

Memorandum

Department of Planning

To: Planning and Public Works Committee
From: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning
Date: September 2, 2021
RE: **Rooftop Screening Requirements**



Summary

In September of 2020, Staff presented a request to make modifications to the Architectural Review Standards (Section 405.04 of the Unified Development Code) to address existing buildings. At that time, P&PW also asked Staff to gather input from the Architectural Review Board regarding the possibility of additional language as it pertains to the screening of rooftop mechanical units, specifically a requirement for the utilization of penthouses as the sole form of rooftop screening within the City Center Land Use Designation of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The code changes were reviewed by ARB prior to a Public Hearing in January 2021. With input and a recommendation from ARB, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the language regarding existing buildings as well as a few minor grammatical changes; however, they did not recommend the changes to the language regarding screening of rooftop mechanical equipment.

P&PW moved the recommendations from Planning Commission forward to City Council, which approved Ordinance 3139. In discussion regarding the rooftop mechanical equipment, P&PW requested that members of ARB attend an upcoming meeting for discussion on the topic of rooftop screening. This meeting took place on February 4, 2021 and was addressed again on February 18, 2021 at which time P&PW took no action but asked that this issue be brought back again in September.

Excerpts of the relevant meetings are attached for your review.

Attachments: September 10, 2020 PPW Minutes
November 12, 2020 ARB Minutes
January 11, 2021 PC Minutes
February 04, 2021 P&PW Minutes
February 18, 2021 P&PW Minutes

Discussion

In response to Chair Hurt's question, Mr. Wyse replied that any time the City initiates zoning, there has to be a public policy justification for why the City is taking that action. Inactivity on the petitioner's part, is not a justifiable action. Property owners have the legal right to obtain a reasonable land use classification under Missouri Law. Removing those rights due to lack of development, would not be a justification.

Councilmember Monachella made a motion to forward an ordinance amending section 405-02-020.E, to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed by a voice vote of 3-0.**

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the September 21, 2020 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on Section 40502.040.E. (Time Extensions).]

C. Architectural Review Design Standards

STAFF PRESENTATION

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, stated that at the last Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting, Staff was asked to look into the potential for including additional language into Section 04-01 Architectural Review Design Standards to address modifications for re-use and redevelopment of existing buildings. ARB believes they have the necessary tools to evaluate new developments, however, they are requesting additional guidelines for older buildings that may not have been approved under today's guidelines.

Prior to commencement of a more detailed analysis by Staff and forwarding the item to the Architectural Review Board for discussion, Staff is seeking direction from the Committee in reviewing the Architectural Review Design Standards. If direction is received to move forward, Staff will complete the requested research and analysis and place the item on an upcoming meeting of ARB. If ARB recommends changes to the Code, a Public Hearing will be held and the Planning Commission will provide a formal recommendation on proposed changes to City Council. These changes would then be reviewed by this Committee and then forwarded to City Council for two readings.

Discussion

The Committee was agreeable to the idea, but also discussed whether or not to go beyond existing structures and include additional items such as the location and composition of mechanical equipment.

The Committee agreed that ARB members provide an element of expertise and professionalism and the Council values their opinion.

Ultimately the Committee directed Staff to begin the analysis and to consider additional items.

Mr. Wyse stated that no motion was required as he just wanted feedback from the Committee before proceeding.

IV. OTHER

- Meetings (when, who, and what we need)
- Purpose (why we meet)
- Requirements (who has to be there and what has to happen)
- Structure (process of meeting)
- Development Timeline (process for site plan review)
- Comprehensive Plan – Overall plan goals: Design streets to enhance the community
- Unified Development Code – Submittal Requirements, Site Design, and Building Design

Back in May there was discussion by the Board regarding amendments to the elevations of existing buildings. In some scenarios, these buildings pre-date the inception of the Architectural Review Board and may even pre-date the incorporation of the City.

These buildings, in current form, may not meet the Architectural Design Standards in the Unified Development Code by which the Board reviews them. Although, it was acknowledged that the ARB understands that these buildings may not be able to be updated into something that meets these standards immediately, as requests come through, each request should further the building towards compliancy with the standards of our code, and the amendments being requested should definitely not extend further deviation from the City's code.

