



**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
MEETING SUMMARY
AUGUST 23, 2021**

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Commissioner Caryn Carlie
Commissioner Allison Harris
Commissioner John Marino
Commissioner Debbie Midgley
Commissioner Nathan Roach
Commissioner Jane Staniforth
Commissioner Guy Tilman
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Merrell Hansen

ABSENT

Mayor Bob Nation
Councilmember Mary Monachella, Council Liaison
Mr. Nathan Bruns, 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

Chair Hansen acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Mary Monachella, Council Liaison; Councilmember Michael Moore, Ward III; and Councilmember Dan Hurt, Ward III.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS - Commissioner Wuennenberg read the "Opening Comments" for the Public Hearing.

- A. P.Z. 14-2020 84 Lumber (17519 Chesterfield Airport Road):** An ordinance amendment to modify development criteria contained in City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2575 which established a "PC" Planned Commercial District on a 7.42-acre tract of land located at 17519 Chesterfield Airport Road (17U510073).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Planner Chris Dietz gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area. Mr. Dietz then provided the following information about the petition:

Site History

In 1995, the site was rezoned from “NU” Non-Urban District to “C-8” Commercial District to accommodate a retail lumber yard. Both a Site Development Plan and Record Plat were approved as well. The site was then rezoned to “PC” Planned Commercial District in 2009 to allow for the Permitted Uses the applicant requested at the time. A Public Hearing was scheduled for this request in 2020 but then canceled at the Applicant’s request.

Zoning and Land Use

The subject site is within the “PC” Planned Commercial District within Chesterfield Valley. The Future Land Use Map designates the site as *Regional Commercial*, which includes specific Development Policies pertaining to this request

Request

The Applicant is requesting three modifications to the development criteria in order to expand the current onsite automotive use.

Request #1

To increase the total building area from 40,000 sq. ft. to 60,000 sq. ft.

Request #2

To remove the detention area setback requirement from the Attachment A, which allow for detention areas to be located within setbacks.

The Ordinance currently contains language requiring all drainage detention storage facilities to be placed outside of the standard governmental agencies planning and zoning setbacks. It was noted that such language is not typically included in the City’s standard Attachment A. It was also pointed out that the location of such facilities is reviewed at the Site Plan stage.

Request #3

To retain vehicular access from Chesterfield Airport Road until Arnage Road is extended to Caprice Drive to the west.

Current Language within the Attachment A states:

The existing direct access to Chesterfield Airport Road shall be permitted until such time that access to the site is provided via a proposed connector road to either Arnage Boulevard or to Caprice Drive.

Proposed Language:

The existing full access to Chesterfield Airport Road shall be converted to a right-in, right-out access. Upon such conversion, direct access to this development from Chesterfield Airport Road shall be permitted via the right-in, right-out access as approved by the St. Louis County Department of

Transportation. The right-in, right-out access shall be vacated at such time that Arnage Boulevard connects to Caprice Drive.

Staff noted the following:

- *Arnage Road has been extended to the east at the present time.*
- *The Applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Study.*
- *Chesterfield Airport Road is St. Louis County-owned and maintained.*

Other Development Criteria

Staff has identified other site-specific development criteria that may not align with the Comprehensive Plan and the Planned Commercial District requirements – such as open space, lighting, signage, and permitted uses.

Preliminary Plan

The Preliminary Plan shows a total building square footage of just under 60,000 sq. ft.

Discussion

During discussion, additional information was provided regarding the following items.

Arnage Road

A timeline has not been established as to when Arnage Road will be connected to Caprice Drive. As the site comes in for redevelopment, the developer will be required to complete the roadway as it extends across their property. Any extension of the roadway west of the subject site will be required at the time of redevelopment of such site.

The Preliminary Plan shows two curb cuts from the existing site onto Arnage Road.

Uses

It was clarified that the current governing Ordinance was developed prior to the City's adoption of the Unified Development Code. In 2009, the City updated its commercial and industrial use terms, and made modifications to which districts such uses were permitted in. Any ordinances prior to this point in time usually include different terminology of uses than the current code.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

1. Mr. Michael J. Doster, Doster, Ullom & Boyle LLC, 16150 Main Circle Drive, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Doster stated that the applicant and owner of the property is Mase, LLC. The occupant of the property is Car Craft, which also has a location on Caprice Drive. The Car Craft business at the subject site repairs bodies of aluminum and carbon-fiber vehicles, such as Tesla, Aston-Martin, Bentley, Rolls Royce, Lamborghini, Porsche, and Maserati. Painting of vehicles is done at the Caprice location. The business has grown substantially since 2013 with future growth expected in the next two years. Such growth necessitates an expansion of their facility.

