

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL  
FEBRUARY 14, 2005**

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

**I. PRESENT**

Mr. David G. Asmus  
Mr. David Banks  
Ms. Stephanie Macaluso  
Dr. Lynn O'Connor  
Ms. Lu Perantoni  
Mr. Thomas Sandifer  
Chairman Victoria Sherman

**ABSENT**

Mr. Fred Broemmer  
Dr. Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr.

Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning  
Ms. Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Senior Planner  
Mr. Kyle Dubbert, Project Planner  
Mr. Nick Hoover, Project Planner  
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant

**II. INVOCATION: Commissioner Banks**

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairman Sherman acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Bruce Geiger, Council Liaison.

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – Commissioner Sandifer read the “Opening Comments” for Public Hearings.**

- A. P.Z. 28-2004 Blue Valley (Agricola Associates, L.L.C.):** a request for a change of zoning from an “NU” Non-Urban District to a “PC” Planned Commercial District for three parcels of land on Olive Street Road, located 0.5 miles west of the intersection of Olive Street Road and Chesterfield Airport Road. Total area to be rezoned: 55.8 acres. (Locator Numbers: 17W-52-0025, 17W-53-0123, 16W-21-0022)

The request contains the following permitted uses:

- (b) Animal hospitals, veterinary clinics, and kennels.
- (d) Arenas and stadiums.
- (e) Associated work and storage areas required by a business, firm, or service to carry on business operations.
- (f) Auditoriums, churches, clubs, lodges, meeting rooms, libraries, reading rooms, theaters, or any other facility for public assembly.
- (g) Automatic vending facilities for:
  - (i) Ice and solid carbon dioxide (dry ice);
  - (ii) Beverages;
  - (iii) Confections.
- (h) Barber shops and beauty parlors.
- (i) Bookstores.
- (l) Cafeterias for employees and guests only.
- (m) Child care centers, nursery schools, and day nurseries.
- (n) Colleges and universities.
- (o) Dry cleaning drop-off and pick-up stations.
- (p) Filling stations, including emergency towing and repair services, provided that no automobile, truck, or other vehicle may be parked or stored in the open on the premises for longer than twenty-four (24) hours.
- (q) Film drop-off and pick-up stations.
- (r) Fishing tackle and bait shops. Open storage and display are prohibited.
- (s) Financial institutions.
- (v) Hotels and motels.
- (w) Local public utility facilities, provided that any installation, other than poles and equipment attached to the poles, shall be:
  - (i) Adequately screened with landscaping, fencing or walls, or any combination thereof; or
  - (ii) Placed underground; or
  - (iii) Enclosed in a structure in such a manner so as to blend with and complement the character of the surrounding area.

All plans for screening these facilities shall be submitted to the Department of Planning for review. No building permit or installation permit shall be issued until these plans have been approved by the Department of Planning.
- (x) Medical and dental offices.
- (y) Mortuaries.
- (z) Offices or office buildings.
- (aa) Outdoor advertising signs (additional to provisions of Section 1003.168.).
- (cc) Parking areas, including garages, for automobiles, but not including any sales of automobiles, or the storage of wrecked or otherwise damaged and immobilized automotive vehicles for a period in excess of seventy-two (72) hours.

- (ff) Recreational facilities, indoor and illuminated outdoor facilities, including swimming pools, golf courses, golf practice driving ranges, tennis courts, and gymnasiums, and indoor theaters, including drive-in theaters.
- (hh) Restaurants, fast food.
- (ii) Restaurants, sit down.
- (jj) Riding stables.
- (kk) Sales, rental, and leasing of new and used vehicles, including automobiles, trucks, trailers, construction equipment, agricultural equipment, and boats, as well as associated repairs and necessary outdoor storage of said vehicles.
- (ll) Sales, servicing, repairing, cleaning, renting, leasing, and necessary outdoor storage of equipment and vehicles used by business, industry, and agriculture.
- (mm) Schools for business, professional, or technical training, but not including outdoor areas for driving or heavy equipment training.
- (nn) Service facilities, studios, or work areas for antique salespersons, artists, candy makers, craft persons, dressmakers, tailors, music teachers, dance teachers, typists, and stenographers, including cabinet makers, film processors, fishing tackle and bait shops, and souvenir sales. Goods and services associated with these uses may be sold or provided directly to the public on the premises.
- (oo) Sewage treatment facilities, as approved by the appropriate regulatory agency.
- (pp) Permitted signs (See Section 1003.168 "Sign Regulations").
- (qq) Souvenir shops and stands, not including any zoological displays, or permanent open storage and display of manufacturing goods.
- (rr) Stores, shops, markets, service facilities, and automatic vending facilities in which goods or services of any kind, including indoor sale of motor vehicles, are being offered for sale or hire to the general public on the premises.

Senior Planner Annissa McCaskill-Clay gave a power point presentation showing pictures of the subject site and surrounding area.

#### **PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:**

1. Mr. Mike Doster, attorney for the Petitioner, 17107 Chesterfield Airport Road, Ste. 300, Chesterfield, MO, stated the following:
  - The petitioner is the owner under contract of the subject property comprising 93 acres and is requesting the rezoning of approximately 56 acres of this property from "NU" Non-Urban to "PC" Planned Commercial.
  - The subject property is located adjacent to Rombach Farm, fronts on Olive Street Road and is visible from Highway 40 and 61.
  - There are approximately 37 acres beyond the Monarch Levee that are not part of the rezoning.

- The development is named “Blue Valley” and is intended to reflect the relatively-new concept of “open air lifestyle centers”.
  - Petitioner believes that this concept is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Land Use Map.
  - The plan calls for mixed use – retail/office/warehouse – and calls for low-density office and retail.
  - The Preliminary Plan shows 25 lots with a hypothetical building footprint on each lot. It is very likely that specific buildings, when proposed, will not have footprints that match the footprints shown on the Concept Plan. It is also very likely that the lot configuration will change.
  - The Preliminary Plan shows a total of 437,550 sq. ft. – 25 lots on 56 acres and open space of 41%.
  - Each lot will have to meet the parking requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - Neighbors have been contacted, including the Rombachs.
  - Agency comments have been received from the Monarch Fire Protection District, MSD and the Levee District, which will be reviewed and responded to.
  - The Levee District is requiring a 300 ft. seepage berm unless reasons are shown why it should be reduced.
  - Characteristics common to an open air lifestyle center are promenades, landscaping and gardens, restaurants, indoor and outdoor entertainment, open air walkways, fountains, easy access to parking, specialty shops including services, supplies, statuary, furniture and accessories for outdoor living, galleries (including art galleries), and wedding and banquet centers with indoor and outdoor facilities.
2. Mr. Rick Clawson, 11477 Olde Cabin Road, St. Louis, MO gave an architectural review of the site noting that a meandering drive has been created through the development.
3. Mr. Chris Mueller, Stock & Associates, Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO 63005 stated the following:
- There are two fire lanes required by the Monarch Fire Protection District at the east and west property lines of the project, in addition to the main entrance.
  - Utilities would be extended along Olive Road to serve the site. The trunk mains would be located along the sides of the serpentine road going north-south through the development and would serve each outlot.
  - Preliminary discussions have been held with the Public Works Department regarding storm water issues. Storm water would generally flow south through the site to Olive Boulevard and then eastward.

Chairman Sherman asked how pedestrian access vs. driving would be handled. Mr. Doster replied that it would be ideal to have pods of similar/compatible uses in the same location that would be easily accessed from a car.

Chairman Sherman asked if any walkways or paths would be included in the garden areas. Mr. Clawson replied that the main intent for the landscape portion is to provide a visual break between the different properties. Pedestrian access will be made available

within the pods but not through the entire project from north to south. Chairman Sherman stated that work is being done on “Pathways on the Parkway” and felt that people may bike to an open air lifestyle center to visit a restaurant. She encouraged the developer to take this into consideration.

Commissioner Macaluso asked that the “Permitted Uses” of mortuaries and sewage treatment facilities be reviewed. Mr. Doster stated that the use list would be reviewed to determine what could be eliminated.

Commissioner Macaluso stated that when the Comprehensive Plan was written, it was her understanding that they were trying to get 50% open space in this area because of the infrastructure of the area. There was concern about sewers, sanitation, etc. being in the area. She asked if the 41% open space includes the back portion of the property.

Mr. Doster replied that the 41% open space only includes the 56 acres that are being requested for rezoning. Efforts are underway to bring infrastructure to the west end of the Valley, which would include the area around the subject site. With infrastructure coming to this area, it seemed to the developer that the rationale for the original guideline may not be there anymore. Also, in other areas where the 50% guideline applied in the Valley toward the eastern end, it has not been applied strictly – 40% has been the norm.

Commissioner O’Connor said that her understanding of the 50% rule is that it doesn’t apply any longer because the current rule is 100% green space because MSD will not allow any developments without sewers.

Commissioner O’Connor asked for the definition of a “lifestyle center”. Mr. Doster stated that they have defined it by the uses that may apply – for example, an art gallery, a facility that provides patio furniture, statuary and garden accessories, a restaurant, or a wine merchant with an outdoor garden. Agricola is trying to attract the kinds of uses for this site that would allow design space for landscaping, gardens, and water features. Some of the features would be tied into what the retailers are selling.

Commissioner Perantoni asked for clarification as to whether the Planning Commission is reviewing only the zoning change for this site. Senior Planner McCaskill-Clay responded that this would be a site-specific ordinance, which would be written based upon the plan that is presented. The setbacks for parking, internal drives and buildings would be based upon the plan presented. It is a change of zoning and it is possible that when the Concept Plans are presented, there may be changes. These changes would be based upon whatever is written based on their Preliminary Plan. They could change how a building is oriented but they would still have to meet the setbacks established.

Commissioner Perantoni asked if the Planning Commission would be voting for 25 buildings. Senior Planner McCaskill-Clay replied that this would depend upon how the Attachment A is written.

Regarding the 56 acres for rezoning, Councilmember Geiger asked if they represent the total development for this property. Mr. Doster replied that the petitioner is only asking for 56 acres, of the 93 acres, to be rezoned and developed – there is no present intent to have any particular use for the property on the other side of the levee. The remaining acreage is zoned “FPNU” – Flood Plain Non-Urban.

**SPEAKERS IN FAVOR:** None

**SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION:** None

**SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL:** None

**REBUTTAL:** None

**ISSUES:**

- Fire Protection District approval.
- Extension of utility service.
- The design of the road that goes throughout the project.
- Storm water design.
- Pedestrian circulation.
- Bicycle access/bicycle-friendly.
- List of permitted uses proposed.
- Green space percentage – whether or not it meets the Comprehensive Plan.
- Compliance with Metropolitan Sewer District standards.
- Definition of a lifestyle center.
- Possible examples of similar types of developments to get an idea of the type of development being proposed.
- Discussion of the traffic and the improvements to Olive Street Road – intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road. Prepare traffic study and compare to the T-model.
- The requirements from the Levee District for the seepage berm. What were the reasons to back off from that requirement to 100’ in the other case?
- The number of buildings on the site.
- Different open space numbers allowed in the Valley. In particular, open space in the area off of Olive Street Road.
- Instead of having the buildings evenly distributed throughout the site, review the possibility of having buildings clustered together to allow larger areas of open space.
- Roughly how many parking spots will be included? (To get an idea of what the traffic might be.)
- Is the cross-access issue resolved or is it something we’re hoping for? Show where the cross access would be.
- Is the project perceived to be done in stages? How can we tell if everything will be sitting next to the road and the rest of the infrastructure never finished?
- Regarding the 56 acres for rezoning, do they actually represent the total ultimate development for this Property?
- What is the potential use for the acreage zoned “FPNU”?

- Where are the utilities (sewer and water) coming from and how will they get there?
- What size main would the residents would be able to tap on?

