

**CITY OF ST. LOUIS  
CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICE  
PRESERVATION BOARD MINUTES  
June 28, 2021**

**Board Members Present**

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

**Cultural Resources Office Staff Present**

Jan Cameron, Preservation Administrator  
Andrea Gagen, Preservation Planner  
Bethany Moore, Preservation Planner  
Deneen Funk, Secretary

**Legal Counsel**

Barbara Birkicht

Commissioner Weber made a motion to approve the May Preservation Board minutes dated May 24, 2021. The motion to approve the minutes was seconded by Commissioner Richardson. Commissioners voted in favor to approve the minutes by voice vote and there were no oppositions. Chairman Callow stated the minutes were approved.

**A. 2853 & 2865-67 INDIANA AVENUE**

Owner: City Life Development, LLC/Nick Shapiro

Architect: U.I.C./Sarah Gibson

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider a Request for Reconsideration of the Preliminary Approval for the construction of a detached, 2-story house at 2853 Indiana and two semi-detached townhouses at 2865-67 Indiana Avenue, in the Benton Park Local Historic District, based on additional information that was provided that the Staff did not have at the time of the previous hearing.

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

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office (CRO) gave a brief presentation outlining the project. She testified that this was an unusual situation, Ms Cameron said she would not go through the

entire project presentation from last month, but it was appended to the Board's agenda for reference. She received additional information following the last hearing date which required her to correct the facts as she presented them to the Preservation Board. The Policy being followed by the Applicant has not been completed. To that end, she requested that a motion be made to send the project back before Benton Park and CRO to complete the requirements of the Compatible New Construction Policy. She noted that both the project developer and representatives of the Benton Park Neighborhood Association were present and would testify.

Neil Shapiro, project developer, testified against the Reconsideration. He stated that the Preservation Board decided to approve the revised designs as presented at the May meeting; but now a month later the Benton Park Neighborhood Association (BPNA) having lost that argument seemed to be trying a last-ditch gambit for further architectural changes. He said it was his understanding that the design of 2853 is not at issue, as a non-corner lot is not subject to the two-meeting requirement. He said he thought that architectural debates are good and healthy, even with conflicting viewpoints, but he did not relish the process issues that have been frustrating for the development team. He stated that Benton Park still opposed their plans after all the changes they had asked for had been made, and said he felt that this was a pretext to nullify the Preservation Board's vote.

Mr. Shapiro noted that the Board had his letter from Friday that spelled in detail all his concerns. Zoom meetings were arranged by CRO and BPNA, where CRO staff provided both CRO and BPNA comments. He noted their team had been disappointed that the Zoom platform preempted their opportunity to present directly to BPNA but felt it acceptable in the current pandemic environment. The second meeting was on April 15, at which time Mr. Shapiro said he asked BPNA to go beyond generalizations to specific revisions they wanted, which were then made. He said he agreed to defer Preservation Board review until the May 24 meeting and heard from BPNA only two days before the meeting. Mr. Shapiro stated that he thought this appeal puts the Board in uncomfortable position, and raises the question of what kind of city we want St. Louis to be: a progressive, forward-looking, welcoming city; or one that is rigid, hostile, insular and fearful of change. He said he meant this in two ways, one from an architectural perspective and one from a business perspective. The first, should St. Louis be welcoming sensitive, respectful, textural yet contemporary infill

the way thriving vibrant cities such as New York, Washington DC and Chicago do in their renowned historic districts; or should St. Louis cling to a purely backward-looking approach that freezes our historic districts in amber and shuts out any development except fake replicas that are designed to fool everyone into believing that everything there is historic and old even when the Standards don't require this. He said that it was clear that BPNA chose the second. Mr. Shapiro added that property owners and developers and businesses should be able to rely on the decisions of the City; that he has ordered final plans based on last month's decision and made an additional financial commitment; and it will have a chilling effect if such decisions can be changed.

Chairman Callow asks for questions for the applicant.

Board Member Killeen recuses.

Alderman Coatar stated that he was reading Mr. Shapiro's submitted letter and asked how many meetings there were with the neighborhood and CRO? Mr. Shapiro responded, two that BPNA was not a part of, although their concerns were expressed by CRO.

Board Member Richardson asked if the plans have been finalized since last Board meeting and Mr. Shapiro replied no, but he had ordered the architect to start preparing them. Mr. Richardson pointed out that the previous motion included review of final design details and the relocation of the garage, and asked if that meeting had occurred. Mr. Shapiro responded that the plans he referred to were for the interior lot at 2853, where there was no conflict.

Ms Cameron asked to respond and the Chair agreed. She stated that the project could not be arbitrarily separated into two separate reviews; the project must be considered as a whole; and that she had had no contact with Mr. Shapiro since last meeting. She also stated that it is the responsibility of the applicant, not the Cultural Resources Office, to arrange the meetings required by the Policy.

