

**CITY OF WILDWOOD  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

---

MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
CITY HALL, 16860 MAIN STREET, WILDWOOD, MISSOURI  
January 13, 2022

---

---

The Architectural Review Board meeting began at 6:30 p.m., on Thursday, January 13, 2022, at Wildwood City Hall, 16860 Main Street, Wildwood, Missouri, and via the videoconferencing tool Zoom.

**I. Welcome and Roll Call by Secretary Ritter**

Acting Chair Ritter called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. The following members were in attendance, as noted:

Present [7]

Acting Chair Ritter  
Board Member McCown Foster  
Board Member Sineni  
Alternate Marion  
Alternate Bartelsmeyer  
Council Liaison Clark  
Commission Liaison Kohn

Absent [3]

Board Member Haefner  
Board Member Loggia  
Alternate Welker

Staff present: City Administrator, Steve Cross, City Attorney, John Young, Assistant Director of Planning and Parks, Melanie Rippetoe, and Planner Keefe

Petitioners present: **Westridge Office Center II:** Reinhold Zeidler and Rick Gangloff, Lawrence Fabric, and Jeff Daniels, Owner of the building at 17014 New College Avenue

**Babler Elementary School:** Kara Neubauer, Excel Signs & Design, and Andrea Lockwood, Babler Elementary School

- II. An **EXECUTIVE (CLOSED) SESSION** is being called **PURSUANT** to **RSMO 610.021 (1) 1994**/Legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys. **All parties are herein advised of such and notice hereby given.**

Acting Chair Ritter made a motion to go into Executive Session. Council Liaison Clark seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Ayes – Acting Chair Ritter, Board Members McCown Foster and Sineni, Alternates Bartelsmeyer and Marion, Council Liaison Clark and Commission Liaison Kohn.

Nays – None.

Alternate Bartelsmeyer made a motion to leave Executive Session. Commission Liaison Kohn seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Ayes – Acting Chair Ritter, Board Members McCown Foster and Sineni, Alternates Bartelsmeyer and Marion, Council Liaison Clark and Commission Liaison Kohn.

Nays – None.

- III. Action on the December 9, 2021 Draft Meeting Minutes

Planner Keefe noted two adjustments to the December 9, 2021 Minutes:

- Add Member Loggia as present but non-voting due to technical difficulties
- Add Jennifer Anders as a representative from Lawrence Fabric speaking on behalf of the awnings proposed for the building located at 17014 New College Avenue

Alternate Bartelsmeyer motioned to approve the December 9, 2021 Meeting Minutes as adjusted. Board Member Sineni seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- IV. Review Agenda Items to be Discussed at Tonight's Meeting by Secretary Ritter

Acting Chair Ritter reviewed the agenda items.

- V. Public Comment - *Special Procedures Will Be In Place To Address This Virtual Meeting and Participation in Such*

None.

- VI. Old Business – Two (2) Items

- 1) Ready for Action – **Two (2) Items**

- a) *Second review* of the Architectural Drawings and related materials for eight (8) proposed awnings over exterior doors to a building located within the City's Town Center, upon the property located at 17014 New College Avenue (St. Louis County Locator Number 24V420313 – Westridge Office Center II, Lot 3), on land that is 1.14 acres total in size, which is zoned C-8 Planned Commercial District, and occupied by office uses. (Ward Eight)

Acting Chair Ritter introduced the item and asked if it was correct that the awning material had been available for review at City Hall. Planner Keefe confirmed.

Planner Keefe gave a brief presentation on the item, noting the following:

- At the last meeting, Board Members noted they would prefer to see smaller lettering on the awnings and have the awning material and specifications sheet available for review.
- Staff contacted the Fire Marshal, who noted that four (4) inch lettering on the awnings was allowable (minimum size allowed), though six (6) inch lettering on the main building address, as well as where the address was featured over main entrances, was preferable. Also, in response to Staff concern over the lack of visibility of the main building address from the street, the Fire Marshal noted that all addressed must be visible from the street.
- The applicant had provided new proofs with two (2) options for the address featured on the awnings, pictures of the building address signage, and had left awning material and specifications sheets at City Hall for review by ARB Members.

Council Liaison Clark brought up a number of points, including the following:

- *Ordinance #1101, Section 2.H.* states that "all buildings shall adhere to the City of Wildwood's Town Center Architectural Guidelines...All buildings shall maintain a consistent theme throughout the boundaries of this C-8 planned commercial district in terms of material, color and style."
  - This would be the only building in that section of buildings with awnings and could alter the consistent theme.
  - Are the tenants of the other buildings fine with these awnings?
- The *Town Center Architectural Guidelines* states that, "Awnings shall be installed so as not to be taut, while rectangular without side panels. The use of rolled up signage shall not authorized."
  - She noted it looked to her like the awnings had side panels.
- The *Guide to Sign Regulations of the City of Wildwood for all Businesses Located in "C" Commercial Districts* states, "when preparing to install signage on awnings at your place of business...the height of these letters, symbols, or logos cannot exceed six (6) inches in size...all awnings must be made of canvas, not plastic...awnings shall not have side panels."
  - Tempotest Starlight FR is composed of a thermoplastic polymer resin, PET (polyethylene terephthalate). Chemical composition of this material would

classify it as a plastic, not a canvas. Are we asking for a variance on this canvas requirement?

