

IA.

MEMORANDUM



TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
July 10, 2008

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on **Thursday, July 10, 2008** in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Vice-Chair Bruce Geiger** (Ward II); **Councilmember Gene Schenberg** (Ward I); and **Councilmember Bob Nation** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Councilmember Lee Erickson, (Ward II); Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr. Planning Commission Chair; Brian McGownd, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Mara Perry, Senior Planner; and Kristine Kelley, Administrative Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at **5:35** PM

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the June 19, 2008 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Gene Schenberg made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of June 19, 2008. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bruce Geiger and passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.

II. INTERVIEW NOMINEE FOR PLANNING COMMISSION

A. Mr. Stanley Proctor

Vice-Chair Geiger began by welcoming Mr. Proctor to the meeting and then continued to introduce individual Councilmembers. **Mr. Geiger** asked whether Mr. Proctor had any personal financial holdings within the City of Chesterfield. **Mr. Proctor** replied by stating **NO**, just home ownership located at Westbury Manor.

Mr. Hirsch asked Mr. Proctor whether he understood the time requirements to be on the Planning Commission. **Mr. Proctor** understood that there are two (2) meetings a month, but his schedule is flexible. **Mr. Hirsch** responded by saying there is preparation involved before each meeting and they also meet “as needed” and that the Planning Commission is there to represent the city as a “**whole**” rather than representing each ward.

Mr. Schenberg, asked Mr. Proctor how he would feel about re-development of a gas station at the corner of Olive Boulevard and 141, which is currently vacant, but the possibility of additional commercial buildings on that site such as; Star Bucks or a fast food restaurant with a drive-thru. **Mr. Proctor** responded by saying the traffic patterns would have to be considered at that intersection.

Mr. Schenberg asked how **Mr. Proctor** felt about over-all development in the City of Chesterfield. **Mr. Proctor** replied by saying development is important if the City is to grow, but it has to be done properly and guided by the current Master Plan. **Mr. Schenberg** asked if Mr. Proctor had any experience looking at blue prints or traffic studies. **Mr. Proctor** replied by stating he has no experience with urban blue prints.

Mr. Erickson questioned his views on condominium height requirements. **Mr. Proctor** replied by saying that it depended on location and surrounding buildings and guidelines under the City of Chesterfield Master Plan. However, any complaints that would arise would be taken under consideration before a decision would be made.

FINAL DISCUSSION

Councilmember Gene Schenberg made a motion to forward Nomination for Planning Commission, Mr. Stanley Proctor to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bob Nation and passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.

III. NOMINATION BY THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

- A. Mr. Dennis Hayden for the Leonard Blake “Chesterfield Ancient History Award”

Landmarks Preservation Committee member, Mark Leach began by recognizing why Mr. Dennis Hayden of Hayden Homes merits this award. Mr. Hayden has made considerable contributions with Chesterfield’s ancient history and, through his efforts major archeological discoveries have been made. He pointed out that Mr. Hayden, home developer, reported the presence of between

50 – 75 artifact looters actively digging on the property to the authorities and contacts the archaeologists at the University of Missouri-Columbia to alert them to a possible prehistoric Native American site and to inquire about the costs of conducting an archaeological study. Hayden homes, Inc. then funded a major archeological excavation on the site. The excavations uncovered a large 4,000 year old village at the site, which greatly contributed to our understanding of Chesterfield's ancient history.

Mr. Casey asked who last year's recipient was. Mr. Leach replied that the winner was a school teacher at River Bend Elementary, Michelle Wisenborn. Mr. Geiger stated how exciting the program is and the importance of recognizing individual efforts with any archeological finding.

Ms. Nassif, as Liaison of the Landmarks Preservation Commission, concluded by describing the application process and commended the program and its recipients. Mr. Erickson expressed his excitement and appreciation for the program and also how unique these findings are to the City of Chesterfield.

FINAL DISCUSSION

Councilmember Gene Schenberg made a motion to forward Nomination of Dennis Hayden for the Leonard Blake-Chesterfield Ancient History Award to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bob Nation and passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, for additional information on Nomination of Dennis Hayden for the Leonard Blake-Chesterfield Ancient History Award].

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- 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 & PRESENTATION:

Senior Planner, Mara Perry directed the council members to the power point presentation. Drew Station came before Planning Commission on June 23, 2008 requesting a twenty (20%) parking reduction and was approved by a vote of 6 – 1 and then will get forwarded to City Council for final approval.

Mrs. Perry stated that the petitioner is required to do a parking study and in that study to show how there are **multiple uses** with **multiple peaks**, both seasonally, as well as throughout the day. The report Mrs. Perry provided to the Planning Commission showed the history of parking reductions that have been

approved for developments along Clarkson Road. The information provided by the petitioner is a summary of a recent parking study, which includes;

- Exhibit A shows the locations of the vacant parking spaces that were surveyed on two (2) days during the peak of the day. During the peak time of 12:30 p.m., the exhibit shows 119 vacant parking 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.