Sarah Gibson, with UIC, the architect of the project, spoke against the Reconsideration. She said she was in support of all that Mr. Shapiro had said and that they were proceeding with contract documents on 2853 Indiana. She said she agreed with Mr. Shapiro that there were two Zoom meetings between UIC, the developer and the Cultural Resources Office and had believed that a representative of Benton Park would be included, but was not.

Tim Mulligan, Benton Park Neighborhood Association, spoke in support of the Reconsideration. He said that he agreed with Board Member Richardson's statement at the last meeting that the Compatible New Construction Policy is not a standard but an add-on to the existing historic district code that has been in place now for fifteen years. He said that this is the second project the BPNA had been a party to and while he would not express the Association's opinion of the Policy at this time, he requested that BPNA be a party to two meetings to provide constructive feedback. He testified that their hope was to meet again with the design team and come up with a more appropriate solution than was shown last month.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

The Preservation Board finds that:

- 2865-67 and 2853 Indiana are located in the Benton Park Local Historic District.
- The Applicant requested review of the project under the Preservation Board's Compatible New Construction Policy.
- The Preservation Board granted Preliminary Approval to the project at its May meeting, with the condition that the garage at 2867 Indiana be reconsidered and exterior materials, details and final plans be reviewed and approved by the Cultural Resources staff.
- The Benton Park Neighborhood Association has requested the Board to Reconsider its Preliminary Approval of the project because the second meeting between Cultural Resources, the developer and the neighborhood did not take place, as required by the Policy.

**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 reconsider its Preliminary Approval due to additional information presented and send the project back to the Cultural Resources Office and the Benton Park Neighborhood Association to complete the requirements of the Compatible New Construction Policy. The motion was made by Alderman Coatar and seconded by Board Member Weber. The motion carried, with Board Members Robinson, Fathman, Weber, Richardson, and Alderman Coatar voting in favor, and Chairman Callow abstaining.

**By Order of the Preservation Board**

**Cultural Resources Office**

**C. 2016 ADELAIDE AVENUE**

Owner: Rodney Northcross

Applicant: TNT Demolition

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, 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 brick, 2-story, single-family Merit building in a Preservation Review Area.

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

Bethany Moore of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in and entered into the record Ordinance 64689, as amended by Ordinance 64925 and as revised by Ordinance 64832, which specifies demolition criteria; the agenda; the PowerPoint; and her presentation.

Ms. Moore stated that 2016 Adelaide Avenue is located in a Preservation Review District where the Cultural Resources Office/Preservation Board has jurisdiction over demolition applications. The building is a Merit structure per the definition in Ordinance 64689, as the building is determined to be a contributing resource to a potential City or National Register Historic District. 2016 Adelaide Avenue was evaluated as part of the O'Fallon Wedge Architectural Survey by the Landmarks Association of St. Louis in December of 2001 for the City of St. Louis Community Development Administration. The building was determined

to be a contributing resource and at the time was stated to be vacant but in fair condition.

Ms. Moore said that the current owner, Rodney Northcross, had acquired the property from the Land Reutilization Authority in March of 2021 with the expressed intent to demolish the building and leave the lot vacant. Mr. Northcross also owns two occupied buildings to the west and immediately adjacent to 2016 Adelaide. The Cultural Resources Office staff conducted an exterior survey and determined the building to be Sound per the definition in Ordinance #64689, as visible portions of exterior walls and roofs appear capable of continuing to support their current loads for six months or more. No damage to the foundation, bulging or cracked walls or collapses were observed. Damage to the flat roof is not visible from the exterior but the owner did provide interior photographs highlighting the deteriorated condition of the roof.

Ms. Moore explained and reviewed the criteria for demolition approval outlined in Ordinance 64689 and reiterated that the Cultural Resources Office had denied the demolition application as a Merit building in Sound condition per the definitions in Ordinance 64689.

Rodney Northcross, owner, spoke on his own behalf. He spoke to the level of damage that was present on the interior as a result of a leaking roof and over two decades of neglect. He also spoke to the costs of to rehabilitation and the lack of return. He explained to the Board that he purchased the property with the expressed purpose to demolish it in order to clean up his neighborhood and to keep his children and grandchildren, who live next to 2016 Adelaide Avenue, safe.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

The Preservation Board finds that:

- 2016 Adelaide Avenue, is located in a Preservation Review Area.
- 2016 Adelaide is a Merit Structure and Sound under the definitions of Ordinance 64689.
- Due to the extensive damage to the interior, the cost of the rehabilitation of the building would far outweigh the financial return on the property given the housing market in the surrounding area.

**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 Cultural Resources Office denial to demolish 2016 Adelaide Avenue. The motion was made by Commissioner Killeen and seconded by Alderman Coatar. The motion passed unanimously with all six votes in favor of the motion.

**By Order of the Preservation Board**

**Cultural Resources Office**

**D. 5200 CATES AVENUE**

Owner: Marie Peterson

Applicant: A-1 Wrecking & Salvage

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, to consider an Appeal of the Cultural Resources Office Director's denial of the demolition of 5200 Cates Avenue, a two-story commercial/residential building located in the Mount Cabanne-Raymond Place National Register District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, Melanie Fathman, David Weber, and Alderman Jack Coatar were present for the testimony for this agenda item. Board member David Richardson recused himself from discussion and voting on this item.

