DOWNTOWN REVIEW BOARD
July 10, 2019
5:30 P.M. – COUNCIL CHAMBER

Name | Attendance | Term of Office
--- | --- | ---
MEMBERS PRESENT: Rebecca Thacker | 1-0 | 2/25/22
Dana Massin | 1-0 | 2/11/22
Pat Dillon | 13-1 | 3/21/20
Fr. Sid Breese | 12-1 | 8/31/18
Cristin Coffman | 2-0 | 5/21/21
Andrew Montee | 2-0 | 3/22/19
Pastor Tim Doyle | 4-2 | 11/25/19

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Spencer | 19-8 | 3/10/20

Quorum Present. Five members constitute a quorum.

STAFF PRESENT: Nic Hutchison, City Planner
Ted Elo, Asst. City Attorney
Rebecca Shipp, Executive Secretary

Elo stated there is not a Chairman or Vice Chairman in attendance. Elo suggested the Board members present elect an acting Chairman.

Doyle made a motion to nominate Dillon as acting Chairman.

Coffman asked if nomination would be for a temporary Chairman.

Elo and Dillon responded yes

Breese seconded the motion

VOTE: Dillon-yes, Breese-yes, Doyle-yes, Thacker-yes, Massin-yes, Coffman-yes, Montee-yes
Ayes - 7, Nays - 0, Abstain -0. Motion approved.

Dillon called the meeting to order at 5:30p.m.

ROLL CALL: Dillon-present, Breese-present, Doyle-present, Spencer-absent, Thacker-present, Massin-present, Coffman-present, Montee-present
Quorum is present. Five members constitute a quorum.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 1, 2018

Breese made a motion to approve the minutes. Doyle seconded.

VOTE: Dillon-yes, Breese-yes, Doyle-yes, Thacker-yes, Massin-yes, Coffman-yes, Montee-yes
Ayes – 7, Nays – 0, Abstain -0. Minutes approved.
Dillon read the rules of conduct

**Item #1  Election of Officers**

Dillon stated nominations were needed for a Chairman and a Vice Chairman.

Coffman made a motion to postpone the vote. Coffman stated there were a lot of new members and she wasn’t sure if this was the right meeting to elect officers.

Thacker seconded.

Dillon opened the motion to discussion among the board.

Doyle asked Coffman why she wished to postpone.

Coffman stated there were two new members and she and Montee had only been to two meetings and they needed time to process it and talk about it.

Doyle asked if Spencer was the only member missing.

Hutchison responded correct. Spencer serves as the Vice Chairman.

Elo responded Montee is a hold over appointee as his term has expired and there is one other vacancy.

Doyle stated he preferred to wait until Spencer was here, should he be nominated.

**VOTE:**  Dillon-yes, Breese-yes, Doyle-yes, Thacker-yes, Massin-yes, Coffman-yes, Montee-yes Ayes – 7, Nays – 0, Abstain -0.  Motion approved.

**Item #2  Certificate of Appropriateness** – A request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for installation of up to six 7’x5’ cement panels on the property to be located at 711 Felix, as requested by Michael Fuson on behalf of St. Joseph Music Foundation.

Hutchison gave the staff report.

O’Dell gave Board members a handout entitled Clarification Points (attached)

Massin asked for clarification. Staff is recommending placement in the North position aligning with the parking

Hutchison responded correct

Massin asked for a moment to read the staff report as the recommendation is not an acceptable location to what the application is requesting.
Hutchison responded sure. Hutchison stated the applicant’s concerns with placement being along the North side are the identity and seriousness of the installation would be compromised because of the proximity to the proposed playground.

Montee stated he was confused. Montee asked what the difference was between this placement and the original proposed placement. He believed they were fairly similar as to where they would be located. Montee asked what the distinction between this and the original serpentine design.

Hutchison stated the applicant is saying they weren’t involved with the design process for the original serpentine design which was submitted.

Dillon clarified the picture present of the overview of the park was submitted way back when committees were meeting to discuss potential options to redesign the Felix Street Square. The sections have changed somewhat with each meeting. There have been discussions of a potential park near that location as well. The Music Foundation has decided to go ahead with the wall portion. Dillon stated Staff has recommended the wall be placed closer to the parking lot.

Hutchison responded the shift is a little bit to the North. The location that was submitted with the application shows the wall being located closer to the proposed playground equipment.

