

**CITY OF ST. LOUIS
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES
JULY 29TH, 2019**

Board Members Present

Richard Callow – Chairman
Randy Vines
Tiffany Hamilton
Alderman Joe Vaccaro
Anthony Robinson
Melanie Fathman
Michael Killeen
David Richardson

Cultural Resources Office Staff Present

Dan Krasnoff, Director
Jan Cameron, Preservation Administrator
Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner
Bethany Moore, Preservation Planner
Adona Buford, Adm. Assistant

Legal Counsel

Debbie Deuster

PRELIMINARY REVIEWS

A. 2019.1083 4710 WESTMINSTER PLACE CENTRAL WEST END HISTORIC DIST.

Owner/Applicant: Rob Monzyk and Sarah Riley

RESIDENTIAL PLAN: Preliminary review for exterior alterations/renovations to front facade.

PROCEEDINGS: On July 26, 2019, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider a Preliminary Review application to paint the front façade of 4710 Westminster Place white as part of total renovations to the building in the Central West End Local Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Randy Vines, Michael Killeen, Melanie Fathman, David Richardson, Tiffany Hamilton, Alderman Joe Vaccaro and Anthony Robinson were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Bethany Moore of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that reviewed the plans for the proposed painted front façade and examined the facades of the other existing buildings of the 4700 block of Westminster Place. She noted that while a few had painted facades only one other building on the block was painted a light color. Ms. Moore recommended that the Preservation Board withhold Preliminary Approval to

the project as the paint color did not comply with the Central West End Historic District Standards.

The owners, Sarah Riley and Rob Monzyk, gave a PowerPoint presentation examining the condition of their painted front façade and style of their home. They also included images of light colored painted facades on buildings within the surrounding blocks of 4710 Westminster Place.

Board Member Hamilton asked Ms. Riley and Mr. Monzyk if the masonry had been evaluated and the owners confirmed that they had consulted with a mason.

Board Member Vines asked if the owners knew when the existing paint had been applied to the front façade and the owners stated they did not know but thought it was applied by the previous owner.

Board Member Richardson asked if the proposed window replacements met the Standards and Ms. Moore confirmed that the other proposed exterior changes had been separated into another permit and approved.

Board Member Fathman asked if the owners knew that many of the buildings were painted before the ordinance was written and therefore were grandfathered in under the Standards meaning the paint on those exteriors did not meet the current Standards. The owners stated they had come before the Preservation Board to try to do the right thing.

Board Member Robinson asked if any area of the front façade had been used as a sample spot to remove the paint. The owners stated that they had not yet done that as they wanted to come before the Board first in order to avoid any damage to the home.

Alderman Vacarro asked if the owners had spoken to their Alderman and they answered that they had not.

Bill Siebert of the Central West End Neighborhood Association spoke in opposition of the project stating that white paint is not appropriate to the style of the building, that there was only one light colored painted façade on the block and that many of the facades had been painted before the Standards were adopted.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- 4710 Westminster Place is located in the Central West End

Local Historic District.

- the Central West End Local Historic District Standards recommend that if masonry was painted either in contravention of the standards or prior to their adoption and the paint can be safely removed then it should be removed.
- the Central West End Local Historic District Standards do not have a specific palette of approved paint colors but recommends that the color of paint used be appropriate to the style of architecture, the character of the adjacent buildings, and the neighborhood.

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to grant preliminary Approval to re-paint the front façade in the event that the owners satisfy to the Cultural Resources Office in consultation with the Central West End Neighborhood Association, that the paint cannot be safely removed from the front façade. The motion was made by Commissioner David Richardson and seconded by Commissioner Michael Killeen. The motion passed with six members voting in favor, none opposing.

B. 2019.1126 #37 WESTMORELAND PLACE *Deferred to August meeting*

C. 2019.1128 1919 SIDNEY STREET BENTON PARK HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner/Applicant: Senate Square 2004 LLC

RESIDENTIAL PLAN: Preliminary review to replace aluminum windows with vinyl windows with interior muntins.