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office submitted into the record a certified copy of Ordinance 64689 amended by Ordinance 64925 and Ordinance 64832; the Board's Agenda; the PowerPoint and her presentation. She explained the history of the project, and explained that the property owner had requested to defer the appeal a number of times. She also entered into the record an email received from Richard Bose in opposition to the demolition of 5200 Cates; and another email in opposition from Guy Slay, President of Mangrove, that was accompanied by a structural engineer's report on the building, completed by Marc Bacchetti PE, SE of DreamRunners Ltd. Ms Cameron stated that copies of these emails had been provided to the Board Members.

Ms Cameron said that 5200 Cates is a “Merit” building because it is a contributing resource to the Mount Cabanne-Raymond Place National Register District and that historic tax credits would be available to assist in its rehabilitation.

Ms Cameron then showed current photos of the building and its context, and noted its unusual form and decorative elements. She showed the collapse of a portion of the rear wall, a result of water penetration due to lack of maintenance, but said that it did not appear to have imperiled the remainder of the building, which had already been standing for much longer after the collapse than the required six months for a building to be considered “Sound” under the Ordinance.

She testified also that the immediate context of the building was not excellent, but that the building held the corner of the block and its loss would have very negative impact on street and neighborhood; and that intact residential areas are located east and south and that directly west of the property is Soldan High School and the Visitation Park historic district.

Ms Cameron recommended that the Director’s denial of the demolition be upheld.

In response to a question from the Chair, Ms Cameron stated that the building was directly adjacent to the Gateway Metropolitan Parks District Greenway development.

Ms Cameron stated that she had not received a letter from Latasha Barnes, but had received a copy of a letter from Ms Barnes to the property owner, Ms Peterson.

In response to a question from Board Member Weber, asking that should the Board uphold the denial and not allow the demolition, what would be the owner’s recourse, Ms Cameron replied that she understood there had been an offer made to purchase the property; but in any case, the owner would have the right to appeal the Board’s decision to the Planning Commission.

Marie Peterson, owner of 5200 Cates, testified on her own behalf. She stated that the building had been in her family since 1963 or earlier; that it had been in very good shape until it fell vacant when resulting vandalism caused the damage to the property. She said she had been fined by the

City and tried to make repairs, including boarding up the building. She said the first floor has fallen into the basement.

Ms Peterson also testified that when she went to the Building Division to ask for demolition, the City said yes, but the Cultural Resources Office Director said no, as the neighborhood association wanted the building. She said she had asked the Association to help her prior to the wall collapse, but then saw they wanted the building for a community center. A contractor she asked to look at it said it would be a minimum of \$500,000 to rehabilitate the building and with the collapse, that would now be about \$800,000. She said she couldn't get into the building to take photos and there were no steps to the second floor and she was afraid the building would collapse.

Ms Peterson agreed the neighborhood association had made an offer of \$15,000 to buy the building but she felt that was an insult, despite its condition, since she had owned the building for so long. She didn't feel that tax credits would be enough to fix the property and she could tear it down and rebuild cheaper.

LaKeesha Brown, niece of the property owner, testified in support of the demolition. She said her concern was the city inspector said the building was an imminent danger to the community; that her aunt had corrected many things on the building. She also stated that the neighborhood residents remembered her aunt, not the building. No one has helped her aunt all these years. She concluded by saying It was not financially feasible to spend \$500,000 in this neighborhood, and that they had plans to construct a new building for a culinary school. .

Ms Peterson testified further, saying the neighborhood has been going down for 20-25 years; that she had closed her store not for lack of business but for personal reasons and there had been no one else to take over. She said the building was dangerous and someone could get hurt; and she doesn't have the money for the City to keep fining her if this denial is not reversed.

In response to a question from Board Member Richardson, Ms Peterson said that she had received an offer of \$60,000 for the building prior to the collapse. Mr. Richardson asked if she had listed it for sale; Ms Peterson said she had before

the pandemic, posting signs around the building, but had not since.

Mr. Richardson asked what were the costs to demolish the building and Ms Peterson replied \$17,000.

Lakesha Brown testified further saying they had created a GoFundMe site to “Save the Junction” and sold t-shirts but noted that none of the people opposing the demolition had contributed. She reiterated that her aunt had received no help to apply for grants or tax credits and stated that it was important to the family to retain the land after demolition as part of its generational wealth.

Anna Soto testified against the demolition. She stated she is an attorney at Legal Services of Eastern Missouri Neighborhood Vacancy Initiative which was assisting the Sherman Park Academy Neighborhood Association. She said 5200 Cates was critical to their plans to revitalize the neighborhood and noted four or five blocks of redevelopment already in progress in the vicinity of the property.

