V

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
OCTOBER 28, 1991

==========

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

PRESENT

Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Jamie Cannon
Mr. Bill Kirchoff
Ms. Barbara McGuinness
Mr. Walter Scruggs
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Chairman Mary Domahidy
Mayor Jack Leonard
Councilmember Jade Bute, Ward II
Mr. Doug Beach, City Attorney
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning/Economic Development
Ms. Laura P. Griggs-McElhanon, Senior Planner
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Dave Dalton
Ms. Pat O'Brien

INVOCATION: Mayor Jack Leonard

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes were approved from October 14, 1991.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 19 and 20-91 Sycamore Development Corporation; a request for change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District and "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District to "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District and a Planned Environment Unit in the "R-3" Residence District; west side of Sycamore Drive, north of Kehrs Mill Road

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon presented the memorandum from the Department, summarizing the items being evaluated relative to the subject tract. According to Planning Commission Policy, the Department recommended that this matter be held until November 13, 1991, at which time the Department will present its report relative to the Sycamore Development Corporation proposal.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION OF COMMISSION

- Concern relative to the impact upon Kehrs Mill Road as a result of traffic generated by this development.

Commissioner Sherman made a motion to hold this matter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs, and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

B. P.Z. 34-89 Benjamin Houlihan (Chesterfield Fence Company); a request for extension of time for submittal of "M-3" Planned Industrial District Site Development Plan; south side of Old Olive Street Road, east of Eatherton Road.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon summarized the request and the Department's recommendation for approval of a one (1) year extension to August 5, 1992, for submittal of a site development plan for P.Z. 34-89, with the additional condition of: **"Architectural elevations, building materials, and colors shall be received and approved by the Planning Commission with the site development plan."**

Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve the one (1) year extension of time. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

Chairman Domahidy welcomed Councilmember Jade Gardner Bute as our Council Liaison tonight.

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

A. D.L. 2-49 Spirit of St. Louis (Tetra Plastics); "M-3" Planned Industrial District Amended Site Development and Landscape Plans; east side of Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard, north of Edison Avenue.

On behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to approve the site plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- An explanation was given relative to landscaping, as depicted on attachments L1 and L2 of the Department's report.
- The drive area on the north side of the building will be held at twenty-two (22) feet.

The motion to approve the site plan passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

B. Wildhorse Village "A"; "PEU" in "R-1" One Acre and "FPR-1" One Acre Residence Districts Record Plat; Wild Horse Parkway Drive, south of Wild Horse Creek Road.

Chairman Domahidy stated the Site Plan Committee held this item because, at this time, the development is out of compliance with the Sign Ordinance. She further stated that the Commission has a policy that items will not be brought before it, if the subject development is out of compliance. Chairman Domahidy said that Commissioner McGuinness brought this policy to the attention of the Committee, and the Committee decided to hold this item until it can be properly placed on the agenda.

Commissioner McGuinness asked for a point of parliamentary inquiry, stating the following: "Since it is out of order for the item to be on our agenda, it would seem to me that it would be out of order to hold anything which is not appropriately on the agenda. Therefore, it should probably be removed from the agenda. I would move that it is removed from the agenda."

Commissioner Scruggs seconded the motion to remove the item from the agenda. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

Chairman Domahidy pointed out that she was merely reporting the decision made by the Site Plan Committee at its meeting earlier this evening. Commissioner McGuinness concurred.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Committee Chairman Brown reported the next meeting will be Monday, November 4, 1991, at 4:00 p.m., and that Mr. Beach will address the Committee at 4:30 p.m. relative to some of the ramifications of making changes to the Sign Ordinance. She further stated that the issue of "banners" was referred to the Committee by PED, and the Committee feels that, since the banners are not allowed in Residential Districts under the current Ordinance, the Committee does not want to encourage their use for subdivisions at this time. Committee Chairman Brown noted that the Committee will be considering the possible use of banners in subdivisions during its review of the Sign Ordinances. She requested that Director Duepner relay the Committee's feelings to the Planning and Economic Development Committee in an informal manner.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The information relative to banners will be an informal communication to PED from Director Duepner.
- Commissioner Cannon stated that one of the reasons the banners work well in St. Louis City, is that they all use a standardized fastener to standard light poles. The light standards are all essentially alike, and there are only two (2) sizes [of banners] that are allowed.
- Planning Specialist Joseph Hanke is to provide a copy of the St. Louis City regulations regarding banner signs.
- Commissioner Cannon added that the City of St. Louis requires a rather substantial insurance policy in favor of the City, when a banner sign is erected ($100,000.00 Liability).

