

# I.A. MEMORANDUM



TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary  
Thursday, March 4, 2010

---

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, March 4, 2010 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Connie Fults** (Ward IV); **Councilmember Barry Flachsbart** (Ward I); **Councilmember Lee Erickson** (Ward II); and **Councilmember Mike Casey** (Ward III).

Also in attendance were: Councilmember Bruce Geiger (Ward II); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); G. Elliot Grissom, Planning Commission Acting Chair; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Susan Mueller, Principal Engineer; Ben Niesen, Civil Engineer; Charlie Campo, Project Planner; Justin Wyse, Project Planner; Kristian Corbin, Project Planner; and Kristine Kelley, Administrative Assistant.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM

## I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the February 18, 2010 Committee Meeting Summary.

**Councilmember Casey made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of February 18, 2010.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

## II. OLD BUSINESS

A. **Ordinance amending Section 300.530 of the City Code** to prohibit parking of large boats, campers, motor homes and commercial vehicles in excess of one hour per calendar day on public streets within the City.

## **STAFF REPORT**

Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, stated that at the last Committee meeting, Staff was directed to hold the vote pending action by St. Louis County who had reportedly been considering establishing a parking restriction on Wings of Hope Boulevard. Staff provided the Committee with a substitute ordinance which mimics the County's proposed ordinance which restricts parking at any time on Wings of Hope Boulevard. Mr. Geisel recommends that the Committee replace the initial proposal with the following Ordinance.

### **An Ordinance Appending Section 300 Model Traffic Ordinance, Schedule IX – Parking Restrictions of the Chesterfield City Code to Prohibit Parking on Wings of Hope Boulevard within the City of Chesterfield, Missouri.**

The above listed Ordinance will prohibit parking globally only on Wings of Hope Boulevard.

**Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to approve the Ordinance Appending Section 300 Model Traffic Ordinance, Schedule IX – Parking Restrictions of the City Code and to forward to City Council with a recommendation to approve.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Casey.

## **DISCUSSION**

Chair Fults asked whether this will become a problem with existing businesses. Mr. Geisel replied that St. Louis County has already passed their Ordinance, so this will now allow the City of Chesterfield Police Department to cite and enforce any violations in municipal court.

The motion then **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

**Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the March 15, 2010 City Council Meeting. See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on Ordinance Appending Section 300 Model Traffic Ordinance, Schedule IX – Parking Restrictions of the City Code].**

## **B. Parking Restriction** – Appalachian Trail at Duxbury Way

## **STAFF REPORT**

Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer, stated that at the last Committee meeting Councilmember Erickson asked that the vote to approve be held until the trustees were notified of the proposed parking restriction.

Since that time, the subdivision Trustees have been contacted. In addition, Mrs. Brown, the resident who requested the parking restriction, has obtained the required signatures from the residents within 500 feet with 100% approval of the two residents immediately adjacent to Appalachian Trail and 90% of those residents within 500 feet. Mr. McGownd noted that all signatures have been obtained and the City Council policy procedure has been met.

Councilmember Erickson stated that he notified the President of the Trustees of Shenandoah Subdivision and found that they were in full support of the parking restriction.

Councilmember Flachsbart questioned whether the parking restriction could be reduced to less than 75 feet. Mr. McGownd felt that further studies would have to be conducted to determine whether it would be feasible to reduce it. He noted that there is a curvature in the road heading to the west, so he feels that 75 feet would be more than adequate.

Mr. Geisel stated that there is a general restriction in place that prohibits parking within 20 feet of an intersection. He feels the 75 feet allows adequate clear line of sight.

There was additional discussion as to how the proposed restriction will affect the number of parking spaces along the street. Mr. Geisel noted that 3 – 4 spaces would be affected.

Councilmember Casey stated that the parking problem mainly occurs in April – May when the Shenandoah Valley Elementary has practice sessions on the athletic field and he does not feel the restriction is necessary. He noted that he will be voting in opposition to the proposed restriction pointing out that the current situation does not raise any safety issues.

Councilmember Erickson stated that in talking to the area residents, they feel there is a problem due to the curvature in the road and parking on both sides of the street. The parking occurs throughout the year when the facility is being rented by outside individuals and organizations and the residents feel it is an issue.

It was noted by Mr. Geisel that Mrs. Brown met the written policy as adopted by City Council. He added that Staff would be more than willing to further review the previously approved policy adopted by City Council.

Chair Fults had a question as to whether there were additional streets affected by parking and had concerns that the City could be setting a precedent. She feels the bigger safety concern is when the school is releasing students for the day.

**Councilmember Erickson made a motion to approve the Parking Restriction – Appalachian Trail at Duxbury Way.** The motion was seconded by Chair Fults.

