



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
MEETING SUMMARY  
NOVEMBER 9, 2020**

**VIRTUAL MEETING VIA ZOOM**

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

**I. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT**

Commissioner John Marino  
Commissioner Debbie Midgley  
Commissioner Nathan Roach  
Commissioner Gene Schenberg  
Commissioner Jane Staniforth  
Commissioner Guy Tilman  
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. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

**ABSENT**

Commissioner Allison Harris

Also in attendance was Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II.

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**III. SILENT PRAYER**

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None**

**V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

**Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the October 12, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tilman and passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0. (Commissioners Midgley and Wuennenberg abstained.)**

## VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

### **Downtown Chesterfield Category C, Lot A (WILDHORSE) Sign Package**

The following Speakers, representing the Petitioner, were available for questions:

1. Ryan Rans, Ruth Chris Steak House, 112 West Jefferson Blvd, South Bend, IN.  
Mr. Rans noted that the proposed locations for the three restaurant signs provide the best visibility from the roads and asked that the Planning Commission be supportive of their request.
2. Jeff Tegethoff, Owner, Developer - Wild Horse Village, 150 Carondelet Plaza, Clayton, MO.  
Mr. Tegethoff pointed out that the proposed monument sign faces the highway and its large size is based on the amount of highway frontage that the site has. He also explained that the monument sign is for the entire project, which includes the hotel as well.
3. Rich Obertino, TR,i Architects, 9812 Manchester Road, St. Louis, MO.  
Mr. Obertino stated that they intend to blend the monument sign into the hillside so it appears to be part of the natural terrain. The back side of the sign will be bermed as much as possible. The proposed sign above the lobby of the multi-family building will assist with identifying the leasing office and guest entrance. The restaurant sign proposed for the north end of the multi-family building provides visibility to vehicles traveling along the highway.
4. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO.
5. Aaron Clippinger, Integrated Sign Associates, 1160 Pioneer Way, El Cajon, CA.  
Mr. Clippinger stated that the proposed monument sign along the freeway “is branding the complex”, and while the signage is large, the use of a thinner font with the rock behind it, reduces its prominence.

### **McBride & Son Center, Lot 3 (Medical Bldg.) Sign Package**

The following Speakers, representing the Petitioner, were available for questions:

1. William Goldstein, MD, Medical Director and Owner of Midwest Vein Care, 6 McBride & Son Center Drive, Chesterfield, MO.
2. Dennis Caldwell, Dale Sign, 13652 Manchester Road, St. Louis, MO.

### **P.Z. 06-2020 15310 Conway Road (SMS Group)**

1. Sean Sortor, representing the Petitioner, 1717 Wilson Avenue, Chesterfield, MO  
– was available for questions.

## VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- A. **Downtown Chesterfield Category C, Lot A (WILDHORSE) Sign Package**: A request for a Sign Package to establish sign criteria for a 7.3 acre tract of land located northeast of the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road and Old Chesterfield Road.

Commissioner Schenberg summarized the discussion held in the earlier Site Plan Committee Meeting noting that there was a consensus of agreement regarding the proposed 6 retail signs, and 2 of the 3 restaurant signs. A final consensus had not been reached regarding the size of the proposed monument sign, or with respect to the restaurant sign proposed for the north side of the building facing the highway.

**Commissioner Schenberg made a motion recommending approval of the Sign Package for Downtown Chesterfield Category C, Lot A (WILDHORSE), as proposed by the petitioner.** The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.

### Discussion

#### Monument Sign

Chair Hansen pointed out that the proposed monument sign is 8' x 30' and is attached to a long retaining wall. It is her understanding that the wall will be embedded into the hillside and will be heavily landscaped.

Mr. Obertino explained that the proposed sign is on a curved wall and as it curves towards the highway, the grade drops down; as it curves back to the parking lot, the grade goes up and the wall gets smaller. The sign wall will not be any more than 2-3 feet above the parking lot. He also pointed out that the transformers and switchgear on site will be screened by landscaping.

#### Wall Signs

Staff confirmed that the wall signs for the retail shops will be either back-lit or halo-lit signs. Mr. Tegethoff also noted that writing on the doors and windows of the retail spaces is standard and can provide directions for visitors.

Chair Hansen expressed concern about the possibility of awnings be added to the building with signage on them. Mr. Tegethoff indicated that he is not interested in seeing awning signage attached to the buildings. Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, clarified that any future requests for awnings would be considered an amended architectural elevation and approved by the Commission. If approved, any request for signage on an awning would either have to meet code or have to be approved by the Planning Commission.

**Upon roll call, the vote to approve, as presented, was as follows:**

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

**Nay: Commissioner Wuennenberg**

**The motion passed by a vote of 7 to 1.**

- B. **McBride & Son Center, Lot 3 (Medical Building) Sign Package:** A request to amend a Sign Package for a medical office building on a 1.69-acre tract of land located southwest of the intersection of Boone's Crossing and Interstate 64 (17U610106).

**Commissioner Schenberg** made a motion recommending approval of the Sign Package for **McBride & Son Center, Lot 3 (Medical Building)**, as presented by the petitioner. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley

Planner Chris Dietz then presented information about the proposed Sign Package:

### **Request**

The sign package includes a total of seven signs, comprised of:

- Five wall signs between four building facades; and
- Two freestanding signs on site.

### **Wall Signs**

The Unified Development Code allows:

- One sign on any two facades of the building; and
- Each individual tenant with its own exterior entrance is allowed one additional sign over the tenant space of the building.

