

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
JULY 9, 2015  
Room 101

**ATTENDANCE:**

Ms. Mary Brown  
Mr. Rick Clawson  
Mr. Bud Gruchalla, Chair  
Mr. Mick Weber, Vice-Chair

**ABSENT:**

Mr. Matt Adams

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Planning Commission Chair, Stanley Proctor  
Planning Commissioner, Laura Lueking  
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison  
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner  
Ms. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Gruchalla called the meeting to order at **6:00 p.m.**

**II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

**A. June 11, 2015**

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

**III. PROJECT PRESENTATION**

- A. Highland on Conway SDP:** A Site Development Plan, Lighting Plan, Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 5.292 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the north side of North Outer 40 Road, east of Chesterfield Parkway East.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner stated the applicants are proposing a 126,760 square foot, five-story office building located on the southern portion of the site and a four-level parking structure. A large prominent fountain is proposed to be located in the southwest corner of the site.

### Circulation System and Access

The proposal does not include any direct access to the site from N Outer 40 Road. The existing driveway will be removed as required by City Code. The proposed building will utilize two internal shared access drives from N Outer 40 Road that are currently located on the adjacent properties.

### Topography

The site has a general increasing slope from south to north that builds up to August Hill on Conway residential subdivision. The parking structure is partly built into the existing terrain with the elevation above ground ranging from at-grade in the northwest corner to approximately 30 feet above grade on the eastern elevation.

### Lighting

The plan includes 19 pole-mounted fixtures which will be provided on the parking structure, along the internal roadway, and in the service area. In addition, wall-mounted non-shielded building accent lighting will be provided along the southern façade of the parking structure. All the proposed lighting meets the lighting requirements of the City and is consistent with the existing Delmar Gardens development. Mr. Raiche pointed out that the light spill is minimal with respect to the neighboring residential development.

### Landscape Design and Screening

The developer has submitted a proposed final Landscape Plan and Mitigation Plan, which includes required trees and mitigation trees. The proposal provides two dense groupings of trees at each end of the southern property line, along with the required landscape buffer between the subject site and August Hill. Staff will fully review this request and determine if the request meets the requirements of City code.

### Materials and Color

The exterior building materials will mimic the existing Delmar Gardens buildings and will be comprised primarily of precast concrete panels with a primary color proposed as "Sandstone/beige" with "Eggshell White" accent panels. The accent details and the landscaping have been designed to flow seamlessly between the existing and proposed developments. The green tinted glass was designed with curvilinear facades which will match the existing office buildings to the west. Other accent materials include various aluminum materials applied to canopies, columns, and decorative parapet panels. The intent of this third building of the Delmar Gardens office complex is to expand the existing campus in a manner that creates an overall cohesive office complex.

Mr. Raiche then explained the elevation details incorporated in the parking structure, which will also be buffered by landscaping on the west and north sides.

### Retaining Walls

Due to the natural topography of the site, there are various portions of the site that will utilize retaining walls.

## DISCUSSION

The Board Members complimented the Delmar Gardens project team on a very well done project and they agreed that the proposed structure ties well into the existing development.

### Landscaping

Board Member Weber questioned whether the proposed landscaping is consistent with the landscaping to the north and west. Mr. Raiche explained that the proposed landscaping appears to be denser. He also pointed out that the petitioner is not able to meet the required 30% tree preservation because of the necessary grading. Consequently mitigation trees will be planted on the site to make up for the extra clearing.

### Resident Comments

Mr. Scott Starling, resident and Board Member of August Hill Subdivision questioned the grade of the proposed parking garage and expressed concerns about the removal of the existing trees which would have served as a buffer with the proposed development. Mr. Raiche explained the elevation details of the proposed parking garage and the proposed landscape buffer which will provide screening.

In response to other concerns raised regarding screening, Mr. Raiche explained that there is approximately 60 feet from the end of the subdivision's cul-de-sac to the parking structure, which will be screened by a landscape buffer 30 feet from the property line.

Mr. Rusty Saunders, Landscape Architect on the project, provided information about the location of the preservation areas which will remain undisturbed. He also noted that grading, up the property line, is necessary in order to build terraced retaining walls for the garage that will be bunkered into the hillside. This area will be heavily re-planted.

