

**CITY OF ST. LOUIS
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES
JUNE 27, 2022**

Board Members Present:

Richard Callow – Chairman
Michael Allen
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

Barbara Birkicht

Chair Callow called roll at 4:02 p.m. Present were Chair Callow, Board members Anthony Robinson, Mike Killeen, David Richardson, Michael Allen, Alderman Jack Coatar.

Board member Allen suggested that agenda items G and H be heard first. Chair Callow moved to place those items first. There were no objections, and the agenda was adopted.

Chair Callow asked if any of the Board members needed to recuse themselves. There were no recusals.

NOMINATIONS TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

G. 8724 Halls Ferry Road

Nomination to the National Register of the Baden School

H. 909 Chestnut Street

Nomination to the National Register of the One Bell Center

Board member Allen moved to direct the Preservation Board to make reports to the State Historic Preservation Office for the National Register Area of Significance for each item listed in the staff report. Board member Killeen seconded. Board members Robinson, Killeen, Allen, and Alderman Coatar voted in favor of the motion. Chair Callow abstained. The motion carried.

PRELIMINARY REVIEWS

A. 4490-4494 Lindell Boulevard, Central West End Certified Local Historic District

Owner: Optimist International

Applicant: Ocean City One LLC/Lux Living, LLC

Commercial Plan: Partial Demolition of Optimist Club Pavilion & Demolition of Optimist Club Tower; Construction of 7- 8 Story Apartment Building

PROCEEDINGS

On June 27, 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 design proposal which would include demolition and new construction at the Optimist Club International at 4490 and 4494 Lindell Boulevard. The proposal involves complete demolition of the “tower” building at 4490 Lindell Blvd. and demolition of all but the north and west walls of the pavilion building at 4494 Lindell Blvd, and subsequent construction of a 7 story apartment building with two levels of underground parking. The site is located within the Central West End Certified Local Historic District.

Chair Callow, Alderman Coatar, and Board members Allen, Killeen, and Robinson were present for this agenda item

Meg Lousteau of the Cultural Resources Office (CRO) gave a presentation outlining the proposal. Ms. Lousteau gave a brief overview of the property’s history, mentioning that both buildings had been designed by Hari Van Hoefen of the firm Schwarz & Van Hoefen; the pavilion was completed in 1962 and the tower in 1972. She then reviewed its history with CRO, noting that an application for demolition and new construction of the residential tower had been filed in 2014 by Covington Realty Partners of Clayton, but the project did not go forward and the proposed design was never reviewed by the Preservation Board. She stated that, in 2015, the Koman Group planned to purchase the property and convert both buildings into Class A office space. The Board granted Preliminary Approval to that proposal at its October 2015 meeting, but that project also did not go forward. More recently, in 2021, Ocean City One LLC/LuxLiving/Vic Alston applied for preliminary review of a proposal to demolish both buildings and construct a 7 ½ story U-shaped apartment building with interior parking. The Preservation Board voted to withhold preliminary approval of that design as presented.

Ms. Lousteau then reviewed photographs of the buildings.

She then explained the current design proposed, which proposes to demolish the tower and all but the north and west facades of the pavilion. An L-shaped, 7 to 8 story apartment building with two levels of underground parking would be constructed on the property, incorporating the retained facades.

She stated that the site is located within the boundaries of the Central West End Certified Local Historic District (Ordinance #69423). It is also in a Preservation Review District (Ordinance #64689) and both ordinances are relevant to this review. The CRO analysis considered the demolition of the Optimist tower, and partial demolition of the Optimist pavilion as well, as a review of the subsequent development proposal follows.

Ms. Lousteau stated that it was important to note that the Cultural Resources Office considered this proposal to include a demolition, as it called for the razing of all but two walls of the pavilion. This project, she said, was an example of Facadism, the architectural and construction practice in which only the facade of a building is retained, and a new building erected behind or around it. Facadism, Ms. Lousteau stated, is not preservation.

She continued that the CRO staff was concerned about the impact of the excavation of two levels of underground parking on the stability of the two remaining facades, as the walls of the underground parking garage would be recessed 1 foot from the existing walls, and detailed engineering drawings explaining how those walls would be stabilized and protected had not yet been submitted.

Ms. Lousteau then addressed relevant legislation in Ordinance #69421, including standards for evaluating proposed demolitions. She noted that the intent of the Central West End Certified Local Historic District Standards is to maintain the distinctive character, quality of construction and individual architectural integrity of structures within the historic district. She then spoke to the historic significance of the pavilion in the context of its proposed demolition, noting that the CRO had conducted a survey in 2013 of 2300 Mid-Century Modern buildings, which determined that the Optimist Pavilion was one of the 25 most significant Mid-Century Modern buildings in St. Louis. She then spoke to the buildings' conditions, stating that both the tower and the pavilion were in good condition, with no evidence submitted as to structural issues.

