

**CITY OF ST. LOUIS
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES
FEBRUARY 28, 2022**

Board Members Present:

Richard Callow – Chair
Michael Allen
Tiffany Hamilton
Mike Killeen
David Richardson
David Weber

Cultural Resources Office Staff present:

Meg Lousteau, Director
Jan Cameron, Preservation Administrator
Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner
Bob Bettis, Preservation Planner
Deneen Funk, Administrative Assistant

Legal Counsel

Barbara Birkicht

The meeting was called to order by Chair Callow at 4:09 pm.

Chair Callow proposed that Agenda Item A be removed from the agenda and re-scheduled at the request of Alderman Coatar, who could not be present, and the neighborhood association. Orlando Askins, the applicant, was present and voiced an objection. Board member Richardson moved to adopt the agenda without Item A. Chair Callow seconded. Discussion ensued.

Chair Callow called the motion to a vote. Voting in support of the motion were Board members Allen and Richardson. Voting against were Board members Hamilton, Killeen, and Weber. The motion failed.

Board member Hamilton then moved to approve the agenda as written. Board member Weber seconded. Voting in favor were Board members Allen, Killeen, Hamilton, and Weber. Voting against was Board member Richardson.

Board member Allen moved to approve the January 24, 2022 minutes. Board member Weber seconded. The vote to approve was unanimous.

Chair Callow then moved to the special agenda item. Ms. Lousteau noted that Jason Whiteley, the featured speaker, was having technical issues and suggested that the Board take up that item later in the meeting.

A. 1027-1029 LAMI STREET Souldard Certified Local & National Register Historic District

Owner: 3301 Pestalozzi LLC

Applicant: Orlando Askins

Plan: Preliminary Review to construct two townhouses

PROCEEDINGS

On February 28, 2021, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider Preliminary Review of a proposal to construct two attached townhouses at 1027 & 1029 Lami Street, at the corner of Menard in the Soulard Neighborhood Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, Tiffany Hamilton, David Weber, David Richardson, and Michael Allen were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Andrea Gagen of the Cultural Resources Office (CRO) made the presentation. Ms. Gagen explained that the owner had submitted a Preliminary Review application to construct two three-story attached townhouses. She stated that the owner had originally applied for a permit in December 2020, but that application was denied by Cultural Resources, and, when that decision was appealed, was denied by the Preservation Board. The applicant then began working with Cultural Resources staff on a design that more closely adhered to the historic district standards. She said that the Alderman as well as the neighborhood made their request to defer the matter to CRO.

Ms. Gagen showed the new Model Example proposed by the applicant at 1852 S. 10th St., observing that the applicant's design doubled the Model Example to create two attached townhouses. She reminded the Board that the applicant had originally wanted to do front entry garages, but due to the June 2021 Preservation Board denial, they had changed to parking pads.

Ms. Gagen showed the Lami (front) and Menard (east side) elevations, commenting that there had been a problem with the solid-to-void ratio on the Menard elevation, but that the applicant had addressed it. She noted another issue: the use of vinyl siding on the portion that extended beyond the brick. Cultural Resources wanted cementitious siding, and the use of vinyl siding would require a Model Example using that material on a Public Façade. On the west elevation, Cultural Resources had asked for the brick return to extend further back, as the distance between the applicant's building and the neighboring building was now larger due to the addition of a parking pad between them. The applicant had agreed to make the change, but CRO had not yet received revised drawings reflecting this change.

Ms. Gagen showed the rear elevation, which illustrated that the applicant had wrapped the brick around on the first and second stories. She stated that a portion of this façade was Semi-Public because it sat forward of the adjacent building line, and that the applicant would need a Model Example to use vinyl siding on that portion of the building. She then showed photos of the surrounding context.

Ms. Gagen stated that the building was in partial compliance with the setback requirements, as it complies on the Lami side, but does not comply on the Menard side due to its position forward of the building line of the adjacent building. She said that the majority of the buildings on Menard are sited on the sidewalk, as was the original building on this site. She noted that the proposed townhouses substantially complied with the mass requirements, being similar in mass to the majority of the buildings on Menard and Lami, and in proportion to the adjacent building on Lami as well as the Model Example. In terms of façade material and color, she stated there was partial compliance, as the brick on the west elevation extends 12 feet, but should extend 14 feet to correspond to the 14-foot distance between the buildings.

