

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
MEETING SUMMARY  
FEBRUARY 8, 2021**

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

**I. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT**

**ABSENT**

Commissioner Allison Harris  
Commissioner John Marino  
Commissioner Debbie Midgley  
Commissioner Nathan Roach  
Commissioner Gene Schenberg  
Commissioner Jane Staniforth  
Commissioner Guy Tilman  
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg  
Chair Merrell Hansen

Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison  
Mr. Nathan Bruns, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville  
Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner  
Mr. Chris Dietz, Planner  
Ms. Annisa Kumerow, Planner  
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

Chair Hansen acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison; and Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II.

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**III. SILENT PRAYER**

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None**

**V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

**Commissioner Staniforth made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the January 25, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**A. 18122 Chesterfield Airport Road (Scott Properties)**

**Petitioner**

1. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc., 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions

2. Mr. Kristopher Mehrtens, Architect with ACI Boland Architects, 17107 Chesterfield Airport Road, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions

### **B. P.Z. 12-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (14001 Olive Blvd)**

#### **Petitioner**

1. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc., 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions

#### **In Opposition**

1. Ms. Trish Reynolds, Riverbend West subdivision, 618 Sunbridge Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Reynolds raised the following questions for the Petitioner:

1. What is the range of the estimated selling price for the multi-family, single-family, and villas?
2. Will the multi-family units resemble townhomes or apartments that are owner-owned?
3. Is the proposed 148 units the maximum or is there more land to be developed at another time?
4. If approved, can the plan be changed to add more multi-family units?
5. Were the trip generation figures for this project taken during the pandemic? If so, Speaker feels that they are not accurate because not as many people are going to work and school during this time.

The following information was provided in response to Ms. Reynolds questions:

1. The estimated selling price is not within the purview of the Planning Commission.
2. The project submitted is for a total of 100 units – not 148.
3. Any amendments to an approved plan would require a review by the Planning Commission.
4. Regarding the trip generation, Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, clarified that these figures relate to the number of trips that the proposed development would generate, not the traffic volume along Olive Boulevard.

## **VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS**

- A. 18122 Chesterfield Airport Rd. (Scott Properties) SDP: A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Tree Stand Delineation, Tree Preservation Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 12.04-acre tract of land zoned "M-3" - Planned Industrial District located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Chesterfield Airport Road and Spirit of Saint Louis Boulevard (17V420157).

Commissioner Schenberg summarized the discussion held at the earlier Site Plan Committee Meeting. Items discussed included the following:

- Whether the curb cut on Chesterfield Airport Road is necessary;
- The questionability of the health of one tree and whether it should be removed and replaced;
- The facades on the north and south elevations of Buildings 1 and 2; and
- Confirmation that the mix of deciduous and non-deciduous trees were assorted properly.

The Site Plan Committee recommended approval of the Site Development Plan by a vote of 8 to 1.

**Commissioner Schenberg** then made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Tree Stand Delineation, Tree Preservation Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for **18122 Chesterfield Airport Rd. (Scott Properties)**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg.

### Discussion

#### Tree

Commissioner Wuennenberg pointed out that the tree in question is listed on the Tree Stand Delineation as being in fair condition. He has concerns that a tree in fair condition is not appropriate when all the other trees on the site will be new plantings. It was agreed that the tree should be evaluated to determine if it is viable or should be replaced.

**Commissioner Harris** made a motion to amend the motion by adding the condition that the health of the existing tree in the northwestern corner of the site be re-examined and that the Developer evaluate whether it should be replaced with a new tree of equal species. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

**Aye: Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Marino,  
Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Roach,  
Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Staniforth,  
Commissioner Tilman, Commissioner Wuennenberg,  
Chair Hansen**

**Nay: None**

The motion **passed** by a vote of 9 to 0.

#### Design

Commissioner Wuennenberg questioned why the north elevation was different than the south elevation in terms of the use of brick and windows.

Mr. Mehrtens, Architect for the Project, explained that the brick accent panels are used along the north elevations of Buildings 1, 2, and 3, and for the interior courtyards of the three service center buildings. They are used as an accent along Chesterfield Airport Road where they would best be seen and provide the most impact as opposed to the southern elevations of the buildings that front to other service center industrial-type buildings. He also noted that the three service center buildings are a transition from the older service center buildings to the east and then onto the retail/office building on the western side of the development.

Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, added that this project was reviewed by the Architectural Review Board whose only recommendation was to incorporate pre-cast planters along the front of Building 4 and utilize the vacant planters shown in front of Buildings 1, 2, and 3.

#### **Curb Cut along Chesterfield Airport Road**

With respect to the proposed curb cut on Chesterfield Airport Road, Councilmember Hurt stated that the subject site is next to the major intersection of Spirit of St. Louis

Boulevard, and pointed out that as this area expands, it will become more populated with increased traffic. He noted that any kind of limit in access management will be helpful, and suggested that the site could be accessed from Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard rather than Chesterfield Airport Road.

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

**Aye: Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley,  
Commissioner Roach, Commissioner Schenberg,  
Commissioner Staniforth, Commissioner Tilman,  
Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Harris**

**Nay: Chair Hansen**

**The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 1.**

### **VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- A. P.Z. 12-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (14001 Olive Blvd):** A request for a change in zoning from R-3 Residence District to PUD Planned Unit Development for a maximum of 100 residential units (16R340151).

Planner Annisa Kumerow stated that the Public Hearing for this petition was held on December 13, 2020, at which time four issues were raised and discussed pertaining to (1) traffic, (2) amenities, (3) 14015 Olive Boulevard, and (4) landscaping around the bioretention basins.

At the January 25<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission Meeting, one additional issue was raised concerning the desired location of detached single-family along the eastern border of this development. The Applicant has submitted a revised narrative stating that Lots 1-10 will be single-family detached, as noted in the draft Attachment A.

**Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve P.Z. 12-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (14001 Olive Blvd).** The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schenberg.

### **Discussion**

#### **Lot 11**

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked that the Petitioner give consideration to also restricting Lot 11 to single-family detached as this lot backs up to the last house in the neighboring subdivision.

#### **Traffic**

With respect to the traffic volume along Olive Boulevard, Commissioner Harris stated that she feels there is a “big disconnect between MoDOT’s opinion and the reality for those people who live along this stretch of road”. She repeated her concerns that making a left-hand turn out of the proposed subdivision on to Olive Boulevard will be exceedingly difficult and dangerous during the morning and afternoon peak hours.

#### **Petitioner’s Response**

Chair Hansen asked Mr. Stock to address the concerns raised earlier in the meeting by Ms. Trish Reynolds, resident of River Bend West subdivision.

Mr. Stock provided the following information:

- Trip Generation: The trip generation is independent of the pandemic, and comes from the ITE Manual, which is utilized by professional transportation engineers. The trip generation is based on the fact that the development will consist of 52 single-family residences and 48 multi-family units, and represents the number of new trips that will be generated from the development during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The trip generation figures do not pertain to the existing traffic along Olive Boulevard.
- Olive Boulevard/MoDOT: Mr. Stock explained that they have done everything possible as an applicant working with MoDOT to garner their approval and support. They have listened to suggestions from the Planning Commission and residents of Eagle Ridge subdivision to try and address the frustrations that residents experience coming out of their subdivisions on to Olive Boulevard. MoDOT has implied that they will work with the City relative to shortening medians and trying to improve the situation.
- Selling Price Point: This information is not yet available but will be commensurate with the market.
- Density: There will not be any more density on the subject site than what is currently proposed at 100 units. Mr. Stock added that they are required to provide 30-foot buffers, allocate land to create amenities, and to conserve the steep, forested topography on the north side of the site. Meeting these requirements does not allow them the opportunity to increase the density.
- Architecture: An architect will not be hired to design the product until it is determined that the PUD is approved. The four condominium buildings are anticipated to be three-stories on the east elevation and four-stories on the west overlooking Hog Hollow Road.
- Lot 11: Mr. Stock stated that no one from Eagle Ridge subdivision has expressed a concern with the attached housing next to them. He noted that they have agreed to having Lots 1-10 as detached housing, and asked that the Commission not require that Lot 11 be detached also.

Commissioner Wuennenberg stated that after further observation, he realizes that Lot 11 is on a curve with significant existing landscaping, so he is fine with not requiring detached housing on it.

### **Landscape Plan**

Chair Hansen reminded Mr. Stock that when a landscape plan is submitted for the site, the Commission will be reviewing it as to how the bioretention and storm water areas will be landscaped.

### **Deed Restriction**

Mr. Stock confirmed that a deed restriction will be placed on the property prohibiting apartments.

### **Propane Tank**

Mr. Stock stated that he has met with both St. Louis County Department of Public Works and Monarch Fire District regarding the propane tank on the adjacent site at 14015 Olive. They have confirmed that the location and size of the tank will not cause any adverse impact to the proposed residential lots, and vice versa.

## **Amenities**

Chair Hansen expressed her hope that the Petitioner “goes the extra mile” with respect to the amenities within the interior and exterior pathways, along within the pocket parks.

## **Resident Input**

Mr. Reynolds inquired again as to whether the multi-family buildings “will look like apartment buildings but ownership will be condo, rather than a townhouse connection”. Mr. Stock responded that the PUD includes a mix of product and the Architectural Review Board will review the multi-family buildings against the City’s design standards. The amenity package will be reviewed by the Planning Commission as part of the Site Development Plan. He added that he will continue to dialogue with the residents throughout the process and it was noted that future meetings regarding this petition will be posted on the City’s website.

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

**Aye: Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Marino,  
Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Roach,  
Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Staniforth,  
Commissioner Tilman, Chair Hansen**

**Nay: Commissioner Harris**

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 1.

**IX. NEW BUSINESS - None**

**X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

---

Gene Schenberg, Secretary