As the property is also within a Preservation Review District, Ms. Lousteau also addressed those criteria for demolition review. In terms of Architectural Quality, she said the CRO staff determined that the pavilion building was High Merit as per Ordinance #64832, and eligible for individual listing on the National Register. However, she noted, removing all but its north and west facades would render it ineligible. She mentioned that the Optimist Club had stated that their staff and membership had been greatly reduced, and that that body had sent a letter of economic hardship which had been shared with the Preservation Board.

Concerning proposed new construction, Ms. Lousteau stated that the applicants were proposing a new 7 to 8 story apartment tower that would wrap around the pavilion site and incorporate the two remaining facades of the pavilion. She offered that the design of the new tower had taken into consideration suggestions from CRO staff, and that the design reflected the pavilion

in materials and character-defining slot windows. However, she said, the overall result was the loss of the pavilion as a distinct and separate building.

Ms. Lousteau then addressed the standards set forth in Ordinance #69423, Revised Rehabilitation and New Construction Standards for Ordinance #56768, the Central West End Historic District. She noted that the proposed building appeared to fall under the high-rise category, and that the proposed project generally complied with the standards set forth for new construction.

Mr. Vic Alston, the applicant, introduced other members of his team, including Eli Hoisington of HOK, Adam from Berkel Engineering, as well as Cheryl, chair of the Optimist Club and the owner. Mr. Alston stated that their original plan involved the complete demolition of the both buildings. Since then, their team had met with neighborhood groups as well as the Cultural Resources Office, and had enlisted the architecture firm of HOK. He mentioned frequent flooding of the basement as well as structural problems with the garage .

Speaking specifically to conditions desired by the Central West End Planning and Design Committee, Mr. Alston stated that the current proposal complied with all such conditions. Mr. Hoisington, an architect with HOK, then spoke. The proposal, he explained, included 150 units and about 150 parking spots, which drove the design process. The plan, he said, would wrap the existing building. The parking would be below grade, to minimize impact on the liveliness of the street. He reviewed floor plans at various levels, to show the locations of parking, apartments, and amenities; then plans reflecting building sections to further illustrate the proposal. He also addressed lighting and curb cuts, and said that further details would be refined as the project progressed.

Adam Hurley of Berkel and Co. Contractors spoke about the methods of preserving the facades. Referring to the submitted marked-up photographs, he went into detail about how the system would keep the walls standing during the demolition of the rest of the building. He then offered some information on the company's history and past projects.

Board member Killeen asked if there had been any other options short of demolishing most of the building. Mr. Hoisington said that they had analyzed other options and this was the best they'd been able to come up with given the scope of the proposal , especially the provision of parking.

Board member Allen asked Mr. Hurley if he could offer information on some similar projects that Berkel had completed. Mr. Hurley named three that were façade supports.

Cheryl Breen, executive director of Optimist Club International, spoke. She stated that their staff has been reduced by almost 75%, so they need less space, and mentioned other issues with building maintenance that affect their ability to meet their mission. She stated that there had been 4 prior attempts to redevelop this building, none of which had come to fruition.

Chair Callow opened the meeting for public comment.

Brian Macklind spoke in support of the project.

Jake Banton spoke in support of the project, referencing similar such projects in European cities.

17th Ward Alderwoman Tina Pihl spoke in opposition to the project, noting precedent and the strong real estate market in the area.

Andrew Weil, Director of the Landmarks Association of St. Louis, spoke in opposition to the project, noting that it contemplated the demolition of a High Merit building.

Jim Dwyer, chair of the Central West End Planning and Development Committee, asked that the Preservation Board withhold preliminary approval until and unless there could be assurances on conditions desired by the CWE Planning and Development Committee.

Brian Take, a neighborhood resident, spoke in support of the project, pointing out that since COVID and the loss of many restaurants, crime had risen in the Central West End. He said he appreciated new development like this that would attract younger people.

Mike Heaney spoke in support of the proposal, noting that he appreciated Mr. Dwyer's comments; and while the project perhaps was not the perfect solution, the building had been underused for a long time and he looked forward to the project.