PROCEEDINGS: On July 26, 2019, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider a Preliminary Review application to install vinyl, multi-light windows on 24 residential buildings located in the Benton Park Local and National Register Historic District. The Preliminary Review Application was submitted by Senate Square 2004 LLC, the property owner.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Randy Vines, Michael Killeen, Melanie Fathman, David Richardson, Tiffany Hamilton, Alderman Joe Vaccaro and Anthony Robinson were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that reviewed each of the 24 buildings and the

window replacements proposed. She noted that the Cultural Resources Office had received several complaints; and a large number of the buildings, but not all, had had windows of inappropriate configurations installed without a permit. Ms. Cameron stated that the Cultural Resources Office had issued a Stop-Work-Order to the property owner; that the windows were vinyl; and that the Benton Park standards required wood, composite or aluminum historic replacement windows on visible facades.

Ms. Cameron further testified that the new windows replaced non-conforming windows installed in the 1970s and early 1980s. She showed photos of all the buildings, and where windows had been replaced, compared them with earlier shots from Google Streetview. She stated that the new windows do not comply with the Standards in any way: arched window where changed to flat heads; some had non-original transoms inserted; some were converted to single-hung; and original brick molding, which remained from the earlier window replacement, was capped.

Ms. Cameron recommended that the Preservation Board deny the Preliminary Review application and asked that it instruct the owner to install appropriate windows that comply with the Benton Park Standards, to include restoration of the appropriate window configurations and brick molds.

In response to an inquiry from Board Member Vines as to what had initiated this work, Ms. Cameron said she unaware of the circumstances that prompted the work. She then submitted a letter from the Benton Park Neighborhood Association against the project.

No one appeared to testify on behalf of the property owner.

Tim Mulligan, Chair of the Benton Park Building Review Committee, spoke against the work. He stated that he had been Chair of the Committee for about 20 years. He said that when he had received word that windows were being replaced, he made calls to the Cultural Resources Office & the Building Division to get a Stop-Work-Order placed. He said the work does not comply with the Benton Park standards in any way, and that the false and divided lights totally cheapen the quality of the windows in this neighborhood. Mr. Mulligan also stated that Senate Square appears to have 99 rental units available, and while the contribution of the development to the neighborhood

is appreciated, the take-away is that it is a significant organization and professional management company and should have known the rules. Mr. Mulligan further testified that in April 2009 a complaint was made about illegal wrapping of original brick mold at 1921 Sidney, the Senate Square Office, so the ownership was certainly aware of the requirements of the historic district.

Dan Guenther, Alderman of the 9th Ward, testified against the proposal. He said that prior to becoming Alderman for 17 years he also had served on the Benton Park Building Review Committee. He stated that it had taken a lot of work to put together a local design code to create a standard for redevelopment in the Benton Park neighborhood and, as Mr. Mulligan had mentioned, this was not the first time the Senate Square development initiated non-compliant work without approved permits. Alderman Guenther further testified that he echoed what Mr. Mulligan had said, and stated that the neighborhood wants the Senate Square windows held to the same standards as other property owners in the neighborhood.

In response to a question from Alderman Vacarro, Ms. Cameron stated that she thought approximately 50% of the buildings had already had their windows replaced.

Alderman Vacarro then asked Alderman Guenther what he wished to happen with these buildings, and Alderman Guenther reiterated that the development should be held to the same standards as everyone else in the neighborhood, and that the non-compliant windows should be removed and replaced by appropriate windows with all correct details.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- the 25 buildings proposed to receive replacement windows are all located within the boundaries of the Benton Park Local Historic District;
- the proposed replacement windows do not comply with the requirements of the Benton Park Standards in material, profiles, configurations and exterior trim;
- the majority of the windows have already been installed without approved permits;

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

JULY 29TH, 2019

Page 6 of 21

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to withhold preliminary approval for the replacement windows, and instructed the applicant to replace non-compliant windows on visible elevations with appropriate replacement windows, to be reviewed and approved by the Cultural Resources Office. The motion was made by Commissioner Michael Killeen and seconded by Commissioner Vines. The motion passed unanimously.