Micah Hainline, a neighborhood resident, testified against the demolition. He stated he lived just north of 5200 Cates and walked by it frequently. He said he felt the current discussion was a dichotomy between private and public stewardship. He said the neighborhood deserves the chance if they can rehab this beautiful building. He said he understood the owner’s viewpoint, but if there was not the ability to fix the building, and the ability was available elsewhere, it would be a shame to lose it. He said that in its current condition it was difficult to imagine what the building and neighborhood could be; but that Mangrove had six houses near where he lives that were in very bad condition, but made them beautiful; so, if they said the same could be done here, he believed it could be done.

Latasha Barnes testified against the demolition. She stated she is an attorney with the Neighborhood Vacancy Initiative and represented Sherman Park-Academy. She requested that the Director’s denial be upheld and provided a copy of a formal letter of opposition that she had sent to Ms Peterson. She said this was not about the sale of property, it was about a building that had been long vacant and preserving it was crucial to maintaining the Academy neighborhood’s environment.

Rhonda Jones, of the Sherman Park-Academy Neighborhood Association, testified that she was very passionate about the building and had been trying to save it for a long time. She noted the Gateway Greenway is directly across from it and said it would be wonderful to have a historic building restored there. She testified that the Association did talk to Ms Peterson to try to work out a way for her to receive compensation in the form of cash and/or tax credits, and by relieving her of the costs of demolition. She stated while Ms Peterson was at first receptive, she afterwards became upset after speaking with her family and decided she would not work with the Association any longer. Since then, she said Ms Peterson has not responded to their attempts to contact her. Ms Jones said the initial suggestion of \$15,000 was intended as beginning negotiation and the offer would perhaps have increased, but Ms Peterson requested \$500,000 which was out of the question given the condition of the building. Ms Jones said the Association respects Ms Peterson's rights and wants to work with her; that the current leadership has only been active for the last 2 or 3 years; but since then they have tried and had no response. She said the Association believes that a restored Junction building with the Greenway will be their city center; and that many people are making substantial investments and the neighborhood will be able to support a restaurant there. They would like to keep Ms Peterson and her family involved. Ms Jones testified that the Association has created a Special Use District for their neighborhood and plans to fill the vacant lots with perhaps an outdoor stage, dog parks, etc. to complement their neighborhood garden. Finally, Ms Jones said that the Association is aware of the \$500,000 cost for the rehab and have the people and resources to accomplish it.

Ms Peterson asked to be recognized and the Chair agreed. She testified that it was true she had not called Ms Jones back, but said she did not understand what she was getting from this, if they would take her name off the building. If the Association were to help her, they wanted the building in the Association's name. She reiterated that the building is a hazard to the community and said that if the Association got the building, there was no guarantee they would not also demolish it to expand the Greenway. Ms Peterson said

they do have a plan for the property, although she did not know if her niece had submitted it; they would like a culinary school. She said the building was not on the National Register, because they would deny it because of its condition. She said, they say they love the building, but it's a danger.

Latasha Barnes requested to be recognized in order to clarify a misunderstanding and the Chair agreed. She stated that 5200 Cates was listed in the National Register as part of the Mount Cabanne-Raymond Place on 12/13/2002 and historic tax credit would be available.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

The Cultural Resources Office's consideration of the Central West End Historic District standards for New Construction or Additions to Existing Residential or Institutional Buildings led to these preliminary findings:

- 5200 Cates is a contributing resource to the Mount Cabanne-Raymond Place National Register Historic District and therefore is considered to be a "Merit" building under Ordinance 64689 as amended by Ordinance 64832.
- The building has not been maintained by the current owner for a number of years, leading to the failure of a portion of the rear façade;
- Despite the collapse, the structure appears able to carry the loads of the walls and roof for at least six months, and therefore is determined to be "Sound" under the definition of the Ordinance.
- There has been interest expressed in purchasing the building for rehabilitation and reuse and Historic Tax Credits would be available to assist this effort.
- The owner is claiming economic hardship but has submitted no evidence to that effect.
- Unusual circumstances justifying demolition have not been shown.
- Criteria A, D, F and G of Ordinance 64832 do not demonstrate that demolition is indicated.

**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 of the application for demolition as it did not fulfill the requirements of the Criteria for demolition approval as set forth in Ordinance 64689. The motion was made by Board Member Fathman and seconded by Alderman Coatar. The motion passed with Chairman Callow, Board Members Fathman, Killeen, Robinson and Alderman Coatar voting in favor; and Board Member Weber abstaining.

**By Order of the Preservation Board**

**Cultural Resources Office**

**E. 1824 ALLEN AVENUE**

Owner/Applicant: Charles Metzner

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, 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 retain front door alteration without a permit in the McKinley Heights Local Historic District.

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

Bethany Moore of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in and entered into the record Ord. 64689, as amended by Ordinance 64925, the enabling ordinance, Ord. 67901, the McKinley Heights Local Historic District Ordinance, the agenda, the PowerPoint, and her presentation. She then gave a brief presentation outlining the project.

