

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MARCH 10, 2016
Room 102/103**

ATTENDANCE:

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

ABSENT:

Mr. Doug DeLong

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councilmember Dan Hurt
Councilmember Barb McGuinness
Planning Commission Chair, Stanley Proctor
Planning Commission Liaison, Allison Harris
Planning Commissioner Merrell Hanson
Planning Commissioner Wendy Geckeler
Planning Commissioner Guy Tilman
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison
Ms. Jessica Henry, 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 11, 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 5 - 0.

III. PROJECT PRESENTATION

- A. Peter Steffan, Proposed Lot 1 (AutoZone): A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for a 0.88 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District, located North of Chesterfield Airport Road west of its intersection with Arnage Boulevard.**

PROJECT PRESENTATION

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner stated the request is for a new 6,000 square foot AutoZone commercial building with proposed parking on the front and side of the building, bio retention basins along the rear of the property, and a dumpster enclosure located in the northwest corner of the site. Ms. Henry provided an aerial photo and google images of the subject site and the surrounding area.

Circulation System and Access

- A single access point off of Chesterfield Airport Road is proposed. Cross access to Lot 2 of the proposed development as well as to the vacant parcels to the west and north is provided as required by ordinance for future development.

Front and Rear Elevations

- The building is almost an entirely brick veneer building. The only material variation in the application of the material is the utilization of soldier courses around the building to provide variation and interest.
- The front elevation is comprised of brick veneer, evergreen glass clerestory windows, black faux windows, EIFS that is to be painted orange and white, and a large clear anodized aluminum storefront.

Ms. Henry explained that the façade is entirely flat lacking entry recess, roof/overhang or projecting canopies as noted by the following Architectural Review Design Standard as being desirable:

- *Provide entry recesses, plazas, roof overhangs, wall fins, projecting canopies or other similar features indicating the building's entry points while providing protection.*

Side Elevations

- The side elevations are almost entirely brick veneer along with soldier courses around the building to provide some architectural interest.
- There is a loading and access door on the side of the building.

Landscape Design and Screening

- As required by the UDC, a 30 foot landscape buffer planted with trees, shrubs, and ornamental grasses is provided along the Chesterfield Airport Road frontage.
- A hedgerow along the parking lot will screen parked vehicles from view.
- Significant landscaping is proposed around the monument sign location and street tree are provided as required by the UDC.
- Landscape beds planted with annuals will permit for seasonal color and interest. The remainder of the landscaping is to be located in the rear of the site consisting of bio retention basins planted per MSD specifications.
- The dumpster enclosure will be screened by shrubs and bushes.

Lighting

- The applicant is proposing five wall-mounted light fixtures and five pole-mounted fixtures.
- Each of these fixtures is utilitarian in nature and features fully-shielded, full cut-optics as required by the UDC.

Retaining Wall

A small red brick wall is proposed along the access drive of the building, which is still under review by Staff.

Material samples were provided and the applicant then explained the exact location of the design, color palette, and materials.

DISCUSSION

Board Member Weber had concerns regarding the overall “flat” façade of the proposed building and felt that there needs to be some articulation or “punching” of the entrances – possibly recess some of the entrances. He suggested breaking up the masonry as it carries around the building so there are not solid facades on the front and sides. He noted that the soldier course is a good effort and that it may be a good transition point for a different masonry color or material to break up the expanse of the solid red brick. He then questioned whether the orange and white painted EIFS is considered signage since those are Autozone’s corporate colors. Mr. Raiche explained that the painted EIFS is considered part of the façade and architecture and, as such, should be evaluated by the Board as part of the building design.

Board Member Clawson concurred with Mr. Weber’s comments. He then noted that since there is developable land behind the proposed AutoZone, he felt the building should be treated as a four sided, finished building with the incorporation of architectural articulation to the facade, along with material changes and details to the face of the building. He also recommended that the applicant work to provide more accurate renderings to match the material samples prior to Planning Commission.

Although Board Member Doug DeLong was unable to attend the meeting, Mr. Raiche presented the following comment on Mr. DeLong’s behalf:

Peter Steffan, Proposed Lot 1 (AutoZone)

- *Board Member DeLong felt that this is a well landscaped project. The plant selection is good and they have been used in a cohesive design. The Sea Green juniper will get tall enough to block the grill and headlights of the average car.*

Retaining Wall

The applicant explained that the retaining wall proposed along the access drive will be at curb height on the AutoZone side and two feet higher on the road side to address grade changes. Because the wall is proposed at curb height, Chair Gruchalla had safety concerns in that a car could back up to the wall and go off the top of it.