## Discussion on the Motion

Councilmember Flachsbart had mixed emotions as to whether the 75 foot restriction is appropriate.

There was additional discussion as to whether the Police Department enforces the 20 foot parking restriction. Mr. Geisel noted that since it is not adequately posted, the occurrences are handled very delicately.

Councilmember Flachsbart would like the restriction reduced to 60 feet.

**Councilmember Flachsbart then amended the original motion to approve Parking Restriction of 60 feet on each side of Duxbury and on the south side of Appalachian Trail. The amendment was seconded by Chair Fults and failed by a vote of 1 – 3.**

The original motion then **passed** by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

**Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the March 15, 2010 City Council Meeting. See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer, for additional information on Parking Restriction – Appalachian Trail at Duxbury Way].**

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. City of Chesterfield Bikeable and Walkable Community Plan.**

#### **STAFF REPORT**

Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer, stated that Staff has completed the bicycle and pedestrian master plan and requests that the Committee make a recommendation to City Council to approve the proposed resolution.

#### History

The City partnered with Trailnet, Inc. to develop a bikeable/walkable community plan. Trailnet received a Federal Grant to cover 80% of the cost – Trailnet would then cover 10% and the City of Chesterfield would cover the remaining 10%.

City Staff and citizen volunteers worked for over a year to collect data and assist in the planning phases of the master plan development.

Ben Niesen, Civil Engineer, then gave a PowerPoint presentation with a detailed overview of a bicycle and pedestrian master plan for the City of Chesterfield. Mr. Niesen stated the following:

#### Bicycle Modes

- Bicycle Warning Accommodations – signage to share the road.
- Bicycle Routes & Shared Roadways – bicycles and cars in the same drive lane.
- Bicycle Lanes – have a dedicated bicycle only – one-way traffic adjacent to a vehicular lane.
- Shared-Use Path – multi-use for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Pedestrian Access – shared-use paths, combined bicycle and pedestrian paths such as, the Monarch Chesterfield Levee Trail and the Riparian Trail corridor. The goal is to help improve global pedestrian access throughout the City.

#### Bicycle Warning Accommodations – “Share the Road” sign

This is intended to acknowledge that there are cyclists on the roadway. Not a facility improvement, but simply signage to alert drivers that there is a bicyclist on the roadway. There are currently notifications on Olive Boulevard and North Outer 40, as well as, multiple other locations, that are primarily MoDOT facilities.

#### Bicycle Route & Shared Roadway

- Guide for favored routes to encourage bicyclists to commute on.
- They would connect major destinations or would be lower traffic volumes to make it safer for bicyclists.
- They can be signed, as well as painted and striped in the lane.

Councilmember Flachsbart liked the idea of painted lanes, which would make it clearer to motorists. It was noted that paint markings require annual maintenance.

Mr. Geisel indicated this is a concept level plan and there are no projects or physical improvements being proposed as part of the plan. Later City Council and the region will have the opportunity to implement the plan.

Mr. McGownd stated that each project will be handled individually based on funding. The City of St. Louis has a bike plan map identifying routes throughout the City, which could also be accomplished within the City of Chesterfield.

It was recommended by one of the citizen volunteers to include an arrow under the Bike Route signage.

It was noted by Mr. Geisel that Staff cannot move to an implementation phase until City Council has approved the proposal.

#### Bicycle Lane

- Exclusive for bicyclists.
- Striped, signed and pavement markings.

- One-way travel with vehicular traffic.
- Bicycle facility for average users.
- Restraints may be R/W, existing pavement width, quality of existing shoulder, and debris.
- Depending on the roadway, infrastructure improvements may be required.

It was noted that the law prohibits cyclists on sidewalks.

### Shared Use Path

- Physically separated from vehicular traffic.
- Accommodates pedestrians, bicycles, in-line skates, dog, walkers, runners and dogs.
- Wheelchairs
- Recreation and daily commuting.
- Encourages tourism.

A concept Plan would include the Ameren Utility Corridor stretching from Clarkson Road to Parkway Central School up to Highway 141. There is currently adequate Ameren UE easement to accommodate a 12 foot trail width. Mr. McGownd indicated that Ameren would potentially allow a pathway.

Mr. Herring asked whether there could be any health risks associated with riding under power lines. Mr. Geisel stated that studies indicate that any health risks are related to prolonged exposure – not transient use.

### Pedestrian Access

- Improves community convenience and connectivity.
- Continuous, safe, pedestrian commuting.
- Improve intersection safety for all users.
- Striped crosswalks & pedestrian signals at intersections and mid-block crossings.
- Bridge the divide US40 creates.

