V

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
NOVEMBER 13, 1991

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

PRESENT	ABSENT
Ms. Mary Brown	Mr. Jamie Cannon
Mr. Dave Dalton	
Mr. Bill Kirchoff	
Ms. Barbara McGuinness	
Ms. Pat O'Brien	
Mr. Walter Scruggs	
Ms. Victoria Sherman	
Chairman Mary Domahidy	
Mr. Doug Beach, City Attorney (arrived later)	
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning/Economic Development	
Ms. Laura P. Griggs-McElhanon, Senior Planner	
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary	

INVOCATION: Ms. Barbara McGuinness

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes were approved from October 28, 1991, as amended.

OLD BUSINESS - None

Commissioner McGuinness left the meeting at this time.

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 request and the Department's recommendation of approval with conditions as stated in the Department's report.

A slide presentation of the subject site and surrounding areas was provided by Ms. Griggs-McElhanon.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS OF COMMISSION

? Is the developer precluded from fronting houses on Sycamore Drive, or is that the way he elected to do this?

A. It is a combination of elected and discouraged as well. In the discussions with the developer, both the Department of Public Works and Department of Planning tried to discourage any additional curb cuts along Sycamore Drive. This design afforded the opportunity to internalize all the curb cuts to the internal street.

? Why do we discourage curb cuts?

A. Minimizing curb cuts along any road also minimizes traffic conflicts on that road. The existing development to the north off of Hester has internalized curb cuts, as has the development of Sycamore Place to the east of this development.

? Why do we sacrifice good looking front yards in order to pick up poor looking back yards in the interest of what appears to be a marginal traffic benefit?

A. If the lots on the subject tract were to front on Sycamore they would be double fronting lots, because they would back up to this Street.

? Is Sycamore a Chesterfield street? If it were a County street, would there be a prohibition to fronting on it?

A. It is now. When it was a County street, the County initiated the prohibition with Sycamore Place where they restricted the number of lots that could have access to Sycamore. This prohibition varies on both City and County streets.

? Will the lots across from Sycamore face the back yards of the Sycamore development?

A. There are some existing lots that front on to Sycamore. The lots in the Sycamore Place development front on to the internal street.

? Why was the Stonebriar development required to provide only an easement and not a stub street, and this development, which is much smaller, is required to provide two (2) stub streets?

A. In terms of Stonebriar's original proposal, it was deemed unlikely that a road connection would occur in the near future. Thus, all that was required was a reserve strip to be dedicated to the City upon demand. The City had not anticipated this area being combined to make the road connection. The stub street being proposed to the south is being proposed by the petitioner and is to provide access to the south.

? Who will be responsible for the cost of the stub street in Stonebriar?

A. This would have to be borne by the City.

? Would there be another curb cut on to Kehrs Mill Road?

A. There would not be another curb cut on to Kehrs Mill Road. The road would loop around to Sycamore.

? What improvements will the developer be required to make on Sycamore?

A. The developer, who is also developing Sycamore Place Subdivision on the east side of Sycamore, will make substantial improvements along the common section in terms of widening it to twenty-six (26) feet, as well as providing storm sewers, as opposed to just adding on to the pavement.

? Will Wendimill ever connect?

A. It will, opposite this development. At present is stops about three (3) lots short of connecting. There is a plat currently under review for that connection.

? Where is the condition limiting the construction traffic?

A. On page 4, letter (r) "Construction traffic shall be via Sycamore Drive only."

? A letter received from the County Highway Department requested many additional requirements of the developer regarding changes on Kehrs Mill. Concern was expressed about the safety of Kehrs Mill Road at the intersection of Sycamore Drive. If we agree that the developer is not responsible for improving this roadway, what are we going to do for the residents of Chesterfield, as well as other people who travel this road?

COMMENTS OF COMMISSION

- If a road is dangerous, it should be the responsibility of the governing body to improve its condition.

- In order to establish a Trust Fund for roadway improvements the City would have to put this before the voters for approval. Also, there would need to be a study done to determine the basic needs, roadway improvements (if necessary), and how much those would cost; then a method of allocating responsibility for paying into those improvements would have to be implemented.

Chairman Domahidy stated that this development is pointing out a need for the Commission to take a look at how the City can go about assessing Impact Fees for developments that have an effect on the traffic system, but may not be directly adjacent to the property they impact. She further requested the Commission make a recommendation to the City Council to create a Study Committee to look at this immediate situation, and beyond.

A motion to refer this consideration to the Planning and Economic Development Committee for a joint effort of the Commission and Council and, perhaps, Public Works to address this issue was made by Commissioner Sherman. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dalton and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

A motion was made by Commissioner Scruggs to approve the Department's recommendation except that Condition 4 (h) of Attachment A be modified to read: Installation of Landscaping and Ornamental Entrance Monument construction, if proposed, shall be approved by the Planning Commission prior to installation or construction. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kirchoff.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION OF COMMISSION

- The side yard setbacks and minimum lot size are the same as what were approved for the prior development. The minimum side yard setback is eight (8) feet, which is consistent with the "R-3" District requirements.

- Concern was expressed about the current petitioner, as well as future possible petitioners for the undeveloped area, sharing the cost of future improvement of Kehrs Mill Road. It was suggested that a plan be in place to give direction for these improvements.

City Attorney Beach stated that the City does not have a mechanism in place at this time which would allow trust funds to be used to address the current roadway improvement problems.

- The property on the corner, which was to be the site of the All Saint's Lutheran Church, will not be developed by the church, as originally stated. At the time the church was looking at the property and had submitted a proposal to the City for review, both the Planning Department and the Public Works Department had reviewed it, and there were going to be requirements for some improvements at that intersection, and the cost was to be borne by the church.

Chairman Domahidy brought up the street connection to Stonebriar for discussion.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION OF COMMISSION

- It was recommended that the street in Stonebriar be connected. This could be an advantage to both Stonebriar and Sycamore residents, i.e., affording the opportunity to access Kehrs Mill Road at two (2) additional points. Sidewalks on this new connector road will be provided to allow people to get back and forth.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.**

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

A. 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.

On behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to approve the petition subject to the request of the Department of Public Works addition: that the petitioner identify on the Record Plat that the responsibility for maintenance of the drainage swale located within the twenty (20) foot wide easement along Wild Horse Parkway Drive shall lie with the developer and future lot owners. The motion was seconded by Commissioner O'Brien and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

B. P.C. 85-86 Gene Mainini; "M-3" Planned Industrial District Amended Site Development Plan and Landscape Plan; southwest corner of the intersection of Chesterfield Airport and Long Roads.

On behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to approve the request subject to the following additions:

1. A sight-proof fence be provided at the northwest corner of the building, surrounding the air conditioning units, in order to screen the units from Chesterfield Airport Road. The sight-proof fence shall be either natural wood or of a color comparable or matching the existing building.

2. When shrubs in that area are replanted, they are to be planted on the outside of the fence.

3. Provision of two (2) additional trees on the north side of the building.

4. There shall also be a two (2) year Landscape Maintenance Bond established for this property.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs.

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Committee Chairman Brown reported that the next meeting of the Committee will be Monday, November 18, 1991, at 4:00 p.m. The Committee has met on Monday, November 4th, and are continuing to review our Sign Ordinances. Mr. Beach was in attendance at that meeting, and provided updated information about the legal issues raised by sign regulations, particularly in terms of whether or not some of these new sign ordinances that we may possibly adopt next year could be amortized, and some of the issues that the Committee will have to take into consideration in its discussion.

B. Architectural Review Committee

Committee Chairman O'Brien reported that the Committee met on November 5, 1991, and discussed three (3) basic items.

1. Wrapped up the summary of the tour. She stated that, for the record, paragraph 1 of ITEM I of the Summary should read "a summary was provided by Dr. Domahidy.

2. The Committee discussed more revisions to the Statement of Purpose of the City of Chesterfield's Sign Guidelines.

3. The Committee will review its Statement of Purpose again at the end of the entire process; perhaps towards the end of next season.

4. A review of the overviews provided by Mr. Duepner on design guidelines from other locals, including Miami, Germantown, Tennessee, etc.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 10, 1991, at 4:30 p.m. There will be a slide presentation by Commissioner Cannon of buildings in Columbus, Indiana. The Committee will also be reviewing in more detail about the overviews of design guidelines.

C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee

Committee Chairman Kirchoff reported the Committee will meet on December 5, 1991, at 4:00 p.m. At the previous meeting, Mr. Rusty Saunders, Landscape Architect with Loomis-Debenport-Boulton, spoke to the Committee about landscape issues and showed slides about good and poor landscaping.

D. Comprehensive Plan Committee

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy reported that the Committee met immediately prior to the meeting tonight and established for recommendation to the Commission as a Whole, a definition of the term "Office Campus."

Director Duepner read the definition that the Committee recommends to the Planning Commission would be as follows. This would go into the Comprehensive Plan to more clearly define what is intended by the term "Office Campus."

> "Low rise appearance office development adjacent to area where the dominant land use is residential or non-commercial institutional. Office Campus development shall emphasize open space and preservation of natural features to serve as a buffer and transition to the residential area. Consideration should be given in Office Campus development to utilization of structured, including underground, parking to facilitate the provision of open areas. Visibility of parking areas should be minimized wherever possible."

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION OF COMMISSION

- Low rise is used instead of delineating what the floor limit should be. The Committee realized it would vary due to the topography of the site.

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy brought the definition of "Office Campus" to the Commission as a Whole for approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

An amendment to the motion was made by Commissioner Kirchoff to delete the words "including underground" from the "Office Campus" definition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

Upon a roll call the vote on the amendment was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The amendment to the original motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.**

Upon a roll call the vote to approve the definition, **as amended**, was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The original motion, as amended, passed by a vote of 7 to 0.**

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy stated the Committee also took up the need to bring our newly annexed area of the City into the City's Comprehensive Plan, and made some preliminary decisions toward a process to update our Comprehensive Plan to include the newly annexed area. The first step will be an open meeting at which residents in the area, as well as other residents, are encouraged to attend to hear an overview of the City and its Plan, then get feedback from people as to how they would like to see development within the annexed area proceed.

E. Procedures Committee

Committee Chairman Scruggs reported the Committee met November 4, 1991. The Committee agreed that Mr. Duepner would send a notice to developers, Chamber of Commerce, etc., that he felt appropriate, presenting the 1992 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule. He further stated that on Exhibit IX-E, the date of June 8th was omitted. This date should be added to the Meeting Schedule.

Commissioner Scruggs made a motion to adopt the schedule as presented on Exhibit IX-E, with the addition of the June 8th meeting date, and direct Director Duepner to notify the developers, Chamber of Commerce, etc., of the new Schedule. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown, **and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

ADD ON ITEM

Planning Commission Chairman Domahidy stated that she and Commissioner Brown met with the Planning and Economic Development Committee last Wednesday night, and they are looking forward to meeting with the Planning Commission as a Whole on Wednesday, December 18th, at 5:30 p.m. She further stated that, at that meeting, we will present to them for their information, reports on what each of the Planning Committees are accomplishing. The reports will be no more than five (5) minutes, so that there will be an opportunity for discussion on items being brought before them. Chairman Domahidy stated that she will attend all future PED Meetings on Wednesdays, and should she not be able to attend, we will proceed with what the Bi-Laws allow. She said she feels the Meeting on December 18th has some potential to establish some groundwork for

the successful implementation of the policies that all the Committee work is directed towards.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

Walter Scruggs, Secretary

[MIN11-13]