To finalize, Mr. Raiche explained that the ARB is a recommending body of the Planning Commission and further discussion regarding landscaping, buffering, and tree preservation will be held during site plan review at Planning Commission. Chair Gruchalla stated that residents are welcome to attend the Planning Commission meeting to voice any concerns at that time.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Highland on Conway (Delmar Gardens III) as presented, to the Planning Commission with a recommendation for approval. Board Member Weber seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0.**

- B. River Crossing Development, Lot 1 (St. Luke's Urgent Care) AAE: An Amended Architectural Elevation and Architect's Statement of Design for a 1.97 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the northeast of the intersection of Chesterfield Airport Road and Arnage Boulevard.**

### STAFF PRESENTATION

John Boyer, Senior Planner explained that the request is to amend the existing structure's approved elevations to permit changes in color. This structure was previously a Villa Farotto's restaurant. The applicant is proposing to retro-fit the building to utilize as an Urgent Care Facility. No structure additions are planned, only painting of the elevations and re-canvassing of existing awnings to correspond with the image of St. Luke's.

Mr. Boyer provided an aerial of subject site and the surrounding area along with color renderings of the existing and proposed north, south, east, and west elevations. He pointed out that the applicant is proposing to paint over the existing wall sign located on the west elevation.

The color changes will incorporate earth-tones as the primary theme accented by the Dignity Blue metal panels over the entrance to match the corporate image of St. Luke's. Mr. Boyer provided clarification to the exact location of the proposed color changes.

Mr. Boyer explained that because the project is a minor amendment it does not require review by the Planning Commission and the project will be reviewed administratively. The proposed changes are compliant with the Chesterfield Valley Design guidelines.

### DISCUSSION

In response to Board Member Brown's question, Mr. Boyer explained that the existing canopy will remain and will be painted the corporate Dignity Blue color.

#### Mechanical Equipment

Board Member Weber asked if the applicant is proposing any additional mechanical equipment and whether the equipment will be ground or roof mounted. The applicant pointed out that there is no additional equipment being proposed and the existing roof-mounted equipment will remain and will be fully screened.

#### Lighting

Board Member Clawson asked if the existing architectural wall-mounted sconce and goose neck lighting on top of the existing canopies will remain. The applicant explained that the goose-neck lighting, the two wall-mounted sconces at the entrance will be removed and, all of the existing string lighting will also be removed. Mr. Boyer stated that the lighting complies with City Code.

Painting/Power Spraying Building

Board Member Clawson added that the project is pretty straight forward but had reservations of painting the building in order to remove the wall sign with regards to the lack of architectural elements on the rest of the building. As an option, he suggested power spraying that portion of the building.

The applicant responded that they are willing to power spray the building to remove the sign but had concerns that the color will not match the rest of the brick on the building.

Screening of Electrical Equipment and Site Landscaping

Board Member Weber had questions as to whether the electrical equipment located on the north elevation will be screened by landscaping. Mr. Boyer explained that Staff will review the Approved Landscape Plan to ensure that all approved landscaping has been installed and maintained. With respect to installing additional landscaping for screening the electrical equipment, he pointed out the lack of surface area for any additional landscaping. In addition, the utility companies prefer that there not be an abundance of landscaping especially in front of areas to allow for access to equipment. Based upon the location, the unit is adequately screened and not visible. There was continued discussion as to whether additional landscaping or gating could be incorporated.

**Board Member Weber** made a motion to forward the Amended Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for River Crossing Development, Lot 1 (St. Luke's Urgent Care) as presented, ***to City Staff with a recommendation for approval.***

Board Member Clawson then amended the motion to include the following:

1. Removal of goose neck lights, two wall sconces near the entrance and all string lighting.
2. Preference to remove the painted wall sign on the western elevation prior to painting. In addition, if the painted wall sign can be completely removed, ARB's preference is to not paint the brick portion of the western elevation, unless to assist in covering up the painted wall sign.

Board Member Weber accepted the amendment to the motion. Board Member Clawson seconded the motion. **The motion then passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0.**

IV. **OLD BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Election of Officers**

Board Member Gruchalla volunteered to serve as Board Chair for the next year. **The Board unanimously approved the election of Mr. Gruchalla as Chair.**

Board Member Weber volunteered to serve as Board Vice-Chair for the next year. **The Board unanimously approved the election of Mr. Weber as Vice-Chair.**

VI: **ADJOURNMENT**

**Board Member Weber made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Clawson seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0 and the meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.**