

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
December 12, 2013**

PRESENT

Mr. Matt Adams
Ms. Mary Brown
Ms. Carol Duenke
Mr. Rick Clawson
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Gary Perkins
Ms. Debbie Midgley, Planning Commission Liaison
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner, Planning Department Liaison
Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner
Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner
Ms. Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Mick Weber

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**A. November 14, 2013**

Board Member Gary Perkins made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written.

Board Member Bud Gruchalla seconded the motion.

Motion passed with a voice vote of 4-0 with Board Members Carol Duenke and Rick Clawson abstaining.

Chair Duenke stated there has been a request to revise the order of the projects on the agenda. The architect for projects A (Monarch Center) and C (Spirit of St. Louis Airpark) is the same; therefore, they are requesting the meeting order be changed. All parties involved concurred with the change.

Board Member Rick Clawson made a motion to amend the order of the projects listed on the agenda.

Board Member Bud Gruchalla seconded the motion.

Motion passed with a voice vote of 6-0.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. Monarch Center, Lots A and B (Edison Express):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 2.58 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Long Road and Edison Avenue.

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner, presented the project request for Monarch Center, Lots A and B, for the Edison Express development. The request is for a convenience store, gas station, car wash, and fast food tenant restaurant. The site is located in the northeastern quadrant of Edison Avenue and Long Road. Both Lots A and B total just over 3 acres in size with a remaining 7.88 acres for future development. The surrounding area is only partially developed.

The proposed building is 11,900 square feet in size and the gas pump canopy is 6,100 square feet in size with eight pump islands. There are two shared access drives for the development; one off of Edison Avenue and other off of Long Road. Both accesses will serve as access to future Lot C.

The governing Ordinance for this site contains several site design requirements. One requirement is the outdoor seating and plaza, which is located north of the building. It requires a public art installation so a concrete pad is being provided at the northwest corner of the site with some type of artwork. It also requires enlarged landscaped islands between each row of parking so the applicant has proposed to increase the islands by approximately 100 feet above City requirements for a double row of parking containing two trees. The site also includes an ATM. The ordinance requires additional landscaping and screening at the ATM, which is depicted on the landscape plan. There are several bioretention areas shown on the plan and they will serve as the required landscape buffer along Long Road and Edison Avenue. The landscape plan is still under review as part of the site development review process so the location of the plantings is not set yet.

The building is comprised mainly of brick, stone, glass with wooden accents. The roof is basically flat except for the metal curved roof panels matching the front canopy over the front entry and side. The rear of the building is primarily EIFS with some brick along the bottom and masonry columns. An outdoor storage area constructed of brick and vinyl plank fence is proposed at the rear of the building. This is not an opaque enclosure and currently does not meet the Architectural Review standards. They are proposing prefabricated cornices and

parapets. They are proposing a raised parapet on the north elevation that should screen any rooftop equipment.

Discussion:

Board Member Matt Adams suggested the colored stone on the columns be carried all the way up to the roof line for visual effect. He also asked about the color of the downspouts. The applicant stated it would be bronze to match the roof.

Board Member Rick Clawson asked what is the proposed material shown on the bottom wainscoting on the east elevation. The applicant stated it was brick. As far as the color of the brick, the applicant stated they have been working on the color for the elevations and started to hand out another plan sheet that was not included in the packet. At that point, Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director asked the applicant if he was passing out a new elevation from what staff has already reviewed. After the applicant confirmed this, Ms. Nassif stated her concern to the Board about introducing new elevations that have not gone through the usual staff review process prior to being presented to the Board. After some discussion on how to proceed, Chair Carol Duenke suggested that the Board continue their discussion to see the extent of the Board's concerns and then decide on how to proceed, however, the discussion will be based on what has been submitted in the packets.

Board Member Clawson stated this is a four-sided building that will be visible on all four sides. Based on the Architectural standards, the Board typically tries to minimize elevations that are predominately EIFS. The entire east elevation, other than a small brick wainscoting at the bottom and faux stone columns, is entirely EIFS.

