

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
March 17, 2011**

PRESENT

Mr. Rick Clawson
Ms. Carol Duenke
Mr. Bud Gruchalla
Mr. Gary Perkins
Mr. Tim Renaud
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner
Michael Watson, Planning Commission Member
Ms. Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Matt Adams
Ms. Mary Brown

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gary Perkins called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

- A. The Reserve at Chesterfield Village (Phase One):** Amended Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 25.929 acre lot of land zoned "R5" and "R8" Residence District with a "PEU" Planned Environment Unit located at Baxter Road south of the intersection with Wild Horse Creek Road.

Mara Perry, Senior Planner, presented a history of both Phase One and Phase Two of The Reserve at Chesterfield Village and stated that both projects will be considered separately. The project was originally zoned in the 1970s. The project had to be split into two phases because the original ordinance prohibited developing more than 35 acres at a time. Phase One was presented to the Architectural Review Board in 2006 as a series of detached single family homes, attached single family homes and condominiums. This new proposed plan changes the boundary between Phase One and Phase Two. Phase One has already been platted and many of the homes have already been constructed. In 2009, a new developer proposed that some of the attached homes be changed to detached homes and the lot lines were adjusted to accommodate this. The petitioner had submitted for approval additional detached elevations for Phase One. Staff administratively reviewed the submittal and approved the amended elevations except for one elevation that is before you which is for a single story home. All previous elevation showed either a 1-1/2 or 2 story elevation. Staff felt this was a substantial change and wanted the Architectural Review Board's input.

Discussion:

Board Member Rick Clawson asked if this elevation matches the previous elevations. Ms. Perry stated there are a variety of elevations. They all match the overall height of 29 feet or 30 feet and meet all other requirements.

Board Member Carol Duenke pointed out that the right side elevation is a long, unbroken expanse of siding. Ms. Perry stated that because of the setback, the homes are very close together. Therefore, Staff did not have any particular concern because a full side view of the side elevation will not be visible once the homes are built, plus there will be extensive landscaping throughout the site.

Chairman Perkins questioned the additional landscaping and if it was required within the right of way on the streets. Ms. Perry stated the landscaping is very intensive. The overall plan calls for 1500 trees including lower level landscaping. The new developer has added additional trees to the rear of the lots that back up to Baxter Road including three to four evergreens per lot. The street tree requirement has also been met.

Board Member Bud Gruchalla expressed concern over the fact that it looked like they were trying to gain more height by using a big gable. He also expressed concern with the way the front to back roof intersects with the main gable that goes from side to side of the house. He suggested that it would look better if the gable extended over the ridge to sit on the back of the roof and look like it ended in a gable instead of in a hip on the back. When approaching the building from the side, it would look better from the side to see a gable on the front and a gable on the back. He also felt it would be more interesting to do something on the gable similar to the single family attached elevation that has a roof over it. It would add a little more interest to the gable other than vertical siding, however, it could be used on some of the models so they are not all the same. Chairman Perkins agreed with his comments. Board Member Clawson concurred that they are trying to make the house look taller like the 1-1/2 and 2 story houses and are not gaining anything but giving up some architectural aesthetics to the front of the house. If that was the intent, he would rather see the house be the correct scale and have a smaller house next to a taller house. The petitioner stated that this elevation is one of their best selling homes and was not designed specifically for this development. It was chosen because it had more architectural elements to it. Planning Commission Member Mike Watson asked if they felt that this would be a big seller. The petitioner stated that he did not feel that it would be one of the more popular elevations. He envisioned seeing more 2-story homes being sold based on previous sales in this development but they wanted to offer this option. The petitioner also stated that it was their policy not to have two identical elevations or color schemes next to each other.

Board Member Duenke pointed out that the “front” door is actually on the left side of the house so there is not really a strong sense of human scale to the entry from the front of the house. A person walking along the left side elevation to the main entry door would be viewing a large expanse of siding on their neighbor’s home. Ms. Perry pointed out that this house may not necessarily be the one located next to them.

Board Member Clawson asked if he was correct to assume that the side elevations consist of vinyl siding on all homes. Ms. Perry acknowledged that this was correct. City standards do not require single family homes to be wrapped on all four sides with a brick, stone or masonry material. Vinyl siding is allowed. There is also a variety of other elements on the side elevation using windows, doors and other elements. In addition, you are not necessarily going to see the same home next to one another on any of the lots.

Ms. Perry reminded the Board that Staff is asking for approval of the single story elevation amongst the other 1-1/2 and 2 story elevations.

Board Member Gruchalla stated that he doesn’t mind the single story but all of the other elevations appear to have more interest than the single story. It just seems relatively plain compared to the others. It would not take much to add a little bit of interest on the gable and maybe extend the gable back over the ridge so it doesn’t have the big pitch on the rear.

