PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
July 12, 1999

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

I. PRESENT **ABSENT**

Mr. David Banks
Mr. Fred Broemmer
Mr. Charles Eifler
Ms. Stephanie Macaluso
Mr. John Nations
Ms. Rachel Nolen
Mr. Jerry Right
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Chairman Dan Layton, Jr.
Mayor Nancy Greenwood
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney
Councilmember Mike Casey, Council Liaison
Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Assistant Director of Planning
Ms. Reveena Shook, Planner II
Mr. Todd Streiler, Planner II
Ms. Annissa McCaskill, Planner I
Ms. Angela McCormick, Planner I
Ms. Kathy Lone, Executive Secretary/Planning Assistant
Mr. Brian Horton, Planning Intern

II. INVOCATION: Commissioner Banks

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All

Chairman Layton recognized the attendance of Mayor Nancy Greenwood, Councilmember Larry Grosser (Ward II), Councilmember Barry Streeter (Ward II), Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III) and Councilmember Dan Hurt (Ward III).

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Commissioner Sherman read the first portion of the "Opening Comments."

A. **P.Z. 25-1999 City of Chesterfield;** to amend Sections 1003.020 Definitions; 1003.140 "PC" Planned Commercial District; 1003.150 "PI" Planned Industrial District; 1003.168 Sign Regulations.

Director of Planning Teresa Price gave an overview of three amendments to the Zoning Ordinance: 1. Large Scale Development Signage – allowing sign size to increase if the overall number of signs decreases; 2. For Lease Signs – removes real estates signs from the temporary sign category and places them in their own section; and 3. PC and PI Uses – to consolidate the uses and eliminate duplicates.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR –

1. Mr. Mike Doster, 16476 Chesterfield Airport Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, attorney for THF Chesterfield Commons, speaking in favor of P.Z. 25-1999 City of Chesterfield;

- Speaker submitted letter requesting change in the sign ordinance;
- Speak would like changes made as quickly as possible as client needs to make a decision to reduce the number of signs in exchange for a small number of larger signs in their current project.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION – None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL – None

REBUTTAL – None

Commissioner Sherman read the middle portion of the "Opening Comments."

B. **P.Z. 16-96 Wild Horse Summit Development Corporation – Walnut Grove**; a request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance 1332 for a "C-8" Planned Commercial District for a 5.226 acre tract of land located on the East side of Long Road, North of Wild Horse Creek Road. (Locator Numbers: 18U44-0081).
Proposed Change in Use:
- Permitting one fast food restaurant without a drive-thru.

Planner I Angela McCormick gave a slide presentation of the subject site and surrounding area.

Mr. David Volz, Volz Engineering, 10849 Indian Hean Industrial Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63132, represents Rising Phoenix Development Corporation, petitioner for P.Z. 16-96 Wild Horse Summit Development Corporation – Walnut Grove;

- Wants ordinance amendment to allow another restaurant on site;
- Restaurant would be Mr. Goodcents, an up-scale deli.

Mr. Bill Schierholz, president of Wild Horse Summit Development Corporation and Rising Phoenix Development Corporation, stated that:

- Buildings in development have emerged as condominiums. The only lease-hold within development is Bond's of Chesterfield (restaurant);
- Development is 80% sold;
- Speaker does not want to go through process again to add additional restaurant, so Bond's and Mr. Goodcents would be only restaurants in development;
- Restaurant would have 40-45 seats, no waiters or waitresses.

Commissioner Macaluso asked petitioner if he would be adding to their landscape.

Mr. Schierholz stated that the Landscape Plan has not been fully executed yet and is substanially different from the one before the Commission this evening.

Commissioner Macaluso would like to see the Landscape Plan.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR – None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION – None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL –

1. Ms. Wendy Geckeler, 26 Chesterfield Lakes, Chesterfield, MO 63005,

- Speaker feels there are already too many restaurants in area;
- Feels this restaurant would mostly be used by Valley employees and thinks that it would be better to have restaurants on Edison Avenue and Chesterfield Airport Road and not on roads heavily used by residents. The restaurant would be on a narrow road close to a dangerous intersection.