Commissioner Sandifer read the closing comments for Public Hearing, P.Z. 28-2004 Blue Valley (Agricola Associates, LLC.), noting that the earliest possible date that the Planning Commission could vote on the subject petition would be March 14, 2005.

**B. P.Z. 01-2005 City of Chesterfield (Adult Entertainment Regulation):** an ordinance amending the City of Chesterfield Zoning Code and establishing regulations for Adult Entertainment Businesses. Amendments include, but are not limited to:

1. Definitions.
2. Development criterion to conform to Section 1003.181 Conditional Use Permit Procedure.
3. Special Conditions for establishment of adult establishments or businesses.
4. Establishment of Site Plan Requirements.

Senior Planner McCaskill-Clay gave a power point presentation and stated that the proposed ordinance provides for definitions for the following:

- Adult Bookstore
- Adult Entertainment Facility
- Bath House
- Massage Parlor
- Modeling Studio
- Adult Entertainment or Establishment

Senior Planner McCaskill-Clay further stated the following:

- Requests for adult entertainment uses must conform to the same procedure for conditional use permits, as outlined in Section 1003.181 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Site-specific governing ordinances with conditions would be written regarding height, lot area, parking, and signage. In addition, a public hearing would be required.
- There are several special conditions that would be applied to proposed adult establishments:
  - ◆ They would not be permitted within 1200 ft. of religious institutions, schools, public parks, residentially-zoned uses or the City's boundaries.
  - ◆ No location or expansion would occur within 1000 ft. of another adult entertainment establishment or any business licensed to sell or serve alcoholic beverages.
  - ◆ All access must be from a public right-of-way.
  - ◆ The minimum of 100 ft. of frontage must occur on the said right-of-way.

- ◆ Setbacks must be, at minimum, 30 ft. from the front, 6 ft. from the side, and 10 ft. from the rear.
- ◆ The design of the building must be made in such a way to prevent view of the operations done within from the sidewalks, street or any public area.
- ◆ The establishment would be limited to one wall-mounted sign that does not flash, blink or move. No merchandise, symbols or pictures can be present on signage.
- Site Plan Conditions – In addition to the City’s standard requirements, the following must be included:
  - ◆ The Site Plan must identify abutting property owners’ names, addresses, zip codes and St. Louis County locator numbers.
  - ◆ Any Board of Adjustment or Planning Commission approvals with date and conditions must be shown on the plan.
  - ◆ Any architectural rendering of all sides of all buildings and structures must be provided.
  - ◆ A traffic study by a registered engineer can be required by the Director of Planning.

**SPEAKERS IN FAVOR:** None

**SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION:** None

**SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL:** None

**REBUTTAL:** None

**ISSUES:**

- Will the definition of “massage parlor” conflict with health spas/beauty centers having massage services?
- The language under “modeling studio” relating to “reproducing the human body wholly or partially in the nude by means of photography, painting, sketching, drawing or otherwise” states that “This does not apply to public or private schools in which persons are enrolled in a class.” Why isn’t it permissible for an artist or a sculptor to be working from a nude?
- On page 4 of the proposed ordinance, Section 4, No. 3 – change “Architectural renderings” to “Architectural elevations”.
- In Section 1 of the proposed ordinance pertaining to “Definitions”, add the word “paraphernalia” to the definitions of “Adult Bookstore” and “Adult Entertainment Facility”.
- Define “partially nude” under the definition of “Modeling Studio” in the same language as it is defined under the definition of “Adult Entertainment Facility” - or have a separate definition for “partially nude” that could be consistently used throughout the ordinance.
- Provide information as to where the language for the proposed ordinance came from – does it come from an ordinance already in place from another city or new language proposed by City Attorney Doug Beach?

Commissioner Sandifer read the closing comments for Public Hearing, P.Z. 01-2005 City of Chesterfield (Adult Entertainment Regulation) noting that the earliest possible date that the Planning Commission could vote on the subject petition would be March 14, 2005.

## V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Macaluso made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 24, 2005 Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perantoni and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

## VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Mr. Mike Doster, 17107 Chesterfield Airport Road, Suite 300, Chesterfield, MO speaking **for the petitioner** for **P.Z. 08-2004 Bull Moose Tube** stated the following:
  - The petitioner understands that the petition will be held until the next Planning Commission meeting and the petitioner does not object to this.
  - Speaker noted that the Public Hearing was held on May 24, 2004 and that the petitioner has been awaiting a traffic study. Ms. Julie Nolfo will give the Planning Commission a preview of the traffic study.
  
2. Ms. Julie Nolfo, Registered Professional Traffic Operations Engineer of Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier (CBB), 1830 Craig Park Court, Ste. 209, St. Louis, MO speaking **for the petitioner** for **P.Z. 08-2004 Bull Moose Tube** stated the following:
  - The current ordinance would allow for a second building, just under 50,000 sq. ft., to be developed on the property.
  - A medical office building of 37,500 sq. ft. is being proposed, which is a change in use but a smaller building.
  - The traffic study focused on two time periods – the a.m. and p.m. peak periods of the weekday. Those times are the commuter peaks along Clarkson Road and they coincide with the peaks for medical office type of use.
  - The traffic study looked at existing conditions and found that turning left out of Bull Moose's drive is a failing condition. It is a Level Service E in the morning and Level Service F in the afternoon.
  - Speaker noted that the ITE Trip Generation Rate for medical office building has been the subject of scrutiny in several municipalities. The data that ITE provides for a medical office building dates back to the 1960s when a medical office building was used differently than it now is. In the past 5-10 years, the medical tradition has changed where doctors have gone together in groups, having larger space and offering more services within a common space – their square footage has gone up where the amount of patients served per square footage has gone down.

- Following ITE standards, two existing medical office buildings in the Chesterfield area were surveyed – Clarkson Square and the Chesterfield Valley Medical Building. It was determined that the trip generation rates for these buildings are lower than the ITE Trip Generation Rate. The two rates for the two different buildings were comparable. The rates were averaged out and applied to the new 37,500 sq. ft. medical office building.
- The ITE Trip Generation encourages municipalities to get local data if it is felt it is more applicable than the nationwide rates provided.
- In the morning, a 37,500 sq. ft. medical office building would generate approximately 20 less trips compared to an office building of slightly less than 50,000 sq. ft. (It was noted that the site is currently zoned for an office building of slightly less than 50,000 sq. ft.)
- In the afternoon, the medical office building would generate the same amount of trips as the currently-zoned office building.
- Compared to an office building, the proposed medical office building would not result in an increase in trip generation for the site overall. It does increase traffic compared to the current traffic without the medical office building. Currently, the site only has a 40,000 sq. ft office building.
- The Levels of Service of E and F would remain at E and F with the proposed medical office building.
- The Chesterfield Police Department has indicated that there have not been any accidents in the subject area from 2002 thru mid-September, 2004.

Commissioner Banks referred to the cross access with St. Joseph Institute for the Deaf and asked how this came about. Chairman Sherman stated that her recollection was that Councilmember Hurt encouraged the cross access. Councilmember Geiger stated that Councilmember Hurt felt that this entrance was safer than the entrance for St. Joseph's.

Commissioner Macaluso referred to the Bull Moose exit where a left-hand turn would be made and asked how many cars could fit in the area considering the island situation. Ms. Nolfo replied that there is about 100 ft. between the drive to Bull Moose and the beginning of the median. In theory, that could accommodate up to four cars. Ms. Nolfo felt it was unlikely that four cars would feel comfortable pulling out and stacking – realistically 2-3 cars could be accommodated.

Commissioner Macaluso noted that, because of the median, the left-hand turn situation would not improve. Ms. Nolfo stated that at the present time, there is not a heavy demand for a left-hand turn. A heavy demand is typically seen with an office use where all the employees leave at the same time – this was not observed at Bull Moose, where there was a traditional office filtering out in the afternoon.

Commissioner Macaluso referred to the ITE standards and questioned why they were used for the weekend counts. Ms. Nolfo replied that they did not perform weekend counts because it was her professional opinion that nights and weekends are not relevant in this particular situation. The paragraph referred to in the traffic study is to give the reader a point of reference.

