

# MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary  
**November 8, 2007**

---

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, November 8, 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 Mike Casey (Ward III); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr., Planning Commission Chair; Lu Perantoni, Planning Commissioner; Rob Heggie, City Attorney; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Aimee Nassif, Senior Planner; Mara Perry, Senior Planner; Charles Campo, Project Planner; Justin Wyse, Project Planner; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

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

## I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

### A. Approval of the October 18, 2007 Committee Meeting Summary

**Councilmember Geiger made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of October 18, 2007.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

## II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **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 the petition was before the Planning Commission on May 30, 2007 and was recommended for approval by a vote of 6 to 0. The petition was then before the Planning & Zoning Committee on June 7<sup>th</sup> with a recommendation to move it forward to City Council by a vote of 3 to 1. At the June 18<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting, the petition had its first reading and was then tabled indefinitely at the July 16<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting.

The City Attorney has recommended the following amendments to the Attachment A **(amendments shown in red)**:

### **AMENDMENT 1 - Section I. Specific Criteria, A. Permitted Uses**

1. The uses allowed in this "PC" Planned Commercial District shall be:
  - a. Offices or office buildings, **and** medical office ~~and ancillary uses provided to the major office and medical uses.~~
  - b. Parking areas, including garages, for automobiles, but not including any sales of automobiles, or the storage of wrecked or otherwise damaged and immobilized automotive vehicles for a period in excess of seventy-two (72) hours.
2. The above uses in the "PC" Planned Commercial District shall be restricted as follows:
  - a. One (1) three (3)-story office building, not including basement area.
  - b. One (1) four (4)-level parking structure or two hundred seventy-two (272) surface parking spaces.

**3. The following ancillary uses shall be permitted:**

- a. Automatic vending facilities for:**
  - i. Ice and solid carbon dioxide (dry ice);**
  - ii. Beverages;**
  - iii. Confections.**
  
- b. Cafeterias for employees and guests only.**

**AMENDMENT 2 - Section I. Specific Criteria, E. Landscape and Tree Requirements**

Amends having the Landscape Maintenance Bond in place for three years vs. two years. Ms. Perry noted that a three-year bond is already in place for this project.

**3. The required Landscape Maintenance Bond will be in place for an additional one (1) year for a total of three (3) years.**

**AMENDMENT 3 - Section I. Specific Criteria, G. Light Requirements**

- 3. All light standards located **in the parking lot** or on the parking structure, other than those for security purposes, will be turned off by 9:00 p.m., seven (7) days a week.

**DISCUSSION**

Councilmember Hurt and Councilmember Casey expressed their agreement with the above amendments.

Councilmember Casey stated that the requested amendment to the parking requirement is the major issue as to why the petition was tabled by City Council.

**Councilmember Hurt made a motion to accept the three proposed amendments to the Attachment A and to forward them 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.**

While the Committee accepts the amendments, Councilmember Hurt noted that the Committee still has issue with the petitioner's request for an amendment to the parking requirement that would allow an additional 22 surface parking spaces.

### III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **St. Luke's Hospital Parcel B (Outpatient Services):** Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Landscape Plan and Signage for 21.75 acres of land zoned "MU" Medical Use District located on the northwest corner of Highway 141 (Woods Mill Road) at the intersection with Brookings Park Drive.

#### **Staff Report**

Ms. Mara Perry stated that Parcel B is the Outpatient Services Building across the road from the main hospital. The petitioner is requesting amendments to their plan for the following two items:

1. A landscaped median is being requested at the approved entrance to the development. The Landscape Plan is being amended to add additional landscaping into the median.
2. The petitioner is requesting additional height and additional square footage of face for the two approved monument signs. The requested additional height is 9.375 inches; the requested additional square footage is 11.95 square feet.

#### **Planning Commission Report**

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the Planning Commission approved the amendments by a vote of 7 to 1. Commissioner Broemmer voted against the amendments but did not state a reason for his vote. The remaining Commissioners felt that the proposed landscaping and scale of the sign were appropriate for the site.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **Median**

Ms. Perry stated that the petitioner needs to widen the median by a foot in each direction to meet the Fire District's requirements. The change to the median impacts the landscaping and height of the sign.

Councilmember Durrell expressed her support of this median but noted that she generally does not support medians in main roadways or in drives coming off a main road as she feels they can cause confusion for motorists making left-hand turns.

**Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the median and proposed landscaping and to forward the amendment to City Council. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed** by a voice vote of **4 to 0.****

### **Monument Signs**

**Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the requested changes in height and square footage for the monument signs and to forward the amendment to City Council. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.****

Councilmember Durrell asked the Petitioner to meet with her to help her understand how the sign will appear. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates, replied that a mock-up of plywood could be made to show the height and size of the sign.

