

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, April 22, 2010

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, April 22, 2010 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Matt Segal** (Ward I); **Councilmember Bruce Geiger** (Ward II), **Councilmember Mike Casey** (Ward III), and **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Councilmember Lee Erickson (Ward II); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr., Planning Commission Chair; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Susan Mueller, Principal Engineer; Shawn Seymour, Senior Planner; Mara Perry, Senior 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 March 18, 2010 Committee Meeting Summary.

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

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. **Selection of Officers and Committee Assignments**

- Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee/Planning Commission Liaison – ***Matt Segal***
- Vice Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee – ***Mike Casey***

- Landmarks Preservation Commission & Historical Commission – **Bruce Geiger**
- Board of Adjustment – **Connie Fults**

Councilmember Fults made a motion to approve the Committee Assignments. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Casey. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

- B. P.Z. 02-2010 Spirit Trade Center, Lot 30 (JMD Investments, LLC):** A request for a change of zoning from a “M3” Planned Industrial District to a “PC” Planned Commercial District for a 1.22 acre tract of land located on the south side of Edison Avenue, east of the Edison Avenue and Spirit Drive intersection (17V320178).

STAFF REPORT

Shawn Seymour, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and surrounding area. Mr. Seymour stated the following;

The Petitioner is requesting to add a retail land use to the site. A Public Hearing was held on March 8, 2010 and there were no issues raised by the Planning Commission. On April 12, 2010 the Planning Commission recommended approval by 7 – 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Commission Chair Hirsch stated that the Planning Commission felt that, given the surrounding uses, the change of zoning was a reasonable request. The only change was to add another use to the site.

Councilmember Fults questioned the percentage of retail that could be allowed on the site. Mr. Seymour responded that the Petitioner is requesting Retail Establishment – Community, which limits the amount of retail to 25,000 square feet. The building is 11,000 square feet, completely built out and already sub-divided to office/warehouse with more than 70% of the building being utilized as warehouse. If the use is changed to Retail Establishment – Neighborhood, it would limit the amount of square footage dedicated to retail use to no more than 4,000 square feet.

It was determined that an office/warehouse requires less parking than a retail use.

Councilmember Fults felt that this area does not lend itself to having this building as completely retail. Mr. Geisel stated that they could not use the full square footage of the building as retail because the parking limits it.

Councilmember Geiger had concerns about setting a precedent. Mr. Hirsch responded that the Petitioner would have to change their site plan in order to make the entire building retail because they would be unable to park the site as retail as it presently

exists. It was determined that as the site presently exists, about half of the building could be used as retail.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward P.Z. 02-2010 Spirit Trade Center, Lot 30 (JMD Investments, LLC) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Casey. The motion **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the May 3, 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. 02-2010 Spirit Trade Center, Lot 30 (JMD Investments, LLC)].

- C. Four Seasons Plaza West (National City Bank ATM):** An Amended Site Development Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Lighting Plan for a 2.35 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Olive Boulevard and River Valley Drive.

STAFF REPORT

Kristian Corbin, Project Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and surrounding area. Mr. Corbin stated the following;

The site is governed by the City of Chesterfield Ordinance #2559, which grants the City Council Automatic Power of Review of the Site Development Plan.

The ATM is located on the northeastern section of the site near the northern entrance. The Lighting Plan complies with the current Lighting Ordinance. The proposed materials will be plastic and painted metal.

The Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 6 – 0 with the condition to landscape the adjacent parking lot island with small shrubs.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Commission Chair Hirsch stated that approval was based on the Architectural Review Board's recommendation to add landscaping.

Councilmember Casey made a motion to forward Four Seasons Plaza West (National City Bank ATM) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger. The motion **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

Note: This is an Amended Site Development Section Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Lighting Plan which requires approval by the City Council. A voice vote will be needed at the May 3, 2010 City Council Meeting.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on Four Seasons Plaza West (National City Bank ATM)].

- D. P.Z. 18-2008 City of Chesterfield (Architectural Review Board):** An ordinance repealing section 1003.177 of the City of Chesterfield Zoning Ordinance and creating a new section to address the Architectural Review Board Policies, Procedures and Architectural Standards.

STAFF REPORT

Mara Perry, Senior Planner, gave background history and explained that a Public Hearing was held at the August 11, 2008 City of Chesterfield Planning Commission meeting. On September 22, 2008, a recommendation for approval of the above-referenced matter was approved by a vote of 7 - 1.

On October 23, 2008, the matter was reviewed by the Planning and Public Works Committee. A recommendation was made for Staff to review the document in greater detail and to create legislation to enable the City to consider architectural impacts and review the same in the development approval process.