NEW APPLICATIONS

D. 2019.0734 1400-10 TOWER GROVE AVENUE FOREST PARK SE NAT'L REG. DIST.

Owner: MFH HQ, LLC

Applicant: Ahrens Contracting, Inc.

DEMOLITION PLAN:

Demolition permit application to demolish a two-story brick building.

PROCEEDINGS:

On July 29, 2019 the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider a permit for the demolition of a corner commercial building at 1400 Tower Grove Avenue in the Forest Park Southeast neighborhood. The proposal was to replace the commercial building with a new building for the Missouri Foundation for Health (the Foundation).

Board members Richard Callow (Chairman), Melanie Fathman, Tiffany Hamilton, Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, David Richardson, Randy Vines and Alderman Joseph Vacarro were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Daniel Krasnoff, Director of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that examined the sections of City Ordinance #64689, as revised by City Ordinance #64925 and City Ordinance #64832 which delineates criteria for the review of demolition proposals for properties in National Register Historic Districts. He submitted a summary prepared by the Foundation regarding the dates of design and construction activities for reuse of the former Columbia Iron Works site. He also noted that at the June, 2019 Board meeting these items were submitted for consideration: a letter of support from 17th Ward Alderman Joe Roddy, a structural analysis of the

1400 Tower Grove building, and a letter from HBD about conditions in the 1400 Tower Grove Avenue building.

Mr. Krasnoff summarized the June meeting, noting that the Board consensus was that the building's condition would warrant demolition, but that concerns regarding the subsequent new construction required additional consideration. He showed images of the revised rendering that improved the initial design by increasing the height of the third story mansard roof and adding windows that match the existing building. He also indicated that, per the staff recommendation, CRO staff be consulted regarding final design details.

Jill Nowak identified herself as the representative of the Foundation and thanked the Board for their consideration. She said the Foundation is solely funded by an endowment. She explained the desire of the Foundation to improve a location in St. Louis City that aligned with the mission of improving community health. She also emphasized the importance to the Foundation of creating a well-constructed campus. She concluded by noting the desire of the Foundation to reuse the 1400 Tower Grove building and that the preservation effort was only abandoned once the magnitude of the structural problems with the building became known.

Michael Gartenberg, construction consultant to the Foundation, addressed the Board. Mr. Gartenberg explained the design and construction team's extensive effort to reuse the 1400 Tower Grove building. He explained the effort required to renovate the main Columbian Ironworks building. Once that building was far enough along in construction, focus turned to the 1400 Tower Grove building. Mr. Gartenberg showed the Board the roles of construction drawings that were required for submission in order to obtain the building permits. He further explained the substantial due diligence that was undertaken before the decision was made to abandon rehabilitation of the 1400 Tower Grove Building.

Board Member Mike Killeen asked how much the Foundation spent on design and construction activities.

Mr. Gartenberg said \$150,000-\$200,000 in design work, with HBD having been paid over \$100,000 for work in trying to reuse the building.

Barb Anderson-Kerlin, of HOK, discussed the design for the proposed new building. She noted the desire of the Foundation to identify a property in distress that could be renovated as its new campus. She reiterated the lengths to which the Foundation and its consultants went in order to preserve the 1400 Tower Grove building. She noted changes to better replicate the mansard roof and the Vista Avenue façade of the building.

Board member Mike Killeen asked if there will be a third floor on the new building. Ms. Anderson-Kerlin replied that there will not be a third floor on the building, and that the Foundation does not need that much square footage. She also noted that the rear portion of the design was unchanged from the June, 2019 presentation.

Board member David Richardson asked if construction drawings have been executed for the new building. Ms. Anderson-Kerlin replied that those drawings are not done, only the rendering shown to the Board. She said completion of such drawings would take approximately three months. There will need to be a determination regarding what decorative aspects of the current building can be recreated on the new building. She said the design work for the 1408 Tower Grove building is complete and permits have been obtained for that renovation.

