

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JULY 13, 2017
Room 101

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Rick Clawson
Mr. Doug DeLong
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Mick Weber

ABSENT:

Mr. Matt Adams

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councilmember Dan Hurt
Planning Commission Chair, Merrell Hansen
Planning Commission Liaison, Laura Lueking
Ms. Jessica Henry, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Ms. Cecilia Dvorak, 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. June 8, 2017

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 4 - 0.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

Due to a conflict of interest, Board Member Doug DeLong, Landscape Architect recused himself on the first item.

- A. Friendship Village of West County 9th ASDP:** An Amended Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 34.57 acre tract of land zoned "R-4" Residence District with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Nursing Homes located on the north side of Olive Boulevard west of Arrowhead Estates Lane.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Cecilia Dvorak, Project Planner explained that the request is for construction of one (1), four-story assisted living and skilled nursing building, and five (5) additions to the existing structures.

Ms. Dvorak provided background history along with color aerials and renderings of the site and surrounding areas.

Site Relationships

- Each building is connected through a series of sidewalks and striped crosswalks provide pedestrian connectivity across drive aisles.
- The subject site is located within the Southwest Quadrant of the Chesterfield Village with frontage on Olive Boulevard and Arrowhead Estates Lane.

Buildings to be demolished

- The proposal also requests the removal of an existing building and garage.

Circulation System and Access

- The site continues to have one (1) main entrance and exit access point in the southeast of the site to Olive Boulevard and one (1) “emergency access only” access point connecting to Arrowhead Estates Lane in the southeast.
- A second “emergency access only” access point off of Braefield Drive is proposed to the west of the site.
- Internally, there is one (1) primary route for vehicles to circulate throughout the site, with an additional loop that connects detached villas to the rest of the campus.
- Each new addition and the addition of Building A have either adjoining or neighboring courtyards promoting pedestrian circulation throughout the site.

Parking

- Surface parking for the new Building A is directly in front of the building. Most of the surface parking for the remaining buildings are combined in front of Building B and next to Building D near the main entrance.
- The site will have a significant increase in surface parking compared to the existing site. Also Building D will have an additional lower level parking garage.

Retaining Walls

- The development also includes two (2) retaining walls to the south and southwest of the site. Both walls are to be terraced with levels of no more than five (5) feet in height. The walls are to be constructed using a versa-lok system and are to match the existing retaining walls on the campus.

Scale, Design, Materials and Color

- The building is designed to complement the existing campus aesthetic while advancing the feel to provide a residential scale and visual interest.

- Exterior materials used throughout the proposed renovation are a mix of masonry brick veneer, stone masonry, painted cementitious horizontal lap siding, and painted cementitious panel siding with batten trim detailing.

Architectural Elevations

- Roof elements will be traditional, gable and shed forms clad with either architectural grade shingles or painted standing seam sheet metal roofing.

Mechanical Equipment

- All the roof-mounted equipment will be screened from view by raised parapet walls.

Landscape Design, Screening and Fencing

- There is a 30 foot landscape buffer along Olive Boulevard and a 20 foot buffer along Arrowhead Estates Lane. A large amount of the tree and shrubbery plantings are on the southwestern boundary lines.
- Due to inconsistencies, the Color Site Plan and the Landscape plan are being further addressed by Staff.
- The northwest quadrant of the site is heavily wooded and this natural wooded buffer area extends along the northern property line, and will be preserved.

Lighting

- The applicant is adding new lighting fixtures but not adding any new fixture types. The pole-mounted decorative light fixture will be utilized along the internal drive lanes.
- A pathway light fixture will be utilized along the pedestrian walking paths within the courtyard areas.

Ms. Dvorak explained that there are a number of UDC requirements for multi-family architecture which are relevant to this project; including architectural expression of individual dwelling units, variety and changes in color, material and planes to articulate facades, and visual transitions between the street and the dwelling units.

This proposal does not emphasize the individual dwelling units by finish or color, but the residential balconies express the individual dwelling units within the building. This also provides outdoor space for each dwelling unit as required by multi-family architecture.

DISCUSSION

Applicant Comment

Brian Paul, Gray Design Group provided details to the color, style and location of the proposed material samples. The brick and stone will match the buildings within the surrounding campus. The roof will be constructed of “dark bronze” metal roofing material. The color of the window / door frames will be painted white and tan.

Board Member Clawson commented that the proposed changes are consistent with the other buildings in the campus and adds visual improvements as seen from Olive Boulevard.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the Amended Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Friendship Village of West County, **as presented, with a recommendation for approval to the Planning Commission.**

Board Member Weber seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 3 - 0.** *As previously stated, due to a conflict of interest, Board Member DeLong abstained from the vote.*

B. Architectural Accent Lighting

Ms. Jessica Henry, Senior Planner explained that Staff was directed to review and develop proposed regulations to be incorporated into the Unified Development Code (UDC) pertaining to architectural accent lighting applications. As a first step in the process, Staff is requesting input on this matter from the ARB.

