

**CITY OF ST. LOUIS
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES
MAY 23, 2022**

Board Members Present:

Richard Callow – Chairman
Alderman Jack Coatar
Mike Killeen
David Richardson
Anthony Robinson

Cultural Resources Office Staff present:

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

Legal Counsel

Nancy Walsh

After calling the roll, Chair Callow noted that there were three board members present. Commissioner Killeen made a motion to delay beginning of the meeting until there is a quorum. The motion passed.

At 4:17 p.m., Chair Callow called roll again. Present were Board members Robinson, Killeen, Richardson, Coatar, and Chair Callow. A quorum was achieved at 4:17 p.m.

Board member Killeen moved to approve the April minutes. Alderman Coatar seconded. There were no objections. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair Callow, proposed that the agenda items be heard in the following order: F, G, H, A, B, C, D, E. There were no objections.

F. 33 Westmoreland Place, Central West End Certified Local Historic District

Owner: Jim & Leslie Bolin

Applicant: PK Construction/Tim Dolan

Plan: Appeal of Director's Denial to retain/replace windows

PROCEEDINGS

On May 23, 2022, 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 retain/replace windows at 33 Westmoreland Place, located within the boundaries of the Central West End Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, David Richardson, and Alderman Jack Coatar were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Meg Lousteau, Director of the Cultural Resources Office, was sworn in and entered into the record

Ordinance #64689, as amended by Ordinance #64925; Ordinance #56768, as amended by Ordinance #69423, which sets forth the standards for the Central West End Local Historic District, and in particular the sections that pertain to Windows; the agenda; the PowerPoint; and her presentation.

Ms. Lousteau stated that she would be making the presentation, although the project had been assigned to staff member, Andrea Gagen, who was present to offer clarity on issues that might arise. Ms. Lousteau stated this item was an appeal of the Director's Denial, and recommended that the Preservation Board uphold the denial as the replacement windows do not comply with the Central West End Historic District Standards.

Ms. Lousteau stated that the property was located within the Central West End Historic District where the Cultural Resources Office/Preservation Board has jurisdiction over windows. She said that the applicant and the window provider initially worked with the Cultural Resources Office (CRO) on the proposed window replacements in the fall of 2021, and discussed appropriate configurations and number of lights. At the time, staff informed the applicant, verbally and in writing, that window details, including how the windows would be installed in the existing openings, would be needed before a permit application could be approved. The Cultural Resources Office did not receive the required drawings, nor was a permit application made.

Ms. Lousteau testified that in March 2022, the Cultural Resources Office was notified that the windows at 33 Westmoreland were being altered. The Building Division issued a Stop Work Order, although most of the windows had already been replaced. Ms. Lousteau said that, in speaking with the appellant, they stated that the windows had been approved via an interior-only building permit issued by the Building Division. However, a CRO review of the interior-only permit showed there was no indication on the submitted plans of windows to be replaced. Subsequently, the applicant applied for a permit to retain the installed windows, and to replace the rest. Ms. Lousteau stated that, as the windows did not comply with the Central West End Historic District Standards, the permit was denied; the denial was appealed, and was now before the Preservation Board.

Ms. Lousteau then displayed a location map for the property, and before and after photos. She noted that the components of the original sashes were lighter in appearance than the replacement windows and were considered "Special Windows" under the Central West End Standards, and discussed the reasons why the replacement windows did not comply with the requirements of the Standards. Ms. Lousteau then presented additional photos to illustrate the contrast between the original windows and the replacement sash.

In conclusion, Ms. Lousteau recommended that the Preservation Board uphold the Director's Denial as the replacement windows did not comply with the historic district standards. She noted also that the Alderman had not commented on the project; however, comments had been

received from the Central West End Association and a representative would testify.

Doug Teasdale, an attorney representing the appellants/homeowners, and a technical appellant, Thomas Wall of Mitchell Wall Architects, were sworn in. Mr. Teasdale stated that he believed the evidence would show that the replacement metal windows were the closest approximation available, and introduced his two witnesses as experts in the field who would confirm that the replacement windows did meet the Central West End Historic District Standards. He briefly outlined the history of the site and current building and summarized the planned testimony of his witnesses.

Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Joe Aleto to testify. Mr. Aleto affirmed he was present and was sworn in. Mr. Aleto stated that he worked for Kirkwood Home Gallery, a division of Kirkwood Stair and Millwork, dealing with windows and doors and had worked in the window business 26 years. He testified that he had been asked by PK Construction to source the windows for the property at issue. Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Aleto to explain to the Preservation Board the current windows, and the significance of metal window versus wood windows. Mr. Aleto replied that the windows were wood on the interior with metal cladding on the exterior, and that the layout of the divided panes and the number of units in each opening very closely replicated what was in the openings before the replacement happened. Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Aleto if he met with Ms. Gagen onsite on August 11th. Mr. Aleto replied that he had and the date sounded right. Mr. Teasdale inquired whether that was before any windows had been ordered and Mr. Aleto replied yes. Mr. Aleto stated his goal as a window contractor was to replicate, as closely as possible, the existing windows. Mr. Aleto agreed that he believed that the windows used were the best replacement windows available for 33 Westmoreland Place. Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Aleto, as a window expert, if he believed these windows met the Central West End Historic District Standards. Mr. Aleto stated that he had never seen their standards for replacing steel windows, but based upon what he knew about replacing windows in this neighborhood, the answer was yes. Mr. Aleto agreed that it was fair to say that there is a more uniform acceptability of what replacements are supposed to be in regard to wood windows. Mr. Teasdale asked if metal windows were more unusual because they are from the 1940s. Mr. Aleto stated that he was correct. Mr. Aleto agreed that it was more challenging to find replacement windows for metal windows from the 1940s than it would be for a Gilded Age mansion and that these were the best replacement windows available to replicate the look and feel of those 1940s windows. He asked Mr. Aleto if there were follow-up emails with Ms. Gagen. Mr. Aleto stated that there were many. Mr. Teasdale stated that in the interest of time he wanted to tell the Board that he sent 25 to 30 emails in a packet. Mr. Aleto confirmed that at some point he had received an email from Ms. Gagen that indicated that the configurations he had presented, after multiple revisions, were acceptable. Mr. Teasdale quoted the email, "I think these configurations will work." Mr. Aleto concurred that it was his understanding that Ms. Gagen had given him what he considered to be approval to order the windows. Mr. Aleto also agreed that he

believed that Cultural Resources had approved the design, look and feel of the replacement windows. Mr. Teasdale inquired whether the price of the windows had changed in any way from what Mr. Aleto had initially proposed to what was ultimately ordered. Mr. Aleto stated that the price had gone up substantially, by 30%. Mr. Teasdale if that was to meet the specific requests of Cultural Resources in the number of panes and muntins and such. Mr. Aleto replied, "Yes."

Mr. Teasdale said that he wanted to speak about the depth of the muntins, as the denial indicated that the depth of the muntins was an issue. Mr. Teasdale inquired as to whether Ms. Gagen had ever mentioned the depth of the muntins at all during the 25 to 30 email exchanges he had during negotiations. Mr. Aleto stated that it had not been mentioned. Mr. Aleto stated that it is difficult to replicate the depth of muntins on replacement windows because the windows being produced today are insulated glass. He said that the insulated glass is somewhere between $\frac{3}{4}$ " to 1" thick, depending on the manufacturer. Mr. Aleto went on to say that windows from the 1930s and 1940s were single-glazed windows, a simple piece of glass. He stated that the muntin bar is much deeper if you are only working with a single pane of glass. Mr. Aleto said that when you are dealing with insulated glass, the muntin bar can only stand out so far from the face of the glass, and never sticks out beyond the face of the sash. The insulated glass depth takes up the majority of that muntin bar profile. Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Aleto if he believed that the installed windows met the Central West End neighborhood historic district standards. Mr. Aleto replied that they did, as he understood them.