In January 2009, amended Architectural Review Guidelines were put in place while Staff continued to work on the Architectural Review Standards. In working with the City Attorney, a draft Attachment A has been prepared, which will become the new Section 1003.177 Architectural Review.

After further review, Staff recommends the following amendments be made to the April 19, 2010 Draft of the Architectural Review Standards. These amendments all relate to the "Applicability and Compliance" section. Staff felt that there were several items that did not require additional review by the Architectural Review Board or Planning Commission. The proposed amendments will allow Staff more flexibility to approve minor amendments.

Attachment A; Section 1003.177 Architectural Review

- 8. Design Standards - Applicability and Compliance.**
 - a. **Applicability:** The City of Chesterfield Architectural Review Design Standards shall apply to all vacant or undeveloped land and all property to be redeveloped including additions and alterations. Projects will be reviewed by the ARB when they come in for approval under the Site Plan Procedure, City Code Sections

1003.179, ~~the Development in Planned Commercial and Planned Industrial Districts, City Code Section~~ 1003.178; and ~~Conditional Use Permit Procedure, City Code Section~~ 1003.181. The ARB will provide recommendations to the City of Chesterfield Planning Commission on projects they have reviewed. Projects which are exempt from being reviewed by the ARB are reviewed by Staff to meet the Design Standards.

- b. Unless otherwise required by the City of Chesterfield to be reviewed by the ARB, new Single Family Residential subdivisions shall be reviewed by Department of Planning and Public Works during Site Plan Review or Municipal Zoning approval.

Exemptions:

(1) **Single Residential Lots** are exempt from the provisions of these Architectural Review Board Guidelines, provided no construction, addition or alteration of a non-residential building is proposed.

(2) **Residential Additions and Tear Downs** are reviewed under the City Code Section 1003.126.

(3) **Non-Residential Additions and Architectural Amendments** that meet all of the following criteria may be considered for administrative approval by the Planning and Development Services Director. Said approval shall be at the discretion of Planning and Development Services Director if:

- (a) The proposed addition is less than 5000 sq. ft.; or
- (b) The proposed addition does not impact the site such that the approved plan for the site must be reviewed by utility and fire protection agencies; or
- (c) The proposed addition **or amendment** does not significantly impact architectural elements previously approved by the Planning Commission or the ARB.

- c. Compliance: Upon recommendation from the ARB **and final review by Staff**, projects will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for **review and consideration**. ~~Vote once review of the project is completed with Staff. The Planning Commission should approve the project based on all design standards being met. The Planning Commission may choose not to approve a project should they not meet all applicable design standards.~~

Ms. Perry mentioned that members of the Architectural Review Board provided input with the revisions to the Ordinance.

Planning Commission Chair Hirsch stated that the Planning Commission has had liaisons attend all the ARB meetings to have an understanding of the full discussion of the site plans. He is thrilled that the guidelines will now be codified and submitted to the City Council for approval.

Mr. Geisel stated that the Ordinance simply codifies in City Code that architectural issues will be considered in the review of projects before the City. This Ordinance will allow the City legal defense if a petition was “rejected” based on quality of material or non-continuity with adjacent properties, scale, etc.

Councilmember Fults had a question as to whether Single Family Residential subdivisions and Multi-Family, Condos, and attached housing require review by the ARB. Ms. Perry replied that these are normally not reviewed by ARB. However, there is the ability to require them to go to ARB in the Attachment A during the rezoning process. In addition, the document has been written in such a way that Staff will be reviewing elevations – even if they are not going to Council. Staff now has key elements for residential developments that they are reviewing against.

Councilmember Geiger questioned what triggers review of a Single Family Residential by the ARB. Ms. Perry responded that if the Ordinance does not dictate review by the ARB, then it will be reviewed just by Staff. It was noted that the exemptions regarding Single Residential Lots apply specifically to residential tear downs and additions.

Regarding Multi-family development, it was noted there are provisions in place to allow the Committee to authorize Power of Review if there are issues or questions. If the Committee had any concerns about a project, they could send it back to the Planning Commission with instructions that it be reviewed by ARB. It was noted that the ARB does not have power of approval or rejection; they only offer recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Casey made a motion to forward P.Z. 18-2008 City of Chesterfield (Architectural Review Board) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults.

Councilmember Casey then moved to amend the motion to include the proposed revisions to the Attachment A as prepared by Staff as a Green Sheet Amendment. The amended motion was accepted by Councilmember Fults. The motion to approve, as amended, passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the May 3, 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. 18-2008 City of Chesterfield \(Architectural Review Board\)](#)].