The five proposed wall signs would be located, as noted below:

- Two on the north façade of the building facing I-64, when combined, do not exceed 5% of the façade's area.
- One each on the south, west, and east facades of the building not to exceed 5% of the façade area.

### **Freestanding Signs**

The Unified Development Code allows:

- One freestanding sign facing each roadway on which the lot has frontage. Such signs are not to exceed six feet in height, and must be adequately landscaped.

The Amended Sign Package proposes two freestanding signs with varying dimensions, as currently exist on site today.

It was noted that all other signage will comply with UDC regulations.

### **Discussion**

Commissioners Schenberg and Wuennenberg indicated that they do not have any issue with the number of signs being requested because of how the building is placed on the site and how it faces the roads.

**Upon roll call, the vote to approve, as presented, was as follows:**

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

**Nay: None**

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

## VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 06-2020 15310 Conway Road (SMS Group)**: A request to repeal and replace Ordinance 2463 to establish a new “PC” Planned Commercial District to modify development criteria for a tract of land totaling 1.492 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Chesterfield Parkway East and Conway Road (18S310557).

Planner Chris Dietz provided the following information about the subject petition.

### Site History

The site was rezoned from “R-3” Residential District to “PC” Planned Commercial District in 2007. The following year, the ordinance was repealed and replaced to update the legal description and development criteria to accommodate a financial institution development that never came to fruition. In September 2020, a Public Hearing was held for this request to repeal and replace the governing ordinance to change the development criteria for the site to accommodate a new commercial building.

### Request

The request is to modify the development criteria of the governing ordinance in two areas:

1. Permitted Uses - to have them closely resemble those of the adjacent site at 15320 Conway Road; and
2. Structure and Parking Setbacks

### Issues

Five issues were raised by the Planning Commission at the September 30<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing, and the Applicant has provided a response to each issue raised, as noted below (shown in *italics*):

1. **Parking Setbacks:** The proposed parking setbacks along Conway Road do not reflect those for the hotel development across the street.  
*The proposed parking setbacks have been changed to reflect the 10' parking setback of the hotel development along Conway Road. The parking setback along Chesterfield Parkway East was also increased from 13' to 25'.*
2. **Landscape Buffers:** The proposed landscape buffers were inherently reduced due to the dimensions of parking setbacks. Planning Commission cited the visibility from Chesterfield Parkway East as a concern regarding the reduced landscape buffers.  
*The landscape buffer along that road has been increased from 13' to 25'.*
3. **Open Space:** Proposal requested a reduction of open space from 40% to 35%.  
*Open space will now remain at 40%, as the proposed development will not require further reduction.*
4. **Building Design:** Due to the building's close proximity to I-64 and Chesterfield Parkway East, Planning Commission expressed the importance that the proposed

building be thoughtfully designed and closely reviewed at the Site Plan review stage to ensure it reflects the aesthetic character of the City Center area of Chesterfield. *Applicant has acknowledged this concern and has expressed intent to incorporate thoughtful architectural design on all sides of the proposed buildings and will ensure that the building's design is consistent with surrounding developments.*

- 5. Location of Public Art:** A suggestion was raised to relocate the designated Public Art Area to the east side of the building. *The applicant has acknowledged the concern and will consider the best location for artwork based on visibility in conjunction with the layout of the Landscape Plan at the Site Plan review stage of the project.*

### **Preliminary Plan**

The Preliminary Plan shows the location of access to the site, as well as the approximate location of the proposed building, and proposed parking. The Plan also shows the proposed parking and structure setbacks.

### **Discussion**

#### **Public Art**

Chair Hansen questioned why the location of public art won't be established until the site plan stage. She noted her preference that it be located so as to be seen while traveling along Chesterfield Parkway. Mr. Dietz explained that the applicant's response letter clarifies that the applicant will review possible locations of the public art in conjunction with the landscaping for the site. Proposed landscaping is submitted with the Site Development Plan.

Question was raised as to whether public art on the site is a requirement. Mr. Wyse, Director of Planning, clarified that the City's Comprehensive Plan *encourages* public art in this part of the City, but the draft Attachment A *requires* the public art. Commissioner Tilman agreed with allowing the applicant some flexibility in putting the artwork where it makes the most sense on the site.

Commissioner Staniforth noted that it could be difficult to decide in advance where art should be placed, and agreed that the placement of the art piece would probably be planned in conjunction with the landscaping.

There was a brief discussion on whether the City has any input on the type of art that can be installed on the site. It was confirmed that this decision is up to the applicant.

#### **Storm Water Basins/Landscaping**

Chair Hansen referred to the two storm water basins along Chesterfield Parkway East and questioned whether the landscaping and tree requirements are sufficient to ensure the basins will be handled attractively.

Mr. Wyse pointed out that the water basins are along arterials roads, which requires a landscape buffer between them and the roadway.

Given the new Comprehensive Plan, Chair Hansen suggested that Council may want to review the landscape and tree ordinances with respect to how the water basins are handled.

**Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve P.Z. 06-2020 15310 Conway Road (SMS Group). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schenberg.**

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

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

**Nay: None**

The motion **passed** by a vote of 8 to 0.

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Calendar**

**Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to approve the proposed 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Calendar. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Staniforth and **passed** by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

**B. 2021 Liaison Schedule for Architectural Review Board Meetings**

The Planning Commissioners will sign up as liaison for the 2021 individual ARB meetings.

**X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

---

Gene Schenberg, Secretary