

MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator
FROM: Teresa J. Price, Director of Planning
DATE: June 5, 2006
SUBJECT: Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting Summary – **June 1, 2006**

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, June 1, 2006 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Mary Brown** (Ward IV); **Councilmember Barry Streeter** (Ward II); and **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III).

Also in attendance were Councilmember Connie Fults, Ward IV; Stephanie Macaluso, Planning Commission Chair; Bud Hirsch, Planning Commission Vice-Chair; Libbey Simpson, Assistant City Administrator for Economic & Community Development; Teresa Price, Director of Planning; Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of May 25, 2006. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Stoneridge Medical Office Building:** Amended Architectural Elevations for a “PC” Planned Commercial located on the south side of South Outer Forty Road, northeast of Yarmouth Point Drive and Candish Lane.

Staff Report

Ms. McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning, stated that the original elevations were approved in December 2005. The Petitioner has since then made the following amendments to the elevations:

- Removal of an entry porte-cochere for pick-up and drop-off of surgery patients from the west elevation.
- Addition of an entry canopy for the same use on the south elevation.
- The addition of sunscreen on some of the windows.
- The addition of pre-finished aluminum composite panel caps.

DISCUSSION

Detention Basin

Mr. Larry Chapman, Petitioner, stated specifications have been sent to a company which specializes in underground detention basins. At this time, the petitioner has not yet received a response from the company as to whether or not an underground basin is workable for the site.

Water Feature

Mr. Chapman stated that they are proposing a water feature across the front of the building. This water feature is on MoDOT's right-of-way requiring MoDOT's approval. MoDOT does not allow any physical hardscape or signage in the right-of-way. If MoDOT does not approve the water feature, they intend to construct a water feature in the walls. The water feature proposed on MoDOT's right-of-way would be seen from the Highway while the other water feature would not.

Amount of Asphalt

Councilmember Hurt noted that the site includes a lot of asphalt. He suggested the addition of a spine in the middle to soften the look.

Path through the No-Touch Zone

It was noted that a subcontractor made a driving path through the no-touch zone of the site. The Petitioner intends to mitigate the problem. They are in the process of arranging a meeting with the neighboring Homeowners Association and Trustees to discuss how the problem will be corrected. The Petitioner's landscape architect will be present at the meeting for advice on what is feasible for the site.

Councilmember Hurt asked that the meeting with the residents take place prior to the June 19th City Council meeting if at all possible.

Mr. Chapman stated that, in order to prevent this problem from occurring in the future, an orange construction fence will be erected along the entire no-touch zone.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to forward the Amended Architectural Elevations for Stoneridge Medical Office Building to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

Note: These are Amended Architectural Elevations, which require approval by City Council. A voice vote will be needed at the June 19th City Council Meeting.

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Director of Planning, Teresa Price, for additional information on Stoneridge Medical Office Building.]

- B. P.Z. 6-2006 City of Chesterfield (“WH” Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay):** A request to repeal Section 003.110 “Urban District Regulations” of the City of Chesterfield Code and to establish a new Section 1003.110 “WH” Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay. Said new section provides general and specific development criteria for all properties in the area known as the “Wild Horse Creek Road Sub-Area” in the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Report

Ms. McCaskill-Clay stated that P.Z. 6-2006 is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, which creates the Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay District - an overlay for the Wild Horse Creek Road sub-area.

DISCUSSION

E-Half Acre and E-One Acre Uses

It was noted that the uses for the E-One Acre and E-Half Acre Districts have not changed.

Defensibility of E-One Acre Residential

Councilmember Hurt expressed concern as to whether E-One Acre Residential near Long Road and Chesterfield Airport Road would be legally defensible when commercial is presently along Wild Horse Creek Road in this area.

It was noted that the subject area is currently designated “residential” with an existing subdivision of about 6-7 homes, which does have indentures.

