

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
April 14, 2016
Room 101

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Matt Adams
Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Rick Clawson
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Mick Weber

ABSENT:

Mr. Doug DeLong

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councilmember Dan Hurt
Planning Commission Chair, Stanley Proctor
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Ms. Jessica Henry, 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. March 10, 2016

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 4 – 0.

Board Member Adams arrived immediately following approval of the meeting summary.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. Chesterfield Village Mall (i-FLY):** Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Landscape Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 4.09 acre lot of land zoned "C8" Planned Commercial District located south of South Outer Forty Road west of its intersection with Chesterfield Center, more specifically addressed 595 Chesterfield Center.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner explained the request is for an indoor skydiving facility located on an out lot of the Chesterfield Mall. The subject site formerly housed

the Chesterfield Ciné, which was demolished several years ago and the site has not been redeveloped. When the theater was demolished, the building area was graded and vegetated. The parking area was left in place and has largely deteriorated and does not adhere to the current lighting or landscaping standards.

Ms. Henry provided aerial, and several photographs of the site and the surrounding area.

Scale and Design

- The proposed building has a foot print of 5,180 square feet and the total gross floor area is 11,200 square feet.
- The applicant is proposing a multi-story building that is approximately 67 feet in height.
- The building is designed to facilitate the indoor sky-diving use. Mr. Henry added the function of the building largely dictates the form of the building.

Parking

- There are a large number of parking spaces in front of the proposed building and while the Unified Development Code has a parking maximum, it was noted that the entire Chesterfield Mall is parked together under a specific parking rate established within the planned district ordinance.
- Overall parking for the Mall is still under review with Staff to determine whether the iFLY facility can be accommodated. Staff is also reviewing whether there are any excess parking spaces that can be eliminated, and whether the number of access points along the internal mall ring road be reduced.

Proposed Front Elevations

- The building structurally is designed to facilitate the indoor sky-diving use. Each side of the building is comprised of a return air tower that funnels air to the flight chamber, located in the center of the building.
- The buildings return air towers are painted a neutral beige color.
- The center portion of the building are comprised of EIFS in three different colors – including two complimentary shades of blue in a vertical striping pattern to provide some color variations.
- Several large windows and a small balcony are featured along the front façade.

Proposed Rear Elevations

- The mechanical equipment yard is located to the rear of the building and includes a CMU block wall which fully screens the equipment and trash enclosure.

Rooftop Equipment

- The rooftop mechanical units are fully screened by the parapet wall at a 54' platform level provided by the protruding center portion of the building and not visible to public view.

Landscape Design and Screening

- As required by the Unified Development Code, trees are provided throughout the parking lot and along the adjacent roadways. Landscaped beds are proposed along the building elevations, and the large area surrounding the area will be graded and seeded and remain open greenspace.
- Street trees as required have been added along the mall access drive. The proposed landscape plan is still under review by Staff.

Lighting

- The lighting plan proposes the typical fully shielded, full cut-off pole mounted parking lot light fixtures and building entry wall mounted light fixtures, both of which are utilitarian in nature. Additionally, canopy light fixtures are proposed at the entry. Each of these fixtures meets City code requirements.
- In addition to these, the applicant is proposing to utilize façade accent lighting on all elevations. This accent lighting consists of projections of a faint blue light on various portions of the façade.

As part of Staff's review, additional information was requested as to how these lights would look when illuminating the building. Ms. Henry stated that the criteria for such lights is that they must be architecturally integrated into the building and serve as an accent to the site with no light passing beyond the building. The applicant provided a reference photo of the Houston facility which does not appear to reflect the ground-mounted "slightly blue-colored light" casting fixtures. Staff will be requesting that the applicant submit additional information specific to the particular fixtures and lighting style that are being requested for the proposed Chesterfield i-FLY development.

Staff is particularly interested in receiving feedback on the use of accent lighting fixtures from the ARB. Staff will continue review of this item and will request further information prior to Planning Commission review.

Color Renderings

- Several color renderings were provided identifying several different views of the proposed building.
- The subject building's height is comparable in size to the existing Dillard's store at its maximum height.

DISCUSSION

Lighting

Board Member Clawson asked for further information regarding the blue flood lighting. Ms. Henry noted that the proposed flood lights are ground-mounted and not distinctively blue in color. Because it is difficult to get a representation of what the lights will look like, Staff will be requesting further information.

Board Member Clawson stated that he feels the accent lighting on the two towers is a positive attribute to the building. Ms. Henry stated that the Applicant has advised that

the light cast will not extend beyond the building elevations. She also noted that any type of search lighting is prohibited.

