

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017  
CONFERENCE ROOM 102/103

**ATTENDANCE:**

Ms. Mary Brown  
Mr. Rick Clawson  
Mr. Doug DeLong  
Mr. Bud Gruchalla  
Mr. Mick Weber

**ABSENT:**

Mr. Matt Adams

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councilmember Dan Hurt  
Planning Commission Chair, Stanley Proctor  
Planning Commission Liaison, Merrell Hanson  
Planning Commissioner, Wendy Geckeler  
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services  
Ms. Jessica Henry, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison  
Ms. Cecilia Hernandez, Project 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. February 9, 2017**

**Board Member Brown made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Clawson seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.** Chair Gruchalla was not present at the February 9 meeting, so he abstained from the vote.**

Mr. Wyse gave a brief project update to the decision regarding the color-changing LED lights for the Metro Lighting building as presented during the January ARB meeting.

**III. PROJECT PRESENTATION**

- A. Chesterfield Commons West, Outlot 4 (Raising Cane's):** Amended Architectural Elevations for a 2.08 acre site within the “PC” Planned Commercial District located south of Chesterfield Airport Road and west of RHL Blvd.

## **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Cecilia Hernandez, Project Planner explained that the request is for approval of a brushed aluminum wall art feature on the northern elevation facing Chesterfield Airport Road.

### **Design**

The applicant was available to provide a brief narrative explaining the thought process behind the piece and what each of the individual icons symbolize which make up the installation as a whole. The artwork contains; a fish, a dog, a disco ball, a hard hat, and a number 1, which forms a heart.

The applicant is proposing to have a painted red square on the wall behind the artwork as provided by the digital image.

There is no additional lighting proposed, and the brushed aluminum pieces would be individually placed on the wall. The applicant has also provided an image of the art being used at another location.

## **DISCUSSION**

Chair Gruchalla questioned whether the proposed “logo” is considered signage. Ms. Hernandez explained the proposed feature is not considered signage but an art feature.

Ms. Henry confirmed that the UDC defines this element as an integrated architectural art feature rather than signage. She provided comparison to the “Rock n Brew” project which uses album cover images on the building.

In his opinion, Board Member Clawson felt that the feature is considered an art piece and could be easily removed if the use changes.

**Board Member Clawson** made a motion to forward the Amended Architectural Elevations for Chesterfield Commons West, Outlot 4 (Raising Cane’s) as presented, with a recommendation for approval to City Staff.

Board Member Brown seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 - 0.**

- B. Summit Development/Topgolf, Lot B (Topgolf):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect’s Statement of Design for a 14.75 acre tract of land zoned “PC” Planned Commercial District located north of North Outer 40 Road and east of Boone’s Crossing.

## **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Jessica Henry, Senior Project Planner explained that the request is for a curvilinear entertainment complex including a golf driving-range, restaurant, bar, meeting space, and game area located on the north side of North Outer 40 Road and east of Boone's Crossing.

Ms. Henry provided a color aerial of the site and pointed out that the site is partially occupied by the Hardee's Iceplex and partially vacant as shown on the color site plan.

### **Circulation System and Access**

- The subject site will be served by one dedicated entrance from North Outer 40 Road which is in the same location as the existing Hardee's Iceplex entrance.
- A cross access easement is provided to proposed Lot A of the development. This easement extends across proposed Lot A to a proposed access point from the Taubman Outlet mall drive off of North Outer 40 Road.

### **Parking**

- Parking is located within the western half of the site. The Chesterfield Valley Design Requirements state that parking should be located "primarily to the side or rear of any building facade facing I-64/US 40 or along North Outer 40."

### **Scale**

- The proposed building is three stories, 66,300 square feet in height and the rear building elevations open into an expansive outfield with poles and netting reaching 170 feet in height.

### **Landscape Design and Screening**

- Several different areas of landscaping are proposed which include; street trees along the site's frontage, a 30 foot landscape buffer behind the stormwater conveyance channel, and parking lot landscape islands.
- Bio-retention and swale areas will be planted with native plantings to fulfill water quality requirements on the site.
- The rear portion of the site does not contain any plantings; this is due to the proximity of the levee and associated seepage berm.

### **Lighting**

- Site lighting is proposed for the parking fields as required by City Code.
- Recessed canopy fixtures are proposed on the cantilevered entry canopy. These fixtures are utilitarian in nature and feature fully shielded, flat lens, enclosed luminaires.
- The applicant is also proposing fully shielded stadium light poles to illuminate the outfield.

### **Scale and Design**

- The building includes a four-sided design with similar materials and treatments on each façade, with the exception of the east façade, which is open to the outfield.

