

PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL  
SEPTEMBER 30, 1992



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

PRESENT

ABSENT

Ms. Mary Brown  
Ms. Jamie Cannon  
Mr. Bill Kirchoff  
Ms. Barbara McGuinness  
Mr. Pat O'Brien  
Ms. Victoria Sherman  
Chairman Mary Domahidy  
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney  
Councilmember Betty Hathaway, Ward I  
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning  
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Senior Planner  
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

Mr. Dave Dalton  
Mr. Walter Scruggs

PROXICATION: Councilmember Betty Hathaway

PRONOUNCEMENT OF ALLEGIANCE - All

PUBLIC HEARINGS - P.Z. 20-92 Ladue Associates, Incorporated has been rescheduled to October 26, 1992.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes from the meeting of September 14 1992, were approved, as amended.

## OLD BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 10 & 11-92 R.J. and J. Partnership; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban Districts to "R-1" One Acre Residence and "FPR-1" Flood Plain One Acre Residence Districts, and a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in the "R-1" and "FPR-1" Residence Districts; west side of Kehrs Mill Road, south of Wild Horse Creek Road.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon presented the request of the petitioner (Mr. Crabtree's letter) for reconsideration of the Planning Commission recommendation on three (3) conditions: 1) minimum lot sizes; 2) architectural review; and 3) front yard setback.

## COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Architectural review is not generally performed on a lot-by-lot basis.
- Building materials and colors have, in past petitions, been specifically stated as required conditions.
- The desire for a site plan to be presented (based on reducing front setback to twenty-five (25) feet) showing the preservation of trees.
- Should the condition (front yard setback of thirty (30) feet) be adopted by ordinance, the only way to vary this would be for the petitioner to have the ordinance amended. Thus, coming back to the Planning Commission with the recommendation, then the ordinance amended by act of the City Council.
- The thirty (30) foot setback is a normal "R-1" condition.
- The thirty (30) foot setback is preferred for the perimeter lots.

Chairman Domahidy noted that the petitioner has requested reconsideration of several conditions. The procedure is that there would be a motion to reconsider, state which points we wish to reconsider, and vote whether or not reconsider. If matter is voted for reconsideration, then the substance would be identified.

Director Duepner noted that, if the petitioner takes issue with the Planning Commission recommendation, they have opportunity to come back to the Commission and receive comments from the Commission, with the understanding

that this response is forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Committee of the City Council. The Council Committee is well aware that the issue was brought forward to the Planning Commission, and the Commission responded on it in whatever fashion. The issue before the Commission is to either reconsider a change, or that you gave consideration to the comments from the petitioner.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to reconsider all of the issues raised by the developer. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, no; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes; **The motion passes by a vote of 6 to 1.**

A motion was made by Commissioner McGuinness to reconsider the lot size.

Commissioner McGuinness withdrew her motion.

Commissioner O'Brien made a motion to reconsider the lot size of the south and west edges of the property to a minimum of 30,000 square feet, in accordance with the desire of the petitioner.

Commissioner O'Brien withdrew her motion.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was suggested that the minimum of 30,000 square foot lots could be approved for a portion of the western boundary (the portion backing-up to the existing tree growth).

Commissioner O'Brien made a motion to revise the eastern, southern and western edges to a minimum of 30,000 square feet. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Reference was made to Mr. Crabtree's letter, page 2, paragraph 1. It was suggested that the eastern edge be included, as well.
- The petitioner proposed 28,000 square foot minimum lot sizes on the southern, western and eastern edges, and the Commission approved 35,000 square foot lots. The interior lots were proposed at 24,000 square feet.