Mr. Teasdale called Troy Duncan of PK Construction to testify, who was sworn in. He discussed the background of his company as a general contractor specializing in remodeling and historic remodels, and stated that had worked on many properties in the Central West End. Mr. Duncan then gave a history of the project. He testified that the house had been in extreme disrepair prior to the current owners' purchase; the windows were unpainted, rusted and inoperable. Mr. Duncan said that Mr. Bolin, the owner, wanted to restore the inside and outside of the house, which was a significant investment. Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Duncan if sellers' disclosure revealed that the first floor windows were inoperable. Mr. Duncan replied affirmatively, and added that some of the bedroom windows were inoperable as well. Mr. Duncan stated that he had reached out to Joe Aleto to source the windows as Mr. Aleto had installed many window replacements on Westmoreland and Portland Place as well. Mr. Duncan said that Mr. Aleto knew the process and the historical standards. Mr. Duncan stated that the reason he had called Mr. Aleto was that Kolbe & Kolbe, a window manufacturer, had a Vistalux window, which, like the metal windows at 33 Westmoreland, has very narrow stiles and rails not typical of other metal windows. He stated that the Vistalux offered a very close match to the existing metal windows. Mr. Duncan said that he reached out to Mr. Aleto, knowing that Cultural Resources was going to require a close match, and knowing their product was the best on the market.

Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Duncan if he was aware of the email traffic between Ms. Gagen at Cultural

Resources and Mr. Aleto. Mr. Duncan stated that he did, and knowing the process, they wanted to get the windows ordered, so Mr. Aleto reached out to Ms. Gagen and Mr. Duncan was copied on the emails. Mr. Duncan said that they wanted to get approval before ordering, knowing it was a substantial amount of money. Mr. Duncan stated that the windows were \$200,000 and they certainly did not want to order them without having the full approval of the office. Mr. Duncan affirmed that he was cc'd on an email that said "OK, I think these configurations will work" on September 1, 2021. Mr. Duncan said that there were many emails back and forth prior to that, in which Ms. Gagen was asking them to make changes, and Mr. Aleto was making those changes. Mr. Duncan stated that he was talking to Mr. Bolin, letting him know about the price increase because Ms. Gagen was directing them to make changes in order for the windows to be compliant with the standards. Mr. Duncan agreed that only after this back and forth were the windows ordered. Mr. Duncan stated that they had spoken with architect Ralph Wafer at the St. Louis City in the Permit Office before the windows were ordered. He said they were trying to figure things out, as they wanted to get the windows ordered because of the tremendous lead time for product. Mr. Duncan said he talked to Mr. Wafer in an attempt to get Ms. Gagen's approval so they could begin the permit process. Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Duncan if he believed the current windows were the best replacement windows available for this property. Mr. Duncan said they absolutely were, and that is why they had chosen Mr. Aleto and his company, knowing that their windows would be the best fit to obtain the look of the original metal windows to the house. Mr. Duncan said that he believed the windows met the Central West End Historic District Standards, based on his conversations with Ms. Gagen. Mr. Teasdale asked Mr. Duncan if he had installed other replacement windows in the Central West End where the muntins were not $\frac{3}{4}$ " deep. Mr. Duncan said yes, that they had installed wood windows up and down the street with that depth of muntin. He said they were primarily worried about matching the width, which they did. Mr. Duncan stated that he could not do anything about the depth unless they were putting in single pane glass, which they have not done.

In response to questioning from Mr. Teasdale, Mr. Duncan testified that he had submitted a building permit application for interior work on the property in October of 2021. The plans had been produced by Rachel Dolan of Mitchell Wall and she had specifically told him all the windows were to be replaced. He said further that it was so stated on Sheet A 2.1 in large bold letters in the center of the page, so he was shocked that CRO contended that he had no permit to replace the windows. He said he had immediately stopped the installation and applied for an addendum to his previous permit.

Mr. Teasdale stated that he had submitted letters from neighborhood residents in support of the project, and read into the record support letters from two of them, and from the Trustees of Westmoreland Place. Mr. Teasdale asked if Mr. Duncan had been sent a letter from a resident, Jim Dwyer, in opposition to the windows, and he replied that he had. Mr. Teasdale stated that he had

no further questions.

