

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
January 12, 2012**

PRESENT

Mr. Matt Adams
Mr. Rick Clawson
Ms. Carol Duenke
Mr. Gary Perkins
Mr. Tim Renaud
Mr. Bruce DeGroot, Planning Commission Liaison
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director
Ms. Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary

ABSENT

Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Bud Gruchalla

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Tim Renaud called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

Board Member Matt Adams recused himself from the meeting as he was representing the petitioner.

II. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. **Spirit of St. Louis Airpark (Spirit Hangars):** Second Amended Architectural Elevations and Second Amended Architect's Statement of Design for a 5.497 acre tract of land zoned "M3" Planned Industrial District located west of the intersection of Wings of Hope Boulevard and Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard, more specifically addressed 18366 Wings of Hope Boulevard.

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, presented the project request for 18366 Wings of Hope at Spirit of St. Louis Airpark. It is currently the only building on the lot. This project was presented to the Board in February 2011 and then it went to the Planning Commission in March. At that time, Mr. Janson, building owner, had requested an amendment to the original design that was approved in 2006. The petitioner, Mr. Janson, had until October to complete all the items that the Architectural Review Board had recommended. Subsequently, the black stripe on the sides and rear of the building has been painted, the landscaping was completed, and the rooftop HVAC equipment was screened. However, the sunshade and the canopy recommended by the Architectural Review Board, and which were approved by the Planning Commission, have not been installed. In October, Mr. Janson sent in a request

asking to amend the elevations again based upon his claim that the approved sunshade was found to be not structurally feasible. Therefore, they are proposing to use the metal wing sunshade as depicted in the packets in lieu of what was previously approved.

Discussion:

Matt Adams, Architect representing the petitioner, stated they are proposing an alternate approach due to structural issues with the previously approved 4 foot sunshade extension. The proposed metal blade would be structurally appropriate. It will still provide a very strong horizontal projection and will provide a striking appearance against the black building.

Board Chair Renaud asked what methodology was used to determine the structural loading requirements. Mr. Adams stated that the manufacturer's structural engineer performed the calculations. Board Chair Renaud asked if he could provide the structural calculations for the Planning Commission's review. Mr. Adams stated there were various alternatives to their concept and they would urge the Board to accept the fact that there is always an alternative to the design. In the event that the Board would want anything else in addition to this, it would have to go back to the mainframe of the building which would require considerable expense to the owner. Ms. Nassif clarified that Board Chair Renaud was just asking for a letter from the structural engineer to verify this issue. She also stated that she had previously requested the same information but did not receive it. Mr. Adams stated they could produce the requested information and then noted that the sunshade presented represents the maximum load possible that the horizontal and vertical mullions would support.

Board Member Carol Duenke did not feel that a 10 inch deep sunshade over the entryway fulfills the requirements to have a protected entry as it is too small and too close to the building. Depending on the required setbacks, she asked if some sort of protection at the entry could be provided that was not hanging cantilevered off the building but perhaps had some support to the ground. Mr. Adams stated that if the entry was of major concern they would consider an alternative.

Board Member Duenke asked if a study had been performed to determine how functional a 10 inch sunshade would be with regard to shading the windows. Mr. Adams stated that the elements presented are for aesthetic value only. Sun shading is already created within the glass of the structure.

Board Member Gary Perkins felt that what was previously presented was not enough and he believes this is a step backwards to some degree. He understands the structural issues but reminded the Board this was constructed without approval and the Board is now looking at a third option..

Planning Commission Liaison, Bruce DeGroot stated that he thought the petitioner would have a hard time convincing the Planning Commission that the current proposal is aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Adams stated that they have been before the Board many times before and asked that they accept this alternative as an end result to the problem that they have been trying to resolve. He noted that the proportions of the horizontal band in relation to the size of the building are negligible. If you stand 150 feet away from this building, you will not be able to detect the size of this compared to the size of another sunshade that is 3 feet wider. As far as the overall aesthetic value that this sunshade or this stripe is presenting to the building, this alternative should be acceptable.

Board Member Duenke pointed out that not everyone's perception is going to be from 150 feet away and that the sunshade could look incoherent closer up.

Mr. Adams stated the building was not designed with a sunshade in mind. The energy elements that were incorporated into the building provide all the energy staples needed. The sunshade was an aesthetic value that was requested by this Board to carry the project forward, therefore, it was incorporated.

Board Member Duenke stated the Board needs to remember that what was built is not close to what was originally approved. She realizes that there have been several iterations, however, it is important to keep in mind how this all came about.

