

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING  
MONDAY, JULY 06, 2020  
17:30 (05:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld at 17:30.

ROLL CALL

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld, City Manager David Gipson, Aldermanic Representative Richard Lintz, Carolyn Gaidis, Robert Denlow, George Hettich, and Helen DiFate answered roll call.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CAROLYN GAIDIS – MOVE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

RICHARD LINTZ – SECOND

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVES JUNE 15, 2020, MEETING MINUTES. 7-0

## NEW BUSINESS

### 7730 BONHOMME AVENUE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – PUBLIC ART

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located on the south side of Bonhomme Avenue, between South Bemiston Avenue and South Hanley Road. The property has a zoning designation of HDC High Density Commercial District and is located in the Central Station TOD Overlay District. The project consists of the installation of a ¼ inch thick painted steel sculpture to be attached to the front wall of the building just west of the main entrance to the hotel.

On February 4, 2019, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) approved plans for the following exterior renovations on the subject property:

1. Replacement of existing canopy and columns with a new cantilever canopy.
2. Main entrance doors moved out, towards the street.
3. Entrance walls clad in a metal and rainscreen system with dark grey and wood pattern panels.
4. Repainting of existing planter beds.
5. Re-pavement of drop-off and private sidewalk with two shades of grey concrete.
6. Installation of a new metal gate across the west side service drive entrance.
7. A new window wall system for the east and west facades of the tower.
8. Up lighting and accent lighting to illuminate the tower façade.

The applicant has commissioned a ¼ inch thick steel exterior wall sculpture painted charcoal grey. The wall sculpture is approximately 298 inches in length and most of the sculpture is 72 inches or less in height. The sculpture is comprised of the silhouette of eleven (11) leashed dogs with the leashes attached to a solid brass leash handle measuring 10.5-inches in length and 4 inches in height and located approximately 30 inches in height from the ground level. The leash handle will project from the building slightly. The remainder of the sculpture is comprised of the silhouette of a human being, 72 inches in height and a smaller unleashed dog sitting behind the human being. Four (4) small birds (silhouette) are located above the eleven (11) dogs and appear to be flying off into the distance.

The art piece is ¼ inch thick and will be attached to the west side front wall, fronting Bonhomme Avenue. The west wall is approximately 35 feet in height and does not have windows or doors, which creates a rather large, flat, blank wall area. The wall is covered in EIFS material. The sculpture will project approximately 3 inches from the wall and will be installed approximately 9 inches higher than the sidewalk. Below the sculpture, one continuous linear light fixture will be placed at the base of the wall. The light will project upward into the 3-inch space between the cutout dogs and the wall, creating a soft backlit effect on the dogs. The light fixture will be covered by a 6-inch-tall extruded aluminum angle painted to match the artwork, to shield it; the lighting will be less than 75 watts and is intended to softly backlight the sculpture.

The Clayton Public Art Advisory Committee met on May 27, 2020, to consider the piece as presented by the applicant and their representatives. The PAAC voted unanimously to recommend approval of the piece to the ARB.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

NORA AKERBERG (NA) – APPLICANT

BRYANT SMITH (BS) – APPLICANT  
DAVE THROP (DT) – APPLICANT  
TERRY EATON (TE) – APPLICANT

NA– Addresses the Board and goes over the project.

Board members confirm that the human on the plans will not be a part of the sculpture and that the brass will be maintained.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.

RICHARD LINTZ – SECOND.

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY VOTES TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED. 7-0

---

#### 6329 NORTH ROSEBURY AVENUE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – EXTERIOR ALTERATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located at 6329 North Rosebury Avenue, on the north side of the street, just east of its intersection with De Mun Avenue. The property is located in the R-5, Medium Density Multiple Family Dwelling district. The proposed project consists of painting the exterior of the 2-story, 6-unit multi-family residence and adding an awning over the front entry door along with replacing the two light sconces with sconces of a similar size.