Request

- Increase total square footage of buildings to 60,000 square feet.

- Delete requirement that all drainage detention facilities be placed outside standard governmental agencies planning and zoning setbacks, or fifteen (15) feet from new or existing right-of-way line, whichever is greater.
- Allow right-in, right-out access to continue until Arnage Road connects to Caprice Drive.



It was noted that Lots B, C, D, and E are owned by TSG Chesterfield Airport Road, LLC, an affiliate of The Staenberg Group. Ordinance 3082, which governs these lots, limits access to these lots to Chesterfield Airport Road to the one unsignalized access between Lot D and AutoZone.

Access and Traffic Study

The Staenberg Group engaged Lochmuller Group to perform a traffic impact study to assess the feasibility of retaining a right-in, right-out access serving the Applicant’s property and The Staenberg Group’s property.

The Traffic Study recommends *that the existing access drive to 17519 Chesterfield Airport Road be retained, improved, connected to Arnage Road, and restricted to right turns only at its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road. This western terminus of Arnage Road would be an interim condition until such time that Arnage Road can extend westward to Caprice Drive. To do so will provide connectivity north of Chesterfield Airport Road to various commercial entities while alleviating the congestion at the unsignalized intersection adjacent to AutoZone.*

It was pointed out that the Traffic Study recommendation has been approved by St. Louis County Department of Transportation and Public Works, and that Chesterfield Airport Road is within County jurisdiction.

2. Mr. Brandon Harp, Civil Engineering Design Consultants, 10820 Sunset Office Drive, St. Louis, MO.

Mr. Harp provided the following information.

Existing Conditions

The site includes one main building and three open-air sheds.

Preliminary Plan

They intend to develop the western side of the property with a larger building to accommodate the auto repair business. Two buildings to the east of the main building are used to keep the high-end cars under roof as they go through the auto repair process.

They are also looking to expand the parking and pavement around the buildings to create the correct circulation for the business operation, and to meet Fire Marshall requirements. A sidewalk is also required along their frontage on Arnage Road.

At this time, nothing is planned for the northern part of the property.

They will be extending Arnage Road that stops short of their north-south driveway out to Chesterfield Airport Road.

Stormwater Management Facilities

It was pointed out that they are not requesting a change in the setbacks; but are requesting that stormwater management facilities be allowed within a setback. Mr. Harp noted that with the increased stormwater management requirements, specifically in Chesterfield Valley where they are extremely stringent, they look for unique and creative places to put stormwater management facilities.

Discussion

During discussion, additional information was provided regarding the following items.

Storage of Damaged Vehicles

Mr. Harp could not confirm whether or not damaged vehicles would be parked outside on the perimeter of the site, but indicated he would get the information for the Commission.

Commissioner Wuennenberg stated that there is a substantial amount of landscaping currently screening the site from the highway and noted that there is the potential of it being cleared away with any future development.

Screening

Security fencing/screening has not been discussed with the applicant, but would be addressed at the site development plan stage.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR:

1. Mr. Sam Adler, Vice-President of Leasing & Development, The Staenberg Group, 2127 Innerbelt Business Center Drive, St. Louis, MO.

Mr. Adler stated that The Staenberg Group owns the four lots adjacent to the subject site (Lots B, C, D, and E). Since these lots have been on the market, they have gotten feedback from prospective tenants regarding concerns about efficient and safe operation of traffic flow, as well as concerns about a dead end at the end of Arnage Road. As a result, they engaged Lochmuller Group to perform a traffic study on their behalf to determine the feasibility of a right-in, right-out turn onto Chesterfield Airport Road. They request that the Commission adopt the recommendations of the Traffic Study.

2. Ms. Julie Nolfo, Professional Traffic Operations Engineer, Lochmuller Group, 411 North 10th Street, St. Louis, MO.

Ms. Nolfo provided information about the Traffic Study performed for TSG Chesterfield Airport Road, LLC.

