

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 11, 2016
Room 101

ATTENDANCE:

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

ABSENT:

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Chair, Stanley Proctor
Planning Commission Liaison, Guy Tilman
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner
Mr. Aaron Hrenak, 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. January 14, 2016

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 6 – 0.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. River Crossings, Lot 4 (Holiday Inn Express):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.17 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located east of Arnage Rd., north of Chesterfield Airport Road.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner explained that the request is for a four story, 91 room hotel located within the River Crossings development, just west of the

Chesterfield Commons Six development. Ms. Henry provided Google street images of the site and the surrounding area.

Site Relationships

- The subject site contains eight separate lots and six buildings to date.
- There are two vacant lots within the development, the subject site, and Lot 6, to the west of the Lamborghini building.

Circulation System and Access

- The River Crossings development has one full shared access on Chesterfield Airport Road.
- The east-west access drive continues westward and eastward to the Chesterfield Commons Six development and the Chesterfield Commons Seven development.

Scale & Design

- The applicant is proposing a four story building of nearly forty-eight feet in height and 52,278 square feet in size.
- The hotel is centered on the site with surrounding parking.
- The dumpster enclosure is located at the northeastern corner of the site and is to be constructed of split face brick veneer to match the building with a prefinished metal wall cap and metal enclosure gates.
- Proposed internal striped crosswalks provide pedestrian circulation on the lots within the development.

Ordinance 2566 includes specific design guidelines for the River Crossings development. Below is a listing of the applicable guidelines (in italics) for the proposed Holiday Inn Express along with Staff input (in bold).

1. *A minimum of seventy-five (75%) of the exterior walls of all buildings will be constructed of brick masonry units.* **The building is constructed primarily of brick in three compatible colors.**
2. *All rooftop equipment will be screened from normal mid-range view lines by building parapets and/or roof screens constructed of metal.* **The applicant is proposing roof parapets that will fully screen the rooftop equipment, as shown by the sight-line study included in the submittal packets.**
3. *Service areas and trash enclosures will also be constructed of brick masonry units. Gates will be made of unpainted wood boards.* **The trash enclosure is constructed of the same brick as the primary building. Cedar wood gates are proposed.**

Materials and Color

- The building will be primarily comprised of brick and stone, with minor white elements of EIFS.

- To incorporate material variation to the hotel, three different colors of brick are proposed – neutral beige, darker brown, and a red brick.
- The design also includes typical hotel room windows on all elevations which will have anodized aluminum frames with louvers incorporated to accommodate the interior HVAC units.
- Introduction of a bright blue paint is proposed for the metal portions of the entrance canopy.

Landscape Design and Screening

- The site will be heavily planted with trees, shrubs, and several bio-retention areas, which meet the UDC requirements.
- Landscape beds containing shrubs will surround the building and parking island areas.
- The dumpster enclosure and ground-mounted utilities are screened by plantings.
- Open space requirement has also been met.

Lighting

- The lighting plan proposes the typical fully shielded, full cut-off pole mounted parking lot light fixtures and building entry wall mounted light fixtures. Additionally, canopy light fixtures are proposed at the entry.
- In addition to these, the applicant is proposing a significant amount of façade accent lighting on both the north and south elevations. This accent lighting consists of projections of intense blue light on various portions of the façade.

Lighting Fixture “G”

- Based on lighting criteria outlined within the Unified Development Code, Staff has determined that the proposed fixture type “G”, which is a 24 LED wall washer mounted to cast light on to the building and beyond into the sky, is not permitted by code and this has been communicated to the applicant as an issue to be addressed prior to Planning Commission review of this project.

Lighting Fixtures “H” and “J”

In addition to the large proposed uplights, smaller down accent lights, identified as fixture types “H” and “J”, which do not cast light beyond the building façade are proposed.

- Fixture “H” is a 12 LED downlight to be mounted on each of the entry canopy stone columns.
- Fixture “J” is a square metal halide fixture with four windows that emit beams of light in a cross pattern to provide decorative illumination on the building façade. Two of these fixtures are proposed on the main façade.
- Smaller applications of accent lighting such as these can be permitted if they are found to be architecturally integrated with the building design and harmonious with the surrounding area.

Although not included with the ARB packet, the applicant provided supplemental lighting documents showing similar lighting applications on other Holiday Inn Express hotels.

Staff is particularly interested in receiving feedback on these smaller wall-mounted fixtures from the ARB. Ms. Henry provided further identification of the proposed lighting fixtures.

Chair Gruchalla explained that due to a conflict of interest, Board Member Doug DeLong, Landscape Architect recused himself from participation.