Ms. Gagen stated that the Cultural Resources Office recommended that the Preservation Board grant Preliminary Approval for the project with the conditions that the siding on the east and rear elevations be 4-inch cementitious siding, and that the Cultural Resources Office review and approve final design details and exterior materials and colors.

Ms. Gagen went on to say that the Souldard Restoration Group had not submitted a letter because they were hoping the matter would be deferred, but had mentioned to her some general concerns. They were not supportive of the curbcuts and parking pads, and wanted the brick to wrap further on the north and west elevations. They wanted cementitious, rather than vinyl siding. Regarding the site plan, they felt it was insufficiently detailed.

Ms. Gagen said that she believed part of the concern over the parking pads is that there is a slope on the Menard side, and the adjacent building is at a higher grade, so it would be helpful to have more detail on how the parking pad in that location addressed the grade. In response to a question from Board Member Killeen about whether the curbcuts were within CRO's purview Ms. Gagen replied that the curbcut on Menard falls more within CRO purview, as the applicant would have to change the slope of the yard to install it. On the Lami side, the parking pad isn't as much of an issue because there is a more consistent grade.

She also noted a few discrepancies between the floor plan and elevations, noting that was something CRO can and does address during later stages of the review process for Preliminary Review projects.

Board Member Killen also inquired whether the office had gotten the usual community consultation from the Souldard Restoration Group (SRG) on this project. Ms. Gagen answered that she hadn't, as the applicant hadn't gone to the SRG, and the SRG only learned of the revised plans when the Preliminary Agenda had been released on February 18th. That was when the Alderman, Jack Coatar, also saw them.

In response to a question from Board Member Richardson as to when the Cultural Resources Office had received the plans, Ms. Gagen responded that the final revised plans had been submitted on February 18th, although they had been working with the owner and applicant previously. Board Member Robinson asked Ms. Gagen to confirm that that everyone had had

the plans for about ten days, which she confirmed, noting that CRO had seen several previous iterations.

Board Member Weber inquired about whether the Cultural Resources Office knew if the applicant was retaining any of the trees. Ms. Gagen replied that the question would be better directed to the applicant.

Board Member Richardson asked about the list of items in the staff report that partially complied. Ms. Gagen replied that she believed those items related to a previous version of the plans. The only items in the revised plans before the Board that partially complied were the setback and the siding.

Orlando Askins of 3301 Pestalozzi, LLC, owner, spoke on his own behalf. He stated that Jason Plough, the project architect, was also available for questions. Mr. Askins stated that he had made every effort to get the SRG involved after the June 2021 denial. Alderman Coatar advised that he, Mr. Askins, meet with the group, but that Alderman Coatar had not put them in touch. Mr. Askins stated that the Alderman eventually recommended that he speak directly with Ms. Lousteau and Ms. Gagen at CRO, and that he had been in touch with them for the past several months, working to bring the design closer to compliance. Mr. Askins said that he'd made substantial compromises, and thought that everyone could agree the project is now closer to what CRO and the Preservation Board wanted.

Mr. Askins stated that they had examples of street-facing garage doors, on both 2 and 2 ½ story buildings. He said that they had foregone the garage doors in this latest revision, and hoped that would please the Preservation Board.

Regarding the curbcuts, Mr. Askins said off-street parking was required by Zoning, and would be a selling point for the properties. He stated that the plans have only two curbcuts, although the parking pads can each accommodate two cars, so they're providing off-street parking for 4 cars. Mr. Askins believed that the project was now in compliance with every element of Souldard's guidelines, with the possible exception of partial compliance on materials. He was open to working with the Board on the siding material, but preferred to use vinyl for cost reasons. Mr. Askins stated that aside from that, he thought they were in line with every item that Ms. Gagen had listed, and that he hoped the Board would take that into consideration. He offered that he and Mr. Plough would answer any questions.