The Board asked Staff to review the Architectural Standards to evaluate the potential for language that could/should be implemented to reinforce this notion. Given that these meeting are recorded, it may serve as a guide to benefit any new future Board members on the overall structure and process of the Board.

The following agenda item identifies the researched design code in surrounding municipalities, reviewed the design standards of the Chesterfield UDC, and will present some draft language.

Information only – no action at this time.

C. General Requirements for Building Design Discussion

STAFF PRESENTATION

Chris Dietz, Planner explained that Staff was approached by ARB to provide guidance regarding redevelopment of existing buildings. Staff was directed by the Planning and Public Works Committee to review the code for the potential additional language regarding this matter as well as defining language which refines screening for rooftop mechanical units, within specific geographical areas of the city.

Review Timeline

Prior to adoption, the following would be required:

- A Public Hearing, recommendation by the Planning Commission, review by the Planning and Public Works Committee, and two readings of a bill before the City Council.

Mr. Dietz then provided a detailed description of the UDC's Architectural Review Design Standards with Staff's recommended language to be incorporated into each section of the code pertaining to the following:

Change #1 - Modification to Existing Buildings

- *Existing Structures: All additions and exterior renovations to existing non-residential structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provisions of the UDC.*

Proposed Language (General Requirements for Building Design):

7. Existing Structures. All additions and exterior renovations to existing structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provisions of Section 405.05.101 D. of the Unified Development Code.

Change #2: Rooftop Mechanical Units

- *Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.*

Proposed Language (General Requirements for Building Design):

2. Screening
 - k.) *Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.*

Change #3: Supplemental Changes - Staff identified a few minor inconsistencies with the design standards. Those line items to be removed shown in **Red**.

Proposed Language (Applicability Exemptions):

3. Exemptions.
 - c.) Non-residential additions and architectural amendments that meet ~~all of~~ the following criteria may be considered for administrative approval by the Director of Planning. Said approval shall be at the discretion of the Director of Planning if:
 - (1) The proposed addition is less than 5,000 square feet; or
 - ~~(2) The proposed addition does not impact the site such that the approved plan for the site must be review by utility and fire protection agencies;~~

Proposed Language (Signage):

5. Signage. *Signs and sign packages are reviewed through a separate process. All signs shall adhere to the Unified Development Code (UDC) and/or the Sign Package for the site.* ~~For existing buildings under review for additional or alterations the following shall apply:~~
 - ~~a.) Integrate sign location into the building or development design theme.~~
 - ~~b.) New sign locations proposed for existing buildings shall be compatible with existing building signage locations. Where no sign package exists, unifying elements such as; size, shape, or materials shall be used to create continuity.~~

The following are points and options for discussion with the Board pertaining to the proposed modifications:

- Agree to move forward with existing language
- Move forward without additional language
- Continue discussion at the next meeting based on input from the Board
-

DISCUSSION

Change #1 – Modification to Existing Buildings

Chair Weber explained that depending on the project, and the percentage of improvements, the changes would be examined on a case by case basis. He questioned whether the design components will allow for transition of additional landscaping. Mr. Knight confirmed that the landscaping must adhere to the approved landscape plan prior to approval of additional plans.

For cohesiveness, Board Member Clawson felt that the modifications should apply universally throughout the whole structure.

Change #2 – Rooftop Mechanical Equipment

Chair Weber felt that due to certain differences in topography, the sight lines of rooftop equipment should also be taken into consideration.

Board Member Clawson asked for clarification whether the change applies to existing buildings or new development. He had concerns that any update to an existing older building held to this requirement would generate costly improvements and deter renovations. It was further discussed whether the changes should be written in the code or site-specific ordinance.

Mr. Knight replied that it will only apply to new development. However, any changes to existing mechanical units will need to be enclosed.

In response to Chair Weber's questions, Mr. Knight defined the meaning of "penthouses" and the similarity to the existing RGA building.