E. City of Chesterfield Traffic Model

STAFF REPORT

Susan Mueller, Principal Engineer co-presented with Justin Wyse, Project Planner. Ms. Mueller indicated that there was substantial assistance with the preparation of the above-listed document. She thanked Ms. Nassif, Mr. Geisel and Mr. Herring for allowing them additional time and training of VISUM software technology.

Justin Wyse, Project Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing a detailed analysis of the updated Traffic Model. He then explained that back in 2007 the City retained George Butler Associates (GBA) to work with Staff to convert and update the City's base network model.

Data collection began towards the end of 2007. Traffic counts were conducted at over 30 locations.

Staff reviewed the two primary model inputs, as follows:

- Roadway Network – the City's model has 1,087 intersections and 2,358 roadway segments, and
- Land Use Input – there are currently 381 traffic analysis zones in the City. A traffic analysis zone is the smallest unit which generates traffic based on square footage, retail space, or number of units.

The City has a Four-Step Model, which is considered a small model; the four-step process is a mathematical representation of supply (roadway network) and demand (estimated using the four-step model).

Four-Step Regional Travel Forecasting Model:

1. Trip Generation - is determined by how many times someone goes from point A to point B (Home-Based Work, Non Home-Based Work and Home-Based/Other).
2. Trip Distribution – calculations based on trips to and from a location with time as the friction factor – the further someone has to drive, the less likely they are to go there.
3. Mode Choice – Because the City is a small model, this step is not included.
4. Trip Assignment – assigns the information to the network, which indicates a direct path.

Mr. Wyse stated that the process was designed to create the City's existing network with existing conditions.

Ms. Mueller stated that the models are used to determine overall system functionality and capacity changes. The analysis was gathered during the worst peak traffic hour of a 24 hour day. Staff continues to manage and maintain a minimum of three models;

1. Existing Conditions – Model is calibrated and validated based on actual field data gathered in December 2007 at 30 different locations with 90% accuracy.
2. Near Term Improvements – Incorporates all near-term planned road improvements projected to be in place by 2015-2020; such as, Blue Valley Development, the half-diamond access to I-64 at Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard, reconfiguration of Wild Horse Creek Road, Kehrs Mill and Long Road. Future projects include connection of Lydia Hill to Baxter Road and the 141 improvements.
3. City Ultimate Planned (CUP) – developed to represent all scheduled projects, all planned Comprehensive Plan road projects; such as, Long Road full-diamond interchange, the Baxter Road extension to Maryland Heights near Hog Hollow, the Baxter Road interchange with I-64 and those associated extensions of the outer road systems to the Valley.

The model looks at other factors such as delay and congestion, at different intersections. The City looked at 15 different intersections with respect to Level of Service. Level of Service (LOS) can be applied to both unsignalized and signalized intersections, but the times are different based on whether it is unsignalized or signalized. For the City's purposes, Staff used signalized intersection Levels of Service that start out with a LOS "A" for less than 10 seconds of delay to a LOS "F" which is defined as more than 80 seconds of delay. It was noted that LOS "F" may only apply to a short period of time during the peak rush hour.

City Ultimate Planned Model

Mr. Geisel explained that the process began when Staff was directed by the Planning & Public Works Committee to update the traffic model and to fund with the North Outer 40 Trust Fund a review of 30-plus road improvements suggested by Chesterfield Village, Inc. /Sachs Properties. The City indicated at that time that these improvements would not be incorporated into a plan until they had been modeled. Each improvement was modeled individually, and in combination, which allowed Staff to come up with suggested improvements on which the State, County and City are in agreement.

Councilmember Erickson asked whether the traffic model can be utilized at Highcroft Estates Subdivision as traffic is impacted by the Eberwein Park. Mr. Geisel responded that it could potentially be used, but noted that traffic to and from the park will not impact the p.m. peak hour.

Recommended Road Improvements include;

- Texas U-Turn at Chesterfield Parkway W and I-64
- Burkhardt Place and Swingley Ridge extension
- North and South Outer 40 Drives – Olive to Parkway
- SPUI at Chesterfield Parkway East and I-64

The recommended improvements all relate to Interstate 40/64 because the model shows that congestion is the worst nearest to this Interstate. One of the benefits of having most of the recommended improvements being associated with I-64/40 is that it gives the City the opportunity of possibly being on the Long Range Transportation Plan at East-West Gateway.

Councilmember Casey excused himself from the meeting at this point.

Mr. Herring commended Staff on the tremendous work involved with this project. He praised the collaborative effort by Planning and Engineering Staff.

The information is for update purposes only. No vote was required. The documents were "Received & Filed".

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.