

# MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator  
FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services  
SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary  
Thursday, October 23, 2014



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, October 23, 2014 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Dan Hurt** (Ward III), **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV), **Councilmember Nancy Greenwood** (Ward I), and **Councilmember Elliot Grissom** (Ward II).

Also in attendance were: Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Planning Commission Chair Mike Watson; Merrell Hansen, Planning Commission Member; Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services; Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; John Boyer, Senior 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 September 18, 2014 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Greenwood made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of September 18, 2014. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

## II. OLD BUSINESS – None.

## III. NEW BUSINESS

A. **Chesterfield Blue Valley, Lot 1A (Site Development Section Plan - Gas Mart):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 2.07 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the north side of Olive Street Road, west of its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road.

B. **Spirit Valley Business Park, Lot 7 (Site Development Section Plan - The Place):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 2.9 acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located southeast of the intersection of Spirit Valley West Drive and Spirit Valley Central Drive.

Chair Hurt stated that the previously-requested Power of Review for items III.A and III.B has been withdrawn.

### **C. Urban Core District**

#### **STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, stated the Planning and Public Works Committee directed Staff to develop proposed regulations to be incorporated into the Unified Development Code (UDC) pertaining to pedestrian connectivity within the Downtown Chesterfield development which is located within the Urban Core. Staff has developed the requested language to modify the UDC, however, there are several limitations inherent in adopting this language.

The area commonly referred to as the Urban Core District is not a legally identified subdivision or development but simply a planned area consisting of a group of parcels included in the City's Comprehensive Plan for higher density development. The Urban Core District does not establish zoning and there is no predetermined zoning district within it.

A PowerPoint presentation was shown depicting aerial views of the area including surrounding developments and a zoning map of the Urban Core area depicting the multiple zoning districts allowed within it. Each zoning district represented already has its own planned district ordinance or site specific ordinance. In many cases, these sites are already built out or have previously approved plans.

Downtown Chesterfield is typically referred to as the area that includes the City's Central Park and is bordered on the north by Burkhardt Place and on the south by Lydia Hill. However, the adjacent area to the north, which is bordered on the south by Burkhardt Place and bordered on the north by Highway 40/61, is also referred to as downtown Chesterfield. This area was zoned Planned Commercial and Residential District in 2008 and spans approximately 98.10 acres. Both of these areas of downtown Chesterfield are located in the Urban Core.

Ms. Nassif cited examples of surrounding developments that have submitted plans to utilize pedestrian covered walkways within their development such as Monsanto, RGA, St. Luke's and Mercy Health Systems.

Ms. Nassif advised that many of the City's current zoning districts include language that requires pedestrian connectivity and it is also covered in the Urban Core plan policy statement within the Comprehensive Plan. However, as requested, Staff prepared language that can be included in the Urban Core District which strengthens pedestrian connectivity requirements between lots, uses, and different sites. Ms. Nassif further stated that while this language can be included within the Urban Core District, it will not have a direct impact on the downtown Chesterfield developments themselves unless they rezone because zoning entitlements, and in some cases, site plans have already been approved. If a new development comes in requesting a change in zoning and they choose the Urban Core District, this language would come into effect; however, there is similar language in the Neighborhood Business District, in the Comprehensive Plan, Mixed Use District, and the PC&R District.

## DISCUSSION

Chair Hurt stated he is not concerned with walkways *within* developments but *between* developments. He stated the proposed language in Item 1.b. basically talks about general concepts. He would like it to be more specific to include language that promotes walkways and skyways between projects so pedestrians would not have to cross traffic. He cited Mr. Sachs' vision of an air skyway from Chesterfield Mall to his buildings across the Parkway. He realizes this would be expensive and developers may not be amenable to building a skywalk from their development to someone else's development, however, including this language may help to obtain cooperation from developers.

Councilmember Fults stated this language is only for the Urban Core District and noted that since both Downtown Chesterfield sites are already zoned, no new criteria can be added to them at this point. She also questioned whether skyways would be utilized in the Mall area where it is fairly easy to cross. She cited other more treacherous crossing areas along the Parkway and suggested they be included. Chair Hurt suggested imposing a TGA fee on developments along the Parkway to provide funds for walkways that would enable pedestrians to avoid crossing traffic. Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services, pointed out that the TGA fees have already been paid on all the properties that have been previously zoned.

Due to the varying amount of zoning districts that are possible within the Urban Core, Ms. Nassif suggested the focus should be in the Comprehensive Plan because you would not be tied down to one specific area/district. Chair Hurt agreed but stated it would take a number of years to get it included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Geisel stated the proposed language not only applies *within* developments but also *between* developments. At a minimum, this would be a good place to start. The difficulty lies with enforcing it within existing zoning. There are multiple mechanisms that can potentially fund this type of improvement but more importantly is the issue of maintaining the walkways.

Councilmember Greenwood expressed her displeasure that pedestrian walkways and bridges may be counted towards the 30% open space requirement. Mr. Geisel pointed out that several years ago Council moved away from a greenspace calculation and adopted an open space calculation where sidewalks and plazas count towards it. Ms. Nassif clarified by stating that sidewalks are allowed to be counted towards the open space, and to encourage *covered* pedestrian walkways, we thought it would be an incentive to encourage developers by allowing them to include this as part of the open space calculation.

