

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
APRIL 9, 2015  
Room 101**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Mr. Matt Adams  
Mr. Rick Clawson  
Mr. Gary Perkins  
Mr. Mick Weber, Vice-Chair

**ABSENT**

Ms. Mary Brown  
Mr. Bud Gruchalla, Chair

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Planning Commission Chair, Mike Watson  
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner, Staff Liaison  
Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner  
Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner  
Ms. Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Vice-Chair Weber called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY****A. March 12, 2015**

**Board Member Clawson made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written. Board Member Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

**III. PROJECT PRESENTATION**

- A. Chesterfield Blue Valley, Lot 1C (Cavender's Boot City): A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.463 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located east of Outlet Boulevard, north of its intersection with Olive Street Road.**

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner explained that the applicant has submitted a request for a 19,250 square foot retail building with accessory parking located on the east side of Outlet Boulevard, north of its intersection with Olive Street Road.

Ms. Patel then provided photos of the area and surrounding sites, which show an existing Phillips 66 station to the southeast and the St. Louis Premium Outlets to the north.

### **Circulation System and Access**

The proposal includes one access point off of Convenience Way, a private drive, which serves the majority of Lot 1 of Chesterfield Blue Valley. Convenience Way is accessed off of Outlet Boulevard or a dedicated right turn off of Olive Street Road. There will be parking on three sides of the building. The front façade faces the site entrance and the architect has designed the building to have the elements of the front façade wrap around to the building allowing prominent views of the adjacent roadway.

The developer has proposed a five (5) foot sidewalk along Outlet Boulevard and Convenience Way which will tie into the future sidewalks along these roadways to provide a continuous sidewalk throughout the development. Cross access to Lot B is provided on the eastern portion of the site and the connection will be made when Lot B develops.

### **Landscape Design and Screening**

There is drainage swales along Chesterfield Airport Road and Outlet Boulevard and no improvements or landscaping are permitted in these areas. The applicant has provided the required street trees and landscape buffers outside these swales. The Landscape Plan meets all requirements of the City's Tree Preservation and Landscape Requirements Ordinance. Additional landscaping will be provided on the corners of the building, as well as at the entrance to the building.

### **Lighting**

The parking area fixtures and fixtures along Convenience Way will be mounted at 20 feet and are fully shielded. The building will include 12 gooseneck fixtures on the front and side elevations to further enhance the western theme of the building. The rear elevations include six (6) LED wall-pack utilitarian lighting fixtures to illuminate the loading area and drive aisle. The parking area light fixtures are currently under review by Staff. The approved design standards for this development require parking area fixtures to match the existing street lights in Chesterfield Blue Valley.

### **Design**

The building materials colors include lighter earth tones with darker accent colors ranging from cream to dark brown-toast color. Furthermore, the design includes a recessed entrance that is enhanced with stonework. Decorative lighted metal stars will be placed on all four sides of the building, with small painted stars along the top of the building.

The elements used on the front façade are wrapped around to the sides giving them an enhanced entrance appearance as well. The dumpster enclosure on the site will be fully screened by 6 foot tall stone and EIFS screen walls to match the building.

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

## **DISCUSSION**

Board Member Clawson had concerns with the vast amount of pavement (shown in the darker color on the colored site plan) that wraps around the entire building. He asked if this area will be used for outdoor displays. Ms. Patel explained that the pavement provides pedestrian circulation around the building. No outdoor displays are being proposed in the pavement areas. Board Member Clawson recommended the addition of landscaping or soft features to break up the look of this pavement. Because the rear elevation will be a very visible side of the building, he also recommends that the wainscot of the stone be brought across the rear of the building to match the sides and front. He further recommends evergreen hedging or trees along the north side of the fire-lane, across from the loading area. Ms. Patel pointed out that the area in question is reserved for a future ramp if the City or MoDOT chooses to pursue it; therefore, there are no improvements shown in that area.

Substantial discussion continued regarding the pavement surrounding the building and monotonous rear façade of the building and options on how to soften the overall look.