Board Member Clawson asked whether they were to just give a recommendation whether they are okay with the range or not instead of attacking the design of the house. Do we feel it meets the same level of quality materials and same level of architectural detailing that is provided on the 2-story? Ms. Perry stated the Board can go with in any direction in terms of whatever they recommend so that the Director will be able to make a decision on whether to approve this set of elevations.

Board Member Perkins pointed out the two motions that were provided and stated the Board was leaning toward the second option which is to move it forward with some recommendations. Board Member Gruchalla said it didn’t bother him that there is a one story version. However, he is concerned that it does not seem to have the same detailing or same quality of the two story elevations. He stated this can be remedied without adding too much to the house.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the amended architectural elevations to allow for a one-story elevation for The Reserve at Chesterfield Village, Phase One, to the Planning and Development Services Director with the following concerns and recommendations:

1. Provide additional architectural detailing to the one-story home so it is of similar quality and level of design as the other approved elevations.
2. Concern over the large flat gable façade above the porch and lack of architectural detailing.
3. Concern over the back of the same gable as it ties into the rear of the house potentially projecting over into a gable instead of a hip to give a more three dimensional view of the house.

Board Member Gruchalla seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote of 5-0.

B. The Reserve at Chesterfield Village (Phase Two): Amended Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 17.65 acre lot of land zoned "R5" and "FPR5" Residence District with a "PEU" Planned Environment Unit located at Baxter Road south of the intersection with Wild Horse Creek Road.

Ms. Perry stated that much of the prior discussion applied here, however; this is a slightly different situation. In Phase Two, the proposed plan called for a series of condominium buildings surrounded by attached homes. These homes have never been platted. A new developer has taken over Phase Two and they will be coming before the Planning Commission to make changes to the line between Phase One and Phase Two and to eventually plat out all of these as detached single family homes. Staff has administratively approved a series of elevations. There are two sets of single story elevations for Phase Two. Instead of the condominiums in the middle, there will now be a cul-de-sac off of the loop road with a series of lots on both sides facing Oak Stand Path and on both sides of the cul-de-sac coming in.

Board Member Duenke did not have a problem with the one-story house being added but the three-car front entry garage is very predominant. It takes up a large percentage of the front elevation and also appears more predominant because it projects forward with very large front facing gable elements. As you drive down the street, you are going to see multiple garages all in a row. They are also depicted with very plain, light-colored contrasting garage doors which directs your eye even more to that element. In the two-story elevations, the three-car garage is less predominant because the whole façade of the house is larger. Board Member Gruchalla commented it is hard to address this issue unless you have a side or rear entry but these lots are not large enough to accommodate that. Board Member Clawson assumed that there would be a variety of garage doors that the home owner could choose from. Board Member Duenke suggested perhaps introducing a variety of styles such as a carriage style or one with windows. Board Member Clawson stated these are detailed

much better than the Phase One and he would feel a lot more comfortable with this set of elevations for Phase Two. Board Member Gruchalla agreed with Board Member Clawson's comments and also with Board Member Duenke's concern with the garage doors but there is no way to improve it other than to have more interesting garage doors which would be up to the prospective buyers. The petitioner stated this is an option for the buyer and they also have a policy not to build the same style of house next to each other.

Board Member Renaud asked if there was a buffer from the park to the lake. Ms. Perry stated there is an existing riparian corridor that cannot be disturbed and there is a new pathway that is being constructed through there and it will provide a buffer. There are also two tree preservation areas located there in addition to the riparian corridor. Chairman Perkins asked if Staff has left pedestrian connections to the riparian area. Ms. Perry indicated there is a trail that has an overlook but because of the severe grade changes, most connections will probably be off August Hill when that street is connected.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the amended architectural elevations for The Reserve at Chesterfield Village Phase Two as presented with a recommendation for approval to the Planning and Development Services Director.

**Board Member Bud Gruchalla seconded the motion.
Motion passed with a voice vote of 5-0.**

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. February 17, 2011

Board Member Clawson noted a correction to the last paragraph on page 2 and the middle paragraph on page 3 where it should read "inches" instead of "feet"

Board Member Clawson made a motion to approve the meeting summary as amended with corrections to page 2 and page 3 changing "feet" to "inches."

**Board Member Gruchalla seconded the motion.
Motion passed with a voice vote of 5-0.**

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Perry pointed out the new report format for the Architectural Review Board report. There previously was a short report with a checklist. The checklist has been eliminated but those key items are included in the Staff report. Suggestions for motions have also been added for the Board to consider. Board Members Perkins and Clawson indicated that they liked the new format better.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Renaud made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Board Member Clawson seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote of 5-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.