The existing structure is constructed of brick, red in color, with exposed concrete at the base of the building, approximately three feet in height. There is a concrete walkway which leads to a single step up into a double glass, aluminum framed entry door. The existing windows are white vinyl and the roof has black shingles. The property is surrounded by multiple family dwelling structures which range in height from three to four stories. All are constructed of red brick with a variety of accent materials such as stone banding, stone window and door surrounds, white window trims, white wood accent material, cut stone accents, plinths, etc. This building is one of only two structures on the street that is two stories in height. All the structures located on surrounding properties and the entire street are constructed with red brick; painted brick is not found in this area.

As proposed, all existing red brick surface areas and the concrete base will be painted with BEHR Ultra-Pure White. A white and black striped awning is proposed over the front door. The fabric awning is eight feet four inches in length and three feet in width with a six-inch valance. The awning will project over the front doors by four feet and attach to the structure with black metal rods.

Unlike other structures in this area, this structure does not have any interesting architectural features. It was built in the 1930’s and it lacks the architectural details and stature that many of the buildings on the street have. Painting the brick white will freshen the appearance; the awning addition will add a classic look to the front entry. It will be the only structure on this street with painted brick, however, staff is of the opinion that painting the brick will not take away from anything of interest on the building, because there is a notable lack of interest and historical reference associated with this building. Painted brick is not inherently incompatible with non-painted brick and white is a neutral color. Additionally, white accents are found on buildings throughout the neighborhood.

Staff notes that the shrubs in the front of the property are overgrown and one appears to be in poor condition. The landscaping lacks design and interest. Staff recommends the property owner consider designing a new planting plan for the front yard to enhance the appearance of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.”

---

Applicant was not present. Item was continued to the next meeting.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – MOTION TO POSTPONE IT UNTIL THE APPLICANT REQUESTS IT BE BROUGHT BACK.

RICHARD LINTZ – SECOND.

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY VOTES TO CONTINUE TO THE NEXT MEETING. 7-0

---

8055 WATKINS DRIVE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – EXTERIOR ALTERATION/RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The subject property is located at 8055 Watkins Drive, on the north side of the street, just east of the Brentwood Boulevard/Watkins Drive intersection. The proposed project consists of changes to the exterior of the building and the installation of a fence and new deck.

The existing home is constructed of brick, red in color. The second story on the front façade has a balcony supported by metal trellis columns and metal railing, painted white. The home has black shutters and the existing front door is white in color with a white glass storm door. At the rear of the home is an existing roofed sunroom. Access to the site is provided off the alley located on the west side of the property; the driveway access is in the northwest corner of the site at the back of the property.

Photo of existing front façade:



**Proposed changes to the front yard/front façade of the dwelling unit:**

- Replace second story balcony trellis style metal supports with three, 10-inch diameter tapered columns painted Chantilly lace (pure white).
- Install custom poplar wood railing to replace existing metal railing (second story).
- Install new fiberglass cornice between second story windows on east and west sides, and roof line, painted Chantilly lace.
- Install new wood door surround (second story) to match casing profile on first floor entry door to be painted Chantilly lace.
- Remove existing shutters on front façade and replace with custom wood shutters on all existing windows including new shutter holdbacks and shutters to be painted black.
- Remove existing window on first level on the east side of front façade and replace it with a new bay window. The window will be set on a brick base (to match existing on house) and will have a standing seam metal roof painted black topped with a new finial painted Chantilly lace to be installed to site flat against the brick front of the house. The window will not require a larger opening than what currently exists.
- Install three new 10-inch diameter tapered columns below the second story balcony. Install new fascia and molding on balcony front.
- Install new molding profile between bay window and standing seam metal roof, painted Chantilly lace.

- Install new molding header over existing front face of the first story west window.
- Install new custom decorative poplar wood trellis ranging in height from four feet to three feet with 6-foot x 6-foot posts, flanking the east and west sides of the front façade.
- Replace roof with cinder black architectural shingles.
- Remove existing storm door. Paint/replace front door, black in color.