Patrick Brown, a member of the Forest Park Southeast Development Committee, of Park Central Development spoke in favor of the proposal. He summarized the review process by the Committee and urged support for the proposal.

Imran Hanafi spoke against the demolition. He said the Board should require that the new structure incorporate the existing front façade.

Maude Essen, a thirty-five year resident of the Forest Park Southeast neighborhood, spoke in opposition to the demolition.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair); Tiffany Hamilton, Randy Vines, Michael Killeen, David Richardson, Melanie Fathman, Alderman Joe Vaccaro and Anthony Robinson were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Daniel Krasnoff of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that examined the sections of City Ordinance #57688, which sets forth the standards for signs in the Skinker-DeBaliviere Parkview Catlin Tract Certified Local Historic District. Mr. Krasnoff said the relevant standard requires that on new construction signs cannot be visually dominant. He said the sign was scaled appropriately. The sign is very colorful and illuminated, but that is in keeping with other signs in the Delmar Loop. Mr. Krasnoff said Alderwoman Heather Navarro; of the 28th Ward is in support of the sign.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- 6111 Delmar is located in the Skinker-DeBaliviere Parkview Catlin Tract Certified Local Historic District;
- the standards state that new buildings cannot have elements that are “visually dominant” ;
- the sign is appropriately scaled to the height of the new building;
- there are many colorful, large-scale signs in the East Loop portion of Delmar Boulevard;
- the proposed sign is not visually dominant because it is in character with other signs approved within the East Loop section of Delmar Boulevard.

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to grant approval of the proposed sign as submitted. The motion was made by Commissioner Michael Killeen and seconded by Commissioner Robinson. The motion passed unanimously.

APPEAL OF DENIALS

F. 2019.1010

4130 SHAW BOULEVARD

SHAW HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner/Applicant: RJE Properties, LLC

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

JULY 29TH, 2019

Page **11** of **21**

RESIDENTIAL PLAN:

Appeal of a denial of a building permit application to replace a door installed without a permit.

PROCEEDINGS:

On July 29, 2019, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider an Appeal of the Director's Denial to retain a front door with side lights and 5 windows that were installed with a permit at 4130 Shaw Boulevard, in the Shaw Neighborhood Local Historic District. Board members Richard Callow (Chair); Tiffany Hamilton, Randy Vines, Michael Killeen, David Richardson, Melanie Fathman, Alderman Joe Vaccaro and Anthony Robinson were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Bethany Moore of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that examined the sections of City Ordinance #59400, which sets forth the standards for door and window replacement in the Shaw Neighborhood Local Historic District. She stated that the project does not comply with the criteria for door and window replacement outlined in the standards for the district. The standards require replacement doors and windows to be in the same vertical and horizontal proportions and style as in the original structure. The replacement door and windows do not match the vertical and horizontal proportions or style of the original doors and windows of the building. Ms. Moore noted that it was the recommendation of the Cultural Resources Office that the Preservation Board uphold the Director's denial as the door and windows installed without a permit do not meet the Shaw Neighborhood Standards.

Eric Hanson, owner, was present and gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining his reasons for replacement of the doors and windows stating he was unaware that a permit was required for the work. Mr. Hanson explained that the original double entry doors with mullion and transoms and the windows were in a state of disrepair and he had replaced them with a new single pre-hung door with sidelights and new vinyl windows as part of a total rehabilitation of the building.

Alderman Vaccaro asked Mr. Hanson if he intended to live in the house and if he had spoken to his Alderman. Mr. Hanson stated that he intended to sell the house and had not spoken to his Alderman.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

JULY 29TH, 2019

Page **12** of **21**

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- the site of the alterations is within the boundaries of the Shaw Neighborhood Certified Local Historic District.
- the alterations were done without a permit and do not meet the standards for door and window replacement in the Shaw Neighborhood Certified Local Historic District.

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to uphold the Director's denial to retain the door and windows replaced without a permit. The motion was made by Commissioner Melanie Fathman and seconded by Commissioner Anthony Robinson. The motion passed with six Board Members voting in favor and one opposed.

