

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
JUNE 23, 2008**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Mr. David Banks
Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Mr. G. Elliot Grissom
Ms. Lu Perantoni
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Michael Watson
Chairman Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr.

ABSENT

Amy Nolan

Mayor John Nations
Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Mr. Michael Herring, City Administrator
Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works
Ms. Sarah Cantlon, Community Services & Economic Development Specialist
Ms. Anissa McCaskill-Clay, Lead Senior Planner
Ms. Susan Mueller, Principal Engineer
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner
Mr. Charlie Campo, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant

II. INVOCATION: Commissioner Grissom

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – All

Chair Hirsch acknowledged the attendance of Mayor John Nations; Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison; Judge Doug Beach, former City Attorney; and City Administrator Mike Herring.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Perantoni corrected page 9 of the June 11th minutes as follows:

Commissioner Perantoni, Chair of **speaking for** the Nominating Committee, nominated the following Commissioners as Officers of the Planning Commission for 2008-2009:

Commissioner Banks made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2008 Planning Commission Meeting, as corrected. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Watson and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0**.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT - NONE

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND SIGNS

- A. **Drew Station (1662-1698 Clarkson Road)**: Parking Reduction for a 4.91 acre lot of land zoned "C-8" Planned Commercial located at the northeast corner of Clarkson and Baxter Roads.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner, stated that the request for a parking reduction was before the Commission on May 28th at which time it was held at the Petitioner's request. The request is for a 20% reduction from the existing parking. The following concerns were raised during the May 28th meeting:

- **Comparison to other area developments and the Mall:**
Ms Perry referred to the following chart of similar mixed retail developments that have already received parking reductions from either the City or St. Louis County. The chart includes developments of similar types and sizes to the Drew Station development. It was noted that the Mall is not included in this comparison as the Mall is 1.3 million square feet of development while Drew Station is 52,000 square feet. Because of the large number of square footage at the Mall, the Mall is allowed to ask the Planning Commission for above a 30% reduction. Thirty percent reductions are allowed for developments over 500,000 square feet; larger reductions are allowed for developments over 750,000 square feet.

Development	Square Footage	Reduction	Approved Date
Chesterfield Ridge (Chesterfield Retail)	20,500	4 per 1,000 (equal to 27.3 % for retail uses)	2002
Drew Station	52,405	N/A	N/A
Chesterfield Oaks	58,749	4.5 per 1,000 (equal to 18.2% for retail uses)	2005
Dierberg's Marketplace	105,000	17.1% (was 10% in 1992)	2006
Hilltown Village	126,856	20% (was 15% in 1995)	1996
Clarkson Square	150,400	15%	1984

Ms. Perry noted that the parking reductions at **Chesterfield Ridge** and **Chesterfield Oaks** were given for retail uses only – the reductions did not include restaurant uses. Any restaurants going into these developments would not have a parking reduction. Restaurants typically have almost double the amount of parking spaces required because of seats vs. square footage.

➤ Seasonal uses – such as holiday hours:

Since the last Planning Commission meeting, additional questions were asked with respect to the seasonal peaks of the current tenants. It was determined that the current tenants' seasonal peaks vary across the board – for example, the tenant that has a massage use has peak seasonal times on Valentine's Day and Mother's Day. Other locations have different key high points regarding their seasonal hours.

Ms. Perry then noted that the meeting packet includes exhibits that are part of the parking study prepared by the Petitioner:

- Exhibit A shows the locations of the empty spaces that were surveyed on two days during the high peak point of the day. During the peak time of 12:30 p.m., the exhibit shows 119 empty spaces.
- Exhibit B shows "Surveyed Current Use", the "Projected Use for all Vacancies" and the "Remaining Capacity". Assuming all projected vacancies being filled, the peak hour of 12:30 p.m. shows 248 spaces being occupied out of 262 spaces – leaving 14 spaces empty.