Commissioner Hurt referred to the topographic features of the area pointing out that it includes a large hill ending at Long Road. The proposed language states that the City wants to preserve the topographical features in the area so that a developer would not be able to cut the hill down to the level of Long Road. The topographical features, along with the serious access issues in the area, led the Commission to designate the area as “E-One Acre”.

Non-Residential Uses of the E-District in “Neighborhood Office” Area

Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning, stated that the City Attorney reviewed the non-residential uses of the E-District to recommend those which he felt would be appropriate for Neighborhood Office. The impact of traffic on the area was reviewed in determining those uses that would be appropriate for Neighborhood Office.

The City Attorney recommends the following Conditional Uses:

- Administrative offices for educational facilities and administrative offices for religious purposes.
- Mortuaries, cemeteries, urn gardens, columbaria.
- Hospices.
- Riding stables and kennels.
- Sewage facilities.
- Libraries.

The City Attorney recommends the following Permitted Uses:

- Churches.
- Public schools.
- Parks, parkways, and playgrounds.
- Forest and wildlife reservations.
- Local public utilities.
- Police and Fire Stations.

It was noted that the following uses were not recommended:

- Child care centers
- Private, not-for-profit clubs, private, not-for-profit recreational land uses, and community centers.
- Specialized private schools
- Nursing homes and groups homes for the elderly.
- Hospitals.
- Radio, television and communication transmitting, receiving, or relay towers and facilities.

Councilmember Fults expressed concern over the fact that a petitioner can request the non-residential uses in the E-Districts with the overlay in place. Ms. McCaskill-Clay stated that two separate votes will be required – one vote for the rezoning and one vote for adherence to the overlay requirements. If a use is not considered appropriate for a specific site, it can be denied.

Councilmember Fults asked if residential uses could be included as uses for the Neighborhood Office. Ms. Price replied that if residential uses are included for the Neighborhood Office, it would make the Zoning Ordinance be in direct conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Brown felt that private schools, child care centers, and community centers should be included as uses. After further discussion, it was agreed that Chair Brown and Councilmember Fults would meet with the City Attorney to review the recommended uses.

Commissioner Hirsch reported that the Planning Commission agreed not to include any residential uses in the Neighborhood Office area. The Commission also wanted to insure that any other uses for Neighborhood Office would not exceed the Office, Medical Dental use in terms of density, traffic, etc. Regarding the E-Districts, the Ordinance Review Committee will be reviewing all non-residential uses in residential districts.

Proposed Language for Neighborhood Office Development

Commissioner Hirsch recommended revising Section 2 of the Draft Attachment A regarding “Neighborhood Office Development” as follows: (**Changes in green.**)

“ . . . Petitions for rezoning seeking access to Neighborhood Office uses shall file a petition to rezone to “PC” Planned Commercial District and be allowed only Office, **and** Medical and Dental uses, excluding surgical centers. . . ”

It was agreed that the City Attorney would review the above suggestion.

General Development Criteria

Councilmember Fults expressed concern that some of the General Development Criteria is not specific enough – such as “Pedestrian Circulation”.

Residential Uses in Neighborhood Office

Mr. Kerchoff, a resident of Chesterfield, addressed the Committee. He felt that some residential uses would be appropriate for Neighborhood Office in those cases where the resident is a tenant and not just an owner – such as “Skilled Nursing” and “Assisted Living”. He noted that the Airport is not opposed to a tenant as they feel that a tenant is less likely to complain about Airport noise vs. an owner.

Chair Brown made a motion to forward P.Z. 6-2006 City of Chesterfield (“WH” Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

**Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the June 19, 2006 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #**

[Please see the attached report, prepared by the Director of Planning for additional information on P.Z. 6-2006 City of Chesterfield (“WH” Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay)

IV. PENDING PROJECTS/DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE

A. Planning Process Part 2

It was agreed that the PowerPoint presentation of the Planning Process would be deferred to a later meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.