Commissioner Macaluso referred to the traffic study which states, “...*Level D is acceptable for peak period conditions in urban areas*” and asked if this area is considered “urban”. Ms. Nolfo replied that the area is considered “urban”, which means Level Service D is acceptable. The area is not considered “rural”.

Commissioner Macaluso referred to the intersection designated at a Level of Service E and asked if an E intersection would ever get worse. Ms. Nolfo replied that normally when such a situation exists, one of the first treatments to be recommended is a widening of the drive to provide separate left and right-turn lanes. In this particular case, there are already separate left and right-turn lanes. The area will not warrant a signal as it is too close to Baxter. The designation of “E” refers to the function of the volume on Clarkson Road – it does not refer to the function of volume coming out of the development. When the traffic count was done, it was done on the traffic coming in and out of the development – not at the intersection of Clarkson and Baxter. The intersection of Clarkson and Baxter had been looked at previously and it was known that the volume going through it is as much as 6,000 vehicles per hour in the peak hour. In the traffic study, the site-generated traffic was carried through the intersection to show where the traffic is going but by the time it is added into 6,000 vehicles, it is less than 1% which will not change anything.

Commissioner Macaluso asked what numbers were used for the intersection of Clarkson and Baxter. Ms. Nolfo replied that the numbers were obtained from a study done for St. Louis County – Department of Highways and Traffic. The study was just presented to the County and covered the past two years.

Commissioner Macaluso asked if the traffic study was applied to the T-Model. Ms. Nolfo replied that they were not asked to apply it to the T-Model.

Commissioner Asmus stated that he would defer his questions until the next meeting with respect to the absence of taking into account doctors, nurses, medical staff, drug reps, and other third party vendors who will come in and out of the medical and dental office, which may create even more of a hazardous situation than already exists.

Commissioner O’Connor referred to the two places chosen for the traffic survey – Clarkson Square and the Chesterfield Valley Medical Building. Since the Chesterfield Valley Medical Building has been in use for less than two years and may possibly not be fully built out, she felt it may not be truly representative of the traffic that could be generated by a medical building. With respect to Clarkson Square, which has very unique tenants of eye care specialists and laser treatments, Commissioner O’Connor felt that it also may not be typical of medical space with a lot of ancillary personnel since medical use space now functions as a mini-hospital. Commissioner O’Connor questioned the comparisons chosen for this traffic study.

Ms. Nolfo explained that these two medical buildings were chosen because after discussions with the petitioner, it was determined that prospective tenants for the

proposed medical building would have comparable uses to Pepose Vision. With respect to the newness of the buildings and/or the occupancy rates, Ms. Nolfo indicated that she had spoken with David Bookless, Project Planner for Chesterfield, and with the property managers for both buildings to determine the existing occupancy rates. The occupancy rates were adjusted accordingly to represent it at full occupancy.

3. Mr. Chris Mueller, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO speaking **for the petitioner** for **P.Z. 08-2004 Bull Moose Tube** stated he was available for questions.
4. Mr. Rick Clawson, 11477 Olde Cabin Road, St. Louis, MO 63141 speaking **for the petitioner** for **P.Z. 08-2004 Bull Moose Tube** stated he was available for questions.
5. Ms. Redia McGrath, 933 Orvill Wood Road, Chesterfield, MO speaking as a **neutral party** for **P.Z. 28-2004 Blue Valley (Agricola Associates, L.L.C.)** stated the following:
  - She owns the store at 18423 Old Olive Street Road.
  - The petitioner has indicated that sewer and water will be provided. Speaker questioned where the utilities (sewer and water) are coming from and how they will get there.
  - Speaker asked what size main the residents would be able to tap on.

Chairman Sherman stated that the Speaker's questions would be added to the Issues list for P.Z. 28-2004 Blue Valley.

