

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator

FROM: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning **JW**

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee **Virtual** Meeting
Summary Thursday, February 18, 2021



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held virtually via Zoom on Thursday, February 18, 2021.

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

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Michael Moore (Ward III); Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen; Justin Wyse, Director of Planning; Annisa Kumerow, Planner; Chris Dietz, Planner; and Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the February 4, 2021 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of February 4, 2021. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ohley and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Unified Development Code (Article 4) – Rooftop Screening Discussion

Based on the previous discussion with Architectural Review Board (ARB) members at the February 4 PPW meeting, Chair Hurt surmised that it is the general consensus that the current language in the Code is acceptable and allows ARB to address rooftop screening on an individual basis. However, as the Urban Core is developed, this issue may come up again and it may need to be readdressed. He recommended that the discussion be tabled until September to see how the Urban Core develops.

The Committee concurred as “one size does not fit all” and each project should be evaluated individually. The Committee did recommend that Staff provide a list of parameters for ARB/Planning Commission to consider in their review process.

The item was tabled until September.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **POWER OF REVIEW - 18122 Chesterfield Airport Rd. (Scott Properties) SDP:** A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Tree Stand Delineation, Tree Preservation Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 12.04-acre tract of land zoned "M-3" - Planned Industrial District located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Chesterfield Airport Road and Spirit of Saint Louis Boulevard (17V420157). (Ward 4)

Chair Hurt stated that the governing ordinance for this property is an old St. Louis County ordinance, which allows for more density and uses that may not be appropriate currently and may be in conflict with the revised Comprehensive Plan. He recommends that the project be postponed until the Planning Commission reviews Ordinance 1430 to see if there are any inconsistencies.

Councilmember Ohley made a motion to hold 18122 Chesterfield Airport Rd. (Scott Properties) SDP until the March 18, 2021 Planning and Public Works Committee meeting and to direct the Planning Commission to review Ordinance 1430. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos.

There was some discussion on the review process and Mayor Nation questioned the City's ability to change the ordinance after the project has been submitted and approved by the Planning Commission.

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, agreed that the original ordinance may be outdated with respect to density and uses. Staff will bring Ordinance 1430 back to the Planning Commission to review it in conjunction with the updated Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission can then make a recommendation to Council.

George Stock, Stock & Associates, then spoke representing Scott Family Properties. He stated that the review process began in February of 2020 by coordinating with Staff. This property is one of the remaining undeveloped properties owned by Scott Family Properties, who also own the properties to the east and southeast, along with many buildings in Chesterfield Valley. Mr. Scott is very vested in Chesterfield and is a great asset to the community. He is anxious to develop this property.

Mr. Stock stated that the ordinance allows up to 10 acres of commercial shopping center. This particular site is 12 acres. In order to design a transitional development, the eastern 5.64 acres are proposed for light industrial; i.e., three small buildings to be commensurate with the buildings immediately to the east and southeast that Mr. Scott owns. The western 6.4 acres are proposed as a two story, 72,000 sq. ft. combination retail/office identical to the center Mr. Scott owns at Long Road and Chesterfield Airport Road. After reviewing the Ordinance, they believe their request is consistent with it. He further stated that the project has been approved by the Planning Commission and he is concerned as to how this additional review will impact the project.

The above motion to hold passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

- B. P.Z. 11-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (13987 & 14001 Olive Blvd):** A request to repeal City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2213 establishing a Planned Environmental Unit over two parcels of land zoned R-3 Residence District and totaling 29.4 acres (16R340207 & 16R340151). (Ward 1)

STAFF PRESENTATION

Annisa Kumerow, Planner, presented the request for a zoning map amendment from the “R-3” Residence District with a “PEU” Planned Environmental Unit to the “R-3” Residence District. The petitioner is requesting to repeal the “PEU.”

A Public Hearing was held on December 14, 2020 and on January 25, 2021, the Planning Commission approved the request by a vote of 8-1. On January 27, 2021, the applicant submitted a request to the Planning & Public Works Committee to hold the item until the corresponding zoning petition, P.Z. 12-2020 (R-3 to PUD) could be reviewed at the same time.

DISCUSSION

In response to Councilmember Ohley, Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen stated that the dissenting vote was cast by Planning Commissioner Harris due to traffic concerns. The Planning Commission discussed traffic as well as other issues pertaining to a “PUD.”

Chair Hurt pointed out that the existing “PEU” only allows for single-family attached and not single-family detached. Chair Hansen added that the revised Comprehensive Plan encourages different types of housing and the neighboring residents are happy with the proposed location of the houses.

Councilmember Monachella made a motion to forward P.Z. 11-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (13987 & 14001 Olive Blvd) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ohley and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the March 1, 2021 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 11-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (13987 & 14001 Olive Blvd).]

- C. P.Z. 12-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (14001 Olive Blvd):** A request for a change in zoning from “R-3” Residence District to “PUD” Planned Unit Development for a maximum of 100 residential units (16R340151). (Ward 1)

STAFF PRESENTATION

Annisa Kumerow, Planner, presented the project request for a change in zoning from “R-3” Residence District to the “PUD” Planned Unit Development District. The proposed project consists of 100 residential units, of which 52 will be split between single-family attached and detached, and 48 multi-family units to be located on the western portion of the site.

A Public Hearing was held on December 14, 2020 where four issues were raised by the Planning Commission: traffic, amenities, 14015 Olive Boulevard, and the bioretention basin plantings.

At the January 25, 2021 Planning Commission meeting, an additional issue was raised concerning the location of the single-family detached lots and the preference for these lots to be along the eastern border of the property. The Planning Commission did not vote on the item at that time.