REBUTTAL –

Mr. Scott Zide, owner of Mr. Goodcents, 15939 Manchester Road, Ellisville, MO 63011,

- Has calls everyday from residents and employees asking for a location in the Valley;
- Mr. Goodcents is considered an up-scale deli that will deliver.

Commission Sherman read the closing portion of the "Opening Comments."

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

A motion to **approve** the June 28, 1999 Meeting Minutes was made by Commissioner Broemmer and seconded by Commissioner Macaluso. The motion **passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Mr. Chris Kehr, 622 Turnberry, Jefferson City, MO 65109, speaking neutral to P.Z. 10-99 Chesterfield Corporate Park;

- Asked the Commission to consider putting a restriction on the ordinance that the owners of the lots need to confer about where the road (immediately to the west of Long Road to provide cross access to the three developments) will go and not to allow one particular owner to dictate that since there are many potential users.

2. Ms. Jane Gardner Bute, 15593 Bedford Force Drive, Unit 11, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking on traffic;

- Speaker stated that 4-5 of the most dangerous intersections in the St. Louis area are in Chesterfield (Baxter & Clayton, Kehrs Mill & Clayton, Long Road & Wild Horse Creek Road, Woods Mill & Clayton, and Schoettler Road & Henry);
- Wondered why the concerns have not been addressed that were mentioned in the final report from the Traffic Issues Advisory Panel, dated 1997;
- Asked the Commission to stop putting development first before addressing the impact of traffic generated on existing roadway systems.

3. Mr. Jay Kirschbaum, 1520 Woodroyal East Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63017, Trustee for Royalwood Subdivision, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Developments on the north side of Highway 40, as well as the proposed developments on the south side of Highway 40, will have a direct negative impact on residents of the Royalwood Subdivision and other residents that live up and down the South Outer 40;
- Petitioner's request is much too dense for the parcel of land;
- Proposed traffic changes that have been recommended force all of the traffic to go past South Outer 40;
- Residents oppose this development.

4. Mr. Stephen L. Kling, Jr., 10 South Brentwood Blvd., Clayton, MO 63105, attorney, representing several subdivisions, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Comprehensive Plan for the northern portion of the property suggests attached single-family residential.

5. Ms. Laura Lueking, 15021 Conway Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Because of the height and density proposed, there will be more cars and traffic to the area which should not be the burden of the residents to accommodate dense development traffic problems;
- Letter from MoDOT, dated July 1, 1999, stated that it is anticipated that with the next 10 years of traffic growth and with additional development congestion, there will be unacceptable levels of service at Chesterfield Parkway and the Outer Roads and continues on with the Timberlake cut-through idea;
- Urged Commissioners to vote for denial.

6. Mr. Harvey Present, 1073 Appalachian Trail, Chesterfield, MO 63017, Trustee for Shenandoah Subdivision, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Speaker stated that the traffic engineers feel the solution to the problem is the Texas U-Turn but speaker stated there will be too great a volume of traffic for this.

7. Ms. Barbara Briggs, 324 Cookshire Lane, Chesterfield, MO 63017, Trustee for Cookshire Lane Subdivision, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Questions for the Commissioners to consider:
  1. Why should every inch of green space in Chesterfield be filled with skyscapers?
  2. Why should all of our streets be filled with cars?
  3. Will Chesterfield sacrifice its most valuable elements, its quiet, safe, neighborhood streets for these large developments that dwarf our beautiful neighborhoods?
  4. Do we want to line Highway 40 with wall-to-wall buildings?
  5. With all of the land available to build in Chesterfield, why crowd the green space?
- Chesterfield has been awarded the Tree City USA award and the theme color for Chesterfield is green. All will be eroded if we continue to consider the types of proposals that we have seen from Vitt and Sachs.

8. Mr. Fred Byrne, 14308 Conway Meadows Ct, #301, Chesterfield, MO 63017, on Board of Managers of the Conway Meadows Condominium Association, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Asked the Commissioners to make sure the density does not overtake the infrastructure that is in place or proposed to be in place in the future.

9. Mr. Hefty Hoffman, 14308 Conway Meadows Court, Trustee for Conway Meadows Condominiums, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Residents will have a tremendous run-off of water if buildings are built and the green space is turned into streets;

- Too much traffic with an elementary school located nearby.

