

**CITY OF ST. LOUIS
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES
JUNE 29, 2020**

Commissioners Present

Richard Callow – Chairman
Randy Vines
Mike Killeen
Hon. Jack Coatar
Anthony Robinson
Tiffany Hamilton
David Richardson
Melanie Fathman

Cultural Resources Office Staff Present

Dan Krasnoff, Director
Jan Cameron, Preservation Administrator
Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner
Bethany Moore, Preservation Planner
Adona Buford, Board Secretary

Legal Counsel

Barbara Birkicht

PRELIMINARY REVIEWS

A. 2020.0607 1910 RUTGER STREET LAFAYETTE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner: Tara & Scott Evans

Applicant: Garcia Construction – Mark Mangapora

RESIDENTIAL PLAN Preliminary review to construct new retaining wall at front façade.

PROCEEDINGS: On June 29, 2020, 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 construct a retaining wall at 1910 Rutger Street, located within the boundaries of the Lafayette Square Local Historic District. Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Randy Vines, Mike Killeen, Alderman Jack Coatar, Tiffany Hamilton, Melanie Fathman, Anthony Robinson, David Richardson and Randy Vines were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Andrea Gagen of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #69112, which sets forth the standards for the Lafayette Square Local Historic District, and in particular Sections 401 and 402, which pertains to the slope of public yards and retaining walls. Ms. Gagen stated that the proposed wall did not have an appropriate Historic Model

Example (HME), and that changing the historic slope of the yard did not meet the historic district standards. She also stated that the wall was much higher than historic walls of limestone slab, which mainly served as the base for wrought iron railings.

Mark Mangapora, the applicant, of Garcia Properties, spoke in support of the project, citing erosion issues as the reason for the proposed retaining wall. He also stated that the wall would only be 30" high.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- The proposed site for the retaining wall, 1910 Rutger Street, is located in the Lafayette Square Local Historic District.
- the proposed wall will alter the historic slope of the yard.
- the proposed wall is not based on an appropriate HME, as what was submitted was not a retaining wall.
- although the material of the wall may meet the historic district standards, the height and design of the wall do not.

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to deny Preliminary Approval to the retaining wall as presented. The motion was made by Commissioner David Richardson. Alderman Coatar seconded the motion. The motion passed 5 to 1 with Commissioners Randy Vines, Tiffany Hamilton, Melanie Fathman, David Richardson, Anthony Robinson and Alderman Coatar voting in favor of the motion and Commissioner Mike Killeen opposing the motion. Chairman Callow abstained.

B. 2020.0790 1116 MISSOURI AVENUE LAFAYETTE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner/Applicant: Cornerstone Development – Sam Chimento

RESIDENTIAL PLAN

Preliminary review to construct 5-story apartment building.

PROCEEDINGS:

On June 29, 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 construct a five-story apartment building at 1116 Missouri Avenue, a part of the proposed Chouteau Avenue Corridor Redevelopment project, located within the boundaries of the Lafayette Square Local Historic District. Commissioners Richard Callow (Chair), Randy Vines, Mike Killeen, Alderman Jack Coatar, Tiffany Hamilton, Melanie Fathman,

Anthony Robinson, David Richardson and Randy Vines were present for the testimony for this agenda item. Commissioners Richardson abstained from discussion and voting on this item.

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #69112, which sets forth the standards for the Lafayette Square Local Historic District, and in particular Section 306, "Residential, Commercial and Mixed-Use New Construction on Large Sites." Ms. Cameron stated that the proposed site was in the center of the former Praxair property, a large parcel in the northwest quadrant of the District that has little adjacent historic context.

Ms. Cameron displayed a site plan of the project and renderings. She testified that the Cultural Resources Office staff initially had concerns about the first submittal, as that design did not comply with the requirements of the Standards that new construction on large sites, although not required to follow a Model Example, should still be compatible with the District in exterior materials and other elements. She stated that the current proposal was a significant response to the suggestions of the Cultural Resources Office, and recommended that the Preservation Board grant preliminary approval subject to final plans and exterior materials to be reviewed and approved by the staff. In response to a question from Alderman Coatar, Ms. Cameron acknowledged that entry to the interior parking was from LaSalle Street, a new extension to be constructed as part of the project, and not from an alley as the Standards require. However, she said elements of the site made this difficult and the appearance of the garage entries had been upgraded from the initial submission. She said the staff did not feel this element was sufficient to prohibit them from recommending the project to the Preservation Board.

Bob Powers of HOK made a presentation describing the Master plan of the entire site, and the proposed apartment building. He noted the many changes that had been made to address the concerns of the Cultural Resources staff, including an altered fenestration pattern, brick and foundation color; a more prominent "cornice" above the brick stories and brick soldier courses and cast stone sills at openings. In response to a question from Commissioner Killeen regarding the building's solid-to-void ratio, Mr. Powers responded that they had looked at historic

buildings in the Square that had a ratio of about 18%, and that the building was very close to that; on street elevations it was as little as 11%. Mr. Killeen asked about sill and head height of the window, as they appeared small to him. Mr. Powers stated that the sill height was 36 inches and the head height 8 feet, and to allow the windows to open sufficiently to meet ventilation requirements, a sill height of 36 inches was required. Mr. Killeen responded that in historic buildings, the sill height was about 24 inches.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Fathman asking why a yellow color had been chosen for the recessed areas of the facade, Mr. Powers stated that the color shown on the renderings and elevations was not the final selection and then displayed other alternatives. Mr. Powers stated that the CRO would have input on the final choice.