Ms. Perry stated that the meeting packet also includes information from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Parking Generation Manual, which shows parking demand statistics for retail centers based on a survey of various retail sites. Eighty-five (85%) percent of those surveyed were at or below the following levels:

- Mon-Thursday Non-Holiday Peak Period Parking demand = **3.35** vehicles per 1,000 SFGLA (19 sites)
- Friday Non-Holiday Peak Period Parking Demand = **4.36** vehicles per 1,000 SFGLA (14 sites)
- Saturday Non-Holiday Peak Period Parking Demand = **3.56** vehicles per 1,000 SFGLA (20 sites)
- Sunday Non-Holiday Peak Period Parking Demand = **2.39** vehicles per 1,000 SFGLA (5 sites)

Ms. Perry responded to questions from the Commission regarding the following:

- What is included in the "projected for all vacancies"?: The study used projection numbers for Metro Design Hair Salon based upon numbers that were gathered from other existing Metro Design salons. The study also used projections for retail uses for the other tenants in the development. As each tenant comes in, Staff would confirm that the parking could be met with the reduction.
- Since the information from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) relates to "retail" only, how does the information relate to a mix of uses?

The ITE information refers to a retail mix of uses for a retail-type development, which would include a mix of office space, retail office space, retail and restaurant uses.

Commissioner Banks stated that this kind of analysis could be made on any proposed development with the conclusion that, in many cases, parking spaces should be reduced. Ms. Perry stated that there are a number of studies that talk about how better green developments can be provided, as well as how more pedestrian connections can be provided based on parking uses. It is only under the City's Planned Commercial Districts that the Commission has the ability to have a separate vote for good design and good planning to amend the current parking requirements for a development.

Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, stated that the Department is thoroughly reviewing the City's parking standards – comparing them to national standards. Staff will be bringing recommendations to the Ordinance Review Committee based upon its research.

Commissioner Banks expressed concern about how one knows that the period observed for the Parking Study is representative of the average busy time. It was agreed that representatives from the Petitioner would address this concern.

Mr. John Ross, 100 South Brentwood, Clayton, Missouri stated that he has owned the subject center since 1991 and during this entire time, they have never had a parking problem. A few years ago, with the help of the Mayor, they tried to address "good development". They did this by working with the adjoining shopping center in creating a project that emphasizes "cross shopping" via pedestrian walkways. In order to create a development that worked cohesively with the adjoining project, they lost a few parking spaces. Today "good development" includes more green space and encourages cross shopping. Because of their own experience with the subject project and with other shopping centers that they own, they are confident that they have enough parking. As an owner, he would never want to not provide sufficient parking for his patrons.

Ms. Julie Nolfo, Crawford Bunte & Brammeier, addressed Commissioner Banks' concern by explaining how Parking Studies are prepared.

- The first step is to determine the mix of uses by reviewing the tenancy. The subject development includes FedEx, Plato's Closet, ABC Trading, Scottrade, Massage Envy etc. – these types of tenants do not have a lot of peaks and spikes, nor do they coincide with one another. Most of the tenants do not have a holiday peak season in November and December as the Mall does. Scottrade peaks earlier in the year while Massage Envy peaks over Valentine's Day and Mother's Day, and FedEx peaks during the holidays.
- The next step in reviewing a retail center with mixed uses and different peaks in terms of months and days would be to pick 1-2 days during the week, which are representative of the usage trend – Monday mornings are generally avoided as a representative day. In this case, Summit

- Development Group picked the month of May. Taking December out of the mix, national charts show that May is a typical month.
- The center is then counted every half hour - from opening time until around 6-7 pm - to determine the existing demand, which is what Summit Development Group did. Noting that CBB did not prepare the Parking Study, Ms. Nolfo stated that they did review it and found Summit's decision to pick May as a representative month to be appropriate. Mr. Ross added that the parking was counted throughout the day including the busiest time for the restaurant – 12:30 p.m.
 - The next step is to assume uses for the current vacancies. Summit assumed retail use for their vacancies applying the City's requirements of 5.5 spaces. Summit then projected Metro Design Hair Salon's parking use by reviewing parking usage at two existing Metro salons and counted the sites on two separate days.
 - These steps will give a forecasted demand for the center. The next step is to compare the forecasted demand to the center's supply and making sure there is adequate supply to meet the demand.