10. Ms. Pam Copeland, 15128 Amherst Green Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Speaker finished Laura Lueking's statement:
- If Commission can not abide by the Comprehensive Plan with residential on the south side of Conway Road and low-rise office fronting North Outer Forty, Ms. Lueking (on behalf of herself) suggests an appropriate use would be a 3-story office building along Conway Road with one level below grade for the parking garage. This would help ease the traffic concerns as well as the visual impact of the residents surrounding it;
- With all of the thousands of additional vehicles which will be added to these developments, traffic problems would be among the worst in St. Louis County.

11. Mr. John McDonald, 1332 Amherst Terrace Way, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- A traffic study needs to be done for westbound traffic.

12. Mr. Mike Doster, 16476 Chesterfield Airport Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, attorney for petitioner, speaking in favor of P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Speaker presented a hand-out for Commission members;
- Client has been willing to listen to all sides;
- Density has been reduced from 626,000 sq. ft. to 549,000 sq. ft.;
- Building heights have been reduced;
- Number of parking spaces have been reduced and the overall parking ratio is up;
- Parking structure distance from Conway Road has been increased (ranges from 165 feet to 175 feet);
- Petitioner has agreed not to not seek access to Conway Road;
- All traffic consultants are in agreement that the Texas U-Turn works; Timberlake is under utilized.

Mayor Greenwood stated she was insulted by the letter received from the St. Louis County Highway Department.

Chairman Layton agreed.

13. Mr. Doug Shatto, Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier, 1830 Craig Park Court, Ste. 209, St. Louis, MO 63146, speaking in favor of P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Speaker stated that the County's position is that existing infrastructure should be utilized to its fullest before building additional, redundant infrastructure;
- St. Louis County has requested a 35-foot right-of-way. They have stated that as part of any development of this tract of land, they are requiring the dedication of one-half of a 70-foot right-of-way. This dedication has also been done on the Solomon Building. This is a standard practice in case they would have to improve the road later on. Conway Road is part of the county arterial system;
- At the May 24, 1999 Planning Commission meeting, petitioner offered to construct the Texas U-turn as a means to mitigate the traffic from this and other developments along Outer 40. This was offered as a concession to the concerns that had been raised by the City and the residents about the ability of previous measures to fully address the traffic impact;
- The plan that is currently submitted probably represents the best overall solution for mitigating traffic on the North Outer Forty Corridor and it also does not necessitate that Timberlake ever be connected to Conway Road;
- Speaker stated that if there is a cross access road from the Solomon Building over to Timberlake Manor, there would be a lot of development traffic in the afternoon that would be using South Outer Forty to get onto Highway 40. The reason the Outer Roads were built was to serve adjacent development fronting the highway and also to help augment the capacity of the freeway system. One-way outer roads are considered the superior system for serving the corridors.

City Attorney Beach asked Mr. Shatto when the revised plan was submitted.

Mr. Shatto stated that it was revised following the May 24, 1999 Planning Commission meeting in response to the comments raised by the Planning Department as well as the state and county highway departments. The information was not submitted earlier as petitioner was awaiting review comments from both of the highway departments stating their position on this matter.

Mr. Doster stated that after the May 24, 1999 Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Shatto and he tried to get the County and MoDOT to issue letters. The MoDOT letter came out July 1 and the County letter came out July 8. As soon as the petitioner received them, they were forwarded to the Planning Department. Mr. Doster submitted his reply on July 9.

Planner I Annissa McCaskill stated that the Planning Department currently has a rezoning petition for another parcel for development for Solomon II. The Department of Planning has not received information on numbers or how the traffic would work.

City Attorney Beach asked Mr. Shatto to submit the numbers to the Planning Department.

Mr. Doster stated that with the rezoning petition was a required submittal of a preliminary development plan that shows future connection between Solomon I and Solomon II and whatever happens on the Kraus property. That will be part of the Solomon proposal.

Mr. Shatto stated that the triple left turn will mitigate the traffic from One Chesterfield Place as well as Sach's, if approved, and the best way to mitigate other developments along North Outer Forty is to provide cross access. This is independent of what happens with One Chesterfield Place.

Mr. Doster stated that MoDOT stated in their July 1, 1999 letter that the triple left turn will mitigate the traffic with respect to this development. Due to concerns regarding the traffic impacts of future development in the corridor, the City should require cross access between Timberlake Manor Drive and all parcels east of Bonhomme Church.

