III. A

THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
September 17, 2009

PRESENT	**ABSENT**
Mr. Matt Adams	Mr. Dave Whitfield
Ms. Mary Brown	
Mr. Rick Clawson	
Mr. Bryant Conant	
Mr. Bud Gruchalla	
Mr. Gary Perkins	
Mr. Stanley Proctor, Planning Commission Liaison	
Ms. Amy Nolan, Planning Commission Member	
Mr. Mike Watson, Planning Commission Member	
Ms. Lu Perantoni, Planning Commission Member	
Ms. Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Lead Senior Planner	
Ms. Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary	

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Rick Clawson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS:

A. St. Luke's Rehabilitation Hospital: Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a rehabilitation hospital governed by a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in an R1A Residence District located at 14701 Olive Boulevard, east of the intersection of Ladue Road and Olive Boulevard.

Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Lead Senior Planner, presented the project request for amended architectural elevations to the rehabilitation hospital connected to the Surrey Place skilled nursing care facility. Specifically, the petitioners seek approval of an amended elevation for the western portion of the building. The original project was presented in 2007. During staff's routine occupancy inspection earlier this year, it was noted that the western elevation was not built per the elevations that were originally presented to the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board. The proposed alternative solution is to paint the siding just below the window sill to match the brick color. This amended plan went before the Planning Commission and they determined that it should go back to the Architectural Review Board for discussion on how to best abate this issue.

Planning Commission Areas of Concern:

- Does the elevation really depict what the original intent was?
- What is the Architectural Review Board's opinion of the total elevation as it was built?
- What is the Architectural Review Board's opinion on how to move forward to bring this more in line with what was previously approved?

Items Discussed:

- Compared to the originally submitted plan, there are more changes than just the missing brick. The roofline has changed, more windows have been added and the pagoda is different. These are major changes to the building and were never approved by the City. These changes are a blatant disregard for the City of Chesterfield and the City does not want this to become a precedent.
- Several current Board members were not members of the Board in 2007 and would not have approved the original plan as it was presented. However, the general consensus was that the changes made do contribute to the overall aesthetics of the building. The omission of the brick actually improves the overall look of the building.
- Even though it was not built according to the approved plan, the building should be evaluated from its aesthetic point of view today.
- When originally approved in 2007, there were no issues regarding site line, heights or any other issues. The changes made do not violate any ordnance.
- Requiring the petitioner add the brick.
- Circumstances would be different if the brick was omitted on the front of the building rather than the rear.
- Painting the siding would detract from the aesthetics as it would be too large of an expanse to paint.
- The paint would never match the existing brick, would never look like brick and would fade and peel over time.
- This portion of the property is located in the rear and is not visible from the street; however, a portion of the building is visible by residents down the hill from Surrey Place.
- General dislike of using trim boards in a crisscross pattern on buildings.
- Trash enclosure was not shown on original elevation. However, it does meet current design guidelines.
- There is a general belief that Architectural Review Board decisions are disregarded by the Planning Commission. Planning Commission members present advised that the Board's input is greatly valued and that is why this item was sent back to them.

Recommendations:

- Best solution is to landscape as much as possible rather than painting the siding.
- Utilize a mixture of evergreens, trees and foundation plantings to soften the look and break up the massive facade. Evergreens will provide year-round foliage.
- Staff to review landscape plan and ensure that it happens as proposed.

Gary Perkins made a motion to forward the proposed amended elevations to the Planning Commission with the following revisions:

1. **Do not paint the siding to match the brick.**
2. **Introduce landscape plantings consisting of medium-sized trees, shrubs of evergreen deciduous character and evergreen trees to mitigate the southwest view.**
3. **Petitioner to provide same elevations with photo imaging of the landscape plan for Planning Commission's review.**
4. **Provide a landscape plan.**
5. **Staff to determine whether additional landscaping is necessary on the western elevation.**

Mary Brown seconded the motion.
Motion passed by voice vote of 6-0.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARIES

A. July 16, 2009

Bud Gruchalla made a motion to approve the meeting summary as written.

Bryant Conan seconded the motion.
The motion passed by voice vote of 6-0.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

The staff was commended on catching this and the Architectural Review Board appreciates that the Planning Commission brought this back to them for further review.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Bud Gruchalla made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Gary Perkins seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote of 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:18 p.m.