### Chesterfield Parkway Pedestrian Bridge

- Complete the final gap for the 'Pathway on the Parkway' – railroad style truss, pre-fabricated bridge or an arched truss.
- Project recommendation from citizens at public forums.
- Improved safety for pedestrians and amateur bicyclists.

There was additional discussion regarding bridge design and cost comparison.

The Committee commended Staff on such an impressive presentation.

**Councilmember Casey made a motion to forward the resolution adopting the City of Chesterfield Bikeable/Walkable Community Plan to City Council with a recommendation to approve.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart.

### Discussion on the Motion

Councilmember Erickson requested that Staff provide feedback from the residents who would be directly affected by the plan. Mr. McGownd replied that each project would be approved by City Council based on priority and funding.

Mr. Herring thanked Staff for all their hard work and thorough analysis of the project.

The motion then **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

**Note: This is a Resolution that will require a voice vote at the March 15, 2010 City Council Meeting as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer, for additional information on City of Chesterfield Bikeable/Walkable Community Plan].**

### **B. City of Chesterfield Commercial Parking Study.**

#### **STAFF REPORT**

Charlie Campo, Project Planner, provided the Committee with information regarding an ongoing parking study that Staff has been working on. During 2008 and 2009, the Department completed parking usage counts at 65 Commercial developments, totaling 150 individual lots.

The purpose of the study was to have data to evaluate the City's current and future parking standards. It is also useful when reviewing Municipal Zoning Applications for interior finishes and existing commercial spaces for Re-Occupancy Permits. This information can also be used for determining future Comprehensive Plan policies.

During the counts for the 150 Commercial lots, there were 27,987 parking spaces in the inventory – totaling 193 acres of parking area. It was noted that upon review, there are sometimes discrepancies with approved site plans vs. existing parking spaces; however, the differences were minor.

Each parking count included; the site plan review, inventory of the existing parking spaces, which can change due to striping and site configuration, and information on the occupants within the development – business name, area of their lease space and the parking requirement.

This portion of the study focused on multi-use Commercial developments, future counts, which can include single user sites or other developments that cause any parking issues. This was done primarily because Staff was looking at shared-parking concepts.

The following information was conducted during peak hours based on national standards and national averages;

- Retail & restaurant use data was collected between the hours of 11:00 AM and 1:00 PM. – during lunch hour.
- Office and industrial and office warehouse uses were counted between 10:00 AM and 11:00 AM. – when the buildings are occupied.
- Winter counts focused on multi-use strip centers – conducted during the holiday season.
- In the summer of 2009, the emphasis was on multi-tenant office warehouse use, and industrial buildings. Results show that due to the economy, the counts were lower than previous years. It was noted by Mr. Campo that this is an ongoing project and parking counts will be conducted on an annual basis.
- Overall for all the developments Staff found that only 42% of the spaces were occupied during peak times.
- Just under half of the developments counted were operating at a 100% tenant occupancy rate.
- Of the 71 lots that were at 100% tenant occupancy, average parking usage was 50.3%.
- Parking standards were compared to the new proposed parking standards. The parking standards will decrease under the new parking standards.

It was determined that, as a whole, there was actually sufficient parking throughout many of the developments. Staff is currently conducting counts on strip-commercial developments.

Chair Fults questioned why some areas such as; Villa Farotto, Chick-Fil-A, Culvers and the Brick House seem to have insufficient parking. Ms. Nassif replied that those restaurants are some of the top revenue generating restaurants in Chesterfield Valley and the parking requirements are for the average parking time – not the busiest time. In addition, studies show that the numbers diminish slightly after the first year in business. Mr. Geisel noted that those sites are parked independently.

Councilmember Flachsbart has concerns with decreasing the requirements in the future. Ms. Nassif stated that the parking requirement for restaurants may not necessarily result in a decrease in the amount of parking stalls.



Justin Wyse, Project Planner, noted that while working with the Ordinance Review Committee, Staff thoroughly reviewed fast food and sit-down restaurants to make sure the parking standards did not change.

Ms. Nassif mentioned that since the City of Chesterfield incorporated back in 1988, the parking regulations were adopted from St. Louis County. Since then, hundreds of Site Plans have been approved and this is the first time that the City has been able to see the impact of our parking requirements. She commended Charlie Campo and Kristian Corbin who directed the project and the entire Planning & Development Services Department for all their hard work.

She also stated that Staff will use this information not just for the parking chapter, but for future parking reduction requests. The study validates prior reductions and shows that they were warranted.

*The information is for update purposes only. No vote was required.*

- C. P.Z. 01-2010 City of Chesterfield (Off-Street Parking, Stacking, and Loading Space Requirements):** an ordinance repealing Section 1003.165 “Off Street Parking and Loading Requirements” of the City of Chesterfield Zoning Ordinance and creating a new Section 1003.165 “Off-Street Parking, Stacking, and Loading Requirements” that revises the procedures and requirements for parking, loading, and stacking spaces within the City of Chesterfield.