Board Member Weber asked if they were going to be able to save any of the trees on the lot. Mr. Askins replied that could save the curbside tree on Lami, but that the two trees in the center of the lot would have to be removed.

Board Member Killeen inquired about community consultation and asked Mr. Askins to repeat what he had said about making an attempt to contact the Alderman and the community. Mr. Askins replied the he first inquired about doing this project around 2016-2017. He said that the SRG had communicated with him via email, and then communication stopped. At that

point, this project was not a priority for them as they were working on a number of other projects. He said they tabled the Lami project for a while and then tried to pick it back up, but got no responses from SRG. Mr. Askins stated that they then spoke to Dan Krasnoff (CRO Director at the time), who told them to submit plans to the Cultural Resources Office in advance of the June 2021 Preservation Board meeting. Mr. Askins said it was then that the SRG objected, indicating that they were not in support. Mr. Askins had spoken to Alderman Coatar for several months leading up to the June meeting, and Alderman had indicated that he was not in support because his constituents were not in support.

Mr. Askins stated that he then asked Alderman Coatar for advice, and the Alderman said he would arrange a meeting with the SRG. That didn't happen. Alderman Coatar then told Mr. Askins to work closely with Ms. Lousteau and Ms. Gagen, and they did.

Mr. Askins said that they had never hidden their intentions from the SRG, and had not gotten cooperation from the neighborhood, despite reaching out via email and text, so they decided to move forward.

Board Member Allen asked if Mr. Askins had developed other properties in Soulard or if this was his first time. Mr. Askins replied that he had, and had also done projects in Compton Heights and was working on one in Benton Park. In those cases, he stated, he'd never had an issue with the neighborhood associations, and that this was the first time he had experienced pushback. Mr. Askins stated that he was content with the current design, despite preferring the earlier version with garages.

Chair Callow asked Mr. Askins if he would abide by the staff recommendations, and Mr. Askins answered yes.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Preservation Board finds that:

- 1027-29 Lami Street is located in the Soulard Neighborhood Local Historic District.
- The applicant has provided a Model Example, located at 2346 S. 11th Street, for the proposed new construction. The new construction creates two attached townhouses.
- The proposed building substantially complies with the Soulard Historic District standards, except for the siding on the Menard and rear elevations.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After due consideration and after weighing each piece of evidence and making a determination of the credibility of the witnesses, the Board has made a determination as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board moved to defer the item until there was community consultation and Aldermanic input. The motion was made by Board Member Killeen and seconded by Board Member Richardson. The motion failed 2-4, with Board Members Killeen and Richardson in favor, Board Members Allen, Robinson, Hamilton and Weber opposed. Chair Callow abstained.

The Preservation Board moved to approve the design as presented at this Preliminary Review with the conditions that the siding on the east elevation and rear of the building be 4" cementitious lap siding ; and that the Cultural Resources Office review and approve final design details, exterior materials and colors; and that the applicant meet with the Soulard Restoration Group one time. The motion was made by Board Member Richardson and seconded by Board Member Allen. The motion passed 5-0, with Board Members Allen, Robinson, Hamilton, Richardson, and Weber in favor of the motion, with Board Member Killeen and Chair Callow abstaining.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

SPECIAL AGENDA ITEM - Presentation and demonstration of interactive map of significant sites in St. Louis's African American history

In honor of Black History Month, Jason Whiteley, Research Analyst for the Planning and Urban Design Agency, presented an interactive website that he and CRO had been working on to map sites of cultural and historic significance to St. Louis's African American community. That map is now available on the CRO website under "Projects."

Mr. Whiteley noted that they'd identified about 150 sites so far, and in making the resource public, hoped to give citizens the opportunity to learn more about them. The map is incomplete, and he hoped to continue adding sites and information.

Mr. Whiteley then demonstrated the map, clicking on marked sites, which revealed the address, neighborhood, and general description. There's also a layer showing the local and national historic districts, as well as landmarks.

Ms. Lousteau added that the map was not comprehensive, and that additional research was needed. She mentioned that CRO would explore the possibility of using HPF grant to do a survey of sites important to the city's African American history.