Suzanne Sessions, Co-Vice President of the Lafayette Square Development Committee, spoke in partial opposition to the project. She said while the Lafayette Square Restoration Committee [LSRC] supports the project, the Standards state that cement board is to be used only in moderation and not as a primary building material. She asked that the Preservation Board withhold approval until the amount of cement board was reduced and/or another material substituted.

William Odell, developer of the project, testified that he had been working with the members of the LSRC for three years and had met many of their requests. He said the project needed to begin and asked for the Board's approval.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- the proposed site for construction, 1116 Missouri Avenue, is located in the Lafayette Square Local Historic District and in an area designated in the Standards as "Residential, Commercial & Mixed-Use New Construction on Large Site."
- the building is in the center of a large vacant site with very little historic context. The building will front on LaSalle Street and new construction is proposed to surround it on the other three sides;
- the design complies with all requirements of the Standards for Large Sites, apart from four garage entry doors on the LaSalle

elevation. These have been articulated to present an appearance more appropriate for a primary façade.

BOARD DECISION: It was the decision of the Preservation Board to grant Preliminary Approval to the design as presented, with the condition that final design details and exterior materials are reviewed and approved by the Cultural Resources Office staff. The motion was made by Commissioner Melanie Fathman. Commissioner Randy Vines seconded the motion. The motion passed with Commissioners Vines, Hamilton, Fathman and Alderman Coatar, voting in favor; Commissioner Killeen opposed; and Chairman Callow and Commissioner Richardson abstaining.

APPEALS OF DENIALS

C. 2020.0103 #9 BENTON PLACE LAFAYETTE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner/Applicant: Thomas Schmidt

RESIDENTIAL PLAN Appeal of a denial of a building permit application to replace an existing side porch.

PROCEEDINGS: On June 29, 2020, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider an appeal of a denial of a building permit application to construct an addition at 9 Benton Place, in the Lafayette Square Local Historic District. Commissioner Richard Callow (Chair), Randy Vines, Mike Killeen, Alderman Jack Coatar, Tiffany Hamilton, Melanie Fathman, Anthony Robinson, David Richardson and Randy Vines 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 #69112, which sets forth the standards for the Lafayette Square Local Historic District. Mr. Krasnoff entered into the record the following items:

- Certified copy of Ordinance 64689
- Certified copy of Ordinance 64925
- Certified copy of Ordinance 69112
- Two messages of opposition by the Lafayette Square Restoration Committee
- Three messages of support from residents of Benton Place.

Mr. Krasnoff showed the design and photos of the site. He noted that the basis for the design is the model example window on the rear façade of the house. He said that replacement of the porch with a frame enclosure is appropriate because the use of frame references the porch more effectively than would a “heavy” enclosure of brick or stone. He acknowledged that the standards would require a brick or stone addition because the rest of the house, besides the porch, is of those materials.

Likewise, he also said that the standards require the foundation of the frame addition to be stone or to replicate stone. However, Mr. Krasnoff noted that the foundation would be unseen due to the grade change and the location of the addition at the rear of the house. Summarizing, he said that the applicant has worked with staff to increase the compatibility of the design and that the project would not have a negative impact upon the historic character of the district.

Commissioner Richardson asked Mr. Krasnoff if he thought the proposal met the “big requirements” of Massing and Scale, Proportions, Solid to void ratio, Exterior materials, Color and Appearance as a secondary portion of the structure. Mr. Krasnoff said his opinion was that the proposal meets those requirements.

Commissioner Alderman Jack Coatar asked Mr. Krasnoff if he knew the age of the porch. Mr. Krasnoff said he did not know the age of the porch but he did not think it is from the 19th century.

Tom Schmidt, owner of 9 Benton Place spoke in favor of the proposal. He stated that the house was in very bad condition when his family purchased it. He identified improvements to the house made by his family.

Phil Lamczyk, representing the Lafayette Square Restoration Committee, spoke in opposition to the project. He said the Lafayette Square Restoration Committee’s opposition results from these deficiencies: the ratio of solid to void is wrong, the original exterior brick wall is removed, the exterior material should be brick or stone, windows should be arched, the foundation should be stone or imitation stone and the model example window is inappropriate.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- #9 Benton Place is located in the Lafayette Square Local Historic District;
- although the proposed addition does not comply with the Exterior Materials and Color section of the Lafayette Square Standards, there was an existing porch at this location and the Cultural Resources Office believes that a frame addition resembling an enclosed porch is appropriate at this location;
- the Standards require that the exterior materials reflect those of the HME, which in this case is an oriole window on the rear elevation of existing house. Although the addition is not brick as required by the Standards, its design is based on the detailing of that window.
- the details of the cornice are similar to the existing oriole window, but the base trim should be revised to match the window detailing more closely. The owner has agreed to this change.

