

MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
December 6, 2007

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, December 6, 2007 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Connie Fults** (Ward IV); **Councilmember Jane Durrell** (Ward I); **Councilmember Bruce Geiger** (Ward II); and **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III).

Also in attendance were Mayor John Nations; Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr., Planning Commission Chair; Rob Heggie, City Attorney; Mike Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

Chair Fults called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the November 8, 2007 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of November 8, 2007. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

The Committee agreed to amend the agenda to review Item III.B. first.

- B. **P.Z. 46-2007 Dugsford Commons (Reliance Bank)**: A request for amendment of City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2198 to allow for one additional permitted use for a 1.436 acre “PC” Planned Commercial District located on Wild Horse Creek Road, approximately 550 southeast of Long Road (17263 Wild Horse Creek Road/18U420522).
Proposed additional use:
(x) Medical and dental offices

Staff Report

Ms. Anissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning, stated that the governing ordinance currently allows for “financial institutions”, as well as “offices or office buildings”. The Petitioners are requesting the addition of “medical and dental offices” for Lot 2 only. They have a potential user at this time.

The approved Site Development Plan has adequate parking for a medical and dental office use.

On November 26th, the Planning Commission approved the Ordinance Amendment.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to forward P.Z. 46-2007 Dugsford Commons (Reliance Bank) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

**Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the January 7, 2008 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #**

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, for additional information on P.Z. 46-2007 Dugsford Commons (Reliance Bank).]

- A. **P.Z. 41-2007 Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC (18394 Chesterfield Airport Road)**: A request for a change of zoning from “NU” Non-Urban District to “PC” Planned Commercial District for a 75.063 acre tract of land located on the north side of Olive Street Road, west of its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road.

Chair Fults stated that Staff will make its report, which will be followed by the Planning Commission Report. She reported that a subsequent meeting was held with Ward IV Councilmembers, Planning Chair Hirsch, Staff, and the Developers where changes were made. These changes will be reflected in the Petitioner’s presentation.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning, stated that the Agricola tract was zoned in 2005 to Planned Commercial.

On November 15th, the Planning Commission's motion to approve, with changes to the number of drive-thrus, failed by a vote of 2 to 4.

Issues Discussed during Planning Commission

Building Height

During Planning Commission's review of the petition, there were discussions relating to the height of the buildings. Planning Commission was presented with buildings of 95 feet or nine stories in height.

The Attachment A, as currently written, has a limitation to the number of structures that would have a height of 6 stories or 95 feet, whichever is less. The maximum height for all other structures is currently stated in the Attachment A as 4 stories or 65 feet, whichever is less.

The Petitioners have since proposed further limitations of having only three buildings of 75 feet (as opposed to 95 feet) or 6 stories, whichever is less. None of those buildings would be along Old Olive Street Road and one would have frontage along Highway 40.

Drive-thrus

The Planning Commission also reviewed the use of drive-thrus in the development. The Attachment A is currently written so that drive-thrus are limited to 30%. Commissioner Banks' motion limited the number of drive-thrus to six but the motion failed.

The Petitioners are agreeable to a further limitation at this time, which will be outlined in the Petitioner's presentation.

Open Space

Planning Commission reviewed the issue of open space during the Public Hearing presentation. The Comprehensive Plan calls for 40% open space for the site. In this particular area of Sub-area 2, there is language that allows re-evaluation of the open space percentage when infrastructure is being planned. Blue Valley I has a 35% open space requirement. Now that the infrastructure is being implemented, 30% open space is being requested for the subject petition, which is reflected in the Attachment A.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Chair Hirsch reported on the information that was available to the Planning Commission at the time of its vote on November 15th.

The Planning Commission was presented with material for Blue Valley II only; information on Blue Valley I was not presented. With respect to Blue Valley II, the Commission saw three buildings at 95 feet or 6 stories in height with the

remaining buildings all possibly being 65 feet tall. Comparing these heights to Blue Valley I, the Commission noted its limitation of 45 feet in height for all its buildings. The Commission had no knowledge that the Petitioner is trying to purchase the land in Blue Valley I with the intention of requesting an ordinance that would cover both sites as one comprehensive site.

Issues Discussed during Planning Commission

Building Height

The Commission questioned whether the proposed height is appropriate for this end of the Valley (Sub-area 2) noting that the Master Plan recommends building height at no more than 45 feet - unless good reasons are presented for a taller height. When the Petitioner was asked why the buildings should be taller than 45 feet, the Commission did not feel they received an adequate answer.