The presentation and information were well-received by the Preservation Board. Chair Callow

asked Ms. Lousteau to share this information with Terry Kennedy, Clerk of the Board of Alderman, former Alderman and former Preservation Board member.

B. 3234 HAWTHORNE BLVD Compton Hill Local Historic District

Owner: Diego Morales & Dr. Toni Frolova

Applicant: Edward M. Heine, Agape Construction

Plan: Preliminary Review for Renovation and Addition to Garage

PROCEEDINGS

On February 28, 2022, 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 and addition to a one-story frame garage at 3234 Hawthorne Boulevard, located within the boundaries of the Compton Hill Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, Tiffany Hamilton, David Weber, David Richardson, and Michael Allen were present for the testimony for this agenda item. .

Andrea Gagen of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #57702, which sets forth the standards for the Compton Hill Local Historic District, and in particular the sections that pertain to Architectural Detail. Ms. Gagen stated that the owners had previously applied to construct a large porte-cochere on the property that did not receive Preliminary Approval from the Preservation Board, and that this was a revised proposal. She displayed the proposed site plan with the existing garage to be converted to a pool house, and noted the location of the addition and a new portico, and showed current photos of the garage, illustrating its visibility from the street.

Ms. Gagen explained that the issue before the Board was the exterior material of the proposed addition, which could be seen from Hawthorne Boulevard. The addition would be sheathed with stucco boards, and Ms. Gagen noted that the Compton Hill Standards require ancillary buildings visible from the street to be compatible with the main building, which was brick. She also stated that while the current garage is stucco, only a very small portion of it will be visible when the portico and addition are constructed.

Ms. Gagen testified that the Cultural Resources Office recommended that the Preservation Board grant preliminary approval of the project with the stipulation that the street-facing facade be brick, and that final plans and materials to be reviewed and approved by the Cultural Resources Office. She added that the Compton Hill Neighborhood was generally in support of the project.

Ed Heine, project architect, testified on the behalf of the project. Mr. Heine stated that he was working with Agape Construction Company and that neither he nor Agape were involved in the project previously reviewed by the Board. In response to a question from Chair Callow, Mr. Heine said he had seen the staff recommendation. Chair Callow then asked if he would agree to it, and Mr. Heine replied they would prefer to use the stucco because that was the material on the current garage. He stated that this structure may have been built after the house, but he did not know. He repeated that they preferred stucco on the street-facing elevation.

Keith Buchholz, head of the Neighborhood Standards Committee, testified in support of the

project with the stipulation recommended by the Cultural Resources Office that brick be used on the street-facing elevation. He said that the Committee preferred the garage addition and pool house conversion to the previous porte-cochere design, and that Committee was ready to support the project if the recommendation of the Cultural Resources Office for brick was included, because the addition would be very visible from the street. He further stated that brick would be compatible with the Tudor-style house, and added that while he thought the garage may be the first on the property, it was not as old as the house and, in fact, had been moved to its current location from the western side of the property.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

The Board finds that:

- 3234 Hawthorne Boulevard is within the boundaries of the Compton Hill Certified Local Historic District.
- The applicant proposes to renovate and construct an addition to the existing garage, the north elevation of which will be visible from Hawthorne Boulevard.
- The Compton Hill Standards require that visible ancillary buildings be compatible to the main house on the property.
- The new garage addition is proposed to be clad with stucco board which is not a compatible material with the house, which is entirely brick.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After due consideration and after weighing each piece of evidence and making a determination of the credibility of the witnesses, the Board has made a determination as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board granted Preliminary Approval to project as presented with the stipulation that the street-facing facade material be brick; and that final plans and materials are reviewed and approved by the Cultural Resources Office. Board Member Allen made the motion, which was seconded by Board Member Hamilton. The motion passed with Board Members Allen, Robinson, Hamilton, Killeen, Richardson and Weber in favor, and Chair Callow abstaining.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

C. 33 WESTMORELAND PLACE Central West End Certified Local Historic District and Portland & Westmoreland Places National Register District

