PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
JULY 22, 2013

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

I. ROLL CALL

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

Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison
Harry O'Rourke, representing City Attorney Rob Heggie
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner
Mr. Justin Wyse, Senior Planner
Ms. Kim Streicher, Civil Engineer
Ms. Sarah Wieder, Planning Intern
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the July 8, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Chesterfield Blue Valley: A request for an Amended Sign Package

1. Mr. Dean Wolfe, representing the Petitioner, 7711 Bonhomme Avenue, Clayton, MO stated he was available for questions.

2. Mr. Joe Phillips, speaking IN FAVOR of the Amended Sign Package, stated he was available for questions.

B. P.Z. 01-2013 & P.Z 02-2013Arbors at Kehrs Mill (17015 Church Rd.):

1. Ms. Jeannie Aumiller, representing the Petitioner, McBride & Son Homes, 16091 Swingley Ridge, Chesterfield, MO stated she was available for questions.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

A. Chesterfield Blue Valley: A request for an Amended Sign Package for Lots 1, 3, 4, and 5 of the Chesterfield Blue Valley development to modify the permitted construction timeframe for one (1) previously approved specialty monument sign.

Commissioner Puyear, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Amended Sign Package for Chesterfield Blue Valley, Lots 1, 3, 4, and 5. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lueking.

Discussion on the Motion

Commissioner Geckeler stated she would be voting against the Amended Sign Package for the following reasons:

1. Aesthetically, she feels it will look like "a billboard to nowhere";
2. It has the potential to confuse circulation; and
3. Dean Wolfe's letter of July 8, 2013 states that the *change in the timing is mandated by the marketing activities for Chesterfield Blue Valley and financial considerations.* Commissioner Geckeler pointed out that the Planning Commission is not allowed to take such reasons into consideration when voting upon petitions.

Commissioner Wuennenberg referenced discussions at the earlier Site Plan Committee meeting where the Applicant discussed concerns about delaying the installation of the proposed sign at Premium Street and potential aesthetic issues as the fourth sign would not weather the same as the signs installed earlier. Commissioner Wuennenberg agreed that stone does weather in outdoor conditions, but felt the stone could be cleaned and sign panels replaced to make all four signs similar in appearance. He indicated that he would be voting against the request as he does not see the need for a sign without a completed roadway.

Upon roll call, the vote to approve was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Nolan,

Nay: Commissioner Puyear, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Geckeler, Chair Watson

The motion failed by a vote of 4 to 3.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. <u>P.Z. 01-2013 Arbors at Kehrs Mill (17015 Church Rd.):</u> A request for a zoning map amendment from "E-2" Estate Residence District (two acre) and "LLR" Large Lot Residential District to "E-1" Estate District (one acre) for 41.082 acres located north of the intersection of Church Rd. and Strecker Rd. (19U420248).

B. <u>P.Z. 02-2013 Arbors at Kehrs Mill (17015 Church Rd.):</u> A request for a zoning map amendment from "E-1" Estate District (one acre) to "PUD" Planned Unit Development for 58.149 acres located north of the intersection of Church Rd. and Strecker Rd. (19U420248).

<u>Senior Planner John Boyer</u> stated that "E-1", "E-2", and "LLR" are the existing zonings for this parcel. The Applicant is proposing to rezone the parcel to "E-1" Estate District, which would establish a density of one unit per acre. The Applicant is also proposing a "PUD" Planned Unit District to establish the subdivision and its densities. The application is for 44 lots over 58 acres with a density of 0.75 (less than one acre).

The Public Hearing for this petition was held on May 29, 2013 at which time issues were raised and three members of the public spoke in opposition to the project. Issues raised during the Public Hearing concerned:

1. Traffic, infrastructure improvements on Church Road, and light glare from the separate entrance point on Church Road; and
2. Proposed minimum lot size and its compatibility to the existing developments in the area.

Relative to the issue of *light glare*, <u>Mr. Boyer</u> stated that an exhibit is included with the meeting packet addressing this concern. The Petitioner has noted that the grade of the access point will project headlights directly into a landscape buffer and berm located across Church Road from the proposed entrance providing a buffer for the homes located across Church Road.

Regarding the issue of *infrastructure improvements on Church Road*, the Petitioner has noted that the portion of Church Road located within the City will be 40 feet wide after the approximately 20-foot right-of-way dedication is granted. The intent of the City and Applicant is to have all the Church Road improvements constructed on the Chesterfield side. It was pointed out that while the roadway is within the City of Chesterfield, the right-of-way is split between both Chesterfield and Wildwood.

Regarding the issue of *proposed minimum lot size,* <u>Mr. Boyer</u> stated that while the E-1 District establishes a one-acre minimum lot size and the associated density, the PUD allows varying lots sizes to keep within the one-acre density. The overall intent of the smaller lot sizes is to preserve additional open space generally not achievable under standard development practices, which accomplishes the intent of the PUD.

<u>Mr. Boyer</u> stated that all Staff issues have been addressed at this time and noted that no vote will be taken tonight on these two petitions.

Discussion

Commissioner Lueking noted that under the existing zoning, a homeowner whose lot backs up to Pacland Place would be allowed to remove a substantial amount of trees. She then asked for the rear yard setbacks under the existing zoning. Mr. Boyer did not have the exact setbacks available but pointed out that the PUD would require a 30-foot buffer and in most places, a much larger buffer is being proposed. Commissioner Lueking felt the proposed PUD with its large buffer areas is a better option than the existing zoning for the site.

Commissioner Lueking noted that some of the lots are subject to Pacland Place indentures and questioned why the indentures did not go with the property when it was sold. Mr. Boyer indicated that he did not want to speculate on how things were done in the past – he stated that the Applicant is showing the property as it legally exists today.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

_____

Steven Wuennenberg, Secretary