Ms. Lousteau asked if she could address some of the points in Mr. Teasdale's presentation. She stated that she had reviewed the email conversations between Ms. Gagen, Mr. Aleto, and Mr. Duncan, noting that saying something is an acceptable configuration is not the same thing as understanding the entire window as installed, which is why CRO required the installation drawings in order to approve a permit application. She said that those drawings, which were only provided in April, would have also shown the muntin profiles, so CRO would have been made aware of the issue with the muntins. Ms. Lousteau stated that the required drawings had only been received last month. She said her office could not delegate the interpretation of those standards to other people, as interpretation is the legal responsibility of the Cultural Resources Office. That is why physical permit applications to be reviewed by CRO are required. She clarified that permits were not issued in this case, nor were they applied for. She stated that Mr. Ralph Wafer was on the phone and could address some of these matters as well. Referring to the drawing Mr. Teasdale had mentioned, she pointed out that the drawing did say that all windows, doors and frames shown dashed shall be removed. However, she stated, there were no dashed lines on the windows. In summary, she said that the plans that were approved did not tacitly or otherwise include the removal of the windows.

James Dwyer was called to speak and was sworn in. Mr. Dwyer, Chairman of the Central West End Planning & Development Committee, read a letter stating the Association's opposition to the replacement windows.

In response to a question from Chairman Callow, Mr. Teasdale said there was nothing further to add to the record, but wished to say that he thought Mr. Dwyer was mistaken that no building permits had been applied for, but that he would leave that determination to the Preservation Board.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

The Board finds that:

- The site of the windows, 33 Westmoreland Place, is located in the Central West End Local Historic District.
- The new windows were installed without an approved permit.
- The original windows are considered "special windows" under the Central West End Historic District Standards.
- The new windows do not replicate the original windows in installation, sizes of the mulls, and depth of the muntins.
- The Central West End Association has submitted a letter in support of the Director's Denial.

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 uphold the Director's Denial, as the window do not comply with the Central West End Historic District Standards. Board Member Richardson made the motion, which was seconded by Alderman Coatar. The motion passed 4-0 with Board Members Richardson, Killeen, Callow, and Coatar in support. Anthony Robinson abstained from voting.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

A. 2245 Hickory Street, Lafayette Square Local & National Register Historic District

Owner: Lafayette Reserve, LLC/Jeff Winzerling

Architect: Barry R. Nelson & Associates

Plan: Preliminary Review to add rooftop access structure and rooftop deck to previously approved townhouse design

PROCEEDINGS

On May 23, 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 at 2245 Hickory Street to revise the shape of a proposed rooftop structure on a 2-story single-family house to be constructed at 2245 Hickory Street. The Lafayette Reserve project, a 14-unit development on the north side of the 2200 block of Hickory, had received Preliminary Approval from the Preservation Board at their meeting of October 28, 2019, but at the time roof access to any unit was not part of that proposal.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen and Anthony Robinson were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #69112, modified by Ordinance #70926, that sets forth the standards for the Lafayette Square Local Historic District. Ms. Cameron summarized the prior action on this development proposal and provided photographs of the current project, at the corner of Hickory Street and Missouri Avenue, showing that it was a highly visible location.

Ms. Cameron stated that at its February 25, 2022 meeting, the Board had approved similar rooftop access for properties in the center of the development that it determined would not be visible from the street, but had declined to approve a similar structure at 2245, because of its visibility. She said that at its last meeting on April 25, Jeff Winzerling, the project developer, had

stated that the visibility of the roof structures would be insignificant, but the Board again withheld Preliminary Approval. Ms. Cameron stated that Mr. Winzerling had revised the shape of the access structure and was requesting that the Board provide design review today to this aspect of the proposed design.

Ms. Cameron in conclusion testified that Section 305.10 of the Standards states that roofs of new construction shall be flat or pitched and shall not have any unusual attention-getting forms, and that given the siting of 2245 Hickory, it appeared there was no way that the roof elements would not be visible. She therefore recommended that the Board uphold its original Preliminary Approval of the building with no roof structures, and withhold approval of the current revised proposal. She also noted that the Cultural Resources Office had received seven (7) letters in support of the project design as presented today, which had been provided to the Board earlier that day; and that just before the meeting commenced, she had received a letter from Maria Hadlow, a 14-year neighborhood resident, also in support, that stated she felt the roof access would enhance building's value, and not be seen from adjacent streets. Ms Cameron also stated she had received a letter from the Lafayette Square Preservation Committee in opposition to the new design, as it had been to the previous proposal.