- The study included the subject site, along with all the undeveloped properties on Arnage Road, west of Arnage Blvd.
- The intent was to investigate the feasibility of retaining the existing access drive to the subject property and converting it from a full access to a more restrictive right-turn only.
- The proposed development could add as many as 500 new trips to this section of Arnage Road west of Arnage Blvd.
- Without a western connection to Chesterfield Airport Road, all of the traffic will have only two points of access to get back to Chesterfield Airport Road – the signal at Arnage Blvd. and the unsignalized access drive immediately west of AutoZone.
- The study determined that it was beneficial to retain the westernmost access point in the interim and restrict it to a right-in/right-out, which would allow the build-out of the undeveloped parcels to be served at the western end, mid-block, and at Arnage Blvd. It also allows for a natural outlet that diverts some of the traffic away from the AutoZone drive.
- Without a right-in/right-out, there would be an increased crash rate and failing levels of service at the AutoZone drive.
- After discussions with St. Louis County Department of Transportation, it was decided that they need to retain the westernmost connection, and restrict it to right turns only until Arnage Road can be extended westward to Caprice Drive.
- St. Louis County has approved these recommendations.

Discussion

Commissioner Tilman asked who will work with Lou Fusz Ford to take the property required in order to extend Arnage Road over to Caprice Drive to fulfill the County's plan for linking the roads. Ms. Nolfo stated that this would be explored at the time when, and if, Lou Fusz comes into redevelop their site.

Mr. Wyse pointed out that there is an approved Site Development Concept Plan for Lots B, C, and D, which includes a curb cut proposed to access Lot B on the western side of the site that would abut the proposed roadway connection.

Mr. Wyse asked for direction from the Commission as to whether or not Staff should fully evaluate all the development criteria of the existing ordinance and bring them into compliance with current standards. Chair Hansen directed Staff to bring all the standards into compliance.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL: None

ISSUES

1. Clarification on what the uses entail
2. Concerns about the access off of Arnage Road
3. Work with the Applicant regarding outdoor screening

4. Evaluation of development criteria of existing ordinances and bringing these standards into compliance with current standards.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Tilman made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the August 9, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Midgley** and **passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. **Wildhorse Village Projects: 2nd ASDCP; Lot 2A-1 (The Flats at Wildhorse Village); and P.Z. 03-2021 Downtown Chesterfield (Wildhorse Village)**

The following Speakers, representing the Petitioner, were available for questions regarding the three Wildhorse Village projects:

1. Mr. George Stock, President, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc. 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO
2. Mr. Jeff Tegethoff, Managing Member of Wildhorse Village, LP, 150 Carondelet Plaza, Clayton, MO.
3. Mr. Andrew Kilmer, Landscape Architect, Lamar Johnson Collaborative, 2199 Innerbelt Business Center Drive, St. Louis, MO
4. Mr. Michael Hamburg, Pier Property Group, 72 Lake Forest Drive, St. Louis, MO was available to answer questions regarding **Lot 2A-1 (The Flats at Wildhorse Village).**

The following Speaker then added concerns regarding the **Wildhorse Village Projects**:

1. Ms. Kelli Unnerstall, 14649 Summer Blossom Lane, Chesterfield, MO – representing *Citizens for Developing Downtown Chesterfield*

Ms. Unnerstall stated that they support the majority of the Wildhorse Village plan, however, they have the following concerns about particular items being requested:

- Concern that the mixed-use development could become predominantly residential. The concern is tied to the loss of commercial space that is being replaced by residential space.
- While they support the conversion of Lots 2B and 2C to condo buildings, they do not want to see any further reductions made to retail or commercial space.
- Regarding the petitioner's request to remove some retail/commercial square footage on the north side of the lake to allow for the new residential development, they oppose any overall reduction in retail/commercial square footage at the street level. *They propose that the retail/commercial square footage be relocated elsewhere in Wildhorse Village. The developer has indicated their agreement with this suggestion and has proposed ways to relocate the commercial/retail square footage. They would like this clearly defined in the ordinance.*

- Regarding the petitioner's request to change the first-story height to 9-30 feet for Lots 2A, 2B, 2C, 5A, 5B, and 5C, they support changing the height for Lots 2A, 2B, and 2C but do not support changing the height requirement for Lots 5A, 5B and 5C. *They have had conversations with the developer and believe that there may be a way to resolve their concerns by defining a percentage of linear feet of street presence that will remain retail commercial and maintain the first story height of 12-30 feet.*
- They are opposed to automatic Power of Review being removed from the ordinance.
- They do not support removal of the bike lane along Wild Horse Creek Road.

