

MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Teresa J. Price, Director of Planning

DATE: January 23, 2006

SUBJECT: Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting Summary – **January 19, 2006**

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, January 19, 2006 in Council Chambers.

In attendance were: **Chair Mike Casey** (Ward III); **Councilmember Jane Durrell** (Ward I); **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV); and **Councilmember Bruce Geiger** (Ward II).

Also in attendance were Councilmember Mary Brown, Ward IV; Stephanie Macaluso, Planning Commission Chair; Teresa Price, Director of Planning; Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning; Kyle Dubbert, Project Planner; Nick Hoover, Project Planner; Dan Kaline, Project Planner; Aimee Nassif, Project Planner; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

Chair Casey called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of January 5, 2006. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger.

Councilmember Fults stated she had requested a letter from Public Works but did not see it noted in the Meeting Summary. (After the meeting, the Planning Assistant pointed out that this request was covered in the Issues part of the meeting as noted below :)

Issues

4. Provide comments from Public Works as to why the City does not require roads throughout the subject area to be brought up to Chesterfield street standards.
11. Provide comments from Public Works regarding “street” vs. “parking lot”.

Upon roll call, the motion **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

II. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 29-2005 Chris Schulenburg (14310 Olive Road):** A request for a Residential Business Use Procedure in an “R-2” Residential Zoning District for a 0.48 acre tract of land located at 14310 Olive Road, south of Olive Road and east of Glenfield Ridge. (Locator Number 16R310846)
The request contains the following permitted uses: Office.

Staff Presentation

Project Planner Aimee Nassif stated that the Public Hearing was held October 24, 2005. At that time, the only open issue was a request for a variance on the side property line for a two-foot landscape buffer in lieu of a twenty-foot landscape buffer. This variance was approved by the Planning Commission at its vote meeting.

Planning Commission Report

Planning Chair Stephanie Macaluso stated that all issues had been addressed at the Planning Commission level. The petition was approved by a vote of 7-1. Commissioner Broemmer voted against it as he is opposed to RBUs.

The petitioner is saving a large amount of the monarch trees on site.

The petitioner is being required to install a fence along the side yard, the length of which is to be approved by the Department of Planning to avoid any line of sight problems. The fence is being required to protect the lot to the east.

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to forward P.Z. 29-2005 Chris Schulenburg (14310 Olive Road) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

**Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the February 6, 2006 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #**

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Director of Planning, Teresa Price, for additional information on P.Z. 29-2005 Chris Schulenburg (14310 Olive Road).]

RBUs

Councilmember Durrell felt that the Zoning Ordinance requires a disproportionate amount of landscaping for RBUs, which usually are considerably smaller than other types of petitions. She would like to present some suggestions at a future meeting on modifying the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Casey stated that the standards for RBUs are different because it is a business use in a residential area.

III. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **St. Louis Family Church:** An amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance Number 2092 relating to the St. Louis Family Church development, zoned “PI” Planned Industrial District located on the south side of Chesterfield Airport Road, west of Valley Center Drive.

Petitioner’s Presentation

Mr. Mike Doster addressed the Committee stating that the petitioner is requesting an amendment to its zoning ordinance to add language which would allow for the submission of a sign package.

Pastor Jeff Perry stated that the reason the Church does not have a sign package in its ordinance is because of the way the Church has evolved over time – from renting a back building to ultimately purchasing all its buildings for a total of 80,000 sq. ft. Each building houses a lot of different activities.

During 2005, the Church had over 5100 first-time visitors on its campus. Without signage, it is difficult for persons to find the correct buildings. They are requesting directional signage inside the campus to accommodate their visitors.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Brown asked why there is an issue with having internal signage within a complex.

Chair Casey stated that the request for the ordinance amendment was turned down by the Planning Commission by a vote of 8 to 0. There are issues involved as outlined in the letter by past-City Attorney Doug Beach.

Councilmember Geiger asked if Sign #11 on Edison Road is a new sign or a replacement sign. Pastor Perry replied that this is a new sign.

Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning, stated that the Department is asking that the amendment request be held to allow Staff further research on what is being proposed compared to what is allowed by Ordinance. Staff would like to review the definition of “directional signage” in the Zoning Ordinance since it may conflict to what the petitioner defines as “directional signage”. Staff would also like to investigate how many times Sign Package Amendments have been approved in PC developments.

Ms. Price explained the procedure of the Ordinance Amendment request. The request to allow a sign package was turned down by the Planning Commission. No sign package was ever presented to the Commission. The Ordinance Amendment would be forwarded to Council with a recommendation. If the amendment is approved by Council, the entire Sign Package would be submitted to the Planning Commission for review.