Massin asked if the proposed playground is a part of a Master Plan revision that has been approved by the Downtown Review Board.

Hutchison responded the overall plan has not been approved but there have been components of the plan that have been approved.

Massin asked if it is being approved piece by piece

Hutchison responded correct

Dillon stated the overall plan had been presented to council in work sessions to show the direction that the committee was going but there was no approval of anything. Dillon stated he believed this is following that direction and each portion would probably be undertaken piece by piece due to funding and who takes it on.

Breese asked for clarification of where the staff proposed location would be

Hutchison responded just a little to the north and at some point a sidewalk would need to be installed so pedestrians would be able to access the installation.

Breese asked if there was enough room in the area to put it in the serpentine design

Hutchison responded they could do it in the serpentine design pattern. Hutchison stated he thought the serpentine pattern became a part of the design because of garden installation depicted on the left side of the site plan. They were designing a wall to act as a buffer between the apartments and the parking lot.

Dillon asked the applicant if there was a preferred location
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Anthony Glise-2703 Mitchell Avenue, stated they were unaware the serpentine design had ever been proposed. A serpentine design would not work because of the curvature of the panels. That would substantially increase the cost of the project and cause problems with plaque casting and attachment. The design the Music Foundation is requesting is a “Stonehenge Design” as shown in the agenda packet.

Dillon asked Glise to discuss their style and location preference

Glise stated the original proposal of the wall location was so that the wall could be used as a sound barrier and also act as a little bit of a containment aid. They would like the location to be between the stage and the playground area so it has a little more of its own identity; a stand-alone.

Breese stated he was confused because he sees a serpentine design in the packet

Glise stated the serpentine was not a part of their original proposal

Breese stated he doesn’t see where the design submitted is curved.

Hutchison gave Glise a copy of the design submitted

Glise stated it (Creal Clark & Seifret design drawing) is what they were requesting. ***There was confusion of the term serpentine—Glise/Music Foundation interpreting staff’s term serpentine as curved rather than flat panels set in a serpentine pattern.

Massin stated the application mentions the placement of the wall would serve as a sound blocking structure. Massin stated placement of a sound blocking structure in a park that wishes to conduct musical performances would be critical. Massin asked Glise if he thought staff’s recommendation was taking that into consideration and would minimize the problem of sound blocking.

Glise responded yes

Massin asked Glise if he then agreed that staff’s proposed location of near the parking lot would be a better fit for sound-scaping.

Glise responded no, it would affect sound-scaping minimally. Glise stated acoustic containment would be a wall maybe 10 times the size of what they are requesting. If the wall they are requesting would be placed more in the center of the park it would have a greater impact on sound containment.

Massin asked for clarification. Massin stated Glise is saying if it were placed in the middle of the park that would be their preferred location.

Glise responded yes

Massin asked if that was what Glise is asking for and that would create more of a sound barrier problem than next to the parking lot.

Glise responded no, it would have a greater benefit
Massin asked if a sound engineer or a sound-scaping expert has looked at the request.

Glise stated yes they could help the Music Foundation with that. Glise stated the number of and placement of the panels would play a role but affect would be minimal. The greater benefit would be if they were closer to the stage.

Massin asked if the imagery and plaques would only be on one side of the wall

Glise responded yes

Massin asked what about the back side-the side that is facing the buildings

Glise responded that is something they would have to look at because imagery/plaques on both sides would mean a double-pour and would increase the cost. Glise stated the front of the wall, the u-shape that faces the park, is where they would like to have the imagery/plaques.

Coffman asked Glise for clarification, they only plan to put plaques on one side of the structure

Glise responded yes.

Massin asked for clarification on a statement on the application regarding OSHA standards and how it was being researched. Massin stated the proposal reads the panels would be 6 inches apart pending OSHA research. Massin asked for their findings.

Glise responded they were relying on the architects for that.

Massin stated that if the Board were to approve it tonight they would not know that information, what the OSHA standards were and how that would impact the layout.

Glise responded the reason he included 6 inches is that tis what the balusters on stairwell need to be in order to be considered safe.

Doyle asked if the applicant would like the placement to be more towards the center and away from the parking garage and staff is recommending it to be closer to the street.