After considerable discussion as to the next steps, Staff will draft the recommended language but the Board agreed to move forward for Public Hearing to avoid delays.

Board Member's DeLong and Adams exited the meeting at this point.

Motion

Board Member Starling made a motion to accept the additional language in RED with the recommended changes in GREEN and to move forward to the Planning Commission for Public Hearing:

Change #1 – Modification of Existing Buildings

- **Existing Structures.** All additions and exterior renovations to existing structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provision of Section 405.05.101 D. of the Unified Development Code. ***Exterior additions shall be incorporated into one cohesive design with the existing structure.***

Change #2 – Rooftop Mechanical Equipment

- Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs ***of new buildings*** within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

Board Member Clawson seconded the motion. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 3 - 0.**

V. **OTHER**

VI. **ADJOURNMENT** 7:08 p.m.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
MEETING SUMMARY
JANUARY 11, 2021**

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

ABSENT

Commissioner Allison Harris
Commissioner John Marino
Commissioner Debbie Midgley
Commissioner Nathan Roach
Commissioner Gene Schenberg
Commissioner Jane Staniforth
Commissioner Guy Tilman (*not present at Roll Call, but arrived shortly thereafter*)
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Merrell Hansen

Mayor Bob Nation
Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison
Mr. Michael Lindgren, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning
Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner
Mr. Chris Dietz, Planner
Ms. Annisa Kumerow, Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

Chair Hansen acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison; Councilmember Mary Monachella, Ward I; and Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS - Commissioner Schenberg read the “Opening Comments” for the Public Hearing.

- A. P.Z. 13-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code—Article 4): An ordinance amending Article 4 of the Unified Development Code to revise language pertaining to architectural review design standards.**

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Planner Chris Dietz provided the following information about the subject site:

Background

On May 14, 2020, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) requested that Staff explore adding language in the Unified Development Code (UDC) pertaining to modification of existing buildings throughout the City.

After presenting the issue to the Planning & Public Works Committee (PPW), Staff was also directed to seek input from ARB regarding adding language to the UDC relative to screening rooftop mechanical equipment within sections of the City Center land use designation. ARB has provided recommendations for both modifications to existing structures and screening of rooftop equipment. Staff has also prepared minor updates to this section of code.

Amendment #1: Modification to Existing Structures

Mr. Dietz pointed out that the Architectural Review Design Standards currently do not have language specific to the redevelopment and modification of existing buildings. As older buildings redevelop throughout the City, these buildings should be advancing towards the Architectural Review Design Standards as if they were new developments.

A seventh category will be added to Section 404.04.010.D of the Unified Development Code with the following proposed language: (*changes shown in red*)

Section 405.04.010.D.7:

Existing Structures: All additions and exterior renovations to existing structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provision of Section 405.04.010.D. of the Unified Development Code. Exterior additions shall be incorporated into one cohesive design with the existing structure.

Amendment #2: Screening of Rooftop Mechanical Equipment

Mr. Dietz explained that Ordinance No. 3114 already provides language regarding rooftop screening for portions of City Center. The language has been modified to include ARB's recommendations, and will now apply to both the Urban Transition and Downtown subareas. The proposed language is shown below, which incorporates language from Ordinance 3114 and ARB. (*additions to Ordinance 3114 language shown in red*)

Section 405.04.010.D.2.k.

Rooftop equipment **in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan** shall be permitted on roofs **of new buildings** within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

Amendment #3: Supplemental Updates

Staff identified a few minor inconsistencies within the Architectural Review Design Guidelines, which should be updated within Code. (*changes shown in red*)

Section 04-01.A. Applicability and Compliance

3. Exemptions.

- a) Single residential lots are exempt from the provisions of these ARB Design Standards, provided no construction, addition or alteration of a non-residential building is proposed.
- b) Residential additions and tear downs are reviewed under Section 405.20.160 of this UDC.
- c) Non-residential additions and architectural amendments that meet ~~all of~~ the following criteria may be considered for administrative approval by the Director of Planning. Said approval shall be at the discretion of the Director of Planning if:
 - (1) The proposed addition is less than 5,000 sq. ft.; or
 - (2) ~~The proposed addition does not impact the site such that the approved plan for the site must be reviewed by utility and fire protection agencies;~~