- The motion on the floor is to approve lots of a minimum of 30,000 square feet on the eastern, southern and western edges.
- Reference was made to Mr. Crabtree's letter, page 1, paragraph 4. It was suggested that, even if the Commission decreases the minimum lot size from 35,000 to 30,000 we will still be overall increasing the size of these outer lots beyond what is in neighboring areas.
- It was noted that both Country Place and Wildhorse developments were acted on by St. Louis County. The area immediately surrounding this project is not developable non-urban, rather, it is developed non-urban, on three (3) to five (5) acre parcels. Therefore, the immediately adjacent properties would not be subject to coming in for "R-1" zoning any time in the foreseeable future.
- There are 486 home sites in the Wild Horse development, and only 2 of these can be viewed from a non-subdivision street.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, no; Commissioner Cannon, no; Commissioner Kirchoff, no; Commissioner McGuinness, no; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Sherman, no; Chairman Domahidy, no. **The motion fails by a vote of 6 to 1.** The minimum lot requirement will remain at 35,000 square feet for lots on the western, southern and western edges.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to reduce the front yard setbacks from 30 to 25 feet. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- More information was requested depicting the resulting view should the setback be reduced to 25 feet.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, no; Commissioner Cannon, no; Commissioner Kirchoff, no; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, no; Commissioner Sherman, no; Chairman Domahidy, no. **The motion fails by a vote of 6 to 1.** The front yard setback requirement will remain at 30 feet.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Concern was raised regarding the impact upon the developer when major changes are made by the Commission.

City Attorney Doug Beach noted that if there is no motion on a particular item requested by the petitioner for reconsideration, then the item remains static at whatever the current condition requires.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGuinness for architectural review of Display House Plat elevations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was suggested that this does not give particular attention to houses backing-up to Kehrs Mill Road.

Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to **amend** the motion to review the houses backing-up to Kehrs Mill Road on an individual basis. The amendment was seconded by Commissioner McGuinness.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The Architectural Review Guidelines state clearly that homes backing-up to non-subdivision streets should look "finished." The petitioner was requested to finish the look on the back of those houses that back up to Kehrs Mill Road.
- Concern that the Commission might be creating a hardship to the petitioner by requiring a lot-by-lot approval for the seven lots abutting Kehrs Mill Road.

Director Duepner noted that no procedure has been established. If the Planning Commission is going to recommend this condition, it could be dealt with in two ways: 1) when the site development plan and elevations are approved, there are certain units or types that are proposed and approved on those specific lots, it means that each one would have to come in on a lot-by-lot basis; or 2) some general type was indicated in terms of what the front elevation was going to be, and if that model or unit was sold on that particular lot, that was what the rear elevation would be, as well. There was a lot of discussion by the Committee in terms of restricting choice and issues of what type units can or cannot be built at a certain location.

- It was suggested that the Department and petitioner could review the policies together and then the Department could make the decision that these do, in fact, follow the intent of the policies.

City Attorney noted the policy has not been officially adopted. He suggested the problems could be solved by making the amendment to read: "The petitioner would need to propose the elevations for those houses which would abut Kehrs Mill Road." Thereby, the Commission would have an idea of what the backs of houses would look like which would abut Kehrs Mill. This could be accomplished with the submittal of elevations for all homes abutting Kehrs Mill.

- The petitioner would submit a rear and side elevation for all homes which do not back up to Kehrs Mill Road, and a rear elevation for each individual model for every house proposed along Kehrs Mill Road.

The roll call vote on the amendment to require submission of rear elevations for the lots along Kehrs Mill Road was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The amendment passes by a vote of 7 to 0.**

The roll call vote on the main motion was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The main motion passes by a vote of 7 to 0.**

- B. P.Z. 17 & 18-92 Fischer & Frichtel, Inc.; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District and a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in the "R-2" Residence District; east side of Wilson Road, northwest of the existing intersection of Wilson and Clarkson Roads.

Director Duepner noted this matter was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission at its last meeting. The petitioner is requesting reconsideration to allow for an eight (8) foot side yard setback, in lieu of the ten (10) foot side yard setback that was recommended.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

Commissioner O'Brien noted that she disagrees with the procedure which prevents her from offering a motion to reconsider, feels that her argument against expanding the setback to ten (10) feet is reasonable, and regrets being unable to argue her point.

Director Duepner noted that the motion of approval of the whole petition was recommended by a vote of 7 to 0. The only revision was to the conditions, by a vote of 4 to 3. Overall, the whole Commission voted to recommend approval of

the petition with that condition. Therefore, Commissioner O'Brien can raise a motion for reconsideration of this condition.