Jeff Winzerling of Lafayette Reserve LLC, testified on his own behalf. Mr. Winzerling summarized the history of the project and the Board's prior decisions. He testified that he was confused by the Cultural Resources Office's current recommendation to withhold preliminary approval, as he thought it was just the shape of the structure that was at issue; he was surprised that the structure's visibility was still an issue, as at the last Board meeting, he had received the impression that a number of the Board Members were in support of the proposal. He thought therefore that it would be approved at the April meeting, so had not offered letters of support, as he had now. He also stated that he felt the Lafayette Square Neighborhood Association Preservation Committee was reviewing the project under a different section of the code that was more restrictive than the requirements for this site.

Mr. Winzerling presented a colored elevation of the complete Lafayette Reserve development, indicating the property at 2245 Hickory, and elevations showing a revised design for the access structure—a rectangular, sided element with a flat roof. He then displayed a number of sightline analyses. The one from Hickory illustrated that the first design would not have been visible from the front, but the rectangular structure he was proposing now would be minimally visible—about three feet. He emphasized that, given the small size of the structure, its visibility was only from north on Missouri; with the large apartment building to the north, no one would notice the small roof structure.

Mr. Winzerling then showed some historic roof appendages in Lafayette Square, mentioning them as possible model examples of what he wished to build. He then showed a number of contemporary roof additions in the District, which he said had been recently approved. He wondered why these would be acceptable and his design would not. He stated that "visible" had always been considered to mean "visible from an adjacent street," and that this structure would be visible only if one moved north of the property and then was no longer adjacent to the building. Mr. Winzerling concluded by asking the Board to consider the number of existing

roof additions that had been approved, and the letters of support he had submitted; and stated that he would be happy to construct the either roof access design.

Ms. Cameron asked to respond. To Mr. Winzerling's contention that the Cultural Resources Office was unfairly reviewing this building under a stricter section of the ordinance, she said that the review was under Section 305 RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND MIXED-USE CONSTRUCTION and that 305.10 stated that "...roofs shall be flat or pitched and shall have no attention-getting form."

Mr. Winzerling interjected that he was referring to the Preservation Committee's review comments and not that of the Cultural Resources staff.

Ms Cameron then explained that the majority of roof structures shown by Mr. Winzerling had never been approved by the Cultural Resources Office. However, she stated that the roof deck at 1912 Park had been approved by the Preservation Board over the staff's recommendation for denial. She also testified that the roof addition at 1804 Chouteau would not have been approved had the staff had requested additional information regarding the visibility of the side elevation. She said it was an unfortunate oversight that had made the staff more concerned to ensure that such additions would not visible from a street.

Chairman Callow asked Mr. Winzerling why he thought these structures were "recently approved." Mr. Winzerling responded that he presumed that they must have been approved if they were constructed.

Suzanne Sessions of the Lafayette Square Neighborhood Preservation Committee, spoke in opposition to the proposal. She stated the entire committee had met and to a person agreed to deny this request. She stated that one would be able to see parts of these structures from the corner of Hickory as well as coming south on Missouri which, she said, will become a major entry to the neighborhood. She testified that the biggest concern the committee has is that if this is approved, it will set a precedent; and that the residents care about their neighborhood and want to be sure it will not happen again.

Chairman Callow stated that the Preservation Board had now heard from Mr. Winzerling several times on the question of roof structures and suggested that the Board members might discuss the roof structure today as a part of these proceedings to give Mr. Winzerling a clearer idea.

Board Member Killeen stated that he had suggested at the last meeting to use a roof hatch instead of a structure; that there were well-designed examples and that then no one would have any objection.

Board Member Robinson stated he was familiar with these hatches but also understood the applicant's position as a developer. He said Mr. Winzerling had made a good case based on examples of existing roof appendages and clearly shown that these structures exist and have existed on buildings in the neighborhood. He stated he was open to either of the two options; ideally the current proposal, because typically a stair tower would have been rectilinear; but if there was a visibility concern the angular roof design would be acceptable. Mr. Robinson agreed that "visibility" should mean from streets directly adjacent to the property; otherwise he

thought it was overreach. He concluded by saying he would vote yes on some sort of stair access

Mr. Killeen stated if the structure was brick, he would say yes also, but vote no as presented.

Mr. Robinson said he agreed he would support brick.

Mr. Winzerling interjected to state that he had once offered to use a slate product and would be willing to use slate or thin brick.

