

## THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

THURSDAY – SEPTEMBER 9, 2021  
CONFERENCE ROOM 102/103

### **ATTENDANCE:**

Mr. Mick Weber, Chair  
Mr. Scott Starling, Vice-Chair  
Ms. Susan Lew  
Mr. Kristopher Mehrtens

### **ABSENT:**

Mr. Matt Adams  
Mr. Doug DeLong

### **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councilmember Dan Hurt  
Planning Commission Chair, Merrell Hansen  
Planning Commission Liaison, Allison Harris  
Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, Staff Liaison  
Mr. Chris Dietz, Planner  
Ms. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

## **II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

### **A. August 12, 2021**

**Vice-Chair Starling made a motion to approve the meeting summary with the following comment:**

- Board Member Lew commented that the front and rear facades of the existing building on Lot 1H lacked cohesiveness and the “Prairie-style” design of the Chesterfield Blue Valley Development. Also, potential consideration should be made to the removal of the timbers.

Board Member Mehrtens seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0.**

## **III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- ### **A. Chesterfield Blue Valley, Lot 1G SDSP:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architectural Statement of Design for a 4.32-acre tract of land located along the east side of Outlet Boulevard, north of its intersection with Olive Street Road.

## **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Chris Dietz, Planner explained that the purpose of this request is to convert a vacant lot to an inventory parking area and car wash in conjunction with the repurposing of Lot 1H.

Mr. Dietz then provided a brief history of the site and the surrounding area along with three (3) sets of criteria by which this development should be evaluated, as all three pertain to this development.

- Unified Development Code Architectural Review Design Standards (City-Wide)
- Chesterfield Valley Development Requirements (Valley-Specific)
- Chesterfield Blue Valley Design Standards (Site-Specific)

### **Project Timeline**

- **Lot 1G** - Presented to the ARB on August 12. The applicant requested to hold the project to address the screening wall and carwash concerns.
- **Lot 1H** - Presented to the ARB on August 12. Approval was granted with conditions. Noting that both projects will be presented to the PC simultaneously.
- *Since that time, Staff has been notified that the applicant is comfortable with consolidating both lots prior to Planning Commission approval.*

### **Site Relationships**

Lot 1G is located along the southeast boundary of Chesterfield Blue Valley development across the street from an undeveloped parcel to the southwest, a retail building to the southeast, and vacant building and parking lot on 1H to the northwest. This lot is being developed in conjunction with 1H as a stand-alone parking area and carwash.

### **Screening Wall - Elevations**

As seen along 1-64 exit ramp.

- Length - Proposing a 300' long.
- Height - 6' – 6'-10" in height.
- Materials – CMU, Manufactured stone veneer, metal fencing and limestone caps.

### **Landscape Design and Screening**

The applicant has proposed a mix of trees and shrubs along the screening wall on the northeast property line to soften the appearance of the wall, and continuing around the east corner before continuing along the southeast property line.

### **Carwash – Elevations**

- Area - 2,006 square feet
- Height – 17'-2"
- Materials – CMU, stucco, brick veneer, galvanized steel (doors).
- No rooftop mechanical units proposed.

### **Circulation and Access**

The subject site shares a cross access easement with Lot 1H. This proposal would fence off most of the proposed parking area on 1G for inventory vehicle parking, with a small carwash—incidental to inventory vehicle storage—located on the north side of the lot.

### **Lighting**

- 17 pole-mounted fixtures (double/single mount) for parking area.
- 2 overhead emergency lighting fixtures above carwash pedestrian doors.

### **Scale and Design**

The proposed carwash building is roughly 2,000 ft<sup>2</sup> and 14'0" in height. The carwash building will utilize a simple four-sided design with inventory vehicles entering through the south door and exiting to the north.

### **Parking**

The parking area will feature a two-foot, six-inch (2'6") bollard fence surrounding a large portion of the site's parking area with gated access to this lot on the east and northwest sides. These mechanical security gates measure between 4'6" and 6'0" in height and will be non-illuminated.

### **Bollard Fencing**

The 2'6" high bollard fencing encircling the inventory lot will be comprised of steel, painted tan to match that proposed on Lot 1H. This bollard fencing will extend across 220 linear feet of pavement on both the north and south sides of the carwash.

### **Materials and Color**

The carwash and screening wall will utilize a collection of materials that closely resemble those found on the existing building on Lot 1H.

## **DISCUSSION**

During discussion, the following information was provided:

- The applicant confirmed that the Stone Veneer to be located on all exterior sides– not exposed CMU. The stone matches the existing building.
- Foot-candle levels, foot-candle distance, and FAA regulations. Mr. Dietz explained the minimum and maximum foot-candle levels. These levels are compliant with the UDC.
- No lighting to be incorporated to the screen wall.

Overall the Board felt that the changes were a substantial and applauded the improvements with the car wash. There were no concerns with the proposed landscaping.

Board Member Lew stressed her concerns that the "timbers" on the front and rear facades were not consistent with the horizontal hip roof, "Prairie Style" of the surrounding Chesterfield Blue Valley development on Lot 1H.

Vice-Chair Starling made a motion to forward the **Chesterfield Blue Valley, Lot 1G** Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architectural Statement of Design to Planning Commission, as presented, with a recommendation of approval.

Board Member Mehrtens seconded the motion. **The motion then passed by a voice vote of 3 – 1.** Board Member Lew voted in opposition.

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

V. **OTHER**

VI. **ADJOURNMENT** 6:23 p.m.