your native to non-native is not great.

RICHARD LINTZ – Maybe we should tell Baxter Gardens to stop using Vinca.

RON REIM – I'm ok with added impervious coverage with all the action taken to mitigate the storm water

PUBLIC COMMENT:

ANDREW DELACATOS (SP) – MARYLAND WALK RESIDENT – The main entrance to Maryland Walk is through Westmoreland, and I call it a runway. The runway is about 30-40 yards long and 9-10 yards wide and is supported by a block wall. There is concern with all the excavation going on that there would be potential ground shift unless that wall were reinforced or rebuilt the entire length. Maryland Walk has gone through some leaks in the underground storage area and it is adjacent to the runway and there is concern that this project will create ground shift and that it will affect the driveway and the drainage into the Maryland Walk storage area. I think a support wall may need to be addressed for all three or four of these buildings since they will be the same developer that it be taken into consideration.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Thank you.

DL – The rear of the home is 30 feet away from the wall so you would need to have a basement that was 30 feet deep for it to have an affect on that, in my opinion.

BILL MELLISH – MARYLAND WALK RESIDENT – I would like to support your position Steve, that when you increase impervious you increase runoff. In my old house, hydrostatic pressure from water, you never know where it's going to go. So if you can limit that as much as possible it's very very helpful to near by structures.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Thank you.

BRIAN MAGUIRE – Susan, what is the philosophy behind pervious and impervious coverage?

SUSAN ISTENES – There are multiple philosophies behind it, I think generally it has been historically viewed as a way to create open space and we have talked quite a bit about revisiting those regulations and making them be geared more towards storm water runoff and what not but we just haven't done it. Right now they are what they are and they are required to mitigate any additional runoff on site based on the engineering they do when they submit for the application. It's not a perfect system but its what we work under now until we can study further.

BRIAN MAGUIRE – Ok, thank you. I feel like they managed the water and that the ordinance for coverage is about aesthetics and not mitigation. I think four of those lined up on that lot will look fantastic and I like it. I think they did a good job.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – I'm concerned we are covering too much and that pop ups create dangerous conditions and I don't think it's a good idea.

DL – We don't have pop up emitters on this project. We don't need them.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – WELL I'M STILL CONCERNED WE HAVE TOO MUCH COVERAGE ON THE SITE. ANY OTHER COMMENTS...NO? OK. WE HAVE A STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE WITH 7 CONDITIONS AND I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE ADD AN 8TH THAT SAYS TO MAINTAIN 45% MAXIMUM FRONT YARD AND 55% MAXIMUM OVERALL SITE IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE. THAT WAS A MOTION.

RICHARD LINTZ – SECOND

CAROLYN GAIDIS, RICHARD LINTZ, JANET WATSON, CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – AYE

RON REIM AND BRIAN MAGUIRE – NAY

BRIAN MAGUIRE – NOTES HE IS OK WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND IS VOTING NAY TO CAPPING THE IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE AT 45% AND 55%. RON AGREES. WE WERE ONLY AGAINST ITEM 8.

APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF WITH AN ADDITION OF ITEM 8. 4-2

136 NORTH BRENTWOOD BOULEVARD – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 6,094 square foot site is located on the east side of North Brentwood Boulevard between Maryland Avenue and Westmoreland Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of R-4 Low Density Multi Family Dwelling District and is currently developed with the vacant building that formerly housed the YWCA. This is one of four lots which will be developed in this block. The applicant is proposing a new, three-story single-family residence measuring 7,055 square feet of air-conditioned space, with an attached, front entry garage.

The proposed house has a square/rectangular design, a flat roof and the height is +/-40 feet 9 inches as measured from the average existing grade to the top of the flat roof. Lots to the north and south are undeveloped. The rear of the property abuts a stone retaining wall to the east, adjacent to a parking lot associated with the Maryland Walk condominium. Maryland Walk condominium fronts on Maryland Avenue, and is located south of the subject site.

The proposed house features a below-grade, front entry garage. This style of garage is not uncommon along Brentwood Boulevard. Decorative walls and landscaping are proposed on both sides of the driveway to buffer the driveway and garage from the street. The proposed massing is articulated on all sides with windows, doors and other architectural features including cut stone banding, cut stone window surrounds, bay windows and a chimney. Staff believes the height and massing of the proposed house are compatible with surrounding neighborhood character.

The primary building material for the proposed home is brown brick with buff colored stone accent materials. The secondary materials are James Hardie trim and stucco board located primarily on the right-side elevation surrounding the bay windows. Twenty-five percent of the right-side elevation will be comprised of stucco. Two cut stone round columns flank the front entry wood door. A cut stone balcony with black metal railing covers the front entry, above the front door. A decorative cut stone cornice is proposed just below the roof line and two black carriage style garage doors are proposed. Gray asphalt shingles are proposed for the roofing material. The windows are casement style, aluminum clad wood windows, black in color.