Board Member Mary Brown asked in general if outdoor storage attached to a building was allowed. Ms. Henry stated the governing ordinance for this site does not specifically prohibit outdoor storage but it still must meet all code requirements, which is to be fully screened from view and not be visible from the street. This would also apply to dumpster closures or ground-mounted HVAC equipment. Board Member Clawson also pointed out that the Architectural Standards mandate that materials be similar to or match the building. The Board asked for information about what type of items will be stored in this area. Ms. Henry deferred the question to the applicant as she has also requested that information from the applicant but has not received an answer yet. The applicant stated that it would be equipment related to the petroleum operation, small tanks and tanks for the car wash as well. The tanks are approximately 3 feet tall by 3 feet wide by 9 feet long and everything would be below the height of the storage fence. He also stated that the slats in the fencing will be much tighter than what is depicted in the rendering and they would be opaque. The material of the

screening is vinyl. Board Member Clawson requested more detail on what the screening material actually is as the applicant just stated that the elevation does accurately represent what it is. His major concern is that this is an all vinyl fence when the majority of materials are to be the same as the building which in this instance would be stone, EIFS or brick. Additional information should be presented to the Board or at least staff before the project goes to Planning Commission.

Board Member Bud Gruchalla asked for a detail of the low wall shown at the exit of the car wash. Ms. Henry has also asked the applicant for dimensions and more detail regarding the purpose of that as part of the Site Development Section Plan review particularly because of the setback, but has not received a response other than it is providing screening for the cars existing the car wash. The applicant stated it was basically a demising wall to separate the car wash detail area from the ingress/egress drive. It is 3 foot tall and 8 feet wide. Ms. Nassif suggested replacing it with landscaping instead. The applicant stated that was possible but they just decided to dress it up with masonry with nice lantern lights on each end. Ms. Henry indicated that she had not seen detail on any lantern lights or cut sheets for that. Having seen other car wash facilities similar to this, Board Member Clawson wondered if a higher structure would be required to conceal the equipment needed in this area. Ms. Henry advised that while that may be an option right now, but as part of her review, she is concerned about the required setback from the Edison Avenue. Although retaining walls, signs, etc., are allowed within a required setback, this particular structure is still under review to see if it would be permitted in a setback. Until she has clarification on this, she cannot really say they can put a 6 foot wall or any structure there at all. The applicant stated they could use landscaping and adjust it to incorporate taller species to help break that up. Chair Duenke commented that it would need to be dense landscaping that was green year round.

In response to Board Member Clawson's question as to how to proceed on this project, Ms. Nassif stated that as a recommending Board, the Architectural Review Board does not typically hold projects. However, she suggested to ask if the applicant, after hearing so many issues stated tonight, may elect to consider making amendments to their submittal to remedy these outstanding items and want to return to the Architectural Review Board prior to moving forward to the Planning Commission; or the Board can still provide a list of items and questions and staff will then present the Board's concerns to the Planning Commission. The applicant would then have the option to address these concerns at that time. Chair Duenke pointed out in the staff report that the applicant did choose to come before Architectural Review Board in order to get a feel for what the comments might be even though there are still some issues to be worked out with staff. She asked the applicant if they wanted to incorporate comments from staff and the Board and then make an amended submittal at a future Architectural Review Board meeting or would they like for the Board to go ahead and have their

discussion and motion with recommendations to the Planning Commission. The applicants requested the Board's recommendations now and they will resubmit for the January Architectural Review Board meeting.

Board Member Gruchalla asked about what is shown as a wall on the site plan by the car wash that is omitted on the rendering. The applicant stated it should be landscaping and not a wall.

Board Member Gary Perkins asked staff if they were looking at the dumpster location in relation to circulation and also how the employees access the dumpster. Ms. Henry has asked the applicant for an analysis of how that location may impact internal circulation but has not received an answer yet.

Board Member Gruchalla commented on the landscaping at the access point and wanted to make sure they do not obstruct the view of oncoming traffic. Ms. Henry stated the placement of landscaping is still under review. On the initial landscape plan, the trees were pushed back but they were in the detention area so they were relocated but this is currently under review.

Board Member Clawson asked if there was a structure around the outdoor seating area. Ms. Henry stated it is currently shown with patio furniture. It will be an extension of the proposed food tenant and there is a perimeter fence around the edge of the sidewalk with heavy landscaping around it, however, no detailing was provided for the fence.

Board Member Rick Clawson made a motion to forward the following recommendations back to the Planning Department in order for the applicant to resubmit the project to the Architectural Review Board at a future date.