Section 04-01 D. General Requirements for Building Design

- 5. Signage. Signs and sign packages are reviewed through a separate process. All signs shall adhere to the Unified Development Code (UDC) and/or the Sign Package for the site. ~~For existing buildings under review for additions or alterations the following shall apply:~~
 - ~~a) Integrate sign locations into the building or development design theme.~~
 - ~~b) New sign locations proposed for existing buildings shall be compatible with existing building signage locations. Where no sign package exists, unifying elements such as size, shape, or materials shall be used to create continuity.~~

Discussion

Considerable discussion ensued regarding the proposed amendment (*shown below*) pertaining to screening of rooftop mechanical equipment:

Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs of new buildings within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

Councilmember Hurt explained that the Planning & Public Works Committee (PPW) had requested a review of the requirements regarding screening of rooftop equipment because of concerns about Wildhorse Village where the buildings sit lower than Chesterfield Parkway. Consequently, roofs are seen at grade level from Chesterfield Parkway, with a direct view of rooftop mechanical equipment. Since the developer agreed to place a penthouse around all the mechanical equipment within the Wildhorse Village development as a “trade-off” for the proposed taller buildings and tower, PPW Committee recommended that all rooftop equipment within portions of the City Center be placed within penthouses.

Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, clarified that the proposed language regarding penthouse screening only applies to new buildings – not to an existing building requesting modifications. It was also noted that the City currently requires screening of all rooftop mechanical equipment, but does not require a fully-enclosed penthouse.

Commissioner Tilman expressed concern that if fully-enclosed penthouses are required for rooftop equipment, it could have a direct economic impact on future development within the City because of the higher costs involved. He also pointed out that the money required for penthouses could prohibit spending on more desirable amenities, such as landscaping or higher design of buildings.

Commissioner Marino also questioned the requirement for penthouses vs. the typical type of rooftop screening.

Through discussions with ARB members, Councilmember Hurt's understanding is that the main concept of a "penthouse" is that the paneling around the screening would match the architecture of the building – not that the penthouse would necessarily be fully-finished or have a roof on it.

Commissioner Tilman objected to the proposed language of *fully enclosed penthouse*. He pointed out that such a structure makes replacement of equipment more expensive because there are no open sides of the screening giving easy access to the equipment.

Commissioner Staniforth agreed that the proposed language could place an undue burden on some developers. She suggested that the City continue with requiring screening of rooftop equipment and review each development on a case-by-case basis to determine if additional screening measures are needed.

Mr. Dietz then provided the current language within Section 405.04.010.D.2.j of the Unified Development Code regarding screening of rooftop equipment:

Screen rooftop equipment on all visible sides with materials that are an integral part of the architecture. Parapet walls or screen walls shall be treated as an integral part of the architecture and shall not visually weaken the design of the structure.

Mayor Nation noted his opinion that if good screening requirements are already in place, there is not a need to require penthouses.

Mr. Wyse acknowledged the points made, and stated that after closing the Public Hearing, the discussion would be continued under "Unfinished Business".

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to approve the **Meeting Summary of the December 14, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Staniforth.

Commissioner Midgley stated that she was not in attendance at the December 14th meeting, but the meeting summary shows her in attendance. It was noted that the Recording Secretary would correct the minutes.

The motion to approve the Meeting Summary, as corrected, **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0**. (*Commissioners Midgley and Roach abstained.*)

- B. **P.Z. 13-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code - Article 4):** An ordinance amending Article 4 of the Unified Development Code to revise language pertaining to architectural review design standards.