A motion was made by Commissioner O'Brien to reconsider the side yard setback back from ten (10) feet to eight (8) feet. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McGuinness.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The lots in this development are 3,000 square feet less than what are normally in the "R-2" District.
- Concern that the lots would be severely restricted with regard to the size of houses to be placed on some of those lots.
- The standard setback in the "R-2" district is ten (10) feet. The petitioner, with the Planned Environment Unit Procedure, is proposing to reduce the side yard setback, as well as the lot size.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, no; Commissioner Cannon, no; Commissioner Kirchoff, no; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The motion passes by a vote of 4 to 3.**

**Commissioner O'Brien left the meeting at this time.**

City Attorney Doug Beach suggested the motion policy be sent to the Procedures Committee for review.

**Commissioner O'Brien returned to the meeting at this time.**

- Concern whether the Commission should be restricted to reconsideration of only one issue. When one condition changes it may necessitate changing another to coincide.

Director Duepner noted that the intent of the Planning Commission, originally, was to address concerns raised by the petitioner to give them a response, and whether to agree or disagree. It was not to reopen the whole issue, but to address those concerns raised by the petitioner. He concurred with the opinion of City Attorney Doug Beach that it would be appropriate to send this to the Procedures Committee.

- It was suggested that too much emphasis has been placed on the term "reconsideration." It is possible to review, or take a second look at something, without using the absolute parliamentary term of "reconsideration."

**Commissioner O'Brien left the meeting at this time.**

**Commissioner Sherman left the meeting at this time.**

### NEW BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 12 & 13-92 Grasse Properties, Incorporated; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-1A" 22,000 square foot Residence District and a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in the "R-1A" Residence District; east side of Straub Road, north of Clayton Road.
- B. P.Z. 14 & 15-92 Grasse Properties, Incorporated; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District and a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in the "R-2" Residence District; west side of Straub Road, north of Clayton Road.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon presented both requests and the Department's recommendation of approval subject to conditions in report and Attachment A and Attachment B. She noted that, since this meeting is on a Wednesday, the petitioner will have until 5:00 p.m., Monday, October 5, to respond in writing to the decision of the Commission.

**Commissioner Sherman returned to the meeting during Laura's presentation.**

### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was noted that the option of responding after Planning Commission recommendation applies not only to the petitioner, but to residents as well.
- Concern that the amount of \$10,000 Bond would be inadequate to cover expense of correcting water retention problem.

- The Department recommends that the amount be determined based upon a more thorough review. The Public Works Department would conduct an inspection prior to development occurring, then there would be a post inspection. The amount required would be enough to cover the necessary upgrading or revisions to the detention basin to ensure it is brought back to its proper condition.
- Concern that we should not be approving additional development where there are existing stormwater problems. If there is a problem now, then additional homes would just add to this existing situation.

Director Duepner noted that there is a recommendation for one (1) detention area, instead of four (4). Detention areas are no longer allowed on private lots, they are placed in common ground areas. It would be the Department's strong urging that this detention area be combined with the existing one (1) in Brook Hill and the proposed two (2) of the Grasse petition. Recognizing that, for whatever reason, that would not be a possibility, there would be a Bond posted to ensure the condition that the detention basin in the Greenberry area functions properly. That nothing done with this site causes deterioration of that detention basin. It is comparable to what the Planning Commission recommended, and Council approved, when they dealt with the Princeton Gate Subdivision. The Bond is not released until the development is completed and an inspection made to determine the condition of that detention basin.

**Commissioner McGuinness left the meeting at this time.**

- It is not known, at this time, if the current stormwater problems could be resolved by combining of the detention areas.
- Clarification was given of the use of Straub Road as it relates to existing development, proposed development, vacation, construction traffic, etc.
- It was suggested that the two requests be dealt with separately.
- The vacation process of Straub Road was discussed.
- Before P.Z. 14 & 15 can be developed, P.Z. 12 & 13 would have to be approved and portions of Straub Road vacated.

**Commissioner McGuinness returned to the meeting at this time.**

- Concern was expressed about emergency access. The FPD would prefer to respond to the proposed development via Straub Road. This access would have to be barricaded to other through traffic.
- There is currently one access for emergency vehicles from Straub Road into the Brook Hill Estates Subdivision.
- The owner's having access to Straub Road were not in favor of improvements to Straub some years ago.
- The City looked at having Straub Road become a public street at the time of the Brook Hill Estates request. It was feared that this might become a major entrance into the High School.

