

CITY OF WILDWOOD
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY HALL, 16860 MAIN STREET, WILDWOOD, MISSOURI
February 9, 2023

The Architectural Review Board meeting began at 6:30 p.m., on Thursday, February 9, 2023, in Council Chambers at Wildwood City Hall, 16860 Main Street, Wildwood, Missouri, and via the videoconferencing tool Zoom.

I. Welcome and Roll Call by Chair

Chair Ritter called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. The following members were in attendance, as noted:

Present [9]

Absent [0]

Chair Ritter

Secretary Loggia

Member Parsons

Member Lavallee

Council Liaison Clark

Commission Liaison Kohn

Alternate Jones

Alternate Welker

Alternate Bartelsmeyer

Staff present:

Assistant Director of Planning and Parks Melanie Rippetoe and Planner Keefe

Petitioners present:

St. Louis Community College - Wildwood: Michael Browning and Michael Keller, Christner Architects, architect for the College.

Rockwood R-6 School District: Wade Welch, Hoener Associates, Inc., architect for the School District.

II. Approval of the Minutes – December 8, 2022 meeting

Member Lavallee motioned to approve the Minutes. Member Parsons seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote, with Commission Liaison Kohn abstaining.

III. Review Agenda Items to be Discussed at Tonight's Meeting by Chair

Chair Ritter reviewed the evening's agenda.

IV. Public Comment

None.

V. Old Business

- 1) St. Louis Community College, 2645 Generations Drive – An initial review of expansion plans, inclusive of two (2) adjoined campus buildings and related infrastructure.**

Assistant Director Rippetoe gave the Department of Planning presentation. She stated the applicant had removed the proposed signage from the buildings and planned to pursue it at a later date. In reference to a question from the last meeting, she noted that City regulations for solar panels required that any front-facing panels that were visible from the road would require a Conditional Use Permit. She then noted the applicant had revised the renderings to better display the differences in brick color from each building component, eliminated the entrance drive around the detention basin, and removed some of the parking. She noted that parking and traffic concerns would be addressed during the site plan review and stated the Department had received a traffic study earlier that day, but had not yet had an opportunity to review it.

Mike Keller, Christner Architects, introduced himself as the Project Manager, along with Michael Browning, Design Architect, as representatives and architects for the Community College. Mr. Keller. Technical difficulties prevented the slide presentation from displaying on-screen, so Mr. Browning presented various material samples that had been brought. He noted that while by Code, the expansion involved one building, there were actually two distinct identities/programs being presented by the design. He noted that each of the facades had a field brick and accent brick component. He noted it was intended to create a welcoming and human scale façade. He noted entries had larger gestures assigned to them. He also noted how the accent brick tied the smaller openings together. He noted that the building was articulated by two L-shaped masses with different colors associated to each of them. The blue brick was being used to highlight the entries to the building, with the intent to create a memorable entrance and use the brand color for the College. He noted that the glass being used was a clear glass with a low e-coating and a fritted glass at various locations to help reduce heat loss/gain for energy efficiency reasons. He noted there would be some roof-mounted equipment that would be painted aluminum gray. He referred to the last page in the packet for the juxtaposition of material colors.

Alternate Jones asked about the blue brick. Mr. Browning noted three (3) colors of it would be mixed. He noted there would be a range of color in a custom blend.

Mr. Lavallee asked if the two (2) bricks could be held up next to one another (health sciences brick and technology building). The architects then held up the accent brick with the field brick with each building. Mr. Browning noted the brick changes were subtle, but the mortar was more distinct. He noted the differences could be better seen in the renderings.

Council Liaison Clark asked about the two (2) blue bricks. She asked why there were two (2) different colors instead of just the one (1). Mr. Browning noted that there was actually a third blue brick not shown, and the intent was to have a range. Ms. Clark asked if it wasn't the school's preference to only display their brand color brick. She stated a concern that the blue brick blend wouldn't match as well with the brand color. Mr. Browning noted they felt the colors were complementary. Ms. Clark indicated she felt like there was too much range between the blues. Mr. Browning noted there would be a mock-up of each of the three (3) major materials before anything significant went up on the building.

Mr. Browning then spoke to the stone as a topic. He noted there was a curving wall that took one's eye from the existing building to the entrance of the new building. He noted that cost had caused there to be some limit to areas with natural stone. He then noted that the facades were primarily facing east and west, meaning the awnings of the existing building didn't help too much. He noted the building was only 30 to 40 percent glass with the intent to make the building energy efficient. He noted they were at 42 points for LEED.