### **STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Susan Mueller, Principal Engineer, introduced Justin Wyse, Project Planner and Ben Niesen, Civil Engineer who were directly involved with the ordinance revisions.

#### History

In July of 2009, the Planning & Public Works Committee directed Staff to work with the Ordinance Review Committee to review the parking requirements within the City of Chesterfield. In September of 2009 and January of 2010 Staff met with the Ordinance Review Committee to make revisions and to refine the content of the document. The major concepts from the original draft from July of 2009 generally remain intact, and the revisions and refinements were minor.

At the January 2010 meeting, the Review Committee recommended that the proposal be forwarded to the Planning Commission. A Public Hearing was scheduled and held on February 22, 2010. Planning Commission voted 7 – 0 to forward the ordinance with one amendment to this Committee.

In order to address sustainability and environmental aspects of impervious parking, Staff has now incorporated actual maximum parking space limits into the requirements. The ordinance now promotes impervious surface mitigation for parking that is in excess of the maximum limits, based on the following;

Parking Requests to exceed:

- Up to 20% → Approved by Planning and Development Services Director
- More than 20% → Approved by Planning Commission

For consistency and to support compliance enforcement, Staff has converted to a Gross Floor Area (GFA) based parking requirement for a few more uses – such as Barber and Beauty Shops and the restaurant uses. The parking requirement has not been reduced for restaurants.

These requirements were reviewed against the parking data that Staff collected and it has been confirmed that the new requirements are in line with functional parking conditions that have been field verified. Staff has taken into consideration the fact that parking is down because of the economy and this has been factored into all of the proposed requirements.

The requirements were also reviewed against National Standards.

- Complies with ITE, APA, ULI, and ICSC Standards
  - “Shared Parking”
  - “Parking Requirements for Shopping Centers”
  - “Parking Generation”
- The most significant enhancement is the proposed Retail Center Category. What has been found is that parking requirements vary most greatly by the size of a retail center and by its percent of restaurant use. This also includes vehicle stacking spaces for various uses; such as, banks and pharmacies.
- The new “Modification of Standards” section replaces the current Parking Reduction section, which has more flexibility for businesses and property owners and identifies material and information to be submitted for review.

Ms. Mueller is very confident that this proposal more closely models the actual parking demand and addresses the sustainability for the community. Staff recommends a motion to forward to City Council for approval.

## **DISCUSSION**

Councilmember Flachsbart asked whether the Planning & Public Works Committee will have an opportunity to further review the proposal if problems occur. Ms. Mueller responded that this is only a “model”, which requires continued monitoring and adjustments. Staff will recommend amendments to the ordinance – as needed.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT**

Planning Commission Acting Chair Grissom, stated that there were no issues raised at the Planning Commission Meeting and there was full support of the ordinance amendment.

Chair Fults had a question concerning “phantom” parking. Mr. Wyse responded that the “deferred parking section” has not been changed.

**Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to forward P.Z. 01-2010 City of Chesterfield (Off-Street Parking, Stacking, and Loading Space Requirements) to City Council with a recommendation to approve.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Casey

### **Discussion on the Motion**

Councilmember Erickson asked for clarification on the maximum number of spaces. Ms. Mueller responded that MSD has started to charge for the amount of pervious surface, per parcel and per lot. Because there is a significant impact on storm water quality and detention facilities, it is significant in the way of cost effectiveness to make sure that we are not only watching our minimums but that the City is also monitoring the maximum parking requirements. This will not have an effect on existing development, unless the use changes.

The motion then **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

**Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the March 15, 2010 City Council Meeting. See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on P.Z. 01-2010 City of Chesterfield (Off-Street Parking, Stacking, and Loading Space Requirements)].**

## **D. Neon Sign Enforcement**

Chair Fults mentioned that there is a restaurant in Chesterfield Valley that was cited for a code violation in Chesterfield Valley for excessive neon lighting. After discussing the matter with the Code Enforcement Inspector, Derrick Redhead, she learned that there were several businesses cited for excessive neon lighting. One of the businesses is asking what would need to be changed to allow more neon. Ms. Nassif responded that the last section of the Lighting Ordinance states that neon lighting is prohibited in the City of Chesterfield unless for certain exemptions, such as, an “Open” sign. When the ordinance was first written in 2004 and subsequently amended around 2007 and 2008, there was a lot of concern in Ward IV that many of the retail establishments had numerous exposed neon signs.

Councilmember Flachsbart is in full support of prohibiting neon lighting.

No action is required unless directed by the Committee.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.