

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
APRIL 23, 2012**

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

ABSENT

Mr. Bruce DeGroot
Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Ms. Laura Lueking
Ms. Debbie Midgley
Mr. Stanley Proctor
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Michael Watson
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Amy Nolan

Mayor Bruce Geiger
Councilmember Randy Logan, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director
Mr. Ben Niesen, Civil Engineer
Mr. Justin Wyse, Senior Planner
Mr. Kristian Corbin, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Nolan acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bruce Geiger; Councilmember Randy Logan, Council Liaison; and former Mayor Nancy Greenwood.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – Commissioner Puyear read the “Opening Comments” for the Public Hearing.

- A. **P.Z. 04-2012 318 N. Eatherton Road:** A request for a zoning map amendment from “NU” Non-Urban District to “PI” Planned Industrial District for a 1.049 acre tract of land located 1/4 mile southeast of the intersection of Wings Corporate Drive and North Eatherton Road (18W410026).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Project Planner Kristian Corbin gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area. Mr. Corbin stated the following:

- All State and local Public Hearing notification requirements have been met.
- The purpose of the request is to allow the property to be used for a landscaping business.
- The subject site is slightly vegetated and most of the area around the site is vacant land.
- The site was zone “NU” Non-Urban District prior to the incorporation of the City of Chesterfield. The properties to the north and east of the site are zoned “NU” Non-Urban District; Spirit of St. Louis Airpark is to the south of the site; and immediately to the west is the City of Wildwood.
- Requested Uses:
 1. Cultivation and Sale of Plant Crops, Commercial Vegetable and Flower Gardening, as well as Plant Nurseries and Greenhouses
 2. Yard for Storage of Contractors’ Equipment, Materials and Supplies
- The Preliminary Plan shows a proposed structure and small parking area on the southern portion of the site with access via Eatherton Road in the northwestern portion of the site.
- The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates the site as *Industrial, Low Intensity* which is defined as *activities in which primary use of the land and building will include manufacturing, fabrication, assembly, processing, distribution, warehousing and/or storage.*
- The proposed uses are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Issues under Review by Staff:
 1. Outstanding Agency comments
 2. Preliminary Plan – possible changes by the Petitioner based upon Agency comments
 3. Tree Stand Delineation will be made available at the next meeting.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Geckeler asked if the Petitioner intends to save any of the trees on the site. Mr. Corbin consulted with the Petitioner and it was noted that all six of the trees will be saved.

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION:

Mr. Tim Meyer, Volz Incorporated and representing the Owner, 10849 Indian Head, St. Louis, MO stated the following.

- The property is currently being used as a staging area for the materials of a landscaping business. The site is being subleased from the Owner and the current landscaping business will continue to work from this site.
- A Tree Stand Delineation Plan is being prepared. The site includes six trees, which they intend to save.
- There is one existing curb cut on the north end of the property, which will be continued to be used.
- At this time, there are no immediate plans for major improvements to the site.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL: None

ISSUES:

No additional issues were brought forth.

Commissioner Puyear read the Closing Comments for the Public Hearing.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve the minutes of the **April 9, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and **passed** by a voice vote of 8 to 0 with 1 abstention from Commissioner DeGroot.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. P.Z. 02-2012 Mercy Health System (Chesterfield Village, SE Quadrant):

Chair Nolan announced that the Traffic Study for this petition has not yet been received.

At the Petitioner’s request, the Planning Commission agreed to defer comment from the Petitioner until after Staff’s report.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS - None

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 02-2012 Mercy Health System (Chesterfield Village, SE Quadrant)**: A request for a change of zoning from a “C-8” Planned Commercial District and two “PC” Planned Commercial Districts to a “UC” Urban Core District for a 40.040 acre area of land located north of Chesterfield Parkway and east of Elbridge Payne Rd. (19S531791, 19S531801, 18S210028, 18S210149, 18S210073, 18S210062, 18S220148, 18S220171 and 18S220061).

Senior Planner Justin Wyse stated that the Public Hearing for this project was held on March 12, 2012 at which time several issues were raised by the Commission and the public. Since that time, the Petitioner has submitted a written response to the issues letter which is included in the meeting packet.

Issues

Mr. Wyse then provided a summary of the issues raised at the Public Hearing, along with responses to the issue:

1. Traffic – Concern was raised as to how traffic will impact various characteristics and operations of the roadway network.

A traffic impact study detailing the impact of the proposed development on the roadway network is underway and will be presented to the Planning Commission prior to its Vote Meeting.