A motion to hold P.Z. 12 & 13-92 Grasse Properties, Incorporated, in the hope that some type of agreement can be worked-out between the Greenberry Baxter Estates Subdivision and the petitioner can be reached in regards to stormwater. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McGuinness.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was the recommendation of the Department that both P.Z. 12 & 13 and P.Z. 14 & 15 deal with the stormwater issue, because each was proposing its own separate detention basin. The Department proposes that the detention basins be consolidated.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to move the previous question.

Commissioner McGuinness withdrew her motion.

City Attorney Beach sought clarification of Commissioner Brown's motion to hold was the concern over stormwater detention.

- It was suggested that the Commission look at this development in the context of all the presumably developable property along Straub Road, before anything is approved. Determine an ultimate plan for the entire area.

Director Duepner noted that the Department tried to look to the future when Brook Hill was reviewed. The Department noted the concern of access limitation, that there were no streets coming from the west. Also, there was concern that Straub Road, in the Department's opinion, should not become a public street because of the potential it creates for a cut-through and another means of access

to Parkway West High School. That was the consideration for these other parcels in terms of providing two (2) stub streets opposite the one site, that would basically allow the road to connect with another stub to the west. The stub coming out of the Brook Hill development going to the west, as well. Looking at the petition on the west side of Straub Road, attempting to say that, instead of two (2) cul-de-sacs, provide a loop street. Much of this is contingent upon what happens to Straub Road; however, at this point, that is something that is not within our control. That has to be determined by those property owners who have rights of access to Straub Road.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The motion passes 6 to 0.**

Commissioner Brown made a motion to deny P.Z. 14 & 15-92 Grasse Properties, Incorporated. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was suggested that Straub Road be improved, possibly develop the property, and use a gate to prevent any cut-through by students at Parkway West.
- There may be other options, other than using Straub Road as access.
- Concern was expressed that this project is premature. Questions need to be addressed, especially regarding emergency access with the closure of Straub Road.

Commissioner Brown noted that her primary objection is the distance of the access to this property from Schoettler Road. Also, the stormwater issue is a concern.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to amend the motion to deny to hold simply out of fairness because the other one was held. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kirchoff.

City Attorney inquired whether the motion should be to **table**, instead of **hold**.

Commissioner McGuinness withdrew the motion to **hold** and moved to **table**.  
Commissioner Kirchoff seconded the motion.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, no; Commissioner Cannon, no; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The motion to table passes by a vote of 4 to 2.**

- C. P.C. 89 & 90-88 Siteman Organization; a request for an extension of time to submit Site Development Plans for "C-8" Planned Commercial and "M-3" Planned Industrial Districts; north and south sides of Chesterfield Airport Road, east of Long Road.

Director Duepner presented the request for an extension of time of thirty-six (36) months to November 26, 1995, and the Department's recommendation of approval of the extension subject to architectural review.

A motion was made by Commissioner McGuinness to approve the extension, subject to architectural elevations and landscaping review, and was seconded by Commissioner Kirchoff.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The specifics and location of items on the site will be determined at the time of site plan review.
- Stormwater requirements will have to be met and the issue of the extension of Edison Avenue.
- Concern regarding space for landscaping on the perimeter of the property. How far can parking lots approach the property line.
- Some requirements relative to review and approval of landscaping will be up for review; however, setbacks along the perimeter and interior have already been established.
- If this is left to expire, a petition to rezone the property would be necessary. There is no automatic consideration, as there is with the Planned Environment Unit.

- The compatibility of this property with the surrounding development was discussed. The detailed development plan for the Valley area has not yet been begun. It was suggested that, in the area along Highway 40 and Chesterfield Airport Road, we are probably looking at industrial and commercial uses.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The motion passes by a vote of 6 to 0.**

### SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

- A. P.Z. 26-89 Midland Capitol Properties (Chesterfield Crossing); "C-8" Planned Commercial Wall Sign (Shermie's Delicatessen); west side of Clarkson Road, north of Lea Oak Drive.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, to approve the Shermie's Delicatessen sign. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Clarification that the area has been cleaned up and signs have been removed, as required.

