II. A.

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 8, 2015
Room 102/103

ATTENDANCE:
Mr. Matt Adams
Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Rick Clawson
Mr. Bud Gruchalla, Chair
Mr. Gary Perkins
Mr. Mick Weber, Vice-Chair

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
Council Member, Nancy Greenwood
Council Member, Dan Hurt
Council Member, Bruce DeGroot
Planning Commission Liaison, Merrell Hansen
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner
Ms. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. October 23, 2014

Board Member Clawson made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Brown seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 6 - 0.**

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

A. Four Seasons Plaza West AAE: Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 2.35 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the south side of Olive Boulevard, west of River Valley Drive.

Staff Report
Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner provided aerial photos of the existing site which is currently zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District and is surrounded by a mix of zoning

districts including residential to the south and west and planned commercial to the east. The zoning mix continues north of Olive Boulevard.

The building was originally developed in 1984. Mr. Raiche provided additional photos of the architectural elevations, vegetation and fence along the existing tree line, as well as photos of the surrounding uses.

The request is for a re-roof, re-paint, and addition of a stucco parapet wall mounted on the roof.

- The parapet wall will match the existing gable materials and will incorporate the same "honeysuckle" paint color that will be used on the existing stucco gables for the dominant color.
- A complementary accent color is proposed along the bottom edge of the stucco parapet wall to provide slight variation in the design.
- Shingles to match existing asphalt shingles.

Although the proposed changes are not fully integrated into the existing roof structure, the applicant has made efforts to use materials and colors that will provide some consistency with the existing structure.

Staff is requesting recommendation from the Board, which would go back to Staff for administrative review.

DISCUSSION

There was considerable discussion of the parapet wall and the gable–style roof. Board Member Clawson explained that by adding vertical height it will allow them to create a sign band to the building. He felt that the proposal does not integrate with the existing architecture of the facility.

Chair Gruchalla expressed his concerns about the visibility of the parapet struts while traveling along Olive Boulevard and near the existing residential subdivision. Mr. Raiche did a site visit and pointed out that due to an existing sound wall and tree line, the parapet wall was not visible from the roadway.

Question was raised about the 8" separation on the front edge with the gap at the bottom and whether it could be smaller in size. Mr. Matt Wolf, Wolf Architecture, explained that the gap was designed so that water could come through and drain with the gutter system. The 8" size is necessary to prevent snow from building up behind it.

Board Member Clawson stated that the existing architecture is acceptable and felt the applicant needs to provide a solution to better integrate the proposal with the existing architecture. The applicant explained that they are trying to address the current problem where signage is not consistent in size and is being hung from a beam. As a solution they are willing to extend the gables to engage with the parapet and bring the architecture back to the facade. The property owner further explained that the

modifications are to improve the overall aesthetics of the building to help promote new tenants.

Ms. Nassif explained that the Board is a recommending body and based on its recommendation, Staff will either approve or deny the request. Chair Gruchalla pointed out that the issue is integrating the parapet wall with the existing architecture.

Chair Gruchalla then summarized the points previously discussed;

1) Extend the parapet wall around the south elevation to conceal mounting bracket for proposed signage.
2) Extend and/or integrate the parapet wall around the west elevation so that it doesn't stop in the middle of the gable.
3) Integrate the parapet all into the existing structure. This could include pulling the gables out to the front of the parapet wall to tie the wall into the gables rather than blocking them.

Board Member Weber made a motion to **deny** the Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for Four Seasons Plaza West as submitted with the recommendations previously discussed along with the following additions to Staff for further review:

1) Articulate details with the roofing.
2) If new materials are introduced, provide material samples.

Board Member Brown seconded the motion.

Council Member Greenwood asked if the proposal could be returned to the ARB for review. Ms. Nassif explained that the Board is a recommending board and they cannot hold projects. However, Staff will work with the Applicant and will stay in contact with the Chair. This project is an administrative review, therefore will not proceed to the Planning Commission. Whomever is the approval authority for a project, can request another review by the full ARB, but the ARB themselves do not have that ability.

Chair Gruchalla stated that the board is comfortable with staff reviewing and is not requesting that the proposal is brought back to the board.

The motion then passed by a voice vote of 6 – 0.

IV. OLD BUSINESS - None

V. NEW BUSINESS - None

VI: ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Brown made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Adams seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 6 – 0 and the meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.**