2. Multi-modal elements associated with the development - including walkability and the Pathway on the Parkway

The proposed development will be required to complete a portion of the Pathway on the Parkway, and is included in the draft Attachment A. Additionally, the Petitioner’s response states that they will contribute their portion to the Pathway. The Preliminary Plan also depicts an internal trail system. The planned district ordinance for the Commission’s review requires this trail system to be constructed and for connections to the public system to be made.

3. Public Art for the project.

Public art has not been included in the draft Attachment A. Staff is reviewing the Public Art Master Plan in connection with this site and would appreciate feedback from the Commission as to how public art could be incorporated into the development.

4. Tree Stand Delineation – The details of the Monarch trees were not included in the Public Hearing meeting packet.

The City Arborist has reviewed the Tree Stand Delineation and has inspected the site. The majority of the trees are noted as in “fair” condition, which is very typical of a woodlands site. The City Arborist has clarified that “fair” is an acceptable rating for trees.

5. Visual impact of the proposed development – There was particular concern from the residential property to the south, Brandywine, and how the property will fit into the larger area as well.

The Petitioner presented a scaled model to clearly illustrate the proposal and how buildings may be constructed to utilize existing topographic conditions.

6. Lighting

An additional requirement has been included for the parking structures located on the east side of the site. Development standards have been included in the draft planned district ordinance to reduce light standard height on these structures and to reinforce the requirement that lighting be directed into the development. The maximum light standard would be at 16 feet.

7. Stormwater management – There were concerns related to any negative impacts that the construction process may have on Brandywine’s detention facilities.

There are standard ordinances in place regarding stormwater management. In addition, the Petitioner has agreed to perform a pre-construction and post-construction survey of the detention facilities at Brandywine. The pre-construction survey has been completed. The site will also be required to manage the stormwater from the Hyatt and Drury development which will be shown on future Improvement Plan submittals.

Preliminary Plan

The proposed Preliminary Plan has changed drastically since the Public Hearing. The original plan required extensive grading and cut/fill on the site. Changes to the plan have revised the internal roadway network to eliminate the loop road, reducing the impact on the existing topography and landscape. In addition, the plan has been modified to work the proposed structures into the existing topography as much as possible. This would drastically reduce the amount of cut/fill required to develop the site and will leave a far greater percentage of the site undisturbed.

Parking

The proposed virtual care center is a unique use and data is not readily available for how such a center operates. Also, because of the large nature of the development and the amount of structured parking, Staff has included language

in the draft ordinance requiring a Parking Demand Study. It is likely that the study will be submitted in phases through the Site Plan review process and will identify the parking needs of each phase of the development.

Height

The draft ordinance includes the idea of two separate areas within the site with differing height requirements for each area – (1) a South Outer 40 area and (2) a Chesterfield Parkway area.

The draft ordinance includes the following height restrictions:

- a. *Any building that is primarily (greater than 50% of square footage) located within 300 feet of Chesterfield Parkway shall not exceed:*
 - i. *700 feet above Mean Sea Level exclusive of mechanical equipment, and*
 - ii. *Three stories in height, exclusive of mechanical equipment.*
- b. *Any structure that is primarily (greater than 50% of square footage) located north of 300 feet of Chesterfield Parkway shall not exceed:*
 - i. *715 feet above Mean Sea Level, exclusive of mechanical equipment, and*
 - ii. *Six stories in height, exclusive of mechanical equipment.*

Mr. Wyse pointed out that the Petitioner has since requested an amendment to item b. above as follows.

- i. *~~715~~ **725** feet above Mean Sea Level, exclusive of mechanical equipment*

As a frame of reference, it was pointed out that the Centene Building is approximately 720 feet above Mean Sea Level and the Drury is 764 feet above Mean Sea Level.

The Petitioner is also requesting that there be some clarification regarding the *exclusion for rooftop mechanical equipment*. They envision that several of the buildings will require a structure on top of the building that would enclose an elevator shaft or stairwell for access to the rooftop equipment. If the Commission is in agreement with this, Staff can include such an exception in the ordinance.

