

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
July 17, 2008**

PRESENT

Mrs. Mary Brown
Mr. Matt Adams
Mr. Gary Perkins
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Dave Whitfield
Mr. Rick Clawson
Mr. Michael Watson, Planning Commission Liaison
Ms. Amy Nolan, Planning Commission Member
Ms. Lu Perantoni, Planning Commission Member
Ms. Wendy Geckeler, Planning Commission Member
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner
Mr. Shawn Seymour, Project Planner
Ms. Carol Olejniczak, Administrative Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Bryant Conant

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Bud Gruchalla, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- II. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS:**

- A. Downtown Chesterfield Lots 3-6 (Buildings D, E, F, & G):** Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for 3.90 acre lot of land located at the intersection of Chesterfield Parkway West and Park Circle Drive.

Senior Planner, Mara Perry, presented the project request for 4 new buildings located on a 3.90 acre parcel that is part of Phase I for Downtown Chesterfield. Site is located at the intersection of Chesterfield Parkway West and Park Circle Drive. The requested buildings will be for retail and restaurant use. The exterior building materials will be comprised of brick, stone, and painted steel. The Architectural Lighting shown on the elevations has not been submitted for review and will be reviewed by Staff. Additionally, the Landscape Plan and Lighting Ordinance are still under Staff's review. Signage is not being reviewed at this time.

Item(s) Discussed:

- Same brick that is used on adjacent building and will be used through out the development
- Buildings are mainly brick with limestone trim/accents
- Parapets used for screening of rooftop units; Rooftop units are sunken down into roof and sit slightly below parapets; parapet height equals five feet
- Buildings entrances located off of Park Circle Drive, but corners of building are curved to face Chesterfield Parkway West
- Change of Elevation Grade significance from Chesterfield Parkway West to Site
- Left turn lane going north on Chesterfield Parkway West into Site
- Park Circle round-a-bout focal point to be constructed at a later date; part of development's indentures
- Open space has been reviewed by Staff and meets all requirements
- Purpose of parking in the rear of buildings; downtown feel and walk-ability
- More landscape screening off of Main Circle Drive to parking areas
- Trash enclosures will be made of brick with landscaping around three of the four enclosures
- Parking lots are connected to fronts by alleyways; alleyways have the same appeal as street side
- Awning color of black was picked for neutrality and cohesiveness

Gary Perkins made a motion to forward the project for approval with the following recommendation:

1. **As part of Staff's Landscape Review look at the possibility of stronger screening on the east and west sides in an effort to better screen parking lots**

Rick Clawson seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 6-0

- B. Valley Gates Subdivision Lot 2 (Value Place Hotel): A Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan and Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.06 acre tract of land located in a "PC" Planned Commercial District north of US Highway 40, and east of Boones Crossing.**

Project Planner, Shawn Seymour, presented the project request for a hotel situated on a 3.06 acre tract of land located north of US Highway 40 and east of Boones Crossing. The hotel building will be 42,204 square feet and contain 121 rooms. The Site was required to provide 128 parking spaces and is providing 131. Additionally, 48 percent open space is proposed which exceeds the requirement. Exterior materials of the building will consist of brick, hardy plank siding, and composite shingles for the roof.

Item(s) Discussed:

- Air-conditioning units; standard hotel thru-wall in every room
- Quality of proposed building compared to surrounding developments of same use; percentage of materials on building – brick and masonry
- Lack of architectural flare of entrance
- Colors used on building - brand identity
- Shutter locations - no shutters on back side of building
- Angles and pitches of the roof
- Type of windows - vinyl sliders with standard glass
- Location of Site – visibility from Highway 40
- Lack of architectural elements and design
- Strengthen landscape screening on southwest side of site
- Quality of materials
- Possibility of creating more recesses in building to create depth and interest
- Possibility of expanding/extending the covered entrance way
- Purpose of building - hotel, extended stay
- Trash enclosure needs to match masonry at base of building
- Gutters and downspouts colored to match trim color
- Color of siding presented is not warm like outlined in submittal text; warm would be preferred

Area(s) of Concern:

- Color, design and materials of building

Rick Clawson made a motion to forward the project for approval, with the following recommendations:

- 1. Percentage of masonry used needs to be consistent with other surrounding developments of similar use**
- 2. Multiple masonry materials and/or colors need to be introduced to provide more interest**
- 3. More architectural design for the entrance canopy and area above the canopy**
- 4. Trash enclosure material to match masonry of building**
- 5. Warmer colors to be used for siding material**

Mary Brown seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 4-2

Additional Comments:

Let it be known that both “nays” were opposition to the project in general, not the motion made. Project thought to not be up to the quality of the area in which it is being built.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING SUMMARY

A. May 15, 2008

Discussion of the meeting summary to be approved as written.

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

Mary Brown seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 6-0

IV. OLD BUSINESS

The Architectural Review Standards, as well as the policy and procedures for the Architectural Review Board are going to public hearing. The ARB members will be receiving an e-mail in regards to the hearing. The date has been set as August 11, 2008 and is being published in the papers in the following week. At the public hearing, any additional issues will be heard in regards to the guidelines, policy, and procedures of the ARB. It will then be voted on at Planning Commission, following that, after any other outstanding issues have been addressed, it will then go to Planning and Public Works Committee and then to City Council for two readings.

All the issues that were brought up at the Ordinance review were integrated into the document. If there are any other issues, they can be brought forward at the issues meeting before it goes to vote at the Planning Commission.

Mara Perry made the recommendation to bring up any questions and comments at the Public hearing when the full Planning Commission and City Attorney would be present.

The members will be re-emailed a draft of the Standards for their review and comments.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

David Whitfield made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Gary Perkins seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 6-0