

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019  
CONFERENCE ROOM 101

**ATTENDANCE:**

Mr. Matt Adams  
Mr. Doug DeLong  
Mr. Bud Gruchalla, Chair  
Mrs. Jessica Stoll  
Mr. Craig Swartz  
Mr. Mick Weber, Vice-Chair

**ABSENT:**

Mr. Rick Clawson

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councilmember Dan Hurt  
Planning Commission Chair, Merrell Hansen  
Planning Commission Liaison, Allison Harris  
Ms. Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, Staff Liaison  
Mr. Andrew Stanislav, 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 14, 2019**

Board Member DeLong made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Stoll seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 - 0.

**III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None**

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. MPD Investments, Lot 1 (Metro Lighting) Lighting Package:** Architectural Specialty Lighting Package for a 4.02-acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located on the north side of North Outer 40 Road west of Boone's Crossing (17U520148).

Board Member Adams arrived to the meeting at this point

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Andrew Stanislav, Planner explained that the applicant is seeking approval for the use of color LED up-lighting above the solar panel awning along the west and east sides of the south elevation as well as within the center arch alcove feature above the storefront entry.

Mr. Stanislav provided color photos and a brief history of the site and the surrounding area. He then pointed out the Comprehensive Plan and the Unified Development Code (UDC) policies relevant to the project.

### **PROJECT TIMELINE**

On January 12, 2017, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) recommended approval of the Amended Architectural Elevations with the following conditions:

- The colors be limited to two, with a primary color along the band above the solar panels and, if desired, a secondary color under the archway.
- The colors be static for a 24-hour period, including from sun up to sun down.

Subsequently, the Planning Commission considered the Amended Architectural Elevations on February 13, 2017 and passed a motion to deny approval noting concerns regarding light spillage and setting a precedent for other developments in the City.

Since this original consideration, the City of Chesterfield introduced the Architectural Specialty Lighting Package. As of February 2019, the light fixtures at Metro Lighting remain mounted on the building and are turned off.

### **PROGRAMMING**

The standard programming for the lighting on the east and west sides is proposed to be one static color and one additional different static color is proposed to illuminate the central arch feature for a total of two colors displayed at a single time. These colors are proposed each to change one time while the light fixtures are in operation, with a transition duration of no longer than two (2) seconds. The overall operation of the light fixtures will be between sunset and 11:00 pm.

The applicant is also proposing static holiday/event displays with no color change or transition as part of the programming. These displays are proposed to feature between one and three colors at one time on the building. Standard programming color light display images were included with the ARB meeting packet.

### **ARCHITECTURAL SPECIALTY LIGHTING PACKAGE**

Below is a *brief* summary of the requirements relevant to this project;

- Architectural specialty lighting should highlight and accentuate traditional building detailing and architectural features.
- The color temperature should underscore the building materials and character.
- All proposed light fixtures should be permanently mounted.
- Architectural specialty lighting shall not interfere with or obscure the public's capacity to receive information, or cause visual confusion by interfering with pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
- Consideration of flexibility in architectural specialty lighting criteria is based on a number of review factors, such as; the physical and quality impact of the proposed architectural specialty lighting package, and mitigation of unfavorable conditions.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Unified Development Code (UDC)**

Ms. Henry, Assistant City Planner explained that the lighting package requirements were written into the UDC to state that any changes above what is allowed in the UDC will require a two-thirds vote at the Planning Commission. She added that the applicant has requested the full spectrum color scheme. Staff will monitor and enforce any substantial color scheme differences.

### **Applicant Comment**

Mr. Ed Snyder, Meglio Lighting Group explained that the intent of the lighting was designed to enhance the building architecture but not meant to be *showy or flashy*.

Board Member Weber pointed out that the original concerns were whether the attention-getting lights are considered advertising or signage.

Overall the Board was not opposed to the lighting; however, there was considerable discussion as to the purpose of the two (2) second color scheme frequency, number of colors and how to minimize a precedent for future development. Mr. Matt Gagnepain, Metro Lighting further explained the lighting programming capabilities.

Ms. Henry noted that the intent of the two (2) second color scheme frequency was *not* meant to be used for client demonstrations.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Weber made a motion to forward the Architectural Specialty Lighting Package for MPD Investments (Metro Lighting) to the Planning Commission ***with a recommendation for approval with the following condition:***

- One color scheme with a maximum of three (3) colors per business day and to remain static from initiating illumination at sunset until ceasing illumination at 11:00 p.m.

Board Member DeLong seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 6 - 0.**

V. **OTHER**

VI. **ADJOURNMENT 6:37**