The draft ordinance also includes the following height restrictions for parking structures:

- a. *Parking Structure Area A, as delineated on the Preliminary Plan shall not exceed 45 feet in height (measured to the top rail) or be greater than 690 feet above Mean Sea Level.*

- b. *Parking Structure Area B, as delineated on the Preliminary Plan shall not exceed 35 feet in height (measured to the top rail) or be greater than 635 feet above Mean Sea Level.*
- c. *Parking Structure Areas C and D, as delineated on the Preliminary Plan shall not exceed 40 feet in height (measured to the top rail) or be greater than 670 feet above Mean Sea Level.*

Mr. Wyse explained that parking structure heights reference a *top rail*. The Petitioner has noted that on the top of Parking Structure B, there will be an open area for pedestrian use. As such, a separate rail will be required for the pedestrian use. The Petitioner is, therefore, requesting that the language be clarified to indicate that the height noted above is for the parking structure and not for the rail associated with the pedestrian use on top of the structure.

Landscaping

Staff has included the following language in the ordinance which seeks to retain as much natural landscaping as possible on the site for buffering.

Where natural buffers exist, every effort shall be made to reduce disturbance and maintain the existing buffer, except for the removal of dead wood and invasive vines and plants. Additional trees and shrubs may be required to bring the natural buffer up to the full perimeter buffer requirements.

Parking Setback

The Petitioner is requesting a reduction to the drive aisle setback on the western side as follows:

No parking structure, parking stall, loading space, internal driveway, or roadway, except points of ingress or egress, will be located within the following setbacks:

- a. *30 feet from the northern, eastern, and southern boundary of the 'UC' District.*
- ~~30~~ **10 feet from the western boundary of the 'UC' District.**

The modification to the perimeter parking setback will require a separate vote by the Commission and will require 2/3 of the Commission to recommend approval of the request. Staff would appreciate feedback from the Commission on this request as the drive location has the potential to greatly affect the design of the site.

Uses

There was limited discussion about uses at the Public Hearing. After reviewing the uses with Staff, the Petitioner has agreed to remove the *heliport* use.

DISCUSSION

Comments from Apartment Complex

Commissioner Geckeler asked if Staff had received any comments from anyone at the adjacent apartment complex. Mr. Wyse indicated that there have not been any.

Mechanical Screening

Commissioner Watson noted that the Petitioner is requesting mechanical screening in addition to the height of the building; he asked if this would be included on the Parkway side of the site. Mr. Wyse stated that this is a possibility but he had no information on how tall the screening would be. He suggested that the Petitioner provide this information.

Landscaping

Commissioner Watson referred to *the removal of dead wood and invasive vines and plants* and asked who would be supervising such activity. Mr. Wyse replied that first the Petitioner would submit a Landscape Plan, which would be reviewed by the Project Planner and City Arborist. The City Arborist would be in charge of site inspections and any technical details as to what is appropriate to remove from the site.

Uses

Commissioner DeGroot asked if a *hospital* would be on site. Mr. Wyse stated that the Petitioner is not proposing a traditional hospital. They are proposing: 1) a traditional corporate office; 2) an orthopedic hospital, which is more like a medical office than a hospital (*it was noted that if a patient requires an overnight stay after surgery, it falls under the "hospital" use*); and 3) a virtual care center.

Hours of Operation

Commissioner DeGroot inquired as to the hours of operation. Mr. Wyse noted that the ordinance shows unrestricted hours. He explained that the virtual care center requires operating hours 24/7 as this facility is a data management center which can receive and provide information nationwide for medical monitoring.

Monarch Trees

Commissioner Geckeler pointed out that there 31 Monarch trees on the site, with 19 of them being in the woodland. She asked if it has been determined yet as to which trees will be retained. Mr. Wyse indicated that this has not yet been determined but if the Commission would like Staff to review any particular trees that they feel are important to the character of the site, Staff could explore options for keeping them.

Parking Structures

Chair Nolan referred to the two parking structures backing up to Schoettler Valley and asked for clarification on the setbacks. Mr. Wyse stated that under the

Urban Core District, parking structures are required to have a minimum setback of 30 feet from the property line to which the Petitioner will comply.

Chair Nolan suggested that the existing trees in this area be kept for buffering purposes. Mr. Wyse stated that the Petitioner has been very receptive about keeping existing vegetation on the site. In addition, the Petitioner recently worked with Ameren's tree trimming contractor to insure that the minimum amount of trees were trimmed back from power lines explaining to Ameren that the lines would be buried underground in the next 18 months.

Chair Nolan asked if part of the parking structure in this area will be underground. Mr. Wyse replied that as the ordinance is written, no portion of the parking structure is required to be underground. The Petitioner has indicated their intent to have two stories of both of the five-story structures built underground dependent upon what is found through a geotechnical study.