Mr. Wyse pointed out that any possible changes to the plans referenced by Ms. Unnerstall in her conversations with the applicant have not been submitted to, or seen by, the City.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- A. **River Crossings (Holman Motorcars of St. Louis)**: A Sign Package for a 15.841-acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located north of Arnage Boulevard and south of Interstate 64. (17U240066, 17U240077, 17U240088, 17U520061, 17U520072, 17U520171, 17U520182, 17U520193)

At the request of the Petitioner, Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to postpone the vote on the Sign Package for River Crossings (Holman Motorcars of St. Louis). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino and **passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

- B. **Wildhorse Village (2nd ASDCP)**: An Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Landscape Concept Plan and Lighting Fixture Concept Plan for the 78.4 acre tract of land located south of Wild Horse Creek Road, west of Chesterfield Parkway, and north and east of Burkhardt Place.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Landscape Concept Plan, and Lighting Fixture Concept Plan for Wildhorse Village. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino.

Commissioner Wuennenberg reported that the Site Plan Committee discussed the applicant's request to reduce the commercial square footage and reviewed the density allocation chart provided by Staff with specific attention to Lot 2A-2. The chart does not show any commercial or residential usage for that lot at this time.

Mr. Knight explained that Lot 2A-2 was proposed as a parking garage to support the office buildings across the street. However, the office buildings are now being programmed to condo buildings. If the lot is to be developed into something other than a parking garage or use that requires commercial square footage or residential units, the applicant will have to come back to the Commission and adjust the density allocation table. At that time, it will be clear as to whether the lot will be commercial, residential, or a mixture of both.

Mr. Knight also referred to earlier comments from Ms. Unnerstall wherein the applicant had indicated that the reduction in retail/commercial square footage could be relocated elsewhere in Wildhorse Village. He stated that any density reallocation should be noted at this time while reviewing the Amended Site Development Concept Plan.

Mr. Tegethoff confirmed that Lot 2A-2 was to be a parking garage to service two office buildings near the lake, but they are now requesting that the office buildings be reallocated to four, 16-unit condo buildings. The condo buildings will be self-parked under the buildings alleviating the need for a parking garage. It is anticipated that Lot 2A-2 will be developed as residential.

He also pointed out that while there has been a significant decrease in the number of residential units, there has also been a dramatic increase in the percentage of for-sale units vs. for-rent units. The development still has over 800,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, which is “a tremendous amount of office and retail to deliver in any environment”, and especially during this time of post-Covid where working remotely will be more of a norm. They are committed to developing a mixed-use development, but have always envisioned that the residential component would be developed first, which will drive retail.

It was agreed that the Commission could proceed with a vote on the Amended Site Development Concept Plan with the understanding that any requested change to Lot 2A-2 would be reviewed at the time the petitioner comes forward with such a change.

The motion to approve passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

- C. Wildhorse Village, Lot 2A-1 (The Flats at Wildhorse Village) SDSP: A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect’s Statement of Design for a 4.9 acre tract of land located southeast of the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road and Old Chesterfield Road.**

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect’s Statement of Design for Wildhorse Village, Lot 2A-1 (The Flats at Wildhorse Village). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked that the liaison to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) provide a report on ARB’s review of this project.

Chair Hansen stated that the ARB provided positive comments on the project with respect to windows, railings, the use of stone throughout the buildings, balconies, rhythm of the buildings, utilities being disguised, garages, enclosed stairwells, and landscaping.

She also pointed out that the modification request pertaining to rooftop mechanical equipment was approved by the ARB because the mechanical equipment will be screened on all visible sides by parapets. The Board stated that this type of screening is sufficient for this application, and is not a concern since the colors on the roof do not stand out. The ARB also accepted the modification to the first floor height.

Chair Hansen added that the applicant has complied with ARB’s recommendations.

Discussion

Rooftop Equipment

Councilmember Monachella stated that Council has been advised by the City's legal counsel that anything within the ordinance cannot be changed by the Site Development Plan, and questioned how a modification to the screening of rooftop equipment could be approved by ARB. She explained that Council has a desire to have the rooftop equipment covered in the Wildhorse Village development because of what will be seen from future development at the mall site.

Mr. Knight pointed out that the site-specific ordinance for Wildhorse Village (Ordinance 3114) includes language that allows modification requests to any of the performance standards within the PC&R District.