If CBB had been asked to prepare this study, Commissioner Banks asked how they would have determined what month/week should be studied. Ms. Nolfo replied that because of the mix of uses in the center, she would have been comfortable studying the center in May.

Commissioner Perantoni noted that during the past two years, the center included a tenant during the Halloween period and asked if this would continue. She added her concern about the vehicular circulation of the site and pointed out that one of the vacancies in the center was a former eating establishment – Einstein Bagels. She also expressed her concern about the study not being done over a longer period of time.

Commissioner Perantoni referred to the development of the project north of the site. She stated that it was her understanding that circulation into the subject site was because of that property. She was not of the understanding that it was to alleviate problems on the subject site, but rather that it was part of the other project. She recalls trade-offs with Barnes & Noble for their parking reduction because of what they were going to do with the site. Because of the subject site being so tight, she does not feel there is anything that can be offered as a trade-off for the parking reduction.

Mr. Ross responded to Commissioner Perantoni by stating the following:

- In the past, there has been a Halloween tenant in the development during the Halloween months. During that time, traffic was not that substantial – there was more than sufficient parking even with the Halloween establishment renting all of the vacancies at one time. The end space has now been leased out so this will not be occurring in the future.
- Regarding the Einstein space, this eating establishment was busy first thing in the morning and then again at lunch – they were not open in the evening. The only parking issues arose during the lunch period because

the western side of the shopping center has less parking. The eastern side of the shopping center always had ample parking – it was never full.

- He does not feel the center has ever had problems with circulation. He added that there has always been plenty of parking and people were able to move around. At the City’s request, they created circulation through the back of the other shopping center up to the north in order to provide circulation going into the adjoining shopping center. This resulted in the loss of eight parking spaces. Ms. Perry stated that a new entrance/exit was added to the far northeast corner of the development to provide additional circulation between the two developments.
- Mr. Ross felt the City should re-evaluate its parking standards because when parking standards were created 10-15 years, there were not the kind of uses now being seen in shopping centers. The subject center includes Scottrade, Massage Envy, and Kinko’s, which do not generate a lot of traffic at one time. Shopping centers are now including more service kinds of uses, which do not require as much parking.

Commissioner Perantoni asked for clarification on the parking that has already been reduced by 8 spaces to accommodate the other shopping center. Mr. Ross stated that the parking was reduced at the request of the City to try and create a harmonious development between the two centers, which would provide good in-flow and good circulation for the other center. Ms. Perry added that the parking spaces that were removed did not result in a parking reduction for the site.

Councilmember Hurt asked if all the uses that are allowed on the site had been evaluated for the parking study. Chair Hirsch replied that Ms. Perry included this information in her Staff Report. Ms. Perry referred to the chart below noting that only the last scenario of uses would not meet the parking if a parking reduction is granted. In such a case, Staff would not approve a Municipal Zoning Approval.

Parking Scenario	Req'd Number of Spaces	With 20% Reduction	Total Current Spaces
Current Development with Vacant as Office	273.9	219.1	262
Entire Development as Retail (5.5 per 1,000)	281.8	225.5	262
Current Development with Vacant as (2) Retail and (1) Sit-Down Restaurant	303.4	242.7	262
Current Development with Vacant as (2) Office and (1) Salon	327.4	261.9	262
Current Development with Vacant as (2) Retail and (1) Salon	351.9	281.5	262

Councilmember Hurt asked Ms. Nolfo if she felt the subject parking study is appropriate when compared to national parking standards and mixed uses. Ms. Nolfo stated that CBB reviewed the data provided in the parking study prepared by Summit Development group. CBB endorsed the study feeling that it had been done consistently and reasonably based upon the City’s standards.

The subject study was prepared in exactly the same way CBB has prepared parking studies for the City for parking reductions – she noted that the City has accepted the methodology of how the studies were prepared by CBB.

Ms. Nolfo added that when CBB does a parking study where vacancies are assumed in it – and it is a retail center such as Drew Station – unless there is a specific user in mind, CBB will provide the City’s retail zoning ordinance requirement. In this case, the City’s standard is 5.5 spaces – the national standards would probably be lower for a typical retail use. CBB does not consider any applicable use for vacancies because the City reviews uses as they come into a development.

