

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
January 13, 2011

PRESENT

Mr. Matt Adams
Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Rick Clawson
Ms. Carol Duenke
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Gary Perkins
Mr. Tim Renaud
Mr. Michael Watson, Planning Commission Liaison
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director
Ms. Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary

ABSENT

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gary Perkins called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

- A. Spirit of St. Louis Airpark (Spirit Hangars):** Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 5.497 acre tract of land zoned "M3" Planned Industrial District located west of the intersection of Wings of Hope Boulevard and Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard, more specifically addressed 18366 Wings of Hope Boulevard.

Board member Matt Adams recused himself as he was representing the property owner.

Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, presented the project request for Spirit Hangars, a 31,200 square foot structure located at 18366 Wings of Hope Boulevard in the Spirit of St. Louis Airpark Subdivision. The project is for the front building near the entrance. The building is to be used for display purposes, a hangar, mechanical repair service and offices. The project was originally brought before the Board in 2006. At that time, the elevations were recommended for approval and forwarded to Planning Commission. During routine construction inspection, it was discovered that the elevations were not built according to what was approved by the City. We contacted the petitioner and advised him that this issue needed to be resolved.

Therefore, the petitioner is requesting approval of architectural elevations as amended.

The existing building materials are comprised of insulated glass and metal panels. There is rooftop screening for the HVAC equipment. The trash enclosure is also screened in. The western, southern and northern elevations as depicted in the packet do not illustrate the wallpack light fixtures that are currently on the building. The applicant has since submitted amended elevations that do include these.

The Board is being asked to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Items Discussed

- Throughout the building process, Staff did perform site construction inspections. When construction was first started, it was halted for a period of time due to economic issues. Once construction commenced, the City continued to inspect the site on a routine basis. The City thought that the building was just not complete and perhaps the owners were going to add articulation to the sides and front of the building as required. Upon realizing that construction was complete, Staff advised the property owner that they were in violation and they needed to remedy this situation. Matt Adams stated that after the initial Architectural Review Board approval, the property owner elected to change the façade in an attempt to design a more hi-tech building. This new design does not comply with any of the architectural detailing required in the Architectural Review Standards.
- Specific deficiencies include:
 - The lack of architectural delineation on the façade at the street level. The human scale that was provided at the entrance in the original design, with the break of materials and the shorter glass panels, is much more welcoming. What is actually constructed is quite foreboding. It does not really have a sense of human scale and it lacks a sense of entry. Additional detailing on the façade, especially at the entrance and at the street level, would help to bring it into compliance. It is noted that planters at the front entrance were not used as depicted in the original plan and the medallion plaza-type round-a-bout at the entrance was not constructed.
 - The large mass of single material used on the sides of the building needs to be broken up with multiple materials. The current elevations do not depict a lot of articulation and there is not much variation in materials, colors or shadows. The original approved elevations contained vertical and horizontal variations that the current elevation lacks.
 - There is nothing that ties the four facades of the building together. Essentially there is a blank metal building and a big glass box. There

are no materials that interrelate between the two of them. The owner does not have to go back and match the original design of the building but there needs to be an attempt to make the design a four-sided design and integrate all four sides. There are multiple different ways to accomplish this that would bring it toward the feel of the original design.

- Lack of landscaping. Some of the landscaping died this past season and some landscaping is still missing around the site. The petitioner is working with Staff and more planting will take place in the spring. Landscaping can help soften the façade and would enhance the entrance to the site. The City's tree ordinance does not prohibit planting at the entrance.
- The Board discussed what can be done when a building is completed that is not in compliance the Architectural Review Standards. The Board is only responsible for making comments based on the Architectural Review Standards. The Board can state whether or not it thinks the building, in its current state, meets the Standards and express comments. It then becomes the applicant's responsibility to resolve the problem. The Board cannot tell the petitioner what to do and the Board is not responsible for the redesign of the building. When the owner decided to make this change at the design stage, he should have come before the Board for approval. The Board needs to decide what to do with the situation that was created by the owner. If the Board makes a recommendation for changes to the building to bring it into compliance, the level of change is up to the property owner.
- Since the building is already constructed, the Board can make a recommendation to approve it as is; they can make a recommendation to deny it or make a recommendation for modifications to the building. The project will go to the Planning Commission if the Board makes a recommendation to approve it or deny it. If there is a recommendation for modifications or changes, the Board can ask the applicant to return with those modifications before the project is forwarded to the Planning Commission. However, the Architectural Review Board cannot hold up a project so the applicant may choose not to go this route. The Planning Commission can then choose to approve it, approve it with modifications or deny it. If denied, the project would go to Municipal Court for the judge to abate it.
- This building is visible from Chesterfield Airport Road. A second building is planned with the intent of matching this building. The Board would not like to see a second building constructed to mirror this one.
- The building is currently occupied without an occupancy permit or a business license. The Director will not release the permit or license until all site issues have been abated.
- The Board is in agreement that they would like to see any proposed changes before it is finally approved.
- The building is two stories with the rotunda open up at stairs.

- There are many things that can be done to bring the building into compliance with the Architectural Review Standards but it is up to the owner to design. The Board wants to be understanding of the owner's position, but the owner needs to realize he put himself in this position. With some creativity in detailing, the owner can come up with something that complies with the Architectural Review Standards, that is aesthetically pleasing, and the Board will not be too upset to see a twin building.
- The Board does not have the authority to hold a project. However, a motion can be crafted that recommends the applicant to resubmit architectural elevations addressing the Board's concerns to the Board prior to placement on the Planning Commission agenda.
- The wallpack lights on the face of the building are not included in the packet submittal but are in compliance with the City's Lighting Ordinance.
- The rooftop mechanical equipment is screened and meets all requirements. The trash enclosure is screened with a light grayish-sand color brick.

Rick Clawson made a motion to recommend that the applicant review the comments here and consider a resubmittal of the exterior elevations for review by the City of Chesterfield due to the fact that several areas of the building do not currently meet the Architectural Review Standards. First, create a human scale and transition at the entry with the use of landscaping and architectural elements. Second, all four facades lack a mix of materials, mix of architectural detailing and articulation which are all outlined in the Architectural Review Standards. Third, there is lack of unification of the design of all four sides of the facade of the building. The Architectural Review Board requests review of said resubmittal once received by the City of Chesterfield prior to review by the Planning Commission.

Carol Duenke seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote of 6-0 with Matt Adams abstaining.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. November 18, 2010.

Rick Clawson made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written.

Mary Brown seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote of 4-0 with Carol Duenke, Tim Renaud and Bud Gruchalla abstaining.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Rick Clawson welcomed Carol Duenke and Tim Renaud as newly appointed members to the Board.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Bud Gruchalla made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Rick Clawson seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote of 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

DRAFT