Owner: Jim & Leslie Bolin

Applicant: Thomas Wall, Mitchell Wall Architecture & Design

Project: Preliminary Review for Second Story Addition

PROCEEDINGS

On February 28, 2022 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 rear addition at 33 Westmoreland Place, located in the Central West End Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow, Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, Michael Allen, Tiffany Hamilton, David Richardson and David Weber were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Andrea Gagen of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #69423 which sets forth the standards for the Central West End Historic District, and particularly the section "New Construction or Additions to Existing Residential or Institutional Buildings." She showed photos of the existing building located at the corner of Westmoreland Place and Lake Avenue and elevations of the proposed second-story addition to be made to the Lake Avenue facade. She indicated the portions of the existing building that would be demolished for the addition as proposed, including the cornice and decorative brick detail of the one-story section, and a portion of the roof at the rear. Ms. Gagen presented a photo of the house's Lake Avenue elevation, stating that the corbelled cornice would be removed and that the addition would extend to the edge of the current first story. She displayed an elevation of the proposed Lake Avenue facade that she said proposed to replicate the one-story section with quoins, toothed-in brick, and other details.

Ms. Gagen testified that the Central West End Standards require that any visible addition made to a historic building be clearly perceivable, but that the owner wished to create a seamless addition that could not be distinguished from the original design of the house. Because the proposed project clearly was not in compliance with the Standards, Ms. Gagen said the Cultural Resources Office was recommending that the Preservation Board withhold Preliminary Approval. She noted that a letter had been received from the Central West End Planning & Development Committee in opposition to the project and copies of it previously had been submitted to the Preservation Board.

Rachel Dolan, Mitchell Wall Architects, testified on behalf of the project. She stated that the house is highly visible from Lake and Westmoreland Place and they had received very strong support for this design from the Westmoreland Place Trustees and the immediate neighbors, particularly the neighbor directly opposite who, Ms. Dolan said, had done many historic renovations throughout St. Louis and was thrilled with the proposal. Ms. Dolan stated that they had discussed the project with the Central West End Association and considered a number of alternatives to the design but could not come to agreement. She also stated that the suggestions of the Central West End Planning & Development Committee were not well received by the Trustees but submitted no evidence of this. Ms. Dolan concluded by saying that the Trustees felt that the design of the proposed addition acknowledged the visual character of the house.

Jim Dwyer, of the Central West End Association Planning & Development Committee, spoke in opposition to the project and read the Planning & Development Committee's letter into the record. The letter stated that the Committee had met with Rachel Dolan, the project architect, on February 19th to discuss the project at 33 Westmoreland Place. The Committee felt that the architectural significance of the house and its high level of visibility elevated the level of sensitivity required regarding the design detail and materials of the proposed new construction. The letter discussed Westmoreland and Portland Places, their listing on the National Register of Historic Places, their importance as unique examples of American domestic architecture and quoted the Central West End Historic District standards. The letter ended by stating that the Committee had recommended several relatively simple design refinements to the architect and, through her, to the property owners, that were meant to address the requirements in the standards, but that all were rejected.

Mr. Dwyer stated that the Central West End standards were adopted in 1978 and have been instrumental in preserving the irreplaceable character of the Central West End. He said that the Committee was not aware of any compelling argument for this to be an exception and urged the Preservation Board to deny the application and to direct the applicants and their architect to collaborate with CRO staff to develop a compliant design solution.

Mr. Dwyer added that it was the consensus of the Planning & Development Committee that an attempt to integrate new construction into the old in what was described as a seamless manner is highly difficult and the chances of success are slim to none. Mr. Dwyer also stated that the Committee had made simple recommendations, some of which were subject to discussion and negotiation, but there was never that opportunity as the ideas were simply rejected.

Ms. Dolan rebutted that statement that there was not much back and forth with the Central West End Association. She stated that she had shared several of their ideas with the owners and Trustees, but those ideas were not well received.

