

# MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator  
FROM: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning **JW**  
SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee **Virtual Meeting Summary Thursday, August 5, 2021**



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held via Zoom on Thursday, August 5, 2021.

In attendance were: **Chair Mary Monachella** (Ward I), **Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos** (Ward II), **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III), and **Councilmember Tom DeCampi** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Michael Moore (Ward III); Chair Merrell Hansen; Justin Wyse, Director of Planning; Mike Knight, Assistant City 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 July 22, 2021 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of July 22, 2021. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0**.

## II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### A. P.Z. 01-2021 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code—Article 4 and Article 10): An ordinance amending Article 4 and Article 10 of the Unified Development Code to revise regulations pertaining to window signs.

### STAFF PRESENTATION

Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, stated that at the February 18, 2021 Planning and Public Works Committee meeting, Staff was directed to review the current regulations of window signage within the Unified Development Code (UDC) and bring forward potential updates. Since that time, the Planning Commission has discussed this topic at four different meetings and as a result, Staff presents the following recommendations.

### Concerns and Recommendations

Concern: Window signs are currently permitted on multiple floors of buildings and shall occupy no more than 40% of the outline area of any window on the ground or first floor level of the building and no more than 20% of any window on any other level of the building.

Recommendation: Staff proposes to remove language referencing other levels and solely permitting window signs on the first and second floors of a building. Currently there are not many,

if any, businesses that have window signs above the first floor and none known above the second. Although this may have minimal impact on the current conditions, it will prevent a full glass office building from having numerous signs on numerous tenant floors above the first and second level.

Concern: Currently there is no maximum on the total number of window signs.

Recommendation: Based on the Planning Commission's recommendation to calculate window signage by a defined window area versus a finite number of signs within individual windows, Staff proposes that window signs shall not occupy more than 25% of any single window area. The window area may include multiple panes of glass separated only by supporting framing materials but not separated by architectural elements. Such signs are solely permitted on a window of that particular tenant space and solely on a façade that has an entrance to said tenant space.

Staff is also recommending some minor changes within the Code for consistency in Article 4 as they relate to window signs and a change to the definition of a window sign in Article 10 for clarification purposes.

When considering the regulation of window signs, Mr. Knight provided the following information

- Items such as hours of operation, open/closed, and other messages that cannot be understood from a position off-site are considered "incidental" and are exempt signs in the UDC.
- Items propped up inside the window area, but not on the window, are not considered window signs, and are not regulated by the City.
- In light of the economic impact on businesses due to COVID-19, Ordinance 3124 was recently approved that allows for reasonable temporary suspension for various development criteria including regulation on temporary signs. The potential updates to the UDC, in no way prohibit or retract from the intent of Ordinance 3124.

### **DISCUSSION**

In response to Councilmember Hurt's question, Mr. Knight stated that the language has transitioned over time. Staff originally recommended limiting signs to the first floor only, however based on concerns from the Planning Commission, the second floor was added. The original recommendation also limited the number of signs, and now it is limited to 25% of any single window area.

**Councilmember Hurt made a motion to forward P.Z. 01-2021 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code—Article 4 and Article 10) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed** by a voice vote of 4-0.**

**Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning and Public Works Committee, will be needed for the August 16, 2021 City Council Meeting. See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 01-2021 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code—Article 4 and Article 10).]**

### III. NEW BUSINESS

#### A. CVAC Entrance Name Change

##### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Chair Monachella stated that the City received a request to name the western driveway entrance to the CVAC and officially designate it as Lion Carl Norton Way.

Councilmember Mastorakos stated that she has known Rev. Norton and his wife for many years and has been involved with their family socially. She stated that Carl is an amazing, generous man who has been very involved in the City. However she is not sure that naming a street is in the best interest of the City as it may be setting a precedent. She is in favor of having “Carl Norton Day” and possibly an official proclamation and a Key to the City. She has spoken to Tom McCarthy, Director of Parks, Recreation & Arts, regarding Rev. Norton’s connection with the original Chesterfield Community Association athletic fields.

##### **DISCUSSION**

Chair Monachella agreed with Councilmember Mastorakos’ suggestions and suggested that perhaps the Lions Club could donate a park bench in his recognition.

Councilmember Hurt also agreed that naming a street would not be the best way to honor Rev. Norton and he concurs with the alternative suggestions that were given. There are numerous individuals whose names are synonymous with the City, however, in his opinion, the naming of streets after individuals is not the best way to honor them.

Councilmember DeCampi stated that he does not understand what the harm would be. When you hear the term “don’t want to set a precedent,” it is usually because there is the potential for a negative trend. He does not see how this could be negative. Reverend Norton has an exceptional background and he represents everything that is great about a community. He feels that the Committee should at least vote on it.

