

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator
FROM: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services

JW



SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, August 23, 2018

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, August 23, 2018 in the Council Chambers.

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

Also in attendance were: Councilmember Michael Moore (Ward III); Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen; Planning Commission Member James Rosenauer; Planning Commission Member Gene Schenberg; Jim Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services; Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner; and Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 6:46 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the August 9, 2018 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of August 9, 2018. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0**.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to discuss Unfinished Business Item C first. The motion was seconded by Chair Ohley and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0**.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- C. Mobil Mart at Baxter and Clayton (Brite Worx): A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 1.72 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the western corner of the intersection of Clayton Road and Baxter Road. (Ward 3)

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, stated that this item was last reviewed at the August 9, 2018 Planning & Public Works Committee. At that time the Committee requested some changes to the building materials and accessory items.

Since that meeting, the applicant has submitted revised elevations that include the removal of blue from the top of the towers, replacing the brick veneer with stone veneer, changing the stone used in the stone base, and changing the color of the EIFS. Additional changes were also made to the vacuum stations. The proposed stations will have a gray canopy and the canopy and the entire system (poles, trashcans and mat racks) will be gray. Their corporate color has been darkened and they are proposing an 8' Artisan masonry wall in lieu of the 6' wall originally proposed around the button hook portion of the site.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Hurt stated that signage is the next phase after the Site Development phase. The Petitioner is allowed to have signage on the wall facing Clayton Road and the wall facing Baxter Road. Ms. Henry stated they are also allowed to have two monument signs, one on each roadway where the development has frontage; one on Clayton Road and one on Baxter Road. Regarding signs on the building, Ms. Henry stated they are allowed to have one attached business sign on any three of the walls. Each sign can be no larger in size than 5% of the total square footage of the elevation or a maximum of 300 square feet. In this case, the signs would fall under the 5% requirement.

Regarding the west elevation, Councilmember Hurt stated that in speaking with Councilmember Moore and the residents, it was determined that the blue arched line on the roofline does not serve any purpose and will not be visible from either Clayton Road or Baxter Road. Additionally, the proposed 8 foot fence between the residents and the property, will not completely screen this view from the residents.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to forward to City Council a recommendation to approval the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Mobil Mart at Baxter and Clayton (Brite Worx) with an amendment to remove the blue at the roofline on the west elevation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos.

Discussion after the Motion

Kevin Kamp, Civil Environmental Consultants, stated that the building itself acts as the branding. This is a very unique building that is designed to house this car wash. The building has curves and atmospheres that provide the brand that customers will recognize when they approach the building as well as when they are paying. Mr. Kamp emphasized the concessions that have already been made so far:

1. The branding color from the free vacuums has been removed.
2. The blue around the top of the towers added a nice architectural touch to the building, but this has been removed.
3. The Petitioner has been amenable to any changes to the fence surrounding the button hook area.
4. There was a concern about the width of the panel fascia board that surrounds the structure. It has been reduced from 24 inches wide down to 18 inches.
5. Almost all of the blue corporate color, which is perceived as an important element by the owner, has been eliminated. He expressed concern that the Committee is now requesting that the "swish" of blue over the west elevation roofline be eliminated. He explained that this particular "swish" of blue is very particular to this building and to this brand as it is one of the last elements that will identify the brand.

Mr. Kamp noted that they have worked in the spirit of collaboration and questioned as to “when have we reached the point where enough is enough?”

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

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services, for additional information on Mobil Mart at Baxter and Clayton (Brite Worx).]

A. Parking Stall Dimensions

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, stated that at the July 19, 2018 Planning & Public Works Committee meeting, Staff presented an analysis of the City’s requirements for parking stall sizes. At that meeting, Staff was directed to provide additional information regarding the composition of the “U.S. Vehicle Fleet.”

Based on the 2017 Federal Highway Administration’s National Household Travel Survey, approximately half of all vehicles fall under the “automobile/car/station wagon” classification of the fleet with combined classifications of SUV and Pickup Trucks accounting for another 39.6% of the fleet. Staff then selected some of the largest trucks and SUVs and compared dimensions for each of them and their respective percentage of U.S. Vehicle Fleet. Those six vehicles, including all configurations of their models, make up about 7.2% of the U.S. Passenger Vehicle Fleet.

Although some of the very large vehicles would protrude into the drive aisle from a 19 foot parking stall, they would all be able to fit in a 9 foot wide stall and vehicles in the drive aisle can generally navigate around longer parked vehicles with ease. Staff, therefore, continues to recommend that no changes be made to the parking stall size requirements.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Flachsbart stated his concern is that larger SUVs and pickup trucks are becoming the norm and while they do fit into a standard parking stall, it is sometimes difficult to exit the vehicles. He suggested that the analysis be repeated again in three years to see if there is any significant change in the data.

Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to accept Staff’s report and request that Staff repeat the analysis in three years. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt.

Discussion after the Motion

Councilmember Hurt complimented Ms. Henry for her analysis. He understands Councilmember Flachsbart’s concern and concurred with reviewing it again in three years.

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

B. Mixed Use Parking

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, stated that at the July 19, 2018 Planning & Public Works Committee meeting, Staff provided information on parking requirements for mixed-use developments. As requested by the Committee, two additional examples of larger mixed-use developments were selected; The Domain (Austin, Texas) and Avalon (Alpharetta, Georgia).

Ms. Henry stated both developments are very high quality in terms of architecture and the mix of uses utilizing a lot of vertical and horizontal integration of the uses. Many of the interior boulevards have a walkable European feel. Both Austin and Alpharetta are thriving communities, with Austin being a true city and Alpharetta being a more suburban but thriving city.

The Domain in Austin is a 300+ acre site. When comparing Chesterfield's parking calculations with Austin's, there is quite a bit of difference. However, this difference may be attributed to different tolerances for parking availability, different urban settings with Austin being a large city and not a suburb, and availability of public transit options.

The Avalon in Alpharetta is an 86 acre site which would be similar to the size of a development that Chesterfield could possibly see. Chesterfield's parking calculation is very comparable with Alpharetta's.

Ms. Henry pointed out that neither development was parked according to their code calculations. Both developments utilized a parking demand study to look at the unique mix of uses and the additional parking services provided, such as valet parking and restricted residential parking. This method entails looking at the actual characteristics of the development to determine a customized parking number rather than just going by the base code calculations. Chesterfield's parking code typically includes a process for reviewing parking demand studies based on unique characteristics of the development that focus on the mix of uses, size of the development and its location within the broader context of the community.

After reviewing this additional information in conjunction with the City's current requirements, Staff continues to recommend that no changes be made to the Unified Development Code at this time.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Hurt complimented Ms. Henry on her analysis. However, he does not agree with her final recommendation. He believes that there will be a shift from retail to office use and suggested that Council consider changing the Code from 1 parking space per 250 square feet of retail and 1 parking space per 330 feet for office to 1 parking space per 250 square feet for both retail and office. He feels that the City should base its assumption on what the mix is going to be in 25 years.

Councilmember Flachsbart also complimented Ms. Henry on her analysis. He does not have an objection to trying to look ahead and concurs with Councilmember Hurt that we are likely to see more office and less retail over time and that we should adjust the Code to anticipate this change.

Ms. Henry pointed out that the Code actually has three different categories of retail. The largest category is regional retail which has the highest parking ratio of 5.0 per 1,000 square feet.

There are two steps down from this category of 4.5 per 1,000 square feet and 4.0 per 1,000. These step downs would be for a smaller boutique or a small retail establishment. The office category is just one general office category; it is not based on the overall size of the office. A smaller accountant's office would not need as much parking versus a large corporate headquarters. Staff can look at a structured approach to office parking based on size similar to retail.

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services, suggested that Staff look into it further and report back to the Committee rather than changing the Code at this time.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Comprehensive Plan and Travel Demand Model

STAFF REPORT

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services, stated that City Council recently approved a transfer of \$300,000 to fund an update to the City's Comprehensive Plan and Travel Demand Model. The Request for Qualifications was issued and an interview process with several consultants was conducted. The interview team selected a preferred consultant for both the Comprehensive Plan and the Travel Demand Model. After detailed negotiations, the costs for the proposed contracts total \$334,207, as noted below:

- Comprehensive Plan: \$210,906
- Traffic Demand Model: \$123,302

Staff recommends an additional \$50,000 be approved by City Council to cover the \$35,000 in excess of the original estimate, and contingency costs for any incidentals that may arise during the process.

Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion recommending that City Council approve an additional \$50,000 to fund the two projects with the understanding that any remaining funds be refunded to the General Fund. The motion was seconded by Chair Ohley.

DISCUSSION

Citizen Input

Councilmember Hurt pointed out that the proposal recommends a 7-day "Planapalooza" for the Comprehensive Plan to include multiple presentations, technical roundtable discussions, public input sessions, and client meetings. He expressed concern that a one-week window of time is not sufficient to get good public input noting that some individuals may not be available during the specified week. He also suggested that consideration be given to establishing focus groups as such groups proved beneficial in the past.