14. Mr. Skip Dufour, 8011 Clayton Road, St. Louis, MO 63117, attorney for Senseman family, speaking in favor of P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus);

- Speaker feels petitioner has worked very hard to come up with a good plan;
- Must rely on traffic experts and look for a consensus to make a decision;
- Feels Commission should give a favorable recommendation;
- Senseman Family owns 10 of the 12 tracts involved (approximately 30 of the 35 acres).

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus); a request for a rezoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "PC" Planned Commercial District for twelve (12) parcels of land located at the intersection of Chesterfield Parkway North, Conway Road and North Outer Forty Road.
Proposed use:
- Offices or office buildings.

Planner I Annissa McCaskill stated that Staff submitted a report to the Planning Commission on May 24, 1999 recommending denial of this petition. The Commission voted to return P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) to the Department of Planning for the following:

1. Review of the petitioner's latest offer with respect to the impact of highway traffic;
2. Further discussion with MoDOT and any other parties that they feel qualified as to the effect of the petitioner's highway improvements;
3. Try to obtain estimates on the growth that could be affected in westbound traffic over the next 5 or more years.

Commissioner Nolen made a motion to accept the Department of Planning's recommendation of denial of P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Macaluso.

Commissioner Sherman asked if Staff, in light of the most recent letters that have been received, still takes the position that the concerns have not been clearly addressed.

Director of Planning Price stated that traffic was the major focus and there has been some consensus. The due diligence has not been done if the Commission directed Staff to do an Attachment A. The detailed review is not there at this time.

Chairman Layton stated that the question is whether or not there are other possible problems with this development or if the traffic problems, as presented and discussed, are so insurmountable that the Commission feels there is no way to go forward.

Commissioner Nolen stated that there are still inconsistencies with the development and does not feel that all of the issues have been fully addressed.

Commissioner Macaluso questioned why the Comprehensive Plan was not addressed at the recommendation level.

Planning Director Price stated that, with this development, the major concern has always been getting a consensus on the traffic issue. Now Staff needs to go back, if it is the Commission's directive, to do an Attachment A. That is when details are included. (Example: buffer-what is substantial buffer? Staff would go back into the detail and define what a substantial buffer would be.)

The motion made by Commissioner Nolen and seconded by Commissioner Macaluso was repeated.

Commissioner Nolen made a motion to accept the Department of Planning's recommendation on denial of P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Macaluso.

Chairman Layton clarified that a vote 'yes' indicated a no on the project; a vote 'no' means having to find another solution.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Banks, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Nolen, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, no; Chairman Layton, no.

The motion to deny this petition passes by a vote of 7-2.

(Commissioner Broemmer's vote had to do with the density of project and the height of the buildings. Commissioner Nations stated that, even though he is a new member of the Planning Commission who has not sat on the Commission through the entire process, feels that he has educated himself to the point where he can make an informed decision.
Commission Sherman stated that she feels that there is some merit to this project. Even though she is not completely happy about all of the traffic issues, she thinks there has been enough concensus to move forward with the project. She feels that there would need to be other restrictions (i.e. buffer, density, etc.) but that they could be addressed in an Attachment A. Chairman Layton's vote had to do with the fact that he felt that the project was worth saving.)

Chairman Layton called a recess at 9:32 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 9:47 p.m. All Commission members were present after the recess.

B. The Planning Commission of the City of Chesterfield will hold a Public Hearing on an update to the City of Chesterfield **Comprehensive Plan**. Specifically, the Comprehensive Plan will be updated relative to property in the Chesterfield Valley not included in **Phase 3 of the Chesterfield Valley Master Development Plan and Implementation Strategy**.

Assistant Planning Director Laura Griggs-McElhanon stated that were not any issues but that she had received a fax from Mr. Bill Kirchoff, Chairman of the Valley Master Plan Committee. Mr. Kirchoff suggested that there be two possible scenarios in the western portion of Area 2. Staff recommended open space management and Mr. Kirchoff suggested the Commission consider dual-use in this area of both open space management and low-intensity industrial. Staff recommends this matter be held until the next Planning Commission meeting.