**The motion was approved by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

- B. P.Z. 6-92 Premier Development Corporation (Wellesley Place Amended); Planned Environment Unit (PEU) in "R-2" Residence District Site Development Plan; west side of Olive Boulevard, south of West Drive.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, to approve the submitted landscape plan subject to:

- All plantings within the right-of-way must be taken from the Public Works Department approved Street Tree List;
- The five (5) foot planting area will contain the required street trees, with a minimum of one (1) per forty (40) square feet.

- Along West Drive, the back of 9,8,7,6,5,4, and that portion of lot 3 which is in that same line, the fence is to be as proposed, but is not dimensioned correctly on the plan submitted.
- The fence would be ten (10) foot west of the property line, and fifteen (15) foot west of the roadway.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon requested clarification that the five (5) foot right-of-way being dedicated is included, which would be ten (10) feet on to the property. The total planting depth will be fifteen (15) feet, which includes the five (5) feet of the right-of-way.

- The same type of planting depth and fence location would also apply to Lot 2.
- Along the portion of Lot 3, where the buffer slopes, the fence would be three (3) feet from the property line, eight (8) feet from the pavement.
- The planting on the north side of Lot 9 is satisfactory.
- The planting along West Drive, between the fence location just mentioned and the roadway is satisfactory, without any planting behind the fence, except that portion of Lot 3 where the roadway slants. Here the planting would be established behind the fence to a total depth of fifteen (15) feet from the roadway.

Director Duepner summarized the motion as follows:

- The fence be located where the petitioner has indicated, which is approximately three (3) feet back from the right-of-way line. Therefore, the fence is about eight (8) feet back from the pavement.
- There would be an effect of fifteen (15) feet of landscaping, including the five (5) feet in the right-of-way, and an additional ten (10) feet, which means that, behind the fence in areas noted, there would be landscaping.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- A summary of the motion was requested. The landscaping behind the fence was questioned.

- Primarily, in that area you have a lack of space outside of the fence because the developer wishes to locate the fence so close to the roadway.
- The landscaping on the other side of the fence was requested by the Committee so that as the trees mature, the canopies would come together to create an effect of more density.
- Landscaping requirement on the back of lots has been a usual occurrence in review of past projects.
- In the past, existing scrub landscaping has been left, rather than require a whole line of new planting.
- Where the area was bare, it was required to be filled-in with new planting.
- A new, improved landscape plan was requested of the developer.

Director Duepner suggested the Commission consider approving the Site Plan, but holding on the Landscape Plan for a more detailed plan to be submitted. This would allow the petitioner to proceed, and the landscaping issue will be dealt with separately on those areas.

Commissioner Sherman withdrew her second to the motion.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The large existing tree, directly adjacent to the utility pole, across from the Jensen residence is still there. The decision of retaining this tree is still being worked out.

Commissioner Kirchoff withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to approve the Site Plan for P.Z. 6-92 Premier Homes, with the exception that we hold on the Landscape Plan to be submitted at a future date for approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was suggested that the petitioner take a good look at the sidewalk alignment at Broeker Place Drive as it enters West Drive.

Commissioner McGuinness wanted the record to indicate that she wants to vote yes because she believes they should have their Site Plan approved; however, she doesn't want to indicate her yes vote is not indicating she does not like the landscaping.

Chairman Domahidy noted that the intent is that, once a vote is taken on the motion, some direction will be given regarding the landscape plan.

**The motion passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

Chairman Domahidy noted that, during the Site Plan Meeting, she heard a lot of conceptual agreement with the verbal description of the plan. The rendering of the plan is causing some problem.

Commissioner Cannon suggested we give the petitioner a copy of our Landscape Policies indicating some examples to follow.

Chairman Domahidy noted that, in addition, some substance of Commissioner Kirchoff's motion regarding the landscaping had some support. The policies, as Commissioner Cannon has indicated, go a long way to explain the direction of the Committee. The idea of the meandering sidewalk and landscape buffer had some support in the Site Plan Committee meetings. Therefore, if this plan is to utilize some right-of-way, there is some rationale for that.

- It was suggested that Public Works Department indicate what landscaping it would require in the right-of-way. Also, clarification the term street trees is requested (i.e., tree or vegetation).