Planning Chair Hirsch went on to say that one could argue that the Master Plan in Sub-area 2 is out-of-date. For example, the 50% open space is out-of-date because it was established when there was no infrastructure in this area. So now the open space reverts back to 30%.

The proposed building height was also discussed in comparison to building height within the City's urban core.

Placement of the Buildings

The Commission also questioned the placement of the taller buildings – feeling they should be closer to the highway. The Petitioner indicated that they wanted the option of placing them near Old Olive Street Road.

Drive-thrus

The proposed number of drive-thrus is based on the Blue Valley I Ordinance, which allows 30% of the buildings to have drive-thru facilities – such as banks, fast food, etc. The Commission questioned the number of drive-thru facilities being proposed. Commissioner Banks made a motion to limit the number of drive-thrus along with his motion to approve the re-zoning.

The motion to approve failed 2 to 4. The two Commissioners voting in favor were Chair Hirsch and Commissioner Banks. The other four Commissioners voted against the petition because of the proposed height of the buildings.

Access

The Commission also expressed concern about access. The road system that is being envisioned for the project was not presented to the Planning Commission.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates, representing the Petitioner, acknowledged that the negative vote from the Planning Commission was a reflection of the presentation made at that time. There were reasons for not presenting information about integrating Blue Valley I at the time; but in hindsight,

they realize not enough information was made available on which to make the Commission comfortable with the project.

Mr. Stock then presented information on the following:

BLUE VALLEY I

- Blue Valley I is the piece of property re-zoned February 6, 2006. At that time, the property known as Blue Valley II, immediately to the east, was not even being contemplated. It was not under contract – it was not part of the project.
- Blue Valley I is 55.8 acres in size and is adjacent to Rombach's Pumpkin Farm.
- There is another 88 acre tract adjacent to it.
- They worked with Staff to develop a Preliminary Development Plan that addressed the issues of road access and drainage.
- An Ordinance was granted for plans for Blue Valley I, which showed 25 buildings, 437,000 square feet, a signalized intersection at its east property line, a serpentine road, cross access to the west and east, and provided for a master drainage channel going in an east/west direction.
- Because of the traffic constraints, and what they are trying to achieve, it has been determined that the road is not in the right location for a major arterial road. Because of the potential cost with pipelines and crossing, it does not appear that the drainage is in the right location either.
- Blue Valley I never got a Concept Plan – it's not a recorded plan.

TRANSMISSION EASEMENT

- Ameren UE has the right to a transmission easement. It runs immediately adjacent to the west property line, which abuts Blue Valley I.
- The easement precludes buildings and has limitations as to what can be constructed.

BLUE VALLEY II

- The plan is consistent with the east/west cross access road. But because Blue Valley I was not recorded, Planning Commission did not see the road being connected – they just saw a long cul-de-sac street within a very linear development.
- The drainage is consistent with the Master Plan showing it coming through the middle of the site.
- A lot of time was spent on traffic analysis and incorporating the relocation of Old Olive into its new location with the I-64 ramp and creating a signal.

BLUE VALLEY I & II COMBINED

- With Blue Valley I and II, there are 138 acres which they intend to fully integrate.
- The issue with Ameren UE's transmission easement has been worked out. Ameren UE has agreed to vacate the easement and run it around the perimeter of the property 30 feet in the under-seepage berm and 70 feet

- into the subject site – and then come along the very western property line and then come across and go due south.
- The site has tremendous highway access, tremendous highway visibility, and is immediately adjacent to the Airport, which is the second-largest private corporate airport in the country.
 - There is a strong interest from outside groups relative to office, retail, entertainment, and hotel.
 - The proposed height of the buildings is driven by the hotel use. There are two hotels that like six stories. It was noted that six stories can be done within 75 feet. The hotels also desire a particular location.
 - The site is a front door to the City and the Petitioners desire a landmark building. Because of the flat terrain, they feel it makes sense to have a little bit of undulation within the buildings.
 - Their goal is to maintain sight lines – they do not want to restrict sight of the proposed Lifestyle Center planned for the center of the site. The perimeter (I-64 ramp/Highway 40) would be flanked with the office/hotel buildings. Olive would have retail along it.
 - They want to come back to the Planning Commission with a Concept Plan and zoning that integrates the whole plan.

ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

- Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier has done a comprehensive analysis relative to the road improvements.
- The intersection that was part of Blue Valley I, with the addition of lanes, is still in the same location.
- This project would construct the proposed road improvements, turn lanes, and signalized intersection on I-64. It would relocate Olive; bring a major boulevard 600 feet into the site; and have a signalized intersection directly opposite of the Airport property.
- The other signalized intersection with Blue Valley I will be moved further to the west.
- On the Airport development, there will be a non-signalized entrance.
- The goal is to move the east/west arterial road all the way back to the levee. It would be built on the under-seepage berm.
- Because of all the traffic that will be on Olive and linked within the development, they are proposing a four-lane, high-quality road running around the perimeter, which services the core area of hotel and office.
- The central core of the Lifestyle Center (retail/entertainment/dining) would be serviced by “Main Street”, which is more of a pedestrian way.

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS

- The maximum height of the buildings would be 75 feet or six stories, whichever is less. These six-story buildings would be limited to three within the development.

PLACEMENT OF BUILDINGS

- One six-story building is being proposed at the first right into the development. Immediately to the west, is the location of another six-story building. The third six-story building would possibly overlook the river.
- There is a minimum setback of 300 feet from Olive.

DRAINAGE

- The drainage was originally bisecting the middle of the property. The site will now be drained to the south.
- The master channel, and the drainage that comes from the eastern quadrant, will be run up and along the back of the retail area. The drainage will be hidden and will not have frontage on Olive.

DRIVE-THRUS

- There may be a convenience store and gas station limited to one.
- There is no desire to have fast-food.
- There are ancillary drive-thrus, such as a Starbucks as an end cap to a building.
- The Developer is agreeable to limiting drive-thrus to four.

DISCUSSION

Transmission Easement

Commissioner Hurt asked if Ameren can bury underground lines in a seepage berm. Mr. Geisel replied that it is possible but it requires special fill material. He noted that the easement was established in the 1940's but has never been used.

Building Height

Planning Chair Hirsch noted that the current proposal allows buildings at 75 feet or six stories. There is still the option that the balance of the buildings in Blue Valley II could be up to 65 feet with Blue Valley I having a maximum height of 45 feet. He questioned how the building heights would be handled when an amendment is presented incorporating the two projects into one.

Mr. Michael Midland then presented a three-dimensional model of the project illustrating the different building heights. They are proposing to have the three higher pad sites away from Olive. One building is being positioned to be seen from the freeway as one approaches Chesterfield. It is at the end of one of the major roads, which is tree-lined and has many of the shops on it. The other two six-story buildings are approximately 500 feet from Olive but at a very strategic point that allows them to have freeway visibility, which is what a better hotel will want.

The main road is seen as having buildings with more than one story but no more than four stories. A four-story building would have a height of 45-50 feet depending on its use.

The remainder of the buildings would be mainly one-story with the exception of a cluster of three-story buildings, which would give a visual density to the park. They are trying to lace walk-able streets, along with a garden, through the site to encourage pedestrian walking.

Councilmember Hurt asked if the height of the buildings includes, or excludes, mechanical equipment. Mr. Geisel stated that the height does not necessarily include mechanical equipment.

The wording in Blue Valley I states:

Maximum height of buildings, exclusive of roof screening, shall not exceed two stories or 45 feet, whichever is less.

Councilmember Durrell expressed concern that other than the three 75-foot buildings, the remaining buildings could all be 65 feet tall. Mr. Midland replied that there will be a regulation on the total square footage, which will control the height of the buildings.

Performance Standards

Mr. Geisel summarized the Performance Standards:

- Three parcels that would allow six-story buildings or 75 feet, whichever is less.
- The remainder of the buildings could be four-stories or 65 feet, whichever is less.

Combination of Blue Valley I and Blue Valley II

Councilmember Durrell stated she is in favor of combining the two projects but noted that Blue Valley I has a maximum height limit of 45 feet. She expressed concern that when the two developments are combined, a request will be made to allow taller buildings in Blue Valley I.

Mr. Geisel stated that discussions have been held with the Petitioner regarding the combination of the two developments. He indicated that Blue Valley II would not be dealt with separately. It is anticipated that the ordinance for Blue Valley I will be revised showing a total of 125 acres. The same performance criteria would cover the entire 125 acres – there will not be different criteria for Blue Valley I and Blue Valley II. Such a revision would change the total number of buildings but there would still be the limitation of three buildings at 75 feet. The revision will not increase the gross square footage. It was also noted that when taller buildings are constructed, the open space increases.

Brachier Tract

Regarding the six acres on the Brachier Tract, Councilmember Durrell expressed her hope that the plans include a type of stub street that could integrate this tract sometime in the future.

It was noted that the Attachment A includes the following language in Section I.2. regarding "Access/Access Management".