Assistant Planning Director Griggs-McElhanon will confirm whether or not these are Mr. Kirchoff's personal opinions or the opinions of the Valley Master Plan Committee. Ms. Griggs-McElhanon will also confer with Mr. Kirchoff to see if he agrees with the remainder of the proposal.

Chairman Layton made a motion to hold this matter until the next Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banks **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0**.

C. **P.Z. 16-96 Wild Horse Summit Development Corporation – Walnut Grove**; a request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance 1332 for a "C-8" Planned Commercial District for a 5.226 acre tract of land located on the East side of Long Road, North of Wild Horse Creek Road. (Locator Numbers: 18U44-081). Proposed Change in Use:

- Permitting one fast food restaurant without a drive-thru.

Planner I Angela McCormick summarized the issues that were raised earlier in the meeting:

- Parking and parking calculations;
- Trash and trash enclosures;
- Possibility of a third restaurant in the development;
- Landscaping (Commission members would like to see Landscape Plan);
- Traffic flow.

Commissioner Macaluso stated that she wants to see the difference in traffic between having a fast-food restaurant versus an office. Commissioner Macaluso would also like to see if the ordinance for the Matthews Market area (Long Road & Chesterfield Airport Road) allows for dining in and then compare the differences and backgrounds with the two locations.

City Attorney Beach stated that this fit the Zoning Ordinance definition for fast food restaurants because people are not served at the table.

City Attorney Beach stated that the Planning Commission does not deal with need. It is not the Commission's duty to say something is not needed. The Commission looks at whether or not the uses are compatible and fit the criteria.

Commissioner Broemmer made a motion to hold P.Z. 16-96 Wild Horse Summit Development Corporation – Walnut Grove until the next Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nolen **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

D. **P.C. 54-86 St. Louis Industrial Properties Ltd., #10;** request for an extension of time for a "C-8" Planned Commercial District Site Development Plan; south side of South Outer Forty Drive, west of Schoettler Valley Drive.

Assistant Director of Planning Laura Griggs-McElhanon gave a report on the history of this project's request for an extension of time. Ms. Griggs-McElhanon stated that Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Nations made a motion to approve the P.C. 54-86 St. Louis Industrial Properties Ltd., #10 time extension. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

City Attorney Beach expressed the need for having a policy for time extensions.

Commissioner Eifler expressed concern about this project being started under St. Louis County in 1986 and the City is still granting time extensions. Commissioner Eifler stated that he wanted to vote 'no' on this extension so that the Commission can research this matter and understand what turning down an extension would mean.

Commissioner Macaluso questioned that if the Commission does not grant an extension, would

the petitioner return to change the conditions but not the zoning. This extension is for an 8-story building and another one was just turned down by the Commission. Commissioner Macaluso asked if the Commission has the option that, by not granting the extension, the petitioner has to come back to the Commission?

City Attorney Beach asked that the extension not be denied but decide what can be done in the future.

Commissioner Nations made a motion to suspend the rules to allow Mr. Doster to speak. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Eifler **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

Mr. Doster stated that it has been very difficult to put together a project of magnitude on this property. There currently is a possible development and there is agreement for this project to go forward but the extension of time is necessary because developers must get Certificate of Need and rezone the property.

Commissioner Broemmer and Commissioner Macaluso expressed their concern for an 8-story building.

Councilmember Casey stated that this project is located near a very residential area.

Mr. Doster stated that his client is more interested in density than building height.

Commissioner Nations made a motion to approve the P.C. 54-86 St. Louis Industrial Properties Ltd., #10 time extension for a period of two (2) years. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, no; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Nolen, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Banks, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to approve this petition passes by a vote of 8 to 1.

