

MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Teresa J. Price, Director of Planning

DATE: August 30, 2005

SUBJECT: Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting Summary – **August 18, 2005**

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, August 18, 2005 in Conference Room 101.

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 Planning Commission Chair Stephanie Macaluso; Teresa Price, Director of Planning; Nick Hoover, 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 Fults made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of August 1, 2005. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.** (Councilmember Durrell abstained as she was not present at the August 1st meeting.)

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **The Villages of Kendall Bluff:** Site Development Plan, Architectural Elevations, Landscape Plan, and Lighting Plan for a 63.80 acre parcel located north of Olive Boulevard east of intersection with Ladue Road.

Project Planner Nick Hoover stated that the proposed project includes 115 single-family attached units. At the August 8, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting, a recommendation for approval was passed by a vote of 8-1 with the condition that all facades visible from Olive Street Road shall have the same exterior finishes as the front units. Ordinance No. 2133 states that City Council shall have automatic power of review for this site.

Chair Casey noted that one resident from Riverwoods Subdivision raised some concerns about the proposed project at the August 8th Planning Commission Meeting.

Planning Chair Stephanie Macaluso stated that one Commissioner expressed concern about water runoff. It was determined that this issue would be addressed by the Public Works Department.

The Architectural Review Board's comments included:

- A desire to see more articulation in the units.
- Wanted to avoid a monotonous look.
- Wanted to avoid large masses of roof
- Wanted to avoid massive-looking units

ARB felt that because of the design of the street, their concerns may not be much of an issue but should be considered. ARB did not offer any solutions for the concerns expressed.

It was noted that there are three builders involved in the proposed development:

- McBride (Units labeled A)
- Mayer Homes (Units labeled D)
- Fischer & Frichtel (Units labeled B & C)

Councilmember Geiger expressed concern about the amount of roof that would be seen in the development.

Concern was expressed by the Committee members about the units that would be seen from Olive Street Road and the amount of siding that would be visible. Mr. Hoover pointed out that a number of units whose rear facades are facing Olive are well below the proposed grade so they will not be visible from Olive. The only units that will be visible from Olive will be the sides of Unit 112A and 111A.

Councilmember Durrell did not want to see 100% siding on specific units as follows:

- Because of their potential visibility from Olive Street Road: Units 111A and 112A (sides); Units 112A, 113A, 114A and 115A (backs); and 115A (street side).
- Along the entrance road into the development: Units 1A (back and side) and 2A (back).
- The units bordering Ladue Bluffs: Units 80D, 81D, 108A, 109A, 110A, and 111A (backs).

Mr. Mike Falkner, JHB, developer for the Partnership addressed the Committee's concerns about what units would be seen from Olive Street Road. He stated that the area along Olive Street Road has an existing berm ranging from 5-10 feet high with existing trees on top of it. The proposed units are situated approximately 20-25 feet below this elevation making them impossible to see from Olive. The only unit that will be visible is the side of Unit 111A. Units 80 and 81D will set 50-75 feet away from the backs of Ladue Bluffs with an undisturbed area of mature trees between the two developments. Because of the topography of the area, the rooflines will be staggered. Mr. Falkner stated

that the Planning Commission only called out Unit 111A as requiring the same exterior finish on its side as the front.

Mr. Hoover clarified that Planning Commission did not specifically call out Unit 111A but stipulated that “all facades visible from Olive Street Road shall have the same exterior finishes as the front units.”

During discussion on the color of siding to be used in the development, it was noted that each homebuilder would have its own color scheme while using only one color of siding – each different from the others. McBride would be using a beige color on 26 units. Mayer has 28 units and would be using a gray/brown color (herringbone). Fischer is using a concrete board siding.

Councilmember Durrell thought that a variety of earth tone colors used by each homebuilder would be more appealing than just one color. Councilmember Fults felt that the number of colors proposed is appropriate and that the architecture can break up any potential monotony.

Since the rooflines will be more visible than the siding on the proposed development, the representative for McBride suggested rather than changing the color of siding, using a 30-year architectural-type roof shingle as opposed to the proposed 20-year pre-tab shingle. These types of shingles offer a lot of color variation with black, gray and white, which would add a lot to the curb appeal of the buildings and character to the roofline.

Councilmember Fults made a motion for all three homebuilders to provide 30-year architectural shingles on all units in the proposed development. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Councilmember Durrell still expressed concern about the use of only one color of siding per homebuilder and felt that the different colors used in Chesterfield Pointe are very attractive.

Councilmember Durrell asked the homebuilders to bring in samples of proposed materials for her review before the next City Council meeting.

Before the next City Council Meeting, the Committee members agreed to view the developments at Chesterfield Pointe (which has approximately 6 different earth tone shades for its siding), Chesterfield Bluffs (which has one color of siding that is broken up by the use of architecture), and the condos on Justus Post (which uses different colors of siding.)

Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward The Villages of Kendall Bluff to Council with a recommendation to approve the Site Development Plan, Architectural Elevations, Landscape Plan, and Lighting Plan which includes the use of 30-year architectural shingles for the entire development. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

- B. P.Z. 9-2005 Wilson Creek (Flower Homes, Inc.):** A request for a change of zoning from “NU” Non-Urban District/”FPNU” Flood Plain Non-Urban to “E-One Acre” for a 20.6 acre tract of land located on Wild Horse Creek Road, approximately .6 miles west of the intersection of Baxter Road and Wild Horse Creek Road. (18T130035)

Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning, stated that the Comp Plan shows a one-acre density. There are a total of twelve lots with the average lot size being 45,825 sq. ft. and a minimum lot size of 29,925 sq. ft. The building height is 50 feet. There is 46% tree cover.

The changes made by the Planning Commission to the Attachment A dealt with setbacks and tree preservation, specifically:

- How to handle custom homes with their accessory uses of decks and pools without having to go through the variance process with respect to tree preservation;
- A Tree Preservation Plan addressing the 30 Monarch trees on the site; and
- A landscaped screening to be put in behind the dedication area on Wilson Road.

Planning Chair Macaluso stated that the Planning Commission was pleased with what was sent forward to the Planning & Zoning Committee on this project especially with respect to the amount of tree preservation required. The Commission addressed the issue of setbacks because if the homeowner wanted to put in a deck or pool, he would have been required to go before the Board of Adjustment because such an addition would have gone beyond the setbacks. It was pointed out that the landscaped screening along Wilson Road will have the chance to mature before Wilson Road is widened.

Councilmember Durrell questioned whether the roots would be disturbed within the landscaped screening when other trees are removed along Wilson Road for its widening. Project Planner Hoover stated that it is possible that this could be done without disturbing the root system of the new trees.

Councilmember Fults appreciated the fact that the dense tree cover along Wild Horse Creek Road will be preserved by the developer. She noted the cooperation received from Mr. Flowers on this project.

Councilmember Durrell questioned why the homes were not situated further back on the lot to afford a larger front yard. It was noted that each homeowner, working with the developer, will determine how his home is situated on the lot.

Discussion was held regarding an easement for Griffith Lane. Mr. Flowers stated that the proposed development does not use Griffith Lane as an entry or exit point. When the title work was done, it did not show any easement for the existence of Griffith Lane on their property.

Councilmember Fults wanted to make sure that there is enough easement for Griffith Lane for any future developer who may want to widen it. It was felt that the required 20 foot easement stipulated in Attachment A was not large enough – it was felt that it should be 26 feet.

Mr. Flowers felt that Griffith Lane could not be used as a street because it is in flood plain and would not be accepted by Public Works as a public street. He further stated that he did not object to providing a wider easement.

Discussion was held regarding the language from MoDOT and item K.8 in Attachment A which states:

“For the Fire Protection Use to Griffith Lane, the improvements to Griffith Lane must meet Missouri Department of Transportation’s standard and require excavation permit.”

It was noted that K.8 was a revised comment from MoDOT. The Committee felt the language was confusing in that it appeared that it could require Mr. Flowers to make improvements to Griffith Lane even though he is not using Griffith Lane as an access point. It was felt that the language should be reviewed by the City Attorney to determine if it should be changed or removed.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to have City Attorney Doug Beach review Item K.8 of Attachment A for clarification or removal. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Councilmember Fults made a motion to increase the easement to Griffith Lane to 26 feet. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward P.Z. 9-2005 Wilson Creek (Flower Homes, Inc.) to Council with a recommendation to approve the request for a change of zoning. 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 September 7, 2005 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #**

Chair Casey amended the agenda to review item III.D. next.

D. The Establishment of Guidelines for the Annual Chesterfield Ancient History Award

Project Planner Hoover stated that the Committee had previously approved the establishment of the Ancient History Award. It is now being requested that the guidelines for the award be established. The City of Chesterfield’s Citizen of the Year Award guidelines have been modified to meet the needs of the Ancient History Award.

Mr. Mark Leech, Landmarks Preservation Commission member, addressed the Committee. The deadline for receiving nominations would be February 11, 2006. They would be reviewed by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, forwarded to the

Planning & Zoning Committee and then on to City Council. The award would be presented at a City Council meeting once a year.

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the guidelines for the Chesterfield Ancient History Award. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

C. Review of Lighting Requirements for Residential Subdivisions

It was noted that the City's Lighting Ordinance requires all fixtures to be flat-lens. Ameren UE does not provide this type of fixture for subdivisions.

Since Ameren's light fixtures do not meet the City's requirements, Ms. Price was clarifying the intent for this stipulation in the Ordinance.

The Committee agreed that the flat-lensed fixtures stipulated in the Lighting Ordinance were intended for commercial development. Subdivision lighting has a different use and purpose.

Until the Lighting Ordinance can be amended, it was agreed that Ameren UE fixtures can be used as subdivision lighting without being raised as an issue.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to direct Staff to clarify wording in the Lighting Ordinance with respect to commercial lighting vs. residential lighting on flat-lens fixtures. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

IV. PENDING PROJECTS/DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE

Ms. Price gave a PowerPoint presentation updating the Committee on the Department's Projects.

Signage

Councilmember Durrell questioned whether street numbers are required on signage for commercial buildings. Ms. Price stated she would check into this matter.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.