G. 2019.1127

3243 INDIANA AVENUE

BENTON PARK HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner: Holly Nighbert

Applicant: Z & L Wrecking Company

DEMOLITION PLAN:

Appeal of a denial to demolish a two-story brick single family.

PROCEEDINGS:

On July 29, 2019 the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider an appeal of a Director's Denial to demolish a single-family house at 3243 Indiana Avenue.

Board members Richard Callow (Chairman), Melanie Fathman, Tiffany Hamilton, Mike Killeen, David Richardson, Anthony Robinson, Randy Vines and Alderman Joseph Vacarro, were present for the hearing on this agenda item.

Daniel Krasnoff of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in to testify. He made a presentation that examined the sections of City Ordinance #64689, as revised by City Ordinance #64925; and City Ordinance #64832, which delineates criteria for the review of demolition proposals for properties in Preservation Review Districts and/or those located in National Register Historic Districts, and City Ordinance #67175 which delineates criteria for demolition in the Benton Park Local Historic District. He entered into the record:

Exhibit 1: Certified copy of Ordinance #64689

Exhibit 2: Certified copy of Ordinance #64925

Exhibit 3: Certified copies of Ordinance #64832

Exhibit 4: Certified copies of Ordinance #67175 (Benton Park Local Historic District)

Exhibit 5: The application for demolition (Including Director's denial letter of application)

Exhibit 6: The PowerPoint presentation by Mr. Krasnoff

Exhibit 7: An E-mail message James Gau appealing the Director's denial

Exhibit 8: Letter of opposition to the demolition by Benton Park Neighborhood Association

Exhibits 9 & 10: Maps of Benton Park National Register District with 3243 Indiana circled

Mr. Krasnoff stated the staff recommendation is to uphold the Director's denial of the demolition of 3243 Indiana Avenue. Mr. Krasnoff showed images of the building proposed for demolition and surrounding context. Mr. Krasnoff noted that a portion of the south façade has collapsed. He said the applicant had obtained a demolition permit for a garage at the back of the property. The garage was demolished, as was a gazebo structure adjacent to the south façade of the building which is proposed for demolition. Mr. Krasnoff showed slides of the Benton Park National Register District maps and noted that the building at 3243 Indiana is listed as a contributing resource.

Mr. Krasnoff analyzed the criteria regarding demolition in the Benton Park Local Historic District ordinance and in Ordinance #64832. He noted the ordinances have standards that are very similar.

Regarding Criterion A—Redevelopment Plans, Mr. Krasnoff testified that this criterion is not relevant because no redevelopment plan calls for the preservation or demolition of the buildings.

Regarding Criterion B—Architectural Quality, Mr. Krasnoff stated that the building is a Merit structure under the definition of Ordinance 64832, as it is identified as a "contributing" building to the Benton Park National Register Historic District.

Regarding Criterion C—Condition, Mr. Krasnoff said that the building is sound because, even with the collapse on the south façade, the building would stand for six months.

Regarding Criterion D – Neighborhood Effect and Reuse Potential, he said almost all buildings in the vicinity seem to be occupied and are in good repair and that the area is a good environment for redevelopment and investment. He said that the building has reuse potential in part because it is eligible for Historic Preservation Tax Credits which could reduce the cost of redevelopment by 25%-30%.

Regarding Criterion E—Urban Design, Mr. Krasnoff said the block is intact and the historic urban design of the block is in place. While the building is not highly ornate, it is a contributing structure to the historic district.

Regarding Criterion F—Proposed Subsequent Construction, Mr. Krasnoff said the owners possess site control. He said the proposal for a side lot for the owners' existing house next door does not equal or exceed the contribution of the existing building to the block. The applicant is not proposing to use the site for parking.

Regarding Criterion G—Commonly Controlled Property, Mr. Krasnoff testified that the house in which the owners live is adjacent to the parcel upon which the building with the collapse is situated, and is considered to be commonly controlled property. However, he noted that there are prominent references to commercial use in this criterion, and do not apply to residential uses.