E. **P.Z. 10-99 Chesterfield Corporate Park;** A request for a change in zoning from "M-3" Industrial District to "PI" Planned Industrial District for a 20-acre tract of land located on the north side of Chesterfield Airport Road, approximately 820' west of Long Road. (Locator Number: 17W 41 0038)
Proposed uses:
- Animal hospitals, veterinary clinics, and kennels;
- Broadcasting studios for radio and television;
- Broadcasting, transmitting, or relay towers, studios, and associated facilities for radio, television, and other communications;

- Business service establishments;
- Cafeterias for employees and guests only;
- Child care centers, nursery schools, and day nurseries;
- Financial institutions;
- Filling stations, including emergency towing and repair services;
- Gymnasiums, indoor swimming pools, indoor handball and racquetball courts (public or private), and indoor and unlighted outdoor tennis courts (public or private);
- Hotels and motels;
- Mail order sale warehouses;
- Manufacturing, fabrication, assembly, processing, or packaging of any commodity except:
  - (i) Facilities producing or processing explosives or flammable gases or liquids;
  - (ii) Facilities for animal slaughtering, meat packing, or rendering;
  - (iii) Sulfur plants, rubber reclamation plants, or cement plants, and
  - (iv) Steel mills, foundries, or smelters;
- Medical and dental offices;
- Offices or office buildings;
- Outdoor advertising sign (additional to provisions of Section 1003.168);
- 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;
- Permitted signs (See Section 1003.168 'Sign Regulations');
- Plumbing, electrical, air conditioning, and heating equipment sales, warehousing and repair facilities;
- Printing and duplicating services;
- Research facilities, professional and scientific laboratories, including photographic processing laboratories used in conjunction therewith;
- Restaurants, fast food;
- Restaurants, sit down;
- Service facilities, studios, or work areas for antique salespersons, artists, candy makers, craftpersons, 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;
- 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;
- Union halls and hiring halls;
- Vehicle service centers;

- Vehicle washing facilities;
- Welding, sheet metal, and blacksmith shops.

Planning Director Teresa Price presented revisions to the permitted uses in Attachment A to bring it more into conformance with the mixed commercial use designated for this area in the Comprehensive Plan. The petitioner has agreed with the new Attachment A.

Commissioner Macaluso made a motion to approve the amendments as shown in Attachment A in regards to permitted uses. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nations **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

Chairman Layton asked Commissioner Broemmer to have the Comprehensive Plan Committee meet to discuss the wording.

Planning Director Price state that there was a difference between the Valley Master Plan, prepared by a consulting firm, and the City's Comprehensive Plan which had mixed use but did not have the word 'warehousing.' The titles need to be clearer for future reference.

City Attorney Beach asked Staff to also look at connector roads as part of the Valley Master Plan.

VIII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND SIGNS:

A. **P.C. 58-75 Southwestern Bell Company**; an Amended Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan and Elevations located on the south side of Wild Horse Creek Road.

Commissioner Nolen, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Amended Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan and Elevations for P.C. 58-75 Southwestern Bell Company with the amendment that the elevation contain a hip roof with the muted colors of brown, beige and gray and that the roof compliment the elevations in either a brown or gray. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Macaluso **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

B. **P.C. 91-88 The Siteman Organization (Spirit Trade Center Plat Two)**; a Subdivision Plat in the "M-3" Planned Industrial District for 30.8 acres located south of Chesterfield Airport Road, west of Chesterfield Industrial Blvd. and east of Spirit Drive.

Commissioner Nolen, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Subdivision Plat for **P.C. 91-88 The Siteman Organization (Spirit Trade Center Plat Two)**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

C. **Towne Centre;** a Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Landscape Plan in a "PC" Planned Commercial District located south of Chesterfield Airport Road on the south-side of Edison Extension, and west-side of Long Road. The project consists of a two-story retail commercial center. (P.Z. 22-98 G.H.H. Investments, L.L.C.)

Commissioner Nolen, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Landscape Plan for **Towne Centre** with the condition to include the signage location and package. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nations **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0**.

D. **Missouri Car Care;** Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations and Landscape Plan for an "M-3" Planned Industrial District, future lot 11 of the Trade Center development, located south of Chesterfield Airport Road and the west wide of Trade Center Boulevard. The proposal is for an Emission Testing Facility. (P.C. 91-88 The Siteman Organization, Governing Ordinance Number 656)

Commissioner Nolen, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Landscape Plan for **Missouri Car Care** with the condition to include the berms as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nations **and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0**.

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. **Ordinance Review Committee** – No Report
B. **Architectural Review Committee** – No report
C. **Site Plan/Landscape Committee** – No report
D. **Comprehensive Plan Committee** – No report
E. **Procedures and Planning Committee** – No report

X. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Chairman Layton and was unanimously seconded. The motion **passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:44 P.M.

Charles Eifler, Secretary