- The *Guide to Sign Regulations of the City of Wildwood for all Businesses Located in "C" Commercial Districts* goes on to say, "The outline area of the message shall not exceed five percent of the horizontal projection in elevation of the exterior surface of the awning."
  - Do the proposed suite numbers meet the 5% max horizontal projection in elevation? I don't remember where I saw that requirement, but I think it was in Ordinance 1101.
  - Also, how is that calculated?
  - Can we ask the applicant for larger lettering on the building so it is not obstructed by those trees?
- What is the flame retardant used in the PET material?
  - Recently New York has set a precedent in banning organo-halogen flame retardants that are often used in thermoplastic materials and coatings. These have been linked to cancer, hormone disruption, reproductive problems, as well as neurological injury to children. This information can be found in the latest C&EN Journal.
  - Can we alter the flame retardants to be used?

Rick Gangloff, Lawrence Fabric, noted the material used for the awnings was a common material approved all over St. Louis County. He noted that "side panels" has to do with an enclosure, such as a front portion of a restaurant to block people from the wind. He noted that the term "plastic" has to do with the clear vinyl of the side walls of those same awnings. He noted the awnings being proposed do not block people in or obstruct the entrance. He said the fire retardant used is specified by St. Louis County. He noted he would have liked to hear Ms. Clark's comments earlier, as he had thought what was to be discussed was the size of the lettering at this meeting.

Ms. Clark followed up noting her background as a chemist, and said the material being used is a plastic polymer. She said she could accept the explanation for "side panel." She did want to know what fire retardants were being used, and whether Missouri was moving away from using them. Rick Gangloff noted there was no intent to move away from using the fire retardant materials, and he did not know what else to say about that subject.

Alternate Bartelsmeyer noted there were existing awnings on the building prior to the new awnings being proposed. Mr. Gangloff confirmed. Member Sineni asked if the size or shape of the awnings was being changed. Mr. Gangloff noted the size was the same and was not sure about the shape. Jeff Daniels, the building owner, entered the conversation noting the awnings were the same size and shape as the awnings that have been on the building for the past seven years. He noted the only reason he decided to redo them was because of storm damage.

Acting Chair Ritter asked if they were the same color as before. The owner, due to technical difficulties, fell off the meeting. Planner Keefe supplied pictures of the past awnings, and the new ones being proposed.

Ms. Clark asked if all awnings were now gone. Mr. Gangloff said he believed they were still there. Ms. Clark noted she drove around the building and did not see any of the previous awnings. Planner Keefe confirmed that they appeared to be gone when Staff visited the site as well.

Commission Liaison Kohn asked if the material being utilized for the new awnings was the same as the previous awnings. Mr. Gangloff confirmed the replacement awnings would be the same material, noting the fabric typically lasts eight (8) to ten (10) years. He noted cleaning the material every year would make it last longer. Mr. Kohn noted that a maintenance procedure could be approved with the awnings to ensure they don't degrade to look like the former ones. He noted the former awnings were not attractive at the time of replacement. Mr. Gangloff suggested cleaning the material twice a year.

Council Liaison Clark noted she hoped the City's requirements were being met. It was clear to her that "canvas" was to be used for any awnings approved in the City. Mr. Gangloff noted "canvas" was becoming an obsolete material and the material being utilized for the awnings was being approved all over.

Assistant Director Rippetoe noted that the consistency of the awnings with other buildings on the street was discussed by the Department, and it was determined the awnings didn't affect the architectural theme of the buildings, but that the Department would leave that determination up to the Architectural Review Board.

Member Sineni made a motion to approve the awnings. He stated he felt this was a maintenance issue, and the Board's responsibility had to do with the lettering. Alternate Bartelsmeyer noted there were two options to choose from: 1) Address with suite lettering, or 2) No address, just suite lettering.

Acting Chair Ritter made a motion to just have the suite letter, concerning the address was prominently featured on the building. Alternate Bartelsmeyer brought up the visibility of the street address, asking Planner Keefe to expand again on that issue. She noted that Staff was concerned that with it currently blocked, drivers to the building would potentially drive past it and have to turn around in an area proposed for residential development. Alternate Bartelsmeyer asked how much of the tree would have to be trimmed, or even if it would have to be taken down. Planner Keefe noted just moving the address signage would be preferred. Mr. Daniels, the owner, noted he was fine with moving the numbering to a more visible location.

Member McCown Foster suggested moving the larger numbers for visibility, and then just have the suite lettering on the awnings. She felt having the street address on each awning was redundant.