Councilmember Hurt stated that he is not concerned about a parking reduction for this particular development, but does have concern about the possibility of setting a precedent for other developments.

Mayor Nations expressed his support for the proposed parking reduction. He added that if there is any change to the interior of a building, the applicant has to come back to the City for a zoning approval.

Regarding the City’s standards for parking, Mayor Nations stated that many of the City’s developments may require too much parking. This is why the ordinances for the City specifically provide for up to a 20% reduction where it has been demonstrated that adequate parking would be provided for the combined uses and customary operations of the uses. He feels that the subject study clearly demonstrates this.

Mayor Nations pointed out that Mr. Ross has been in this area since 1991. When Capitol Land came in, there were a lot of issues to be addressed which required a lot of cooperation and coordination. The City and Capitol Land worked together to make sure this development and the adjoining development were both improved. Mr. Ross accommodated the City’s request to provide cross access to the adjoining development. He felt that Mr. Ross’s cooperative actions should not be penalized. He then publicly acknowledged Mr. Ross’s cooperation over the years and stated that he feels the request should be approved. He added his appreciation of Staff’s review of the City’s parking standards.

Referring to Staff’s review of the parking standards, Commissioner Banks stated that he is looking for “a rationale, rigorous review that is science-based” so the Commission can be assured they are reviewing facts and not just a Petitioner’s desire for a reduction.

Commissioner Watson made a motion to approve the Parking Reduction for Drew Station (1662-1698 Clarkson Road). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 6 to 1** with Commissioner Perantoni voting “no”.

- B. Friendship Village of West County:** An Amended Site Development Plan, Architectural Elevations, Landscape Plan, Tree Stand Delineation Plan, and Tree Preservation Plan for a 34.5 acre tract of land zoned “NU” Non-Urban District, located at the northwest corner of Olive Blvd and Arrowhead Estates Lane.

STAFF REPORT

Mr. Charlie Campo, Project Planner, stated that the Amended Site Development Plan would add three attached villas. The exterior building materials would be identical to the other villas presented to the Commission. The Landscape Plan is in compliance with the City’s Tree Manual. A Boundary Adjustment Plat was approved in February, 2008 to add approximately a .5 acre tract of land. Subsequently, the Conditional Use Permit for Friendship Village was amended to include the extra acreage so the three proposed attached villas could be built.

The Architectural Review Board has approved identical villas on the Friendship Village site, therefore, these three villas were not presented to ARB.

Mr. Campo gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the Amended Site Development Section Plan; the Tree Stand Delineation Plan; the Tree Preservation Plan; the Landscape Plan; and the Elevations.

Commissioner Perantoni asked if the brick material is carried all around so that brick is seen from Olive. Mr. Campo replied that brick veneer is on all four sides of the buildings.

Commissioner Geckeler noted that Petitioner is saving a lot of existing trees and is doing root pruning trenches. She asked what the Tree Manual requires in the event some of the existing trees die. Ms. McCaskill-Clay replied that when the City has an approved Tree Preservation Plan, there is a requirement for a Tree Preservation bond. If some trees that are to be protected are removed, the bond would allow the City to replace the trees, or penalize those parties who remove the trees. Commissioner Geckeler asked if the bond would provide for replacing the trees on the site. Ms. McCaskill-Clay replied that it would.

Chair Hirsch stated that the Petitioner, Bill Remis of Friendship Village, was available for questions.

Commissioner Grissom made a motion to approve the Amended Site Development Plan, Architectural Elevations, Landscape Plan, Tree Stand Delineation Plan, and Tree Preservation Plan for Friendship Village of West County. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Watson and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

VIII. OLD BUSINESS - None

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Next meeting is June 25, 3:00 p.m.

B. Committee of the Whole/Training Session

Next meeting is June 30, 5:00 p.m. The Commissioners were asked to either e-mail Mr. Geisel or to call his secretary, Carol Kroie, to let him know whether or not they would be in attendance.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Michael Watson, Secretary