PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
MAY 27, 1992

==========

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

PRESENT	ABSENT
Ms. Mary Brown	Mr. Jamie Cannon
Mr. Bill Kirchoff	Mr. Dave Dalton
Ms. Barbara McGuinness	Ms. Pat O'Brien
Mr. Walter Scruggs	
Ms. Victoria Sherman	
Chairman Mary Domahidy	
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney	
Mayor Jack Leonard	
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning	
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Senior Planner	
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary	

INVOCATION: Commissioner Victoria Sherman

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes were approved from May 11, 1992.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 6-92 Premier Development Corporation; a request for a Planned Environment Unit Procedure in the "R-2" Residence District and amended Planned Environment Unit Procedure in the "R-4" Residence District; west side of Olive Boulevard, south of West Drive.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval, subject to conditions in Attachment A, and the addition of condition (4.f.) to read: The right-of-way for West Drive shall be dedicated as required by the City of Chesterfield subdivision street standards. West Drive shall be improved to one-half (1/2) of a twenty-six (26) foot wide pavement section, via the installation of a concrete curb and gutter, with a four (4) foot wide, full-depth, asphalt widening strip along the entire frontage of the development.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Under the existing zoning, the developer would be allowed to build fewer than the sixteen (16) homes proposed.

- The City of Chesterfield currently has no regulations for common ground areas in subdivisions.

- It was suggested that, since the Commission may allow lots smaller than the present zoning allows, the developer could provide additional common ground.

- The appropriateness of giving credit to developer for retention of existing landscaping was discussed.

- Should the residential trend occur in this area and continue northward into the Monsanto property, "R-2" 15,000 square foot zoning may be appropriate for the existing Jansen parcel.

- The S-curve along West Drive would be widened by four (4) feet along the petitioner's portion only.

- It was suggested that the developer improve the entire length of West Drive, as this is the main entrance for Wellesley Place Subdivision, as well as for existing residences.

- The roadway may be asphalt.

- The berms could be within the twenty (20) foot setback area.

- The conditions recommend review of the architectural elevations in the rear portions of the residences that abut West Drive.

Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to deny the request. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- "R-2" Zoning was suggested as appropriate for this development.

- If the Planning Commission would deny this request, the existing Planned Environment Unit Procedure covering the site being developed would still be in force. The petitioner would have the ability to submit to the Planning Commission for review, a subdivision plat for the "R-2" portion. Another option for the petitioner would be to request withdrawal of the petition at any time after the Planning Commission makes its recommendation.

- It was suggested that the developer be given an opportunity to come back to the Commission with an amended plan.

- If the petition was denied, the Department would submit a report to the Commission addressing the denial. The petitioner would have an opportunity to be informed of the Commission concerns, and could seek to address those concerns, or request withdrawal of the petition. If withdrawn without prejudice, a petition more acceptable to the Planning Commission could be submitted.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to table the request, with a stipulation that the petitioner meets with the Department to address concerns raised herein. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The lot sizes along West Drive are too small.

- The Olive access could remain bi-directional until West Drive is relocated. At this time, the right-in and right-out requirement could be enforced at the Olive access. The City has control over this access requirement.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes.

The motion to table passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Commissioner McGuinness left the meeting.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- West Drive should be improved in width from the project to Olive, and improve the S-Curve along the portion of the development.
- It was suggested that lots adjacent to West Drive be 9,000 square feet, and 7,000 square feet on the opposite side of the project.
- It was suggested that minimum setbacks be ten (10) feet between residences on the side away from West Drive, and fourteen (14) feet between residences adjacent to West Drive.
- It was suggested that the twenty (20) foot landscape buffer suggested along West Drive be subject to Commission approval, and a twenty (20) foot landscape buffer be required on the northwest and southeast property lines.

B. P.Z. 7-92 Dierberg's Chesterfield Village, Inc.; a request for Amended "C-8" Planned Commercial District; northeast corner of Clarkson Road and Baxter Road.

Director Duepner noted that the petitioner had contacted the Department requesting action tonight on this request. He noted that the Department is presenting its normal report relative to issues being reviewed, and the Department's recommendation to hold.

Commissioner Scruggs made a motion to approve the request. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kirchoff.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The restrictions would be to not include overnight boarding, outside exercise areas, or surgery, other than emergency surgery.
- Appointments would be scheduled every twenty (20) minutes.
- The appropriateness of this use was questioned.
- No information was provided regarding the hours of operation.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, no; Chairman Domahidy, yes.

The motion failed by a vote of 4 to 1. Five (5) votes are needed for amending of the ordinance.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- A motion for reconsideration would have to be made by Commissioner Sherman. This would be the only way to bring the matter back to the Commission for review.