Regarding Criterion H—Accessory Structures, Mr. Krasnoff did not address this criterion.

He concluded by noting that for a Merit structure to be demolished, there must be unusual circumstances that make demolition favorable. He said there are no such conditions in this case. He also said there is an unusual circumstance because the Building Commissioner has expressed the willingness to rebuild the collapsed portion of the south façade of the building if the owner does not. Should this happen, there is even less reason to justify demolition of the structure.

Mr. Krasnoff also reiterated that none of the four criteria that are specifically mentioned in the first paragraph of Section Five of Ordinance 64832 were met:

(A) The demolition is not called for in an approved Redevelopment Plan; (D) the neighborhood is in good repair and the building has reuse potential; (F) the Proposed Subsequent Construction—a side yard— does not equal or exceed the contribution of the existing building to the existing streetscape and block face; and (G) although there is Commonly Controlled Property, it is not commercial property, so the case for that criterion holding sway is limited. Mr. Krasnoff concluded by saying the Board should uphold the Director's denial.

Board members Anthony Robinson and Alderman Joseph Vacarro asked Mr. Krasnoff if he could elaborate on the Building Commissioner's willingness to have the collapsed south façade rebuilt. Mr. Krasnoff said he had no further information. Mr. Krasnoff said the Building Commissioner would charge the owners the cost of rebuilding the wall.

Board member Michael Killeen asked if the reason for the collapse was related to the demolition activity on the site. Mr. Krasnoff said he thought it was and that question could be put to the applicant.

Attorneys and co-appellants Jim Gau and Holly Nighbert, (Ms. Nighbert is the listed in City of St. Louis records as the owner of 3243 Indiana) were sworn and testified before the Board. Mr. Gau entered into the record:

Exhibit 11: the PowerPoint presentation by the applicant

Mr. Gau proceeded to go through the PowerPoint. He said the building is contributing but that the National Register nomination does not list the building at 3243 Indiana in the inventory of structures in the National Register District. He then showed slides of buildings on the block. He noted that two buildings are vacant/condemned; he noted that most buildings in the vicinity were built with red brick; that many have ornamental brickwork; that some were listed in the National Register as Craftsman style, and that the brick of some buildings have been painted, Mr. Gau then showed streetscape photos. Mr. Gau said it appears as if the street trees were planted in front of 3243 Indiana in order to hide the building from public view.

Mr. Gau testified that 3243 Indiana is listed on the National Register District map as a Craftsman style building. He then read a description of that of the elements of that style and concluded that the design of 3243 Indiana is not in keeping with the description.

He then submitted a cost estimate derived from online sources and consultation with others who have had such work done on their houses; and argued that, when compared to the sale value of the property, repair costs would be approximately \$9,500.00 greater than the house's resale value. To buttress this argument he submitted the sale prices of recently sold houses in the area. Therefore, Mr. Gau stated that, per the Benton Park ordinance, the only feasible rehabilitation of 3243 Indiana would be equivalent to the cost of total reconstruction of the building. He also noted that the seller's disclosure when he and Ms. Nighbert purchased the building showed termite damage, and he did not know how that would impact the cost. Mr. Gau testified that the cost to demolish 3243 Indiana and regrade and seed the lot is \$59,000.00. He stated that the value of the property at 3249 would likely increase by more than that amount with the larger side yard. He showed a parcel a block away on Missouri with a building and three adjacent parcels combined, stating that this showed that such large parcels with one house on them exist in the neighborhood. Mr. Gau said that the Commonly Controlled Property criteria is applicable to the demolition proposal and that, because the zoning is allowed, and there is common ownership of both parcels, favorable consideration should be given for the demolition to go forward.