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services, explained that the term *technical roundtable discussions* is a similar concept to focus groups. These focus groups would include experts in the particular field and those individuals who would be impacted by the Plan's recommendations. He also noted that the meetings would be open to anyone in the community making the focus groups both inclusive and targeted.

Mr. Wyse also explained that the Planapalooza includes focus groups that would go into further depth on identified subjects, such as the urban core.

Planning Commission Chair Hansen stated that she understands Councilmember Hurt's concern, but pointed out that if the time period is extended, the costs will increase.

Discussion items:

- Discussion as to how the 7-day period would be scheduled – whether a full 7-day period running from Sunday-Saturday, or Monday-Friday with an additional two days within the traditional work week.
- Discussion on possibly extending the 7-day period to 14 days and the costs associated with such an extension. It was noted that the time and money budgeted for the Planapalooza is 535 hours at a cost of \$75,750, and entails *Tasks 4.2.1 thru 4.2.8*. Mr. Wyse cautioned against increasing the time and money at this point without first going through the process to determine how much citizen engagement there is.
- Suggestion made to utilize already-scheduled events to maximize the number of people engaged.
- Councilmember Hurt stated that the goal is to find out what the residents want vs. having the “technical people” tell the residents what they need.
- Mr. Wyse pointed out that there have been a number of recent projects that spurred resident opposition and the email addresses associated with these projects could be used to contact residents about citizen participation on focus groups.
- Councilmember Flachsbart expressed his concern that the City may have trouble attracting the same kind of intelligent and helpful resident input as it did when the City first created the Comp Plan and its subsequent update during the moratorium period.
- Councilmember Hurt pointed out that there is significant interest among residents about how the Chesterfield Mall area will be redeveloped.
- Concern was expressed that if the Planapalooza was conducted during traditional working hours, it would prevent participation from a large portion of employed residents.
- It was pointed out that the Committee wants to have both developers and residents involved in the same meetings discussing the same topics together. Consequently, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday-Friday may not be a feasible meeting time.
- Recommendation made that a representative from the consulting firm attend a City Council meeting to address any concerns.
- Chair Ohley stated that she wants the Committee to be mindful that any requests outside of the scope of the proposal will require additional funds. Councilmember Hurt stated that additional funding would be worth the investment if it provides the type of input necessary to have a Comp Plan that would be relevant for the next 10 years.
- Prior to approving additional costs, Councilmember Mastorakos suggested that the consulting firm provide detailed information about each task within the proposal, and specifically *Task 2.6 Community Kick-Off*.
- Councilmember Hurt stated that he would like to be involved in the process of choosing residents to serve on the focus groups and asked how the selection process will be conducted. Mr. Wyse stated that the consultant will conduct individual interviews with each member of the Planning Commission and City Council, as well as some members of Staff. These interviews will help define how the process will be implemented.

Ms. Hansen requested that members of the Planning Commission be invited to the Council meetings to hear Council's discussion on the Comp Plan. Councilmember Hurt agreed and stated he would encourage the Planning Commission to attend the Council meetings.

Chair Ohley called for a vote on the previously-stated motion to approve an additional \$50,000 to fund the two projects. The vote to approve passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

B. Planning Commission Training

STAFF REPORT

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services, stated that the City regularly provides training opportunities for members of the Planning Commission. The form of training has varied, but training in the past has been provided by the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL), staff led training or a third party facilitator.

Due to Staff's time constraints this year, Staff recommends hiring a third party facilitator to conduct the training. There is a substantial cost involved, however, this is a budgeted item so a budget transfer is not necessary.

This training is not limited to the Planning Commission. City Councilmembers will be invited as well as members from the various Boards and Commissions and the general public may attend as this will be considered an open meeting.

Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to receive and file Staff's recommendation to hire a third party facilitator to provide training. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos.

Discussion after the Motion

Councilmember Hurt stated he has no objections to the training, but he would prefer a "meeting of the minds." Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen concurred and suggested that it be included in the training.

The above motion was passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

IV. OTHER

Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen suggested that when interviewing nominees to serve on the Planning Commission, the Committee should query them about their willingness or ability to attend training and to stress the importance of such training. Formal training is a critical piece that can change how one approaches this job and makes for a better planning commissioner. Chair Ohley agreed that training is essential for them.

There was further discussion regarding what is expected of planning commissioners. Councilmember Flachsbart encouraged the Planning Commission to develop a one-page handout outlining the key elements that are expected of planning commissioners.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.