On February 8, 2021, the petition returned to the Planning Commission. The Petitioner's Narrative Statement had been revised to note that proposed Lots 1-10 along the eastern property line be designed as single-family detached residential only. The Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 8-1.

DISCUSSION

The following areas of discussion then took place.

GRAVEL TRAIL

Councilmember Mastorakos expressed her concern that gravel is not very conducive for bicycles and added that she is looking for connectivity to the amenities and use by the residents.

TRAFFIC

Once again, Chair Hansen stated that the dissenting vote from the Planning Commission was from Planning Commissioner Harris due to traffic concerns and who felt the proposed development added more aggravation to an already difficult situation. Chair Hansen stated that while the applicant has changed the median and added three lanes at the entrance, it is acknowledged that these improvements will still not help anyone turning left out of the subdivision onto Olive, and that traffic will back up into the development. The Planning Commission felt there was no satisfactory answer to alleviate the traffic problem.

“PUD” CRITERIA

Councilmember Monachella stated that she had spoken to Planning Commissioner Harris who informed her that in addition to her traffic concerns, she also felt that there are not enough amenities for this project to qualify as a “PUD.” Councilmember Mastorakos concurred and stated that this is a huge, concentrated development but feels it lacks the spirit of what a “PUD” is intended to be. She understands that the neighboring residents are pleased with the project and will, therefore, support it. However, when the applicant comes in with the Site Development Plan, she expects an exceptional design with character and quality as outlined for “PUDs” in the Unified Development Code. She also will look to see if the greenspace is dispersed throughout the site and not concentrated in all one area.

Councilmember Monachella stated that she would like to see more amenities, such as increased useable park space. She also feels that the pocket park in the front of the development is not really useable for the residents. She recommended creating more open space by the retention pond by including picnic tables or benches to the flat area.

DETENTION POND

Councilmember Mastorakos expressed her concern about the long-term effect of the detention pond due to its size.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

George Stock, Stock & Associates, responded to the issues raised:

“PEU” - There are several reasons why the applicant wants to repeal the “PEU.”

1. The existing ordinance allows for 82 attached units, but there currently is not a market for such a large number of attached units. Consequently, the applicant is proposing both detached and attached villas and/or townhouses, as well as condominiums.
2. The property boundaries have changed from the original Briarcliff development. The Briarcliff proposal included the property at 13987 Olive Boulevard, which is not part of the subject petition. Therefore, the boundaries need to be amended.
3. The “PEU” district no longer exists, so a “PUD” is being requested.

Density – “R-3” zoning allows for 117 units but the applicant is only asking for 100. While that is 18 more than the 82 units allowed under the existing “PEU,” significant improvements have been made to the design of the Site Plan. In the original “PEU,” the houses were located closer to Olive Boulevard. The houses are now moved to the rear. Pocket Park B is 100’ x 250’, 25,000 sq. ft. Playground and/or exercise equipment will be placed to the north of the site.

Trail – The “PUD” creates a 30-foot landscape buffer along all property lines that did not exist in Briarcliff. Within that landscape buffer, the applicant is proposing a trail for passive recreation integrated into a landscaped area similar to the Katy Trail. The trail is not primarily intended for bicycles.

Pocket Parks/Connectivity – The pocket park at the north end of the site is situated on top of the bluff and thus has different features than the pocket park located to the south. The trail, along with the sidewalks, creates a connection within the development.

Traffic – It is acknowledged that the traffic situation cannot be changed. However, based on their experience, the residents at Eagle Ridge suggested having three lanes at the subdivision’s entrance. This will make it easier for residents wanting to turn right out of the subdivision by not having to wait behind cars turning left onto Olive. MoDOT has agreed to the three lanes.

Greenspace – The development is at more than 50% open space and greenspace with a large percentage of it along the west and north. The proposed lots are 7500 sq. ft. with a 30-foot buffer behind them compared to the proposed lots in Briarcliff of 6200 sq. ft. with private streets. There is also a level area around the retention basin to the west of the condominiums where a few picnic tables and benches could be added. However, Mr. Stock questioned the need to create more greenspace.

In conclusion, Mr. Stock stated that they have worked diligently to come up with a development that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and creates diversification.

There was further discussion regarding the location of the pocket parks and the ability to add a flat greenspace area around the retention pond so that benches and/or picnic tables could be placed there.

After further discussion on the wording for the motion, **Councilmember Monachella made a motion to forward P.Z. 12-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (14001 Olive Blvd) to City Council with a recommendation to approve with the condition that a 20’ useable flat area with picnic benches and/or sitting benches be positioned between the retention basin and buildings A, B, and C.** The motion was seconded by Chair Hurt and **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 1, 2021 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 12-2020 The Residences at Hog Hollow (14001 Olive Blvd).]

IV. OTHER

At the request of Chair Hurt, Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, explained the allowable window signage regulation as defined in the Unified Development Code (UDC). At the time the City incorporated in 1988, the existing St. Louis County Ordinance allowed for 50% window signage. Sometime between 1993 and 1997, the City reduced it to 40%, which has been the only change to that regulation since incorporation. The maximum allowable window signage on first floors is 40% and 20% on higher floors. It does not differentiate by use type or zoning district type and only pertains to commercial and industrial districts. Therefore, if an office building wanted to put up window signs, they could do so. To further clarify, Mr. Wyse stated that if a building has windows on four sides, then signage could be placed in all of the windows.

There was further discussion on whether this regulation should be in the Sign Package rather than the Code. Ultimately, the Committee decided to keep it within the Code and for Staff to bring the matter to the Planning Commission for further discussion on reducing the allowable percentage of window signage.

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to direct Staff and Planning Commission to review the allowable signage regulation in the UDC. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ohley and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.