

**CITY OF ST. LOUIS
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES
NOVEMBER 22, 2012**

Board Members Present

Richard Callow, Chairman
Alderman Craig Schmid
Nate Johnson
Melanie Fathman
Anthony Robinson

Cultural Resources Office Staff Present

Betsy H. Bradley, Director
Jan Cameron, Preservation Administrator
Bob Bettis, Preservation Planner
Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner
Adona Buford, Administrative Assistant

The Chairman called the roll. The Board approved the current agenda and the minutes of the September 24, 2012 and the October 22, 2012 meetings.

PRELIMINARY REVIEWS

A. 2012.1982 1105-07 OLIVE STREET PRESERVATION REVIEW DISTRICT

Owner/Applicant: Enkelkind, LLC

DEMOLITION PLAN: Preliminary review to demolish a five (5) story brick commercial building in a Preservation Review District for the construction of a new parking lot.

PROCEEDINGS: Director Betsy H. Bradley made a presentation that examined the criteria for demolition in City Ordinance #64832, which sets forth the review standards for a proposed demolition in a Preservation Review District. She stated that she had received 31 email messages opposed to the proposed demolition and construction of a parking lot at this address.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 2 of 11

Thomas Connally, representing the present owner, Enkelkind LLC, presented information relating to a recent court case concerning alleged damage caused to 1105-09 Olive Street during excavation for the construction of an adjacent underground parking facility and addressed the demolition criteria.

James Martin, the attorney of record for the defendant in the law suit concerning the property, provided additional information about the court case.

Larry Deutsch, principal of Enkelkind, requested that the proposed demolition and parking lot construction be approved.

Testimony on behalf of the project:

Mark Pitliangus, owner of nearby properties on Olive, spoke in support of the proposed demolition.

Mike Borman, a tenant in the Laclede Gas Building, stated that businesses in downtown buildings prefer parking close to their offices and therefore supported the proposal.

Testimony against the project:

Ruth Keenoy, representing the Landmarks Association of St. Louis, stated that the organization is opposed to demolition of the building based on urban land-use issues and that the City should send a message that demolition will not be tolerated for surface parking.

Paul Hohmann, architect, stated that alternatives to surface parking for tenants of the Laclede Gas Building include parking in the basement of the LGL building; that the right engineer could design the stabilization of the east wall of the building and further, that he did not see evidence on the exterior of the building of eminent collapse.

Randy Vines stated that developers should address parking needs in a way other than providing each building with its own parking and that the proposed parking lot does not equal or exceed the contribution of the existing building in the streetscape.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 3 of 11

- the building is located in a Preservation Review District and therefore the criteria in City Ordinances #64689 and #64832 apply to the proposed demolition;
- there is no redevelopment plan for this property adopted by City Ordinance;
- the store and loft building, built in 1881, the remaining portion of a larger building and one that has seen some façade alterations, is a contributing building in terms of the ordinance definitions;
- Ordinance #64689 defines “sound” to mean that visible portions of exterior walls and roofs appear capable of continuing to support their current loads for six months or more;
- the exterior inspection of the building indicates that 1105-09 Olive reveals that the upper stories of the Olive façade display few indications of loss of masonry elements or needed maintenance; the exposed east party wall exhibits water damage near the top of the south side, missing parapet coping that allows water damage to continue, and needs for maintenance and repair; and the north wall has some step cracks in the east bay and some areas that have been repointed;
- the descriptions of the condition of the building immediately following the construction of the adjacent underground garage focus on actions taken during excavation but do not address how the completed construction of the adjacent structure further affected the stability of the building – positively or adversely;
- no engineering evaluation of the current condition of the building was presented;
- as the building has stood for nearly ten years since the alleged destabilization by the excavation for the adjacent construction project, and the exterior examination of the building reveals conditions that relate to deferred repairs and maintenance, it is difficult to conclude that this building does not meet the definition of “sound;”
- the building stock on the 1100 block of Olive and adjacent blockfronts includes buildings of varying ages

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 4 of 11

and scales and the condition of the buildings and the area present no deterrent to the rehabilitation and occupancy of 1105-09 Olive;

- a renovation project could restore the amount of glazed area in the upper stories and provide a simulation of the historic character of the lower stories or a compatible new design;
- buildings of this size and type have proven to be good candidates for rehabilitation and reuse as offices and residential lofts, and projects offering these uses are underway in this vicinity;
- the applicant has not presented any itemized estimate for the projected cost of rehabilitation of this building or made a claim of economic hardship for the rehabilitation of this property, as demolition and construction of a parking lot are proposed;
- the demolition of 1105-09 Olive and construction of a surface parking lot would adversely affect the continuity and rhythm of the structures on the block as surface parking is the use that most disrupts the density, integrity, rhythm and balance of a block;
- three parking lots and one historic building, the Laclede Gas Building, occupy the corners of the Olive and 11th intersection, the immediate setting of 1105-09 Olive, and additional surface parking is located on the block to the south, as well as on the block to the north.
- proposed subsequent construction is a surface parking lot to serve tenants of the Laclede Gas Building at the northeast corner of Olive and 11th and the surface parking lot would not equal or exceed the contribution of the current building in the streetscape and block-face;
- as to commonly-controlled property, the proposed parking lot would be close to the Laclede Gas Building, which Enkelkind LLC owns, but the two properties are not adjoining; and
- the building proposed for demolition is not an accessory structure.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 5 of 11