Director Duepner noted that, in the past, it has always been indicated as a "Street Tree List." He indicated that he would inquire of the Department Works Department whether or not they would consider expanding the list.

#### COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was suggested that the twenty (20) foot wide buffer requirement remain.
- A landscape plan should communicate what it is you need to do.
- Examples can be offered to the petitioner of drawings that depict landscaping preferred by the Commission.

Chairman Domahidy noted that, it is her recollection, the premier example for landscaping is that for the Famous Barr addition at the Mall.

- It was noted that there are some drawings attached to the Landscape Policies that could be utilized by the petitioner.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

### **A. Ordinance Review Committee**

Committee Chair Brown referred to the letter included with the packet.

### **B. Architectural Review Committee - No report**

### **C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee**

Committee Chair Kirchoff reported that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 6, at 4:00 p.m., to begin consideration of landscape policies with respect to industrial land in the Gumbo area.

Director Duepner noted that the Planning and Zoning Committee meeting at which the proposed Residential and Commercial Landscape Policies will be discussed, will have to be scheduled.

### **D. Comprehensive Plan Committee**

Committee Chair McGuinness reported the Committee will proceed to public hearing on October 26, 1992.

### **E. Procedures Committee**

Commission Chair Domahidy noted the items discussed earlier are to be referred to the Procedures Committee.

Director Duepner gave a brief update on the meetings on development process.

The City Administrator, Director of Public Works and myself have been meeting with a group of consulting engineers and architects reviewing the development process. They had previously met with a group from the Chamber of Commerce. Some issues and concerns raised relative to the Planning Commission were:

- Guidelines the Planning Commission is working on.
- Concerns about the amount of detail and issues the Planning Commission focuses upon.
- Another meeting will be held with that group in several weeks.
- One point made was that the Commission is attempting to identify its polices through landscaping and architecture; but, there was some concern voiced relative to some of the detail the Planning Commission gets into, and some of the subjectivity, at times, that comes into review.
- The question was raised by Commission of what kind of details are they becoming too detailed on?

Director Duepner noted that, in discussion at the meeting, examples provided were relative to:

- landscaping;
- architectural review in terms of treatment and color of some building details;
- attempt to preserve natural qualities/features of a site which runs in conflict with some of the design guidelines of the City relative to street grades and acceptable slopes;
- the need to be sensitive, at times, to changing conditions on a site that may require revisions in a plan that were not anticipated when the matter was originally presented, or approved, by the Planning Commission.

## COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMITTEE

- It was noted that the Commission cares very deeply about what happens to this community, and if it fine-tooth-combs some issues, it has been good for Chesterfield.
- The conflict between the Commission's desire to preserve natural features and the City's guidelines/design standards has been a recurring issue which deserves extra attention. It was stated that the assumption that standards are always correct is false.
- Some of the meetings with Public Works Department has brought about discussion relative to changing requirements for sidewalks.
- Concern was raised whether design guidelines really work. The minimum standards can become the maximum anyone is willing to follow. It could be that if we had no guidelines, someone might surprise us with strong developments on their own. A lot of communities developed in this manner.

Commissioner Cannon noted he will attend a symposium in Cincinnati on October 8th, that will address design guidelines, and deal with a critical review of whether or not these guidelines work. He will report anything useful from this meeting. He further stated that, any time the Commission has been offered a project where serious care has been taken, in terms of planning and architecture site design, we become enthusiastic backers for that project.

Planning Commission Chair Domahidy noted that this job is always going to be one of looking at many different interests of the community. The Planning Commission has the obligation of being aware of future residents of Chesterfield. She further noted that she believes there is a real spirit of fairness among the Commission.

Director Duepner pointed out that, as the process goes through and development process sheets are reviewed with other groups, the results of all those meetings will be brought back to the Planning Commission and to the City Council, with a view towards looking for areas where we might need to improve on our process, where we might need to revise, or where we feel the process works very well. The Commission will get the benefit of all the comments from all the groups, as we go through this process.

Commission Chair Domahidy suggested that November would be a good time for a quarterly meeting with Planning and Zoning. Director Duepner will coordinate a schedule for this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Walter Scruggs", is written over a horizontal line.

Walter Scruggs, Secretary

[MIN9-30]