When prompted by Chair Callow to respond to Ms. Dolan, Ms. Gagen stated that it appeared from the submitted drawing that details were identical to existing, so the addition was not distinguished from the original house. She stated that the Trustees, unlike the Cultural Resources Office and the Central West End Association, do not necessarily consider the historic district standards in their review of a project. Ms. Gagen reiterated that she did not believe the current design was in compliance with the Standards.

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

The Preservation Board finds that:

- The proposed site for the addition, 33 Westmoreland Place, is located in the Central West End Local Historic District.
- The proposed addition does not comply with the Central West End Standards for new additions to historic buildings, as it designed to blend with the historic fabric and not be easily identified as an addition.

- The design complies with the Central West End Standards for fenestration on additions to existing buildings.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

After due consideration and after weighing each piece of evidence and making a determination of the credibility of the witnesses, the Board has made a decision as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board moved to withhold preliminary approval of the addition, as the design does not comply with the Central West End Historic District Standards. The motion was made by Board Member Weber, and seconded by Board Member Allen. The motion passed, with Board members Allen, Hamilton, Killeen, Richardson and Weber in favor, and Chair Callow and Board Member Robinson abstaining.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

D. 2018 & 2020 GEYER AVENUE McKinley Heights Local Historic District

Owner and Applicant: Jolen Investments LLC

Project: Preliminary Review for 2 Single Family Homes/New Construction on Vacant Lot

PROCEEDINGS

On February 28, 2022, 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 two detached townhouses on a vacant site at 2018 and 2020 Geyer Avenue, in the McKinley Heights Local Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, David Richardson, Michael Allen, Anthony Robinson, Tiffany Hamilton and David Weber were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office briefly described the project and design of the buildings, noting that the front facades would be two colors of brick, although both would be appropriate for neighborhood. She displayed a streetscape drawing submitted by the applicant which showed that the rhythm of block would be replicated as required under the Standards. Ms. Cameron said that some details, such as the door style, needed revision, but that these details were generally reviewed by the staff at the time of building permit application. She displayed the selected Model Example, a building in the Shaw Historic District, but said it was not inappropriate in style for McKinley Heights district; and then showed slides of the context of the street. She explained that initially the project had been a more contemporary design and the applicant had intended to pursue the Board's Compatible New Construction Policy, but revisions

made that unnecessary and the design now follows the Standards in almost every point, except for the brick foundation and two brick colors, which are modest changes and do not detract from the compatibility of the building design.

Ms. Cameron testified that no comments had been received from the Alderman or from the McKinley Heights Neighborhood, but noted that a representative from that organization was present at the meeting. She recommended that the Board grant preliminary approval to the design as proposed, subject to review of final drawings and facade materials by the Cultural Resources Office.

The applicant, Leonard Adewunmi of Jolen Investments LLC, testifying on his own behalf, said in response to a question from the Chair, that he agreed with the staff recommendation.

Rocco Danna, representing the McKinley Heights Neighborhood Association, testified on behalf of the neighborhood. He said that this had been a great process; that what was once a contemporary design had, through revisions, become more a historic replica. Mr. Danna said he was uncomfortable with the selection of a Model Example from another neighborhood; this was an issue in the district's Standards; and that the large stone lintels over the front façade openings are not something found in the block or in McKinley Heights. He also noted that although the streetscape drawing that was displayed made it appear the project's windows are in rhythm and in proportion with adjacent buildings, while actually they are not as tall. And finally, Mr. Danna asked that cement board siding with a 4-inch exposure be required instead of vinyl.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 2018 and 2020 Geyer Avenue are located in the McKinley Heights Local Historic District.
- The initial submission was viewed in by the Cultural Resources Office together with a representative of the McKinley Heights Association. These comments have been incorporated in the revised design, which complies with a majority of the McKinley Heights Standards for New Construction.
- The lone deviation from the Standards is the use of two colors of brick on the front elevation. This is intended to produce a more contemporary interpretation of what is basically a traditional design.
- The Cultural Resources Office had not received written comments from the neighborhood on the latest revisions, nor any comments from the Alderman.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After due consideration and after weighing each piece of evidence and making a determination of the credibility of the witnesses, the Board has made a determination as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board moved to grant preliminary approval to the project subject to review of final drawings and exterior materials by the Cultural Resources Office. The motion was made by Board Member Allen and seconded by Board Member Hamilton. The motion passed, with