6. Ms. Mary Schultz, 640 Cepi Drive, Suite A, Chesterfield, MO, representing the Petitioner and speaking **in favor of** **P.Z. 13-2004 Vision Ventures LLC and Plan Provision LLC (Wildhorse Executive Center LLC)** stated the following:
  - She is an attorney with the law firm Schultz and Little and is formally requesting that P.Z. 13-2004 appear on the agenda of the February 28, 2005 Planning Commission meeting.
  - It has been eight months since the Public Hearing was held on P.Z. 13-2004.
  - Numerous issues have been addressed by the Petitioner.
  - The issue to be addressed and concluded is the appropriate land use for the subject property so that all parties can move forward.
  - The Preliminary Plan that has been submitted is simply a Concept Plan to allow the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council to prepare an Attachment A to an enabling ordinance.
  - Deciding the land use for this site should be addressed at an early stage to allow the developer to move on or to explore other options.
7. Mr. Ken Capps, 11850 Studt Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63141, **petitioner** for **Chesterfield Oaks (Capitol Land Company)** stated he was available for any questions.

8. Chief Clifford Biele, 13725 Olive Boulevard, Chesterfield **petitioner** for **Monarch Fire Protection District (Station #4)** stated he was available for any questions.
9. Mr. Ralph Bicknese, Hellmuth & Bicknese Architects, 4112 West Pine Boulevard, St. Louis, MO speaking **for the petitioner** for **Monarch Fire Protection District (Station #4)** stated he was available for any questions.

## VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND SIGNS

- A. **Central Park Condominiums (Parcel C-211):** A request for a three (3)-year time extension for submittal of the landscape plan and architectural elevation to complete a Partial Final Development Plan for two (2) multi-family residential buildings located on the northeastern side of Lydia Hill Extension.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the request for an extension of eighteen months. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banks and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- B. **Chesterfield Commons Four, Outlot D:** Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, Lighting Plan, and Landscape Plan for a 1.01 acre parcel located south of THF Blvd, east of its intersection with Public Works Drive.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, Lighting Plan, and Landscape Plan with the condition that all the mechanical rooftop equipment is shielded. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banks and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- C. **First Baptist Church of Creve Coeur:** Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan and Architectural Elevations for an addition to a church zoned "R-2" Residential located on the west side of Creve Coeur Mill Road, north of Olive Blvd.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan and Architectural Elevations with additional landscaping in the front. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sandifer and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- D. Chesterfield Commons West, Hardees:** Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, Lighting Plan, and Landscape Plan for a 1.02 acre parcel located southeast corner of Chesterfield Airport Road and Chesterfield Commons West Drive.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Section Plan, Lighting Plan, and Landscape Plan; the Architectural Elevations are to be held until a rendering or picture showing the lighting detail is received; and all mechanical equipment is to be fully shielded from public view. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banks and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- E. Chesterfield Montessori Children's Home:** Revised Architectural Elevations for a building addition, located on a 5 acre tract on the south side of Ladue Road, east of Saylesville Drive.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Revised Architectural Elevations noting that the temporary Trespa will be allowed until the new elevation is built with brick. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banks and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- F. Chesterfield Commons Technology Park Building B:** Amended Architectural Elevations for a building sited on a 17.2 acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District and located south of Chesterfield Airport Road, West of RHL Drive.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Amended Architectural Elevations allowing only the logo on the canopy. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banks and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- G. McLain – 18061 Wild Horse Creek Road:** A Lot Split for a 7.4 acre tract of land zoned "NU" Non-Urban located at the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road and Pine Bend Road.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Lot Split as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Asmus.

Commissioner Perantoni expressed her objection to the second curb cut opposite Pine Bend Road.

The motion to approve **passed by a voice vote of 6 to 1.** (Commissioner Perantoni voted "nay".)

- H. Spirit Trade Center (Lot 6):** Amended Site Development Concept Plan for an approximately 126.5 acre parcel, zoned M3 located south of Chesterfield Airport Road and West of Long Road.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Amended Site Development Concept Plan as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner O'Connor and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- I. SSM Health Care Central Region:** A request for a second eighteen (18)-month extension of time to submit a Site Development Plan as required by Chesterfield Ordinance Number 1823 for a “PC” Planned Commercial District located on South Outer Forty, with frontage on Chesterfield Parkway East, east of Clarkson Road/State Highway 340.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the request for a second eighteen-month extension of time to submit a Site Development Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner O'Connor and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

- J. Monarch Fire Protection District (Station #4):** Site Development Plan, Architectural Elevations, Lighting Plan and Landscape Plan for a new fire station located at the intersection of Olive Boulevard and White Road.

Commissioner Macaluso, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Plan, Architectural Elevations, Lighting Plan, and Landscape Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner O'Connor and **passed by a voice vote of 6 to 1.** (Commissioner Banks voted “nay”.)

## **VIII. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. P.Z. 08-2004 Bull Moose Tube:** A request to amend the City of Chesterfield Ordinance 1218 for Bull Moose Tube Holdings, Inc., zoned “C-8” Planned Commercial district located at the west side of Clarkson Road, south of Baxter Road and north of Forest Meadows Drive at 1815, 1819 and 1855 Clarkson Road. (Locator Numbers 19T 34 0345, 19T 34 0367, 19T 32 0468)

Project Planner Kyle Dubbert stated he was available for any questions.

Commissioner Banks referred to the cross access with St. Joseph Institute for the Deaf and asked if there was an issue as to whether or not the developer was agreeable with it. Project Planner Dubbert replied that the petitioner agreed to the cross access without any hesitation.

During discussion, it was noted that the traffic study had not been applied to the City's T-Model. Commissioners Macaluso and Asmus expressed concern about the safety issue of traffic in the area of the proposed development. Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning, indicated that if the traffic study is to be applied to the City's T-Model, it would not be available by the Planning Commission's next meeting of February 28<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Banks stated that his observation has been that traffic associated with a medical building tends to peak later than traffic associated with an office building, which, in his opinion, would be a plus. After further discussion, it was agreed that the traffic study would not be applied to the T-Model.

Commissioner Asmus moved to postpone the vote on **P.Z. 08-2004 Bull Moose Tube** until February 28, 2005. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banks and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

## **IX. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Chesterfield Oaks (Capitol Land Company):** A request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2132, Section I(B)(3) for a change in operating hours.

Senior Planner Annis McCaskill-Clay advised that Section I(B)(3) of Chesterfield Ordinance 2132 currently states that the hours of operation for all uses shall be between 7:00 a.m. and 9:30 p.m., except for those hours that would be extended to 10:00 p.m. when operating as a bookstore. The petitioner has requested an amendment to this Section, to read:

*Hours of operation for all uses shall be between 7:00 a.m. and 9:30 p.m. with two exceptions. A.) that hours would be extended to 10:00 p.m. for the operation for a bookstore and B.) that hours would start at 6:00 a.m. for a bakery/coffee shop restaurant located at the west end of building A.*

Commissioner Macaluso noted that there had been a lot of input from the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods at the time of approval and asked if the residents were aware of this request for a change of time. Councilmember Geiger stated that there had been a lot of discussion about the closing time for the bookstore and a compromise of 10:00 p.m. was reached. Councilmember Geiger has discussed the 6:00 a.m. opening time for the bakery/coffee shop with several residents and Trustees and no one has expressed any concerns to him.

Commissioner Macaluso made a motion to approve the request for an amendment to Ordinance 2132. The motion was seconded by Commissioner O'Connor.

**Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:**

**Ayes: Commissioner Macaluso, Commissioner O'Connor,  
Commissioner Perantoni, Commissioner Sandifer,  
Commissioner Asmus, Chairman Sherman**

**Nays: Commissioner Banks**

**The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 1.**

**X. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

- A. Committee of the Whole - None**
- B. Ordinance Review Committee - None**
- C. Architectural Review Committee - None**
- D. Landscape Committee - None**
- E. Comprehensive Plan Committee - None**
- F. Procedures and Planning Committee - None**
- G. Landmarks Preservation Commission - None**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

---

Lynn O'Connor, Secretary