Mrs. Perry stated there is a surplus of 14 in accordance to the total current spaces of 262. Staff also provided to the Planning Commission a chart listing developments that have already received parking reduction as described below:

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

Mrs. Perry stated that the meeting packet also includes information from the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s Parking Generation Manual, which shows parking demand statistics for retail centers based on a survey of various retail sites. Eight-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)

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT:

Planning Commission Chair Hirsch commends staff's efforts to resolve any confusion over this matter and continued to state that the parking ordinance will continue to be reviewed.

Mr. Nation asked what the main reason was to ask for a reduction to required parking. **Mrs. Perry** responded by saying that one of the potential tenants is a Beauty Salon which has rental space for individual hair dressers. As each new tenant comes in, Staff confirms that the parking will be met with the reduction. **Mr. Hirsch** referred to a multi-use retail establishment and multiple times of operation and recommends a ***“blanket”*** for parking regulations. This will help alleviate spillage into parking on adjacent property, but not eliminate.

Mr. Nation expressed skepticism regarding the reduction of parking spaces. However, **Mrs. Perry** noted that the City of Chesterfield is trying to become more ***“Green”*** and ***“Pedestrian Friendly”*** economy as well as a community. If you reference the study provided, all of the “Green” spaces are currently vacant, exactly 119 parking spaces. By providing reductions for developments that can show us there will be a mix, it's supposed to help with the pedestrian walk ability, open-space, green-space and more friendly for the community.

Ms. Nassif pointed out that you have to look at the development as a whole. It is understandable that certain retail operations get very busy during certain hours, and parking in front of those businesses can be minimal, but there are almost 120 spaces in the development for additional parking that are available.

FINAL DISCUSSION

Councilmember Gene Schenberg made a motion to forward **P.Z. Drew Station (1662 – 1698 Clarkson Road) with 20% Reduction** to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by **Councilmember Bruce Geiger** and passed by a voice vote of 2 to 1.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, for additional information on P.Z. Drew Station (1662 – 1698 Clarkson Road) with 20% Reduction]

PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE

Planning Commissioner Hirsch provided a status update from the Planning Commission.

- Temporary Sign Ordinance. No current related issues. However, Staff is reviewing comments from the Ordinance Review Committee.

- Architectural Standards to the Uniform Development Code. The architectural standards will be an ordinance and not guidelines as they are now.
- Residential Districts. Review lot sizes.
- Planned Commercial & Planned Industrial. Development standards.
- Parking Reduction standards which will be discussed at a later date.

B. Residential Street Tree Program

STAFF REPORT & PRESENTATION:

Director of Public Works/City Engineer, Brian McGownd, stated committee directed Staff to develop a Residential Street Tree Program to include the following;

- The program would only apply to public residential streets.
- All trees planted under the Street Tree Program list which would ensure that the correct tree would be planted at the correct location.
- Staff would contract with ***local*** nursery.
- Resident would apply for the program and upon approval; City Arborists/Urban Forester Mindy Mohrman would review the location to make sure it was correct location within the right-of-way.

Mr. McGownd stated there would be a \$100 application fee submitted by the property owner. Tree will benefit community as well as resident's property. By having to contribute to the cost of the tree, owner will be more inclined to property care for the tree, but the City of Chesterfield will continue to trim. The tree would be 2 – 2-1/2" caliper. Staff anticipates receiving applications to plant 200 to 300 trees per year at a cost of \$150 to \$250 to plant. Staff would recommend including an estimated \$75,000 be included in the 2009 budget for the program.

Mr. Geiger questioned under Policy and Procedures, Section I-General Item A whether Schoettler Valley is included in this program. **Mr. McGownd** replied that the City of Chesterfield does not control right-of-way on state or county streets, so unsure that the county or state would allow a tree to be placed at that location, but will discuss with both county and state officials.

Mr. Geiger asked whether resident has the option to choose a specific type of tree and over abundance of identical trees becoming a problem.

Mr. Geiger would like to suggest making the following changes in the language under; Section I-General, Item D:

All species choices will be **reviewed** by City Staff before approval.
To
All species choices will be **approved** by City Staff.

Ms. Nassif replied by stating that currently if your project exceeds 50 trees either residential or commercial, then it is required to have a mix of 20%.

Mr. Geiger stated there would be NO vote this evening. **Mr. Schenberg** would like the language to be appropriate and flexible and to make it clear that due to location and species choices, the resident must understand that they may not get their choice under the Tree Selection Guide.

Mr. Erickson discussed a potential power line issue and possible specific list of trees allowed at those locations. **Mr. McGownd** replied that there is language included that the arborist must go out and review location before planting may begin.

Ms. Nassif stated that the current Tree Manual encourages and has language regarding street trees for residential areas and that the City is part of the “Tree City USA” program. **Mr. Schenberg** responded how eye appealing it is with a tree-lined street versus one without.

Mr. Geiger stated there will not be a vote this evening. However, he would like to make a recommendation to refer back to staff to address questions, discuss numbers and revise language before bringing back to committee. **Mr. McGownd** commented that they will also discuss adding language to include fall and spring planting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at **6:54** p.m.