

# III.A

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
February 17, 2011

**PRESENT**

Mr. Matt Adams  
Ms. Mary Brown  
Mr. Rick Clawson  
Ms. Carol Duenke  
Mr. Bud Gruchalla  
Mr. Gary Perkins  
Mr. Tim Renaud  
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 6:32 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.

Chairman Gary Perkins stated the Board's discussion tonight should focus on whether the concerns raised from last month's meeting were adequately addressed.

Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, presented the project request for Spirit Hangars located at 18366 Wings of Hope Boulevard in the Spirit of St. Louis Airpark Subdivision. This project was presented at the January meeting and several concerns were raised at that time. Staff met with the petitioners to discuss those concerns and also advised them of the City Code requirements for projects being placed back on the Architectural Review Board agenda. Not all of these requirements were met; however, the item was still placed on the agenda so as not to further delay this. The new submittals were

presented in black and white and late yesterday afternoon, the petitioner did provide a narrative. Packets had already been distributed so she offered the narrative at this time for consideration. Chairman Perkins stated that unless someone else on the Board objects he felt that the narrative would not be needed as the Board should be able to evaluate the project based on the elevations included in the packet. Board Members Bud Gruchalla and Mary Brown wished to review the narrative and it was distributed to all Board Members.

### **Items Discussed**

- **Sunshades:** Board Member Bud Gruchalla inquired about the depth of the sunshade along the second floor. Matt Adams, Project Architect, stated it was 24 inches and is in proper proportion to provide shade for the office on the second floor. This sunshade will add a strong horizontal band going toward the top of the parapet. The sunshade at the entry is in symmetry and complements the upper sunshade and both will blend in with the black paneling on the front of the building. The black and gray colors complement each other and he feels this addition adequately completes the building.

Board Member Carol Duenke inquired as to the projection of the sunshade at the front entry. Mr. Adams stated it extends about 4 feet. It is attached with stainless steel cables and a coupling bolt attaches it to the building providing a very hi-tech look. Board Member Duenke asked if the entry is just a sunshade and not really a canopy that will provide protection. Mr. Adams stated that it would have some type of protection. He anticipates it will be made of a sustainable material, chromium base, which will be highly reflective.

Board Member Rick Clawson asked for clarification of the material used on second floor sunshade. Mr. Adams stated it was clear anodized aluminum that will have a reflective quality along with stainless steel cables, anodized aluminum frame for the canopy and nontransparent screen, smoked glass panel on aluminum ribs.

Chairman Perkins asked about drainage for the sunshade. Mr. Adams said it will be a simple drain toward the back to the front. There is a drip edge that goes around and transfers down the sides. Similar material will be used on the upper sunshade too.

Board Member Clawson expressed concerned with the upper sunscreen as it would basically become the biggest element of the architectural detailing of the building. He felt that an 18-24 foot projection at the top of the second floor is not a substantial enough piece to stand alone to become the architectural detailing for the building. If there was a larger projection, it

would give more detailing to the building and more shadow. He said the Board should review this as a new building first being presented to determine whether it meets the Architectural Review Board Standards. Does the building and the scale of the details meet the intent of the Standards?

Chairman Perkins stated the proposed additions are headed in that direction but he is not convinced these additions are significant enough to make an impact. He is more concerned that appropriate detailing at the building entrance is achieved because that is most visible. If this is approved, the scale of the sunshades need to be sufficient enough to give detailing to the building. He would prefer to see a much more substantial sunshade at the top of the building.

Board Member Clawson was concerned that there would not be enough repetition of the blades in the sunshade that will give it the shadow affect. Mr. Adams presented an exhibit of the sun shading device that is being proposed. The Director stated that since Staff has not seen the exhibit, she will need to log it in prior to distribution.

Board Member Gruchalla was also concerned with the scale of the sunshades. Since it will be on the second floor of the building, 24 feet is just going to disappear and will not provide much functionality with that projection. For the sunshade to become the architectural detail that will carry that side of the building, it has to be substantially larger. He asked why this same shade was not on the first floor too. The owner stated that he did not like the way it looked there. Board Member Gruchalla also felt that the canopy over the front entrance should be increased also. Board Member Duenke agreed that 4 feet is not substantial enough to provide human scale at the entry. Mr. Adams then suggested a 6 foot projection.

Chairman Perkins does not feel it is at the proper scale to meet the intent of the Architectural Review Board Standards. There is still no material relief from the large expanse of similar materials. There are no vertical accents as on the original elevations. The horizontal bands and sunshades do not adequately break up the large mass of similar materials.

