

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017

CONFERENCE ROOM 102/103

ATTENDANCE:

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

ABSENT:

Mr. Matt Adams

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councilmember, Guy Tilman
Councilmember, Dan Hurt
Planning Commission Chair, Merrell Hansen
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services
Ms. Jessica Henry, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Ms. Cassandra Harashe, Project Planner
Mr. Joseph M. Knight, 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. May 11, 2017

Board Member DeLong made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Weber seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 3 – 0. Since Board Member Clawson was not present at the May meeting, he abstained from the vote.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. Dierbergs the Market Place 3rd Amended Site Development Plan:** An Amended Site Development Plan, Partial Amended Landscape Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for an 11.35 acre tract of land zoned "C-8" Planned Commercial District located east of Clarkson Road and north of Baxter Road.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Knight, Project Planner explained that the request is to add three (3) separate small additions to the front of the Dierbergs supermarket, and one (1) addition to the rear southeast quadrant of the supermarket.

Mr. Knight provided a color aerial showing the site and details of the surrounding zoning areas – to the north is the Drew Station Subdivision, to the east is Eberwein Park, to the south is the Lord of Life Lutheran Church, and to the west is the Clarkson Square shopping center and subdivision.

Proposed Architectural Elevations

There are four small changes requested for the building, and one small change requested for the landscaping as detailed below:

- The first addition is a 500 foot addition requested at the rear of the building. This addition would be constructed of the same material as the existing brick and would blend with the existing structure.
- The three small additions are requested for the front façade.
 - The first small addition is roughly a 420 square foot addition under the already covered walk way and is to be constructed of brick to match the existing brick, and new aluminum and glass windows and doors.
 - The second small addition is roughly a 250 square foot glass addition which would be used as an indoor/outdoor four seasons seating area.
 - The third small addition is roughly a 125 square foot addition under the already covered walkway on the eastern side of the front façade. In its place there would be new aluminum and glass doors and windows.

Landscape Design and Screening

- Minor changes to the landscaping are proposed and include additional landscaping for the central courtyard area, and additional landscaping at a parking lot island located near the southwestern entrance to the site.
- The applicant has requested to eliminate two (2) parking spots near the southwestern entrance to add additional plantings as well as more plantings near the new front addition.

DISCUSSION

In response to Chair Gruchalla's question regarding the small addition located at the rear of the building, Mr. Mark Martin, Dierbergs clarified that the addition is for the deli use.

Front Elevation

Board Member Clawson had concerns that the aluminum and glass storefront addition is lacking integral design and interrupts the existing archway of the building. He did not have any concerns with the proposed landscaping for sign banding.

It was discussed as to whether it would be possible to extend the archway so that it terminates at the columns.

Board Member Weber identified an error on the front elevation which shows the center arch being constructed of solid brick versus the rendering which depicts an arched aluminum and glass window.

The applicant confirmed the discrepancy and added that the front elevation is correct. The center archway will be painted brick, but Board Member Weber felt that the painted brick lacked symmetry.

Roof Design

Chair Gruchalla asked for clarification to the roof design. The applicant explained that the slate shingle-style sloped roof will transition to a flat-style roof with an internal draining system to allow water to drain into the existing stormwater channel.

The applicant provided further explanation of the design details specifically; the free-standing colonnade area which creates an open visual framework to define the courtyard.

Mechanical Equipment

The applicant explained that additional roof-top mechanical units are proposed and will be located behind the tall parapet wall which connects to an existing unit.

Landscaping

Board Member DeLong did not have any issues or concerns with the proposed landscaping.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the 3rd Amended Site Development Plan, Partial Amended Landscape Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Dierbergs the Market Place to **Staff** with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

- The applicant amend the design of the glass addition to ensure better integration with the arched arcade of the existing building façade.
- The drawings be updated to match the proposed changes.

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

- B. Four Seasons Plaza, Brunswick Zone:** Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.46 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial located on the south side of Olive Blvd., west of Highland Park Drive.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Knight, Project Planner explained that the applicant is proposing cosmetic changes to the existing Brunswick Zone by painting three of the four exterior walls. The rear wall of the building will not be painted or altered in any way.

Mr. Knight provided a color aerial showing the site and the surrounding developments and further explained the history of the site.

Scale and Design

- The applicant is proposing to install three-sided rooftop screening for eight (8) equipment units currently on the roof which are visible from the street.

Materials and Color

- The proposed color palette for the building includes; two shades of gray (Charcoal and Grizzle), one shade of red (Cherry Tomato), one shade of white (Extra White), and one shade of gold (Gusto Gold).
- The updated paint scheme proposed for the building utilizes the existing structure while significantly altering the appearance of the building. The material of the exterior walls will not change with this renovation.

Unified Development Design requirements

Design and coordinate all façades with regard to color, types and numbers of materials, architectural form and detailing.

- All façades are receiving a similar treatment in the proposed renovation compared to the existing state. The front and side façades will be painted red, gray, and white with gold and white accent stars painted throughout. The rear façade will remain unpainted. The front façade and west façade have parking adjacent. On those walls are additional accent arrows painted to direct patrons to the building entrance.

Provide architectural details particularly on façades at street level.

