

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 10, 2015
Room 102/103

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Matt Adams
Mr. Doug DeLong
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Mick Weber

ABSENT:

Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Rick Clawson

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councilmember Dan Hurt
Planning Commission Chair, Stanley Proctor
Planning Commission Liaison, Merrell Hansen
Planning Commissioner, Guy Tilman
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Ms. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gruchalla called the meeting to order at 6:18 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. July 9, 2015

Board Member Weber made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

Jonathan Raiche then introduced Doug DeLong as a new member of the Architectural Review Board.

Due to a conflict of interest Board Member Doug DeLong, Landscape Architect on the project, has recused himself from participation. Although there will be no vote taken on the project due to the lack of a quorum for this item, the project still moves forward to Planning Commission with a summary of the discussion and recommendations on this item.

- A. Wings Corporate Estates, Lot 14:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 1.61 acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned

Industrial District located on the east side of Eatherton Road, south of Wings Corporate Drive.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner explained that the site is located east of Eatherton Road, south of Wings Corporate Drive, and west of Buzz Westfall Drive and is within the interior of the Wings Corporate Estates development. There are three (3) lots that have been developed with an additional lot near completion. Photos were then provided showing the existing buildings on these four lots.

Proposed Site Development Section Plan

- The proposal is for a 16,640 square foot office/warehouse building.
- Situated on the southern portion of the site.
- There are two (2) proposed shared access points.
- The parking is situated around the northern and eastern portions of the site.
- The proposed sidewalk bordering the northern end of the site complies with the overall Concept Plan for the development.
- There are two (2) small bio-retention areas to the west of the proposed building for stormwater purposes.
- The loading area for this site is proposed on the western façade along with the dumpster enclosure.
- The applicant is proposing a train depot design to match the transportation theme of the larger development.

Proposed Landscape Plan

- The plantings include the required street trees along Wings Corporate Drive and Buzz Westfall Drive as well as plantings dispersed throughout the site along each side of the building.
- Situated at the northeast corner is a proposed retaining wall to allow for a drainage facility. The wall will be fully screened with various plantings.
- The proposed plantings also enhance the covered porch and parking island areas near the pedestrian walkways.
- Screening plantings are proposed around the dumpster enclosure and the mechanical equipment.

Proposed Lighting Plan

- The plan proposes (4) four parking lot area lights, along with one (1) street light in the northeast corner of the site as required by the approved Improvement Plans for the development, which matches the existing streets lights on adjacent sites.
- There are seven (7) wall-mounted shoebox type fixtures located on three (3) of the building facades – four (4) will illuminate the building entrances with (3) provided on the south elevation.

Proposed Architectural Elevations

- Elevations of the north, south, east, and west elevations were provided.

- The building materials will be comprised primarily of tilt-up concrete and glass with a prominent sloped roof.
- The developer has chosen a neutral color palette with bronze and taupe paint utilized on the concrete, and bronze utilized for the various window and wood trim elements located on the porch.
- The colors are consistent with the existing buildings in the development.
- The wood trim brackets and posts, along with the scale of the porch, help create the train depot inspired design. The previously approved Lot 5 was the first to begin this transportation inspired design through the use of an airport hangar inspired design.
- The introduction of three (3) dormers on both the front and rear façades adds articulation to the elevations.
- The western elevation includes the service entry area with loading, and one (1) pedestrian door.

Material samples were provided and the applicant was available to explain the details to the design, color palette, and materials. In response to Chair Gruchalla's request, the applicant provided further information regarding the proposed window color palette and trim which matches the existing buildings within the development.

DISCUSSION

Roof Design

Chair Gruchalla had questions regarding the symmetry of the proposed roof design, and the inconsistency between the front and rear dormers. He questioned if anything is in the dormer area or if light will come into the space. The applicant responded that the dormers are designed to allow light entry to the front façade of the building but because this area will be used as office areas, it may not be seen dependent upon how the area is used by the purchaser. Light will be allowed through the trusses within the warehouse portion of the building. It was noted that the inside area of the warehouse is designed with trusses to give the feel of an old train depot.

Board Member Weber inquired as to the use of the building. The applicant explained that the building is designed for office/warehouse/manufacturing use. Board Member Weber asked for information about the percentage of office use vs. warehouse use noting that an office building would be held to a higher design standard than a warehouse. The applicant replied that the building has been designed as a single-user building. Usage is dependent upon the individual who leases or purchases the building, but it is anticipated that 15-25% of the building would be used as office, which is typical for this area.

Outdoor storage

Mr. Raiche pointed out that no outdoor storage is being proposed which is a separate use and would require a separate review process. The covered canopies are for pedestrian use only. The applicant added that the indentures do not allow for outdoor storage.

Elevations

Board Member Weber expressed concern with the lack of masonry features to the front elevation of the building. He suggested the incorporation of additional material or landscaping to soften the overall look of the tilt-up concrete. He further recommended the addition of banding around the south elevation of the building.

General discussion continued about the design of the elevations and concerns about the symmetry of the building – specifically differences between the front and rear facades. Suggestions were made for additional landscaping; the possible addition of a false gable; extending the canopy along the east elevation; the addition of reveals to provide more symmetry to the building; and enlarging the windows on the south elevation.

The Board agreed that the train depot style design of the proposed building is a unique and interesting concept. The applicant indicated that future construction on other lots in the larger development will be designed with the same 1910-1930 style.

Gutters and Downspouts

In response to Board Member Weber's questions regarding the vertical elements, the applicant confirmed that continuous underground guttering and downspouts are proposed along the south elevation for water collection and runoff purposes. However, the Board recommended that the architect provide additional details on the proposed downspout locations on the north elevation.

Roof Materials

The roof will consist of architectural asphalt shingles and depending on the cost the applicant is considering upgrading to composite slate-style materials – both similar to the “Barkwood” color. Staff clarified that the proposal before the Board was for the architectural asphalt shingles.

Jonathan Raiche then summarized the points raised:

- Incorporate additional landscaping or materials to the north elevation along the porch platform.
- Consider making the roofline more symmetrical when looking at the east and west elevations or add elements to give the perception of symmetry.
- Consider matching the design of the front and rear dormers
- Provide additional details on downspout placement along the front of the building.
- Consider enlarging the windows on the south elevation of the building and providing additional articulation on this façade.

As stated previously, due to the lack of a quorum a vote will not be made on the project; however, Board Member Weber recommended that the applicant provide material samples of the building and roof to the Planning Commission. Additionally, the Board members eligible for discussion confirmed that Staff's summary was an accurate representation of the discussion. The Board Chair also clarified that these were items

that Staff could review before the items goes forward to Planning Commission without the need to being the item back to ARB.

Signage

Signage is not part of the proposal, but the applicant indicated that a monument sign is being considered but will require a separate review process.

IV. **OLD BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Proposed 2016 Meeting Schedule**

Board Member Weber made a motion to approve the 2016 Meeting Schedule. Board Member Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

VI: **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm.