

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
FEBRUARY 24, 2014**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Ms. Merrell Hansen
Ms. Laura Lueking
Ms. Debbie Midgley
Mr. Stanley Proctor
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Michael Watson

ABSENT

Ms. Amy Nolan

Mayor Bob Nation
Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner
Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner
Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Watson acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison; Councilmember Nancy Greenwood, Ward I; and Councilmember Bruce DeGroot, Ward IV.

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

- A. **P.Z. 01-2014 Chesterfield Valley NE Interchange (CVPBA III)**: A request for an amendment to Ordinance 2715 to modify development conditions for a 6.172 acre tract of land zoned “PC” Planned Commercial District located north of US Highway 40/Interstate 64 and immediately east of its intersection with Boones Crossing (17U620172 & 17U620183).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Senior Planner Jonathan Raiche stated that the request is triggered by two new proposed tenants consisting of one medical office building and one financial institution. Notification was sent to property owners and subdivision trustees within the required distances. Mr. Raiche then gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area.

Existing Conditions

- The zoning classification will remain unchanged from the existing Planned Commercial District.
- The existing uses are permitted and compatible to the surrounding areas.

Comprehensive Plan

- The Comprehensive Plan places the subject site within a mixed commercial land use, which allows for retail and office uses.
- The site is currently surrounded by office and retail uses beyond the adjacent rights-of-way.

Site History

- The site was incorporated into the City of Chesterfield as an “NU” Non-Urban District from St. Louis County.
- The zoning was first amended in 2006 to a “PC” Planned Commercial District.
- In 2012, the City of Chesterfield approved Ordinance 2715 which allowed an accessory activity for patients to remain on the premises overnight not to exceed seventy-two (72) hours.
- Both previous zoning amendments limited the site to one access point from North Outer 40.

Proposed Changes – Development Conditions

The following table shows the changes being proposed for this petition:

Existing Regulations	Proposed Regulations
Lot 1 setbacks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern – 160’ • Eastern – 105’ • Western – 135’ • Southern – 85’ 	Lot 1 setbacks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern – 140’ • Eastern – 70’ • Western – 65’ • Southern – 85’
Permit 2 total structures	Permit 3 total structures
Access from North Outer Forty shall be restricted to one (1) entrance	Consider a second access point on North Outer Forty Road as “Right-in Only”

Mr. Raiche pointed out that the proposed setbacks are generally consistent with the existing setbacks for Lot 2.

Items for Consideration

- Due to the visibility of building signage and to allow for more desirable development, the prohibition of freestanding signs along the Interstate 64 and Boone's Crossing corridors should be considered.
- There have been two previous requests for a second access point to the site, which were denied by the Commission due to Access Management concerns.
- This ordinance amendment opens the zoning ordinance for both property owners involved in the site. The City's policy requires that the Applicant make sincere efforts to gain signed consent from all property owners. Although attempts have been made by the Applicant, this has not yet been achieved.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Lueking asked whether Staff recommends the prohibition of all signage or just freestanding signs. Mr. Raiche clarified that Staff recommends the Commission consider prohibiting just freestanding signs since the building signage would be visible.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO gave a PowerPoint presentation and stated the following:

- He is representing CVPBA III, LLC, the owner of Lot 1.
- They are requesting amendments to Lot 1, which is 6.172 acres in size and located at the northeast corner of Boone's Crossing and I-64. The road has been improved from a two-lane road to a four-lane road, with the addition of a left-turn lane and improvements on Boone's Crossing.
- Lot 2 is fully developed.
- The request to the ordinance would take the two existing lots and make them three lots to accommodate three buildings instead of two buildings. In order to accomplish this, they are asking for setback reductions as noted below:
 - Front yard setback (*along North Outer 40 Road*) from 160 ft. to 140 ft.
 - Eastern setback (*Lot 2*) from 105 ft. to 70 ft.
 - Western setback (*along Boone's Crossing*) from to 135 ft. to 65 ft.

The existing setbacks were established to accommodate the building being proposed in 2006.

- The second access point being requested would be a right-in only. The previously-denied second access points were for a full access driveway and for a two-lane road, which was a different access management situation.
- The new four-lane section of road should address the previous access management concerns. When there was only one lane going to the east, there were concerns about cars slowing at this drive to turn in or out. There is now an additional lane to continue eastbound to the Taubman Prestige Outlet Mall. The Petitioner believes that the new proposal meets Access Management guidelines.
- St. Louis County Highway Department has given conceptual approval for this driveway.

Mr. Stock noted that Ordinance 2175 allows the following:

- 89,000 sq. ft. of building floor area.
The proposed buildings on Lots 1A and 1B, plus the existing building on Lot 2, will not exceed the total 89,000 sq. ft. allowed.
- Height limitation of 45 feet.

- *The proposed new buildings for Lot 1A and Lot 1B will not exceed 45 ft. in height.*
- 40% Open space
This requirement will be met.
- 0.55 Floor Area Ratio
The proposed plan does not exceed 0.55 Floor Area Ratio.

Mr. Stock pointed out that a bank has expressed an interest in this particular piece of property and would like to have the ability to have a right-in access to the site to utilize a drive-thru. There are not a lot of trees on the property, with a limited number along the ramp and along the east property line.

DISCUSSION

Access Management/Proposed Second Entrance

Commissioner Wuennenberg pointed out that on Boone's Crossing there is only one lane that turns right. In his opinion, there will still be access problems with cars backing up at this point. He noted that while there is a second lane, it only serves traffic coming across the Outer Road. Mr. Stock explained that previously there was only a single lane so any cars coming from the west going east would have been slowed; but now there is enough space for a car to make a free-flowing right and merge over into the inside lane to continue traveling. He added there is very light movement coming from the west; the majority of the traffic is coming across Boone's Crossing. The proposed entrance would be a free-flow right-in only so there would be no opposing movements; it would have a deep throat to allow cars to enter; and there would be no east-west internal traffic crossing the entrance causing the cars to back up.

Chair Watson asked for clarification on the access points being requested in the past. Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director explained that when the plan was first presented in 2006, the Applicant requested full access. Then when the final plans were presented to the Commission, the access was for egress only. During the Public Hearing, the Commission expressed concern about any second access point for this site and the Applicant removed it.

Chair Watson asked if the proposed second entrance meets the City's Access Management requirements. Ms. Nassif replied that there are some concerns with the entrance meeting Access Management requirements.

Lot Separation

Commissioner Lueking asked if the Applicant is procuring an official deed or property instrument separating Lot 1 into Lots 1A and 1B. Mr. Stock replied that Ordinance 2715 governs both Lots 1 and 2. Lot 2 is the site for Cornerstone Mortgage. The Petitioner intends to subdivide Lot 1 into 1A and 1B. Currently, there is one property owner for Lot 1 (CVPBA III). If the amendment is approved, the Applicant will follow up with a Site Plan, Preliminary Plat and Lot Split Plat, which would subdivide Lot 1 into two lots. The intent would be for the current owner to sell Lots 1A and 1B to third parties to develop.

Setbacks

Commissioner Lueking asked if there would be additional side yard setback requirements once the lot is separated. Ms. Nassif replied that currently the ordinance is written so that the setbacks are from the Planned Commercial District – it is not internal to the lots. This encourages shared access and shared parking.

Commissioner Lueking questioned whether the 89,000 square feet of building floor area could be accomplished if the setbacks were not reduced. Mr. Stock explained that the three setback reductions are being requested to accommodate building designs. The setback reductions are not to achieve 89,000 sq. ft. – that could be achieved by building three-story buildings vs. two-story buildings.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL:

Mr. Patrick Andre, representing Cornerstone Mortgage, 812 Big Bend Woods Drive, Manchester, MO passed on speaking.

ISSUES

1. Proposed right-in only access point
2. Setback reductions

Ms. Nassif pointed out that when the site was zoned in 2006, the City required Site Plans at the time of zoning, and the setbacks were established using the exact footprint of the buildings proposed at that time. She noted that the Applicant could still accommodate the 89,000 square feet of building area with the existing setbacks; the reduced setbacks help them accommodate getting the square footage in two separate buildings.

Commissioner Puyear asked for information on the setbacks for Cornerstone Mortgage (Lot 2). Ms. Nassif stated that these setbacks are from the roadway system – there are not requirements from any internal lots. The setbacks for Lot 2 are 45 feet from the right-of way; 85 feet from the southern boundary; 35 feet from the eastern boundary; and 95 feet from the western boundary. It was noted that the requested setback reductions for Lot 1 are similar to the existing setbacks for Lot 2.

Ms. Nassif asked the Commission for further clarification on what they need from the Applicant because the requested setbacks meet the minimum requirements for the “PC” District. Commissioner Lueking pointed out that the Applicant is requesting reductions from 160 feet to 140 feet; from 105 feet to 70 feet; and from 135 feet to 65 feet noting that there is a 60-foot reduction being requested for the western setback.

Ms. Nassif stated that Staff will ask the Applicant for further clarification and justification on the proposed setbacks.

3. Does the right-in access point conform to the City’s Access Management guidelines?
4. Prohibiting freestanding signs along the roadways. *Ms. Nassif stated that Staff would include this in the draft Attachment A.*

Since a representative from Cornerstone Mortgage was present at the Public Hearing and chose not to speak, Commissioner Lueking questioned if that would address Staff’s concern regarding the Applicant not being able to gain signed consent from all property owners. Ms. Nassif indicated that Staff will ask the Petitioner to reach out again to Cornerstone Mortgage.

- B. P.Z. 02-2014 Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.):** A request for an amendment to Ordinance 2319 to modify development criteria for 26.3 acres zoned “C8” Planned Commercial District located northeast of the intersection of Interstate 64/ US Highway 40 and Olive Boulevard (18S240179, 18S240421, 18S520602, 18S240410, 18S240498, 18S331392, 18S240443, 18S240311, 18S240201).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Project Planner Purvi Patel gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area. Ms. Patel stated the following:

- The specific request is to remove the restriction which limits an individual office building to 50,000 square feet as the Applicant would like to construct a building at a maximum of 100,000 square feet.
- All State and City Public Hearing notification requirements were met.

Existing Conditions

- To the north, south, and west of the site are Planned Commercial Districts, both C-8 and PC.
- There is a mix of developments to the east across from Chesterfield Parkway East, which include both residential and commercial properties.
- The existing buildings in this development include:
 - A medical office building located at the intersection of Chesterfield Parkway East and Swingley Ridge Road;
 - Two identical office buildings south of Swingley Ridge Road;
 - An office building at the northeast and southeast of the Olive Boulevard and Swingley Ridge Road intersection; and
 - A car-wash on Olive Boulevard.

Comprehensive Plan

- The City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Land Use Map delineates the subject site within the *Urban Core* land use designation.
- Land uses for the Urban Core include a mixture of high density residential, retail, and office uses containing the highest density development in Chesterfield.

Site History

- The subject site was originally zoned “C-8” Planned Commercial District by St. Louis County in 1978 under Ordinance 8801.
- In the decades since, the site-specific governing ordinance has been amended several times for changes to the permitted uses, building heights, site access, and setback requirements.
- The most recent ordinance amendment occurred in 2006, when the City of Chesterfield approved Ordinance 2319 to allow a medical office use at 1001 Chesterfield Parkway East only.

Ordinance Amendment Request

- The ordinance amendment request is to remove the restriction which limits an individual office building to 50,000 square feet.
- Of the 338,000 square feet permitted:
 - 149,780 square feet has been constructed in 3 office buildings.

- The Applicant is currently entitled to a full build out, with multiple buildings on this site, of 188,220 square feet.
- In lieu of constructing this as currently permitted, the Applicant would like to build one building, at a maximum of 100,000 square feet.
- This is the last buildable lot in this development. The site must meet all open space, parking, site circulation, and other site-specific requirements for the proposed buildings.

Items under Review by Staff

The final item required before Staff prepares the Attachment A is outstanding Agency Comments.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Lueking asked for the number of stories of the 100,000 square foot building. This question was referred to the Applicant.

Commissioner Geckeler asked who maintains the vacant lot at 15450 Conway Road. This question was referred to the Applicant.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO gave a PowerPoint presentation and stated the following:

- He is representing MiTek, the owner under contract of Lot A of the Herman Stemme Park.
- The request is to amend the ordinance to remove the condition that does not allow a building to exceed 50,000 square feet.
- The proposal is for a single 100,000 square-foot building, three stories in height to go on Lot A.
- They intend to comply with the ordinance as it exists. The ordinance allows additional square footage beyond what is being requested.

