

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

AUGUST 15, 2016

*(Note: These minutes do NOT include the Centene project;  
a transcription of the deliberations  
regarding Centene was prepared by a Court Reporter and are in a separate document)*

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld  
Joanne M. Boulton, Aldermanic Representative  
Craig Owens, City Manager  
Ron Reim  
Josh Corson  
William Liebermann  
Scott Wilson

Absent:

None

Also in Attendance:

Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Director of Planning & Development Services  
Louis Clayton, AICP, Planner

Note: This meeting took place at the Clayton High School Auditorium.

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phones be turned off, that conversations take place outside the meeting room and that those who wish to speak approach the microphone stand in front of the stage. He announced that a court reporter is in attendance at this meeting. He indicated that the first item on the agenda, 111 Crandon, will not be heard this evening; it will be placed on the September 6<sup>th</sup> agenda.

## MINUTES

The transcription of the August 1, 2016 meeting was presented for approval. The transcription was approved after having been previously forwarded to each member.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SIGNAGE – 7921 CLAYTON ROAD (GROUND SIGN)

Karen Gelb was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for the installation of a ground sign to be located in the front landscaped area adjacent to Clayton Road, oriented perpendicular to the street. The sign consists of four aluminum panels totaling 9.5-square-feet that will hang from a 5-foot wood frame faced with PVC. The size and location of the proposed ground sign meets the requirements of the Sign Ordinance. More recently, the Architectural Review Board has expressed a preference for monument signs constructed with masonry instead of PVC post and panel signs; however, the sign as proposed is in compliance with the Sign Regulations and staff recommends approval as submitted.

There were no questions or comments from the members or the audience.

Hearing none, Ron Reim made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Joanne Boulton and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - SIGNAGE (MODIFICATION TO SIGN REGULATIONS)– 16  
NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE (WICKED GREENZ-RESTAURANT)

Joe Phillips, sign contractor, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for the installation of a 31.88-square-foot sign onto an existing canopy that projects +/- 3 feet from the front building wall. The internally illuminated sign is constructed of an aluminum cabinet, acrylic push thru letters with applied white and green vinyl, and will be internally illuminated. The Sign Regulations allow individual ground floor tenant spaces with display windows and separate street entrances one wall sign 15 square feet or 5 percent of the front wall area up to a maximum area of 50 square feet. In this case, the ground floor tenant is permitted a 33 square foot wall sign. The regulations also state that wall signs “shall be attached to front walls at or near the first (1st) floor ceiling level.” A wall sign is defined as “A sign attached or erected against the wall of a building with the face in a parallel plane to the plane of the building wall.” Because the proposed sign is installed onto a canopy that projects beyond the front wall, the sign is not considered a wall sign, and therefore a sign modification is requested. According to the Sign Regulations, modifications should only be granted due to unusual conditions of the building or site. Staff recognizes that the placement of the existing canopy, ground floor windows, and second story windows, leave a small amount of wall area available for a wall sign that would be in conformance with the placement requirements of the Sign Regulations. Most signs along North Central Avenue are either applied to fabric awnings facing the street or feature individual channel letters attached to the wall of the building. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed placement and design of the sign is not appropriate in consideration of the characteristics of the subject building and adjacent buildings. Although cabinet signs are not prohibited, staff would prefer that the sign contain individual letters for an improved appearance as is more typical with storefront signage

and consistent with previous Architectural Review Board approvals. Susan stated that staff recommends denial of the sign as currently proposed.

Mr. Phillips stated that a wall sign would be difficult to see with the canopy projection and the sign they are proposing would result in fewer holes in the masonry and would look better visually.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the graphics on the sign is a depiction of their logo.

Mr. Phillips indicated that this is their first restaurant; more will come.

Josh Corson asked if the sign is back lit.

Mr. Phillips stated that the letters are internally illuminated; only the letters will illuminate at night.

Ron Reim asked how far the canopy projects from the building.

Mr. Phillips replied “3-feet”.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he realizes the size is within the limits of the code, but there are no other signs on the edge of a canopy and is concern that this would start a precedent.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he knows this is a little different, a little new; however, he hopes they don't object, as they tried to design something tasteful.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if they considered making the letters “Wicked Greenz” smaller.

Mr. Phillips stated that the rendering is a bit misleading.

Scott Wilson commented that it seems that staff would prefer a sign more consistent with the area, but it seems to fit, although an awkward placement. He asked if the applicant would consider eliminating the curve and flags and making the entire sign 15” high.

Mr. Phillips stated that he didn't know; although the owner was here this evening.

Matt Ross, co-owner, stated that they could do that; the sign could simply read “Wicked Greenz”. He stated he would discuss it with his partners.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked the applicant if they would like to redesign the sign and come back.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that the applicant come back to staff with a redesign and staff could determine its compliance with what was discussed.

Scott Wilson made a motion to approve a revised sign to read only “Wicked Greenz” and to fit the face of the canopy. The motion was seconded by William Lieberman and unanimously approved by the Board.

### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – FRONT YARD FENCE – 72 CRESTWOOD DRIVE

Adam Schneider, owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for the installation of a 6-foot tall cedar (or cedar composite) fence that will include brick pilasters with limestone caps every 22 feet. The fence as proposed will be placed within the required front yard setback along Clayton Road. The plans show the fence located 20 feet from the Clayton Road sidewalk. The applicant proposes to plant Ornamental Feather Reed Grass, Oak leaf Hydrangea and Gold-tip Junipers between the fence and the sidewalk. The applicant has submitted approval from the subdivision trustees and the adjacent property owners. Susan stated that Section 405.1900 of the Zoning Regulations permits 4 foot decorative fences located in the front yard in single-family zoning districts if 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 example, on corner lots, 6-foot fences have been approved on “secondary” front yards (what functionally would be a property’s side yard) provided the fence is ornamental or decorative (not a solid wood, chain or vinyl fence) and is placed on the property in a manner which provides a sufficient area for landscaping to break up the monotonous appearance of the fence. The proposed design and materials of the fence is not consistent with the requirement in the zoning regulations for a 4-foot “ornamental or decorative” fence; however, an ornamental or decorative fence would not likely provide the opacity needed to provide adequate screening of Clayton Road. Staff is of the opinion that the fence is designed with high quality materials, is appropriately set back from the adjacent sidewalk, and provides sufficient landscaping and recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Schneider introduced himself.

Chairman Lichtenfeld complimented Mr. Schneider on such a thorough submittal. He asked if the fence will enclose the entire back and side yard.

Mr. Schneider replied “yes”.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the brick pilasters are only located along the two street frontages.

Mr. Schneider replied “yes”.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Josh Corson made a motion to approve the fence as submitted. The motion was seconded by William Lieberman and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Lichtenfeld re-announced that the proposed new home at 111 Crandon Drive will be taken up at the next meeting. He then apologized to everyone in the audience for not being able to accommodate everyone at the August 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, which was held at City Hall. He announced that the next order of business is the proposed Centene project.

The court reporter now began transcribing (6:10 p.m.). Note that Josh Corson recused himself and did not participate in any vote or discussion with regards to the Centene proposal.

---

Recording Secretary