Mr. Wyse clarified that the recommendation from both ARB and Planning Commission regarding rooftop screening was to use the standard language within the Unified Development Code, which evaluates screening on a site-by-site basis. He also pointed out that this topic will be brought back to the Planning & Public Works Committee in September for further review.

ARB also noted that, in this case, a fully-enclosed penthouse could and probably would have a much more dramatic impact on the architecture of that building because of the size and scale the structure would need to be to house the number of units necessary for this type of residential building. ARB felt that parapets are a more appropriate application in this instance and would be less visibly intrusive than a penthouse.

Commissioner Staniforth stated that the applicant also provided information on the substantial financial impact of utilizing enclosed penthouses. It was also pointed out that the units would not function properly when fully enclosed. Commissioners Wuennenberg and Tilman confirmed that such equipment has to be exposed to the air for heat transfer and proper functioning, which is not possible within an enclosed penthouse.

Mayor Nation stated that he feels it is unreasonable to require penthouse screening of rooftop equipment for Wildhorse Village.

Commissioner Harris suggested that visuals be provided.

The Chair then called for a vote on the motion to approve, which passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 03-2021 Downtown Chesterfield (Wildhorse Village):** A request to amend the specific development criteria and Preliminary Development Plan of an existing PC&R Planned Commercial and Residence District for a 99.6 acre tract of land located west and southwest of the intersection of U.S. Highway 40/I-64 and Chesterfield Parkway West (18T620185, 18S410240, 18S410206, 18T620228, 18T620239, 18T630348, 18T630195, 18T640248, 18T620064, 18T640260, 18T640271, 18T620174, 18S430259, 18S430282, 18T640336, 17T320169, 17T320158, 18T640392, 18T640381, 18T640259, 18T640237, 18T640369, 18T640370).

Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, provided the following information about the subject petition.

Request Summary

The applicant has five primary components to their request:

1. Modify the maximum height for residential buildings located on Lots 2B and 2C;
2. Update the first floor building heights on 7 lots;
3. Remove the ground floor retail requirement from the east side of Lot 2C;
4. Revise the rooftop mechanical equipment screening requirement; and
5. Remove the public art requirement for each lot.

Petitioner's Response to Issues Raised (shown in *italics*)

Public Art

A concern was raised by both the Planning Commission and the public in moving away from the Public Art requirement for each lot. Although both the Commission and the public were generally open to a different approach than the current requirement, there was not support for moving forward with solely one piece.

Applicant continues to request to remove the public art requirement for each lot and continues to describe the holistic approach to the Public Art.

Applicant has noted that seating has been specifically designed to view the art sculpture, which they consider public art.

Applicant has indicated that if the public art requirement for each lot is removed, they will include a fountain feature in the lake for additional public art.

Penthouse Screening

There was concern from the public on removing the penthouse screening requirement completely, but open to areas where the applicant described would not be applicable (ie residential).

Applicant continues the same request to remove the current language and replace with language that matches the Unified Development Code. Applicant notes that screening should be considered independently because different building types have very different requirements (ie multi-family, commercial, restaurant, grocery).

Applicant also notes that penthouse screening is substantially more expensive.

Increasing the Residential Stories from 3 to 4

There was a concern from the public that increasing the residential stories from 3 to 4 in certain defined geographic areas, and decreasing the first floor height of residential buildings in the defined geographic areas would shift the development away from a downtown development and more towards a development that was predominately residential.

The new residential total height will be below what an office building would be. In addition, the smaller footprints of the condo buildings will allow more visual connection to the lake from the development.

Requests

Mr. Knight explained that the first three amendments are largely being requested to allow for more condo units vs office and apartment complex.



Request 1

Modify the maximum height for buildings located on Lots 2B and 2C [Lots shown in blue (2B) and yellow (2C)]

This request refers to the condo buildings. The existing ordinance permits commercial buildings to be 4 stories and residential buildings 3 stories. The applicant is requesting that the residential buildings on Lots 2B and 2C be 4 stories.

Request 2

Update the first floor building heights on 7 lots – Lots 2A-1, 2A-2, 2B, 2C, 5A, 5B, and 5C [Lots shown in blue (2B), yellow (2C), and red (2A-1, 2A-2, 5A, 5B, and 5C)]

This request also refers to the four, 16-unit condo buildings. The first floor requirement for these lots is currently 12 feet; the Applicant is requesting a first floor height of 9 feet.