Chair Monachella commented that Chesterfield is a young city and as the years go by, there will be many individuals who have “stepped up to the plate” making it difficult to determine which individuals are more deserving than others. It is easier to honor them by putting up a plaque or naming a bench.

Councilmember DeCampi stated that it is common for cities to name streets after people. This is a private entrance, not a major thoroughfare. Since he has been on the Council, this is the first time anyone has come forward with such a request. The City does not receive requests like this on a regular basis. Given Rev. Norton’s exceptional background, he feel that this is a great way to honor him

**Councilmember DeCampi made a motion to officially designate the western driveway entrance to the CVAC as Lion Carl Norton Way and forward to City Council with a recommendation to approve.** The motion died due to lack of a second.

##### **Discussion after the Motion**

Councilmember Hurt stated that by putting the Reverend’s name on a pavilion in Central Park or other public location, can be just as important as naming a driveway after him. In fact, it would be seen by more people.

Councilmember Mastorakos stated that she is in favor of honoring Reverend Norton in some capacity. She suggested that the Lions Club meet with City Staff and Officials to discuss options that would be agreeable to all. However, the bigger issue of naming rights has come up in the past. She feels that the City needs to establish a set policy for handling this type of request that does not conflict with the City's efforts to solicit sponsorships for the CVAC, the Amphitheater and other similar venues.

Mr. Wyse stated that from Staff's perspective, a request was received to name the driveway, however, the City does not have a policy for this type of request. The City typically recognizes individuals through formal proclamations. This request is something out of the ordinary, and instead of Staff making the determination of what should be done, it was brought to the Committee for review. Staff believes that some sort of recognition is appropriate, but since the City does not have a formal policy of naming streets, Council should decide how to handle the request.

**Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to direct Staff, including the Director of Parks, Recreation & Arts, to work with the Lions Club to explore options to honor Reverend Carl Norton that are consistent with the City's Policies and Practices.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Monachella and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

There was some discussion regarding establishing a policy for this type of request, however, the Committee could not reach a consensus so Staff will not pursue the matter.

## **B. Ordinance 1430 – Resolution of Intent**

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, stated that over the past several months, there has been considerable discussion regarding the provisions of Ordinance 1430 relative to the current Comprehensive Plan. This Ordinance originated as a St. Louis County Ordinance to which there have been several amendments over the years. After careful consideration, the Planning Commission ruled that Ordinance 1430 does not fully implement the vision in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Following this ruling, the Planning and Public Works Committee directed Staff to work with the Planning Commission to create a process to review and modify the zoning within Chesterfield Valley to reduce reliance on discretionary reviews and align the regulations of the Unified Development Code (UDC) with the Comprehensive Plan.

The City Council has the ability to initiate changes in zoning, however, the Council must first adopt a resolution of intent. After adoption, a public hearing must be set before the Planning Commission within 90 days.

### **DISCUSSION**

In response to Mayor Nation's question, Mr. Wyse stated that Ordinance 1430 allows for a 10-acre maximum retail commercial shopping center. Concerns include the lack of open space, height requirements, landscape requirements, and several permitted uses in the Ordinance.

**Councilmember DeCampi made a motion to adopt a resolution to initiate the process of rezoning for certain parcels covered under an "M-3" Planned Industrial District, defined as an "inactive district" under the City's UDC and have the Planning Commission provide recommendations on bringing Ordinance 1430 into compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

**Note: One Resolution, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the August 16, 2021 City Council Meeting. See Resolution #**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on Ordinance 1430 – Resolution of Intent.]**

### **C. Trailers in Residential Areas (Monachella)**

Chair Monachella stated that there was a resident who operated an autobody shop from his garage and used a portable storage trailer parked in his driveway to store his tools. Section 210.2460: Regulation of Portable Storage Units of the City Code provides definitions for portable storage units, storage sheds and storage trailers. However, paragraphs B through F then refer to storage sheds and storage trailers as a “similar device” as in paragraph C as follows:

“It shall be unlawful for any person to park, place or suffer placement of a portable storage unit or similar device upon any lot or property in the City of Chesterfield other than on a concrete, asphalt or other improved surface.

Chair Monachella recommended that storage trailers on lots less than 2 acres in residential areas be subject to the same regulations as campers. She proposed that paragraphs B through F replace “a similar device” with “storage trailers.”

**Councilmember DeCampi made a motion to replace “a similar device” with “storage trailers” in paragraphs B through F of Section 210.2460 Regulation of Portable Storage Units and forward to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos.**

### **DISCUSSION**

There was further discussion regarding the intent of the proposed language. It was ultimately decided to accept the recommendation to add “storage trailers” to each of the sections regardless of the size of the property.

**The above motion passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

**IV. OTHER - None.**

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.