Board Member Duenke agreed that the element at the front door is a step in the right direction but visually on a building this size, it seems sort of unsubstantial as far as its purpose of defining the entryway and bringing in human scale. She also pointed out that the sunshade above has more prominence than the protection for those entering the front door. It looks out of proportion. Mr. Adams and the petitioner both feel that the entrance is very pronounced given the fact that the rest of the building is rather simplistic. The material is very reflective and will provide a reflective spark to the building.

Aimee Nassif stated the Board can make a motion to forward this on to the Planning Commission as is, forward it to Planning Commission with recommended changes, forward it to the Planning Commission with modifications that the petitioner will work on with Staff prior to being forwarded to the Planning Commission or request that the Board review the project again.

- **Utility Screening:** Board Member Tim Renaud asked about utility screening. Aimee Nassif confirmed that the rooftop screen is being amended to match the proposed changes. There are no ground transformers and the trash enclosure is currently screened.
- **Landscaping:** Aimee Nassif stated there are currently no planters at the doorway. The two planters depicted on the proposal have been added in an attempt to address the Board's concern for the lack of human scale at the entrance. Board Member Gruchalla asked if the planters were going to look like what is depicted in the rendering. If so, are the pots big enough to sustain what is planted? The owner stated the plantings would be more of a topiary. Aimee Nassif stated there were landscaped planters shown on the southeast elevation as well as the front. Typically landscaping is separate from the elevation. She pointed out that the Board may want to address the planters when making a motion since they were included in this as a way to address the Board's concern.

Board Member Clawson asked that if the pots are approved as part of this package, what happens if the plantings do not survive? Would we require that they be replaced and maintained? Aimee Nassif advised if approved, the planters as shown in the rendering will become part of the site requirement and if they are never planted, removed or die, this will become a site violation. Since we do not know what species, size, quantity or color is being planted, she can request that the petitioner provide this information in its narrative to the Planning Commission.

Board Member Mary Brown indicated that at the last meeting it was noted that the planters at the front entrance were not used as depicted in the original plan. Aimee Nassif said the original plans show inground planters that covered a larger area. There were also trees and a mix of shrubs and colors. Board Member Brown asked if the inground plantings could be incorporated in the current plan. Aimee Nassif could not confirm as the size of this area was unknown; the petitioners were also unable to answer.

Board Member Renaud expressed concern that the planters shown on the back of the building would die with that sun exposure. Chairman Perkins stated that when you are using pots in our climate, you will constantly be replacing the plants. If the Board approves the pots, we need to make sure

that as plants die, they get replaced. There are not many planting choices. Chairman Perkins suggested having more substantial plantings at the entrance. Board Member Clawson suggested fewer planters at the end of the building and more focus on the entrance. Board Member Gruchalla stated he would be in favor of fewer pots but larger pots at the entrance. With a reflective building, potted plants located along the southwest side will not last. The focus should be on the front of the building.

Chairman Perkins stated that since landscaping is not part of the Board's purview except in how it impacts the elevations, we can only suggest that the plantings at the entrance be more substantial and how they achieve that, whether through inground plantings or larger pots is up to the owner. Board Member Gruchalla suggested recommending that they work with staff on that.

- **Banding around the Building:** Board Member Gruchalla stated that the black banding around the building would be acceptable but would suggest that it be wider. Board Member Clawson stated that it helps somewhat to tie the building together.

Chairman Perkins reminded the Board that it was the original intent to have another building identical to this one.

**Board Member Gruchalla made a motion to forward the project to the Planning Commission with the following recommendations:**

1. The sunscreen at the top of the building should be increased in size based on the manufacturer's standard with a minimum depth of 4 feet.
2. The canopy at the front entrance should be increased in depth based on the manufacturer's standards with a minimum depth of 6 feet.
3. The sunshade material is to be comprised of clear anodized prefinished aluminum material and the canopy is to be made of prefinished aluminum, clear anodized with stainless steel fasteners and a translucent glass canopy.
4. The petitioner is to work with Staff regarding the entryway plantings.
5. The proposed black banding as depicted in the rendering is acceptable, however, it is suggested that the size of the stripe be increased.
6. Rooftop screening is to match the building accent color.
7. The petitioner is to work with Staff on addressing these items prior to placement on the Planning Commission agenda.

**Board Member Brown seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed by voice vote of 5-1 with Matt Adams abstaining and Chairman Perkins voting nay.**

**III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

**A. January 13, 2011.**

**Board Member Duenke made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written.**

**Board Member Renaud seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by voice vote of 7-0.**

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

**None.**

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Board Member Clawson made a motion to adjourn the meeting.**

**Board Member Gruchalla seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by voice vote of 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.**