The proposed driveway material and the material for the front entry steps were not specified on the plans.

An 8-foot-tall wood, decorative fence is proposed at the rear property line. Brick clad retaining walls with cut stone caps are proposed on both sides of the driveway and along the front stairs and porch. The proposed brick will match the primary building material of the house.

Decorative, black metal railings are proposed for the balconies, porches and stairs and standing seam metal roofing is proposed for the bay windows and rear porch. The applicant is proposing a new eight-foot-tall solid wood fence with two feet of lattice on top, for a total fence height of eight feet. The proposed fence will parallel the rear

property line. The applicant is proposing to install the fence against the neighbor's stone retaining wall on the east property line.

The proposed house is in conformance with the requirements of the R-4 Low Density Multi Family Dwelling District and the Architectural Review Guidelines. Staff believes the plan is compatible in terms of mass, height and design with surrounding structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE PROPOSED DRIVEWAY MATERIAL SHALL CONFORM TO THE REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE CITY'S ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW GUIDELINES.
 2. REVISE PLANS TO SPECIFY APPROVED STAIR MATERIAL AND DRIVEWAY MATERIALS.
 3. REVISE SHEET A-6 OF THE SUBMITTED PLANS (LEFT SIDE AND RIGHT SIDE OF DRIVEWAY ELEVATIONS ARE RESERVED)."
-

CHRIS PIKE (CP) – THOMAS ALLEN GROUP
AJ – THOMAS ALLEN GROUP

CP – agrees with the staff report.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Where do the shingles go?

CP – So there was a chimney and i took it off so there will be no shingles anymore, sorry.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – Could you do glass instead of the bricked out window, like a frosted glass? I get it's a bathroom, maybe stainless glass?

CP – It's actually an elevator shaft so it wouldn't look so great for people to look at that.

RON REIM – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

BRIAN MAGUIRE – SECOND

ALL – AYE

PUBLIC HEARING

10 NORTH BEMISTON AVENUE – TEXT AMENDMENT – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: "This is the fourth public hearing to review and consider changes suggested by the public and the Plan Commission at the June 17 Plan Commission and the June 22 Board of Aldermen meeting. Changes to the text are underlined and are predominantly located starting on page 4, Section 405.1380, including the addition of the Table.405.1380.1, starting on page 6. The last item of discussion is the point system for public benefits, which is summarized by the table.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN".

BOARD COMMENTS:

Chairman Lichtenfeld: I had a lot of understanding on this go around but I have a question on page 3 would a restaurant fit into retail if there were no hotel? Could retail include a public restaurant?

Susan Istenes – Yes. This is old language that is in there now and I think that it came about as a result of a very specific project where someone wanted to build a hotel and a restaurant. It has to be a public restaurant.

Chairman Lichtenfeld – It was very informative in how it was rewritten. There are some items that are definitely judgmental or subjective and one of them is the architectural distinction and signification but I don't know how it could be clarified. More affordable housing, I'm not sure how we look at that.

Susan Istenes – When it comes to POUDs in general, we want flexibility so we don't want to be too prescriptive in these. When I did the suggestive exercise, it is really the applicant that has to make the case for public benefit. It's not our job to do that for them. For example Celyon, I think, argued that a smaller unit size than that was required would mean that they could rent them for less money than the other units that met or exceeded the amount required and it was an interesting argument. I thought it fit within the context of what we were talking about. So affordable housing is defined by HUD or whoever and they do calculations to say this is affordable housing for this area. From a Clayton perspective, I am not sure we are going to get there given the higher cost of living and cost to build here. So the argument of smaller units and them charging less for them makes sense.

Richard Lintz – I sent Susan an email asking if we should have negative points. So if they take out the Shanley Building, they would start with negative points and have to work their way up from that starting point. And Stephanie's response would it would add to the complexity of the system. I think there should be acknowledgement that during the development certain benefits were lost that already existed. Maybe that's all you say but it should be acknowledged.

Susan Istenes – Again, it is subjective to allow for flexibility in what is seen as public benefit and Clayton does not recognize the Shanley Building as a historical site. Would public underground parking be more of a benefit than keeping the Shanley Building – it is subjective.

There are no members of the public present

RON REIM – MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN WITH MINOR MODIFICATIONS AND ADDITIONS FROM THIS MEETING.

WILLIAM LIEBERMAN – SECOND

ALL - AYE

HAVING NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE COMMISSION, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:00 (20:00).

Recording Secretary