

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
January 9, 2014

PRESENT

Ms. Mary Brown
Ms. Carol Duenke
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Gary Perkins
Councilmember Dan Hurt
Planning Commission Liaison, Mike Watson
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner, Planning Department Liaison
Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner
Ms. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Matt Adams
Mr. Rick Clawson
Mr. Mick Weber

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Carol Duenke called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. December 12, 2013

Board Member Brown made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Perkins seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. Monarch Center, Lots A and B (Edison Express):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 2.58 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Long Road and Edison Avenue.

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner, stated that this is the second time this project has appeared before the Board for review. During the December 12th meeting, the Applicant requested an opportunity to make modifications to the project in order to satisfy the concerns expressed by the Board during that meeting.

- The site is located at the intersection of Long and Edison Roads. Lot A is where the bulk of the development will occur; Lot B contains an existing dental office; and the proposed Lot C is slated for future development.

- The photos presented to the Board show the surrounding area which is only partially developed.
- The updated Site Development Section Plan shows that the proposed building is 11,940 square feet in size and will house a new convenience store/gas station, a fast-food restaurant, and a carwash. The applicant is proposing a gas pump canopy with eight pump islands. The two shared access drives—one off Long Road and one off of Edison Road—remain unchanged on the site plan.

Some of the changes made to the site plan, based on the recommendations the Board made during last month's meeting, include:

- The location of the western portion of the sidewalk located along the internal drive on Proposed Lot B was modified in order to place landscaping between the internal drive and edge of the sidewalk.
- An access path for employees to the dumpster area was added off the carwash vehicular circulation area.
- The sidewalk that used to connect under the carwash canopy currently terminates on the drive-through lane for a proposed restaurant tenant within the convenience store.

Ms. Henry stated that the location and orientation of the dumpster enclosure has not changed. The dumpster enclosure is accessed from the internal shared drive to Lot C, which is slated for future development.

Changes on the Landscape Plan include:

- Some trees were shifted away from the curblin of the access off of Long Road. Staff will fully evaluate the location of these trees to verify that they meet sight distance criteria when a revised Landscape Plan is submitted in conjunction with a revised Section Plan.
- The replacement of two demising walls with landscaping. The Landscape Plan will be fully reviewed by the City Arborist and Staff to ensure that the proposed species provides adequate screening for the area.

The new downlight cylinder type of light fixture has been added to the new architectural elevations. The Lighting Plan will be reviewed by Staff when it is resubmitted to ensure that light levels comply with the Lighting Ordinance.

A sight-line study was submitted based on the Board's recommendation. As a result of this, additional screening is now provided for the rooftop utilities as shown on the architectural elevations.

In addition to the rooftop screening, changes to the architectural elevations include:

- The brick on the east elevation was extended significantly with only a small band of EIFS remaining on the east elevation of the building.

- The outdoor storage area screening was modified to appear opaque. The direction of the proposed vinyl plank was changed from horizontal to vertical. This storage area screening does not appear to commence at the ground level. However, there was no change in materials used on the outdoor storage area and the material used remains vinyl plank, which is not a primary material throughout the development.

The materials remain the same – tinted glass with anodized aluminum window frames with stone and brick.

The Applicant has provided architectural elevations for the other structures in the development.

- The carwash canopy columns are the same brick and stone veneer used on the building and the prefinished metal roof also matches those used on the building.
- The dumpster enclosure is constructed of the same brick that is used throughout the development and white vinyl plank doors. A note on the plan states that the finishes and colors will match the building standard.
- The gas station canopy also has brick and stone veneer columns that match the building with a standard gas station branding roof.
- The ATM uses the same brick as the building and has a blue metal roof canopy. The roof is being designed according to the branding of the leasing bank.

During the previous ARB meeting, the Board asked for clarification regarding the pole-like structures along the south elevation near the drive-thru carwash exit. The Applicant has clarified that these are five foot tall vacuum stanchions.

- The rendering is provided only to give an artistic interpretation of what the development could look like. The Applicant clarified that there will be nine stanchions.

A rendering was also provided for the outdoor patio area to include a low metal fence and patio furniture.

To summarize, many of the concerns raised by the Board have been addressed by the Applicant, however there are a few remaining concerns including:

- The primary material used on the outdoor storage area is vinyl plank which is not consistent with the material used throughout the development as required by the Architectural General Requirements of the Municipal Code. Additionally, the screening does not start at the ground level, so clarification will need to be provided by the Applicant.
- The location of the dumpster enclosure has not been modified.
- It needs to be determined whether the sidewalk that provides pedestrian access to the dumpster provides a safe access since it is off a vehicular area.
- Regarding the large vacuum station area at the carwash exit, there is concern whether adequate screening is being provided by the proposed landscaping for the area.

- Question remains as to whether the vacuum stanchions will / will not be considered structures pertaining to the Site Development Section Plan review.

Material samples have been provided and the Applicant is available to answer any questions.

DISCUSSION

Planning Chair Watson asked for clarification as to Staff's concerns regarding the sidewalk near the vehicular area. Ms. Henry explained the safety concerns regarding the employees when entering and exiting the vehicular area.

