

PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

January 17, 1990

Minutes

A meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on January 17, 1990, at 5:43 p.m., in the City Council Conference Room. In attendance were Councilmember Dick Hrabko, Chairman (Ward IV); Councilmember Betty Hathaway (Ward I); Councilmember Jade Bute (Ward II). Also in attendance were Jerry Duepner (Director of Planning/Economic Development) and Anna Kleiner (Planning Specialist). Councilmember Dan Hurt (Ward III) arrived later.

ITEM #1 P.Z. 34-89 Benjamin D. Houlihan, Jr.; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "M-3" Planned Industrial District; south side of Olive Street Road, approximately 3400 feet east of Batherton Road.

Director Duepner presented the report of the Planning Commission recommending approval of the requested rezoning.

Councilmember Hathaway raised a question concerning contributions to the Trust Funds established in Chesterfield Valley.

Director Duepner noted that such contributions are required of all developments which are the subject of rezoning in the Chesterfield Valley Area.

A motion was made by Councilmember Bute for approval of the Planning Commission recommendation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hathaway, and approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Note: An Ordinance relative to this matter is needed for the February 5, 1990 Council Meeting.

ITEM #2 P.Z. 35-89 City of Chesterfield Planning Commission; a proposal to revise the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Chesterfield by amending Section 1003.168 relative to Off-Site Signs for Churches and Houses of Worship.

Planning Specialist Kleiner presented the report of the Planning Commission recommending approval of amending the Sign Regulations relative to churches and houses of worship.

A motion was made by Councilmember Bute for approval of the Planning Commission recommendation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hathaway, and approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Note: An Ordinance relative to this matter is needed for the February 5, 1990 City Council Meeting.

ITEM #3

P.C. 39-78 Sachs Properties and Hazel C. Kraus (Roosevelt Bank); a request for an amendment of "C-8" Planned Commercial District Ordinance; southeast corner of Olive Boulevard and Roosevelt Parkway.

Director Duepner presented the report of the Planning Commission recommending approval of the requested Ordinance Amendment.

Councilmember Hathaway questioned whether adequate parking would be available for a medical office use.

Director Duepner noted that, as pointed out in the Planning Commission report, there is a surplus of parking currently on the site, and there would continue to be a surplus with conversion of 20,000 square feet of floor area to medical office use.

Councilmember Hathaway recommended that, at such time as the parking requirements of the Zoning Ordinance are reviewed, special attention be given to parking requirements for medical office use, with consideration given to requiring five (5) spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area in a medical office use.

A motion for approval of the Planning Commission recommendation was made by Councilmember Hathaway. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bute, and approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Note: An Ordinance relative to this matter is needed for the February 5, 1990 City Council Meeting.

ITEM #4

Christopher Woods; Subdivision Record Plat; west side of Wilson Road, north of Wilson Manor Drive.

Director Duepner presented the report of the Planning Commission recommending approval of the Subdivision Record Plat.

A motion was made by Councilmember Bute for approval of the Planning Commission recommendation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hathaway, and approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Note: An Ordinance relative to this matter is needed for the February 5, 1990 City Council Meeting.

ITEM #5

Stonebriar Subdivision (Lots 23 and 24); Boundary Adjustment Plat; Stonebriar Ridge Drive.

Director Duepner presented the report of the Planning Commission recommending approval of the Boundary Adjustment Plat.

A motion was made by Councilmember Hathaway for approval of the Planning Commission recommendation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bute, and approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

Note: An Ordinance relative to this matter is needed for the February 5, 1990 City Council Meeting

ITEM #6 Correspondence from JRB/Flagg in response to Ms. Peggy Gredington of Queatham House.

Director Duepner noted that correspondence is expected from JRB/Flagg indicating that the invoice for services performed for Queatham House will be voiced. This matter is to be held on the Committee Agenda until such time as the correspondence from JRB Flag is received.

ITEM #7 Correspondence from the Department of Planning/Economic Development regarding P.Z. 29-89 Midland Capitol Properties I; "C-8" Planned Commercial District; east side of Clarkson Road, north of Baxter Road.

Director Duepner presented the report of the Department of Planning/Economic Development noting that Conditions 4a and 4b of Ordinance No. 393, should be revised to indicate setbacks measured from the old right-of-way of Old Baxter Road, rather than the new right-of-way of Old Baxter Road. These setbacks are for parking and structures, and are to be measured from the existing right-of-way per the recommendation of the Planning and Economic Development Committee. In addition, Director Duepner noted that Condition 6 relative to Issuance of Building Permits should be revised to indicate that no Building Permit shall be issued sooner than March 1st of 1990, rather than May 1st of 1990, per the recommendation of the Planning and Economic Development Committee.

A motion was made by Councilmember Hathaway to revise Conditions of Ordinance No. 393 as recommended by the Department of Planning/Economic Development. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bute, and approved by a vote of 3 to 0.

**Note: An Ordinance relative to this matter is needed for the February 5, 1990 City Council Meeting**

ITEM #8 Correspondence from the Department of Planning/Economic Development regarding business signs for Tuck's Pourhouse; Chesterfield Executive Parkway.

Director Duepner presented the report of the Department of Planning relative to prior requests by the operators of Tuck's Pourhouse for off-site signs to provide direction to Tuck's Pourhouse. It was noted, that such off-site signs are considered advertising signs under the current definition of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Chesterfield and, therefore, would require petitions for rezoning of the property upon which said signs were to be located. In a related matter, Director Duepner presented to the Committee, a copy of correspondence from Mr. Walter Lamkin requesting consideration of amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Chesterfield relative to real estate signs for apartment complexes. It was noted that under the current regulations, an apartment complex is permitted a temporary real estate sign having a maximum outline area of sixteen (16) square feet. This is in contrast to the current regulations for commercial and industrial properties which allow real estate signs of thirty-two (32) square feet.

Director Duepner noted that, in the case of Tuck's Pourhouse, the current sign regulations make no provisions for directory signs for industrial parks. In addition, the request by Mr. Lamkin indicates a disparity between an apartment complex which frequently has a turn-over in units and commercial properties

which also has turn-over in tenants. Director Diepner recommended to the Committee that these two (2) situations warrant review of sections of the Sign Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, and rather than approaching review on a individual case basis, the entire Sign Regulation should be reviewed.

The Committee recommended that the Department of Planning review the entire Sign Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and present a report on this matter to the Planning and Economic Development Committee prior to any report to the Planning Commission.

(Councilmember Dan Hurt arrived at this time.)

ITEM #9 Discussion with representatives of Union Electric regarding installation of underground utilities.

In attendance at the meeting were representatives of Union Electric; Robert Roulkoetter, Steven Braphy and Dennis Lammert.

Mr. Roulkoetter summarized Union Electric policies relative to installation of lines underground.

Councilmember Hrabko questioned representatives of Union Electric regarding, if the City passed an ordinance requiring all lines to be underground, whether it would be legal and its impact on the rate base.

Mr. Roulkoetter responded that the ordinance would probably be legal, however, there would be a surcharge placed upon rate payers in the area to pay for the installation of lines underground. Mr. Roulkoetter pointed out that high voltage lines, those of 34 kv or more, are considered to be high voltage, while lines of 12,470 volts are provided from distribution centers to sites.

Councilmember Hurt questioned whether, while some lines from the distribution center are located underground, why all are not.

Representative from Union Electric noted that the switch gear utilized by Union Electric was designed for overhead use, and it is easier to tap into an overhead line than it is for underground, and the cost of switching cubicles involved with underground use. Presently, Union Electric operates under Rider Q, which allows a surcharge for installation of any lines 34 kv and above. Less 34 kv, there would be a charge for straight cost of underground wiring.

Representatives from Union Electric noted that it is easier to find outages where lines are located above ground than under ground. In addition, installation of lines underground requires a separate easement to be established for the switch cubicle. It was noted that redundancy must be built into any utility line in order to better serve customers, therefore, as with overhead lines, it would be necessary to build redundancy into an underground system which would increase cost.

Councilmember Hrabko directed Staff to determine how much additional revenue could be generated by a two (2) percent increase in the City's Utility Tax. This increase in revenue could be used to fund underground wiring. The Committee also requested that Union Electric respond on the standard cost of installation of underground lines.

Councilmember Hathaway recommended that the issue of underground installation of utilities be received and filed by the Committee, and held on to the Committee's Agenda. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt, and approved by the Committee by a vote of 4 to 0.

ITEM #10 Site Plans, Building Elevations, and Signs approved by the Planning Commission at the January 8, 1990 Meeting.

- A. Legacy Homes (Princeton Gate Subdivision); a request for a temporary subdivision promotion sign; north side of Clayton Road, west of Claymont Estates Drive.
- B. P.C. 22-88 (Charles Hennemeyer, Inc. (Savings of America)); "C-8" Planned Commercial District revised building elevations; east side of Clarkson Road, north of Baxter Road.

ITEM #11 Councilmember Hathaway requested that the Department of Planning/Economic Development review the Zoning Ordinance relative to regulations permitting funeral homes. The Councilmember suggested that the Department review the Residential Districts for inclusion of funeral homes as a Conditional Use in appropriate district or districts.

ITEM #12 Councilmember Bute requested that the Department of Planning/Economic Development review the possibility of a City-wide Ordinance for trash pick-up at commercial and industrial sites adjacent to residential development. It was noted that on several occasions there have been problems with commercial projects adjacent to residential development, where trash pick-up has occurred early in the morning. The Committee recommended that a sample ordinance be prepared for consideration by the City Council relative to this matter.

ITEM #13 Future Planning and Economic Development Committee Meetings.

The Committee decided that, henceforth, meetings of the Committee will begin at 5:45 p.m., rather than 5:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

[MINI-17]