THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
December 15, 2011

PRESENT	**ABSENT**
Mr. Matt Adams	
Ms. Mary Brown	
Mr. Rick Clawson	
Ms. Carol Duenke	
Mr. Bud Gruchalla	
Mr. Gary Perkins	
Mr. Tim Renaud	
Mr. Steve Wuennenberg, Planning Commission Liaison	
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner	
Mr. Shawn Seymour, Senior Planner	
Ms. Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary	

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Tim Renaud called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

II. PROJECT PRESENTATION

A. Arbors at Wild Horse Creek: A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statements of Design for a 23 acre tract of land zoned "PUD" Planned Unit Development located on the south side of Wild Horse Creek Road west of its intersection of Long Road and east of its intersection with Wild Horse Parkway Drive (18V330046).

Mr. Shawn Seymour, Senior Planner, presented the project request for a proposed residential development, Arbors at Wild Horse Creek, located on the south side of Wild Horse Creek Road, just east of Wild Horse Parkway and west of the Long Road/Kehrs Mill intersection. The proposed landscape plan calls for 90+ street trees. Typically a 30 foot buffer is required between like developments but they are proposing a 50 foot buffer on the western property line to provide separation from the Wild Horse Development. On the eastern border, they have maintained over 45% of the existing tree canopy and will not alter the existing elevation or grade work, thus providing an additional buffer. They are proposing 22 single family units. The various elevations are depicted in the packet and color samples are available for review.

Discussion

Board Member Mary Brown asked if there was a specific reason that they are reviewing this project as the Board does not typically review residential projects. Mr. Seymour indicated that one of the Council members from that ward requested that ARB review the project. There were only minor issues discussed during the zoning petitions.

As discussed at previous meetings and per the Architectural Review Standards, Board Member Rick Clawson stated they have generally required a mix of architectural detailing, finishes, materials and color changes to break up the façade on front elevations for both commercial and residential buildings. He pointed out that there are some options for 100% siding on the front façades that are included in the elevations. He also stated that when a corner lot is involved, which has multiple sides exposed to public streets, typically the Board requires a mix of materials on those elevations too. He is concerned about the elevation facing Wild Horse Creek Road on lot 1 and suggested that the same mix of materials used on the front façade be carried through to the side facing Wild Horse Creek Road.

Steve Wuennenberg, Planning Commission Liaison, said that one of the things they discussed was the back side of those houses along Wild Horse Creek Parkway and the buffer provided. Residents in the adjacent Wild Horse subdivision were concerned that they will see the back of those houses.

Board Member Carol Duenke agreed with the concern about the side elevation on lot 1. The side elevations are quite plain. They do not have a lot of variety of material, some only have one window, and she is concerned that this would be the predominant view of the development from Wild Horse Creek Road. She did applaud the petitioner on their ability to preserve the existing trees on the eastern border.

In response to Board Member Gary Perkins' question, Mr. Seymour stated the houses alongside Wild Horse Parkway will be slightly above the roadway but the buffer would block most of the view of those homes.

Board Chair Tim Renaud asked if the City has a requirement on the diversity of housing types on a street. Mr. Seymour stated there was no requirement.

Board Member Bud Gruchalla pointed out that masonry is included on all of the front facades except the colonial. The petitioner stated they will not be using vinyl siding but rather hardie board siding.

In response to Board Member Brown's question, Mr. Seymour confirmed that the proposed homes were comparable to the adjacent subdivision with regard to size and type of materials used.

Board Member Matt Adams asked if the homes had fireplaces. The petitioner stated this is an option and is not shown on the elevations. Board Member Gruchalla asked where the chimneys would be located. The petitioner said it depended on the particular plan but the majority of the plans had fireplaces in the rear but only about 2 or 3 feet of the chimney stack would be visible from the front view.

Board Member Perkins agreed with Board Member Clawson's comments regarding the material used on the front elevations. He also suggested planting as many evergreens as possible in the buffer to provide year-round coverage and Board Member Gruchalla concurred.

The petitioner stated that the buffer is not intended to be a common area but rather a private secluded area and it will be privately owned. However, it is to be maintained by the Home Owners Association. Homeowners will not be allowed to build anything in that area or put in a fence in that buffered area. This will be a 50 foot buffer between the lot line and Wild Horse Parkway.

Mr. Seymour stated the neighboring subdivision was more concerned with extra green area to separate the two developments.

The petitioner stated that since lot 1 will be more visible, they could make it their display home. They could also add some type of brick on that side elevation; however, it would be rather difficult to promise the same on the remaining lots.

Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner, reminded the Board that if they have a particular concern with an elevation, they can remove it from the approved list of elevations or they can request that staff work with the petitioner to add some detailing to that particular elevation.

Board Member Clawson made a motion to forward the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan and Architectural Elevations for the Arbors at Wild Horse Creek to the Planning Commission with the following recommendations:

1. **Staff is to work with the petitioner to make sure that a mix of architectural detailing, finishes, materials and color changes be utilized on the front elevations as required by the Architectural Review Board Standards.**

2. **Request that the detailing used on the front elevation of lot 1 be carried through to the side elevation facing Wild Horse Creek Road.**
3. **Include additional evergreens in the 50 foot buffer along the western boundary of the development.**

The petitioner stated that another function of 50 foot buffer is to promote water quality as there are no storm sewers in the rear of the lots along the western boundary. Currently 30% of the trees in the buffer are evergreens but some hearty trees need to be included too.

Board Member Perkins proposed an amendment to the motion to include taking into consideration the location of evergreens in relation to screening in helping to soften the view from the roadway.

The motion was amended with the following:
The petitioner is to take into consideration the location of the evergreens in the 50 foot buffer in relation to screening to help soften the view from the roadway.

Board Member Clawson accepted the amendment to his motion.

Board Member Brown seconded the motion.
The amended motion passed with a voice vote of 7-0.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. November 10, 2011

Board Member Carol Duenke made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written.

Board Member Rick Clawson seconded the motion.
Motion passed with a voice vote of 5-0 with Board Members Gruchalla and Perkins abstaining.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VI: ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Bud Gruchalla made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Board Member Mary Brown seconded the motion.
The motion passed by voice vote of 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.