Mr. Raiche explained that any wall height concerns will be reviewed by Staff as part of site plan review.

In response to Board Member Brown's comment, the applicant explained that due to the location of the wall and lack of space, landscaping is not proposed. Mr. Raiche stated that Staff will work with the applicant to see if landscaping can be integrated near the proposed retaining wall. Board Member Weber agreed that some landscaping should be incorporated to provide some relief and separation to eliminate the "pavement to pavement" effect which is prohibited.

Ms. Henry pointed out the road is not a public road but the internal access drive and part of the site circulation as proscribed by ordinance and the approved preliminary plan to allow for future expansion. She added that the preliminary plan would not have shown the grade change.

The applicant stated that they are more than happy to work with Staff to provide architectural elements to the façade and additional landscape design.

Mr. Raiche then summarized the points raised:

- ***The building design should include architectural elements to add depth and to break up the flat façade through change of color, material, or building articulation.***
- ***Treat the design as a "four sided" building and take into consideration future development of the properties behind the proposed development.***
- ***The architectural renderings should accurately correspond to the material and color samples provided.***
- ***Reconsider the location and design, including material and height of the retaining wall and consider incorporating landscaping to delineate the wall from the adjacent drive aisle.***

Board Member Brown made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for Peter Steffan, Proposed Lot 1 (AutoZone) to the Planning Commission ***with the recommendations as summarized above.***

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

- B. Trails West Village of Greentrails, Lot 270 B:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.6 acre tract of land zoned "C-8" Planned Commercial District, located at the southeast corner of Ladue Road and Greentrails Drive.

PROJECT PRESENTATION

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner stated the request is for a new 4,000 square foot retail center to be located on Lot 270 B of the Trails West Village of Greentrails subdivision. The building will have four separate entries to tenant spaces. The site is heavily wooded and a creek runs through the southeast corner of the site. Ms. Henry provided photos of the site and the surrounding area.

Although the Trails West Village of Greentrails subdivision is primarily residential in nature, Lot 270, is zoned “C-8” Planned Commercial District which allows the existing neighborhood service station and retail development.

Site Relationships

- A large portion of the site is not developable due to the creek and buffering requirements.

Circulation System and Access

- The subject site has direct access from South Greentrails Drive as well as access from Ladue Road via the shared internal drive.
- No changes to the location of these access points are proposed.

Materials, Color and Design

- The primary materials on the building are CMU block along the base and the brick.
- Dark Bronze anodized aluminum and glass storefronts.
- Proposed roof screening of the mechanical equipment.

Ordinance 378 states that submittals for building within this “C-8” Planned Commercial District should “*show the architectural character of the neighborhood and how the buildings blend with and complement the surrounding residential neighborhood.*”

The applicant is proposing to utilize primarily brick veneer on all four elevations of the building. The proposed colors are appropriate for the neighborhood. However, the metal fascia, flat roof, and the use of CMU block are not typical to residential neighborhoods.

During Staff’s review several inconsistencies were found with the ARB submittal and will be addressed throughout the presentation and will not proceed to the Planning Commission until all outstanding items have been addressed. ***The following inconsistencies were identified:***

Parapet

The drawings show a parapet around the rear of the building - the checklist states no parapet will be provided along the rear of the building.

Wood Screen Enclosure

The drawings show a wood screen enclosure for the roof top equipment – the checklist states the use of standing steel material instead of wood. This information was not presented to Staff prior to receipt of the meeting packet. Staff has requested additional information on the screening with concerns due to the small height and scale of the building.

Lighting

Three fixtures are proposed however only two light fixture cut sheets were included in the ARB submittal. The third wall pack was submitted after distribution of the packets.

- *The applicant is proposing nine wall mounted light fixtures and seven pole mounted fixtures throughout the site.*
- *Each of these fixtures is utilitarian in nature and features fully-shielded, full cut-off optics and closed luminaires as required by the UDC.*

Architectural Rendering

The parapet is clearly shown in the rendering as being extended around the building. The checklist that was provided states – a proposed black EPDM roof material but the rendering depicts a white color.

Topography/Retaining Wall

- There is a significant grade differential on the site as it slopes down towards a creek along the southern property line.
- A concrete retaining wall is proposed around the back of the building with a metal railing.

Landscape Design and Screening

- As required by the UDC, a thirty foot landscape buffer and berm planted with trees, shrubs, and ornamental grasses is provided along the South Greentrails Drive frontage. This will serve to buffer the adjacent residential area from the commercial use of the site and to provide screening from headlights.
- Additional street trees and plantings are located within the parking area in accordance with City code.