Provide cross access easement and temporary slope construction license or other appropriate legal instrument or agreement guaranteeing permanent access between this site and adjacent properties as directed by City of Chesterfield and the St. Louis County Departments of Highways and Traffic.

Mr. John King stated that access to the Brachier tract will come out of the interior road – it will not come off the main road.

Traffic

Councilmember Hurt stated he has a regional concern with respect to the traffic pattern. He feels that traffic should move through the City as easily as possible. His concern is that there is only a limited amount of space to do fly-overs for access. The fly-over that is shown is acceptable for the subject project; but he has concern that it limits the spacing for any other fly-overs that may be needed for Highway 109. He stated that major traffic patterns work better when there is a cloverleaf vs. a signalized intersection.

Councilmember Hurt pointed out that the Traffic Study prepared by Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier shows some of the intersections going down to a "Level D" in about 20 years.

Mr. Geisel stated that a problem arises because the site is too close to the bridge. Weaving cannot be accomplished on the bridge – it would require a separate overpass. The proposed configuration allows traffic from Eatherton Road to bypass the development and go westbound.

Mayor Nations then expressed his support and enthusiasm for the project, and encouraged its approval.

Issues

Chair Fults summarized the issues discussed that could be possible amendments to the Attachment A:

- To limit the six-story buildings from Olive Street Road by 300 feet.
- To limit three buildings to six stories or 75 feet, whichever is less.
- To limit the number of drive-thrus to four.
- To reserve space for a Chesterfield landmark.
- To incorporate the conclusions from the Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier Traffic Study, dated November 12, 2007.
- To limit the number of filling stations to one.
- To provide Automatic Power of Review.

Signage

Councilmember Hurt recommended that a Sign Package, similar to the one used for the Mobil on THF, be used for this development. He noted that the Mobil project did not allow pylon signs or signs above a certain height.

Ms. McCaskill-Clay stated that the Attachment A requires an overall design package for the development.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward P.Z. 41-2007 Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC (18394 Chesterfield Airport Road) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell.

Chair Fults made a motion to amend the Attachment A to: (1) limit the six-story buildings from being no closer than 300 feet to Olive Street Road; (2) limit the number of drive-thrus to four; (3) require a Chesterfield landmark; (4) accept the November 12, 2007 Traffic Study from Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier; (5) limit the number of filling stations to one; and (6) provide Automatic Power of Review. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Chair Fults made a motion to amend the Attachment A to limit three buildings to six stories or 75 feet, whichever is less. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell.

Councilmember Hurt asked for the height of the Hilton Hotel in the Valley. Mr. Stock replied that the Hilton is 51 feet tall. Mr. Geisel stated that the highest building in the Valley will be the structure next to the ice rink, which was recently approved for six stories.

Councilmember Hurt stated that he would be voting against this motion at this time in order to do some investigating on the issue. He indicated that his vote may change at the Council meeting.

The motion on the height limitation **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 1 with Councilmember Hurt voting “no”.**

Councilmember Hurt then stated he would be voting against the project at this time because of his concerns with the access issue.

Mr. Geisel stated that when the Valley Master Plan was established 15 years ago, a corridor study was developed for Highway 40. At that time, Federal Highways approved four access breaks on Highway 40 – a half-diamond at Baxter Road; a full diamond at Boone’s Crossing; a full diamond at Long Road; and a half-diamond at Spirit. The accesses were approved by Federal Highways

with the caveat that MoDOT add a third bridge. Mr. Geisel pointed out that Federal Highways already has a corridor plan approved for the area, along with approved highway accesses.

Chair Fults felt the proposed project would improve both the area and the traffic.

Mr. King stated that he has recently met with Ed Hasinger of MoDOT, who was very happy that the plans were presented to him. Mr. Hasinger indicated that any plans for Highway 109 are way down the road, but acknowledged that the proposed plans are preparing for any such improvements.

After further discussion among the Committee members, and with a meeting being scheduled for Councilmember Hurt to meet with Mr. Hasinger, Councilmember Hurt agreed to vote for the petition with the understanding that he still has concerns with access to Highway 40.

The motion to forward P.Z. 41-2007 Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC (18394 Chesterfield Airport Road), as amended, to City Council with a recommendation to approve **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

**Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the January 7, 2008 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #**

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, for additional information on P.Z. 41-2007 Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC (18394 Chesterfield Airport Road).]

C. 2008 Meeting Schedule

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to accept the 2008 Meeting Schedule noting that the April 10th and December 18th meetings may be canceled at a later date. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Durrell and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.