John Warren with Cushman & Wakefield, real estate agent for the Optimist Club, spoke in support of the project. He stated that this was the Optimists' fourth attempt during almost a decade to market the building. He noted that the only potential offers they had previously received were from not-for-profits and church groups, who he felt would not have the finances to maintain the property. He noted that the building had recently been broken into, and that there were continuing foundation problems. He concluded by saying the property was the final best development opportunity in the West End, which had few remaining sites left to develop. He noted that cities of a size like St. Louis, such as Nashville and Kansas City, were constructing thousands more residential units every year than St. Louis. He ended by saying that the developers had worked with the Central West End Association to come up with this solution, and the proposed development would be a great addition to a premier corner.

Greg Wattig spoke in support of the project. He said he lived at Maryland and Taylor across the street and looked at the property every day. Lux, he said, had done a great job keeping the historic nature of the building and seeking to alleviate a difficult situation for the Optimists. He felt this might be the last chance for the building, and said that the proposed development would drive the future economic development of the neighborhood.

Tim Graham spoke in support of the project. He said he is a longtime neighbor of this project and thought it a beautiful compromise. He further stated that the city was losing thousands of

residents each year and to stop this we had to build where people want to live. He would love to see new residents activate the streets and add to the tax base. He said he had spoken with many of his neighbors about the project and not one was opposed; he had never seen such unanimous support for a development.

John Guenther, architect, and President of the Society of Architectural Historians, spoke against the project. He said he echoed Mr. Weil's and Alderwoman Pihl's testimonies that this project may create a precedent for the loss of Modern buildings and mentioned his support for the Cultural Resources Office and its outstanding report on the project. He felt that we could work together to explore how the Pavilion might be reused, as its proposed partial demolition would be very expensive. He noted he had earlier asked about the occupant capacity of the Pavilion as it stands. He concluded by saying that the embodied energy in the buildings was significant, and we would be losing both our culture and the physical properties of the building.

Carlos Goldberg-King spoke in support of the project. He said he had always admired the beauty of the building and wondered what could be done with it. He thought the proposal from Lux Living is one of the most unique and best adaptive reuses he knew, keeping the exterior appearance of the Pavilion and providing luxury residential living.

Bryan Hadley spoke in favor of the project. He said he had been following the development proposal for a while and had been adamantly opposed to the first which he thought was quite generic. He said Lux had listened to feedback, and he would support the current design as a fit, fair compromise. He said he understood that other preservationists think it is a demolition, but he thought it seemed to be the best option for this site.

Madelyn Garcia spoke in support of the project. She said that she lived in a Lux Living property in the DeBaliviere neighborhood. She said she was sad to see such a historic building go, but thought it was a positive renovation/demolition of the building. She asked that Lux consider keeping the historic Optimist statue in front of the building, and a place marker in front of the building recognizing its former use. She applauded the idea that this building could create care-free living with all the services nearby. She further recommended that the building should be a sustainable development, and that the pavilion might be used for community inclusion.

Chris Stitzel spoke in support of the project and its creativity, and of the additional density and more variation to the already varied architecture of the area. HOK had proved they had an answer to a unique challenge. He said he wanted to see the city grow and thrive and the project had the support of such a young, urban-minded person.

Chico Weber, a resident of a Lux Living property, spoke in support of the project. He said it was hard to find a modern property with the amenities you'd expect here in St. Louis, but that Lux Living provided that, and was quite accommodating; the quality of his living situation he expected would be similar here.

Matt Beauman, also a tenant of Lux Living, spoke in favor of the project. He said he supported the project and the ability that Lux Living had to make good on their promises. St. Louis has a rich history, he said, but what if no one is there to enjoy it? The city should attract the younger generation that Lux is catering to, so that young people are excited to remain in St. Louis. It should be made more livable and more walkable.

Jeri Beckley also a current Lux resident, spoke against the project. She stated that since Lux was known for offering incentives for their tenants to speak at meetings in their favor, she thought it was important for the Preservation Board to hear the other side of the story. She said she was aware of the risks of speaking out, as the company was litigious, but what she would say was 100% accurate). She spoke about Staff entering units with no notice, power outages, elevator breakdowns, ceiling leaks, mold and pest problems; AC not working between last August and last week, (organize a tenant union). She testified that a current resident had attempted to intimidate her and when she complained to management, they ignored it for 45 days. She said Lux had retaliated against her for complaining to the city about a building code violation; and that they have no regard for the people who live in their properties, just money. She concluded that the city's ignoring past and present transgressions of the company erodes people's trust in government.

