

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
MAY 14, 2012**

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Mr. Bruce DeGroot
Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Ms. Debbie Midgley
Mr. Stanley Proctor
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Michael Watson
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Amy Nolan

ABSENT

Ms. Laura Lueking

Councilmember Randy Logan, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director
Mr. Kristian Corbin, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Nolan acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Randy Logan, Council Liaison.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 23, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Geckeler and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0 with 1 abstention from Commissioner DeGroot.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Spirit Trade Center, Lot 12A (Club Dog):

Petitioner:

Mr. Pat McLain, General Contractor for Club Dog and representing the Petitioner, 16769 Benton Taylor, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. McLain stated that the Architectural Review Board has asked for a mansard across the back of the building. He questioned why the Club Dog building is required to have the mansard when other buildings in the area do not.

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director stated that when the ARB reviews architectural elevations, they try to get a mix of materials and colors around the building. The City's code requires that materials used on the front façade also be utilized on the sides and rear of the building in order to provide a vertical or horizontal break.

Commissioner Puyear stated that he attended the Architectural Review Board meeting and indicated that ARB did not like the design of the roof without the mansard.

Mr. McLain asked if there were any options to pursue in order to have the mansard roof requirement removed. City Attorney Heggie stated the Planning Commission could, if so desired, remove ARB's recommendation regarding the mansard roof.

Ms. Nassif stated that Staff worked with the Applicant after the ARB meeting and the Applicant chose to submit elevations that included the recommended changes from ARB. There was no indication from the Applicant that there was an issue.

Mr. McLain stated that the Architect asked that the roof be revised based on ARB's recommendation. Mr. McLain then indicated that the Owner is not opposed to it from a design standpoint, but has concerns about the costs involved. He would like to be able to tell the Owner that there are other avenues available where the matter can be discussed in more detail.

Ms. Nassif asked if he is requesting that Planning Commission hold the elevations until the Applicant can work with Staff on a submittal they want

considered by the City. Mr. McLain stated that his goal is to get the building started; he would like to start building the structure without the mansard detail while the Owner works with Staff on a new submittal.

Commissioner Watson questioned why these concerns weren't voiced at the ARB meeting.

Ms. Nassif stated that Staff has been working with the Owner for quite a while and this is the first that Staff is hearing of any concerns. She advised that the Planning Commission can move forward to approve with amendments as they see fit and construction can start. The Owner would still have the option to amend the elevations for a third time if so desired. However, if the third amendments are denied, the building would have to be constructed based on the current submittal and any amendments made by Planning Commission. The other option is to ask Planning Commission to hold the vote on the elevations at tonight's meeting.

Commissioner Watson referred to past projects that have been approved and then built differently than what was approved. He does not want this to happen in this situation. Ms. Nassif indicated that procedures have now been set in place where Staff does routine site inspections to insure that what is built matches the approved plans. When a discrepancy is discovered, it is addressed immediately.

Mr. McLain stated he does not want the elevations held at this time.

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked what would be involved if the Commission approves with amendments and with direction that the Owner work with Staff. Ms. Nassif replied that Staff would need clear direction from the Commission on what they would like to see regarding the use of stone. After working with the Owner, new elevations would be submitted and reviewed by Staff to determine if they meet the Planning Commission's criteria. If so, they would be approved by Staff; if not, permits would not be approved until appropriate changes were made. The Planning Commission also has the option of asking that the revised elevations come back to the Commission for review and approval.

City Attorney Heggie asked Mr. McLain what he proposes with respect to the use of stone on the south, west, and north elevations. Mr. McLain proposed the following:

- **South Elevation:** Stone would be kept up to the octagon shape of the porch area to be stopped where the façade starts to change to the flat façade along the side. At the other end of the south elevation, no stone would be used.
- **West Elevation:** No stone. *It was noted that this is the back elevation and faces the outdoor play area.*
- **North Elevation:** Facing the building, stone at the right end would be eliminated; on the left end, stone would be taken to the beginning of the first triple window.

Chair Nolan expressed concern that the north elevation would still look unbalanced.

Commissioner Geckeler recommended having Staff review the elevations and having them brought back to the Commission.

Commissioner Watson felt that enough issues had been raised to warrant having the elevations sent back to ARB. He does not want to overrule ARB's recommendations regarding the stone and roof vs. the Petitioner's request to lessen the amount of stone and eliminating the mansard.

Commissioner Puyear pointed out that ARB did not specify how much stone wrap is needed.

Mr. McLain stated that they are flexible on the use of the stone; he was just giving his opinion in response to the City Attorney's question.

Ms. Nassif stated her concern that the new submittal was received about two weeks ago and Staff was not made aware that there were any issues. She noted that the next ARB Meeting is June 14th, followed by the June 25th meeting of the Planning Commission where the amended elevations could be reviewed.

B. P.Z. 04-2012 318 N. Eatherton Road:

Petitioner

Mr. Tim Meyer, 10849 Indian Head, St. Louis, MO stated he was representing the Petitioner, Mr. James Busch, and was available for any questions.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- A. Spirit Trade Center, Lot 12A (Club Dog):** Amended Architectural Elevations and Amended Architect's Statement of Design for a 2.01 acre "LI" Light Industrial District-zoned property located a half-mile southwest of the intersection of Chesterfield Airport Road and Trade Center Boulevard.

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, stated that the Site Plan Committee agreed to continue its discussion of this project during the Planning Commission Meeting, and as such, did not have a recommendation.

Commissioner Watson made a motion to return the Amended Architectural Elevations for Spirit Trade Center, Lot 12A (Club Dog) to the Architectural Review Board with the Owner's and Builder's comments. It is recommended that the Owner and Builder attend the ARB Meeting to present their submittal and to voice any concerns. The motion was seconded by Commissioner DeGroot and **passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 04-2012 318 N. Eatherton Road:** A request for a zoning map amendment from “NU” Non-Urban District to “PI” Planned Industrial District for a 1.049 acre tract of land located ¼ mile southeast of the intersection of Wings Corporate Drive and North Eatherton Road (18W410026).

Project Planner Kristian Corbin stated that the purpose of the request is to allow the use of the land to store materials and equipment for a landscaping business. The Applicant is requesting the following two uses:

1. Cultivation and sale of plant crops, commercial vegetable and flower gardening, as well as plant nurseries and greenhouses; and
2. Yard for storage of contractors’ equipment, materials and supplies

The City’s Comprehensive Plan designates the area as *Industrial, Low-Intensity*. The proposed zoning and uses are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan, as well as with the developments along Eatherton Road..

Public Hearing for this petition was held on April 23, 2012 at which time Staff identified three issues – (1) obtaining comment letters from outside agencies; (2) submission of a Tree Stand Delineation; and (3) amendments to the preliminary plan. No other issues were raised during Public Hearing.

Since the Public Hearing, all outstanding issues have been addressed, and all development standards have been incorporated into the Attachment A

Commissioner Puyear made a motion to approve P.Z. 04-2012 318 N. Eatherton Road. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Geckeler.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner DeGroot, Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Puyear, Commissioner Watson, Chair Nolan

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Nassif updated the Commission on the following upcoming projects:

- Wendy’s Restaurant has submitted for a new building on Chesterfield Airport Road.
- An industrial building is being proposed for Spirit Valley Business Park.

- Mercy Medical will be submitting its traffic study in the next week or two, which would place it on Planning Commission's agenda sometime in June.
- Public Hearing is coming up for the Northeast Interchange Medical Office Building. An Orthopedic Group is requesting that their medical office use be expanded to allow for overnight stays of surgery patients for observation purposes.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Michael Watson, Secretary