**Proposed changes in the rear yard:**

- Install a new 6-foot-tall cedar wood shadowbox privacy fence surrounding the rear yard between the western edge of the concrete driveway and 4 feet 2 inches east of the west side property line.
- Construct a 10-foot x 12-foot concrete turnaround in the northeast corner of the property connected to the concrete driveway at its curve.
- Remove existing concrete walkway and replace with new concrete walkway and steps in the rear yard leading to a new wood deck.
- Install a new elevated wood deck constructed with the finished floor to align with an existing enclosed sunroom located east of the proposed deck. Bottom of deck to be screened with a deck skirt constructed of the same cedar wood used on the deck. Deck size is approximately +/- 10 feet by 17 feet.

Surrounding properties are mainly constructed with red brick and the use of white columns and black shutters is common throughout the immediate neighborhood. The proposed changes include some interesting details which will enhance the appearance of the house. The wood shutters and columns will give the front façade a more substantial appearance using quality building materials. The installation of the bay window, and custom touches such as the addition of finials and dental molding at the top of the roof will add visual interest.

The proposed black door, black wood shutters, Chantilly lace molding details, black shingle roof colors combined with the existing red brick is complimentary and will blend well into the neighborhood. The proposed rear yard deck will be constructed of cedar wood and will be located adjacent to an existing enclosed porch and is of similar size to the existing porch. The proposed cedar wood shadowbox fence meets the code requirements for height and material type.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.**

---

JAMES JAMMIESON (JJ) – JAMIESON DESIGN

JJ – Addressed Board and goes over the project has nothing to add to the staff report.

Chairman Lichtenfeld – I think it really makes the house look nice and I'm happy you are not using vinyl.

Other board members share similar thoughts.

Richard Lintz – Why was there no impervious coverage? And there is no need for a more detailed landscape plan?

Susan Istenes – It was not a big enough increase that it was needed – it doesn't need to be mitigated and is not exceeding the maximum allowable coverage. No, there is not.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Anything else?

\*NO\*

CAROLYN GAIDIS – MOTION TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.

RICHARD LINTZ – SECOND.

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY VOTES TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED. 7-0

---

### 635 WEST POLO DRIVE – ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – EXTERIOR ALTERATION/RENOVATION

Director Susan M. Istenes summarizes the following staff report: “The 26,277 square foot site is located on the west side of West Polo Drive. The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The site was recently developed with a 4,664 square foot new single-family home approved by the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board in March 2017. It was completed and occupied in the Spring of 2019. After the home was constructed and occupied, the owner received administrative approval via the building permit review process, to install an in-ground swimming pool and spa with a 1,400 square foot pool deck. The building permit was approved in late winter, 2020, and the pool and spa are currently under construction. The owner would like to now install an outdoor kitchen/covered pavilion adjacent to the pool and an outdoor lighted sport court in the rear yard.

The proposed court measures 29 feet 1 inch wide by 30 feet deep. Two, 15-foot-high light poles, one at each end of the court, are also proposed.

The proposed covered pavilion is 24 feet in length and 13 feet 6 inches wide. It is a 3-sided structure with openings in the walls and is open on the side that faces the pool. It is located approximately 4.5 feet from at the southern edge of the pool and is located +/- 6 feet from the south (side property line). Among other features it has an outdoor kitchen area, counter tops, a fireplace, and bench seating.