B. Architectural Review Committee

Director Duepner reported there will be a meeting of the Architectural Review Committee at 4:30 p.m., on Tuesday, November 5, 1991. The purpose will be to develop a Mission Statement, and the Department Staff is in the process of reviewing some architectural guidelines from other communities. The Department has obtained one that uses a point system.

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy noted that the Ordinance Review and Architectural Review Committees have sketched out their Plan for the year.

C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee

Committee Chairman Kirchoff reported the Committee will meet Thursday, November 7, 1991, at 4:00 p.m., with Mr. Saunders, Landscape Architect. The Committee will develop its Plan for the year.

D. Comprehensive Plan Committee

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy noted that Commission Members have been provided a new, updated copy of the Comprehensive Plan.

Committee Chairman McGuinness reported the Committee still needs to define "office-campus," and its Work Plan for the year. She stated the Committee will meet Wednesday, November 13, 1991, at 5:30 p.m., the night of the Planning Commission Meeting.

Committee Chairman McGuinness requested three (3) ring notebooks for the Zoning Ordinance and future updates of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances on a timely basis.

Director Duepner noted that codified updates of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances have been ordered and will be provided, as soon as possible, to the Planning Commission.

Committee Chairman McGuinness said that the Committee will be reaching out to the, hopefully, newly annexed area residents to include them in future Comprehensive Plan deliberations.

E. Procedures Committee

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy referred to the Procedures Committee the matter of preparing a Planning Commission calendar for the upcoming year.

Director Duepner stated that, once the calendar is completed, the Department will notify developers, firms, etc., advising them of the meeting schedules for the upcoming year.

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy suggested the Quarterly Meeting be held on Wednesday, December 18, 1991, with the Planning and Economic Development Committee. She said the Commission would present an update to the PED Committee on the various Planning Commission Committees' efforts and achievements.

Commissioner McGuinness inquired as to why the Planning Commission was copied on the letter to Nancy Hardgrove, Chairman of the Chesterfield Historical Commission.

Director Duepner stated that the Planning Commission, under our Zoning Ordinance, has the ability to reserve a site for a Landmark Preservation Designation. The letter was sent to Ms. Hardgrove due to correspondence received in the past from the Historic Commission indicating that they would be supportive, or consider a particular location for a Landmark Preservation Area. The Department's concern is that the procedure needs to be further explained to the Historic Commission; therefore he plans to meet with the Historic Commission to explain the process for an LPA, and the factors that the Commission would take into consideration.

Commissioner McGuinness inquired if the Planning Commission is referenced in the State Statutes in terms of Historic Designations.

Commissioner Brown inquired why the LPA has to be a petition.

Director Duepner responded that the LPA allows for the owner, or owner under contract, of a building to utilize that structure for other than residential purposes (i.e., Queatham House is a Landmark Designation, and a Special Procedure on our Zoning Ordinance).

City Attorney Doug Beach read a portion of State Statute, Chapter 89, stating the following: "The reference is Municipal Legislative Bodies, and through that the Planning Commission, has the power for the purpose of promoting health, safety, morals, or the general welfare of the community, to deal with preservation of features of historical significance, and location and use of those buildings, structures and land." He further stated that, in a generalized fashion, the Planning Commission has the ability to designate what the buildings are to be used for, their location, and things of that nature.

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner Cannon. The motion passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 P.M.

Walter Scruggs,
Secretary

[MIN10-28