Since the Ordinance Amendment request was denied by Planning Commission, Staff was directed to clarify whether a super-majority vote is needed by Council to pass the request.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to hold St. Louis Family Church until the next meeting of the Planning & Zoning Committee. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

Chair Casey announced that the agenda order would be changed to review Item III. D. next.

- D. **P.Z. 15-2005 Chesterfield Airport Road Investments LLC (Terra Corporate Park)**: A request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance 1708 to permit additional uses and amendments to several area, height, lot and setback requirements in conjunction with a revised preliminary plan for a 24.9-acre “PI” Planned Industrial district located on the north side of Chesterfield Airport Road across from its intersection with Trade Center Boulevard. (Locator Numbers 17V62-0049, 17V62-0050, 17V62-0072)

Staff Presentation

Ms. Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning, stated that the project was approved by the Planning Commission on October 14, 2005. It has been held by the Planning & Zoning Committee on three different occasions for two reasons:

1. The Committee asked Staff to provide a mark-up showing changes made to the Attachment A by Planning Commission, as well as changes that came from the Petitioner.
2. The Committee asked the Petitioner to provide information regarding traffic generation for the proposed filling station and convenience store.

Currently, the Attachment A allows the proposed service station/convenience store to be on either Lot 6 or Lot 7. Information from the Petitioner’s traffic engineer indicates that Lot 6 would be the most appropriate site for this use because of the two right turns into the development.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Filling Station Use

Councilmember Fults stated that she can accept the filling station use if it is limited to Lot 6. She expressed concerned about traffic stacking if the filling station were allowed on Lot 7.

Chair Casey stated that the other option would be to eliminate the service station use.

Staff agrees with the filling station use on Lot 6.

Councilmember Durrell agreed with limiting the service station to Lot 6. She questioned whether the filling station would generate more traffic than a bank or restaurant on Lot 7.

Councilmember Fults stated that traffic was compared between a filling station and a retail space – not a restaurant – which showed more trip generations from a filling station than a retail space. She felt that drivers stopping for gas are in a more “hurried” state than drivers stopping at a restaurant, which is why she felt Lot 6 would be more appropriate for the filling station use.

Number of Buildings

Councilmember Fults stated she wanted the number of buildings limited to three because this would be the view from Highway 40.

Height of Buildings

It was clarified that the buildings can be three-stories, exclusive of roof screening.

Easements and Cross Streets

Councilmember Fults questioned whether all the language pertaining to easements and cross streets is included in the Attachment A. Ms. McCaskill-Clay stated that this language is included and was not changed.

Attachment A Amendments for Green Sheet

Councilmember Fults made a motion to amend Section I.D.1.b of the Attachment A as follows: (Changes are in bold.)

“North of Long Road Crossing Boulevard: Total building floor area shall not exceed 150,000 square feet for a maximum of three buildings.”

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed** by a voice vote of **4 to 0**.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to amend Section I.C.1.c.1 of the Attachment A as follows:

“Use #10 above shall be limited to ~~one (1) out parcel~~ either Lot 6 or Lot 7 as shown on the preliminary plan.”

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed** by a voice vote of **4 to 0**.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to delete Section I.C.1.30 from the Attachment A.:

~~“Sales, rental, and leasing of new and used vehicles, including automobiles, trucks, trailers, construction equipment, agricultural equipment, and boats, as well as associated repairs and necessary outdoor storage of said vehicles.”~~

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Discussion was held regarding Use #34:

~~“Stores, shops, markets, service facilities and automatic vending facilities in which goods or services of any kind, including indoor sale of motor vehicles, are being offered for sale or hire to the general public on the premises.”~~

It was noted that Use #30, deleted above, was for outdoor sales while Use #34 is for indoor sales.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to delete Section I.C.1.c.3 from the Attachment A:

~~Use #34 above shall be limited to the sales, rental and leasing of new and used passenger vehicles, including automobiles and trucks and excluding traditional automobile dealerships.~~

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Permitted Uses

Discussion was held on Use #16:

Manufacturing, fabrication, assembly, processing, or packaging of any commodity.

Chair Casey asked if there would be manufacturing on the site. Mr. Doster stated that it is possible.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward P.Z. 15-2005 Chesterfield Airport Road Investments LLC (Terra Corporate Park) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

**Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the February 6, 2006 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #**

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Director of Planning, Teresa Price, for additional information on P.Z. 15-2005 Chesterfield Airport Road Investments LLC (Terra Corporate Park).]

B. Justus Pointe at Chesterfield Village: Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan for a 3.3 acre parcel located East of Justus Post Road at the intersection of Justus Post Road and Milbridge Drive.

And

C. Justus Pointe at Chesterfield Village: Architectural Elevations, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan and Site Development Section Plan for a 2.31 acre parcel located East of Justus Post Road at the intersection of Justus Post Road and Milbridge Drive.

Staff Presentation

Project Planner Nick Hoover stated that the project was held January 5, 2006 for a series of issues.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Tree Removal

Mr. Hoover stated that the petitioner wanted to correct an error on his part. It had been indicated at the last meeting that trees would not be removed from the site; however, trees will be removed from the site during construction. The trees to be removed are shown on Site Development Concept Plan.

Chair Casey pointed out that the Planting Plan has a note stating “No existing trees are being removed on this site.”

Mr. Bruno addressed the Committee. He stated that while the Landscape Plan mistakenly has the notation of no trees being removed, the Site Development Concept Plan has always shown the percentage of trees to be removed. Trees are being removed because of the movement of Building 6 and because of the addition of extra parking spaces.

Site Layout

Mr. Hoover pointed out that Buildings 1 and 2 face Justus Post; Building 6 backs up against the lake; and Buildings 3, 4 and 5 front Milbridge. Temporary parking of 8 spaces would be located in the Phase II area.

R6/PEU

Mr. Hoover stated that the governing ordinance for this project, Ordinance 2021, says that minimum standards for building height, density and yard requirements will be as determined by the R6 City of Chesterfield zoning – not R6/PEU or various other zonings throughout the Chesterfield Village.

Councilmember Geiger noted that since there isn't an Attachment A for this project, the controlling documents are the plans presented – so if something is not shown on any of the drawings presented, it is not part of the project.

Submittal

Councilmember Geiger pointed out that there are a number of discrepancies between the elevations and the floor plans. Ms. Price advised that the floor plans were provided for informational purposes only. They are not part of the Site Plan; however, the elevations are part of the Site Plan and are subject to approval.

The submittal consists of the Site Development Concept Plan, Site Development Section Plan, the Landscape Plan, the Lighting Plan, and the Elevations. The contradiction between the Site Plan and the Landscape Plan will have to be corrected.

Allowable Height of Buildings

R6 allows for a four-story building – 3 stories above ground and 1 story underground.

Issues

Councilmember Geiger indicated he still has issues with the following items:

1. Parking – He feels tandem parking should count as one space. If counted as one space, there would be a total of 81 spaces, including the 8 temporary parking spaces in Phase II. He feels 1.5 parking spaces/unit will cause residents/visitors to park along Justus Post. He would like to see the Petitioner present plans showing 2 parking spaces/unit for this project.
2. Accessibility of parking spaces to units – He expressed concern that most of the surface parking is too far away for two of the buildings.
3. Backing out of garages – He expressed concern that backing out of some of the garages could have the driver backing into a car coming around the corner.
4. Temporary parking spaces – He would like to see the 8 temporary parking spaces made permanent.

5. Density & Tree Removal – He feels the project is too dense and will be compounded by the removal of 51% of the trees.
6. Patios – He expressed concern about the concrete-slab patios on the front of the buildings not being enclosed.

Councilmember Brown had the following questions:

1. How would parking for the project be affected if the City restricted parking on Justus Post?
2. Could Council require guest parking for Buildings 1 and 2 as a condition of approval of the Site Plan?
3. Can parking be prohibited on the private street, Milbridge, through indentures as mentioned by one of the residents at the last meeting?

She further stated that she is disappointed that the proposed development is part of Chesterfield Village and there appears to be so little cooperation in terms of the elevations and parking on Milbridge.

Councilmember Geiger stated that he cannot support the project in its present state.

Councilmember Fults stated that if Building 6 were removed, it would eliminate the density issue, would add more parking, and would allow the preservation of more trees.

(Councilmember Brown left the meeting at 7:03 p.m.)

Councilmember Geiger stated he would like to see the Petitioner present a plan that would:

- Eliminate one building in Phase I to decrease the density;
- Provide two parking spaces/unit;
- Improve the flow of getting to the parking spaces from the units;
- Show how these changes would impact the retention of trees along the back side of the project.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward the Amended Site Development Concept Plan for Justus Pointe at Chesterfield Village to City Council with a negative recommendation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 1.** (Councilmember Casey voted “no”.)

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward the Site Development Section Plan for Justus Pointe at Chesterfield Village to City Council with a negative recommendation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

(Councilmember Fults left the meeting at 7:13 p.m.)

Councilmember Durrell expressed her views on the project as follows:

- The “driveway vs. street” is immaterial to her.
- She feels the front elevation has been improved tremendously; however she does not like the concrete-slab patios. If the slabs had a little bit of fencing, she thinks it would be acceptable.
- She does not feel there is a problem with the traffic flow.
- Parking is a real concern. She feels if there is extra outdoor parking for Buildings 1 and 2, she could support the project.
- Regarding density, she suggested eliminating all or part of Building 6, or making all the buildings smaller.

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Director of Planning, Teresa Price, for additional information on Justus Pointe at Chesterfield Village.]

IV. PENDING PROJECTS/DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE - None

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.