Mr. Adams stated they had an out-of-town developer and sometimes all the rules and regulations are not remembered. It was not the developer's intention to bypass any City rules or regulations. An alternative was presented which he felt worked better aesthetically and so the changes were made without the approval of the Architectural Review Board. They are now trying to rectify this. He is positive the Board will be more than satisfied with the results of this type of element on the building which produces a tremendous horizontal projection from the building. This type of feature is commonly used along Highway 270.

Board Member Rick Clawson reiterated that the Architectural Standards require the breaking up of materials, breaking up of details, breaking up big, long blank facades of buildings and especially bringing it down to human scale. He agreed that something else needs to be done with the canopy at the front door. Based on information in the packet, there is a 14 inch louver available along with a double row. He thinks that increasing the size and having a double row at the top of the building would be more aesthetically pleasing. He realizes that the functionality of the sunshade is not an issue. He also commented that in the rendering, the blades appear as a nice radius louver around the entryway but in

reality, there will be several little cut up pieces with ends exposed as it wraps around the cylinder. He suggested that the petitioner come back with something different at the front and show what it will look like on each side.

Ms. Nassif informed the Board that because the petitioner is presently in court, the Board's options are to recommend approval, recommend denial or recommend that changes be proposed for the Planning Commission. The Board's concerns will be presented to the Planning Commission and Mr. DeGroot will serve as liaison to the Planning Commission to express what he is hearing this evening to ensure all concerns are addressed.

Petitioner Chris Janson expressed his extreme dissatisfaction with the Board's proceedings and then left the meeting at 6:55 p.m. Chair Renaud continued the discussion.

Board Member Duenke clarified that she understood that the functionality of the sunshade was not an issue. It is just a matter that if you can look at it and see that it does not function as a sunshade, it comes across as strictly a decorative element and it is a subjective judgment call whether you find that aesthetically pleasing or not.

Board Member Perkins said he was going to ask about the possibility of a double row being used if it is structurally possible. If the larger single row cannot be used, perhaps the double row can be used. Mr. Adams thought the double row could be considered. Due to the situation they are in, he believed the double row would look better; however, it still does not meet the Architectural Standards.

Board Member Clawson thought that leaving the building as it is presently constructed is preferable to the alternative of using one little 10 inch wing along the top and front, however, this is against the Standards, and he expressed concern about setting a precedent if the Board approves something that doesn't meet the Standards. He stated that what is there now is not acceptable and what is proposed tonight is not acceptable. He understands the petitioner's frustration but questioned how the Board can look at a design that is a concession to the Architectural Standards and move it forward.

Board Member Perkins asked how the blades interface going around the cylinder segment at the front entryway. Board Member Clawson said if there are several segmented pieces it will look horrible. He suggested an alternate design with a ground-mounted pedestrian canopy at the front door, which will provide a vertical element. In addition, by providing a double row of blades on the two sides of the building, it will balance architecturally and make more sense.

Ms. Nassif stated she will check to see if there are any structural setback issues with erecting a ground-mounted entryway.

Board Member Duenke wanted to ensure that any proposed canopy design creates human scale and provides sufficient protection of the entryway in order to meet the Standards. Board Member Clawson also suggested that the colors and materials be compatible with the sunshade.

Board Member Rick Clawson made a motion to deny the project as presented.

Board Member Carole Duenke seconded the motion.

After considerable discussion, Board Member Clawson made the following amended motion:

The motion was amended to approve the project provided that each of the following recommendations are met:

1. A double row of the Versoleil Sunshade shall be utilized instead of a single row on the two curtain wall glass facades and placed at the same elevation as approved in 2011.
2. The sunshade should be consistent with the material and color of the previously approved sunshade in 2011.
3. The Applicant is to provide a letter from the structural engineer verifying that the existing structure cannot support the sunscreen that was previously approved by the Architectural Review Board and approved by the Planning Commission in 2011 and to ensure that a double row of sunshade blades attached to the structure would be acceptable and cause no structural issues.
4. If structurally feasible, a 14 inch sunshade blade on the double row should be utilized instead of the proposed 10 inch blade.
5. Both levels of the segmented blade sunshade over the front entryway shall be removed and substituted with a ground-mounted pedestrian canopy at the entryway.
6. The ground-mounted canopy is to be compatible with the sunshade and the building and should provide human scale and sufficient protection from the elements.

Board Member Carol Duenke seconded the amended motion.

The amended motion passed with a voice vote of 4-0.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. December 15, 2011.

Board Member Carol Duenke made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written.

Board Member Gary Perkins seconded the motion.

Motion passed with a voice vote of 4-0.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Chair Renaud asked the Board to please remember to review their meeting packets before each meeting so they are prepared the night of the meeting.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VI: ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Rick Clawson made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Board Member Carol Duenke seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote of 4-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.