Cindy Lufton, a neighbor adjacent to another LuxLiving property, the Hudson, testified against the project. She stated that the plans were impressive, but they were just paper. She related her experience with Lux Living regarding her building at 5560 Waterman, where construction of the new building had made her fence collapse. She said the replacement fence was supposed to be of the same quality and design as her fence and it was not; that she and her neighbors were forced to hire an attorney. Another issue she mentioned was that a tree which was on both properties was cut down by the Hudson with no notice. She emphasized that if the project was approved, the city should monitor its construction closely.

Board Member Michael Allen made a motion to withhold Preliminary Approval of the project as presented as the demolition as the Optimist International is a High Merit building under the Preservation Review Ordinance, a contributing resource to the Central West End historic district, and a significant element of the historic architecture of the City of St. Louis. Board Member Mike Killeen seconded the motion.

In discussion, Mr. Allen stated that the applicant has put effort into its project, but the Board's job was to protect a High Merit structure from demolition, and this was demolition.

Mr. Robinson stated that he was torn; he was in agreement with Mr. Allen but that he lived two blocks away from the building, sees it every day, and nothing has happened with the building in the 18 years that he's lived there. He said that HOK had done a thorough job in its design, saving two walls, and wondered what else might be possible. He noted that plenty of buildings fall into disrepair while waiting for development because of feasibility at the time. He said he was leaning towards approval with a number of conditions.

Mr. Killeen stated that he felt for the Optimist owners, but that a developer really has to work with the Ward and neighborhood, and there had been no communication since April.

Alderman Coatar stated that he had read the conditions requested by Mr. Dwyer and it sounded like the developer was willing to abide by them. He said he echoed Mr. Robinson's comments: that the reality is that no one has stepped up to buy the building except this developer who has worked with the neighborhood. He said the design strikes a good balance, provides a more modern, livable building, and more density. Alderman Coatar noted that this would be more housing, which would keep people in the city, and that the comments from the surrounding neighborhood had been mostly positive. He said he would oppose the motion; time was not going to be kind, and we should move forward with a viable project.

Mr. Richardson did not participate in the discussion, except to say that he would abstain, and that he had not been present during the presentation.

Mr. Robinson said his understanding per Mr. Dwyer's testimony was that the applicant had satisfied earlier requests made by the neighborhood. He said he would support the project based on those additional requirements.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

The Cultural Resources Office consideration of the criteria for demolition in the Central West End Historic District and in the Preservation Review District Ordinance, as well as the requirements for new construction in the Central West End Historic District led to these preliminary findings:

- 4490 Lindell and 4494 Lindell are located in the Central West End Historic District.
- Both buildings were erected by the Optimist International organization. The corner pavilion was designed by Hari van Hoefen of the Schwarz & Van Hoefen firm and was completed in 1962. The east building, also designed by Van Hoefen, was completed in 1978.
- The pavilion was identified as of high architectural significance in the recent survey of Mid-Century Modern architecture in St. Louis and based on that survey; it is considered to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Its near-total demolition would be a significant architectural loss, and the razing of all but two of its facades would render it ineligible for listing on the National Register.
- The 1978 Tower building, while at an age of slightly less than 50 years, is part of history of the Optimist site and as such would be eligible for the National Register as part of a district or thematic nomination; however, it does not have the exceptional architectural significance of the pavilion and its demolition would have much less impact upon the district, the street and the architectural history of the City.

- The Central West End historic district standards acknowledge that buildings such as the Optimist will attain significance as the years pass and therefore may be considered contributing structures to the district.
- The applicant has not submitted an analysis of the condition of the buildings nor of the feasibility of their reuse. Based on these preliminary findings, the Cultural Resources Office recommends that the Preservation Board withhold preliminary approval to the project and recommends the applicants explore the possibility of reuse of the pavilion building in their future development.

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 withhold Preliminary Approval for the project as presented. Board member Allen made the motion, which was seconded by Board member Killeen. The motion passed 3 to 2, with Board members Allen and Killeen, and Chair Callow voting in favor, and Board members Robinson and Alderman Coatar voting against. (Board member Richardson abstained from this agenda item.)

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

B. 700 Allen Avenue, Soulard 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 June 27, 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 Soulard 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.

Andrea Gagen, of the Cultural Resources Office, presented this item. Ms. Gagen showed some photos of the building and its context, including an aerial view and a location map. She stated that this item had been deferred from the May 2022 Preservation Board meeting

Ms. Gagen stated that the project did not comply with the Soulard Historic District Standards in two

areas. She said that the applicant had applied for and received a building permit in June 2021 for an overall renovation. The applicant is now asking to construct a rooftop deck and alter the plans for the south elevation of the 2nd story.