Planner Chris Dietz summarized the material presented at the earlier Public Hearing noting that there are three proposed amendments pertaining to:

1. Modification to Existing Buildings;
2. Screening of Rooftop Mechanical Equipment in portions of City Center; and
3. Supplemental updates to provide consistency in this section of Code

Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to:

- Approve the proposed amendment regarding modifications to existing structures;
- Approve the proposed amendments regarding supplemental updates to address minor inconsistencies within Article 4 of the Unified Development Code; and
- Reject the proposed amendment regarding screening of rooftop mechanical equipment and to keep in place the current language.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Roach, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Staniforth, Commissioner Tilman, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Marino, Chair Hansen

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

Discussion

Discussion continued on the proposed language regarding penthouse enclosures.

Proposed Language

Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs of new buildings within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

Current Language

Screen rooftop equipment on all visible sides with materials that are an integral part of the architecture. Parapet walls or screen walls shall be treated as an integral part of the architecture and shall not visually weaken the design of the structure.

Commissioner Tilman noted his objection to requiring rooftop equipment to be fully enclosed within a penthouse. He feels that the current language requiring adequate screening around rooftop units is sufficient. He also believes that ARB has done a good job in managing this by reviewing the height, materials, and color of proposed screens.

Chair Hansen felt that more clarity is needed about a design standard.

Councilmember Hurt stated that ARB has wrestled with this issue with respect to the design standards, and suggested that ARB be asked for their input on the matter.

Mr. Wyse pointed out that the Code currently cites: *screen walls shall be treated as an integral part of the architecture*. He noted that *integral* is defined as: *necessary to make a whole complete; essential or fundamental*. He feels that the existing language in Code is strong enough, but agrees that additional thought needs to be given on how to implement this moving forward.

It was the consensus of the Commission to get ARB's input on the issue before making a final determination on whether the language in Code needs to be updated.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



Digitally signed by 2e55e937-bba7-4c74-ade9-9eafa0c5edda
DN: cn=2e55e937-bba7-4c74-ade9-9eafa0c5edda
Date: 2021.01.27 19:08:43 -06'00'

Gene Schenberg, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator

FROM: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning *JW*
James Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer *JE*

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee **Virtual** Meeting
Summary Thursday, February 4, 2021



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held virtually via Zoom on Thursday, February 4, 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; Architectural Review Board Chair Mick Weber; Architectural Review Board Member Scott Starling; Jim Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Justin Wyse, Director of Planning; Annisa Kumerow, 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 January 21, 2021 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Ohley made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of January 21, 2021. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0**.

Chair Hurt requested that Item II.B be discussed before Item II.A and the Committee concurred.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

Chair Hurt stated that two members of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) were present for the discussion. He then introduced Chair Mick Weber and Scott Starling. He stated that the Committee is looking for the ARB's feedback on the subject of rooftop screening.

Chair Hurt explained that the issue first arose during the Wildhorse development, primarily due to the topography of that area. Depending on the level of the building, rooftop elements may be seen. This has not been an issue in the past with commercial buildings, however, with the popular mixed-use developments, it is becoming more of a concern. Thus, Council is questioning whether the requirement of penthouse screening should be included in the Unified Development Code (UDC), especially within the Urban Core where an uninterrupted visual flow is desired.

If this requirement is not in the Code, it should be determined whether ARB has the latitude or authority to advise Council as to when penthouse screening should be required. ARB has often said that certain issues are not within their purview.

Chair Hurt also stated that he would like to know how ARB defines penthouse screening.

Councilmember Mastorakos stated that she would like to know if there is a value to uniformity throughout the Urban Core, or if it is not particularly relevant.

DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board Chair Mick Weber stated that there is a certain amount of architectural freedom that you want to give developers. Each building is unique and how to go about screening HVAC equipment is about as open as the creativity in the design of the building itself. There are a lot of ways to conceal rooftop equipment - sometimes it is integrated into the actual composition and massing of the building, while other times it is left as more of an attachment type element, or another layering element at the roofline as a cap. Everyone takes a different design approach. He is of the opinion that “one-size-fits-all” would not be appropriate in terms of uniformity of the roof. However, there is a certain level of containment in screening that needs to take place, and obviously, as the topography changes, this will alter his opinion on what needs to be screened.