DISCUSSION

Chair Watson asked if this would be the last building to be built. Mr. Stock replied that this is the last lot that has not been constructed upon – the majority of the lots are owned by different entities of Sachs Properties. He could not confirm that another building wouldn't be constructed on another piece of property; but for Lot A and MiTek, the intent is to purchase the subject six acres and develop their corporate headquarters on this site with a three-story office building and surface parking. This will be the only building on Lot A.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL: None

ISSUES: None

- C. **P.Z. 03-2014 The Summit at Chesterfield (Chesterfield Management Association)**: A request for a zoning map amendment from an “R-3” Residence District (with a PEU) to a “PUD” Planned Unit Development for 29.385 acres located on the north side of Olive Boulevard east of its intersection with Hog Hollow Road (16R340151 and 16R340207).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Project Planner Jessica Henry stated that the Petitioner is requesting the proposed zoning map amendment in order to construct single-family detached dwellings. She noted that all State and local Public Hearing notification requirements have been met and then gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area.

Existing Site Conditions

- The Eagle Ridge Subdivision is to the west of the site, Westbury Subdivision to the south, and the City of Maryland Heights shares a border with the northern boundary of the property.
- The last remaining structure on the site is the masonry wall from the former Chesterfield Manor nursing home.
- The property is fairly overgrown and includes some pavement that dates to the site’s use as a nursing home.

Site History

- The subject site was originally zoned “R-2” Residence District by St. Louis County prior to the incorporation of the City of Chesterfield.
- A Conditional Use Permit was issued by St. Louis County in 1971 to allow for the expansion of an existing nursing home on the site.
- In 1998, the nursing home closed. Consequently, the site suffered from neglect and abandonment until all the structures were demolished in 2011.
- In 2005, the City of Chesterfield approved a change in zoning to the “R-3” District with a PEU.
- In 2006, the City approved a Site Development Plan for Briarcliffe Villas; however, Briarcliffe Villas was never constructed.

Site Layout

- The site design and layout for The Summit at Chesterfield is very similar to the design and layout for Briarcliffe Villas. The plans are very similar in part because this is effectively a zoning from a planned district to a planned district.
- The change in zoning request was triggered by a change in the lot size — the PEU planned district procedure included a minimum lot size, whereas the PUD planned district does not have a minimum lot size, which is why they could not amend the current governing ordinance.
- The reason for the change in lot size is directly attributed to the requested change from private to public streets. City street standards require that a certain amount of street frontage be dedicated as right-of-way in order to provide sidewalks, streets trees, and other improvements.
- Providing the necessary right-of-way for public streets reduced the lot size and triggered a rezoning to the PUD planned district.

Proposed Changes

The following table shows the changes being proposed for The Summit at Chesterfield vs. what was previously approved for Briarcliffe Villas.

Briarcliffe Villas	The Summit at Chesterfield
82 Lots	74 lots
Attached Villas	Detached Homes
Private, Gated Streets	Public Streets
Average Lot Area: 7,667 sq. ft.	Average Lot Area: 7,850 sq. ft.
Landscape buffers varied in width and were not continuous around the entire development	30-foot continuous landscape buffer provided around entire perimeter of development
	Over 40% Common Open Space provided

Zoning

There are several different zoning districts in the area surrounding the subject site; however, the area is mostly residential.

Comprehensive Plan

- The City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates the site as *Residential Single Family*.
- The request adheres to the Comprehensive Plan as the proposal is for single-family residential homes.

Items under Review by Staff:

Staff is waiting for one outstanding Agency Comments before the Attachment A is prepared for this request.

DISCUSSION

Gated Access

Commissioner Puyear asked why the access to the adjacent subdivision is gated. Ms. Henry replied that the approved Site Development Plan for Briarcliffe Villas included the gated access and the Petitioner is maintaining this exact connection in the exact location for The Summit at Chesterfield. While the loop street will be a public street, the small emergency access will remain a private stub street gated to the adjacent subdivision.

Chair Watson asked who will be responsible for maintaining the private street. This question was referred to the Applicant.

Commissioner Lueking asked for Staff's opinion on the number of lots being requested with the gated street. Ms. Nassif replied that when the application was submitted in 2006, the second access was proposed as a thru-street. There was then some concern expressed from neighbors and residents. The current plan was approved by City Council, which allowed the street as an emergency access, gated drive. At this time, the Applicant has not made any changes to this approved emergency access.

Chair Watson asked if the adjoining subdivisions have public streets. Ms. Nassif replied that they are public streets.

Councilmember Fults asked if the City had received comments from the Fire District on the emergency access. Ms. Henry stated that she has received comments from the Fire District and they have no changes to the Preliminary Plan as submitted to them.

Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked what requirements from the R3 zoning are being eliminate for the requested PUD. Ms. Nassif stated that they would be changing the required 10,000 square-foot minimum lot size, street length, and the setbacks. She suggested that the Applicant would be better able to define their reasons for not requesting a straight R3.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION:

Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO gave a PowerPoint presentation and stated the following:

- He is representing Pulte Homes.
- The project proposes 74 single-family detached homes. The address of the site is 13987 and 14001 Olive Boulevard.
- Part of Hog Hollow Road is on the subject site. The Applicant would dedicate right-of-way to the City to encompass Hog Hollow Road.
- He has not spoken to any of the residents in the adjacent Eagle Ridge Subdivision but he has sent letters to all the residents. He did have communication with the residents in 2005/2006 at which time the idea of the gated access was raised.

Mr. Stock then provided the following comparison between the approved Briarcliffe Villas and the proposed The Summit at Chesterfield:

Briarcliffe Villas	The Summit at Chesterfield
Attached Villas	Detached Single-Family Homes
82 Units	74 Units
Private Streets	Public Streets
Avg. lot w/o street easement: 7,667 sq. ft.	Average Lot: 7,850 sq. ft.
East landscape strip/easement: 20 ft. <i>(along Eagle Ridge)</i>	East landscape strip/easement: 30 ft. <i>(along Eagle Ridge)</i>
SW landscape strip/easement: 30 ft. <i>(along the commercial property)</i>	SW landscape strip/easement: 45 ft. <i>(along the commercial property)</i>

- Mr. Stock summarized that they have increased the perimeter buffer, increased the common ground to 40%, and reduced the number of units.
- Briarcliffe Villas had private streets because they wanted a gated community – he noted that as soon as a gate is installed at the entrance of a subdivision, it becomes a private street.
- The proposed plan offers a conventional, public City street – standard 26-foot wide pavement with no gate.

- There is still the 20-foot wide emergency access tying into the Eagle Ridge Subdivision but they have increased the buffer by 10 feet to be 30 feet along the east property line.
- Units 16-19 have been pulled south about 100 feet from the bluff from where they are located on the approved Briarcliffe Villa plans.
- They have increased the green space 15 feet along the southwest property line.
- The bio-retention is being placed on top of the ridge so there will be plush plantings and grasses incorporated for the stormwater to tie into.
- About 40% of the site is proposed as common ground open space around the perimeter.
- While they will have to move a lot of dirt to develop the site, it is less than what was proposed for Briarcliffe Villas. They estimate they will be moving 350,000-360,000 yards; dirt will not be removed from or imported to the site. They plan to lower the area where the nursing home once sat by about 15-20 feet and then place the fill around the perimeter.
- They are trying to reduce the disturbed area; preserve the perimeter buffers; and enhance the views looking to the north and west.

Some of the features of the site include:

- Preservation of natural resources and trees;
- Sidewalks;
- Possible trail around the bio-retention;
- A lookout over the bluff;
- Rain garden that will provide water quality and runoff reduction;
- Landscape buffers to the east and southwest;
- Views over the Missouri River;
- Price range on the homes would be in the mid-\$500,000's;
- Appealing architecture

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Puyear asked why the Applicant couldn't develop the site under the current zoning ordinance. Mr. Stock stated that the current ordinance requires (1) attached units vs. detached; (2) a minimum lot size of 7,400 sq. ft. and while the proposed plan has lots larger than that, it does have some lots smaller than 7,400 sq. ft.; and (3) private streets vs. public streets.

Chair Watson clarified that Commissioner Puyear was questioning why the site couldn't be developed under R3 without the PEU. Mr. Stock stated that if the site was developed under the straight R3, it would "look dramatically different" - the lot sizes would be 10,000 sq. ft. instead of an average 7,800 sq. ft. This would cause the Applicant to either lose lots or expand the area so more lots could be developed. They feel that the Briarcliffe development pushed the lots too far to the north and southwest in order to achieve the 82 units. They feel it is more beneficial to have the smaller lots and the preservation of as much natural resources as possible.

Commissioner Proctor asked how the view of the Missouri River will be made available to people other than those whose homes are on the north part of the site. Mr. Stock explained that the development is terraced with elevations of 646-650 on the eastern streets and elevations of 624-636 on the western streets. There will be view lines between or over the houses.

Commissioner Geckeler noted that the “Justification for the PUD” included in the Applicant’s Narrative Statement refers to *Adherence to MSD stormwater requirements*. She questioned whether this is really a *feature of exceptional design*. Mr. Stock replied that they feel it qualifies as an exceptional design feature because it is a learning, sustainable, environmental-friendly feature and is accessible to the subdivision. They intend to post signage as to what Best Management Practices are actually doing and they will be putting in native grasses. Commissioner Geckeler suggested putting in trails to this area with an observation deck. Mr. Stock indicated that they are open to such a suggestion.