Request 3

Remove retail requirement on west side of view corridor – Lot 2C (shown in yellow)

The current ordinance requires ground floor retail on the east side of Lot 2C, which is within the 125' view corridor. Since the building on Lot 2C is now proposed as a residential condo building vs an office, the applicant is requesting that the requirement for ground floor retail be removed.

Request 4

Revise the rooftop mechanical equipment requirement to allow the language that exists in the Unified Development Code, which states: *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.*

Request 5

Remove the public art requirement for each lot

The applicant states they are requesting to develop a holistic approach for the Wildhorse Village Public Art. The placement of art is centered around the lake maximizing the public experience.

Given the concern, the applicant is proposing to add a fountain as an alternative to emphasizing the holistic approach.

Preliminary Development Plan

There are minimal changes from the previously-approved plan. The changes are predominately located within Lot 2 (A,B,C) and Lot 5 (A,B,C). The lot configuration is largely the same, but the building configuration and entrance locations into those lots have been altered.

Discussion

On-Street Parking

Chair Hansen asked for clarification as to whether on-street parking has been removed from the 300 ft. view corridor. Mr. Knight didn't recall parking within the 300 ft. view corridor.

Amenities - Rentals

Commissioner Tilman noted that amenity renderings show kayaks at the boathouse, and discussed the potential for the Attachment A be reviewed to insure that the rental of items such as kayaks, paddleboats, bikes, etc. is included in the Attachment A in order to permit such rental.

Public Art

Commissioner Wuennenberg stated that he supports all of the requests from the applicant with the exception of removing the public art requirement for each lot. He referred to the discussions during the Public Hearing wherein it was the general consensus that the Commission preferred additional artwork throughout the development.

Commissioner Wuennenberg then made a motion to approve P.Z. 03-2021 Downtown Chesterfield (Wildhorse Village), as requested by the Applicant, with the exception of the Applicant's request to remove the public art requirement for each lot. The motion died due to the lack of a second.

Applicant's Response

Mr. Jeff Tegethoff, Managing Member of Wildhorse Village, LP stated that in order to make Wildhorse Village "the marquee development for Chesterfield, the State, and entire Midwest," he felt a centerpiece was needed for the development. The art being donated for the site has an estimated value of nearly \$1 million and is by world-renowned sculptor Rafael Barrios. The significance of the art piece will be a draw for

people to visit the site. Plans are to install the artwork at the end of October, which could potentially attract office users to the development.

Mr. Tegethoff also pointed out that the sculpture will be complemented by three sculpted concrete seating elements by designers Arriola & Fiol from Barcelona, Spain, which are “pieces of art in their own right”.

Commissioners’ Comments

Several of the Commissioners acknowledged the significance of the art being proposed and noted their agreement with not requiring additional artwork throughout the development.

Chair Hansen stated that “there is merit in having a remarkable piece that people would take note of” and “is in the spirit of this high-quality, remarkable place”.

Commissioner Marino stated that he “resoundingly supports” Mr. Tegethoff’s comments about the art pieces and pointed out that *The Awakening* sculpture is also nearby, which is what is wanted for downtown Chesterfield – large, significant, and important pieces of art. He noted his appreciation of “having the developer take the time to search for, and select pieces of art for his development to put in our City”.

Commissioner Harris also noted that the Applicant is offering to install a fountain within the lake, which will be seen and appreciated by everyone around the lake.

Commissioner Staniforth stated that she was in agreement with the comments made.

Public Restrooms

Commissioner Carlie asked whether public restrooms would be available within the development. Mr. Knight stated that the City does not require them as this is a private development.

Commissioner Tilman made a motion to approve P.Z. 03-2021 Downtown Chesterfield (Wildhorse Village), as requested. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino.

At Commissioner Carlie’s request, Mr. Knight summarized the concerns raised by Ms. Unnerstall and the City’s response to them. He noted that discussion had taken place regarding **residential heights**, and the **reallocation of retail**. The **bike lane** infrastructure is on a shared use path **off of** Wild Horse Creek Road vs **on** Wild Horse Creek Road. The City Attorney has advised to not enforce the **Automatic Power of Review** in the site-specific governing ordinance.

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

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

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2022 Proposed Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Chair Hansen noted that the Planning Commission Meeting Schedule for 2022 was included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Wyse announced that future Planning Commission meetings will again be in person in Council Chambers.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Marino reported that the Ordinance Review Committee will meet on August 26th at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom. It was confirmed that these meetings will continue to be held via Zoom.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Jane Staniforth, Secretary