Ms. Gagen stated that the roof deck did not comply with the historic district standards as it is located above a Public Façade and will be highly visible from 7th Street. She also said that the roof deck would be prominently visible when viewed from the south. Ms. Gagen stated that the windows on the 2nd story did not comply as the four original, symmetrically placed window would be exchanged for a non-historic configuration where the units are mulled together to create a large glazed opening. This new opening would be highly visible from 7th Street. Ms. Gagen showed drawings, renderings and photos of the proposed changes and visibility of the area of work. She stated that the staff recommended that the Board withhold Preliminary Approval as the roof deck and exterior alterations do not comply with the Soulard Neighborhood Historic District Standards. Ms. Gagen said that they had received a letter and comments from the Soulard Restoration Group (SRG). She said the SRG would have no opposition to the roof deck if the 7th Street railing were set four feet back from the parapet wall and that, the doors and windows of an appropriate style are used. Ms. Gagen stated that no revised drawings had been received from the applicant.

Alderman Jack Coatar, Alderman for the 7th Ward, stated that he has not spoken to the applicant, but he had spoken to Mr. Gibbs of the SRG and was in agreement with their comments. He said that if the handrail were moved back four feet on the east side and the windows were historic he would be fine with it. He stated that the historic configuration likely did not include doors, so he was not worried about changing the configuration. He believed the configuration could be worked out.

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. He said that there was not a problem with moving the handrail back 4 feet from the parapet wall. Mr. Anderson stated that he had proposed a wood railing, but if the Board wanted a metal railing that 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.

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 visibility of the roof deck would be minimized by setting the handrail back four feet from the parapet wall and changing the material to black metal.
- The windows and doors on the 2nd story rear wall should be appropriate to the building.

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 approve the rooftop deck with a black metal handrail and a setback of four feet, and at that the new windows and doors be approved by the Cultural Resources Office. Alderman Coatar made the motion, which was seconded by Board Member Killeen. The motion passed 5-0 with Board Members Robinson, Killeen, Allen, Richardson, and Coatar in support. Chairman Callow abstained from voting.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

C. 3409-3411 Juniata Street Shaw Local Historic District

Owner: Adam Roberts – Triple H Real Estate, LLC

Applicant: John Wimmer – Jeff Day Architect

Plan: Preliminary Review to construct a four-family apartment building

PROCEEDINGS

On June 27, 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 two-story, four-family apartment building at 3409-3411 Juniata Street, in the Tower Grove East Local Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, David Richardson, Michael Allen, Alderman Jack Coatar, 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 #70938, which sets forth the standards for the Tower Grove East Historic District, and particularly the sections that pertain to new construction.

Mr. Bettis explained that the item is being brought to the Preservation Board for consideration as it is new construction in the Tower Grove East Local historic District. He stated that the project generally complies with all of the guidelines set forth in the Tower Grove East design guidelines and that the applicants have been easy to work with to refine the design. Mr. Bettis stated that the neighborhood group is in full support of the project on the project. Mr. Bettis stated that staff is satisfied with the design and recommended the Preservation Board grant preliminary approval.

Chair Callow asked if any member of the Board wished to hear from the applicant. Mr. Killeen stated that hearing from the applicant was not necessary and made a motion to grant preliminary approval. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 3409-11 Juniata Street is located in the Tower Grove East Local Historic District.
- The proposed building substantially complies with the Tower Grove East Historic District 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 for the construction of a four-unit apartment building located at 3409-11 Juniata Street with the stipulations that final plans and materials be reviewed and approved by the Cultural Resources Office

The motion was made by Board Member Killeen and seconded by Board Member Allen. The motion passed 5-0, with Board Members Killeen, Coatar, Richardson and Robinson in favor of the motion. Chairman Callow abstained.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

D. 3811 Russell Boulevard Shaw Local Historic District

Owner: Carl Wurm

Applicant: Carl Wurm

Plan: Preliminary Review to construct a new frame garage and curb cut.

PROCEEDINGS

On June 27, 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 new garage and curb cut at 3811 Russell Boulevard, in the Shaw Local Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, David Richardson, Michael Allen, Alderman Jack Coatar, 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 #59400, which sets forth the standards for the Shaw Historic District, and particularly the sections that pertain to new structures and curb cuts.

Mr. Bettis explained that the item is being brought to the Preservation Board for consideration as a Preliminary Review because the Shaw Standards require that all new curb cuts must be approved by the Preservation Board. Mr. Bettis stated that all aspects of the proposed garage are compliant and would have been approved without Preservation Board review. However, the 3800 block of Russell Boulevard is not serviced by an alley thus necessitating the new curb cut and approval from the Preservation Board. Mr. Bettis stated that the neighborhood group has not commented on the project.