**Note: This is a Site Development Section Plan which requires approval by City Council. A voice vote will be needed at the November 19, 2007 City Council Meeting.**

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

- B. P.Z. 29-2007 Elbridge Payne Office Park (1281 Chesterfield Parkway East):** A request for an amendment to St. Louis County Ordinance Number 8,800 for an amendment to the parking setback requirement for Elbridge Payne Office Park, an approximately 5.4 acre tract of land, zoned “C-8” Planned Commercial District and located at the intersection of Chesterfield Parkway East and Elbridge Payne Road.

### **Staff Report**

Mr. Charles Campo, Project Planner, stated that the request is for an amendment to the governing Ordinance to allow for a zero-foot parking setback from all interior parcel lines. The zero-foot parking setback will only apply to the lots west of Elbridge Payne Road.

Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, stated that the site is being sub-divided. In sub-dividing the parking lot, a line is being cut through the middle of the parking lot necessitating a zero setback.

The site currently has two lots – the Petitioner is proposing three lots.

Mr. Campo stated that on July 7, 2003, City Ordinance No. 1940 for a lot split was approved, but the Ordinance was never recorded by the Petitioner. The Petitioner re-applied for the same lot split in August, 2006. At that time, it was realized that the lot would not be able to be split and still be in conformance with the Ordinance with respect to the required five-foot parking setback.

### **Petitioner's Report**

Mr. Mike Doster, representing the Petitioner, stated that the land which is subject to this amendment is owned by Sachs entities. The Petitioner is requesting the amendment because they need separate lots for financing reasons. The Ordinance was not recorded in 2003 because the lender never executed the plat and the time elapsed for recording it.

### **Planning Commission Report**

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the Commission had no issues with the requested amendment.

**Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward P.Z. 29-2007 Elbridge Payne Office Park (1281 Chesterfield Parkway East) 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 November 19, 2007 City Council Meeting.  
See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, for additional information on P.Z. 29-2007 Elbridge Payne Office Park (1281 Chesterfield Parkway East).]**

- C. P.Z. 42-2007 Spirit Valley Business Park II (18730 Olive Street Road):** A request for a change of zoning from a "NU" Non-Urban District to a "PI" Planned Industrial District for an approximately 27.4 acre parcel of land located at 18730 Olive Street Road, south of Olive Street Road and west of Wardenburg. (17W420024)

### **Staff Report**

Mr. Justin Wyse, Project Planner, stated that the Public Hearing was held on October 8, 2007. At that time, several issues were raised by the Planning Commission and Staff. The Petitioner has since addressed all of the issues.

The Attachment A was drafted to replicate the Attachment A for Spirit Valley Business Park I, which is located immediately east of the subject site.

The project went before the Planning Commission on October 22, 2007 and was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

The Petitioner is also requesting a modification to the parking requirements. The subject site is located in Sub Area 1 of the Comprehensive Plan, which suggests

a parking standard of 4 spaces/1,000 square feet. The Petitioner is requesting that they be held to the parking requirements of Section 1003.165 of the City Code. This parking requirement was granted to Spirit Valley Business Park I.

As a result of City Council's request, Staff has also drafted language for the Committee's review regarding recycling opportunities to be provided on the site.

### **Planning Commission Report**

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the Commission took a separate vote on the requested parking requirement. The Commission voted 8 to 0 on both the parking amendment and the rezoning request.

The Commission's basic concerns related to the development's conformance to Spirit Valley Business Park I's specifications with respect to uses, setbacks, parking, etc. The Commission was satisfied that the specifications were similar between the two developments.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Parking**

Parking for retail use varies. Parking for banks requires 5.5 parking spaces/1,000 square feet while general retail could require 4 or 5 spaces/1,000. The Petitioner is requesting the flexibility of not having to be fixed to one use.

Mr. Geisel stated that the site will be sub-divided into individual lots so the parking associated with a building will be related to the building itself, along with the use of the building.

### **Permitted Uses**

Councilmember Geiger expressed concern about the following requested uses:

- b. Meat packing facilities
- j. Filling stations, including emergency towing and repair services.
- l. Storage and charter of boats on land, repair facilities for boats, and sale of fuel and other supplies for marine use.
- m. Highway department garages.
- dd. Sales, servicing, repairing, cleaning, renting, leasing, and necessary outdoor storage of equipment and vehicles used by business, industry, and agriculture.
- ff. Storage and repair garages for public mass transit vehicles.
- mm. Yards for storage of contractors' equipment, materials, and supplies, excluding junk yards and salvage yards.

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the requested uses are the same uses approved for Spirit Valley Business Park I. Given the location of the site, Planning Commission felt the uses were appropriate.

Mr. Doster, representing the Petitioner, stated that Council approved these same uses for Spirit Valley Business Park I a few months ago. He felt that the uses should be identical for both Spirit Valley I and Spirit Valley II. If the uses are different, he feels it could present difficulties in marketing the property.