- The outfield poles and netting are also visible in the distance at a height of 170 feet, as permitted by Ordinance. Plane changes on the front and side elevations of the building lend a dramatic appearance to the building.
- The proposed materials include natural stacked stone, honed concrete masonry, composite panels, and EIFS. Architectural metal mesh screens are proposed as an accent.
- A fully screened integrated trash enclosure is proposed on the eastern elevation.
- An exterior staircase is proposed for both sides of the building.
- As required by the Chesterfield Valley Design Requirements for new construction, the architectural materials are carried around the perimeter of the site.

The following information was provided by the applicant for reference;

- Architectural rendering depicting two points of access along N Outer 40 Road.
- Color reference photos showing the curvilinear design to highlight the building articulation.
- Comparison photos showing daytime and night time views.

### **Signage**

- Signage is not part of the proposal before Architectural Review Board and will be reviewed separately.
- Typically signage is not shown on architectural elevations and the sign that was included in error on the Architectural Elevations presented in the ARB packet will be removed by the applicant prior to this project moving forward to Planning Commission.

Ms. Henry provided further clarification to some of the proposed accent lighting which includes; small LED lights integrated to the stair railing, mounted directional light fixtures, LED color changing wall washer lights that are projected onto the architectural screens, and flexible LED lighting.

Some of the proposed lighting is consistent with other developments. Staff is seeking specific input from the ARB on both the LED color-changing “wall washer” element and the LED outline lighting utilized on the logo architectural element.

Material samples were provided and the project team was available to answer any questions.

## **DISCUSSION**

Board Member Clawson questioned the location of the outfield poles due to the proximity of the levee and seepage berm. Mr. George Stock, Stock and Associates stated prior formal approval was granted by the Corp of Engineers.

### **Staircase**

Board Member Clawson asked for clarification of the details regarding the exposed metal staircase on the south elevation. The architect explained that the staircase is comprised of metal bands and painted to match the EIFS. In his opinion, Chair Gruchalla was under the impression that any exposed staircase would require a cover. Staff confirmed that the project is still actively under review, but will seek additional information prior to submittal before the Planning Commission.

### **Proposed Lot C**

Board Member Weber asked whether additional landscaping can be incorporated near the outfield lights and fence to buffer the vacant easternmost parcel along I-64/US 40.

Board Member DeLong suggested the addition of evergreen clusters or shade trees to help break up the fence line. He pointed out that the planter boxes on the west elevation were shown on the color rendering but not on the Landscape Plan.

### **Architectural Element**

Board Member Clawson did not have any issues with the overall quality, design and materials. His main concerns are the architectural recessed EIFS of the front façade and the color changing mesh panels. He felt that if the mesh accent panels were to remain one color he would not be opposed, but did not want to create a “Las Vegas” effect.

### **Architect Comment**

The architect clarified that the mesh panels are lit by hidden top and bottom metal channels. The front accent feature is comprised of single blue surface static lighting.

Chair Gruchalla pointed out that the EIFS element was a nice feature which could be removed. He felt that without the accent feature, it would resemble an office building.

Substantial discussion ensued to the overall impact of the proposed color-changing mesh panels, the staircase intent and the architectural EIFS element. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to identify the color-changing mechanism abilities, and the applicant’s overall intent of these comments prior to Planning Commission review.

Ms. Henry explained that the Chesterfield Valley Sub-Area Policy is relevant to the proposed accent lighting which states the following:

- Lighting of Buildings Along I-64/US 40 – The facades of buildings facing I-64/US 40 should be lighted to provide an attractive image at night for individuals traveling along I-64/US 40.

In response to Board Member DeLong's question whether additional landscaping is being provided to the raised planters located along the front/west elevation, the landscape architect confirmed that plantings are proposed.

If the lighting feature is not removed from the proposal, Board Member Clawson stated that he will be voting in opposition.

**Board Member Brown** made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for Summit Development/Topgolf, Lot B (Topgolf) to the Planning Commission ***with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions:***

- The staircase on the south elevation should be architecturally integrated with the building design.
- Landscaping within the planter boxes should be shown on the Landscape Plan and consistent with the color rendering.
- Landscaping should be added along the southeastern net elevation using species proposed in the planting schedule included on the Landscape Plan and comprised of a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees.
- The LED wall washer lighting that is cast on the wire mesh panels should be static in nature and limited to a single color.

Board Member Weber seconded the motion.

**Board Member Clawson** then made a motion to amend the recommendation for approval with the following condition:

- Remove the LED ***lighting*** from the logo architectural element on the West elevation, resulting in an unlit architectural element.

Board Member Weber seconded the motion. **The motion then passed by a voice vote of 3 – 2. Chair Gruchalla and Board Member Brown voting no.**

***The motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for Summit Development/Topgolf, Lot B to the Planning Commission with a recommendation for approval with conditions as amended then passed by a voice vote of 5 – 0.***

#### **IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

VI: **ADJOURNMENT - 7:15 p.m.**