The subject property is located in an area of the Polo Drive neighborhood where lots tend to be on the larger side and often have unique configurations in relationship to the surrounding street network. In this case, the lot is over 26,000 square feet in area, is 93 feet wide at the front, 76 feet wide at the rear and 316 feet deep on the right side and 370 feet deep on the left side (per St. Louis County Assessor records). The rear of the lot backs up to city owned property that is vacant green space approximately 50 feet in width, planted with a variety of trees and shrubs. The green space is adjacent to the South Central Avenue right-of-way and the west side of South Central Avenue is developed with single family residential structures. The City granted permission to the pool contractor to use this property (accessed from Central Avenue) as a temporary rear entrance to the West Polo property for construction of the pool. Along the rear property line is a +/- 5-foot-wide swale and a utility easement that is grown up with a dense thicket of honeysuckle and several trees. Some of the honeysuckle has been removed as a result of construction. The elevation of the lot slopes downward from West Polo Drive to the rear of the property. It appears that the rear of the property is lower than the 50-foot-wide green space adjacent to the rear of the lot, on

Central Avenue. The proposed sport court is in the rear yard and is located approximately 12.5 feet from the rear property line and 24 feet 2 inches from the south, side property line. Staff recommends screening the court per the recommendation of the City's contracted Landscape Architect to mitigate the impacts of the court and lighting from nearby residences. Due to the proximity of the proposed court light poles to residential areas, staff recommends that the light is replaced with an LED equivalent to the 75-watt lights historically allowed in residential areas and that a shield is provided to limit light trespassing onto adjacent properties. Additional buffering along the rear property line will provide screening of the proposed light from adjacent properties.

The outdoor kitchen/pavilion is 14 feet 3 and ¼ inches in height as measured from average existing grade to the mean height of the roof. It will be constructed of wood with stone, siding and a shingled roof. The shingles will be architectural profile, slate grey in color, to match the existing roof of the single-family home. Gutters, fascia and soffits will be white to match existing. The stone on the columns will be mayer blend natural stone with pewter grey Indiana limestone caps and coping; colors to match the swimming pool. The horizontal siding located on the front and rear roof elevations will be fiber cement with a color to match the existing residence (not specified). The natural wood beams and the bead board ceiling will be left a natural color and stained with clear varnish. The aluminum downspouts will be tied to a 4-inch stormwater drain which will be located in the middle of the back yard. The proposed pavilion meets the setback and height limitations of the R-2 zoning district. The materials are comparable and compatible to the principal structure and the accessory pool structure. The additional impervious surface area added by the pavilion will not exceed the maximum allowed in the R-2 district and the additional runoff will be piped to a discharge point in the middle of the yard and allowed to percolate through the soil on site. The back side of the pavilion will be screened from the south side property line using viburnum, hydrangea and spiraea. Hard surfaces on the north side of the pool/spa will also be softened with appropriate trees and shrubs.

The City's contracted Landscape Architect reviewed the proposed landscape plan and noted that 28,427 square feet of canopy coverage will be removed for the project. The previously approved landscape plan had an overage of 49,385 square feet of canopy coverage and met the requirement for native trees at 33.3 percent native, therefore additional canopy will not need to be installed. Construction impact at the critical root zone of all other site trees on the west end of the back yard has occurred through compaction and material storage. The stockpiled soil and materials will need to be removed from the critical root zone of all site trees and tree protection fence will need to be installed at the critical root zone. She also recommends that after construction, the homeowner contract with a certified forester to provide a tree protection plan to mitigate for construction compaction impact including aeration, etc.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS APPROVE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE ENTIRETY OF THE WESTERN REAR PROPERTY LINE SHALL BE PLANTED WITH LARGE SHRUBS NO LESS THAN 36 INCHES IN HEIGHT AT THE TIME OF PLANTING, PLANTED NO LESS THAN 5 FEET ON CENTER (SUGGESTED SPECIES, VIBURNUM).
2. ALL STOCKPILED SOIL AND MATERIALS SHALL BE REMOVED IMMEDIATELY FORM THE CRITICAL ROOT ZONE OF ALL SITE TREES AND TREE PROTECTION FENCE SHALL BE INSTALLED AT THE CRITICAL ROOT ZONE.
3. THE HOMEOWNER SHALL CONTRACT WITH A CERTIFIED FORESTER, ONCE CONSTRUCTION IS COMPLETED, TO PROVIDE A TREE PROTECTION PLAN TO MITIGATE THE CONSTRUCTION COMPACTION TO INCLUDE AERATION, ETC. THE PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH THE MITIGATION MEASURES.
4. THE REMAINING HONEYSUCKLE ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE AND ADJACENT GREEN SPACE SHALL BE REMOVED FOR THE LENGTH OF THE REAR PROPERTY LINE.
5. THE LED LIGHT SHALL BE AN EQUIVALENT TO 75 WATTS AND SHIELDED FROM ADJACENT PROPERTIES.
6. THE PROPERTY OWNER SHALL RESTORE THE SOD ON THE CITY OWNED PARCEL AND SHALL PROVIDE RESTITUTION TO THE CITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY STANDARDS FOR ANY DAMAGE TO TREES LOCATED ON CITY PROPERTY.”

