

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2017
Room 101

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Matt Adams
Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Rick Clawson
Mr. Doug DeLong
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Mick Weber

ABSENT:

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councilmember Dan Hurt
Planning Commission Chair, Stanley Proctor
Planning Commission Liaison, Steve Wuennenberg
Mr. Justin Wyse, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Ms. Jessica Henry, Senior Planner
Ms. Cecilia Hernandez, Project Planner
Ms. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gruchalla called the meeting to order at **6:00 p.m.**

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. December 8, 2016

Board Member Clawson made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member DeLong seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 – 0. *Board Member Adams was not present for the vote.*

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. MPD Investments, Lot 1 (Metro Lighting) 2nd AAE:** Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 4.02 acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located west of Boone's Crossing, and north of North Outer 40 Road (17U520148).

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Cecilia Hernandez, Project Planner explained that the applicant is requesting amended architectural elevations to install 36 color-changing LED up-lights. The existing single-story Metro Lighting building is located off of I-64/40, along North Outer

40 Road within the MPD Investments development. These fixtures are already in place, and were placed without going through the necessary permit process.

When a notice of violation was given, the lights were turned off in order to go through the necessary approval process. There are no other changes proposed in this application. Ms. Hernandez provided a color aerial of the site and the surrounding developments. Night time color photos were available as part of the meeting packet, which confirmed that off-site glare was not an issue.

Unified Development Code (UDC)

The Unified Development Code allows the Planning Commission to approve decorative lighting fixtures when it can be proven that there will be no off-site glare light trespass, and the proposed fixtures will improve the appearance of the site.

However, the UDC also requires three things: that exterior lighting be accent lighting, that it be architecturally integrated, and consistent with that on surrounding buildings.

DISCUSSION

Board Member Weber asked how often & how quickly the lights will change. Ms. Hernandez explained that the changes are gradual within a five minute period. If the colors are limited to two colors with cycle limitations, Board Member Weber felt that the overall affect would be more desirable. Board Member Clawson would like to limit the “Las Vegas” continual color wheel affect.

Board Member Adams arrived to the meeting at this point.

Board Member Weber had concerns due to the number of color palette selections and the continual lighting changes and whether it’s considered signage or an architectural feature. He asked for clarification as to whether the intent is to add lighting to the building or advertisement to the building.

The question remains as to how to address the issue to avoid setting a precedent for existing or future development.

Since there is no light trespass, nor any rapid change to distract drivers along I-64/40, Chair Gruchalla did not have any concerns with the existing lighting.

Board Member Brown explained that in order to place limitations, the lighting could be tied in the “use”.

Applicant Comment

Mr. Bill Frisella, owner of Metro Lighting and Frisella Properties addressed the Board’s concerns, as follows:

- The color changing program is set at five minute intervals with very gradual changes to limit highway distractions. However, the program can be changed to reflect a specific color scheme and timing.
- The intent of the lighting was designed to enhance the building.

There was considerable discussion on frequency, color palette, and how to regulate the lighting to eliminate a precedent for future development. Mr. Wyse explained that the approval is for the building not the use.

Board Member Clawson expressed concerns as to whether the attention-getting lights are considered signage. Ms. Henry confirmed that the lighting is considered an architectural feature of the building not signage.

Board Member Brown made a motion to forward the 2nd Amended Architectural Elevations for MPD Investments, Lot 1 (Metro Lighting) to the Planning Commission as presented with a recommendation for approval. Board Member DeLong seconded the motion.

Board Member Weber made a motion to amend the recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

- The colors be limited to two, with a primary color along the band above the solar panels and, if desired, a secondary color under the archway.
- The colors be static for a 24-hour period, including from sun up to sun down.

Board Member Adams seconded the motion for an amendment. **The motion for an amendment then passed by a voice vote of 6 – 0.**

The motion to forward the 2nd Amended Architectural Elevations to the Planning Commission with a recommendation for approval with conditions as amended then passed by a voice vote of 6 - 0.

- B. Trails West Village of Greentrails, Lot 270 B:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.6 acre tract of land zoned "C-8" Planned Commercial District, located at the southeast corner of Ladue Road and Greentrails Drive.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Jessica Henry, Senior Planner explained that this project was presented to the ARB in March of 2016, where a motion to recommend approval with recommendations was passed. Since that time, the property owner has engaged a new Architect and this

project for a new retail center is being brought back to the ARB due to the extent of the design revisions since it was initially presented.

Ms. Henry added that the request is for a small 4,000 square foot retail center with four individual retail units to be located on Lot 270 B of the Trails West Village of Greentrails subdivision. Ms. Henry provided current and proposed front and rear architectural elevations.

At the March 10, 2016 ARB meeting, the ARB passed a motion to recommend approval of the project with the following recommendations:

1. **The design should reflect the residential character of the neighborhood, particularly in regards to the roof design, materials, and color** - *The applicant has proposed a peaked roof design which is characteristic of a residential development.*
2. **Screen the roof top mechanical equipment to be integrated into the roof design** - *The applicant is proposing to construct a screen out of the same fiber-cement board siding utilized elsewhere on the building. Although the proposed screen will adequately shield the mechanical units from view, the light color of the siding contrasts against the dark brown roof shingles.*
3. **The design should be integrated across all four facades given the site relation and proximity to the adjacent buildings** - *The materials and design are carried across all four building elevations.*
4. **Incorporate landscaping around the dumpster enclosure** - *A small landscape island planted with Juniper shrubs has been added around the rear of the dumpster enclosure.*

Material samples were available and the applicant was available for questions.

DISCUSSION

Roof Design

Board Member Weber questioned whether a gable roof could be incorporated into the rear elevation of the building to hide the roof-top mechanical equipment or whether ground-mount equipment could be provided. The applicant explained that the building owner did not want ground-mount units due to previous occurrences with theft related issues.

Site Relationship

Based upon previous concerns, Board Member Clawson explained that although the proposed building is small in nature, he did not feel that the proposed structure integrated well within the residential development. Ms. Henry stated that all ordinance requirements have been met. She added that a large portion of the site is not developable due to an existing creek and buffering requirements.

Landscaping

In response to Board Member Brown's suggestion to add free-standing shrubbery containers, Ms. Henry explained that during previous discussions on this topic, the project architect explained that ADA requirements limit options to incorporate additional landscaping along the walkway adjacent to the building storefronts.

Board Member Clawson questioned whether additional landscaping could be incorporated into the large sidewalk area to the northern end of the site. The applicant replied that they would be willing to remove some sidewalk space to add some additional landscaping. Board Member DeLong suggested some tall shrubbery and ornamental grasses.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations for Trails West Village of Greentrails, Lot 270 B to the Planning Commission ***with a recommendation for approval as presented by Staff with the following conditions:***

- Incorporate five (5) foot sidewalk space for the addition of material landscaping to soften the northern end of the site.
- Evaluate options for reconfiguring the screening of the roof-top mechanical units.

Board Member Weber seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 6 - 0.**

IV. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Wyse informed the committee that starting in February, Ms. Henry will be taking over as ARB Staff Liaison.

Councilmember Hurt touched on the Board's substantial lighting concerns due to the new lighting technology available, and how those changes may affect existing and future development. He requested that the Metro Lighting project be brought forward to the Planning & Public Works Committee with an invite from the ARB Board to be present during that time.

VI: **ADJOURNMENT** 7:22 pm