Hutchison responded yes

Dillon pointed out to Doyle the image included in the agenda packet on the back of the staff report page. Image #1 is what is preferred by the applicant and image #2 is staff’s recommendation.

Doyle stated staff isn’t opposed to the preferred location just suggesting it might work better at the other location.

Hutchison explained Staff here to guide and assist the Downtown Review Board in the decision making process and issuing a certificate of appropriateness. Staff reviews the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the overall goals and objectives of the Downtown Precise Plan. That’s how the recommendation was determined.
Doyle asked if there was a legal reason for the recommendation. If the board went with the applicant preferred choice there would not be a problem.

Hutchison responded there was no legal issue.

Coffman asked if the project would be shifted to staff’s recommended location couldn’t the playground area be shifted in another direction to provide more room so that the board could go with staff’s recommendation since staff has done the research.

Hutchison responded absolutely. Hutchison stated the Downtown Review Board has not officially approved the concept plan for Felix Street Square. They have approved components of it. The playground equipment at this point is just a conceptual idea which may or may not happen.

Montee asked if that included the secondary wall Hutchison proposes. Montee asked if that is that something that is independent of what is being discussed at this time.

Dillon explained the pictures are of two different possibilities-the first being what applicant prefers and the second being Staff’s recommendation.

Hutchison states one of the elements of the Downtown Precise Plan is to improve the streetscape, landscape, etc.

Breese stated he is noticing the plantings behind the apartments, asks how much is on city property that could be used for this purpose.

Hutchison responded a survey would be needed to mark the official boundary but it is safe to assume the plantings are encroaching on city property.

Doyle stated he remembers when the committee reviewed the overall concept for the entertainment venue and is concerned if the wall is moved too far away it would be beyond what the original intent was. Doyle also stated he is concerned if the playground is positioned too close to the stage area, attendees could spill over into the area during high attendance events.

Coffman asked if the placement of the wall in the center of the area also have the same affect by cutting off a portion of the park during larger events.

Doyle responded he didn’t think so because of the placement and the depth of the wall whereas the playground equipment takes up the depth of the green space. Shifting it to the west would encroach upon where people sit in their lawn chairs. Doyle asked Hutchison how much depth they would lose.

Hutchison responded you would lose 12 feet on the north side of the park. Hutchison stated he believed Coffman was referring to moving the playground equipment further to the south.

Coffman clarified she didn’t propose a direction. Coffman stated she thinks if something needs to be shifted the decision could be made when and if it is proposed.
Massin asked Hutchison if it is considered best practices to approve large scale permanent projects and installations without an approved strategic plan.

Hutchison stated from a planning perspective having an approved strategic plan would be best practices because it reduces the amount of alterations to the existing infrastructure. Because this application was brought before the board we are going through the process of reviewing that request. Felix Street and parks in general are public spaces that should be designed for public use 24/7/365. Hutchison stated the placement of the structure shouldn’t be based solely on specific events.

Dillon stated the original plan is not set in stone but had a lot of debate and a lot of input from the community. There isn’t any funding behind it so that is why it’s coming in pieces. There was a heavy push by Leadership St. Joe on the park piece so there would be something for families year round.

Thacker stated she likes the concept of this but reminded the board they were talking about a very small space. Thacker stated she feels it cuts the area in half so placing it further east and back would be best since the playground is not set in stone yet. Thacker stated she thinks it should be placed where it draws people into the area.

Massin stated page 12 of the Downtown Precise Plan says the goal is to support connectivity throughout downtown space. Massin stated a wall doesn’t exactly support connectivity.

Breese asked how wide the design was. If the wall could be moved closer to the property line it would create more room where the people sit.

O’Dell responded over 30 feet.

Hutchison stated approximated 35’ east to west.

Breese stated it was shown to be 12 feet from the property line.

Hutchison responded correct.

Breese asked if it had to be 12 feet.

Coffman asked if Breese was referring to the plan the applicant is proposing or staff’s recommendation.

Breese stated he was looking at the drawing.

Kent O’Dell -2701 Pear, spoke in favor of the item. O’Dell suggested placing the wall as far back on the property as possible so it would not be in the way of future development. Moving it closer to the property line would not inhibit viewing or crowd overflow. Twelve feet is an abundance of space. O’Dell asked Hutchison how far from property line a structure could be placed.

Hutchison responded it could be one foot off of the property line.

O’Dell stated moving the wall closer to the property line would provide plenty of room for the future. O’Dell stated there were many groups excited about the Missouri Wall of Fame.
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Brian Myers-507 S 15th, spoke in favor of the item. Myers stated he is speaking as a business owner who is strongly in favor of the wall. Myers asked the board consider the placement of the structure with relation to future development, different groups who utilize the area throughout the year and property owners adjacent to the park.

No one spoke in opposition.

Coffman made a motion to approve Staff’s recommendation for placement-image #2. Montee seconded.

Doyle asked if the motion is approved would it stop them from moving forward

O’Dell responded it would not hamper the construction aspect of it. O’Dell asked the board to keep in mind the drawing the City has are of concepts from years ago where placement was never discussed only the concepts.

O’Dell also cautioned the Board about having walls around or near playgrounds as it is too easy to lose sight of a child playing.

Coffman responded what O’Dell is saying is based off of what might be there, not off of anything approved by the board. Coffman stated the playground is not approved or even exists at this time nor is it in motion at this time.

O’Dell stated the Missouri Wall of Fame is a part of the entertainment and should be closer not further away. If it’s further away, people won’t notice it.

Dillon clarified O’Dell is in favor of the original placement as shown in image #1

O’Dell responded yes

Thacker stated it’s a hard decision because it’s like putting together a puzzle without all the pieces

O’Dell spoke away from podium *inaudible*

Breese stated he is not in favor of the design. He finds the other design more aesthetically pleasing.

Coffman stated she wished to repeat Hutchison and say public use of the space throughout the year should be considered not just use for one type of event. The board does not have all the pieces of the puzzle. Coffman stated she is excited about the project being in our downtown but is trying to make all of the space function for all types of events. We should rely on our experts with the city to give us the best recommendation.

Dillon stated there is a motion and a second to approve Staff’s recommendation-image #2

**VOTE: Dillon-no, Breese-no, Doyle-no, Thacker-yes, Massin-no, Coffman-yes, Montee-yes**

Ayes – 3, Nays – 4, Abstain -0. Motion denied.

Breese made a motion to adopt the plan as presented with the group working closely with the City on actual placement in a place where it shows
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Dillon asked Breese for clarification

Elo suggested possible wording for the motion could be placement submitted by applicant with condition of working with Staff.

Elo stated there are several things he notices that may pose problems later on, lack of sidewalks for one example. Elo stated the best thing he could recommend is the applicant and City Staff work together to find a solution to address all of the issues so the project can move forward.

Breese withdrew motion.

Coffman asked if there was enough time to work with City Staff so the applicant could meet their deadline

Elo stated he would be unable to answer that question without knowing everyone’s schedule. Elo stated there are a lot of variables involved with making the structure accessible for those who may have different needs.

Elo stated he does not think it should be postponed until the next meeting. He believes the changes that need to be made can be done in the next couple of weeks.

Dillon asked if the applicant’s submittal would be enough or would they have to spend more money providing Staff with additional architectural plans. Dillon stated he realizes additional costs may be an issue to the applicant.

Elo responded if all parties, public works, Hutchison, parks representative etc work together he’s sure they can come up with something that addresses all possible roadblocks so the project can proceed.

Dillon asked if the DRB could approve it on its premise as long as it meets City’s code for ADA

Hutchison responded that’s the standard process for any project that is submitted to the City. It goes through the development review process and that’s what Elo is referring to. The DRB is reviewing it as it applies to the zoning component and the Downtown Precise Plan which gets more into the design of it.

Hutchison stated by approving the concept by the DRB it could still proceed as long as there isn’t a substantial modification. If the DRB approves the configuration of the panels and the general vicinity of its location it can proceed to the development review phase.

Doyle made a motion to approve the request as submitted by the applicant with the understanding that the next phase is up to development review

Hutchison clarified it would be a motion to approve the Stonehenge configuration

**inaudible-several speaking at once**

Doyle added to Hutchison’s motion -to be placed in the location as presented by applicant but worked out between the applicant and staff.

Breese seconded
Montee stated the reason he approved the other motion was his concern over the depth into the park-how far south it is, and whether it would obstruct the garden that is outside the existing property. If those concerns were addressed with the current proposal he would feel more comfortable voting for it.