KARL KOCH (KK) – HOMEOWNER  
RACHEL KOCH (RK) – HOMEOWNER  
STEPHEN MUSIAL (SM) – APPLICANT – LIFESTYLE CONSTRUCTION  
MATT MAYER (MM) – ARCHITECT

KK– Addresses the Board and goes over the project and agrees to the staff recommendations. We looked at a lot of spots and this is where it fits best.

MM – The pool contractor is not with us tonight but Stephen is here.

Chairman Lichtenfeld – I understand where the kitchen is going and I was concerned about the court but what I found is where the court is shown, it is at the lowest and flattest part of the site and about 7 feet lower than the pool and city owned land. I came to the conclusion that this is really the only spot to put the court and that heavy planting will be acceptable. There are two other homes with pavilions and other activity areas in their yard along the western border. This seems to be the right location.

Richard Lintz – I agree Steve. I would like to know how much lower the court is from the green space? Exactly? I also want to know where the property line is, if the landscape is up where the greenspace is then it will be ok. If there is 7 feet of elevation and large enough shrubs to block those about 7-8 feet to block the light it seems to work for me. As long as the shrubs are going at the top of the elevation. I think we need a landscape plan to ensure that the light will be blocked with the shrubs.

Carolyn and Helen share similar comments as well as comments regarding a designated path from the pavilion and pool to the court and a detail landscape plan.

Helen DiFate – Will there be fencing to prevent other kids on the neighborhood from using the court? Why is there not a designated path. That is something we need to know, if it will be a footpath we need to know that. I think we need this all on paper.

Robert Denlow – What is a sport court?

KK – A basketball court (single) my son plays basketball on his schools team. There is fencing around the pool.

Carolyn Gaidis – How do we know the trees will not be disturbed. I will need to see a landscape plan. The light levels, it was mentioned there would be trees at the slope – I think it needs to be lower than that so that it will actually block things.

PUBLIC COMMENT

GARY FEDER (GF) – NEIGHBOR  
DAVID LEGESSE (DL) – NEIGHBOR

Both share similar concerns regarding, light, noise, lack of detailed landscape plan and the restoration of the rear yard that faces their homes.

CHAIRMAN LICHTENFELD – Anything else?

\*NO\*

KEVIN O'KEEFE – IF I MAY, I HAVE WROTE OUT A MOTION, I MOVE THAT THE COMMISSION APPROVED PLANS FOR THE PAVILION AREA ONLY SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS APPLICABLE TO THAT PORTION OF THE SITE AS DETERMINED BY CITY STAFF, AND THAT ALL PROPOSALS FOR PORTIONS OF THE SITE WEST OF THE PAVILION BE CONTINUED TO A LATER MEETING.

CAROLYN GAIDIS – SO MOVED.

RICHARD LINTZ – SECOND.

BOARD UNANIMOUSLY VOTES TO APPROVE THE MOTION. 7-0

---

HAVING NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE COMMISSION, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 19:30.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary