MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning

SUBJECT: Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting Summary
June 7, 2007

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, June 7, 2007 in Conference Room 101.

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

Also in attendance were Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); Maurice L Hirsch, Jr., Planning Commission Chair; Wendy Geckeler, Planning Commissioner; Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning; Aimee Nassif, Senior Planner; Mara Perry, Senior Planner; Jennifer Yackley, Project Planner; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

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

I. INTERVIEW OF PLANNING COMMISSION NOMINEE

Councilmember Geiger introduced Mr. Mike Watson, who has been nominated to serve on the Planning Commission. Mr. Watson would replace Commissioner Lynn O'Connor. He noted that Mr. Watson was president for Oak Subdivision and Chesterfield Village during the petitioning process for Justus Pointe.

Mr. Watson stated he has worked in Chesterfield Valley for Cambridge Engineering for the past 17 years as a mechanical engineer. He has been a resident of Chesterfield for 12 years. Prior to working for Cambridge Engineering, he served in the Air Force for 20 years, which included a tour of duty of Vietnam.

Councilmember Geiger asked Mr. Watson if he or his family has any financial interest in the City of Chesterfield. Mr. Watson replied that he does not.

Councilmember Hurt noted Mr. Watson's career with Cambridge Engineering and felt this would add some technical strength to the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Durrell stated that the Planning Commission is not ward-sensitive. Mr. Watson indicated his understanding of this.

Chair Fults explained that serving on the Planning Commission requires a lot of time and stressed the importance of attending the meetings. She then asked Mr. Watson for his thoughts on how the City has been developed to date.

Mr. Watson stated that he was working in the Valley during the flood of 1993. He has experienced the Valley before and after the flood. Since 1993, the traffic has increased immensely in the Valley, which he feels is a positive change for the City. The Valley has attracted new businesses to the area, along with the relocation of businesses from other cities. He likes the progressiveness of Chesterfield. He noted that as the population grows, "everything moves west". He felt that one of the goals of the Planning Commission should be to maintain Chesterfield's current focus over the next 20-40 years.

Planning Chair Hirsch invited Mr. Watson to observe the June 11th Planning Commission meeting. He noted that an orientation meeting with the Planning Staff would be scheduled for both Mr. Watson and Mr. Grissom in the near future.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the May 24, 2007 Planning and Zoning Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of May 24, 2007. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 28-2006 Chesterfield Neighborhood Office Park (17655 and 17659 Wild Horse Creek Road): A request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban to "PC" Planned Commercial District with a "WH" Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay for 8.04 acre tract of land located north of Wild Horse Creek Road and west of Long Road.

Staff Report

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Senior Planner, stated that City Council reviewed the petition on May 21st, at which time it was referred back to the Planning & Zoning Committee. She noted that the two green sheet amendments, which were previously unanimously passed by the Committee, had no action taken on them by City Council.

Planning Commission Report

Chair Fults asked Planning Chair Hirsch to provide the Committee with information relative to the Planning Commission's intent when they adopted the Wild Horse overlay. She asked that he specifically address the parking requirements.

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the parking requirements are based on the notion of an "RBU" considering that most of the sites are fairly small – one-half to one acre in size. The idea was to have a residential kind of development in terms of how the office buildings would look. Because the buildings would be smaller, there would be minimal parking.

The overlay also includes a provision for modifying the parking requirement due to good planning. When dealing with large tracts of land, consideration has to be given as to how many square feet of building will be allowed. Parking will then have to be provided for the square footage permitted based upon the City's general ordinances. He noted that the bowtie area includes some large blocks of land, which includes the subject petition.

Chair Fults referred to the Staff Report which states: "The effect of the development requirements would be that a commercial area would be developed which would not resemble a standard planned commercial district." Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the intent was to have very limited uses, with the architecture giving a residential feel.

Planning Commission's Approval of the Petition

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the Planning Commission reviewed the original plan, which included 48,000 square feet of development. The development was then reduced to 40,000 square feet.

The discussion of the Planning Commission dealt with the scale of the project on the site and the amenities in terms of architecture, hardscape, water, etc., - all of which are proposed as part of the development.

Taking everything into consideration, the Commission felt that the proposed 40,000 square feet was a reasonable amount of square footage for the site.

Chair Fults asked if the Planning Commission reviewed the petition in terms of the Wild Horse Creek overlay. Planning Chair Hirsch replied that the Commission did. The Commission considered the size of the project in terms of its acreage; and considered what would be appropriate for the site with respect to the overall look and feel of the project. They felt that the proposed architecture looked residential in nature and would fit in with the surrounding residential properties.

The Planning Commission's vote to approve the petition was 8 to 1 with Commissioner Geckeler voting "no". At the time of the vote, the Commission understood the requirements of the Wild Horse Overlay and understood the

precedent-setting of this particular property. He noted that the overlay guidelines include a provision for modifying parking if good planning can be demonstrated.

DISCUSSION

Chair Fults felt that the subject petition does not meet the intent of the Planning Commission and does not meet the requirements of the overlay. As a result, Staff was asked to review the overlay and to provide information on how an Attachment A would look based on the overlay requirements.

Parking/Square Footage

Ms. Nassif stated that in order to meet the current overlay parking requirements, with no modification, the subject petition would only be permitted 36 parking spaces for the four proposed buildings. It was noted that the overlay allows nine parking spaces per building. If the building configuration is altered, the parking number would be altered also.

The Attachment A currently allows 160 parking spaces, which is based on the City's standard parking requirements for general office and medical office. General office is parked at 4 spaces/1000 square feet; medical office is parked at 4.5 spaces/1000 square feet. The Committee has the ability to modify the permitted parking for the site.

Councilmember Geiger noted that the eight-acre site includes two acres of the bluff area, which forces the Petitioner to build on only six acres. He does not feel that the proposed 40,000 square feet on six acres achieves the goals of the "Neighborhood Office Overlay". He feels that a reduction in square footage is required.

He also stated that he would not want a reduction in square footage to come back in as all "medical" use as such a use would require more parking that an "office" use.

Councilmember Durrell felt the RBU parking requirement is a "distraction". She noted that the permitted uses are in conflict with the number of parking spaces allowed. She felt that the Planning Commission should modify this wording.

Councilmember Durrell felt that the proposed 40,000 square feet for the site is acceptable. She noted that the Petitioner has revised the plan a number of times and she felt that the architecture is compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods. She stated that the development is not visible from Wild Horse Creek Road.

Councilmember Nation referred to the Staff Report which indicates that the intent of the Neighborhood Office is to have "very limited uses". The uses and parking are to be very limited so as not to create any traffic or safety concerns and to preserve the natural character of the area. He noted that there is a 12,000 square foot daycare center directly in front of the subject site. Directly across the

street is Chesterfield Elementary School. He feels that the proposed development is too dense and would adversely affect the traffic along Wild Horse Creek Road.

Referring to the parking requirements for the overlay allowing only 36 spaces for the site, Councilmember Nation suggested that some flexibility be allowed taking into consideration the size of the parcel and the architecture proposed. He recommended doubling the parking to allow 72 spaces, which would permit 18,000 square feet.

Chair Fults felt that the proposal does not have a neighborhood feel. She also stated that this site will set a precedent for the rest of the area and expressed concern that 160 parking spaces are permitted on these six acres. She felt this would lead to "a huge parking lot for the entire bowtie area". She agrees with the requirements of the overlay but does not feel this petition meets them.

Petitioner's Presentation:

Mr. Ed Griesedieck, Attorney for the Petitioner, stated that as a Developer, they look at the guidelines provided by the City. He noted that the guidelines for this site allow an "educational, collegiate" use. Such a use is not feasible with only nine parking spaces. He stated that the uses allowed cannot be parked with only nine spaces. The nine-space parking requirement only works on small lots. As a result, the guidelines allow a modification to parking for larger tracts of lands.

Since the proposed project is on a large parcel, they did not use the nine-space parking requirement when planning the site. They worked within all the other guidelines of the overlay. They provided open space of 65% vs. the 50% required – without the bluff, 52% open space is provided. Mr. Griesedieck noted that the ordinance does not require the removal of the bluff in calculating open space.

Chair Fults stated that the ordinance calls for plazas and she noted that the plazas being proposed service the office buildings and are facing the bluff. The intent was to have the plazas seen from the residents' side. She felt the residents would only see a parking lot and the back of a building.

Mr. Griesedieck disagreed and noted that the site is over 800' away from Wild Horse Creek Road – he did not feel that a one-story building would be visible from the road. He also pointed out there is an 80' setback along the front of the site. If the City wants this area heavily landscaped or wants an 8' high berm, they are willing to provide it. He didn't feel the petition should be denied because of a visibility concern.

He stated that the Developer is bound by the guidelines and felt the City should be bound by the same guidelines. He noted that the approved daycare has a greater density than the proposed development.

Chair Fults pointed out that the daycare center is a residential use under a Conditional Use Permit. She feels that the proposed plan is identical to the plan that was submitted prior to the implementation of the overlay requirements.

Mr. Griesedieck stated that the original plan was 48,000 square feet; it is now 40,000 square feet. Additional landscaping has been added; the road has been changed; paths and plaza areas have been added; and architectural changes have been made to the buildings.

Density

Councilmember Durrell noted that the Stoneridge Office Development has 130,000 square feet on nine acres, which backs up to Chesterfield Hill. This is almost 14,000 square feet per acre. The proposed development of 40,000 square feet computes to 5,000 square feet per acre. Because of these calculations, she feels the subject petition falls under the definition of "Neighborhood Office Park".

Chair Fults stated that there are approximately six acres of non-disturb land behind Stoneridge, which backs up to the residents.

Councilmember Durrell felt that the proposed site would not be visible from the road because the buildings are one-story in height and would be screened with trees 800' back from the road.

Chair Fults noted that the playground of Christian Church is visible and it is approximately 800' from the road. Councilmember Hurt stated that the Petitioner offered to provide a landscaped berm, which would address the visibility concern.

Chair Fults made a motion to amend the Attachment A as follows: (changes in green)

> **Section I.C.1.b.**
> There shall be a maximum of ~~four (4)~~ **three (3) 6,000 square-foot, one-story** buildings on this site. The total square footage shall not exceed ~~40,000~~ **18,000** square feet.
>
> **Section I.E.1.a.**
> A maximum of ~~160~~ **72** parking spaces shall be permitted for this site.

Discussion on the Motion

Mr. Steinbach, representing the Petitioner, stated that they want to work with the City on this development. He noted that the site cannot be built with only 72 parking spaces and 18,000 square feet.

The above motion died due to the lack of a second.

Councilmember Hurt felt that a decision should be made based upon a maximum footprint and the character of the neighborhood. Consideration should then be given on how to park the site based upon the desired character. He stated that if the site was developed as residential, eight acres would allow eight houses of 5,000 square feet each equaling 40,000 square feet.

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to amend the Attachment A as follows: (changes in green)

> **Section I.C.1.b.**
> There shall be a maximum of ~~four (4)~~ **three (3)** buildings on this site **comprised of one (1) two-story building with a 9,000 square foot footprint and two (2) one-story buildings with each having a 9,000 square foot footprint**. The total square footage shall not exceed ~~40,000~~ **36,000** square feet.

The above motion died due to the lack of a second.

.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to amend the Attachment A as follows: (changes in green)

> **Section I.C.1.b.**
> ~~There shall be a maximum of four (4) buildings on this site~~. The total square footage **on this site** shall not exceed ~~40,000~~ **30,000** square feet.
>
> **Section I.E.1.a.**
> A maximum of ~~160~~ **120** parking spaces shall be permitted for this site.

The motion was seconded by Chair Fults.

Discussion on the Motion

Mr. Steinbach stated that the Petitioner should be consulted as to what he is willing to do before a motion is made determining how the site is to be built. It has been previously suggested that the Council look at The Pines development and the development next to Grayfield to see developments comparable to the one being proposed in terms of footprint. Chair Fults responded that the Committee is trying to decide how much square footage will be allowed on the acreage along Wild Horse Creek Road because this site will be setting a precedent for the area.

Representing the residents, Ms. Rene Henney stated that their concern relates to the building use and the amount of traffic the use will generate. The proposed plan does not appear to be “neighborhood office” based on the definitions that

were set forth. The residents are looking for smaller buildings, less parking, and more green space.

Councilmember Hurt stated he would not vote on a motion that does not specify a footprint size. He feels that the size of the footprint is important to insure it is compatible with the neighborhood. He recommended a 5,000 square-foot footprint.

Planning Chair Hirsch asked for clarification of the issues of "usable square footage" vs. "footprint". He felt that the proposed 40,000 square feet is usable square footage, which would require a footprint larger than 5,000 square feet.

Councilmember Geiger amended his motion as follows: (amendments in red)

> **Section I.C.1.b.**
> ~~There shall be a maximum of four (4) buildings on this site~~. The total square footage **on this site** shall not exceed ~~40,000~~ **30,000** square feet **with buildings having a 5,000 square-foot footprint and a maximum height of 45 feet.**
>
> **Section I.E.1.a.**
> A maximum of ~~160~~ **120** parking spaces shall be permitted for this site.

Chair Fults seconded the amendment to the motion.

Discussion on the Amended Motion

It was noted that a 5,000 square-foot footprint would allow both one and two-story buildings. Ms. Henney asked if allowing two-story buildings would set a precedent for other sites closer to Wild Horse Creek Road. City Attorney Heggie stated this would not be setting a precedent taking into consideration the overlay guidelines and the fact that the subject site is clearly different than any other parcel in this area.

Councilmember Geiger amended the above motion as follows (amendments in blue):

> **Section I.C.1.b.**
> ~~There shall be a maximum of four (4) buildings on this site~~. The total square footage **on this site** shall not exceed ~~40,000~~ **30,000** square feet **with buildings having a 5,000 square-foot footprint and a maximum height of 45 feet. The maximum height of 45 feet is being allowed because of the distance from Wild Horse Creek Road.**
>
> **Section I.E.1.a.**
> A maximum of ~~160~~ **120** parking spaces shall be permitted for this site.

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

Landscaped Berm
Discussion was held on whether the Petitioner should be required to provide a berm with trees.

Mr. Geisel recommended that this issue be addressed at Landscape Review.

Chair Fults made a motion requiring the berm to being heavily landscaped parallel to the east-west collector road, as directed by the City of Chesterfield. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0,**

Chair Hirsch reported that Staff is now taking specific notes about Committee recommendations that pertain to Site Plan and Landscape Plan issues to insure that all recommendations are addressed at that time.

Automatic Power of Review
Chair Fults made a motion requiring Automatic Power of Review of the Site Plan and Landscape Plan for this development. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Parking Requirements of the Overlay
Councilmember Hurt recommended that the Planning Commission review the parking requirements of the Wild Horse Overlay.

Councilmember Geiger pointed out that the remaining parcels are smaller than the subject petition. He suggested that the existing parking requirement of nine spaces remain.

Councilmember Durrell made a motion directing the Planning Commission to review the RBU comparison with Neighborhood Office for the sake of clarification. The motion **died due to the lack of a second.**

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to amend the Attachment A as follows:

> **Section I.E.1.b.**
> ~~Phantom parking may be utilized for 42 of the parking spaces for this development as directed by or with the consent of the City of Chesterfield.~~

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

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward P.Z. 28-2006 Chesterfield Neighborhood Office Park (17655 and 17659 Wild Horse Creek Road), as

amended, 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 June 18, 2007 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 28-2006 Chesterfield Neighborhood Office Park (17655 and 17659 Wild Horse Creek Road).]

B. P.Z. 02-2007 The Estates at Upper Kehrs Mill (Miceli Construction): A request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban to "E" One Acre District for a 10.2 acre tract of land located on the eastern side of Kehrs Mill Road, 4,100 feet south of its intersection with Wild Horse Creek Road. (19U530062, 19U530392)

Chair Fults announced that a Protest Petition has been filed for this petition. The Protest Petition Hearing has been set for June 21, 2007.

Because of the Protest Petition, the Committee did not discuss the petition.

Chair Fults noted that at the last meeting, the Committee requested information from Staff regarding this petition. She asked that it be available for the June 21st meeting.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Stoneridge Office Building: An Amended Site Development Plan and a Sign Package for a 9.3 acre parcel of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the south side of South Outer 40 Road, northeast of Yarmouth Point Drive and Candish Lane.

Staff Report

Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner, stated that this project has Automatic Power of Review. The Planning Commission approved it on May 30th by a vote of 6 to 0 with the condition that one additional directional sign be added towards the entrance. This additional sign will have to be reviewed by MoDOT because it is located in the North Outer Forty right-of-way.

The proposed signage on the building falls within the 5% of square footage of the face of the building. The signs on the north and east elevations do not exactly match due to the unique architecture of the building. The signs do have the same elements – the names of the businesses, etc.

The monument sign is in compliance with the ordinance requirements of height, square footage, and location.

The directional signs are in compliance with the zoning requirements of height and square footage. Handicapped parking signage is also provided.

DISCUSSION

Signage with Postal Addresses

Councilmember Durrell commended the petitioner for providing signage with the post office address. She urged the Planning Department to encourage developers to have signage showing addresses.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to forward the Amended Site Development Plan and Sign Package for Stoneridge Office Building to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger.

Because she has been a BJC employee for the past 22 years, Chair Fults stated she would be abstaining from voting on the Amended Site Development Plan and the following Ordinance Amendment.

The motion to approve passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0 with 1 abstention from Chair Fults.

Note: This is an Amended Site Development Plan and Sign Package which require approval by City Council. A voice vote will be needed at the June 18, 2007 City Council Meeting.

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning, for additional information on Stoneridge Office Building.]

B. P.Z. 18-2007 Stoneridge Office Building (Ordinance Amendment): A request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2145 to amend the parking requirements for a 9.3 acre "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the south side of South Outer 40 Road, northeast of Yarmouth Point Drive and Candish Lane (19R610400 and 19R620025)

Staff Report

Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner, stated that the Ordinance Amendment was approved by the Planning Commission on May 30th by a vote of 6 to 0.

The Petitioner has requested an amendment to allow 22 additional parking spaces. The additional spaces will not touch the do-not-disturb area. Additional trees will be added to the parking lot to be in compliance with the current Tree

Manual. Landscaping will also be provided to serve as a buffer from the neighboring residential area.

DISCUSSION

Discussions with Residents

It was determined that the Petitioner has not discussed the additional 22 parking spaces with the neighboring residents.

Councilmember Hurt stated he would not be able to vote in favor of the additional parking until he has met with the area residents. It is his understanding that the residents are concerned about the "green look of the area".

Ms. Perry reported that this Ordinance Amendment request had a full Public Hearing. No residents attended the Public Hearing. A few phone calls were received from residents but none of them voiced any concerns. She pointed out that the Petitioner is above the required open space calculation and is putting in additional trees.

Need for the Additional Parking

The Petitioner is anticipating additional business due to market conditions and due, particularly, to the Highway 40 closure. As a result, they are requesting the additional parking. They would like to have requested more parking, but the 22 parking spaces is the limit they can build without touching the do-not-disturb area, as well as staying within all current setbacks and regulations for the site.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward P.Z. 18-2007 Stoneridge Office Building (Ordinance Amendment) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed by a voice vote of 2 to 1 with 1 abstention from Chair Fults.** (Commissioner Hurt voted "no".)

Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the June 18, 2007 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 18-2007 Stoneridge Office Building (Ordinance Amendment).]

C. P.Z. 25-2006 Simply Storage (OB Development, LLC): A request for a change of zoning from a Non-Urban "NU" to a Planned Industrial "PI" for an approximately 2.3 acre tract of land located at 17555 and 17551 Chesterfield Airport Road east of the intersection of Long Road and Chesterfield Airport Road.

Chair Fults reported that the plans were revised after the Petitioner met with Ward IV Councilmembers and after being reviewed by the Planning Commission. She expressed her appreciation for the changes.

Staff Report

Ms. Jennifer Yackley, Project Planner, stated the original plan has been revised as follows:

- Height of the Building: Reduced from 53' to 41'10".
- Setback: The setback was not met on the original plan but it is now in compliance.
- Elevations: The second and third stories of the building have been stepped-back from the retail portion of the building. The retail portion is now one-story in height.

DISCUSSION

Cross Access

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to provide cross access to the east property as directed by the City of Chesterfield for any future development. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

It was noted that the reservoir is to the north of the site.

Chair Fults made a motion to forward P.Z. 25-2006 Simply Storage (OB Development, LLC), as amended, to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the June 18, 2007 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 25-2006 Simply Storage (OB Development, LLC).]

D. Evaluation/Discussion of the area west of Long Road, located within the Chesterfield Valley, in the context of "PI" vs. "PC"

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to hold the Evaluation/Discussion of the area west of Long Road, located within the Chesterfield Valley, in the context of "PI" vs. "PC" until the next Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting. The motion was seconded by Chair Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

V. PENDING PROJECTS/DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.