Councilmember Grissom stated he agreed with Chair Hurt in principal but questioned if the elderly population would be able to climb up or down a stairway in order to cross the street. Mr. Geisel stated to be ADA compliant, an elevator would be required if there were stairs. Councilmember Grissom did not think this would be feasible because of cost and maintenance.

During additional discussion, Mr. Geisel stated that the Urban Core area will have to consider a CID or TDD for parking garages and overhead walkways because it is very difficult to impose such requirements on any one individual property owner.

When asked how to proceed, Ms. Nassif stated the proposed language is a good start. She suggested recommending approval with the understanding that Staff will continue to research ways to encourage this in a more global fashion.

**Councilmember Fults made a motion to amend the Unified Development Code to encourage pedestrian connectivity within the Urban Core District.** The motion was seconded by Chair Hurt.

Councilmember Greenwood repeated her concern about sidewalks being included in the open space calculation and stated she cannot support it.

From a process standpoint, Mr. Geisel stated all that is needed is a consensus from the Committee for the proposed language as it will then be forwarded to the Planning Commission where a public hearing will be held. The final legislation will come back to this Committee.

Councilmember Fults withdrew the motion and Chair Hurt concurred as the Committee agreed to forward the amendment to the Planning Commission.

#### **D. Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance**

##### **STAFF REPORT**

Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer, stated that since 2009, FEMA has been working to update its Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMS). This process has been completed and will become effective February 4, 2015. In order to remain compliant with FEMA's ordinance, the City is required to officially adopt the new maps which is done through a revision to the City's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.

The proposed Ordinance is essentially the same as the previous Ordinance minus some minor housekeeping issues and the two sections which adopt the FEMA maps and the new flood insurance section.

##### **DISCUSSION**

In response to Chair Hurt's question, Mr. Geisel and Mr. Eckrich discussed changes to the map area since 1993 noting that the changes take advantage of better topographic information.

**Councilmember Greenwood made a motion to recommend approval of the Ordinance as proposed.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

For informational purposes, Ms. Nassif stated the Ordinance will go to a Public Hearing first and then be brought back to PPW before going to City Council for final vote.

#### **E. Floodplain Overlay District**

##### **STAFF REPORT**

John Boyer, Senior Planner, advised in conjunction with the newly updated FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Staff is proposing to address changes necessary to the City's zoning districts, and the Flood Plain Overlay District.

The Flood Plain Overlay District is a district that was carried over from the St. Louis County Zoning Ordinance in 1988. However, since Chesterfield's incorporation, no additional parcels or developments have zoned into this district designation, nor are they required to do so. This overlay district does not provide any additional protections or regulations nor does it augment

the FEMA flood damage prevention regulations already in place. Therefore, this overlay district is unnecessary. Since there are a number of lots that do have this designation, Staff is proposing to make it an inactive district.

## **DISCUSSION**

In response to Chair Hurt's question, Ms. Nassif stated inactive means that no additional parcels could ever be zoned to the Flood Plain District and as new developments come in that are already zoned to this overlay district, Staff would encourage them to rezone. Mr. Geisel advised the City has not put an FP overlay on a property in 26 years and does not anticipate using the FP zoning within the next 20 years. This was in place in a County ordinance prior to the existence of FEMA mapping. This was a way to control floodplain development but is not needed because we now have regulatory flood maps. This is not a zoning issue but rather a regulatory insurance issue.

**Councilmember Grissom made a motion to recommend Planning Commission hold a public hearing to amend Article 2 and Article 3 of the Unified Development Code.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Greenwood and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

### **F. Public Street Acceptance – Squires Way Drive**

#### **STAFF REPORT**

Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer, stated Squires Way Drive within the Manors of Schoettler Valley subdivision has been designed and constructed to meet the City's standards for acceptance as a public street.

**Councilmember Grissom made a motion to accept Squires Way Drive as a City street.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Greenwood and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

**Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the November 3, 2014 City Council Meeting.  
See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer, for additional information on the acceptance of Squires Way Drive as a City street.]**

## **IV. PROJECT UPDATES**

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, provided the following summation.

### **Ward 1: Project Update**

- Monsanto Campus
- Friendship Village
- Four Seasons Plaza

**Ward 2: Project Update**

- Herman Stemme Office Park – Mitek

**Ward 4: Project Update**

- THF Chesterfield Commons Development – Lowe's
- Bur Oaks Development

**OTHER PROJECTS UNDER REVIEW**

- Reserve at Chesterfield Village
- Chesterfield Blue Valley – Outlet addition
- Chesterfield Blue Valley ASDCP
- Mercy Health Systems
- Arbors at Wild Horse
- Arbors at Kehrs Mill
- The Wedge zoning map amendment
- Spirit Valley Business Park, Lot 7, The Place
- New Covenant Group (Kemp Auto Museum Subdivision)
- Property Maintenance Code research/update
- Brattle Hill
- Chesterfield Blue Valley – Gas Mart
- Wild Horse Bluffs
- St. Luke's Hospital
- Taubman Amended Architectural Elevations – H&M
- Schoettler Grove
- RGA
- Wilson Creek
- Beckmann Properties

**V. OTHER – None.****VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:17 p.m.