

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator

FROM: ^{SW} Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services
James Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, February 9, 2017



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, February 9, 2017, in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Dan Hurt** (Ward III), **Councilmember Barbara McGuinness** (Ward I,) and **Councilmember Nathan Roach** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bob Nation; Planning Commission Chair Stanley Proctor; Jim Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services; Jessica Henry, Senior Planner; and Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary. The following members of the Architectural Review Board were also present: Mick Weber, Rick Clawson and Mary Brown.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the January 19, 2017 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember McGuinness made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of January 19, 2017. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Roach and **passed by a voice vote of 3-0.**

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Planning Commission Nominee Interview

Chair Hurt introduced nominee James Rosenauer.

Mr. Rosenauer stated that he met the Mayor a year ago and has had several conversations with him regarding the City. The Mayor has explained the purpose and responsibilities of the Planning Commission. He understands the Committee's role in advising Council on planning and development within the City and he understands the importance of the position. Now that he is fully retired, he would like to give back to the City by offering his time and taking part in something meaningful. He has lived in Chesterfield for 38 years and has seen how the City has developed over the years. He stated his business and education background lends credence to his ability to learn and absorb what will be required of him in order to participate and make

meaningful decisions. He has begun to review the Comprehensive Plan and has been reading the monthly PDS Activity newsletter. He feels that he will be up to speed in a very short time.

Councilmember McGuinness expressed her appreciation to Mr. Rosenauer for his willingness to serve and she is pleased that he has already begun reviewing the Comprehensive Plan. She stated this is a big job that entails important responsibility. The Planning Commission is a statutory committee that advises the City Council on planning and development in the City.

Councilmember Roach advised Mr. Rosenauer that the position requires quite a bit of time and encouraged him to work with the other two Planning Commission members from Ward IV. Packets are distributed the week prior to meetings and he advised Mr. Rosenauer to physically go out and look at the sites to familiarize himself with the projects prior to meetings.

Councilmember McGuinness made a motion to recommend approval of the Mayor's nomination of James Rosenauer, representative of Ward IV, to the Planning Commission to serve out Nathan Roach's term. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Roach and passed by a voice vote of 3-0.

Chair Hurt stated City Council will vote on the nomination at the February 22, 2017 meeting.

Chair Hurt stated there is an Architectural Review Board meeting tonight at 6:00 p.m. and since there are several members of that Board present, Item III.C. Architectural Lighting, will be discussed next.

C. Discussion of Architectural Lighting (Hurt)

At the last Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting, Chair Hurt stated there was discussion regarding the colored lighting on the Metro Lighting building located in Chesterfield Valley. One of the main functions of ARB and the Planning Commission is to address the character of buildings and neighborhoods based on the materials, colors and architectural detailing that are to be used on structures. Because of how the new technology of LED lighting and the use of holograms can change the character of a building, it became apparent during discussions at the ARB meeting that the City needs to establish guidelines for this type of lighting.

Rick Clawson, member of ARB, stated that LED technology is computer generated which means there are unlimited ways to program the patterns, colors and motions of the lighting. Metro Lighting is only utilizing a few colors, however, there are 39 LED lights that are all connected and in theory, they could use 39 different colors. In many instances, architectural lighting can lend dramatic improvement to the face of a building and ARB encourages that.

Chair Hurt stated the City Code restricts illumination, so that is not a major concern. He suggested considering the following possible restrictions on LED lighting:

- Number of colors
- The area of square footage
- Changing patterns
- Frequency of color change
- Speed of color change
- Consideration of color from one building to another
- Location of building

Mick Weber, ARB member, stated that color on an isolated building is not concerning, but if all the buildings along Highway 40 in the Valley start doing something different with lighting, it would become chaotic. During the ARB discussion, the question was raised as to whether lighting can be considered signage or architectural articulation when used on a lighting company's building. He feels each request should be evaluated on a case by case basis. In the event of an existing building requesting a change in lighting that does not necessitate a full building review, he questioned how it would be determined as to what is appropriate and how one would create an unbiased judgement in reviewing buildings.

Mr. Clawson stated that perhaps the ARB standards can be modified to state that building façade lighting may be acceptable but it must be reviewed separately. He would not want to strictly prohibit it, but would like it to be reviewed on a case by case basis.

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services, stated that the City's current code accomplishes that. In the instance of Metro Lighting, the lights are existing lights that were in violation. Metro Lighting was not aware that they needed a permit. They have been to ARB and now they will be going to Planning Commission. The current process is governed by the Architectural Section of the UDC.

Mr. Clawson stated that this technology is ever changing so it is difficult to pinpoint restrictions as they may change in the future.

Chair Hurt was in agreement in maintaining the current process, however, he would be in favor of developing standards or guidelines for allowing LED lighting. He suggested that Staff be directed to begin such a review and develop preliminary language for discussion before solidifying a path.

Councilmember McGuinness made a motion to direct Staff to establish parameters to control Architectural Lighting and present recommendations to the Committee. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 3-0.**

B. Article 04-01 Architectural Review Standards – Update on Code Amendment

STAFF REPORT

Councilmember McGuinness stated that she raised this issue because it has become tiresome to remember to require siding to grade on all new residential developments. She called Power of Review on Harmony Seven for this issue and during her tenure on the Planning Commission, she would have to remember each time to request this. She stated it is much easier to include this requirement in the Code. She noted that Staff has suggested the following wording:

- Primary building material shall be extended and installed so that a maximum of twelve (12) inches of concrete foundation wall is exposed.
- Any exposed portion of concrete foundation wall must be painted to match the color of the adjacent building material.

With reference to the first bullet point, Councilmember McGuinness stated that she interprets this to mean that 12 inches *has to be exposed* which is a concern for her. She suggested the

following modification thereby giving developers the flexibility to provide less than 12 inches of exposed concrete:

Primary building material shall be extended and installed so that *no more than* twelve (12) inches of concrete foundation wall is exposed.

Councilmember McGuiness made a motion to forward to City Council the following amendments to Article 4 - Architectural Review Design Standards of the Unified Development Code with a recommendation to approve.

- **Primary building material shall be extended and installed so that no more than twelve (12) inches of concrete foundation wall is exposed.**
- **Any exposed portion of concrete foundation wall must be painted to match the color of the adjacent building material.**

The motion was seconded by Chair Hurt.

Discussion on the Motion

After some discussion on the pros and cons of painted concrete, Councilmember McGuiness amended her original motion to delete the second bullet point.

The amendment to the motion was seconded by Chair Hurt and **passed** by a voice vote of 3-0.

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services, clarified that the amendment applies to new construction only and would also include additions or major changes to a residence that would require a permit and noted that simply re-siding a home does not require a permit.

The above motion to approve, as amended, **passed** by a voice vote of 3-0.

Since this is an amendment to the Code, Mr. Wyse advised that it will require a Public Hearing and will, therefore, be sent to the Planning Commission.

IV. OTHER – None.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.