1. Lack of detail on the gas canopy, no elevation, materials, color or finish of canopy and columns.
2. Lack of detail on the canopy at the entrance to the car wash, no elevation, materials, color or finish of the canopy and columns.
3. Request details on all screening walls, materials, heights, locations, etc. Recommend they be replaced by landscaping utilizing evergreens at a height that will provide adequate screening.
4. Provide a sample of the proposed wooden material.
5. Provide a sight line study to ensure full screening of rooftop equipment.
6. Recommend incorporating diverse materials on the east elevation besides EIFS.
7. Submit elevations that match the proposed materials for the building.
8. Provide details on the ATM.
9. Provide details for screening walls around the car wash exit. Provide details on the columns, posts and heights so it can be determined if the screening is sufficient.

10. Provide more detail on the screening wall of the outdoor storage area and determine if they meet code requirements.
11. Provide details on the perimeter fence around the outdoor plaza area.
12. Shift the sidewalk near Lot B off the road and add landscaping between the road and sidewalk.

Board Member Bud Gruchalla seconded the motion.

Motion passed with a voice vote of 6-0.

- C Wings Corporate Estates, Lot 5:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 1.32 acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located on the east side of Eatherton Road, north of Wings Corporate Drive.

Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner, presented the request for a 12,773 square foot office/warehouse building located on the northern perimeter of the Wings Corporate Estates development east of Eatherton Road. The exterior building materials will be comprised of tilt-up concrete, brick, EIFS and glass. The proposal includes a curved roof comprised of tilt-up concrete as well as a standing seam metal roof.

The entrance is off of Wings Corporate Drive. Parking has been broken up into three areas on the site. The loading area and dumpster are located at the rear of the building. The loading dock is screened by the building as well as a portion of the dumpster.

They are proposing four street trees with some additional landscaping along the eastern and northern property limits. There is a rain garden on the northern property limits to serve as bioretention for the site. They have also proposed some additional landscaping around the loading dock to help screen that area as well.

The lighting plan includes five types light standards including wall-mounted flicker-flame gas lights to enhance the overall historic design of the proposed building.

Discussion

Board Member Rick Clawson inquired about the screening for the ground-mounted HVAC equipment. Ms. Patel stated it was not shown on the plan as the plan is under review with staff. The applicant will use whatever is required in order to comply with code.

Board Member Gary Perkins encouraged that the proposed landscaping be included on the elevations. He also stated that Hawthorns have thorny branches and would suggest a thornless Hawthorn be used instead from a safety standpoint.

Board Member Rick Clawson made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Wings Corporate Estates, Lot 5, to the Planning Commission with the following recommendation:

1. Depict the location, approximate size and proposed screening of the ground-mounted HVAC equipment.
2. Update the renderings and elevations to match the landscape plans.
3. Consider using a thornless variety of Hawthorn tree.

Board Member Gary Perkins seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a voice vote of 6-0.

- B. Spirit of St. Louis Airpark, Monsanto Hangar:** An Amended Site Development Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for an 11 acre tract of land zoned "M3" Planned Industrial District located on the south side of Edison Avenue, east of Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard.

Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner, presented the request for a 28,460 square foot aircraft storage and light maintenance hangar building located within the Spirit of St. Louis Airpark development. The exterior building materials will be comprised of painted metal panel siding. The proposal includes a flat painted metal panel roof. There is an existing office building on the site as well an attached hangar. The office building is predominately brick and the existing hangar is a metal hangar similar to the proposed hangar.

There are two existing access points to the site off of Edison Avenue. There will be no public access to this hangar.

No new landscaping is proposed, however, they are proposing a bioretention area and grass on any of the areas not being used for the taxiway or aircraft staging areas.

No rooftop units are proposed with this hangar or any parapets.

Discussion

Board Member Bud Gruchalla asked if the facility on the back will be used as a workshop. The applicant stated it will be used for storage, restrooms and a small mechanical/electrical space.

Chair Carol Duenke asked where maintenance personnel will be parking and how will they access the facility. The applicant stated they will park in the existing parking lot and go through the brick portion of the building, exit at rear and cross the existing pavement.

Board Member Rick Clawson made a motion to forward the Amended Site Development Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for the Spirit of St. Louis Airpark, Monsanto Hangar, as presented with a recommendation for approval to the Planning Commission.

Board Member Matt Adams seconded the motion.

Motion passed with a voice vote of 6-0.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VI: ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Bud Gruchalla made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Board Member Rick Clawson seconded the motion.

Motion passed with a voice vote of 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:48 p.m.