

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
August 14, 2008**

PRESENT

Mrs. Mary Brown
Mr. Bryant Conant
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Dave Whitfield
Mr. Rick Clawson
Ms. Lu Perantoni, Planning Commission Liaison
Ms. Amy Nolan, Planning Commission Member
Ms. Wendy Geckeler, Planning Commission Member
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner
Ms. Carol Olejniczak, Administrative Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Matt Adams
Mr. Gary Perkins

I. CALL TO ORDER: Bud Gruchalla, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS:

- A. Kraus Farm Office Center/Building A (Opus Northwest):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for a 14.414 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located at 14730 Conway Road, near the northwest corner of Highway 40/Interstate 64 and Timberlake Manor Drive.

Rick Clawson recused himself from the discussion and voting because his architectural firm is directly involved in the project.

Senior Planner, Mara Perry, presented for Assistant Director of Planning, Anissa McCaskill-Clay, who was unable to attend. The project request is for a 172,665 square feet commercial office building which is the first building of two that will occupy the site. The site is zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District. There is a parking garage to the rear of the building and a retention basin to the front. Additionally, at the very rear of the site, behind the fire lane, there is a green area that is proposed to be dedicated to the City for recreational use. The building and parking garage exterior materials will consist of architectural pre-cast concrete, tinted glass, and pre-finished metal panels. The landscape plan has been reviewed by Staff, and there are no outstanding issues at this time.

Item(s) Discussed:

- Retention basin in front has the possibility of having a fountain feature, but it is not proposed at this time
- Berm in back with retaining wall screens residential neighbors off Conway Rd. from building
- Walkway from parking garage to building is made of pavers and accent pavement
- Trash enclosure is located out of the way, under trees and is an 8 ft. high enclosure with materials that match the building
- Site meets all of Monarch Chesterfield Fire District's requirements
- Both retention basins will be constructed at the same time but the second one will be dry until the second building is constructed
- Retaining wall will be a modular split face architectural retaining wall
- Purpose of aquatic bench is for water quality requirements by MSD that they adopted last October
- Doorway access
- Strong pedestrian pathway between parking garage and building
- Second building will be a mirror image of the first building

Mary Brown made a motion to forward the project for approval.

Bryan Conant seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 5-0

- B. Spirit Valley Business Park, Lot 12 (Chesterfield Fence): A Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, Landscape Plan, and Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.47 acre parcel located at 620 Spirit Valley East Drive, west of the intersection of Olive Street Road and Chesterfield Airport Road.**

Senior Planner, Mara Perry, presented for Project Planner, Justin Wyse, who was unable to attend. The project request is for a 25,000 square ft. building on a 3.47 acre parcel of land. The site is zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District. The exterior building materials will consist of tilt-up concrete panels and glass. The roof will be a pre-finished, standing seam, metal roof. Chesterfield Fence is expanding their current location to this site and they will be connected in the rear to their adjacent property by a gate. There will be a fence surrounding the site. Landscaping and lighting are still under review by Staff at this time.

Item(s) Discussed:

- Fencing will surround the area of the lot that is being used for storage, just the rear of the lot, not the parking area in front
- Fence material will consist of chain-link with vinyl slats
- Trash enclosure can be constructed of either tilt-up concrete panels or masonry

- Landscaping to side and rear are limited due to drainage swales; additionally landscaping was added to other areas of the site to compensate
- Space behind building that is fenced in will be used for material storage
- Roof-top units will be hidden with parapet wall everywhere but in the rear; question of visibility from the rear
- Gutters and downspouts will be used and will be a darker color compared to the building

Rick Clawson made a motion to forward the project for approval, with the following recommendations:

- 1. Rooftop units must be adequately screened so they are not visible**
- 2. Trash enclosure material to be an architectural concrete block, painted to match the color of the building**

Dave Whitfield seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 5-0

III. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING SUMMARY

A. July 17, 2008

Discussion of the meeting summary to be approved as written.

Rick Clawson made a motion to approve the meeting summary with the correction of removing the “1.” bullet in the motion made for project IIA.

Mary Brown seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 5-0

IV. OLD BUSINESS

The Architectural Review Standards given to the members was exactly the same as what was posted on the website. Verbally, Mara Perry made two changes that were asked to be changed after the packet was given out. The two changes were:

- 1. In the Makeup of the Board section, it talks about a liaison from Chesterfield Arts and it is suppose to say, “Member of the Chesterfield Arts Board.”**
- 2. Many of the City’s titles have changed, consequently it was originally written, “Department of Planning and Development Services will be reviewing single-family residential,” it should now read, “Department of Planning and Public Works.”**

Members of the Architectural Review Board discussed the Architectural Review Standards regarding what it allows and what it does not allow them to do. Discussion was centered on the positives and negatives of the document. Mara Perry made the recommendation to bring up any questions and comments at Planning Commission.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Under the Terms of the Officers, the Architectural Review Board thought it might be necessary to hold an election of new officials at the next meeting. Mara Perry informed the Board that she would review the by-laws and see if it was necessary at this time. The Board would be informed before the next meeting if a vote is or is not required.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Rick Clawson made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Bryant Conant seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote 5-0