DISCUSSION

Lighting

Board Member Brown asked for clarification as to the permissible lighting differences. Ms. Henry provided an explanation stating that the UDC specifies the following:

- Utilitarian Lighting - all utilitarian applications of lighting should be fully shielded and full cut-off light fixtures with flat lens and closed luminaires – particularly the beam of light should be shielded from public view. The utilitarian lighting is intended for safety purposes.
- Decorative lighting - is meant to complement or enhance the architecture or draw attention to interesting focal points such as; art work or architectural elements of importance and not meant to be used for signage or advertising purposes. For example; the UDC prohibits roaming spot lights, search lighting, and light leaving the site.

Ms. Henry further explained that the blue canopy lighting proposed is purely for decorative purposes that will accentuate the stone columns in the front of the building.

Ms. Henry noted her concern that the building is not harmonious with the surrounding development as it is not architecturally integrated enough and asked for comments from the Board.

Architecture

Board Member Clawson stated that due to the visibility of the proposed hotel, he had concerns with the overall lack of architectural elements of the building as compared to the surrounding buildings, which are highly-detailed with respect to finish, architectural fenestration, shade and shadow, and ins and outs on the buildings. He has concerns that the proposed building is a rectangle with different colors of brick that are all in the same plane, has very little architectural ornamentation, and very little shadow or detail. He added that in his opinion the Architectural guidelines have not been met.

While he applauded the use of masonry on the building, Board Member Weber concurred with Mr. Clawson's comments and voiced his additional concerns about the multitude of colors proposed, which he feels gives a "patch work" appearance to the

building. He suggested a change in the façade when there is a change in the color or material to create depth to the building.

Material samples were provided and the applicant was available to explain the details to the design, color palette, and materials.

Lighting

Board Member Clawson noted his concern about the lack of decorative housing for some of the smaller pedestrian lighting.

Color/Architecture

Board Member Weber had additional concerns pertaining to 1) the choice of location of the blue corporate color and whether there is enough of it; 2) inconsistencies in the drawings that could change the appearance of the project – such as all the mullions shown as red anodized, and the depiction of some of the stone and coloring that may not be accurate; and 3) lack of horizontal banding around the top of the building.

There was continued concern expressed about the integration of the blue color and how the blue light will look on the different colors of brick. Concern was also expressed about the lack of architectural elements to the proposed building.

Mechanical Equipment Screening

Because the rooftop mechanical equipment is above the parapets, the Board had concerns as to whether it would be visible from the highway. Mr. Raiche pointed out that a sight line study was provided which meets the UDC guidelines. It was noted that the rooftop mechanical equipment will be shielded by the parapet wall and not be visible to public view from various areas near the site. It was also explained that due to topography differences, it is impossible to screen the equipment from every off-site viewpoint but that the information provided does meet the requirements of the UDC.

Mr. Michael Sapp, Architect on the project, replied that the units will be completely centered in the building. Ms. Henry further explained that Staff will conduct a final review of the architecture and site items prior to issuance of the occupancy permit. If the units are visible, screening would be required per code which states that *all rooftop equipment will be screened from normal mid-range view lines by building parapets.*

Mr. Raiche then summarized the points raised;

- Lack of articulation in the overall façade depth.
- Lack of coordination of change in materials with architectural features.
- Lack of the integration of the “blue” accent light color.
- Lack of decorative housing for the proposed pedestrian level lighting fixtures.
- Renderings should correspond to the Architectural Elevations and material samples presented for the window frames.
- The Architectural Elevations should accurately reflect the material samples presented at the meeting.

Due to the substantial issues, the general consensus of the Board is to forward to Planning Commission with a recommendation to deny.

Mr. Raiche explained that the applicants have the option to request that the project be held with a request to return to ARB in order to address the concerns raised or to move forward to Planning Commission. Mr. Rob Schmidt, R.J.P. Development understands the Board's concerns and will continue to work with Staff to address those concerns, but has chosen to proceed to Planning Commission.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for River Crossings, Lot 4 (Holiday Inn Express) to the Planning Commission ***as presented with a recommendation for DENIAL based upon the following concerns;***

- *Lack of articulation with the overall façade depth – building is flat.*
- *Lack of coordination of change in materials with architectural features of the building.*
- *Lack of integration of the “blue” accent light color with the overall architecture of the building.*
- *The Architectural Elevation colors should more closely match the material samples provided.*
- *The red window frames should be revised to show the correct color.*
- *Non-decorative light fixture housings are not appropriate at the pedestrian level.*

Board Member Clawson recommended that the applicants drive through the Chesterfield Valley area in order to get a better understanding of the quality in design of the surrounding buildings and the expectations for new development.

Board Member Weber seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 – 0. As previously stated, due to a conflict of interest, Board Member DeLong abstained from the vote.**

IV. **OLD BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS** - None

VI: **ADJOURNMENT**
6:46 p.m.