Mr. Stock noted the industrial look of the area. He stated that the City's reservoir location is immediately adjacent to the site; the Airport is proposing to build its maintenance facility to the south; and Fred Weber's asphalt plant is also immediately adjacent to the site.

Mr. Doster pointed out that Vermeer plans to move its facility from Chesterfield Airport Road to the Spirit Valley site. It is felt that the Spirit Valley site is more appropriate for Vermeer because of its outdoor storage of equipment.

Chair Fults stated she could accept the requested uses as long as there is adequate screening for any outdoor storage.

**Chair Fults made a motion requiring screening of exterior storage of materials and/or equipment along Olive Street Road. Said screening is to be directed by the City.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

#### **Cross Access**

The site has been set up so that there is cross access availability – all roads have been required to have cross access.

#### **Residential Home on the Site**

It was noted that there is a two-acre residential lot between Spirit Valley I and II. The home will be screened by a 30-foot landscape buffer.

#### **Recycling**

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to amend Section Q, "Miscellaneous" of the Attachment A by adding the following language:

- 3. An opportunity for recycling will be provided. All provisions of Chapter 25, Article VII, and Section 25-122 thru Section 25-126 of the City of Chesterfield, Missouri Code, with the exception of the land use designation, shall be required where applicable.**

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

#### **Road Completion**

Councilmember Durrell referred to the Attachment A which requires all roadway and related improvements to Olive Street Road to be constructed prior to 60%

occupancy of the development. She questioned whether the improvements should be required at a lower percentage of occupancy as she felt the roads should be complete before tenants are on the site. She noted that once customers are visiting the site, it is more difficult to do the road improvements.

Mr. Geisel stated that requiring road improvements at 60% occupancy is fairly consistent with other developments in the City. However, in all the recent developments, the road improvements were constructed fairly early. He noted that early road construction is almost essential to comply with all the siltation and erosion control problems.

Mr. Stock also pointed out that sometimes the utility companies and MoDOT delay the construction of the road improvements.

**Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward P.Z. 42-2007 Spirit Valley Business Park II (18730 Olive Street 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 November 19, 2007 City Council Meeting.  
See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, for additional information on P.Z. 42-2007 Spirit Valley Business Park II (18730 Olive Street Road).]**

**D. Landmarks Preservation Commission:** Amendment to Ordinance 1719

### **Staff Report**

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Senior Planner, stated that several citizens have expressed an interest in joining the Landmarks Preservation Commission. However, the current Ordinance does not allow for any alternate members. The following amendment to Section 23-52 of Ordinance No. 1719 is being proposed **(changes shown in green):**

**A. Composition of the Chesterfield Landmarks Preservation Commission.** The Chesterfield Landmarks Preservation Commission shall consist of nine (9) members, no less than three (3) and no more than five (5) of whom shall be members selected from the Chesterfield Historical Commission and the remaining members selected for their expertise in the various disciplines involved in historic preservation, all of whom shall be residents of the City of Chesterfield, and all of whom shall

be appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the City Council. **In addition, a maximum of five (5) alternate members may be appointed to serve in the absence or the disqualification of the regular members.** Also, a member of the City Council and of the Planning Commission may be appointed to serve as liaisons. The Council and Planning Commission representatives shall not vote and shall not hold office. The Mayor shall make every reasonable effort to appoint persons with a demonstrated interest in the history and preservation of the City of Chesterfield.

Staff is also recommending the following changes (minor housekeeping issues) **(changes shown in green)**:

Section 23-54 M refers to a “Building Inspector”, which is not a position in the City. The City of Chesterfield contracts out with St. Louis County for the issuance of building permits once the City has provided Municipal Zoning Authorization. Language has been amended to reflect the correct process.

- M. Interim Control.** ~~No building permit shall be issued by the Building Inspector~~ **No Municipal Zoning Authorization** shall be issued for alteration, construction, demolition, or removal of a potential Landmark or of any property or structure within a potential Historic District unless such alteration, removal or demolition is authorized by formal resolution of the City Council as necessary for public health, welfare or safety. In no event shall the delay be more than one hundred eighty (180) days.

Section 23-55 B also refers to a “Building Inspector”.

- B.** Applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall include accompanying plans and specifications affecting the exterior architectural appearance of a designated Landmark or a property within a designated Historic District; and applications for demolition permits shall include plans and specifications for the contemplated use of the property. The ~~Building Inspector~~ **Department of Planning and Public Works** shall forward applications for building and demolition permits to the Chesterfield Landmarks Preservation Commission within seven (7) days following the receipt of the application.

The current ordinance refers to the “Department of Public Works” on several occasions which Staff has amended to accurately reflect the **“Department of Planning and Public Works”**. In addition, reference is made to actions of the

“Planning and Zoning Committee”. This language has been amended to refer to the **“Planning and Public Works Committee”**.

**Councilmember Durrell made a motion to forward the above amendments 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.**

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.