Chair Duenke questioned as to whether the location of the dumpster was an ARB consideration or to be determined during site plan review. Mr. Boyer pointed out that the Board does have some purview regarding the flow of the site but ultimately it will be reviewed at site plan. Ms. Henry responded that typically the screening is oriented in a way that the vinyl doors are facing interior to the development.

Chair Duenke also questioned as to whether the screening for the outdoor storage area and the dumpster could be compatible. She felt that the white vinyl on the dumpster enclosure is not consistent with the quality of the materials on the existing development. The white is extremely prominent against the more-muted colors.

Mr. Boyer asked for clarification as to whether the concerns were primarily the material or color of the screening. Overall the Board indicated that their concerns dealt more with the color and perhaps the vinyl material could be more acceptable if it were a more subdued versus a contrast color.

On behalf of Board Member Rick Clawson, Board Member Perkins presented his concerns:

- Whether it is possible to reduce the amount of vinyl material and increase the masonry base to the outdoor storage area. The Board recommended a more muted color.
- There were concerns of the dumpster orientation, but because of the internal circulation a resolution may not be possible.
- He also had concerns of the roof-top screening material. The Applicant clarified that the material would be an aluminum vent material. Mr. Boyer replied that based upon the material finish, a potential glare could be visible. The Applicant responded that a matte-finish material is an option and clarified that the equipment will be fully screened and not visible. The equipment above the restaurant area is currently not visible.
- Based upon the building setbacks, a question remains as to whether the vacuum stanchions are considered structures. The Applicant confirmed that the vacuuming will be piped underground.

Chair Duenke did not feel that the low lying shrubbery was adequate screening around the stanchions. The Applicant replied that the shrubbery is to be three to four feet tall. Board Member Perkins noted that the landscaping to the south is shown as ornamental grass which can grow to three to five feet in height, but expressed concern that it would not provide adequate screening during the winter months. He recommended that the final review of the planting plan take this into consideration.

Board Member Gruchalla commented on a letter that was recently sent from the Police Chief indicating their safety and crime concerns if the shrubbery is too tall. Ms. Henry replied that the City has an Officer who does the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) review, and lower shrub landscaping was recommended to prevent persons from hiding. She added that the screening will have to adhere to the architectural standards of the City Code. Because of the circulation, distance from the roadway, and allocation of the landscape island in a well-lit area, Staff would prefer taller landscaping and screening.

Because it was not previously provided, Chair Duenke noted the material being used on the garage doors and explained that the garage doors would remain open most of the time. The Applicant then provided additional material samples for the Board to review.

Board Member Gruchalla asked for clarification to the EIFS colors. The Applicant then provided information about the building materials and colors noting that the dark EIFS color will be on the back wall of the car wash. Board Member Gruchalla felt the dark bronze colors of the downspouts are acceptable and that it is more of an architectural element than a utilitarian feature.

Chair Duenke felt that the east elevation has been greatly improved.

Board Member Gruchalla recommended a dark brown color on the vinyl of the outdoor screening instead of the white color. Board Member Brown asked if the Board wanted to tie the Applicant to the dark brown vinyl of the outdoor storage area as she felt the Board wants the “best color” so it is unobtrusive. Chair Duenke felt that a more subdued color closer to the adjacent materials would be more adequate. It was agreed that it should be in the color palette to match the existing colors of the building other than white.

Chair Duenke questioned why the screening on the carwash equipment area is not originating at ground level. The Applicant replied that due to drainage and air flow, the equipment will be elevated on a concrete pad six to eight inches so the equipment will not be visible. The Board recommended a maximum six inch elevation and no taller than the concrete equipment pad. A slight elevation of the equipment will provide for better maintenance.

Board Member Gruchalla asked for clarification to the width of the planting island near the carwash area. The Applicant replied that it is 3-4 four feet and that the island provides adequate width for growth.

Planning Chair Watson suggested that a green-type screening be provided.

Mr. Boyer suggested that the landscaping height be aligned with the height of the vacuum poles. The Board agreed with this suggestion. It was also suggested that a green screen be considered for this area. Ms. Henry reminded the Board that there is a structure setback in this area and anything placed in this area must be reviewed to ensure that it meets the setback criteria.

Chair Duenke stated that Staff will continue to address any outstanding items before moving on to the Planning Commission for review.

Board Member Gruchalla made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for Monarch Center, Lots A and B (Edison Express) to the Planning Commission with the following recommendations:

- The dumpster gating - the color palette to match the existing colors of the building other than white.
- Outdoor storage equipment screening – same color vinyl that will be used for the dumpster screening and the gap to be no taller than the concrete equipment pad at a maximum of six inches.
- Height of the demising landscaping or green screen – no more than five feet in height and subject to further review by Staff.
- Roof-top screening to include a matte finish and all major roof-mounted equipment is to be located within the screening. It was noted that the Applicant indicated the restaurant vent may be located outside the screening. Mr. Boyer stated that this too must be screened so it will be reviewed as it goes to construction.

Board Member Perkins seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0.**

IV. **OLD BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS** - None

VI: **ADJOURNMENT**

Board Member Gruchalla made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Brown seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.**