Commissioner Lueking felt that the views should not be considered an *exceptional design feature*. Mr. Stock stated that they try to provide efficient, economical and sustainable design but there are some limitations as to what they can and cannot do. The site is expensive to develop and because of its zoning, the property owner has an expectation of 82 attached villas. They have a buyer ready to develop the property but not as dense; however it still costs the same amount of money to develop and is expensive when there are fewer homes.

In terms of the “owner having the right to 82 lots on the PEU”, City Attorney Heggie pointed out that there was some fairly extensive litigation between the owner and a previous purchaser on this particular property. At some level, the owner had a role in that; and the fact that the site was not developed years ago when it was first approved was nothing that the City had anything to do with. City Attorney Heggie stated that, in his opinion, the fact that a large amount of time has gone by between then and now eliminates the expectation of 82 homes on this lot.

Commissioner Puyear asked how the homes in the proposed subdivision compare to the homes in Eagle Ridge. Mr. Stock stated that Eagle Ridge is a very nice subdivision but he doesn’t know the price point on their homes.

Chair Watson asked for the minimum and maximum lot sizes for the proposed development. Ms. Nassif stated that the minimum lot size is 6,224 sq. ft. and the maximum lot size is 14,106 sq. ft.

Commissioner Hansen stated that the PUD is to result in exceptional design quality and character and asked Mr. Stock to further address this. Mr. Stock stated that part of exceptional design is common areas, open spaces, preservation of natural woodlands, and amenities that can be added in the form of a trail. Exceptional design is also not importing and exporting 100,000 yards of material, and retaining 40% open space vs. 20% open space. He feels spending a lot of time on designing the plan and trying to make it a functional, sustainable plan is part of good design.

Commissioner Geckeler pointed out that none of the common ground is in the middle of the site or disbursed evenly across the site, which is one of the important design features of the PUD. She noted that on the Tree Stand Delineation, there are a few trees in the middle of the site that are in excellent condition. These are Sweet Gum trees which are not acceptable as street trees, but she suggested that the Applicant consider a pocket park or green cul-de-sac while leaving the trees in place.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL:

1. Mr. Bill Muhs, Eagle Ridge Subdivision Homeowners Association, 14009 Eagle Manor Court, Chesterfield, MO noted the following concerns of the residents of Eagle Ridge Subdivision:
 - Density in regards to open space.
 - Density on Olive Street Road – during rush hour it is already difficult to access Olive Street Road from their subdivision and they have concerns about adding additional cars to the same intersection.
 - Development – general concerns with infrastructure requirements and sewers.
 - Home values and how smaller lot sizes could affect their home values.
 - Cut issue – the proposed site is being elevated 10 feet; during conversations with the previous proposal, the residents had asked that the site be lowered.
 - Redevelopment of Hog Hollow Road – they suggested that dirt be moved from the subject site onto Hog Hollow Road.
 - Fire Access – In 2005, the Homeowners Association submitted a letter to the City asking why the fire access “should be the burden of the Eagle Ridge Subdivision – why couldn’t it be a burden to Hog Hollow Road?” This is still a concern with the proposed development.
 - Zoning – Why isn’t the R3 zoning good enough for this site?

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked Mr. Muhs for the approximate values of the homes in Eagle Ridge Subdivision. Mr. Muhs replied that recent comps show the homes’ value from \$450,000-\$510,000.

Commissioner Lueking asked when the Eagle Ridge Subdivision was developed. Mr. Muhs replied that it was developed in 1997.

Commissioner Lueking asked what the plans were for the stub street when the subdivision was developed. Mr. Muhs stated he didn’t know but pointed out that, at that time, the nursing home was fully-operational.

Ms. Nassif suggested that Mr. Stock and Mr. Muhs meet to discuss some of the concerns of the Eagle Ridge Subdivision, particularly the plans involved for the cut and fill of the site. She further explained that if the zoning gets approved, the City will continue working with MoDOT to get a traffic study to determine what improvements are needed on Hog Hollow Road to help alleviate some of the traffic that would be generated from the proposed development.

Commissioner Wuennenberg suggested joining the two subdivisions together with a walking trail to give the residents of Eagle Ridge Subdivision access to some of the features that will be provided as part of the PUD.