### **Applicant Comments**

Mr. Perry Thompson, Architect for the project agreed with the Board's comments concerning the rear elevation. He asked if it would be acceptable to the Board to include a 5 foot landscaping border along the entire rear of the property with plantings in between the columns. Board Member Perkins stated there should be a relationship between the planting areas and the architectural features provided. Board Member Clawson suggested that there be a variation in the height of landscaping to break up the façade. He then recommended that the applicant continue to work with Staff on this matter. He also recommended that plantings be included at the northeast corner of the building as there is a substantial amount of pavement that needs to be broken up in this area.

It was noted that the roof-top mechanical equipment will be fully screened by a parapet wall. Due to the Boards concern about screening, Ms. Patel added that Staff will ask for a sight study to ensure that the equipment will be screened.

Planning Chair Watson requested more information about the lighted stars noting that they include neon lighting and which will shine 360° around the star. The applicant confirmed that the lighting will be fully-shielded and will not shine outward as it is on a 2" standoff, but there will be a 360° wash on the wall. The applicant added that photographs of the lighted stars will be provided to the Planning Commission for review.

**Board Member Clawson** made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for Chesterfield Blue Valley, 1C (Cavender's Boot City) to the

Planning Commission *with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions;*

1. Break-up the rear elevation by adding the stone wainscoting on the rear façade, similar to the other three façades of the building and/or include additional landscaping along the rear elevation.
2. Add landscaping, especially evergreen trees, on the north side of the fire-lane on the rear of the building to provide screening for the loading areas.
3. Add landscaping to break-up the large paved areas between the building and parking areas and consider adding flowering trees on the side elevations, near the doors.
4. Provide additional lighting information on the decorative, lighted stars to ensure there will be no light-trespass. Provide night-time exhibits of these lighted stars.

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

- B. Chesterfield Blue Valley, Lot 1H (Gander Mountain):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 6.015 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located east of Outlet Boulevard, north of its intersection with Olive Street Road.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner explained that the applicant has submitted a request for a 60,000 square foot retail building with accessory parking located on the east side of Outlet Boulevard, north of its intersection with Olive Street Road.

Ms. Patel then provided photos of the area and surrounding sites, which show an existing Phillips 66 station to the southeast and the St. Louis Premium Outlets to the north.

A Boundary Adjustment Plat has been submitted to readjust the boundaries between the subject site (Lot 1H) and the lot to the south (Lot 1G). This application is still under review.

### **Circulation System and Access**

The applicant is proposing one access point that would be shared between Lot 1G and 1H off of Outlet Boulevard and two secondary access points through the Outlet Mall site. There will be parking in front of the building, with a loading area on the back-side of the building which will be fully screened. A sidewalk is proposed along Outlet Boulevard with a connection through the landscaped island in the parking lot to connect to the front of the building.

### **Landscape Design and Screening**

Due to a drainage swale along Chesterfield Airport Road, no improvements or landscaping are permitted in this area. The applicant has provided the required

landscape buffer outside of the drainage swale. In addition, street trees along Outlet Boulevard are provided between the sidewalk and parking areas, to ensure the trees will be protected from vehicular traffic along Outlet Boulevard. Landscaping will be provided surrounding the building to help break up the facades. In addition, three rain gardens will be included.

### **Lighting Plan**

Ms. Patel noted that the lighting fixtures will match that of the Burlington store. The parking area consists of 14 fixtures mounted at 20 feet and are fully shielded. There will be two (2) lights along the shared drive of between Lot 1G and 1H. The project also consists of 22 architectural fixtures and 9 utilitarian fixtures which will illuminate areas around the building and the loading area.

### **Design**

The proposed building design features elevations that are articulated with brick, textured coated concrete wall panels, and stone. The front and rear elevations will have an enhanced timber canopy system with a standing seam metal roof and accent metal awnings on each side. There will be large aluminum curtain walls on the front elevation. The proposed parapet walls will fully screen the roof-top mechanical equipment. There will be a green accent band on top of the building to match the metal awnings and the roof over the timber canopy system, which is associated with the Gander Mountain brand. The textured concrete walls will have a khaki finish. An additional accent brick band will run along the bottom of the building on all four sides.

Staff has been working with the applicant to provide additional landscaping to the front of the building. It is Staff's understanding the applicant does not wish to proceed with large trees on the front of the building but they are willing to incorporate some additional planters.