Board Members Allen, Robinson, Hamilton, Killeen, Richardson and Weber voting in favor of the motion and Chair Callow abstaining.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

E. 2231, 2233, 2235 HICKORY STREET Lafayette Square Local Historic District

Owner: Lafayette Reserve LLC, Jeff Winzerling
Applicant: Mathew Hartig
Project: Appeal of Director's Denial of Three Permits

PROCEEDINGS

On February 28, 2022, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider an appeal of an Administrative Denial for the construction of three townhouse units in the Lafayette Reserve development, at 2231, 2233 and 2235 Hickory Street, in the Lafayette Square Local Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, David Richardson, Michael Allen, Anthony Robinson, and Tiffany Hamilton were present for the testimony for this agenda item. Mr. Richardson recused himself from discussion and voting on this item.

In response to a question from the Chair, Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office stated that the Board had previously seen this project of 14 townhouses and granted it preliminary approval; what was before the Board now were 3 building permit applications with a roof access structure that was not in the original preliminary submission. She said that this was an appeal of the denial of three permits, as the staff had administratively denied these permit applications due to time constraints per Ordinance #64689. The staff asked, in addition to its decision on the appeal, for the Board's guidance for review of the entire development should the appeals be granted. She noted also that the Board's agenda was incorrect in stating that the staff recommendation was to withhold preliminary approval; it should instead have been to uphold the Director's denial of the permit applications.

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in and entered into the record Ordinance #64689, as amended by Ordinance #64925; Ordinance #69112, the Lafayette Square Historic District Ordinance; the revised Standards for the Lafayette Square Historic District, Ordinance #70926, in particular Section 305 Residential, Commercial and Mixed-Use New Construction with Historic Context; the agenda; the PowerPoint; and her presentation.

Ms. Cameron displayed current photos of the site of the 14 townhouses, some detached and others semi-detached. She explained the site was in what she called Tier 2 of the Standards for New Construction, which had a somewhat lesser compliance requirement for infill buildings. The design that is the subject of the permits under appeal did not need to closely follow a

Historic Model Example as would be necessary elsewhere in the district, although some compatibility was required. Ms. Cameron then showed a chart of permits for the Lafayette Reserve development received to date.

She stated that the matter now before the Board involved access to newly proposed rooftop decks on nearly all the properties. Ms. Cameron stated that for those designs with a third-story mansard or side-gable roof or those towards the center of the development, the new roof structures likely would not be seen, but that the houses toward each corner of the block needed particular attention. She showed sight-line studies submitted previously by the appellant who, she said, would have more details in his testimony.

Despite the drawing, Ms. Cameron contended that on corner buildings, the deck rails and protrusions, or “pop-up” access would be visible. She displayed photos of the corner sites and surrounding context, stating that she thought it was almost impossible that these roof additions would not be visible from the street. She mentioned one alternative the Board might consider: on these properties, to alter the shape of the very unusual form of the pop-up to something more like a monitor. While these were not normally placed on residential properties, it might be something that the Board would wish to consider.

Ms. Cameron concluded by recommending that the appeals be denied by the Board, and that additions not be approved until it can be proven that they will not be seen from the street.

Jeff Winzerling, project developer, was sworn and testified on behalf of Lafayette Reserve LLC. Mr. Winzerling showed a PowerPoint presentation with colored renderings of the development and outlining changes he desired to make to the original design as submitted when he was before the Board for Preliminary Review. He stated that the proposed revisions had reduced substantially the amount of siding on the rear elevations which had been a concern of the neighborhood, and included a new Historic Model Example with a mansard roof for the building at 2241 Hickory, and removed the dormers from the side gable models.

Mr. Winzerling next displayed an elevation of the proposed deck and pop-up access with a sight-line indicated. He testified that constructing a third story was very expensive, but that elevated outside space had been a consistent demand from many of his buyers. He said that the triangular shape of the pop-up was an inexpensive solution.