Mr. Robinson said he was open to consideration of thin brick material.

Mr. Killeen said he needed to look at the standards before he could consider thin brick, but still thought his suggestion of a hatch would save thousands of dollars.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The Preservation Board previously granted Preliminary Approval to the initial design of Lafayette Reserve, a development of 14 new single-family houses to be constructed on the north side of the 2200 block of Hickory Street, a number of which are currently under construction. The Board had also subsequently given preliminary design approval to certain other roof access additions and roof decks on those units in the development where these structures would not be visible from the street.
- The Board did not grant Preliminary Approval to the proposal to construct similar roof elements on 2245 Hickory after consideration of the same, which is a corner building where it was clear that a portion of the handrail and the access structure would be visible from Missouri Avenue.
- The owner is proposing a redesign of the roof access, replacing the sloping roof with a flat roof.
- Eight letters/emails have been received by the Cultural Resources Office in support of the roof access.
- The Lafayette Square Restoration Committee does not support this revision.
- No comments have been received from the Alderwoman concerning this proposed revision, but she was not in support of the previous roof deck proposal.

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 made a determination as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board moved to withhold Preliminary Approval of the design before it tonight to construct rooftop access on the property at 2245 Hickory Street. The motion was made by Board Member Killeen and seconded by Chairman Callow. The motion passed 2-1, with Board

Members Killeen and Chairman Callow in favor of the motion, and Board Member Robinson voting against.

By Order of the Preservation Board

Cultural Resources Office

B. 4974 Lindell Blvd., Central West End Certified Local Historic District

Owner: Koplak Properties, Inc.

Applicant: Albion Residential, LLC, Andrew Yule

Plan: Preliminary Review to construct a 30-story multi-family residential development

PROCEEDINGS

On May 23, 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 for new construction of a 30 story, 293 unit multi-family residential tower and garage at 4974 Lindell Blvd. in the Central West End Certified Local Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, and Anthony Robinson were present for the testimony for this agenda item. Board member Richardson abstained from this item.

Meg Lousteau of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #56768, which sets forth the standards for the Central West End Certified Local Historic District. and focused on the sections that pertain to new construction.

Ms. Lousteau gave a summary of the proposal, which is for a 30 story, 293 unit apartment building that would include an attached garage with approximately 360 parking spaces. Atop the garage would be a pool and amenity roof terrace. A decorative façade along Lindell would feature a green wall. The building would sit at the corner of Lindell and Kingshighway, adjacent to the recently-completely apartment tower at 100 N. Kingshighway.

Ms. Lousteau showed the site plan, some floor plans, and drawings reflecting the context. She then reviewed the portions of the Central West End standards pertaining to new construction, which state that height, scale, massing, and materials shall be considered, as shall the context and neighboring buildings.

The CRO analysis found that while the proposed building complied substantially with the Standards, it did not comply regarding windows. However, she noted, the Standards contemplated a new building being inserted into an existing historic block face, which is not the case on this site, which is situated along a wall of tall buildings overlooking Forest Park. She noted the attention paid to the design of the first floor, which was responsive to the pedestrian experience. Ms. Lousteau stated that the proposed tower was of exceptional architectural

design, and elegant in its form and materials. Its position next to 100 N. Kingshighway would produce a creative interplay between its streamlined form and the angularity of the adjacent tower.

Regarding form-based zoning, Ms. Lousteau stated that the project had been reviewed under the Form-Based Code by the Zoning Department and the Cultural Resources office, which found that it complied with the 6 story minimum height, and unlimited maximum height. There were, however, elements of the proposal that would require variances from the Form-Based Code on matters such as plane breaks, vehicular access, and materials. Variances from the requirements of the Form-Based Code can be granted by the Board of Adjustment, which heard this appeal at its April 6, 2022 meeting. Their action was “to continue the appeal for up to 60 days to allow the petitioner to meet with Cultural Resources.” Ms. Lousteau stated that CRO was now bringing the project to the Preservation Board for its review.