Mr. Gau objected to the neighborhood association's letter. He said it is not known if they have the ability to act without showing a resolution from the Board of the organization. Under section 24 of St. Louis City ordinances, the Board should consider the opinion of adjoining property owners. Mr. Gau then submitted into the record the signatures of nine owners within 150 feet of the building in support of the demolition. He submitted the following into the record:

Exhibit 12: Petition signatures collected by the appellants seeking demolition of 3243 Indiana

Exhibit 13: Notarized affidavit signed by the applicant seeking demolition regarding this petition

Mr. Gau testified that Z & L Wrecking applied for the demolitions, not Mr. Gau or Ms. Nighbert. Also, he said that the gazebo would have been considered an ancillary structure and would be approved for demolition, per the ordinance. Mr. Gau then concluded his remarks.

Chairman Callow asked if Mr. Gau thought a permit was issued for demolition of the gazebo. He replied that he thought there was such a permit. Mr. Gau said neither he nor Ms. Nighbert was on site when the collapse occurred, but that the wrecking company said the wall fell while they were on the site.

Board member Randy Vines asked about the history of their ownership of the properties. Mr. Gau said 3249 Indiana was bought in May, 2016 and that 3243 was bought in September. Mr. Gau said that property was going into foreclosure sale for back taxes. Their intention at the time was to increase the size of their lot and they were unsure what to do with the house.

Mr. Vines asked Mr. Gau if he knew the house being purchased was in an historic district and if neighbors were asked if they would like to see rehabilitation of the building. Mr. Gau said two or three neighbors wanted the building rehabbed, and therefore did not sign the petition.

Board members asked Mr. Gau how Historic Tax Credits might impact the reuse potential of the house proposed for demolition. He said he was unsure how to use the tax credits.

Board member Anthony Robinson said the cost estimate for the garage was too high by \$15,000, as was the cost for the kitchen, and the cost to tuck point the building was \$5,000.00 too high. Mr. Gau said there is no kitchen in the house at this time and the plumbing had been removed from the house. Mr. Robinson said that with \$35,000.00 in savings from the garage, kitchen and tuck-pointing, plus the savings in tax credits, the economics of the project might be feasible. Board member Tiffany Hamilton said the projected sale value of \$130,000.00 was too high.

Ms. Hamilton asked Mr. Gau about the Building Commissioner potentially rebuilding the wall. Mr. Gau said he had never heard that before.

Board member David Richardson asked the date of construction of the building proposed for demolition. Mr. Gau said it was built in 1905. Mr. Richardson quoted the Benton Park historic district ordinance, that:

“Buildings which are considered contributing on the National Register of Historic Places listing #8500323 and/or 75 years old or older are considered historically significant.” He asked if the building met the seventy-five year test. Mr. Gau said the building does but that such a clause makes no sense as a seventy-five year

old house today was built in the 1940's and those are not historic. Chairman Callow noted that buildings from the mid-20th century period are now being designated historic. Mr. Richardson noted the ordinance was approved in 2010 and that the authors surely thought that a house built in 1905 was historic. Mr. Gau said he does not believe the house is a Craftsman house. He thought it was not put in the proper category in the Benton Park Historic District National Register nomination form.

Karen Bode Baxter was sworn and testified in opposition to the demolition. She said state Historic Tax Credits would be available for this building and would not be subject to caps that are applied to large projects. She said the rehabilitation would qualify for approximately \$50,000.00 in tax credits based upon the numbers presented by Mr. Gau.

Chairman Richard Callow asked how she knows this information. Ms. Bode-Baxter said she has worked in the historic tax credit field since 1998 and she has worked on over 400 such projects.

Holly Nighbert objected to Ms. Bode Baxter testifying as an expert as her credentials were not entered into the record. Chairman Callow said that was noted.

Tim Mulligan represented the Benton Park Neighborhood Association and identified himself as the Chair of the Building Review Committee for the neighborhood and also as a former member of the Preservation Board. He was sworn and testified against the demolition. He said that the owners of the building are active in the neighborhood association and he was sympathetic to their situation, but that the building should be preserved. He also said that a few buildings have been lost through accidents since the historic district was created in 2006. He said the neighborhood organization works to seek solutions that make sense for owner and the community.

