I.A. MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary Thursday, June 6, 2013

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, June 6, 2013 in Conference Room 101

In attendance were: Chair Connie Fults (Ward IV); Councilmember Barry Flachsbart (Ward I); Councilmember Derek Grier (Ward II); and Councilmember Dan Hurt (Ward III).

Also in attendance were: Councilmember Bruce DeGroot (Ward IV); Planning Commission Chair Mike Watson; Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services; Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Justin Wyse, Senior Planner; Jessica Henry, Project Planner; and Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at <u>5:30 p.m.</u>

- I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY
 - A. Approval of the <u>May 23, 2013</u> Committee Meeting Summary.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of <u>May 23, 2013</u>. The motion was seconded by <u>Councilmember Hurt</u> and <u>passed</u> by a voice vote of 4 - 0.

- II. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. <u>P.Z. 05-2013 Monarch Center (JLA Development, LLC)</u>: A request for an ordinance amendment to a "PC" Planned Commercial District to add a 0.85 parcel of land currently zoned "M-3" Planned Industrial District to an existing "PC" Planned Commercial District and to modify development standards of the "PC" Planned Commercial District totaling a 10.94 acre area of land located north of Edison Avenue and east of Long Rd. (17U120188 and 17U120100).



STAFF REPORT

<u>Justin Wyse</u>, Senior Planner stated that the request was before the Planning and Public Works Committee on May 9th and May 23, 2013.

Structure Setbacks

At the May 23rd, 2013 meeting, the Committee asked Staff to clarify the changes to the setbacks that were not involved in the addition of the additional property on the northwest side of the site. The changes are detailed below - Staff has no new information but is available for questions.

Proposed Inclusion of ATM:

Attachment A, Page 4: Section I. Specific Criteria C. Setbacks – The following section in bold below **has been added** to Attachment A as part of the request.

 Structure Setbacks (for Buildings A through E). No building or structure, other than: a freestanding project identification sign, boundary and retaining walls, light standards, flag poles, fences, or <u>one (1) ATM</u> will be located within the following setbacks:

Proposed Change to Permitted Service Station Canopy as Presented:

Attachment A, Page 4: Section I. Specific Criteria C. Setbacks 1. Structure Setbacks c. – The following section **has been added** to Attachment A as part of the request.

(i) For the canopy associated with Building A: fifty (50) feet from the western boundary of the "PC" District.

Proposed Change to Setback for Building E:

Attachment A, Page 4: Section I. Specific Criteria C. Setbacks 1. Structure Setbacks d. – The following section **has been deleted** from Attachment A as part of the request.

(*i*) For Building E: one hundred twenty (120) feet from the right-of-way of Edison Avenue. *It has been requested that it comply with the sixty five* (65) foot setback requirement.

Petitioner Presentation

<u>Mike Doster</u>, on behalf of the Petitioner, gave a board presentation showing a site layout with more detail than a Preliminary Development Plan, but less detail than what would be required for Site Plan review. *Additional copies were not available for the Committee.* He then provided background history of the site with additional comments:

• The Access Management Agreement between the Kirchoffs and the City allowed for three full access points along Edison and one full access along the Kirchoff property line at Long Road provided governmental agency approval. He noted

that County has jurisdiction over the site but is deferring to MoDOT on these issues at this time.

- The Kirchoffs and the developer have reached an agreement regarding the amendment of one of the full accesses along Edison to a right-in / right-out only. At that time, he noted that an amendment to the Kirchoff agreement would be required, which would be conditioned upon *"legislative & site plan"* approval.
- He further explained that because the agreement between the Kirchoffs and the City provides for full access along Long Road which is now being converted to a right-in only, another amendment to the agreement is required.
- The Site Plan also shows the additional openspace and landscaping that is being provided which is required under the current planned district ordinance.
- The restaurant use will be located within the building area shown on the Preliminary Plan (a coffee/donut shop with a drive-through). No additional buildings would be proposed as part of this operation.
- The car wash will have two entrance lanes which will be combined into one prior to entering the car wash.
- The canopy has been moved 10 feet to the east. The canopy setback has been amended from 50 feet to 60 feet.
- The right-in only along Long Road will be moved 10 feet north, which angles the vehicles further away from the pump islands. Moving the access any farther north would cause the loss of parking and potentially a reverberated effect on how traffic circulates on the site. The site is parked per the City's requirements, but it has not yet been completely resolved as to what is needed. At the site plan stage, it may be possible to reduce the parking but at this time, the site is parked per City requirements.