Ms. Moore explained that the Cultural Resources Office became aware of the alterations through a complaint of a violation. She relayed that the owner was notified via letter that the alterations were a violation of the standards and a permit was required for the work. The owner submitted paperwork showing a permit was applied for and approved by the Building Division without being sent to the Cultural Resources Office for review. The permit was rescinded as issued in error as it had not been forwarded to CRO for

approval. Ms. Moore explained the relevant section of the Standards for Doors and Abandoned Doors and clarified that similar alterations on two adjacent buildings were also done without a permit in violation of the Standards. She then gave the Cultural Resources Office's recommendation that the appeal be denied, as the front door alteration did not comply with the Standards.

Charles Metzner, owner, spoke on his own behalf. He explained that he based the door alterations at 1824 Allen on the existing entries of two adjacent buildings. He stated that he applied for a permit, it was approved and then rescinded as issued in error. He asked for the Board to allow his alterations to be retained and permitted due to the fact that he was issued a permit for the work, had already spent the money on the project and could not replicate the original door.

In response to a question from Board Member Richardson as to when he had applied for the permit, Mr. Metzner said that he applied for the permit around March 31 or April 1<sup>st</sup> and was called to pick up the permit on April 14<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Richardson then asked how he knew to apply for a permit and Mr. Metzner said that the inspector for the area told him to apply for a permit.

Mr. Richardson then asked Mr. Metzner if the work was completed before he applied for the permit in late March, and Mr. Metzner responded that he had done the work after picking up his permit in April.

In response to a question from Board Member Weber, Mr. Metzner that he did the work after April 14, and explained that he had it boarded the entry with plywood prior to April 14<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Weber then asked Ms. Moore what could be done about the other non-compliant front door alterations cited by the appellant as examples, and she explained that the Cultural Resources had no information about the work on the other two houses and that her first communication about the violation at 1824 Allen Avenue was on April 5<sup>th</sup> with pictures of the completed work.

Rocco Dana spoke in opposition to the alterations and stated that he supported Cultural Resources Office's recommendation.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

The Preservation Board finds that:

- The site of the front door alteration, 1824 Allen Avenue, is located in the McKinley Heights Local Historic District.
- The alterations at 1824 Allen do not comply with the McKinley Heights Local Historic District Standards for Doors and Abandoned Doors.
- The work was completed without an approved permit signed off by the Cultural Resources Office as required in Title 24 of the Revised Code.

**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 Denial of the permit to retain the front door alteration. The motion was made by Commissioner Killeen and seconded by Commissioner Richardson. The motion passed with five votes in favor of the motion, Commissioner Weber voting against the motion, and the Chairman abstaining.

**By Order of the Preservation Board**

**Cultural Resources Office**

**F. 1027 & 1029 LAMI STREET**

Owner: 3301 Pestalozzi LLC/Orlando Askins

Architect: Gateway Architecture/Jason Plough

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, 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 of the appellant's permit to construct a two-family building at 1027-29 Lami Street, in the Soulard Neighborhood Historic District.

Board members Richard Callow (Chair), Mike Killeen, Anthony Robinson, Melanie Fathman, David Weber, 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, the enabling ordinance, as amended by Ordinance 64925; Ordinance 62382, the Soulard Neighborhood Standards, the agenda,

the PowerPoint, her presentation, and a letter of opposition from the Soulard Restoration Group (SRG). She then gave a brief presentation outlining the project.

Ms. Gagen explained that the owner had applied for a permit to construct a two-family building at the corner of Lami & Menard Streets, in December 2020. The application was denied as the proposed new construction did not comply with the Soulard Historic District standards. The owner appealed the decision, but deferred going before the Preservation Board as he and his architect were working with the Cultural Resources Office to bring the proposed new construction closer in line with the historic district standards. Ms. Gagen stated that while the current proposal was a great improvement over the original submittal, there were still elements of the design, such as the mass, scale, garage placement, and ratio of solid-to-void on the Menard elevation that only partially complied with the historic district standards. She also stated that owner had provided door, window & material details since the agenda had been published.

Ms. Gagen read into the record the letter of opposition from the Soulard Restoration Group. They objected to the use of 1852 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, as the front-entry garage door was installed after the 1929 cut-off date given in the standards; the amount of deviations from the Model Example, including the height, garage doors, and number of bays; the size of the building footprint, and the lack of brick on the north side of the building.

Orlando Askins of 3301 Pestalozzi, LLC, owner, spoke on his own behalf. He stated he had first contacted the SRG and that they were initially responsive, but at some point had stopped communicating. He thanked Alderman Coatar for getting him in front of Dan Krasnoff, then Director of the Cultural Resources Office. Mr. Holst explained that he had worked with Dan, and Andrea Gagen, and that Dan had suggested and approved the use of 1852 S. 10<sup>th</sup> St. as a Model Example. Mr. Askins also stated that they had proposed to use the new construction at 1851-53 Menard as a Model Example, but that the Cultural Resources Office said that it would not work.