Due to the residential nature of the surrounding development, Staff requested that a sight-line study be provided related to the proposed mechanical screening; however, the applicant has elected not to provide this document. The introduction of wood roof-top screening, including the apparent change in material, remains under review by Staff and input on this item from the Architectural Review Board is encouraged.

DISCUSSION

Although Board Member Doug DeLong was unable to attend the meeting, Mr. Raiche presented the following comment on Mr. DeLong's behalf:

Trails West Village of Greentrails, Lot 270 B

- *Board Member DeLong felt that the grading plan did not seem to reflect the proposed berm other than call it out. He added that the berm is a good idea and the plantings proposed on the top of it should help to mitigate the headlights shining onto the residential property across the street. The plants selected are hardy and have been used appropriately. He suggested that an island be added to the back and side of the proposed dumpster for screening purposes.*

Roof Design

Board Member Weber stated he likes the material selection on the building, however, he has concerns that some of the architectural elements do not match some of the character in the residential neighborhood such as; the pitches of the residential roofs are steeper than the flat roof being proposed for the subject site. He also commented that the building design should consider all four facades in relationship to the surrounding buildings.

Chair Gruchalla pointed out that the building on Lot 270-A1 has a gable roof design similar to the residential homes along Ladue Road and S. Greentrails Drive versus the flat roof of the proposed building. Because the site is highly visible specifically from the residential area along S. Greentrails Drive, he felt that a pitched roof design could be incorporated to match the existing buildings within the development. Chair Gruchalla did not object to the use of metal roof and fascia, but he did not feel that a flat roof is appropriate for the site.

Site Circulation and Access

Board Member Clawson stated that in his opinion, the site did not "flow" well and lacked a cohesive design. He questioned whether there is a cross access agreement for parking or whether the building is a 100% standalone building with no cross access parking. He strongly felt that the proposed structure was not well integrated into this "planned development" nor was it adequately positioned within the site. Ms. Henry explained that cross access is provided. During Staff review, site orientation, layout, access, and circulation are taken into consideration.

Ms. Nassif stated she appreciates Mr. Clawson's comments and concerns, but explained site access, circulation and the building layout are still under review by the planning and engineering staff so we can and will keep note of the concerns as we continue our review, but should not be included in the formal ARB motion for this project.

As a neighbor of the subject site, Chair Gruchalla provided information about how the circulation of the site currently works.

Building Materials and Design

In response to Board Member Clawson's questions concerning building fascia and sign band materials, the applicant explained the exact location of the design, color palette, and materials that were provided. Board Member Clawson stated that he has serious concerns with the building itself and felt that the proposed structure is a very "dated" retail design. He felt that the proposed retail building did not match the surrounding residential area with respect to material, design or color.

Substantial discussion continued regarding concern about the proposed flat roof and how it does not match the roofs of the surrounding residences.

Roof top Mechanical Equipment Screening

Board Member Brown felt that adequate screening of the roof top mechanical equipment needs to be integrated into the building design such as through the use of a parapet wall. The applicant responded that they will continue to work with Staff and incorporate the recommendations from the Board.

Building Orientation

There was additional discussion about how the building is oriented on the site. Mr. Michael Meiners, P.E. St. Charles Engineering & Surveying, further explained the location of the future access. He pointed out that due to an existing creek along the southern property line, some of the parking had to be removed to meet the 25 foot setback requirements. In his opinion, he feels that the proposed building orientation is the best way to position the building on the site.

Mr. Raiche then summarized the points raised:

- ***The design should reflect the residential character of the neighborhood, particularly in regards to the roof design, materials, and color.***
- ***Any proposed roof top mechanical equipment and associated screening should be integrated into the roof design and fully shielded from public view.***
- ***The design should be integrated across all four facades given the proximity of the proposed building to the adjacent buildings within the Greentrails commercial development.***
- ***Incorporate landscaping around the dumpster enclosure.***

Note: Although the building location/orientation in relation to the rest of the buildings within the development is out of the purview of the board, Staff noted that the concern is appreciated and will review this concern as well.

Board Member Weber made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for Trails West Village of Greentrails, Lot 270 B to the Planning Commission *with the recommendations as summarized above.*

Board Member Brown seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 - 1. *Board Member Clawson voted NO.***

IV. **OLD BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS** - None

VI: **ADJOURNMENT**

7:10 PM