Material samples were provided and the applicant explained the details to the design, color palette, and materials.

## **DISCUSSION**

Board Member Clawson recommended possible reveal work, trees or landscaping to break up the large painted tilt up areas along the front of the building, on each side of the entrance.

### **Applicant Comments**

Mr. Dustin Rassbach, Project Manager for Gander Mountain explained the following:

- Horizontal and vertical chamfered reveals are being provided to help break up the façade. They do not show up well on the submitted elevations.
- They are open to additional landscaping including wrought-iron planters to enhance the overall look of the front of the building.

Vice-Chair Weber also recommended incorporating some additional accent lighting to the front facade. Mr. Rassbach explained that the front and rear canopies will have the Gander Mountain logo along with internal accent lighting to provide a warm glow within the canopy system. The architectural features are designed to tie into the Prairie Style theme of the nearby Outlet Mall.

Vice-Chair Weber requested that the roof-top mechanical equipment be fully screened. The applicant clarified that no dumpster is proposed except for an outside trash compactor.

In response to Planning Chair Watson, Ms. Patel confirmed that the end brick and glass columns only include two exterior architectural light fixtures, no other exterior lighting is proposed in these areas. Mr. Rassbach added that these areas will have spandrel glass and therefore the internal building light will not shine through.

**Board Member Clawson** made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for Chesterfield Blue Valley, Lot 1H (Gander Mountain) to the Planning Commission *with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions;*

1. Add landscaping along the front elevation, between the brick columns and building entrance. These can be planting beds or planters.
2. Clearly show all the reveals on the building.
3. Ensure the rooftop equipment is completely screened by the parapet wall and provide Staff with sight line studies from all property lines.

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

- C. Chesterfield Commons Six, Lot 7B (Courtyard by Marriott):** An Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Landscape Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 2.807 acre lot of land zoned "C-8" Planned Commercial located south of Interstate 40 and west of the intersection of Boone's Crossing and Chesterfield Airport Road.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner explained that the request is for a four story, 112 room hotel located within the Chesterfield Commons Six development. The proposed hotel is 61,668 square feet in size and will be located on Parcel 7B which is 2.8 acres in size.

Ms. Henry then provided history of the subject site which contains nine separate lots and seven buildings to date. The proposed Courtyard by Marriott hotel is situated behind the fast food restaurants located on the four (4) outparcels along Chesterfield Airport Road.

### **Circulation System and Access**

The Chesterfield Commons Six development has one full access on Chesterfield Airport Road, which leads to Butler Drive, a private cross access drive that serves all nine lots. Cross access is also provided along the northern and southern parking lot perimeters of the three buildings that house HH Gregg, Amini's, and Treasure Rooms. A sidewalk is proposed along the southern perimeter of the subject site which will connect to the existing sidewalk and provide for pedestrian circulation to each of the lots within the development.

### **Site Design**

There is an existing MSD pump station at the northeastern corner of the site. MSD will retain access to this station through an easement, and the pump station will be screened from view by landscaping. Ms. Henry then provided photos of the surrounding buildings within the Chesterfield Commons Six development.

The proposed hotel is oriented so the front façade faces inward to the Chesterfield Commons Six development.

The courtyard area that is proposed at the rear of the building will be enclosed by a six (6) foot tall screen wall and topped with a two foot aluminum decorative cap. The interior of the courtyard will have a circular fire pit and will be furnished with tables and chairs.

### **Landscaping Design and Screening**

A full landscape buffer is provided along the northern boundary of the subject site. This buffer will screen the parking areas from the view of I-64/40. Trees will be planted throughout the site along with landscape beds containing shrubs which will surround the building and parking areas. In addition to the landscaping shown on the plan, beds of annual plantings will provide seasonal color around the main entry to the hotel. Three (3) rain gardens are proposed which will be planted with native plantings. Both the MSD pump station and trash enclosure are proposed to be screened by trees and/or shrubs.

### **Lighting**

The lighting plan proposes pole-mounted parking lot light fixtures, utilitarian building entry wall-mounted light fixtures, canopy light fixtures, and 11 bollard light fixtures in the courtyard area. The decorative bollard light fixtures will be screened by the courtyard screen wall.