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to overturn the Director's denial of the addition, as it has been revised to substantially comply with the Lafayette Square Historic District Standards, and with the stipulation that the details be approved by the Cultural Resources Office staff. The motion was made by Commissioner Tiffany Hamilton. Alderman Jack Coatar seconded the motion. The motion passed 5 to 1 with Commissioners Vines, Alderman Coatar, Hamilton, Fathman and Richardson voting in favor and Commissioner Mike Killeen opposed.

D. 2020.0599 6152 WASHINGTON BLVD. SKINKER-DeBALIVIERE CATLIN TRACT

Owner/Applicant: Cameron and Rebecca Ayers

RESIDENTIAL PLAN

Appeal of a denial of a building permit application to replace a slate roof with asphalt shingles.

PROCEEDINGS:

On June 29, 2020, 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 replace a slate roof with GAF Slateline, at 6152 Washington Boulevard, in the Skinker-

DeBaliviere-Catlin Tract-Parkview Local Historic District. The application was submitted by the roofing company, John Beal, Inc. Commissioner Richard Callow (Chair), Randy Vines, Mike Killeen, David Richardson, Melanie Fathman, Tiffany Hamilton and Alderman Jack Coatar 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 #57688 which sets forth the standards for roofs in the Skinker-DeBaliviere-Catlin Tract-Parkview Local Historic District. She entered into the record Ordinance #64689, as revised by City Ordinance #64925, the enabling legislation; and Ordinance #57688, the Skinker-DeBaliviere-Catlin Tract-Parkview Local Historic District Ordinance, the Preservation Board Agenda, the PowerPoint, her presentation and financial documents submitted by the applicant for the Board's review. Ms. Moore stated that the existing roofing material was slate. She explained that, according to the Standards, when the historic roofing material exists on a sloped roof, that material or an approved replica material shall be used. Ms. Moore noted that GAF Slateline was not an approved replica material for slate and therefore did not meet the Standards. She explained that an approved replica material would be a synthetic slate material, such as a DiVinci slate product. Based upon the standards, Ms. Moore recommended that the Board uphold the Director's denial of the application.

Cameron Ayers, owner of the property, spoke on his own behalf. He stated that due to the deteriorated condition of the slate he was anxious to get the roof fixed by applying the GAF Slateline. He said he did not disagree with Ms. Moore's presentation but wanted to use the GAF Slateline as the replacement.

In response to a question from Alderman Coatar, Mr. Ayers responded that they were not proposing to use an approved replica material that would meet the Standards due to the extreme cost difference between GAF Slateline and an approved replica material. He stated that the cost of the GAF Slateline was less than half the cost of replacing the roof with DiVinci synthetic slate. He also thought it was unfair to require them to replace their roof with a costlier material when no other houses on their street were required to do so due to the existing circumstances of their roofs.

In response to a question from Chairman Callow, Mr. Ayers stated

that he had submitted financial information to the Cultural Resources Office to support his claim of financial hardship. He explained that his wife had been furloughed due to the COVID-19 pandemic and that their insurance claim for the work had been denied and they unexpectedly had to pay for the roof repairs in full out of their bank account.

In response to a question by Ms. Moore, Mr. Ayers stated that John Beal had given them the lowest quote out of other companies they asked for the roof repairs using the GAF Slateline. He explained that the GAF Slateline was a high quality product that was made to look similar to slate. He told the Board that the GAF Slateline replacement would cost them \$3,800 while the DiVinci synthetic slate would cost \$8,300.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board found that:

- the site of the proposed roof replacement, 6152 Washington Blvd, is located in the Skinker-DeBaliviere-Catlin Tract-Parkview Local Historic District.
- the Skinker-DeBaliviere-Catlin Tract-Parkview standards for Roofs require where historic roof material exists, that material or an approved replica material shall be used to replace it.
- GAF Slateline does not meet the Standards as an approved replica material to replace slate.
- the applicants had provided enough evidence to support their claim of financial hardship.

BOARD DECISION:

It was the decision of the Preservation Board to overturn the Director's Denial on the grounds of financial hardship. The motion was made by Commissioner Mike Killeen and seconded by Commissioner Melanie Fathman. The motion passed unanimously.

SPECIAL AGENDA ITEMS

Nominations to the National Register of Historic Places

E.

ACTION:

ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN POLICE GARAGE- 3919 Laclede Avenue

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 St. Louis Metropolitan Police Garage meet National Register Criterion A for Community Planning and Development. The motion was made by Commissioner David Richardson and seconded by Randy Vines and Tiffany Hamilton. The motion passed unanimously.

F. **HOFFMAN MAGNETO CO. & GARAGE aka NASH MOTOR CO.**
3868-74 Washington Boulevard

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 Hoffman Magneto Company & Garage Building meets National Register Criterion A for Commerce. The motion was made by Commissioner David Richardson and seconded by Randy Vines and Tiffany Hamilton. The motion passed unanimously.