Mr. Askins addressed the three-story height of the building, stating that the extra floor was necessary to provide the require parking on the site. He also noted that their proposed building was similar in height to the neighboring building on Lami. He stated that the Zoning Code required two units on the property. He stated that he was not sure why the SRG would oppose the curb cuts needed for the parking.

Mr. Askins said he was frustrated with the SRG, whom he had emails from as far back as 2016. He stated that Dan [Krasnoff] said that they should be fine with the Model Example they were using, and that his architect had been working the last 6-8 weeks with Andrea Gagen to get the details as close as possible. He stated he believed that they should be in a position to move forward.

In response to a question by Board Member Killeen about whether he had considered constructing a single-family building on that lot, he responded that they were staying within the Zoning guidelines and there were finances to consider.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

The Preservation Board finds that:

- 1027-29 Lami Street is located in the Soulard Neighborhood Local Historic District.
- The applicant has provided a Model Example, located at 1852 S. 10th Street, for the proposed new construction.
- The proposed building varies from the Model Example in height; number of bays; garage doors; size of building footprint, and lack of brick on north elevation.
- It only partially complies with the Soulard Historic District standards in mass, scale, material at Semi-Public Façade, and garage placement. The Menard elevation windows do not comply in fenestration and ratio of solid-to-void.

**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 Denial to construct a two-family building as the project's design does not meet the Soulard Historic District guidelines. The motion was made by Board Member Killeen and seconded by Board Member Richardson. The motion passed with five votes in favor of the motion with Board Member Robinson, and Chairman Callow abstaining.

**By Order of the Preservation Board  
Cultural Resources Office**

**G. 2825 LEMP AVENUE**

Owner/Applicant: Timothy Sullivan

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, as amended by Ordinance 64925, to consider an appeal of the Cultural Resources Office denial of the appellant's permit seeking to permit and to retain exterior alterations made without a permit, at 2825 Lemp Avenue, located in the Benton Park Local Historic District.

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

Bethany Moore of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in and entered into the record Ordinance 64689, amended by Ordinance 64925, the enabling ordinance; Ordinance 67175, the Benton Park Standards; the agenda; the PowerPoint; and her presentation. She then gave a brief presentation outlining the project.

Ms. Moore explained that the work at 2825 Lemp Avenue included replacing a section of a historic stone retaining wall with CMU; the replacement of wood entry stairs; and the addition of new concrete stairs, all completed without a permit. 2825 Lemp is the end unit of three rowhouses. The other properties have similar entries based upon historic examples.

The Cultural Resources Office received a complaint for work being done at 2825 Lemp. Upon inspection by CRO staff, it was determined that there was no permit for the work, which was in violation of the Standards. A Stop Work Order was placed and a violation letter was sent to the owner. Staff advised the owner that the project did not comply with the Historic District Standards; the owner wished to appeal this determination and applied for a permit for the work already completed. The Cultural Resources Office denied the permit.; and the owner has appealed the denial to the Preservation Board.

Ms. Moore noted that since there were three entries on the single façade of the three attached townhouses the appendages of all three should match. She noted that the introduction of the concrete stairs shortened the available rise and run for the replacement wood stoop. She also pointed out that CMU is not an allowed material for retaining walls.

Tim Sullivan, owner, spoke on his own behalf. He explained that his neighbor's tree had caused the portion of the retaining wall abutting his property to lean onto the stoop and damaging it. He noted that the walkway leading to his entrance was sloped significantly more than the other two entrances and this slope caused unsafe conditions, which he hoped to alleviate with the introduction of the concrete steps. He also showed the Board images of other retaining walls in the district. He stated that he was worried about the costs of changing the project and the safety of his walkway.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

The Preservation Board finds that:

- The retaining wall does not meet the Benton Park Standards.
- The wooden stairs should match the existing wooden stairs at the other two entrances.
- The existing concrete stairs do not detract from compliance of the overall entry configuration.

**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 Cultural Resources Office denial of the retaining wall but to overturn the denial of the concrete and wood steps. The motion was made by Commissioner Killeen and seconded by Commissioner Fathman. The motion passed with six votes in favor of the motion., and Chairman Callow abstaining.

**By Order of the Preservation Board**

**Cultural Resources Office**

**H. 2001 PARK AVENUE**

Owner/Applicant: 2001 Lafayette Park Avenue, LLC/Jarrad Holst

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, 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 enlarge roof deck not built according to the approved permit, in Lafayette Square Local Historic District.

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

Bethany Moore of the Cultural Resources Office was sworn in and entered into the record Ordinance 64689, as amended by Ordinance 64925, the enabling ordinance; Ordinance 69112, the Lafayette Square Standards; the agenda; the PowerPoint; her presentation; and a letter of opposition from the Lafayette Square Development Committee. She then gave a brief presentation outlining the project.

Ms. Moore explained that the Cultural Resources Office received a complaint that the rear, second-story roof deck was being built and upon inspection it was determined that the work was not according to approved permit. On March 11, 2021, the Cultural Resources Office staff inspected the property and found that the deck was larger than had been approved and the handrail design was incorrect. A Stop Work Order was placed on the building. After communication between the owner and Cultural Resources

Office staff, the new handrail was removed and replaced with an appropriate black metal handrail in the location that had been previously approved. However, the deck, which had been constructed to extend to the edge of the roof, was not altered to comply. Instead, the owner applied to keep the deck at the current size; the application was denied and appealed.