.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The proposed site for the fencing, 3811 Russell Boulevard, is located in the Shaw Local Historic District.
- The proposed new garage will be at the rear of a parcel that does not have alley access and requires a new curb cut and accompanying driveway.

- All new curb cuts require the approval of the Preservation Board.
- The design of the proposed garage is compliant with Shaw Neighborhood Local Historic District 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 new garage and associated curb cut.

The motion was made by Board Member Allen and seconded by Board Member Killeen. The motion passed 5-0, with Board Members Killeen, Allen, Coatar, Richardson and Robinson in favor of the motion. Chairman Callow abstained.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

E. 1925 S. 11th Street, Soulard Neighborhood Certified Local Historic District

Owner: 333 Realty LLC

Applicant: Anthony Duncan

Plan: Appeal of Director's Denial retain/finish infilled porch

PROCEEDINGS

On June 27, 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/finish an infilled porch at 1925 S. 11th Street, located within the boundaries of the Soulard Neighborhood Historic District.

Board members Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, Michael Allen, David Richardson, and Alderman Jack Coatar were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Andrea Gagen of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in and entered into the record Ordinance #64689, as amended by Ordinance #64925; Ordinance #57078, as amended by Ordinance #62382, which sets forth the standards for the Shaw Neighborhood Local Historic District, and in particular the sections that pertain to Structures; the agenda; the PowerPoint; and her presentation.

Ms. Gagen stated that the owner originally had applied for a permit in January, which the Cultural Resources Office was in the process of reviewing, when it was observed that a portion of the work was already underway, including the installation of a wall to infill the recessed

portion of the porch. She showed before and after photos of the side elevation where the infill occurred. Ms. Gagen said that the staff advised the owner that the new wall did not comply with the Soulard Historic District standards. At the request of the owner, the Cultural Resources Office approved revised plans that did not include the wall. Ms. Gagen stated that the owner then applied for an addendum to the permit to retain and finish the wall and install a window. She said the new application for addendum to the permit was denied, and the owner has appealed here. Ms. Gagen also said that some additional work, including installation of windows and closure of a window on the other side of the building, had been completed without a permit. She stated that the owner had applied for a permit for that work.

Ms. Gagen showed a historic Sanborn map, indicating that the area of the porch in question had not been enclosed when the building was built. She also showed additional photos of the infill and context. Ms. Gagen stated that the infill did not comply with the Soulard Historic District standards, as the illegally-constructed wall was added to a Semi-Public Façade that is not at the rear of the building. She said that the Alderman, Jack Coatar, had expressed his support for the project and that the Soulard Restoration Group (SRG) was in support of the infill with some modifications to some of the window openings. Ms. Gagen said she believed the applicant would show the Board those changes during their presentation.

Ms. Gagen stated that the Cultural Resources Office recommended that the Preservation Board uphold the Director's Denial of the addendum for the infilled porch, as it did not comply with the Soulard Neighborhood Historic District Standards. Board Member Richardson questioned whether the suggestions by the SRG had changed their recommendation. Ms. Gagen replied no, as the infill still did not meet the historic district standards. Board Member Allen asked about the previous infill on the building and whether it was done with Cultural Resources or Preservation Board approval. Ms. Gagen replied that it had not, as it had been completed without permits. She said the first story had been done long ago, but the other half of the second story was done within several years ago by a previous owner.

Matt Cassidy, of the owners of 333 Realty, testified on his own behalf. He was sworn in by Board Member Richardson. Mr. Cassidy shared his PowerPoint presentation. He spoke about the permit that was applied for in January 2022. He stated that they had wanted to hit the ground running on their first development and preliminarily put up a wall to enclose the space so that the contractors could work and seal it off from the elements before February hit. Mr. Cassidy said that when they found out the plans could not be approved due to the wall they left it up, he did not get a clear answer about whether it needed to be taken down. He said that he took ownership of the issue with the windows. Being their first development, he thought that it had been communicated to the architect that they were replacing all of the windows, but there had

been a miscommunication. Mr. Cassidy stated that as soon as Ms. Gagen alerted him to the issue, he contacted the architect and got plans drawn up and submitted as quickly as possible. He said that Ms. Gagen had brought up another element, which was the south wall. He stated the architect had not provided a plan for the south wall and as soon as they were aware of the problem, they submitted a plan for that work.

