

**THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
September 16, 2010**

**PRESENT**

Mr. Matt Adams  
Ms. Mary Brown  
Mr. Rick Clawson  
Mr. Bryant Conant  
Mr. Bud Gruchalla  
Bruce Geiger, Councilmember  
Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director  
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner  
Ms. Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary

**ABSENT**

Mr. Gary Perkins

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**II. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS**

- A. Manors at Schoettler Valley:** Amended Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for an 8.85 acre lot of land zoned "R2" Residence District located approximately 600' NE of the intersection of Squires Way Drive and Schoettler Valley Drive.

Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, explained that the new Architectural Review Standards allow for requests such as these to be approved by the Planning and Development Services Director, however upon reviewing the project, she determined that she would like a recommendation from the Architectural Review Board prior to rendering her decision. This project originally was presented to the Board in 2006 and was unanimously approved but at that time a different developer had submitted the project. The Director requested that the Board complete its review process as usual, but instead of forwarding the project to the Planning Commission, it be forwarded back to herself before she renders a decision.

Current homeowners, Mr. & Mrs. Martin and their representative as well as Mr. Adler were present. Mr. Roger Cox, Project Manager, and others representing Consort Homes were also present.

Mara Perry, Senior Planner, presented the project request for amended architectural elevations. She pointed out the location of the development and that you must drive through two other subdivisions before reaching it. The first subdivision is Bridle Creek and the second is Highland Forest. Two homes have already been constructed since the subdivision was approved; one on Lot 1 and the other on Lot 4. There are a total of nine lots in the subdivision.

When the project was first presented in 2006, there were four floor plans with a series of elevations tied to each floor plan. There were three elevations for the Monarch, four elevations for the Stratford, seven elevations for the Chandler, all of which were two-story homes. There were also seven elevations for the Sedona, which is a ranch-style home.

The proposed elevations also include four floor plans with a series of elevations tied to each floor plan. The Bridgeport model has six elevations, the Lancaster has six elevations, the Windsor has seven and the Sierra, a ranch style, has six elevations. Photos of the two existing homes were also included in the packets.

In the current Architectural standards there are requirements that relate to how elevations and massing must be similar to adjacent developments as well as materials and colors are required to be similar to surrounding developments. The majority of homes in the adjacent developments do have a very wide range of materials used on the front facade; however, there are a couple of homes that just have one material on the front façade.

The petitioner has provided sample materials for brick, roofing materials, shutters and siding for review.

#### Items Discussed

- Concern that some elevations lack a variety of materials being used on the front façade compared to what was approved in 2006. The current standards require materials be used that are similar to adjacent subdivisions.
- Based on other projects that the Board has approved, the front facades have included brick or masonry along with other types of material. There is no requirement for a 100% masonry façade, but some diversity is required. Many of the proposed elevations meet these requirements; however, there are a few elevations that do not meet these criteria.
- Other areas of concern include the lack of architectural detailing, scale of elements on some of the façades and a lack of interest in the roof line on some of the elevations.
- Discussed the wide variety of choices for brick color and feel there may be too many choices available.

- Discussed plain side facades on the two existing homes in the development. The new standards only address facades that are visible to exterior streets of the subdivision. Some facades will be visible but the standards do not require them to be hidden because they are not visible to exterior streets. Once inside the subdivision, it is not required that all four sides of residential structures be the same materials.
- The development was first approved for nine single-family detached homes to be developed by Taylor Morely. The two existing homes were built by Schoettler Manor Homes, LLC/Seabrook Homes and do not match what the board recommended for approval in 2006. The two existing homes are larger than the homes now being proposed. The existing homes were reviewed for basic requirements regarding setbacks and height requirements. The proposed homes are similar overall to the homes in the subdivisions adjacent to Manors at Schoettler Valley. Homes in the adjacent subdivisions were reviewed under a different ordinance and had different lot size requirements. The size of the homes originally approved for this subdivision in 2006 is very similar to what is being proposed now. The two existing houses were built larger than what the Board originally approved for this subdivision. The Board cannot review the square footage of a home. As long as a home meets the requirements for setbacks and height, the square footage of the home is not regulated.
- Are the proposed homes appreciably different, i.e., scale, color, textures, proportions, aesthetics, than those in the other two subdivisions? Would someone really notice that they are appreciatively different? The overall massing and heights of the homes in the subdivisions adjacent to Manors of Schoettler Valley are larger in scale, the size varies greatly and the materials are all varied and the majority of them consistently have some sort of masonry on the front elevation which is consistent with other developments within Chesterfield.
- The Board needs to decide if the proposed elevations meet or do not meet the standards outlined in the current Architectural Review Standards with regard to detailing and materials used in order to assist the Director in making a final decision on approving the amended elevations.
- There needs to be a combination of brick and stone added to the siding materials that are depicted on some of the elevations. One-hundred percent siding on four sides of the building is consistently something that the Board has not allowed previously in developments. The Board can discuss each individual elevation within each model that does not have enough variation or can recommend removal of those elevations. An example is the Windsor 1. There is no porch, very little offset, very little interest in roof and no brick or masonry on the façade. This elevation does not meet the Architectural Standards and is not consistent with what

- the Board has approved in the past. It is the petitioner's choice if he wants to redesign that façade and resubmit or he can remove it as an option for the Windsor. The other Windsor elevations have interest in the architecture, window trim, difference in roof lines, include porches and brick.
- The Board can require that the first floor, whether it is a ranch or two-story, be brick or some sort of masonry to add interest to it. The opportunity to use different kinds of siding materials in different combinations above that would give us the variation. Windsor #1 is so plain. All other Windsor elevations include a porch that allows a stopping point for the brick on the lower half and allow the ability to continue with other materials above it.
  - If homeowners cannot afford to be in a house that meets our guidelines, then this is not their subdivision. It is understood that the builder is trying to sell houses but we are trying to maintain a look and quality according to the City of Chesterfield's Standards. The cost of the home cannot be regulated by the City. The Board should be concerned with the consistency of new homes that are being built with regard to the rest of the subdivision and how they blend in with existing homes. The prior subdivisions were built under different requirements. However, most of the existing houses seem to have the detailing that is required now. The two existing homes meet the current Standards and the proposed elevations must also meet the current Standards.

**Bud Gruchalla made a motion that we recommend to the Planning and Development Services Director that there be masonry on the first floor level of the front façade and that a mix of other materials be used on the upper portion of the façade that is consistent with the other homes in the subdivision. Some discretion is to be used as far as the architectural detailing is concerned in that the elevations that do not have articulation, i.e., the façade moving in and out that creates gables or roof changes, have those features added in some way so that there will be separation points where some of the materials can be used in combination with each other in such a way that is consistent with the detailing of the larger homes.**

**An amendment was made to the motion to add: Should they wish to configure the required masonry to go vertically on the façade, the following shall be recommended: The square footage of masonry on the front façade shall be equal to the square footage of the first floor front façade being a masonry material.**

**Mary Brown seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed by voice vote of 5-0.**

**III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

**A. August 12, 2010.**

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

**Mary Brown seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by voice vote of 5-0.**

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Bud Gruchalla made a motion to adjourn the meeting.**

**Mary Brown seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by voice vote of 5-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.**