Alderman Dan Guenther was sworn and testified against the demolition. He said he was active in the neighborhood organization. Except for illegal demolitions that happened on weekends, he is unaware of any demolitions that have been approved since the historic district's creation. He said there have been a number of buildings that were proposed for demolition that have been rehabilitated after their demolition being denied by the Preservation Board.

Alderman Guenther showed a picture of the building before the collapse. He noted that the owners had applied for a demolition

permit for 3243 Indiana that was withdrawn prior to the collapse of the south wall while the gazebo was being demolished. He said that the building at 3215 Indiana, a few parcels north of 3243 Indiana, is being offered for sale for \$500,000.00. He said there is a strong real estate market in the neighborhood. Alderman Guenther also said there is plenty of park space in the neighborhood. He questioned the petition signature of Kevin Hampton, of 3349 Indiana. Alderman Guenther said Mr. Hampton told him that he did not recall signing the petition.

Director Krasnoff re-addressed the Board. He said that 3243 Indiana is a record of the development of the Benton Park neighborhood. The building is not heavily ornamented, but that does not diminish its contribution to the built fabric of the District. He also noted that the owner had applied for a permit for building demolition that was cancelled within the last 12 months. He reiterated that every demolition degrades the architectural integrity of the District. He noted that Commonly Controlled property is the second lowest category for consideration, and that the criteria are listed "in order of importance." Criteria B – Architectural Quality – is the second most important criteria, after –A- Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Krasnoff also said unusual circumstances were not shown, and that the cost analysis to reuse the building was not done based upon expert-derived figures, and if it were, the use of tax credits would indicate the building is viable for reuse.

Mr. Jim Gau re-addressed the Board and stated that there have been 24 demolitions approved within the Benton Park neighborhood since 2006, according to City of St. Louis data. He said the ordinance does not say the criteria are in order of importance. In response, Mr. Krasnoff quoted the first paragraph of Section 5 which states that the criteria are listed in order of importance.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- the building proposed for demolition, 3243 Indiana Avenue, is a Merit building under Ordinance #64832.
- the building is a contributing resource to the Benton Park National Register District and the Benton Park Local Historic District.
- the building suffered a collapse while a demolition contractor was working on site to demolish a garage, for which there was an approved demolition permit.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

JULY 29TH, 2019

Page 20 of 21

- the contractor also demolished a gazebo near the south façade of the house for which there was no approved permit.
- an application for State and Federal Historic Tax Credits would be available to assist in the economics of the rehabilitation of the historic building.

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to uphold the Director's denial of the demolition because it does not satisfy the criteria of the ordinances that were entered into the record.

3243 Indiana is a Merit building and contributing resource to the Benton Park Local Historic District.

The motion was made by Commissioner David Richardson and seconded by Commissioner Fathman. The motion passed with all members voting in favor.

SPECIAL AGENDA ITEMS:

Nominations to the National Register of Historic Places

H.

Maplewood Historic Commercial District

7145-7233 and 7146-7192 Manchester Blvd., 7209-11 Lanham

ACTION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to direct the staff to prepare a report for the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office that the Maplewood Historic Commercial District meets National Register Criterion A for Commerce and C for Architecture. The motion was made by Commissioner David Richardson and seconded by Ms. Hamilton. The motion passed unanimously.

I.

Ringen Stove Company Factory – 2001 S. Kingshighway Blvd.

ACTION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to direct the staff to prepare a report for the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office that the Ringen Stove Company Factory meets National Register Criterion A for Industry. The motion was made by Commissioner David Richardson and seconded by Ms. Hamilton. The motion passed unanimously.

TRANSMIT LANDMARK DESIGNATION TO PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Oscar Waring Home – 1211 Tower Grove Avenue

Galilee Missionary Baptist Church - 4300 Delmar Blvd.

PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES

JULY 29TH, 2019

Page **21** of **21**

BOARD ACTION:

Commissioner David Richardson moved to transmit the Landmark designations of the Oscar Waring Home and the Galilee Church to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Public Service. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion, the motion passed unanimously.