### **Materials and Color**

The building will be primarily comprised of EIFS, split-face concrete block, pre-cast concrete accent band, and sheet metal roofing. Three different colors of EIFS are proposed – white, neutral beige and deep green that corresponds to the metal roofs proposed on the rear elevation. The brick color will match that of the surrounding

buildings within the various Chesterfield Commons developments. The courtyard screen wall and trash enclosure will be constructed of the same brick.

The building is articulated to break up the repetitive window pattern. This articulation breaks up the elevations and reduces a box-like appearance and large, flat expanses of EIFS. The roof-mounted utility units will be fully screened by the parapet walls.

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

## **DISCUSSION**

In response to Board Member Perkins' questions, Ms. Henry clarified that the native plantings near the bio-retention areas will adhere to MSD requirements.

### **Applicant Comments**

Ms. Stacy Holmes, Architect for the project answered the board member's questions pertaining to the location of the stamped concrete, which will be underneath the porte-cochere. She also confirmed that the building design is reflective of the newest Courtyard by Marriott standards.

She provided additional information about the window utility grills explaining that they will be flush mounted and in the same color as the adjacent material in order to blend into the façade of the building. The additional space within the proposed trash enclosure will be used strictly for maintenance equipment.

Board Member Clawson stated that although the project meets Architectural Review Standards, he had concerns with the overall scale and proportions of the design – specifically there are dramatic color changes from light to dark, and a lack of architectural rhythm to the building. He feels that the proposed building does not equal the design standards of the surrounding developments.

*Additional discussion continued as to the materials, color palette, and architectural elements of the proposed building.*

Mr. Boyer then asked for clarification and further explanation of the points raised by Board Member Clawson. Board Member Clawson stated it is his opinion that there are some awkward terminations of the materials; he noted the different sizes and materials of the vertical bands that comprise the elevations. He added that some of the bands do not have any repetition through them; some of details used are totally different than what is used in other areas; and there is some awkward scaling and an awkward use of materials.

Ms. Holmes pointed out that the elevations only show the project in two dimensional form versus three dimensional which would provide a better understanding of the detail and design. Board Member Clawson recommended that the applicant provide

additional three dimensional architectural renderings at the Planning Commission meeting in an effort to better communicate the overall design of the building.

**Board Member Clawson** made a motion to forward the Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Landscape Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Amended Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for Chesterfield Commons Six, Lot 7B (Courtyard by Marriott) to the Planning Commission *with a recommendation for approval with the following conditions;*

- Provide additional architectural renderings to better represent the building design.
- Evaluate opportunities to improve some of the terminations, scale, and proportions of the building materials to create a more cohesive design.

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

- D. Larry Enterprises – Lynch Hummer, Lot B (Scott Retail):** Amended Architectural Elevations and an Amended Architect's Statement of Design for a 7.09 acre lot of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located on the west side of Boone's Crossing on the north side of North Outer 40 Road.

***Due to a conflict of interest as Architect for the project, Board Member Clawson recused himself from discussion and vote leaving one vote short of a quorum on this item. Although there will be no vote taken on the project due to the lack of a quorum, the project still moves forward to Planning Commission.***

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner explained that the Scott Retail building is adjacent to the Jim Lynch Hummer building. She then provided photos of the site and the surrounding area.

### **Site History**

The Planning Commission approved the project in October 2013 and construction began on the site in the fall of 2014. With the shell building complete, in January 2015 the applicant began applying the brick veneer to the exterior of the building. However, the coloration of the brick veneer on the building does not conform to the brick that was presented as part of the Architectural Elevations approved by the Planning Commission.

Therefore, this is a violation of the approved elevations, and as such, the applicant submitted an application for Amended Architectural Elevations and Amended Statement of Design to request approval of the new brick. The approved Architectural Elevations and Architects' Statement of Design explicitly state that the subject building was intended to match the building materials of the adjacent Lynch Hummer building including the use of a predominantly red brick. This project was presented at the

March 9, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, where a motion to send the project to the Architectural Review Board for recommendations was passed.