If the Geotechnical Report supports underground construction, City Attorney Heggie asked if the ordinance will be changed to require it. Mr. Wyse strongly recommended that the Commission ask for such a requirement.

Timeline for Construction

Commissioner Midgley asked how many phases are involved in construction of the development. Mr. Wyse indicated that the Petitioner originally proposed a ten-year horizon for the site to be fully constructed.

Commissioner Midgley asked as to where the construction traffic will access the site. Mr. Wyse stated that the Petitioner will have to go through a review process with the City, and either County or MoDOT, to obtain temporary construction access.

DISCUSSION WITH THE PETITIONER

The following individuals representing the Petitioner were available for questions:

1. Mr. Mike Doster, Doster, Ullom, attorney, 16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Chesterfield, MO.
2. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, St. Louis, MO.
3. Mr. Terry Bader, 14528 South Outer 40, Chesterfield, MO.
4. Mr. Kirk Warden, Clayco, 719 East Monroe, Oakland, MO.

Buffer

Commissioner Lueking asked if the Petitioner would consider an 85-100 foot buffer on the Chesterfield Parkway side near Brandywine. Mr. Stock indicated that they are not opposed to an increased structure buffer off Chesterfield

Parkway. They have represented to Brandywine that they are reserving the topography and tree mass in that area. At this time, they are showing 175 feet to the closest structure and will work with Staff prior to the next meeting regarding the matter.

Public Art

Commissioner Watson stated he would like to see public art incorporated within the development. Mr. Doster stated that they intend to include public art and will work with Chesterfield Arts in this regard.

Building Elevations

Commissioner Geckeler asked for information on the elevation of the proposed structure nearest to Brandywine. Mr. Stock stated that the Brandywine condos are either east or west from where the office building is located. The existing grade of the Brandywine building is at about the same grade as the proposed office building. The trees in the area are 40-50 feet tall so the three-story office buildings will be behind the trees.

Regarding the issue of the mechanical equipment, Mr. Stock stated that it could be 15 feet tall - but would be in the center of the building making it 200 feet north of the north right-of-way line, or 300 feet from the closest building.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION

Monarch Trees

Commissioner Geckeler asked that Monarch Tree 30 (Bald Cypress) and Monarch Tree 63 (American Beech) be reviewed for possible preservation.

Parking setback – drive aisle

Commissioner Wuennenberg indicated that he does not have an issue with the Petitioner's request regarding the drive aisle setbacks as proposed below:

No parking structure, parking stall, loading space, internal driveway, or roadway, except points of ingress or egress, will be located within the following setbacks:

- *30 10 feet from the western boundary of the 'UC' District.*

Enclosures for stairwells/elevators to access the rooftop equipment.

Commissioner Watson expressed concerns regarding the potential of mechanicals on the roofs of the buildings on the Parkway side of the site. He has no issue with mechanicals on the roofs of the buildings near Highway 40 or those up against existing commercial sites.

Setbacks

Commissioner Watson stated he would like to see a minimum 100-foot setback off the Parkway.

Commissioner Geckeler agreed with requiring a 100-foot setback in addition to the 30-foot landscape buffer.

Commissioner Watson has no issue with the setback on the west side up against the commercial district. He also felt the landscaping standards could be eased on this side.

Commissioner DeGroot stated he agrees with the comments made by Commissioner Watson.

Lighting

Commissioner Watson stated he would like to see the dark sky initiative maintained and to insure there are no up-protruding lights in the development.

Building Heights

Commissioner Lueking stated she has no issues with the height of *700 feet above Mean Sea Level exclusive of mechanical equipment*, or with the Petitioner's request of **725 feet above Mean Sea Level, exclusive of mechanical equipment**.

Parking Structures

Regarding the parking structures, Chair Nolan stated she wants to see as many floors as possible underground.

Buffer along Apartment Complex

Chair Nolan wants as many trees as possible kept along the apartment complex line.

Commissioner Wuennenberg agreed with providing as much buffer as possible in this area.

Commissioner Puyear then commended Staff for their outstanding work on this project to date.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Nominating Committee

Chair Nolan reminded the Commission members to contact Commissioner Geckeler, Proctor, or Watson if interested in being considered as an Officer of the Commission. She then gave a brief description of each of the Officer's duties.

B. Planning & Public Works Committee

Ms. Nassif updated the Commission on the status of the Blue Valley project.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Michael Watson, Secretary