Coffman asked if what they were voting on was that the request would move forward without the DRB seeing the finalized plans.

Hutchison responded he could provide the DRB with the approved version if there is a modification but at this time the board would be approving the concept of the Stonehenge configuration.

Massin stated she voted no on the earlier motion due to lack of long term plan for such a large permanent structure. Massin agrees the best place for it would be next to the parking lot. Massin feels there are a lot of unanswered questions including what color it would be. Massin stated she would like to see in be a part of a longer term plan.

Dillon clarified the motion. Motion to approve the originally proposed Stonehenge concept as close to the original proximity of the drawing, working with City Staff.

**VOTE: Dillon-yes, Breese-yes, Doyle-yes, Thacker-no, Massin-no, Coffman-no, Montee-yes**

**Ayes – 4, Nays – 3, Abstain -0. Motion approved.**

Doyle thanks Glise for his hard work on the project and wished him well in the future.

Ken Reeder-no address given, asked if the concept of moving the stage was off the table.

Dillon responded there have been at least five different drawings/plans and with all of them the stage is located where its currently at.

Reeder asked if this group will discuss the gates.

Dillon responded the gates have already been approved, the project is not finished yet but it is going forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Rebecca Shipp.
CLARIFICATION POINTS
MISSOURI MUSIC HALL OF FAME®, “WALL OF FAME”®

I. TITLES
1) Please remember we need to use the full titles, “Missouri Music Hall of Fame”® and “Missouri Music Wall of Fame.”® These are the legal titles registered with the US Dept. of Trademarks. Consistent use protects the identity of the entities and qualifies our exclusive use of those titles.

II. WALL SHAPE
The “U-Shaped” wall (called the “Stonehenge Design” in the first proposal) was the original and agreed-upon design.

The serpentine design won’t work for several reasons:
- a) flat plaques can’t be securely mounted on a curved surface
- b) casting curved plaques (for a serpentine wall) would raise the price of each plaque from ca. $35 to over $600 each plus several thousand for etching set-up
- c) pouring the wall in a serpentine form would require on-site form construction
- d) in the event of expanding the wall, matching the original design of the existing serpentine pattern would be difficult-to-impossible. With the paneled walls we would already have the reusable single-panel form

III. PLAQUE PLACEMENT ON BOTH SIDES
I have been able to find no other similar wall that is two-sided. On the contrary, every memorial-type wall which I researched while designing the proposed Missouri Music Wall of Fame® is single-sided.* This is partially due to aesthetics, and partially because the back side of a wall designed for exhibition, has minimal “presence.”

* This includes the National WWII Memorial, Vietnam Mem. (Washington, D.C.), the Women in Service for America Mem. (Arlington, VA), Omaha Beach Mem. (St.-Laurent-sur-Mer, France), Vietnam Mem. (Pensacola, FL), Korean War Veterans Mem. (Arlington, VA), American Martyrs Wall (Manhattan Beach, CA), Middle East Conflicts Mem. Wall (Marseilles, IL), Basra Memorial Wall (Alrewas, England), National Museum of the Pacific War (Fredricksburg, TX), Yamba Mem. Wall (New So. Wales, Australia), Childrens’ Mem. Garden (Wilmington, NC), et al.

Additionally, single-sided walls are the norm to the extent that I have not been able to find a single memorial wall contractor who offers a two-sided wall. Cf.: Columbarium Memorial Wall Corp. (cf. [https://www.columbariumusa.com/memorial-walls/]), Granart Memorial Walls ([http://www.granart.co.uk/our-memorials/memorial-walls/]), et al.

IV. WALL INSTALLATION LOCATION
Our concern with the newly proposed placement is that:
- a) the Missouri Music Wall of Fame® might appear to be part of the proposed retaining wall
- b) the newly proposed placement would be so near the playground area that the identity of the installation and
  i) identity of the installation and
  ii) the “seriousness” of the installation would be compromised
V. TIMELINE
We hope to have the wall installed for unveiling at the 2019 “JoeStock” music festival, Labor Day Weekend (August 30-31). This will be the 10th-year anniversary of the Missouri Music Hall of Fame and:
   a) several inductees will be performing that weekend to help publicize the installation and
   b) we have had numerous inquiries from the press as far away as Joplin, Missouri, regarding their intent to publicize the unveiling.