ISSUES:

1. Possibility of adding trails, a pocket park, and a lookout for the water quality area.
2. Possible trail system connecting the proposed development with Eagle Ridge.
3. Have the exceptional design features of the City Code for a PUD been met?

4. Review the disbursement of the common open space and the open space areas that are to be preserved.
5. Is it possible to preserve more trees and in a more disbursed manner? Possibility of creating a pocket park or something in the central area of the site to give some exceptional design and detail to it.
6. The Applicant to meet with Mr. Muhs, Trustee of Eagle Ridge Subdivision.
7. Continue working with MoDOT regarding a traffic study for Hog Hollow Road.
8. What could the yield for this site be if built as detached single family homes under the R3 zoning?
9. Review the fire access gate between the two subdivisions.
10. Provide the Commission with the Attachment A for Eagle Ridge Subdivision regarding the stub street.

Commissioner Wuennenberg read the Closing Comments for the Public Hearings.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the February 10, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0 with 1 abstention from Commissioner Proctor.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Chesterfield Outlets

Petitioners

1. Mr. Bill Remis, 16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Chesterfield, MO stated he was available for questions.
2. Mr. Christopher Wong, 2 North Riverside Plaza, #1475, Chicago, IL was available for questions.

B. P.Z. 14-2013 St. Luke's Hospital-West Campus (175 S. Woods Mill Rd.)

Petitioners

1. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO stated he was available for questions.
2. Mr. Mike Doster, DosterUllom, Chesterfield, MO stated he was available for questions.

C. P.Z. 22-2013 Beckmann Properties (16625 & 16635 Old Chesterfield Rd)

Petitioners

1. Mr. Bruce Beckmann and Mr. Gene Beckmann, 2012 Emerald Crest Court, Chesterfield MO were available for questions.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- A. **Chesterfield Outlets**: A request for an Amended Sign Package to modify sign criteria for the Chesterfield Outlets development located on the north side of North Outer 40 Road, east of Boone's Crossing.

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Amended Sign Package for **Chesterfield Outlets**. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Midgley** and **passed by a voice vote of 5 to 3** with **Commissioners Geckeler, Lueking and Watson** voting "no".

- B. **Kemp Auto Museum (Chesterfield Covenant Group) SDP**: A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 0.709 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District on the north side of Chesterfield Airport Rd., approximately 1,000 feet east of Chesterfield Commons Dr. (17T230189).

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for **Kemp Auto Museum (Chesterfield Covenant Group)**. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Wuennenberg** and **passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0**.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

The Commission agreed to re-arrange the agenda to next discuss P.Z. 22-2013 Beckmann Properties (16625 & 16635 Old Chesterfield Rd.).

- B. **P.Z. 22-2013 Beckmann Properties (16625 & 16635 Old Chesterfield Rd)**: A request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2295 to add "Gymnasium" as a permitted use within an existing "PI" Planned Industrial District (LPA) for a 1.95 acre tract of land located at 16625 and 16635 Old Chesterfield Road. (17T310379)

Project Planner Jessica Henry stated that the Public Hearing for this project was held on February 10, 2014 at which time no issues were identified. Items discussed during the Public Hearing were the historic nature of the area, the LPA status of the property, and the existing site conditions. As directed by the Planning Commission, Staff has prepared an Attachment A which complies fully with all City Code requirements. Staff has no further comments and the Commission may vote on the project if it so chooses.

Chair Watson asked if the restrictions pertain to the existing buildings only. **Ms. Henry** stated that language was incorporated into the Attachment A restricting the hours of operation; permitting the gymnasium use only in conjunction with the buildings which were in existence at the time of passage of the ordinance; and limiting the maximum square footage for the requested gymnasium use to 6,000 square feet.

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve P.Z. 22-2013 Beckmann Properties (16625 & 16635 Old Chesterfield Rd). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Puyear, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Chair Watson

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

- A. P.Z. 14-2013 St. Luke's Hospital-West Campus (175 S. Woods Mill Rd.):** A request for a zoning map amendment from "MU" Medical Use District, "R-2" Residence District and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban District to create a new "MU" Medical Use District for a 40.3 acre tract of land located west of the intersection of South Woods Mill Road and Hwy 141 (18Q140343, 18Q510278, 18Q230204 and 18Q210211).