Ms. Lousteau went into further detail about areas of compliance and non-compliance with the Form-Based Code related to setbacks, driveways, and materials. She also noted that the developers, in response to feedback from the Cultural Resources Office as well as neighbors, had shifted the tower building southward to maintain the Lindell Blvd. setback. Ms. Lousteau also read a letter of support from Alderwoman Tina Pihl.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The design is of high quality and will be an asset to the Central West End and the City.
- At the suggestion of the Cultural Resources staff, the developer agreed to revise the original project site plan and adjust the location of the building to comply with the established setback on Lindell, maintaining the critical boulevard appearance.
- The developer has held a several meetings with adjacent property owners and addressed most of their concerns.
- The Planning & Development Committee of the Central West End Association is in support of the project, as is the board of the neighboring St. Regis Apartments, Inc.
- A letter of support from the Alderperson has been received. .

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 made a determination as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board moved to grant Preliminary Approval to construct a 30 story tower at 4974 Lindell Blvd as presented. The motion was made by Board Member Killeen and seconded by Board Member Robinson. The motion passed 2 – 0, with Board Members Killeen and Robinson voting in favor, and Chair Callow abstaining.

By Order of the Preservation Board

C. 700 Allen Avenue, Souldard Neighborhood Certified Local Historic District

Owner: Southside Property, LLC

Applicant: Anderson Design Consultants, LLC/Albert E. Anderson III

Plan: Preliminary Review of a new roof deck and exterior alterations for a 2-story restaurant

PROCEEDINGS

On May 23, 2022 the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider a Preliminary Review of a new roof deck and exterior alterations for a 2-story restaurant at 700 Allen Avenue, in the Souldard Neighborhood Certified Local Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, and Alderman Jack Coatar were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Bob Bettis, of the Cultural Resources Office, presented this item. Mr. Bettis showed some photos of the building and its context, including an aerial view and a location map. He stated that the building was located at the very edge of the historic district.

Mr. Bettis stated that the project did not comply with the Souldard Historic District Standards in two areas. First, the Standards state that rooftop decks must not be visible, and this rooftop deck is proposed for the 1-story portion of the building with a handrail that would be visible from the street. Second, the original openings on the building's rear wall are proposed to be altered. The rear wall is a Semi-public façade, where the Standards do not allow alteration of original openings.

Mr. Bettis showed renderings of the proposed changes and visibility of the area of work. He stated that the staff recommended that the Board withhold Preliminary Approval as the roof deck and exterior alterations do not comply with the Souldard Neighborhood Historic District Standards. Mr. Bettis said that they had not had any comment from the Souldard Restoration Group or the Alderman.

Albert Anderson of Anderson Design Consultants, the applicant, testified that they were doing a 2-story restaurant in the building and the client wanted to put a deck off the upper rear of the building. They had proposed a wood railing, but a metal railing would be OK. He stated that they were changing the rear wall from what was previously approved so that doors could open onto the deck, and that the windows would match the 7th Street side elevation of the building. Mr. Anderson stated that their goal was for the restaurant to have outside seating.

Board Member Killeen asked Mr. Anderson if he knew what the staff was referring to when they mentioned "ganged windows" and Mr. Anderson replied that he did. Board Member Killeen then asked if the design would still work if the windows were not ganged together. Mr. Anderson said that he thought

that it would work as long as the doors had a similar appearance.

Walker Hamilton of the Soulard Restoration Group (SRG) commented that the SRG had not seen the project. He stated they would like to have an opportunity to review the project.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

The Board finds that:

- The proposed site for the new roof deck and exterior alterations, 700 Allen Avenue, is located in the Soulard Neighborhood Certified Local Historic District.
- The Soulard Restoration Group has not had adequate time to review the project.

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 the next meeting to give the applicant time to present the project to the neighborhood. Board Member Killeen made the motion, which was seconded by Board Member Robinson. The motion passed 3-0 with Board Members Robinson, Killeen, and Coatar in support. Chairman Callow abstained from voting.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

D. 1032 & 1034 Geyer Avenue - Soulard Local & National Register Historic District

Owner: Hank Hart/He Hart Investments

Applicant: Anthony Duncan, Architect

Plan: Preliminary Review to construct two townhouses on a vacant lot

PROCEEDINGS

On May 23, 2022, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider a preliminary review to construct two townhouses at 1032 & 1034 Geyer Avenue, in the Soulard Local Historic District.

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

Bob Bettis of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #62382, which sets forth the standards for Soulard Local Historic District, and particularly the sections that pertain to new construction.

