THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2020

VIRTUAL MEETING VIA ZOOM PLATFORM

ATTENDANCE:
Mr. Matt Adams
Mr. Rick Clawson, Vice-Chair
Mr. Doug DeLong
Mr. Scott Starling
Mr. Mick Weber, Chair

ABSENT:

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
Planning Commission Chair, Merrell Hansen
Planning Commission Liaison, Allison Harris
Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, Staff Liaison
Mr. Chris Dietz, Planner
Mrs. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Weber called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. May 14, 2020

Board Member Clawson made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Starling seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed 2021 Meeting Schedule

Board Member Adams joined the meeting at this point.

Board Member Starling made a motion to approve the 2021 Meeting Schedule. Board Member DeLong seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 - 0.**

B. Architectural Review Design Standards Overview: Staff Presentation

STAFF PRESENTATION
Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner gave a brief summary explaining the ARB's role as a professional recommending body to the Planning Commission.

- Meetings (when, who, and what we need)
- Purpose (why we meet)
- Requirements (who has to be there and what has to happen)
- Structure (process of meeting)
- Development Timeline (process for site plan review)
- Comprehensive Plan – Overall plan goals: Design streets to enhance the community
- Unified Development Code – Submittal Requirements, Site Design, and Building Design

Back in May there was discussion by the Board regarding amendments to the elevations of existing buildings. In some scenarios, these buildings pre-date the inception of the Architectural Review Board and may even pre-date the incorporation of the City.

These buildings, in current form, may not meet the Architectural Design Standards in the Unified Development Code by which the Board reviews them. Although, it was acknowledged that the ARB understands that these buildings may not be able to be updated into something that meets these standards immediately, as requests come through, each request should further the building towards compliancy with the standards of our code, and the amendments being requested should definitely not extend further deviation from the City's code.

The Board asked Staff to review the Architectural Standards to evaluate the potential for language that could/should be implemented to reinforce this notion. Given that these meeting are recorded, it may serve as a guide to benefit any new future Board members on the overall structure and process of the Board.

The following agenda item identifies the researched design code in surrounding municipalities, reviewed the design standards of the Chesterfield UDC, and will present some draft language.

Information only – no action at this time.

C. General Requirements for Building Design Discussion

STAFF PRESENTATION

Chris Dietz, Planner explained that Staff was approached by ARB to provide guidance regarding redevelopment of existing buildings. Staff was directed by the Planning and Public Works Committee to review the code for the potential additional language regarding this matter as well as defining language which refines screening for rooftop mechanical units, within specific geographical areas of the city.

Review Timeline

Prior to adoption, the following would be required:

- A Public Hearing, recommendation by the Planning Commission, review by the Planning and Public Works Committee, and two readings of a bill before the City Council.

Mr. Dietz then provided a detailed description of the UDC's Architectural Review Design Standards with Staff's recommended language to be incorporated into each section of the code pertaining to the following:

Change #1 - Modification to Existing Buildings

- *Existing Structures: All additions and exterior renovations to existing non-residential structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provisions of the UDC.*

Proposed Language (General Requirements for Building Design):

7. Existing Structures. All additions and exterior renovations to existing structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provisions of Section 405.05.101 D. of the Unified Development Code.

Change #2: Rooftop Mechanical Units

- *Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.*

Proposed Language (General Requirements for Building Design):

2. Screening

k.) Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

Change #3: Supplemental Changes - Staff identified a few minor inconsistencies with the design standards. Those line items to be removed shown in Red.

Proposed Language (Applicability Exemptions):

3. Exemptions.

c.) Non-residential additions and architectural amendments that meet ~~all of~~ the following criteria may be considered for administrative approval by the Director of Planning. Said approval shall be at the discretion of the Director of Planning if:

(1) The proposed addition is less than 5,000 square feet; or

~~(2) The proposed addition does not impact the site such that the approved plan for the site must be review by utility and fire protection agencies;~~

Proposed Language (Signage):

5. Signage. Signs and sign packages are reviewed through a separate process. All signs shall adhere to the Unified Development Code (UDC) and/or the Sign Package for the site. ~~For existing buildings under review for additional or alterations the following shall apply:~~

~~a.) Integrate sign location into the building or development design theme.~~

~~b.) New sign locations proposed for existing buildings shall be compatible with existing building signage locations. Where no sign package exists, unifying elements such as; size, shape, or materials shall be used to create continuity.~~

The following are points and options for discussion with the Board pertaining to the proposed modifications:

- Agree to move forward with existing language
- Move forward without additional language
- Continue discussion at the next meeting based on input from the Board
-

DISCUSSION

Change #1 – Modification to Existing Buildings

Chair Weber explained that depending on the project, and the percentage of improvements, the changes would be examined on a case by case basis. He questioned whether the design components will allow for transition of additional landscaping. Mr. Knight confirmed that the landscaping must adhere to the approved landscape plan prior to approval of additional plans.

For cohesiveness, Board Member Clawson felt that the modifications should apply universally throughout the whole structure.

Change #2 – Rooftop Mechanical Equipment

Chair Weber felt that due to certain differences in topography, the sight lines of rooftop equipment should also be taken into consideration.

Board Member Clawson asked for clarification whether the change applies to existing buildings or new development. He had concerns that any update to an existing older building held to this requirement would generate costly improvements and deter renovations. It was further discussed whether the changes should be written in the code or site-specific ordinance.

Mr. Knight replied that it will only apply to new development. However, any changes to existing mechanical units will need to be enclosed.

In response to Chair Weber's questions, Mr. Knight defined the meaning of "penthouses" and the similarity to the existing RGA building.

After considerable discussion as to the next steps, Staff will draft the recommended language but the Board agreed to move forward for Public Hearing to avoid delays.

Board Member's DeLong and Adams exited the meeting at this point.

Motion

Board Member Starling made a motion to accept the additional language in RED with the recommended changes in *GREEN* and to move forward to the Planning Commission for Public Hearing:

Change #1 – Modification of Existing Buildings

- Existing Structures. All additions and exterior renovations to existing structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provision of Section 405.05.101 D. of the Unified Development Code. ***Exterior additions shall be incorporated into one cohesive design with the existing structure.***

Change #2 – Rooftop Mechanical Equipment

- Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs ***of new buildings*** within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

Board Member Clawson seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 3 - 0.**

V. OTHER

VI. ADJOURNMENT 7:08 p.m.