DISCUSSION

<u>Chair Fults</u> clarified that the plan provided by the Petitioner is for information only and a full site plan review will be required by Staff. <u>Ms. Nassif</u> noted that Staff has not reviewed what was before the Committee and had serious concerns as to whether City Code requirements are being met.

Chair Fults summarized the following changes presented by Mr. Doster:

- Right-in / Right-out only along Edison Road
- Setback modification from 50 feet to 60 feet for the canopy
- Moving the right-in only on Long Road 10 feet to the north.

<u>Mr. Doster</u> noted the discussions have been held in the past about not wanting to legislate a site plan, because if changes are necessary per Staff review, then the Petitioner would have to go through the process again. <u>Chair Fults</u> replied that if the Committee accepts the changes as listed above, Staff will be directed to discuss the proposed language with City Attorney Heggie before final review by City Council.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> asked for clarification as to whether Power-of-Review will be exercised. <u>Ms. Nassif</u> responded that Power-of-Review has been included in the Attachment A.

<u>Councilmember Hurt</u> still has concerns with access based upon what the Petitioner has proposed. He agrees with the concept of moving the right-turn in farther to the north and noted while, parking spaces would be eliminated, there may be opportunities to revise the layout to accommodate more parking elsewhere on the site. He added that he did not have concerns with the use but feels it's possible to move the access even further north than what is being proposed. Additionally, he feels that only four pumps are needed vs. the proposed eight. He then provided options to address his concern with the access.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> asked as to whether Staff had any specific ingress safety concerns relative to what is now being proposed by the Petitioner. <u>Mr. Geisel</u> replied that as compared to what was presented previously, the plan presented to the Committee has improved. He added that Staff will give full review at the site plan stage.

Chair Fults summarized the following recommendations from the Planning Commission:

Setback to Building E

The Committee agreed to accept Planning Commission's recommendation to amend the setback from the right-of-way of Edison Avenue from 120 feet to 65 feet for Building E.

Access Points

The Planning Commission recommended three full access points off of Edison Avenue.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> then made a motion requiring the westernmost access point to be a Right-in / Right-out only. The motion was seconded by <u>Councilmember</u> <u>Hurt</u> and <u>passed</u> by a voice vote of 4 - 0.

Service Station Canopy

The Planning Commission recommended a 50-foot setback for the service station canopy. The Petitioner has stated that they can now provide a 60-foot setback for the canopy.

<u>Councilmember Flachsbart</u> then made a motion to amend the canopy setback from 50 feet to 80 feet. The motion was seconded by <u>Councilmember Hurt</u> and <u>failed</u> by a voice vote of 2 - 2 with Chair Fults and Councilmember Grier voting no.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> then made a motion to amend the canopy setback from 50 feet to 60 feet. The motion was seconded by <u>Chair Fults</u> and <u>passed</u> by a voice vote of 3 – 1 with Councilmember Flachsbart voting no.

<u>ATM</u>

The Planning Commission recommended having the ATM located within the setback at the southwest corner of the site.

<u>Planning Chair Watson</u> explained the Planning Commission's main concerns dealt with the ATM and access. <u>Councilmember Grier</u> expressed concern about the location of the ATM as he feels it will add additional traffic congestion and would prefer the ATM to be located inside the structure.

<u>Mr. Wyse</u> stated that if the Committee accepts the location of the ATM, he felt language should be included in the Attachment A requiring that the ATM be screened.

<u>Councilmember Flachsbart</u> then made a motion prohibiting the ATM within the setback. The motion was seconded by <u>Councilmember Hurt</u> and <u>failed</u> by a voice vote of 2 – 2 with Chair Fults and Councilmember Grier voting no.

<u>Councilmember Fults</u> then made a motion requiring the developer to provide landscaping or screening to the ATM. The motion was seconded by <u>Councilmember</u> <u>Grier</u> and <u>passed</u> by a voice vote of 4 - 0.

Access along Long Road

The Planning Commission recommended a full access and a right-in only along Long Road.

<u>Mr. Doster</u> requested that the Committee not make any amendments to these access points prior to Staff review. <u>Councilmember Hurt</u> stated that the only way to amend the location of the access points is to include language specifying minimum distances.

<u>Mr. Geisel</u> had concerns with distances being specified tonight noting that St. Louis County owns and maintains Long Road and they gave the Petitioner the location of the entrance. If the access is moved north, a problem arises with the distance between the right-in and the full access as there is a separation requirement between the access points. <u>Councilmember Hurt</u> asked that Staff provide him with the distance requirements required by County.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> has no amendments to offer for access and felt that Staff will provide a thorough examination of the access based upon the traffic study.