BOARD ACTION: The Preservation Board concluded that the building at 1105-09 Olive Street meets the definition of “sound” condition in Ordinance #64689; the loss of a contributing building for a surface parking lot would adversely affect the urban design of the blockfront and intersection; and the proposal would not result in new construction that equals or exceeds the contribution of the existing building.

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to withhold preliminary approval of the demolition of 1105-09 Olive Street. The motion was made by Board Member Melanie Fathman and seconded by Alderman Schmid. The motion passed unanimously.

B. 2012.1984 4272 W. ST. FERDINAND THE VILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner: Sharon Anderson c/o Louise Williamson

Applicant: James V. Alverson, Architect & Catco Inc.

DEMOLITION PLAN: Preliminary review to demolish a fire-damaged house and construct a new single family dwelling.

PROCEEDINGS: Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner, represented the Cultural Resources Office and presented a PowerPoint presentation illustrating the proposed project. She stated that a fire that destroyed an adjacent house had damaged 4272 West St. Ferdinand and that the owner wished to construct a new house rather than attempt to repair the existing building. Ms. Gagen stated that the design of the proposed house complies with The Ville Historic District standards, with the exception of the lack of basement windows on the front elevation.

Ms Gagen recommended that Preservation Board approve the demolition of the house, subject to the condition that no demolition permit should be issued until the owner had applied for a building permit for the new construction; and that final details of the new design be approved by the Cultural Resources Office staff.

Daryl Branco, contractor for the project, testified on his own behalf.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 6 of 11

James W. Alverson, architect for the project, testified on his own behalf.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Board found that:

- the proposed new construction would be an equitable replacement for the damaged historic house, which had received previous alterations;
- that the front elevation of the proposed design was generally in compliance with The Ville Historic District Standards, with the exception of the basement openings on the front elevation.

BOARD ACTION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to grant preliminary approval of the demolition of the house and also of the general design for the new construction, with the stipulation that windows be added to the basement of the front elevation and design details and materials be approved by the Cultural Resources Office; and that the demolition be contingent upon the submittal of a building permit application for the new construction. The motion was made by Board Member Anthony Robinson and seconded by Mr. Johnson. The motion passed unanimously.

C. 2012.1246 3001 MISSOURI AVENUE BENTON PARK HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner: Benton Park Developers LLC – Peter Reinecke

Applicant: Z & L Wrecking Company – Zarak Little

DEMOLITION PLAN:

Preliminary review of a demolition permit application to demolish a two-story brick commercial building.

PROCEEDINGS:

Jan Cameron, Preservation Administrator, represented the Cultural Resources Office and presented a PowerPoint presentation illustrating the proposed project. She stated that under the definitions of Ordinance #64689, the factory building, which had been determined in 1985 to be non-contributing to the Benton Park National Register District, cannot be considered a “Qualifying,” “Merit” or “High Merit” resource; and that its structural condition is not “Sound” under the definition of that ordinance. She also stated that, being at least 75 years old, the building is considered under the Benton Park Historic District Standards as historically significant to the character of the district and that the standards strictly limit the demolition

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 7 of 11

of such buildings. Ms Cameron noted the presence on the same parcel of a historic house, dating from the mid-19th century, that is a Merit building and an important resource in the Benton Park historic district. She stated that both the factory building and the house were in violation of the Benton Park standards: the factory building is vacant and unsecured, and both buildings have been open to the elements for a number of years, and therefore are examples of Demolition by Neglect.

Ms. Cameron recommended that Preservation Board approve the demolition of the factory building, subject to the condition that no demolition permit should be issued until a building permit was issued for the appropriate protection and stabilization of the small house.

Peter F. Reineke, owner, testified on his own behalf. He recounted the history of the property since its purchase, and his intention to rehabilitate the historic house and develop the remainder of the property at some future date.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Board found that:

- the factory building under Ordinance 64689 is not considered to be “Qualifying, Merit or High Merit,” but is considered historically significant under the Benton Park standards;
- both the factory building and the adjacent historic house, a “Merit” building, have been allowed to deteriorate and their condition qualifies as “Demolition by Neglect” under Section 213 of the Benton Park standards; and
- the owner has agreed to take appropriate steps to secure and mothball the historic house and intends to rehabilitate it fully in the future.

BOARD ACTION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to grant preliminary approval of the demolition of the factory building, with the condition that the plan for the subsequent treatment of the property be revised to include the steps needed to be taken to preserve and appropriately mothball the historic house on the property, a Merit building, until its rehabilitation. The motion was made by

Board Member Nate Johnson and seconded by Ms. Fathman. The motion passed unanimously.