### **Overhead doors**

In addition to the change in the brick that was used in the construction of the building, there is one other minor deviation from the approved architectural elevations. The approved elevations for the rear elevation shows four overhead loading dock doors and one smaller dock door with a leveler. On the actual building and included in the proposed revised architectural elevation, all five overhead doors are the same size.

Further, after this project was presented to the Planning Commission, the protective coating on the composite metal panels on the front façade of the building was removed. At that time, Staff noticed that the metal panels appeared darker in color than anticipated based on the approval elevations. Therefore, Staff is requesting that the Architectural Review Board review the metal panels and determine if they comply with the approved Architectural Elevations.

*Comparison photos were provided of the Approved Elevation which is comprised of a solid, red brick and the Proposed Elevation which is predominately red in color with lighter and darker accent bricks. Additional photos of the composite metal panels in a variety of weather conditions were presented.*

If the Board is opposed to the change in brick as requested in the Amended Architectural Elevations, the applicant included the following ideas in their submittal for the ARB's consideration:

1. Insert a thick evergreen landscape buffer between the Scott Retail building and the former Lynch Hummer building to mitigate the contrast, which would also result in some parking reconfiguration;
2. Stain the lighter bricks to soften the variation in the brick and minimize the contrast between the two buildings; and
3. Completely modify the brick by staining or painting of the entire building.

Staff has been diligently working with the applicant regarding this violation. The applicant is aware of the seriousness of the situation and has provided various ideas for abating the violation that resulted from the incorrect brick begin used in construction of the building.

### **DISCUSSION**

The Board noted the significant difference of the Approved Elevation versus the Proposed Elevation and the need to address the situation. Ms. Henry clarified that the project is still actively under construction; however, Staff is not aware of any additional departures from the approved Architectural Elevations in the construction of this building. Vice-Chair Weber expressed concern that the fix could possibly be worse than the original intent.

Vice-Chair Weber would like to have the brick stained but has concerns that it will not match the initial intent. He suggested having this option investigated to see if the brick can be successfully stained.

### **Applicant Comments**

Mr. Nick Joggerst, with Scott Properties explained that Brick Imaging Company has been contacted to provide a professional assessment of the staining options in order to achieve the desired color effect. Brick Imaging is a highly reputable company that specializes in this process and has transformed old buildings to have a completely different appearance. Mr. Joggerst does not feel that painting the building is the best solution for the long-term, citing maintenance concerns. However, he also stated that Brick Imaging advised him that darker bricks are more difficult to stain and it is difficult to know in advance how their staining treatment will react on the darker bricks. There was considerable discussion regarding the complexity of the staining process noting that it is a trial and error operation.

Vice-Chair Weber suggested that if the staining of the brick does not adequately match the Lynch Hummer building, a landscape buffer be provided to separate the two buildings. It was agreed that test panels would be necessary in order to test the staining process prior to any changes to the building.

Planning Chair Watson questioned whether the brick veneer could be removed and replaced. Mr. Clawson explained that size of the brick in these panels required field modifications to the building dimensions to accommodate the windows and canopies. Therefore, it would be difficult to remove the veneer panels and replace them with a brick veneer that complies with the approved brick color.

Discussion occurred on the process for this project. Ms. Henry noted that the application will go back to the Planning Commission once the applicant has determined the method for altering the color of the brick comply with the approved Architectural Elevations. Mr. Boyer summarized that the Board's direction is to have the brick color match the approved elevations.

The Board did not have an issue with the overhead door and found the metal panels to be compliant with the approved Architectural Elevations, so no further action on these items is required. However, prior to going back to the Planning Commission, it is recommended that high quality photos be provided of the test panels of the stained brick.

***As stated previously, due to the lack of a quorum a vote will not be made on the project; however, the three (3) Board Members concur that the applicant's Planning Commission submittal should include high quality photos, samples, and building mock-up of the applicant's test staining method for the brick panels.***

IV. **OLD BUSINESS** - None

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

Because this is Board Member Gary Perkins final meeting, Mr. Boyer thanked and presented him with a letter of gratitude for his dedicated service for many years to the City and wished him well.

VI: **ADJOURNMENT**

**Board Member Perkins made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Clawson seconded the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.**