Senior Planner John Boyer stated that this meeting is to follow up on issues identified at the Public Hearing held on December 9, 2013. He explained that two applications were presented for St. Luke's Hospital at the December 9th meeting – P.Z. 13-2013 for the East Campus and P.Z. 14-2013 for the West Campus. No issues were identified at the Public Hearing for P.Z. 13-2013 and since the two petitions are tied, the Petitioner has asked that no vote be taken on P.Z. 13-2013 until P.Z. 14-2013 is ready for vote.

Multiple issues were identified during the Public Hearing for P.Z. 14-2013 by the Commission, the public, and Staff. An Issues Letter was sent by Staff to the Petitioner and a response to that letter has been included in the meeting packet. Within the Staff Report, additional commentary was provided on some of these items and a draft Attachment A has been prepared for the Commission's review.

Some of the issues identified at the Public Hearing are as follows:

1. Heliport Use – this use has been removed from the proposal as requested from the public.
2. Height of the Proposed Buildings – Specifically the buildings on the west side up on the bluff with respect to how they will appear to adjoining residences.
3. Need for inclusion of Parcel C – Parcel C includes the two properties located at the southern end of the site along South Woods Mill Road. Concerns were raised regarding uses, buffering, and traffic for this parcel.
4. Traffic – Overall concern of how traffic in the area would be affected from the development.

Mr. Boyer stated that since the Public Hearing, Staff contacted MoDOT to inquire about any possible changes intended for this area. There are improvements planned, separate

from the St. Luke's project, which would extend Highway 141 from I-64 North to the St. Luke's drive. The intent is to add additional thru-lanes, both northbound and southbound, and to provide two additional lanes – an exit and on ramp onto I-64 to alleviate some of traffic concerns associated with the Highway 141 improvements. The Attachment A requires a Site Development Plan and a traffic study will be provided that will identify how the St. Luke's development works with the overall plan.

Mr. Boyer than noted the issues that still remain open:

1. Setbacks
2. Parcel C inclusion
3. Berming/buffering
4. Building height

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Lueking still has concerns about development of Parcel C; access to Parcel C considering its close proximity to Highway 141; the whole intersection in this area; and setbacks.

Chair Watson questioned why Parcel C is still included in the proposal. Mr. Boyer explained that the Commission can evaluate the proposed uses associated with the request – whether some of the uses are appropriate for this parcel, additional buffering or setbacks beyond the minimum standard requirements. He noted that St. Luke's previous ordinance split the site into two parcels with each parcel having its own design criteria and the Commission has the option of doing the same with the current request.

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked for the current zoning for Parcel C. Mr. Boyer stated that it is zoned R2 Single-Family Residence. Commissioner Wuennenberg added that he agrees with Chair Watson and Commissioner Lueking regarding concerns about Parcel C.

ISSUES

The Commission then agreed that the following items are still open issues:

1. Parcel C - Petitioner to evaluate the necessity of including Parcel C in this zoning petition.
2. If Parcel C is included, separate it out in the Attachment A and provide specific criteria regarding setbacks, landscaping, access, zoning, and uses.

Mr. Doster addressed the concerns raised regarding Parcel C. When St. Luke's came through with the original MU District zoning, Parcel C was part of the request. During the course of that process, it was removed because there was no near-term use for it. While they still don't have any near-term use for Parcel C, he noted that St. Luke's owns Parcel C and they don't feel it is suitable to be developed as residential considering all the road improvements in this area. If Parcel C is removed at this time, St. Luke's will be coming back in the future asking for it to be rezoned. They feel it makes more sense to have it rezoned to the MU District at this time so everyone is aware of what is expected on this parcel.

Chair Watson pointed out that several homeowners expressed concern about this parcel during the Public Hearing and asked if the Petitioner would consider removing it from the current petition. Mr. Doster indicated that they would consider it.

City Attorney Heggie stated that one of the issues in connection with Parcel C is the long-term uses intended for it. The Commission would like to know if there is any interest in St. Luke's acquiring property further south of Parcel C and what it would that look like 5-10 years from now. Mr. Doster replied that there was interest, but Brooking Park owns the parcel immediately adjacent to Parcel C, so St. Luke's doesn't have "continuous ownership". City Attorney Heggie stated that there are issues that will have to be visited at some future time because this is a residential area that goes from Parcel C to Conway Road. Whether or not the Commission or Council is interested in having this area turn into a medical use or a nursing home use remains to be seen. Anyone acquiring property in this area needs to be aware of that concern.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Steve Wuennenberg, Secretary