APPEALS OF DENIALS

D. 2012.1523 1218 S. JEFFERSON AVE. LAFAYETTE SQUARE HISTORIC DIST.

Owner: Dubman Realty, LLC

Applicant: Piros Signs Inc.

COMMERCIAL PLAN: Appeals of the Director's denials of two building permit applications to 1) install one illuminated ground sign, and 2) erect wall signs and awnings with signage.

PROCEEDINGS: At a suggestion from Chairman Callow, the owner requested that the Board defer its consideration of its appeal to allow the opportunity to work with the Cultural Resources Office staff to revise the current proposals.

E. 2012.1562 2158 ALLEN AVENUE MCKINLEY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DIST.

Owner/Applicant: Herman & Constance Turner

RESIDENTIAL PLAN: Appeal of the Director's denial of a building permit application to retain eighteen (18) vinyl windows installed without a permit.

PROCEEDINGS: Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner, represented the Cultural Resources Office and presented a PowerPoint presentation illustrating the property and the window installation. She submitted Ordinance #64689 and #67901 and the Agenda into the record. She stated that the windows were installed without a permit, and that vinyl is not an approved material for replacement windows under the McKinley Heights Historic District Standards. In addition, the replacement windows did not replicate the original windows in size, proportion, shape or detailing. The historic semi-circular-arched and segmentally-arched windows of the front façade have been replaced with flat-headed windows and the resulting exposed framing covered with caulk. Ms. Gagen recommended that Preservation Board uphold the Director's denial of the replacement windows. Ms. Gagen noted also that the

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 9 of 11

exterior brickmold had been wrapped with coil stock, resulting in a flattened appearance.

Constance Turner, owner of the property, testified on her own behalf. She stated that she was unaware that she was in a historic district and therefore didn't know a permit was required to replace her windows, which she installed for security. Ms. Turner also stated that she could not afford to replace the front windows with appropriate windows and submitted financial information to that effect. Ms. Turner requested a hardship variance from the standards.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Board Preservation found that:

- the windows were installed without an approved permit and do not comply with the McKinley Heights historic district standards; and
- the owner submitted proof of her current economic condition and the hardship she would undergo if she were required to replace the front façade windows.

BOARD ACTION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to grant a variance based upon economic hardship and overturn the Director's denial of the application for window replacement. The motion was made by Alderman Schmid and seconded by Mr. Johnson. The motion passed unanimously.

F. 2012.1587 2300-02 RUSSELL BLVD. MCKINLEY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DIST.

Owner/Applicant: Lensi Ann Hoang

RESIDENTIAL PLAN:

Appeal of the Director's denial of a building permit application to retain sixteen (16) vinyl windows on the front façade installed without a permit.

PROCEEDINGS:

Deferred until the December Preservation Board meeting per applicant's request and agreed to waive the time period limitation for the resolution of an appeal.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 10 of 11

G. 2012.1800 3457 SHENANDOAH AVE. COMPTON HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner/Applicant: Dan Williams and Rachel Kassel

RESIDENTIAL PLAN: Appeal of the Director's denial of a building permit application to retain a retaining wall installed without a permit

PROCEEDINGS: Bob Bettis, Preservation Planner, presented an overview of the project, describing the Versa-Lok retaining wall that was installed, and how it fails to comply with the requirements of the Compton Hill Historic District Standards. He submitted into the record the agenda item and City Ordinances #64689 and #57702. He recommended that the Preservation Board uphold the staff denial of the project.

Appearing in support of the project were the owners, Rachel Kassel and Dan Williams.

FINDINGS OF FACTS: The Board found that:

- the wall does not meet the Compton Hill Historic District standards;
- the property does not require a retaining wall at the site due to the slope of the yard and the distance of the house from the sidewalk;
- the wall was installed without a building permit; and
- that the former Alderwoman for the Ward submitted an email that requested that the Preservation Board follow the district standards in rendering a decision regarding the project.

BOARD ACTION: It was the decision of the The Preservation Board to uphold the Director's denial as the retaining wall does not comply with the Compton Hill Historic District standards under Ordinance #57702, Section I: Residential, Walls, Fences and Enclosures. The motion was made by Board Member Melanie Fathman and seconded by Mr. Robinson. The motion passed unanimously.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Page 11 of 11

H. 2012.1574 1824 KENNETT PLACE LAFAYETTE SQUARE HISTORIC DIST.

Owner: Scott Jones and Susan Wofford-Jones

Applicant: The Grand Garden Company LLC

RESIDENTIAL PLAN: Appeal of the Director's denial of a building permit to retain a thirty (30) foot long retaining wall installed without a permit.

PROCEEDINGS: Deferred until the December Preservation Board meeting per applicant's request, and agreed to waive the time period limitation for the resolution of an appeal.