Mr. Cassidy showed a photo of the north side of the building, saying that they were going to eliminate the existing vinyl siding and wanted to infill the remainder of the second story. He then showed the plans of what they were proposing and said that they were going to infill it using Hardie Board-type siding to give it a wood look. Mr. Cassidy stated that the architecture of the exterior is amazing, but on the interior, they wanted to make it more functional, as they want to rent it for \$3,000.

Mr. Cassidy said that he had spoken to the building inspector, Mike Wood, who told him if he could show other infills in Soulard it may help. He showed and discussed infills at 824 Ann, 1021 Geyer, and 2010 S. 11th St. Mr. Cassidy stated that another reason they wished to infill this space was weather infiltration, which could possibly cause hazards such as mold. He showed photos of the interior of the infilled space. Mr. Cassidy said that he had had a good conversation with Mr. Gibbs of the SRG, showing him their original plans. He stated that Mr. Gibbs said they would support the project with a few tweaks. Mr. Cassidy then read the SRG's letter into the record. He then showed revised plans that complied with the SRG's stipulations and discussed the changes.

Board Member Richardson asked Ms. Gagen if she had seen this drawing before. She said yes, that they had received them last week. Board Member Richardson asked Ms. Gagen to comment on the front façade changes. Ms. Gagen stated that they had already installed the window, but that the preference was for two shutters rather than a single shutter at the third story. She said that the shutter closure is allowed under the historic district standards. Alderman Coatar testified that he supported the project with conditions set forth in the SRG's letter, and he appreciated Mr. Cassidy and his team working with the neighborhood on this project. He also stated that the building had been in rough shape with Mr. Cassidy and his team bought it, and that there were other issues on this block, so he was appreciative of this project. Ms. Gagen stated that the Cultural Resources Office had not approved the infill examples shown by Mr. Cassidy. She said she thought all of them were completed before the historic district was in place.

Mr. Allen asked the staff if a decision one way or the other would impinge on the review of the remainder of the project. Ms. Gagen replied that it would not.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

The Board finds that:

- The site of the infill, 1925 S. 11th Street, is located in the Soulard Neighborhood Local Historic District.
- The infilled wall was installed without a permit. Previous owners completed most of the infill on the building.
- The Alderman and the neighborhood group support the owners' proposal with conditions that the owners have agreed to follow.

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 and approve the infill subject to the conditions set forth in the Soulard Restoration Group's support letter with final design details to be approved by staff. Alderman Coatar made the motion, which was seconded by Board Member Allen. The motion passed 5-0 with Board Members Allen, Richardson, Killeen, Robinson, and Alderman Coatar in support.

By Order of the Preservation Board
Cultural Resources Office

F. 2156 Forest Avenue (aka 6845 Bruno Avenue)

Owner: City Restorations LLC, c/o A.J. Adewunmi

Applicant: Z&L Wrecking Co. Inc., Zack Little

Plan: Demolish 1-story brick house

PROCEEDINGS

On June 27, 2022, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider an appeal of the Denial to demolish a 1-story, brick residential building at 2156 Forest Avenue in the Franz Park neighborhood. The site is in a Preservation Review District.

Chair Callow, Alderman Coatar, and Board members Killen, Allen, Richardson, Robinson were present for the testimony for this agenda item.

Meg Lousteau of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in. She entered into the record Ordinance #64689 as modified by Ordinance #64925 and Preservation Review Ordinance #64832, her presentation, the agenda, and the staff report. She noted that the site was located in a Preservation Review District, where the Cultural Resources Office and Preservation Board

have jurisdiction over demolition applications. She stated that the building was a Merit structure per the definition in Ordinance #64689, and would be a contributing building to a possible National Register District.

Ms. Lousteau then showed a map of the site and a current photograph of the building. She stated that the owner had first applied for demolition in January of 2021 and had been denied by the Cultural Resources Office, as the building was a Merit structure in solid condition. On February 22, 2022, an inspector with the City's Building Division issued a Stop Work Order for demolition without a permit. Notes from that inspection file indicated that, despite the Stop Work Order, work had continued on February 23, 2022.

She stated that CRO was first alerted to the demolition by a citizen complaint in April 2022. In May of 2022, the owner applied to demolish the remainder of the building. CRO denied that application, and the owner has now appealed that denial to the Preservation Board.

Ms. Lousteau testified that the property owner, Mr. Adewunmi, in a prior conversation had stated that the rear portion of the building had collapsed, but, she said, a site visit by CRO staff in 2021 found a solid, intact building. She then referenced a letter submitted by Bethany Moore, former CRO staff member, and showed photographs taken by Ms. Moore during that 2021 site visit. Ms. Lousteau then reviewed the criteria for evaluation of demolition applications in Preservation Review Districts, noting that the building was a Merit structure and, despite the loss of the rear half, was still in solid condition. She also noted that no information had been submitted by the appellant regarding new construction or economic hardship, and therefore she concluded by stating that the application did not meet the standards set forth in those criteria.