Ms. Moore presented to the Board a copy of the previously approved plans that showed the location of the deck and handrail as three feet back from the south edge of the roof. She also presented a copy of the plans that were denied and showed a larger deck with a pulled back handrail. Ms. Moore pointed out that the dimensions on the plans differed.

Jarrad Holst, owner, spoke on his own behalf. He stated that the deck was built according to the approved permit. He examined sections of the Standards. He stated that the deck was not on the uppermost story of the building and was therefore permissible. He also stated that there was nothing in the code that prohibited the second story deck from being visible from the street. Mr. Holst admitted that the deck as built was larger than had been drawn on the approved plans, but said the 12-foot dimension had been marked on the plans, although the plan itself showed the deck projecting no further than the window.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The Preservation Board finds that:

- The location of the deck is not on the uppermost story of the building.
- The location of the second story deck is visible from the street.
- Pulling the location of the deck back three feet from the edge of the roof would limit its street visibility.

**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 Cultural Resources Office's denial to retain the larger roof deck. The motion was made by Commissioner Robinson and seconded by Commissioner Richardson. The motion passed with five votes in favor of the motion and Commissioner Webber voting against the motion.

**By Order of the Preservation Board  
Cultural Resources Office**

**B. 5612 WATERMAN BOULEVARD**

Owner: Real Estate Investor Wholesale LLC/Greg Daney

Applicant: Margaret Riter

Architect: Zwick & Gandt Architecture, Inc.

**PROCEEDINGS:**

On June 28, 2021, the Preservation Board of the City of St. Louis met, pursuant to Ordinance #64689 of the City Code, as amended by Ordinance 64925, to consider a Preliminary Review application to construct a five-story apartment building on a vacant corner parcel at 5612 Waterman Boulevard, located in the Central West End Historic District.

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

Jan Cameron of the Cultural Resources Office gave a presentation outlining the project and submitted photos of the site and surrounding context. She noted that while there were elements that did not comply with the Central West End Standards, the applicants had substantially revised the original submission and the design now followed a model example, a 6-story apartment building at 317 Belt, constructed in 1924. Ms Cameron noted, however, that because the building adjacent on the east was only 2 stories, the east elevation will be visible and care should be taken to address its design and amount of brick return. Also, she noted that while the garage entry from Waterman was necessary, as the site had not alley access, its design should be carefully considered. With these conditions, Ms

Cameron recommended that the Preservation Board grant preliminary approval, subject to review of final plans, details and exterior materials by the Cultural Resources Office.

Ms Cameron testified that the Board members had been provided with a number of exhibits that had been submitted: (1) a letter from the Central West End Association Planning & Development Committee requesting brick on all four elevations due to the visibility of the building; and reconsideration of the design of the service entrance on the west elevation; (2) petitions against the proposal from residents of the Waterford Square Condo Association; the Randolph Condo Association; the Waterman Condo Association; the Waterman-Pershing Condo Association and the Warwick Condo Association, totaling 300+ signatures; and (3) 185 signatures against the proposal from Change.org.

Ms Cameron then read an email received from Alderwoman Heather Navarro that stated while she appreciated the level of engagement the developers had made, given the prominent site on a corner, the design should include more brick, as would be consistent with other projects in the 28<sup>th</sup> Ward; and that more attention should be paid to the garage entrance.

Margaret Riter, the applicant and developer's representative, spoke on behalf of the project. She said there was not another good option for the location of the service areas the site was relatively. She stated that other projects have been considered for the site and nothing succeeded and that it had therefore been vacant for a while. She then asked the project architect, Brian Zwick, to speak to design concerns.

Brian Zwick, project architect, testified on behalf of the project. He said they had made a considerable number of revisions to the original design and that he had modeled decorative elements on a three-story apartment building across Waterman. Regarding the service area, he said he copied blind windows on this building, and that they intended to use a quality door that would be decorative. Mr. Zwick stated that he agreed design work was still required for the Waterman garage entry, perhaps a decorative gate to screen opening. He stated that the design fits the neighborhood, the context and has a

connection with the neighborhood. He also noted that the parking is completely below grade.

Ms Riter testified again, stating that they had already added additional brick, and to do the entire building brick would be cost-prohibitive, especially as construction costs have greatly increased in the last year. (Shares screen showing rendering of building in context and the transition from brick to siding.) She displayed a rendering showing the brick return on east elevation, with the remainder of the facade composite that would match the color of the brick. She also spoke regarding the service area, saying that there was no other option for its placement. She testified that the site would be landscaped to match the neighborhood and that will hide to some extent view of the trash door.

Mr. Zwick testified again that service entrance door could be reconsidered but detailed the reasons for its location. He added that building's rear elevation would be fairly visible going north on Clara but the rears of other buildings are as well.