Signage

In response to Board Member Brown's questions, Ms. Henry stated that the red "halo" style lighting can be permitted in smaller applications and will be reviewed at Staff level as part of signage. The proposed iFLY logo is also considered signage and would have to comply with the UDC. It is undetermined at this time whether the applicant will be requesting a sign package or applying for separate sign permits.

Board Member Weber asked whether signage is allowed on all sides of the building. Ms. Henry explained that the UDC does not permit signage on all four sides of the building. A sign package request would be necessary in order to achieve additional signage which would require review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Landscape Plan

Board Member Clawson had concerns that landscaping is only shown around three sides of the building as well as the lack of landscaping near the pedestrian area between the parking lot and the front entry. He felt that if some parking spaces are eliminated, additional landscaping could be incorporated near the front door.

In response to Board Member Brown's question to the basis of the vast amount of turf, Ms. Henry explained that when the Cine' was demolished, the building area was graded and seeded. Landscaping is not being proposed in this area and, as the mall is retaining ownership of the entire parcel, additional future redevelopment could occur in this area.

Parking

Because the mall is parked as one entity, Ms. Henry explained that it's required to have nearly 6,000 parking spaces. The applicant will be providing staff with an up-to-date parking worksheet and exhibit showing the existing parking spaces. If it is determined that some parking spaces can be eliminated while maintaining the required parking, Staff will explore that option.

Material samples were provided and the applicant explained the location of the design, color palette, and materials.

Although Board Member Doug DeLong was unable to attend the meeting, Mr. Raiche presented the following comments on Mr. DeLong's behalf:

- Board Member DeLong felt that the landscape plan does not meet the requirements of the ordinance as far as percentages of tree species for projects having over 50 trees. In particular the evergreen trees are well below the 20%. The Japanese Tree Lilac is not a canopy tree, but an ornamental. He would not consider a River Birch an ornamental but a canopy tree. Mr. Raiche explained that these comments are technical items that are a part of Staff's review and will be provided to the applicant as necessary.

- There does not appear to be any plantings around the dumpster enclosure or mechanical yard. He feels that the type of plantings within the first two islands should be continued in the other three islands along the drive in front of the building. Mr. Raiche clarified that these areas do have trees proposed but do not contain low lying plantings.

Applicant Comments

Mr. Frank Weber, Architect on the project explained that the parking spaces should accommodate the maximum occupancy of the building. Mr. Raiche further explained that Staff will review to certify that all parking requirements are met. In response to a question regarding noise from the internal equipment, the applicant added that the building is well insulated and the noticeable sound will be limited to the front entryway of the building. A small retail facility will be available within the building.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Landscape Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for Chesterfield Village Mall (iFLY) to the Planning Commission ***with the following recommendations:***

- Integrate and soften the pedestrian areas with additional landscaping near the front entry.
- Incorporate additional landscaping in the row of landscape islands adjacent to the front elevation of the building as previously explained by Board Member DeLong's comment.

Board Member Weber seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 – 0.**

- B. River Crossings, Lot 4 (Holiday Inn Express):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.17 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located east of Arnage Rd., north of Chesterfield Airport Road.

Mr. Raiche stated that the applicants were not in attendance to answer any questions or provide the Board with material samples necessary for review. Mr. Raiche further explained that as a recommending body the ARB cannot hold an item, but it's within the purview of the Board to recommend Denial based upon lack of information. Mr. Raiche explained that Ms. Henry is prepared to present the project and Staff will answer any questions from the Board.

Board discussion occurred regarding the fact that although the applicant submitted revised documents for the Board's consideration, there are still outstanding issues. As stated above, because the applicants were not in attendance, material samples, and color palette were unavailable so the issues could not be addressed.

The general consensus of the Board was to provide Staff with a list of the outstanding issues and go back to the applicant with a summary of those concerns as noted below:

- **Consistency of the actual building color** – While the building is supposed to be two colors, the renderings indicate the building in two different colors in three different versions.
- **Screening of the rooftop mechanical equipment** – The rooftop units are shown as screened but there is question as to whether all of it is adequately screened. Consistency in depicted height of equipment between the elevations and the sight line study is needed.
- **Request a sample of the actual building materials.**
- **Canopy material** - not provided
- **Provide clarification for building materials of various minor elements (e.g. brick caps, bands, etc.)**
- **Patio fence material and color** – not provided
- **Window color and materials** - not provided
- **Lack of EIFS joints depicted**
- **Consider a more neutral tone for the EIFS elements**
- **Consider additional brick patterns for variation**
- **Purpose of the vertical stripes to the facade** – detracts from the simplistic form of the building

Ms. Henry further addressed the following previous concerns:

- **Lighting** - All the accent lighting was eliminated from the proposal. The lighting plan now proposes the typical fully shielded, full cut-off utilitarian pole-mounted parking lot light fixtures and building entry wall-mounted light fixtures.
- **Increased Articulation** – the applicant has added a cornice along the top of the building, along with pilasters at various points along the building
- **Architectural elements** – the applicant has added white EIFS band and cornice is carried around the building for a sense of completion.