<u>Councilmember Flachsbart</u> noted that there was a desire by the majority of the Committee to have the right-in only moved further north.

Chair Fults expressed the following points:

- She will be exercising Power-of-Review during site plan review.
- She requested that the meeting summary be available at the Planning Commission meeting during site plan review.
- She requested that the Architectural Review Board specifically review the materials so that they match the surrounding developments, such as, Towne Center. <u>Councilmember Hurt</u> referred to the architectural articulation and does not feel that a flat canopy is appropriate for the area.
- She requested that art or beautification be included on the plan during site plan review. <u>Mr. Wyse</u> noted that such language has been included in the Attachment A.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> made a motion to forward <u>P.Z. 05-2013 Monarch Center</u> (JLA Development, LLC) as amended to City Council. The motion was seconded by <u>Chair Fults</u>. The petition moves forward to Council with a voice vote of 2 - 2 with Councilmembers Flachsbart and Hurt voting no.

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the June 17, 2013 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, for additional information on <u>P.Z. 05-2013</u> <u>Monarch Center (JLA Development, LLC)</u>].

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. St. Louis Branch APWA Salt Cooperative

STAFF REPORT

Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer stated that the City coordinates the process by which salt is purchased and delivered to members of the St. Louis Metro APWA Salt Cooperative (Coop), which is comprised of 44 cities and two school districts.

In 2011, the City went out to bid for salt for the Coop with the low bid being provided by North American Salt (\$41.89 / ton) and Beelman Logistics LLC (\$8.38 / ton) for delivery. Both companies have served the Coop well and are willing to provide their salt and delivery services in 2013 at the same unit price. The original contract allowed for one optional one-year extension, which the City, on behalf of the Coop, exercised in 2012.

<u>Mr. Eckrich</u> added that the contract will include language to allow unlimited one-year extensions, with the consent of both parties, provided any unit price increase does not

exceed any increase in the consumer price index (CPI) as measured by the Department of Labor.

DISCUSSION

<u>Councilmember Flachsbart</u> fully supports the contract extension. In response to questions from Councilmember Hurt, <u>Mr. Eckrich</u> explained that the City is 3,500 tons short and the dome stocks 6,000 tons.

<u>Councilmember Grier</u> made a motion to authorize the City Administrator to execute contracts with North American Salt (\$41.89 / ton) and Beelman Logistics, LLC (\$8.38 / ton) for the purchase and delivery of deicing salt and forward said contracts to City Council with a recommendation to approve.

It was clarified to Councilmember DeGroot that the City shops for competitive salt pricing.

The motion was seconded by <u>Councilmember Flachsbart</u> and <u>passed</u> by a voice vote of 4 - 0.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer, for additional information on <u>St. Louis Branch APWA Salt</u> <u>Cooperative</u>].

IV. PROJECT UPDATES

<u>Aimee Nassif</u> provided a thorough project update. (The next update will be on July 18th)

Ward 1: Project Updates

 Monsanto Campus improvements and expansion of the campus: Currently, Staff is reviewing a request for an additional temporary parking area in preparation of the expansion. As the project progresses, Councilmember Hurt would like to pursue the addition of sidewalks and a trail system connection from Chesterfield Parkway to the levee. Staff responded that due to stringent security by Monsanto, it is not likely that it will be allowed.

Ward 4: Project Updates

- Pacific Dental located at 16889 Chesterfield Airport Road Chesterfield Covenant Group, LLC is in for a change of zoning request to allow for a dental office. Staff is waiting on agency comments.
- Arbors at Kehrs Mill is in for a change of zoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The Public Hearing was held at the May 29th Planning Commission Meeting.
- Pets and Company has been approved at Spirit Valley Business Park, Lot 1. Pet kennel and grooming.

Other projects in various stages of the development process include but not limited to:

- 16636 Old Chesterfield Road
- Valvoline Instant Oil Change
- Taubman-Prestige Outlets
- Mercy Health Systems
- Monarch Center
- Hyatt Place Hotel
- Chesterfield Commons Six, Chick-fil-A restaurant
- Chesterfield Blue Valley-Premium Outlets
- Chesterfield Ridge Center, RGA site
- Chesterfield Senior Living
- Timberlake Corporate Center
- 325 N. Eatherton Road

Other Activities in May....

- Reviewed/approved over 143 MZAs (building permits)
- Reviewed 17 business licenses
- Conducted 10 pre-application meetings
- 30 sites currently under construction which we inspect/monitor regularly
- Staff answered 87 planner-of-the-day inquiries

V. OTHER

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at <u>6:20 p.m</u>.