- No modifications have been made specifically to the architectural details at street level as all the updates on the facades are painting. The addition of the "Charcoal Gray" roof top screening on eight equipment units is in a similar color to the "Grizzle Gray" painted walls. Currently there is no screening present on the roof top equipment.

Screen rooftop equipment on all visible sides with materials that are an integral part of the architecture. Parapet walls or screen walls shall be treated as an integral part of the architecture and shall not visually weaken the design of the structure.

- The applicant is proposing to install three-sided rooftop screening for eight (8) equipment units currently on the roof which are visible from the street. There are three (3) units not visible from the street, but visible from the top by an apartment complex behind the bowling center that are to be unchanged. The rooftop equipment screening will be “charcoal gray” similar in color to the exterior walls.

The Unified Development Code also outlines “Desirable Practices” for materials and colors which states:

- “Use compatible colors, materials and detailing on a building. Colors, materials and detailing should also be compatible with adjacent buildings and properties. Encourage the use of integral color where practical.”

Mr. Knight provided a comparison photo of an existing Brunswick Zone facility located in St. Peters. Both have similar colors, striping and accent stars and arrows.

The applicant indicated that color samples were not available because they did not arrive in time for the meeting.

DISCUSSION

Board Member Clawson had concerns with the proposed color palette and felt that it was too dramatic and did not match the surrounding development. In his opinion, he felt that the color and elements throughout the entire façade were being used as attention getting signage, and lacked any architectural detailing or materials.

With regards to previous franchise projects discussed by the Board for development within the Valley, there was agreement from the Board that these changes were not consistent and do not adhere to the City’s architectural design standards.

Mechanical Equipment

Chair Gruchalla had concerns that the roof-top mechanical equipment would be visible from the rear. He suggested that screening be added to hide the exposed units from the neighboring residential property.

Board Member Weber made a motion to forward the Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect’s Statement of Design for Four Seasons Plaza, Brunswick Zone as presented, with a recommendation for **denial** to the Planning Commission.

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

Discussion after the Motion

The applicant asked whether a specific color palette would be more desirable. Ms. Henry suggested that the applicant take the feedback from the Board and provide a more compatible design that reflects more of the surrounding development.

Chair Gruchalla added that the code has been updated since the building was originally constructed and he felt that what is being presented is highly questionable.

Due to a conflict of interest, Board Member Mick Weber, Weber Architects recused himself on the next item.

- C. **Tower Center, Lot AA (Pets & Company)**: An Amended Site Development Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and Statement of Design for a 2.01 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the northwest corner of Long Road and Edison Avenue.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Cassie Harashe, Project Planner explained that the applicant currently runs a doggy daycare and boarding facility and would like to expand her facility with an additional approximately 5,500 square feet of outdoor play areas for the animals. Ms. Harashe provided a color aerial showing the site and the surrounding areas.

Circulation System and Access

- The subject site is removing one (1) drive aisle along the west side of the building to accommodate the outdoor play area expansion.

Parking

- Parking is located along the southern and eastern portions of the building. The applicant is proposing to remove a total of six (6) parking spaces for this outdoor play area expansion.

Materials and Color

- Aluminum fencing along the western edge will be similar to the black metal, six-foot tall fencing currently on the site. Additionally, there is an existing beige panel wall near the door that is approximately three feet (3') tall, with an additional three feet (3') of black metal fencing on top.
- The applicant is proposing to increase the amount of this fencing to bring it further away from the building into the parking lot. Finally, the ground in all of the play areas will be covered with K9 grass, a faux turf on top of aggregate to assist with drainage.

DISCUSSION

It has just recently come to the attention of Staff that the applicant would like to add some curbing, "tulip poplar trees", and potentially some permanent shade umbrella-type structures. However, these details have not yet been provided to Staff for review.

Landscape Plan

It was pointed out by Board Member Clawson that no landscape plan has been submitted. He suggested that the parking area be pulled back to allow for some planters or plantings as a buffer and to help soften the area near the fence line and entrance.

Ms. Henry responded that a partial landscape plan would be required to include trees to help soften the fencing area. She added that removal of the drivable surface area would increase the open space area.

There was discussion as to whether the proposed shade structure will require review by the ARB. Ms. Henry stated that Staff will do a thorough review to ensure that the proposed structure meets the UDC, and that specific criteria is met such as; the colors, quantity, and location.

Mr. Wyse commented that Staff will discuss with the Chair to determine the appropriateness of the structure and whether ARB review will be necessary.

Applicant Comment

Mr. George Stock, Stock and Associates explained that the asphalt will remain and artificial turf will be applied over the gravel area to allow for adequate drainage. It was noted that the applicant was unaware of the proposed shade structure. He did not have any issues by adding some planters or plantings near the entrance along the fence line area.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the Amended Site Development Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and Statement of Design for Tower Center, Lot AA (Pets & Company) to **Staff** with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

- *Pull back the fencing closest to the entrance from Edison Avenue to be further away from the drive aisle to allow for curbing, plantings, and/or planters in order to soften the appearance of the fence.*
- *Submission of the Landscape Plan showing the additional trees and plantings for review.*
- *Provide detailed plans of the proposed shade structure to review for appropriateness and contact the ARB Chair for additional comments.*

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

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

V. NEW BUSINESS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT 6:59 p.m.