

# MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator

FROM: James Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer   
Justin Wyse, Director of Planning 

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee [Virtual Meeting](#)  
Summary Thursday, January 21, 2021



---

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held virtually via Zoom on Thursday, January 21, 2021.

In attendance were: **Chair Dan Hurt**, (Ward III), **Councilmember Mary Monachella** (Ward I), **Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos** (Ward II), and **Councilmember Michelle Ohley** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Michael Moore (Ward III); Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen; Jim Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Justin Wyse, Director of Planning; Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner; Annisa Kumerow, Planner; Chris Dietz, Planner; and Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

## I. **APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

### A. **Approval of the January 7, 2021 Committee Meeting Summary**

**Councilmember Ohley** made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of **January 7, 2021**. The motion was seconded by **Councilmember Mastorakos** and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0**.

## II. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None.

## III. **NEW BUSINESS**

### A. **Chesterfield Fairgrounds Easements** (Ward 2)

#### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

**Jim Eckrich**, Director of Public Works/City Engineer, stated that in November of 2020, the City purchased approximately 7.8 acres of property on the east side of Veterans Place Drive adjacent to Central Park, commonly referred to as Chesterfield Fairgrounds.

As part of the property acquisition, the City has worked to eliminate unnecessary easements and restrictions to the property. To accomplish this, Staff has contacted the utility companies and requested that they submit no objection letters related to the vacation of easements. All utility companies complied with the request except that the Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) is requiring two replacement easements to protect their existing facilities located on this property.

## Discussion

Councilmember Mastorakos inquired as to whether this will have any future implications as the City moves forward with development of this parcel. Mr. Eckrich stated that the purpose of the easement vacation is to remove unnecessary restrictions on the property. He explained that the entire common area is currently restricted by easements. By proceeding as recommended, the City will be removing a number of easement restrictions and replacing them with two smaller easements for MSD's use.

**Councilmember Monachella made a motion to forward an ordinance vacating four existing easements and dedicating two replacement easements on property adjacent to Central Park with a recommendation to approve.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

**Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the February 1, 2021 City Council Meeting. See Bill No.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Jim Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer, for additional information on Chesterfield Fairgrounds Easements.]**

- B. P.Z. 10-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code-Articles 3 & 10)** An ordinance amending Article 3 and Article 10 of the Unified Development Code pertaining to uses and definitions.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Annisa Kumerow, Planner, stated that the City was approached regarding a potential motorcycle dealership within the Chesterfield Valley. Staff identified that the "automobile dealership" use would not be permitted in a new "PI" Planned Industrial District. Staff researched the issue and brought forward the notion of a potential code change. In September 2020, the Planning and Public Works Committee directed Staff to review the "automobile dealership" use for possible revisions.

A Public Hearing was held for this request at the November 23, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. There were no speakers for this item, however, the Planning Commission raised the following three issues:

1. Vehicle Storage – Requested that storage uses be separate from dealership uses.
2. Motorcycle Dealership Use – Requested to replace the words "all other motor vehicles" in the use term with "similar vehicles."
3. Airplane Sales Use – A concern was expressed over the lack of a sales use for aircraft.

Subsequently, separate vehicle storage uses were introduced along with a new proposed use for the sale of aircraft. The use term for motorcycle dealerships was also amended to reflect the requested language. The project was then presented for vote at the January 11, 2021 Planning Commission meeting at which time it was unanimously approved by the Planning Commission.

**Councilmember Ohley made a motion to forward P.Z. 10-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code-Articles 3 & 10) to City Council with a recommendation to approve.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos 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 1, 2021 City Council Meeting. See Bill No.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 10-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code-Articles 3 & 10).]**

At this time, Chair Hurt requested that Item III.C be discussed after Item III.D, and the Committee concurred.

- D. POWER OF REVIEW: Downtown Chesterfield, (Categories A&B) ASDCP:** An Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Landscape Concept Plan, Signage Concept Plan, and Lighting Fixture Concept Plan for the 78.4 acre tract of land located south of Wild Horse Creek Road, west of Chesterfield Parkway, and north and east of Burkhardt Place. (Ward 2)

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, stated that the request is for an Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Landscape Concept Plan, Signage Concept Plan and Lighting Fixture Concept Plan for a phased development of 17 lots. The subject site is located in what is known as “Categories A&B” of Downtown Chesterfield.

Staff has completed the review of the project. It meets all Unified Development Code (UDC) requirements and all of the site-specific requirements of Ordinance 3114.

The project was reviewed by the Planning Commission on January 11, 2021. At that meeting, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Amended Site Development Concept Plan as submitted by the applicant.

Power of Review was subsequently called on January 14, 2021.

### **Discussion**

Chair Hurt preceded the discussion by stating that there are three main issues that need to be addressed: a density table and corresponding note, the lake front trail and street trees and stated that they will be discussed individually.

### **DENSITY**

Based on the Amended Site Development Concept Plan, there are 72 units depicted on Lot 1 and 35 units on Lot 6. There is also a notation that indicates that the density on Lot 1 is permitted up to 90 units and the density is permitted up to 45 units on Lot 6. Council proposes that the number of units match what is shown on the SDCP and remove the corresponding note that references future density allocation. It is the Chair’s opinion that the notation is not necessary because if the developer wants to change the density, it would require a new concept plan.

**Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to amend Downtown Chesterfield (Categories A&B) ASDCP to both modify the density allocation table on the Amended Site Development Concept Plan and to remove a note on the plan that allocates future density for Categories**

**A&B. (The modification to the table is for Lot 1 to be allocated 72 units and Lot 6 to be allocated 35 units.)** The motion was seconded by Chair Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

### **LAKE FRONT TRAIL**

It was noted that some areas of the trail are 8 feet wide and other areas are 10 feet wide.

**Chair Hurt** made a motion to amend **Downtown Chesterfield (Categories A&B) ASDCP** by requiring that the lake front trail around the entire lake have a minimum width of 10 feet. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ohley.

#### Discussion after the Motion

Councilmember Monachella asked for clarification of the trail areas that are 8 feet wide and 10 feet wide. Mr. Knight then provided a diagram of the area.

**Councilmember Monachella** made a motion to amend the above motion to require a 10-foot-wide trail from the boat dock to just past the 125-foot view corridor. The motion died due to lack of a second.

There was further discussion regarding how the trail would be utilized. Andrew Kilmer, Landscape Architect, explained the reasoning behind the variable widths. He stated they tried to balance and prioritize the widths to correspond with density.

The original motion was **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

### **STREET TREES**

Mr. Knight provided the landscape plan and pointed out the five areas of Chair Hurt brought forward as a concern.

Street Trees Along Lake Front Drive – These are London Planetrees and meet the City’s street tree requirements. They mature at 45 feet in height and are considered fast growing trees. Because these trees have a higher crown, the City Arborist referenced they may not obstruct too much of the view.

Trees to the West of Lake Front Drive - There is a 30 foot drop from Lake Front Drive down into the 300-foot view corridor, and ten Honey Locust trees will be planted in a row going down the side of the corridor. According to the City Arborist, these trees are planted at 6 feet in height and only grow about 6 inches per year. Because the leaf is quite small, it is anticipated that these trees will minimize the impact on visibility.

Trees on the Connecting Street from Chesterfield Parkway Down to Lake Front Drive – There are ten London Planetrees, five on each side of the road, which trail the roadway leading up to Lake Front Drive.

Trees within the 125-Foot View Corridor – The trees are ornamental Eastern Redbuds and the public art piece would be located at the base of this view corridor.

Trees within the 75-Foot View Corridor –These trees are Alee Elms. Their growth rate is 30-36 inches per year and they have a high branch structure, which should not impede the view at a higher elevation.

## TREES ALONG LAKE FRONT DRIVE

**Chair Hurt made a motion to amend Downtown Chesterfield (Categories A&B) ASDCP to remove all street trees along Lake Front Drive within the 300-foot view corridor, except for any trees that are adjacent to the northern and southern boundaries of the corridor. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ohley.**

### Discussion After the Motion

Mr. Kilmer stated that trees are just one aspect of creating design and space. There will be ground plantings below the trees consisting of mixed shrubs and other plantings that create identity to these areas. If a view corridor is really important from Chesterfield Parkway, then he would not have any objection to removing some of the trees along Lake Front Drive to open that area up. The reason the trees were placed there was to control the right of way experience with tree canopies because there are private lots adjacent to the public areas. The intent was to try to control the perspective of the pedestrian on that streetscape. The trees along the entry into the development from Chesterfield Parkway are important because they define an entry point. If the desire is to have the view corridor to remain as open as possible, then the trees along Lake Front Drive can be thinned out.

**The above motion passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

There was considerable discussion regarding the size, species and intended purpose of the proposed trees along the connecting street from Chesterfield Parkway, below Lake Front Drive and the other two view corridors. Ultimately, no changes were made at these locations.

**Councilmember Ohley made a motion to forward Downtown Chesterfield (Categories A&B) ASDCP, as amended, to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Monachella and passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on Downtown Chesterfield (Categories A&B) ASDCP.]**

- C. P.Z. 13-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code-Article 4)** An ordinance amending Article 4 of the Unified Development Code to revise language pertaining to architectural review design standards.

## **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) asked Staff to explore additional language in the Unified Development Code (UDC) regarding the modification of existing buildings throughout the City. The issue was presented to this Committee who directed Staff to also seek input from ARB regarding the inclusion of possible language for screening rooftop mechanical equipment within sections of the City Center. ARB reviewed the issues and provided additional language and recommendations to Staff for both issues. Along with their recommendations, Staff is also proposing some minor updates to this section of Code.

A Public Hearing was held on January 11. At that time, the Planning Commission voted 9 to 0 to approve the proposed language for existing buildings and supplemental updates to the Code. However, they did not approve the proposed language regarding screening of rooftop mechanical equipment.

### Discussion

With reference to penthouse screening for mechanical equipment, Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen stated that the Planning Commission thoroughly discussed the issue. The Commission felt that in some cases, utilizing full penthouse coverage for those units made sense. However, in many instances, the Committee viewed that the requirement placed an undue burden on developers. Additionally, they felt it was unnecessary as the current language allows the City to require a penthouse when the situation is appropriate.

Chair Hurt stated that he was under the impression that ARB was looking for additional direction on penthouse screening and he would like to discuss this directly with the members of ARB. He suggested that ARB be invited to the next PPW meeting so the parameters can be addressed. He respects their opinion and would like to discuss this topic further with ARB.

**Councilmember Ohley made a motion to forward P.Z. 13-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code-Article 4), as recommended by the Planning Commission, to City Council with a recommendation to approve.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

**Councilmember Ohley made a motion to invite the Architectural Review Board to a future Planning & Public Works Committee meeting to further discuss penthouse screening of HVAC equipment.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos 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 1, 2021 City Council Meeting. See Bill No.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 13-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code-Article 4).]**

IV. **OTHER** – None.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.