Director Duepner stated that the Department could prepare a report on this matter, noting the reasons for the votes, have it reviewed by Chairman Domahidy, and present it to Planning and Zoning Committee for its meeting on June 3. He further stated that this Bylaw (a vote of 5 members) applies only to matters recommending approval of a zoning ordinance amendment, rezoning, or Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Brown made a motion that the Commission direct Staff to prepare a report to the Planning and Zoning Committee of Council, indicating the Commission's denial of the request. Commissioner Sherman seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 to 0.

C. P.C. 65-88 Montessori Children's House, Inc.; a request for amendment of Conditional Use Permit in "NU" Non-Urban District; south side of Ladue Road, east of Saylesville Drive.

Director Duepner presented the request and recommendation of approval, as stated in report.

A motion to approve the request was made by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 to 0.

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

A. P.C. 168-71 Sachs Properties, Inc. (Chesterfield Mall); "C-8" Planned Commercial District Amended Site Development Plan; southwest quadrant of I-64/U.S. Highway 40/61 and Clarkson Road.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the Amended Site Development Plan, as recommended by the Department, adding the following conditions:

1. The developer and Department of Planning work out an agreement to paint the HVAC units on the roof of the Cinema building.

2. The developer and Department of Planning work out an agreement to improve the landscaping around the Cinema building.

3. To include the twelve (12) recommendations contained in Mr. Spencer's letter of May 22, 1992, with specific attention to the issue that Chesterfield Mall, with regard to these conditions, post a Letter of Credit, Bond, or similar instrument, in an acceptable amount to guarantee installation of improvements.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs and **passed by a voice vote of 5 to 0.**

B. P.Z. 10-91 Edward J. Shaheen, Jr.; CSP in "NU" Non-Urban District; Sign Illumination Plan; south side of Olive Boulevard, east of White Plains Drive.

Director Duepner presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval for a one (1) month period, of the lights, painted flat black, with a lamp size limitation of 60 watts each. He noted the handout provided to the Commission from two (2) Councilmembers indicating their wishes relative to this matter.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the Department's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was noted that the Commission had nothing to do with lighting conditions of adjacent properties noted in the Councilmembers' memo.

- It was noted that because this property is in the Commercial Service District, the Commission was hesitant to approve the lighting at the previous meeting; and required additional information before making its final decision.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 to 0.

C. P.Z. 34-89 Benjamin Houlihan (Chesterfield Fence); "M-3" Planned Industrial District Amended Site Development Plan and Elevations; south side of Old Olive, west of Chesterfield Airport Road.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve this Amended Site Development Plan and Elevations, as presented by the Department. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was requested that the two (2) overhead doors on the north side of the building (visible from Olive Street Road) will be painted the same color as the building.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 to 0.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon summarized the proposed Landscape Policies for commercial and residential developments. The proposal is to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Committee for comment. The Planning and Zoning Committee's input would then be brought back before the Commission.

Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion that the Commission approve this document, and direct the Planning Department to forward same to the Planning and Zoning Committee for its comment. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The Planning and Zoning Committee will meet next Wednesday, June 3, at 5:30 p.m. Some members of the Landscape Committee will attend.
- The Committee decided to address, at its next meeting, the issue of requiring a Landscape Maintenance Bond for multi-family development.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 to 0.

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Committee Chair Brown reported that the Ordinance Review Committee met on May 26, to complete review of the major items of the Draft Proposal. The next meeting is scheduled for June 9; a meeting with members of community will be two (2) weeks after that; and a public hearing may be scheduled by the end of July.

B. Architectural Review Committee

Director Duepner reported that Committee Chair had requested him to schedule the next meeting; however, Commission could not agree on a date from those provided.

D. Comprehensive Plan Committee

Director Duepner reported that Committee Chair had requested him to schedule the next meeting; however, Commission could not agree on a date from those provided.

E. Procedures Committee

Commission Chairman Domahidy reported that she spoke with the Kirkwood Planning Commission Chair, who stated that their Commission refers petitioners to a sub-committee, composed of Planning Commissioners, staff, residents, and the developer/petitioner. He further stated that this allows for interaction and in-depth discussion of the proposal among those parties most directly involved. That sub-committee then brings, to the whole Commission, a recommendation on what action to take. She referred this to the Procedures Committee to evaluate a policy we may want to adopt.

Committee Chair Scruggs requested the Department Staff to acquire information from Kirkwood and submit a written report to the Committee.

Commission Chair Domahidy appointed the Nominating Committee Officers for 1992/93 as follows: Commissioner Scruggs, Chair; Commissioner Sherman; and Commissioner Kirchoff. Commissioner Scruggs is to notify the Department of the meeting so that it may post a notice. She further noted that last year the Commission expressed a desire to transition these offices, and that there is an abundance of leadership talent on the Commission. She requested the Committee, in accordance with Commission Bylaws, to bring to the meeting a slate of one (1) person for each office.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 P.M.

Walter Scruggs, Secretary

[MIN5-27]