Board Member Weber then added the following recommendations:

- Work with the color of the EIFS on the top so it's not snow white relative to the rest of the building
- Simplify by taking the lines out of the tan masses
- More articulation is needed of the cap

Mr. Raiche stated that Staff fully understands the Board's concerns and will notify the applicant of the Board's recommendation of denial. In addition to the Board's recommendation, Staff will provide a summary of the concerns discussed by the Board to provide some feedback for the applicants. Mr. Raiche explained that if the motion is for denial, the list of concerns would not be listed as conditions of the motion.

Councilmember Hurt commended and thanked the Board for their professional input over the years associated with the development within the Valley. He then explained that during his travels, he has discovered that structures differ from one location to another, and therefore suggested that Staff request photographs along with material samples for review. Mr. Raiche agreed with Councilmember Hurt's comments and noted that photographs have been requested by Staff in the past to assist in evaluation of materials.

Ms. Henry stated that actual photos were requested for this item specifically at the February 11th ARB meeting. The site specific ordinance for the River Crossings development requires 75% or greater of brick masonry units. However, the applicants stated that they did not have an existing hotel to use as a reference for this custom designed hotel given the use of brick as the primary building material. Board Member Weber expressed his concern over the lack of effort to detail, renderings, clarity and design for a second time which could've been prevented.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for River Crossings, Lot 4 (Holiday Inn Express) to the Planning Commission ***with the recommendation to DENY as presented.***

Board Member Weber seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 - 0.**

Planning Chair Proctor added that the Planning Commission relies heavily on the comments made by the ARB.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Raiche gave a brief project update:

- Trails West Village of Green Trails, Lot 270B – awaiting resubmission after providing feedback from last ARB meeting.
- Peter Steffan, Proposed Lot 1 (Auto Zone) – Revisions were made to address ARB's comments and the item is going before Planning Commission April 25th

Board Member Brown excused herself from the meeting at this point.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion of ARB motions and recommendations

Chair Gruchalla explained that after the last ARB meeting some discussion was held pertaining to the Board's authority to recommend denial of a project.

The motion language has provided the Board the opportunity to separate each motion depending upon the issues presented, which in turn, helps identify the points raised to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Raiche explained that there are effectively three (3) motions currently available to the Board including a motion to approve as presented, deny as presented, or to approve with conditions. In an effort to clear up any confusion about these available options, Mr. Raiche provided a recommendation to the Board regarding minor changes to the language that Staff will use in Staff reports for the second motion available to the board. The recommendation is as follows:

- 2) “I move to forward the Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Landscape Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect’s Statement of Design for Kraus Farm Office Center (OPUS I & II), to the Planning Commission ***with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions...***”

Mr. Raiche stated that even though a list of items will not be included in a motion for denial, Staff will still be able to summarize the reasons for the denial recommendation to the Planning Commission. This will provide clear input and give the Planning Commission the ability to send it back to ARB or deny the project. Planning Chair Proctor added that when the PC gets a recommendation from the ARB, the Commission will always ask Staff what the applicant has done to address concerns raised. He added that the PC takes the recommendations from the ARB very seriously. Chair Gruchalla explained that the ARB is an advisory board and does not determine the final outcome of a project.

Mr. Raiche also reminded the Board that once their recommendation is made for denial or with conditions, the following outcomes are possible:

- 1) The applicant can voluntarily ask to present to ARB again,
- 2) Staff can recommend to PC that the item is sent back to ARB,
- 3) PC can decide on their own to send it back to ARB, or
- 4) Staff can solicit input from the ARB chair before presenting to PC.

Councilmember Hurt suggested that because some projects do not require review by the City Council that they be notified of any upcoming projects based upon the unfavorable recommendation by the ARB. Mr. Raiche will present Councilmember Hurt’s suggestion to Planning and Development Services Director, Ms. Aimee Nassif. Other than normal outcomes, Staff will solicit input from the ARB chair before presenting to the Planning Commission. Councilmember Hurt also suggested that the current vacancy of the Board be brought to the Planning and Public Works Committee for discussion.

VI: **ADJOURNMENT – 7:06**