Doug Rasmussen spoke in support of the project.

Beverly Burner, resident of the block, spoke in opposition to the project and stated that she was not against development but this project did not fit in the neighborhood.

Neil Costello, resident of the block, spoke in opposition to the project and said that although the Cultural Resources Office had stated that the project complied in height, scale and mass, the height was not within 15% of existing buildings on the block. All except the Randolph are only three stories. He also testified that he thought that the Randolph is not an acceptable model example, as it was built in 1923 long before most of the current codes went into effect; therefore, to compare the two is a false equivalency.

Steve Pulowski, President of the Warwick Condo Association, resident of the block, spoke in opposition to the project and stated that he wished to make the Board aware of the five condo associations whose members are direct stakeholders of the proposed apartment building, and that he had submitted petitions and emails, which represented 29 buildings, 185 condo units and over 300

owners. While many addressed setback, parking and density, elements that he knew the Board did not have purview over, the petitions also concerned the fact that the building did not blend in with the neighborhood. While the developers referenced one model at opposite corner, there are 29 buildings only 2 or three stories tall. He said 290 people would be directly impacted by this development, and they wanted to maintain their quiet street between Belt & Clara.

Cindy Lefton, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition to the project and stated that she had lived in the Waterman-Perishing Condominiums here 40 years. She remembered when Leon Straus resurrected the neighborhood and thought he would not be in favor of this project. If site too small, she asked why the developer did not change to different design that would blend in with the neighborhood? And she understood that brick is expensive but the neighbors had invested in their buildings and the developer should be willing to do so, so that the building would blend in with the neighborhood. She stated she was not against development but the building was too big and doesn't fit.

Dick Simms, spoke in opposition to the project, stating that he and his wife had lived in the neighborhood for 27 years. Although he had many issues with the project, he was concerned with two key elements: the scale of the building considering the lot size and the proposed setbacks. He said that Waterman is a boulevard with landscaped setbacks, and the project seeks variances that do not conform with the setbacks of adjacent buildings and that would alter the character of the street as a boulevard. He testified that the front façade seemed more like a commercial office building, with little green space. Mr. Simms said he took issue with the colored rendering displayed by the applicant, as it seemed to show the proposed building with the same setback as the adjacent building. And he stated that the project required setback variances on Clara as well. As to the model, Mr. Simms said, the Randolph is on a much larger lot and has a very large setback. He said he was very concerned, and that when the developer bought the property, he also bought the code and the rules should apply. He said he was not opposed to development but this is not the right one.

Tonie Desano, resident at 5512 Waterman, spoke in opposition to the project and stated that the scale was not compatible with the existing architecture on the street. Unlike Randolph and the building opposite to which it had been compared, Ms Desano felt that the building was a utilitarian box, missing ornamental details, charm & setback; and that it was too tall and too utilitarian. She also said it lacked greenspace and was not compatible with the sweeping terraces and landscapes of other buildings.

Tracy and Bruce Renason, 437 Clara, spoke in opposition to the project and stated that the proposed building was too tall, with not enough brick; and that it looked like a motel.

Steve Callaway, 5555 Pershing Avenue, spoke in opposition to the project. He that he was a St. Louis native; and that while he lived on Pershing several blocks west of this site, he had experienced the issues that a large apartment building can cause. He said he lived directly east of the large Chelsea apartment building at DeBaliviere and Pershing and that his concern was not just about the people on Waterman, but the whole neighborhood and the effect this building would have. He further stated that while the Chelsea was attractive, it was 152 apartments, 5 stories, and doesn't fit with the neighborhood buildings; and in this situation, the idea is the same, having buildings that fit or don't fit. He said that his building was significantly affected by the large building going up. Mr. Callaway concluded that the Board had the opportunity to approve something more fitting to the neighborhood.

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

The Cultural Resources Office's consideration of the Central West End Historic District standards for New Construction or Additions to Existing Residential or Institutional Buildings led to these preliminary findings:

- 5612 Waterman Boulevard is located in the Central West End Local Historic District.
- The applicant has worked with the Cultural Resources staff to revise many issues with the original submission. The revised design is now compliant with the requirements of the Central West End Standards for New Construction in siting, massing, scale and exterior materials.

- The design only partly complies with the requirements for exterior materials, fenestration, and curb cuts and driveways. The Cultural Resources Office recommends that the designs of both east and west elevations be reconsidered.
- Similarly, the design only partly complies with the requirements for curb cuts and driveways. Given the unusual shape of the parcel, without access to an alley, the staff recommends an exception to the Standards, with the condition that the applicant work with staff to reduce the visual impact of the exposed garage entry on Waterman.
- Opposition to the project was expressed by a number of neighborhood residents because of to the building's scale and massing and design.

**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 of the project, as it did not comply with the Central West End Historic District Standards. The motion was made by Board Member Richardson and seconded by Board Member Weber. The motion passed unanimously.

**By Order of the Preservation Board  
Cultural Resources Office**

**There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Callow.**