Mr. Weber then discussed the issue of sight lines and distance when screening rooftop equipment. He explained that in certain circumstances, a penthouse may be needed, but it may be totally out of line with construction costs. Screening can significantly add to the cost of a project and he would prefer not to impose such costs on the developer. When sitting on the fifth floor of a residential unit looking down across another building, it should be expected that some of the mechanical equipment will be seen. Depending on how a building is sited, it may not be possible to conceal the equipment. He would prefer to evaluate it on a case-by-case basis during project review. The Urban Core designation allows the Board to do that in some cases. It was suggested that during the pre-application process, the Director of Planning could inform applicants of potential problems with rooftop screening, or identify problem areas on the zoning map. ARB has begun calling for sight lines on submittals to show that parapets are either hiding the unit, and/or some type of screen is hiding the unit from grade level around the perimeter of the property line. In most cases, this level of screening suffices. He does not want to arbitrarily drive someone’s buildings costs up significantly by requiring a penthouse.

Regarding the definition of a penthouse, Mr. Weber explained that in the past when elevators were used for 3 or 4-story buildings, an equipment room was placed at the top of the building. That room was a contained room, which is how the term “penthouse” originated. Mr. Weber felt that a penthouse could look out of place on a building that does not have multiple floors.

Scott Starling, ARB Member, concurred with Mr. Weber’s comments. He also stated that it would be reasonable to require screening on all non-residential buildings while allowing some flexibility as to how that screening is accomplished. The context of the design will be different, along with material and elements of the design. It would also be reasonable to require screening from grade level, with some limits where complete screening of the rooftop unit is not visible from grade level adjacent to the building for 100 or 200 feet. He pointed out that it would be expected to see some kind of rooftop equipment on buildings where there are topography issues. It is not reasonable to penalize developers by requiring a totally enclosed penthouse as people are accustomed to seeing rooftop equipment.

Mr. Weber stated that ARB has been very cognizant of trying to protect the property line dimension. In reviewing projects along the I-64 corridor and the Urban Core, ARB takes a stricter stance.

To summarize, Chair Hurt stated that ARB does not necessarily think that something specific needs to be written into the Code. However, it is suggested that some kind of reference could be formulated so that as projects come through for review, the ARB/Planning Commission could give Council advice on the screening of rooftop equipment and/or the inclusion of a penthouse. Mr. Weber agreed.

Mr. Starling commented that the Code should definitely include that screening will be required and it should also require that the materials used are consistent with the materials used elsewhere on the building and complementary to the design. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning then read what is written in the Code regarding rooftop screening:

Section 405.04.010 D.2.K.

Screen rooftop equipment on all visible sides with materials that are an integral part of the architecture. Parapet walls or screen walls shall be treated as in integral part of the architecture and shall not visually weaken the design of the structure.

Section 405.04.010 D.4.

Integrate the design of fencing, sound walls, carports, trash enclosures, rooftop screening, and similar site elements into the building design and construct with similar materials.

Chair Hurt again summarized that from Mr. Weber's and Mr. Starlings' standpoint, a change is not necessary in the Code as the issues of screening and materials are already addressed in Code. Mr. Weber pointed out that screening primarily becomes an issue when there is a considerable change in topography.

Chair Hurt stated that no action needs to be taken at this time, and requested that the issue be tabled to the next Committee meeting.

A. Wilson Avenue Sidewalk (Ward 4)

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jim Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer, stated that on November 5, 2020, the Planning and Public Works Committee directed Staff to determine the cost and feasibility of constructing a missing section of sidewalk on the west side of Wilson Avenue north of Buchholz Mortuary.

There is a 70-foot gap of sidewalk and in order to fill in that gap, it will be necessary to replace an additional length of sidewalk on either side due to the poor condition of that sidewalk as well as some grade issues. Staff estimates the cost of the sidewalk replacement would be approximately \$48,000.

If the Committee determines that this project should be constructed, Staff can include the sidewalk project in the 2022 Capital Projects Budget submittal, or the Committee can recommend a 2021 Budget Amendment in the Capital Projects Fund in the amount of \$48,000.

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.