Ms. Clark asked if the archway structure on the existing building would tie in. She noted that on the rendering on page 22, there was an area of recessed brick that looked awkward to her. She noted a lot of sidewalks were shown in the renderings, and asked if they could be made pervious. Mr. Browning noted the recessed brick areas were intended to receive signage and would probably look more complete to the eye in the future. He noted pervious sidewalks were not in the budget at this time. He noted the stormwater runoff goes to the detention pond. He then discussed the archways, stating it was the intention of the College and the design team to have a distinct identity with the new building. He noted the curve had been taken into the site plan, from the colonnade to the entrance of the Health Sciences portion of the building.

Mr. Lavallee asked about page 5, asking about the landscape buffer to the adjacent property. Mr. Browning noted the landscaping was along the property line. He noted there was not currently any development being screened, but that originally the parking had been intended to extend further.

Mr. Browning noted the building was being carved into the hill, with a walk-out basement situation. He noted the fill would be located in the "green finger" shown on the landscaped rendering. He noted the green showed the site disturbance on the rendering.

Mr. Lavalley noted he had a concern about the impact of traffic given the significant number of new parking spaces, the increase in students, etc., in addition to the traffic already coming into the site. He then noted there was potential to relieve the traffic through a separate access onto Manchester Road. Mr. Browning responded that the result of the traffic study concluded that separate access was not needed for Phase Two, but any additional development would require a separate access. Ms. Clark also touched on the issue, noting that she hoped the traffic studies were conducted in a way that corresponded with the school's peak traffic times. Mr. Browning noted that peak times had been included.

A motion was made to approve. Member Parsons seconded the motion. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote, with Chair Ritter abstaining.

VI. New Business

- 1) Rockwood School District, 17146 Manchester Road – An initial review of architectural elevations and associated plans for a proposed addition to the Rockwood School District's Transportation Facility.**

Planner Keefe read the case into the record and introduced the item.

Wade Welch of Hoener Associates, Inc. presented on the item as Rockwood School District's representative. He noted the modular buildings currently on the site would be completely removed. He noted they were currently addressing stormwater issues on the hill descending from Pond Elementary School. He noted a set of gang-toilets would be removed, and new gang-toilets would be added to the addition. He noted it was a CMU block building painted in a light gray. He noted the existing facility would also be repainted with sheet metal trim at the roofline. He noted the glass sample from the previous case would match this building as well.

Ms. Clark asked about the stormwater runoff issues. Mr. Welch noted the area where the addition was going was flat, with the slope coming off of the elementary school being very steep. He stated a trench drain was in there now, but it would be replaced with a wider one that should take it off the site at a better rate. He noted it would be piped to the creek to the south, with the plan already being reviewed by the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District and the City. Mr. Lavalley asked about the Outdoor Pavilion and the concrete area around it. Mr. Welch noted they were reducing the overall impervious area, but the pavilion area was concrete for budgetary reasons. Mr. Lavalley recommended native plantings in the greenspaces to help with the stormwater runoff issues and long-term maintenance. Mr. Welch noted he would provide the suggestion to the School District. Mr. Lavalley also noted there may be an educational value to the students as well to see it.

Mr. Lavalley asked about the canopy. Mr. Welch noted the outdoor pavilion would be like a picnic shelter, with a metal canopy connecting from it to the addition. Mr. Welch noted there would be downlight wall packs. The existing building's fixtures would be removed and replaced to match.

Ms. Clark asked if everything would match completely. Mr. Welch confirmed. He noted this was not intended to be pretty, but rather functional.

Mr. Lavallee asked if there would be updated HVAC systems. Mr. Welch affirmed that the existing systems would be replaced, and that it would be a centralized system. Mr. Welch noted the overall budget was \$2 million.

Planner Keefe noted that the Department of Planning had reviewed the project and provided comments to the applicant. The project would go through the site plan review and permitting process.

Member Lavallee moved to approve. Member Parsons seconded. The motion passed with a unanimous voice vote.

VII. Other Items

Assistant Rippetoe noted it was time to hold elections for officers. She noted the Department would be happy to coordinate with members and put together a proposed slate. She noted there was a current vacancy on the Board, and assuming it was filled shortly, the election could be held at the next meeting. Chair Ritter indicated he would like the Department to help in this regard. She noted, in response to a question, the Mayor was responsible for making appointments to the Board and would choose whether to promote an alternate to a regular member of the Board or appoint a new member.

It was asked whether any members would term out in the near future. Planner Keefe noted that no members would term out in 2023.

VIII. Next Meeting Date – Thursday, March 9, 2023, if needed

IX. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

Approved by:

Date Approved:



William Ritter, Chair
City of Wildwood
Architectural Review Board