Mr. Winzerling further testified that, from the front, one would have to be about 95 feet away to see any of the pop-up, and even then it would be only a few inches of the top. Given that there's only 60 feet between the building and the existing buildings to the south, it would not be visible. He said his goal was to illustrate that none of the structures will be visible from the street. Mr. Winzerling then showed several other sight-lines at different positions and angles, indicating that view of the structures would be blocked by the cornices of adjacent buildings. Mr. Winzerling further testified that 2245 Hickory was the only property in the development not yet sold, and again showed several sight-lines for that building at different angles. His drawings indicated that the roof structures would not be visible from directly in front of 2245

Hickory, from west of the site at Hickory, nor from the building directly opposite on Missouri Avenue. However, they will be visible on Missouri Avenue from the north. He displayed the rear elevation showing 2 feet of railing and 5 feet of the pop-up, about 4 feet wide, and described it as similar to an oversized refrigerator in scale. He said it was important to consider it was the only building in the development that had a view not blocked by adjacent construction and requested that, as all the other structures would not be visible, the Board allow him to do a pop-up on this one. He noted that in the previous Board approval, "visible from the street" meant visible from an adjacent street. It was, he said, the same situation here, as the structures on 2245 Hickory were visible from south of the site, but not visible from directly adjacent property.

The Chair asked Ms. Cameron if some change to the design of the pop-up could improve the project and she believed that such change could be accomplished .

Preservation Board counsel, Barbara Birkicht, restated that the hearing was only an appeal of the denial of 2231, 2233 and 2235 Hickory Street and that there was no current application for 2245 Hickory, so the Board is not called on to make any decision with regard to any other address, including 2245 Hickory. Any discussion on 2245 Hickory by the Board would just be guidance for the staff.

Suzanne Sessions, member of the Preservation Committee of the Lafayette Square Restoration Group, was sworn and spoke against the project. Ms. Sessions read a letter from the Committee to the Board that stated that the Committee had hoped to see more information regarding these changes from the developer but had not. The letter said that the Committee was particularly concerned with the corner units at 2201 and 2203 Hickory as well as 2241 and 2245 Hickory, and the shape of pop-up access; and requested to see it revised. Ms. Sessions cited Ordinance sections "101.5 Atypical massing not seen in historic buildings;" and "202.8 No roof deck on top of uppermost story of a structure shall be visible from street."

Ms. Sessions further testified that she and Kyle Jeffers, another committee member, had surveyed the site and surroundings and that 2245 Hickory was still an issue with them. She stated that an "oversized refrigerator" is not good for any part of the Square.

She further testified that they had found no other examples of an historic pop-up of any shape, so the Preservation Committee of the Lafayette Square Restoration Group urged that the Director's Denial of the three permits be upheld unless it was positively determined that all pop-ups and railings would not be visible from the street.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The Preservation Board previously granted Preliminary Approval to the Lafayette Reserve development, 14 new single-family houses to be constructed on the north side of the 2200 block of Hickory Street, and several are under construction.
- **The developer applied for three new permits for 2231, 2233 and 2235 Hickory for new construction that included popup roof access. Those permits were denied by staff, and appeals of these staff denials are being heard on this agenda.**

- The developer wishes to revise the design of the approved townhouses by incorporating pop-up roof-top access and decks on each building; on those with a third story these structures will not be visible.
- Those properties with flat roofs would have access to the decks through a pop-up structure, and the Cultural Resources Office staff has expressed concerns about the visibility of these additions.
- The Lafayette Square Restoration Committee does not support these changes.
- No comments have been received from the Alderman concerning this appeal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After due consideration and after weighing each piece of evidence and making a determination of the credibility of the witnesses, the Board has made a determination as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board moved to overturn the Director's Denial of the building permit applications for 2231, 2233 and 2235 Hickory Street. The motion was made by Board Member Hamilton and seconded by Board Member Killeen. The motion passed, with Board Members Killeen, Allen, Robinson and Hamilton in favor of the motion, Board member Richardson recusing, and Chair Callow abstaining.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

Board member Richardson moved to adjourn. There were no objections. The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.