



## KIRKWOOD LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES

**Wednesday, November 9, 2016**

**Kirkwood City Hall, City Council Chambers**

**Present:** Commissioners Judith Brauer, Andrew Raimist, Robert Rubright, Walter Smith and Staff Liaison Amy Lowry

**Guests:** Angela Gracey, Jamie Kneen, Susan Burkett, Drew Bradshaw, James Vatterott, Joe and Kate Day, Ann and John Harrison, Joe Meyer, Beth and Tom Anagnos, Larry Sherwin.

The meeting was called to order at 6:40 p.m.

1. **Approval of Minutes** – Motion to approve the October 12, 2016 meeting minutes as submitted by Comr. Brauer, seconded by Comr. Raimist and unanimously approved.
  
2. **Public Hearing**
  - a. **Case #16-12, 1111 Craig Road** (Craig Woods Historic District) – Demolition of home and new construction. Ms. Lowry presented a PowerPoint findings of fact slideshow including existing conditions, required notices of the public hearing, dates of the 60-day stay (until November 18, 2016) and potential 270-day extension (June 17, 2016), history of the home, and site plan and elevations for proposed new home. Property owner Tom Anagnos discussed the structural report which referenced problems with the existing home and site including expansive clay soils causing heaving of the structure, main beam moved away from beam pocket, concrete slab poured without a frost wall on the carport, structural issues, deferred maintenance issues, low floor height, and potential costly repairs. Comr. Rubright referred to significant cracking of walls and floors. Mr. Anagnos reported that he has not looked at mold or asbestos issues. Comr. Raimist agreed that the house is probably not livable and will be costly to repair. Mr. Anagnos met with the Trustees and Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of Craig Woods and got a general positive feeling regarding the demolition and new construction. Joe Meyer of the ARC reported that the Trustees had no objection on the demolition. Comr. Brauer made a motion to approve the demolition at the lapse of the 60-day automatic stay. Comr. Rubright seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Anagnos presented the site plan, elevations and floor plans for the proposed new home. The house will be built roughly in the same footprint, a little forward of the existing structure, with same driveway development. House will be entered at the upper level of 1800 square feet with 1200 finished square feet on lower level and a breezeway to the garage. Mr. Anagnos reported that the house will have a large stone fireplace, fiber cement or cedar siding, masonry piers, modified scissor tress roofline with overhang, and large windows in between the piers. Final details are still to come

on the windows and a 5-6' cantilevered deck. Ms. Lowry said that the Landmarks Commission would need to approve the final plan. The Anagnoses reported minimal tree removal would be required. Craig Woods resident Kate Day questioned how to avoid repeating the same problems with the 1207 Craigvale Court home which was still unfinished, unoccupied and tied up in court with Aberdeen Heights. Mr. Anagnos reported that he had no known issues with Aberdeen Heights other than a retaining wall that they were aware of needed fixing. Joe Day asked about the use of the arrow truss. Mr. Anagnos said it was traditional in mid-century modern design. Comr. Raimist said that type of roof is appropriate in general to mid-century modern and if other homes in Craig Woods have the same type of roof, it would probably be acceptable. Mr. Anagnos said that it would probably not be an issue to make the roof a straight line. Comr. Raimist also commented on the use of masonry piers, concern regarding the veneer stone looking too thin, and the use of a shallower roof with large timber beams under the eaves. He suggested that Mr. Anagnos look at examples of other homes in the neighborhood to rework the gable ends. Joe Meyer of the neighborhood ARC and 711 Craig Woods Drive had six concerns with the home design: (1) the use of horizontal siding rather than vertical redwood; (2) the use of the arrow roof versus the straight roofs in the neighborhood with 36" eaves; (3) the percentage of stone as the existing homes just have stone fireplaces – only one house has an exterior wainscot of stone; (4) the wire cable on the balcony as too modern- look to examples of other homes with balconies; (5) the windows as broken up – should be one large 6'x4' pane; and (6) the post-and-beam structure should have exposed beams at the window sills and ridge. Mr. Anagnos countered that without the stone the home was featureless and dull. Comr. Raimist said that there was some room for modern interpretation. He suggested making the brick piers the same dimensions as the chimney and using wood for the top rail of the balcony with the rest as painted steel. He did not see a problem with breaking up the large panes with some operative windows or using painted fiber cement in lieu of the more expensive redwood. Mr. Anagnos said the design would include gutters and downspouts. The approval of the home design will be on a future agenda of the Landmarks Commission.

### 3. Certificates of Appropriateness

- a. **Case #16-06, 631 East Jefferson Avenue** (Jefferson-Argonne Historic District) – Ms. Lowry had no new information on the efforts to save the home from demolition. The Commission will revisit the decision in December.
- b. **Case #16-14, 400 East Argonne Drive** (Jefferson-Argonne Historic District) – Drew Bradshaw of The Pool Specialists presented plans and materials for the new in-ground pool. The Commission discussed the retaining wall matching the existing flatwork, meeting pool fence safety requirements, meeting the zoning code in the tight area, the location of pool equipment and landscaping. Comr. Rubright made a motion to approve the pool plans as submitted for the Klebe residence. Comr. Raimist seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### 4. New Business

- a. **Citizens Comments/Seeking advice** to preserve their historic properties – none.

- b. **Sugar Creek Ranch** – Ms. Lowry reported on a neighborhood meeting she attended in October regarding a potential historic district.

5. **Old Business**

- a. **Revisions to Landmarks Ordinance** – The Commission discussed strengthening the ordinance on a district by district basis, with different levels of review decided by each individual district, and approaching City Council through the Council Liaison to gauge prospects for change.
- b. **Design Guidelines** –no discussion
- c. **Mermod Place Subdivision** – The Commission discussed setting up a site visit for the potential historic district.

6. **Adjourn**– Motion to adjourn at 8:00 p.m. made by Comr. Rubright, seconded by Comr. Brauer and unanimously approved