Ms. Henry provided several color photos showing Architectural accent lighting which have been proposed on a number of recent projects within Chesterfield along with other locations as listed below.

Projects within Chesterfield

- *i-Fly Indoor Skydiving* – this building was approved but never constructed (use of Floodlighting Luminaires)
- *Holiday Inn Express* – the project is currently under construction, and approved without any accent lighting (use of LED Wall Washer lighting)
- *Metro Lighting* – the lighting was installed without obtaining proper approval (use of Color Graze beam bar angle lighting)
- *Top Golf* – this project was approved with pending construction (mixture of lighting styles; rope lights, flex lights, bar lights, floodlights, and LED accent lights). This project was limited to the use of one (1) color and static.
- *Townplace Suites* – this project was approved with pending construction within the Chesterfield Blue Valley development (use of two (2) types of LED lighting at the entry and under the cornice)
- *Hampton Inn* – this project was approved (use of building-mounted Cornice Lighting)

- *Brew Hub* – this project was approved but never constructed (use of lighting within the wooden reveals to visually break up the façade).

Other locations

- St. Louis Science Center (utilizes color and projected images)
- St. Louis Public Library (recently renovated and reopened, which utilizes classical historic accent lighting)
- Locations throughout the country (use of more modern lighting)

Ms. Henry further explained the purpose of the ARB as identified under the Architectural Review Design Standards and the Lighting Standards of the Unified Development Code (UDC). Staff references these two sections of the code to prepare draft regulations.

With the numerous technological advances, architectural accent lighting has nearly limitless applications and has the potential to greatly impact the style, quality, and consistency of architectural design.

Staff has prepared the following list for the ARB's consideration and to help guide the discussion:

1. Static vs. changes/shifting lighting applications
2. Type and number of fixtures
3. Limitations on allowed number of colors
4. Limitations on location – e.g., primary façade vs. all facades
5. Limitations on percentage of building/façade coverage
6. Type of light projection – e.g., beams vs. wall washers
7. Ground-mounted vs. building-mounted applications
8. Proper shielding and prevention of light projections beyond roofline
9. Appropriateness of lighting applications for different uses.
10. Geographical limitations – e.g., restricted to certain areas of the City
11. Hours of operation for lighting.
- 12. *Specialty / accent lighting (Board recommendation)***

DISCUSSION

Board Member Clawson explained that extreme caution needs to be made by not prohibiting innovative use of these types lighting without resulting in the “Las Vegas Strip” or “Times Square” effect. In his opinion, he felt that the lighting should accent the traditional architectural features and not be used as an attention getting device.

He commented that the type and number of fixtures is dependent upon the style and size of the building. He suggested that the guidelines discourage the use of substantial ranges of color to limit the “rainbow” effect, but handled on a case by case basis.

Below is a list of Board Member Clawson's concerns:

- Computer control use of the lighting
- Animation of the lighting
- Movement
- Color Change
- Locations on the buildings
- Hologram use

Below is a list of Board Member Clawson's suggestions:

- Provide visual examples of the proposed lighting in the design intent.
- Provide clear and concise drawings indicating location, size of fixture, and proposed lighting effects.

Chair Gruchalla stated that there needs to be some consideration regarding distraction, location, and the number of lights. Dependent upon the distance, the focus, and type of lenses design perimeters need to be considered.

Board Member Weber suggested that high quality renderings be provided. He commented that under the right circumstances the lights can be incorporated very elegantly as shown on the color images of the historical buildings.

Landscape Lighting

Ms. Henry explained that the code allows lighting of signs and retaining walls.

Commissioner Hansen commented that if done tastefully, the lighting can actually bring a building to life and add character to even warehouse or industrial style buildings.

It was in agreement from the Board that 1) specialty lighting, and 2) accent lighting be reviewed separately and that the submittal packages include the use of high-quality images - colors, materials, animation, etc.

Councilmember Hurt has serious concerns that the lighting may become a problem as it approaches residential areas within the Urban Core. He noted the code limitations of lumens at the property line. To allow for flexibility, he suggested limiting the number of lumens, frequency, number of colors, etc.

Ms. Henry explained the difficulties from a Staff level of review in that with the new LED applications, the light trespass may not be near the property line, but the brightness of the lighting is visible from a distance.

Chesterfield Mall

Board Member Clawson pointed out that with the potential redevelopment of Chesterfield Mall, the new lighting advances in technology need to be addressed. He suggested that some minor adjustments to the current guidelines be considered at this time to allow the ability to move forward.

Councilmember Hurt felt that City Council would not be opposed to some minor adjustments. There was substantial discussion of lighting as it could potentially affect the redevelopment of the mall.

Staff is diligently working on a draft to be completed by the year's end 2017 to be brought forth to the Planning and Public Works Committee for further direction.

IV. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS** - None

VI: **ADJOURNMENT** 7:14