Mr. Bettis provided an overview of the context of the block and the adjacent built environment. Mr. Bettis then discussed the current proposal in detail. He stated that he has been working with the applicant to refine the design to better adhere to the Soulard Guidelines. He stated that the Soulard Restoration Group (SRG) has several concerns that the applicant is willing to address and change in the final submission. Those concerns included the building setback, the brick returns and the fenestration levels. With those items addressed, the SRG is supportive of the project.

Board Member Killeen asked if the project had any opposition. Mr. Bettis stated that CRO had not received any negative feedback. Mr. Killeen made a motion to preliminarily approve the project. Chair Callow asked if anyone was present to speak. Walker Hamilton, representing the SRG, commented that the group is in support of the submission. Chair Callow asked for a second to the motion which was made by Board Member Richardson. The motion passed with all present voting in favor.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1032 & 1034 Geyer Avenue are located in the Soulard Neighborhood Local Historic District.
- The applicant has provided a Model Example, located at 2108 South 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.
- Staff has received comments from the Soulard Restoration Group, which would be addressed in the final permit application. No comments have been received 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 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 with the stipulations that final plans and materials be reviewed and approved by the Cultural Resources Office. The motion was made by Board Member Allen and seconded by Board Member Richardson. The motion passed 3-0, with Board Members Killeen, Richardson, and Robinson in favor of the motion. Chairman Callow abstained.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

E. 5727 Waterman Boulevard Skinker-DeBaliviere Catlin Tract/Parkview Local & National Register Historic District

Owner: Sharon Ellerson

Applicant: Sharon Ellerson

Plan: Preliminary Review to construct an artificial stone retaining wall

PROCEEDINGS

On May 23, 2022, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider a preliminary review to construct a retaining wall at 5727 Waterman Boulevard, in the Skinker-DeBaliviere Catlin Tract/Parkview Local Historic District. Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, Tiffany Hamilton, David Richardson, Alderman Jack Coatar, Michael Allen, Anthony Robinson and David Weber were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Bob Bettis of the Cultural Resources Office made a presentation that considered City Ordinance #70281, which sets forth the standards for Skinker-DeBaliviere Catlin Tract/Parkview Historic District, and particularly the sections that pertain to front yards, slopes, walls, fencing and paving.

Mr. Bettis explained that the item is being brought back to the Preservation Board as a Preliminary Review because the motion made at the April 23rd meeting did not give Staff the flexibility to approve a non-compliant retaining wall in any form. Mr. Bettis stated that Commissioner Allen's previous motion was definitive in that it denied the wall outright. However, just prior to the motion Mr. Allen did state that given their appeared to be some compromise with that Staff and the applicant could come to a resolution, and the applicant has continued to work with staff This comment was made following the testimony of the applicant.

Chair Callow asked how the motion was inaccurate. Mr. Bettis stated that the motion wasn't necessarily inaccurate, but that it didn't give Staff the ability to approve a retaining wall that would not conflict with the Standards.

Chair Callow asked the applicant to speak and state what she would like to have constructed. Sharon Ellerson spoke and stated that she would like to install a retaining wall exactly like what the Board had approved at another house on the same block in 2020, which was a 3' high artificial block wall located at the sidewalk.

Chair Callow asked Commissioner Richardson for a motion. Mr. Richardson made a motion to grant Preliminary Approval to construct a retaining wall at the sidewalk pursuant to the applicant's proposed design.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 5727 Waterman Boulevard is located in the Skinker-DeBaliviere Local Historic District.
- The proposed 3' tall retaining wall is in the front yard parallel to the public sidewalk.
- Less than 50% of the earth terraces on the block have been altered.
- The proposed materials and wall configuration do not meet the criteria outlined in the Standards.

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 made a determination as to the substance and credibility of the evidence and exhibits.

The Preservation Board moved to grant Preliminary Approval to construct a retaining wall at the sidewalk pursuant to the proposed design as presented.

The motion was made by Board Member Richardson and seconded by Board Member Killeen. The motion passed 3-0, with Board Members Killeen, Richardson and Robinson in favor of the motion. Chairman Callow abstained.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

Board member Richardson moved to adjourn. Board member Killeen seconded. The vote was unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.