Ms. Clark asked City Administrator Cross if he was comfortable with the wording in the City regulations. She asked if the terms "canvas" and "plastic" should be further defined. Mr. Cross noted he was not comfortable with the wording. He asked Ms. Clark to put her questions in writing. He then asked Chair Ritter to table the issue. He felt all questions needed to be answered.

Mr. Sineni was asked to retract his motion. He stated he felt that to delay the project any longer was unnecessary, and that he felt the purpose of the Board was not being met. However, he retracted his motion.

Ms. Clark made a motion to postpone the issue until the next meeting so the questions could be answered. Commission Liaison Kohn seconded the motion. Motion passed by voice vote with several members abstaining.

Acting Chair Ritter asked if Staff would contact the applicants, if necessary to answer questions. Planner Keefe confirmed.

b) Selection of Officers for the Architectural Review Board (ARB)

Assistant Director Rippetoe noted there had been some turnover on the Architectural Review Board, making the election of new officers an important consideration. She noted the Department had received a slate of candidates nominated by members via email. The following slate was nominated, with nominees accepting their nomination:

Chair: William Ritter  
Vice-Chair: Andrew Sineni  
Secretary: Rhonda Loggia

Commission Liaison Kohn motioned to accept the officer candidates as a slate. Member McCown Foster seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed.

Ayes – Acting Chair Ritter, Board Members McCown Foster and Sineni, Alternates Bartelsmeyer and Marion, Council Liaison Clark and Commission Liaison Kohn.

Nays – None.

VII. New Business – One (1) Item

1) Ready for Action – **One (1) Item**

- a) *Initial review* of rendering and related materials for the replacement of an existing monument sign located at Babler Elementary School, with the applicant requesting an exception to the Minimum Yard Requirements (General) and the Supplementary Regulations from the Board of Adjustment, and an exception to the Outdoor Lighting Requirements from the Architectural Review Board (subject property is

located at 1955 Shepard Road, St. Louis County Locator Number 22V140338). (**Ward Five**)

- a. **Board of Adjustment:** The applicant is requesting an exception to the Minimum Yard Requirements (General) and the Supplementary Regulations from the Board of Adjustment. The setback area of the subject lot would be adjusted to allow the monument sign to encroach into the required fifty (50) feet. *Chapter 415.400, Section F, Sign Regulations – General requires that signs seeking review and action from the Board of Adjustment must first be submitted to the Architectural Review Board for comments, suggestions, or recommendations in this regard.*
- b. **Architectural Review Board:** Additionally, the applicant is requesting black lettering against a white background, which is contrary to the City's Outdoor Lighting Requirements, stipulating a black background with light colored lettering. *Per Section 415.450, General Requirements, Subsection 4 (F), the Architectural Review Board carries the authority to act upon this request.*

Planner Keefe gave a brief presentation of the agenda item. She noted that Staff has received feedback from the City Lighting Consultant on the proposed sign, and through discussions with the applicant, had come to the following compromises:

- The color temperature be reduced to 3,500k (from 7,000k)
- The sign be equipped with an internal dimmer.
- The sign be turned off at 8:00 p.m. every night there is not a school function

Ms. Clark asked if the Planning and Zoning Commission should revise the Code to address LED (light emitting diodes) lighting. She then motioned to recommend acceptance of the variance to the Board of Adjustment, and approval of the sign with a white background and dark lettering with the conditions noted by Staff:

- The color temperature be reduced to 3,500k (from 7,000k)
- The sign be equipped with an internal dimmer.
- The sign be turned off at 8:00 p.m. on every night, when there is not a school function

Acting Chair Ritter asked if the sign was changeable. Ms. Neubauer, the applicant representative, noted that it was changeable by hand, but not of an electric messaging type. Mr. Cross asked if the sign was lit currently. Ms. Rippetoe confirmed it was currently lit and noted it was an older sign and was most likely not LED. Mr. Cross asked Ms. Rippetoe if she had investigated the LED Code, and she confirmed she had as part of her "Dark Sky" research. She also confirmed that LED signs were permitted via the present Code. Mr. Kohn noted LED was utilized everywhere for energy efficiency purposes and the Commission was currently working with the Planning Department on this issue.

Mr. Kohn seconded Ms. Clark's motion to recommend acceptance of the variance to the Board of Adjustment, and approval of the sign with a white background and dark lettering with the conditions noted by Staff:

- The color temperature be reduced to 3,500k (from 7,000k)
- The sign be equipped with an internal dimmer.
- The sign be turned off at 8:00 p.m. on every night, when there is not a school function

Alternate Bartelsmeyer confirmed the sign's location was not under the authority of the Architectural Review Board. Planner Keefe confirmed. The ARB was only recommending approval of the variance.

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

VIII. Other Items – None for Consideration

IX. Next Meeting Date – February 10, 2022 (Thursday), if needed

X. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Acting Chair Ritter made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Kohn seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.