Ms. Lousteau mentioned a letter and structural report that had been submitted to CRO by a structural engineer, noting that the report appeared to be based solely on photographs and not a site visit.

The appellant, Mr. A.J. Adewunmi was sworn in. He stated that he was doing 28 townhomes on adjacent to this site. At the time of the January 2021 site visit, he said CRO staff was not able to enter the building because of its poor condition and water in the basement. He said that the rear of the building had been compromised, and that it had not been stable anyway. He disputed that this was a Merit building.

Board member Killeen asked Mr. Adewunmi if he knew what happened to the back of the building. Mr. Adewunmi responded that he was not sure. Board member Allen asked Mr. Adewunmi about the stop work order regarding the demolition. Mr. Adewunmi stated that the Stop Work Order was for work on a parking lot, not the demolition of the building. Board member Allen followed up, asking if Mr. Adewunmi had ever discussed the demolition of this building. Mr. Adewunmi responded that he had not.

Ms. Lousteau asked to respond, and read into the record notes from the Building Inspector stating that demolition work had continued the day after the stop work order had been posted. Mr. Adewunmi disputed that demolition was the reason for the Stop Work Order.

Mr. Aziz Kadric, structural engineer, was sworn in. He stated that, in his professional opinion, it would be unsafe to attempt to repair this building because it is too deteriorated. Board member Allen asked Mr. Kadric if he'd inspected the building prior to the loss of the rear section. Mr. Kadric responded that he had not. Board member Killeen asked Mr. Kadric if he believed, as a structural engineer, that the building was about to collapse. Mr. Kadric stated that he believed it to be in danger of further collapse. Board member Richardson asked about leaving the building alone, as had been mentioned earlier. Mr. Kadric responded that the building might be standing in six months. Over the course of a year, he stated, weather or geological events could destabilize the building. In response to a question from Board member Richardson regarding whether he had ever visited the site, Mr. Kadric responded that he had not. Board member Allen then asked if Mr. Kadric had an opinion as to what could have caused the damage. Mr. Kadric said that Mr. Adewunmi had told him that a contractor was removing trees from the lot, and that perhaps a tree had fallen on the building.

Dan Krasnoff, former Director of the Cultural Resources Office, was sworn in. He stated that, in January of 2021, CRO had received a demolition permit for this and adjacent buildings. He spoke about the context, and noted the possible connection between this building and a nearby steel plant that has since been lost. Mr. Krasnoff said that they had not been able to access the building because there was no key. He and Ms. Moore were able to see inside, and found the building remarkably intact and solid on both the interior and exterior. Mr. Krasnoff said he had advised Mr. Adewunmi that CRO would recommend that the Building Commissioner deny the application for demolition, but that he could file an appeal of that denial and be heard by the Preservation Board. He concurred with the remarks made in Ms. Moore's letter. He concluded by encouraging the Preservation Board to deny the demolition.

Board member Richardson asked Mr. Krasnoff if he believed the structure to be sound. Mr. Krasnoff responded that he was extremely confident that the building would stand for more than 6 months.

Mr. Adewunmi then spoke. He reiterated that there had been water running in the basement for over a year, and that the foundation was compromised. He stated that he had sent an email to Mr. Krasnoff asking to appeal from the denial of his permit application. He further stated that he had safety concerns about the building, and people getting hurt.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 2156 Forest Avenue is located in a Preservation Review District.

- The remainder of the building appears to be in good condition and is Sound under the definition in the ordinance.
- The building is a Merit structure, as it would be a contributing resource to a potential National Register District.
- The building is located in a stable area and would have had good reuse potential.
- There are no immediate plans for new construction on the site.

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.

Board member Allen moved to uphold the Director's Denial of the demolition application as it did not meet the standards set forth in the Preservation Review District ordinance. Board member Killeen seconded. Board member Richardson remarked that the current CRO director, the past CRO director, and the appellant's structural engineer all agreed that the building would still be standing in 6 months. Voting in favor were Board members Killeen, Allen, and Richardson and Alderman Coatar. Board member Robinson abstained. The motion passed with 4 votes and 1 abstention.

By Order of the Preservation Board Cultural Resources Office

Board member Killeen moved to adjourn the meeting. Board member Coatar seconded. The meeting adjourned at 7:11 p.m.