PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
FEBRUARY 8, 1993

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

PRESENT

Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Dave Dalton
Mr. Jamie Cannon
Mr. Bill Kirchoff
Ms. Barbara McGuinness
Ms. Pat O'Brien
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Chairman Mary Domahidy
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney
Councilmember Betty Hathaway, Council Liaison
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Senior Planner
Mr. Joseph Hanke, Planning Specialist
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Walter Scruggs

INVOCATION: - Commissioner Sherman

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes from the meeting of January 25, 1993, were approved.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 1-93 Greater Missouri Builders Inc. (Chesterfield Gardens); "C-8" Planned Commercial District and "R-1" One-Acre Residence District to "R-6A" 4500 square foot Residence District; Olive Boulevard between East Drive and West Drive;

and

P.Z. 2-93 Greater Missouri Builders Inc. (Chesterfield Gardens); Planned Environment Unit Procedure in "R-6A" 4500 square foot Residence District; Olive Boulevard between East and West Drive.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon summarized the issues listed for review by the Department and added the following: 1) compatibility of the proposed units (one-story versus the two-story); and 2) architectural review/treatment of the units. She noted the Department's recommendation that this matter be held until the meeting of February 22, 1993.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Clarification of the process for the residual "C-8" portion of the original tract was requested.

Director Duepner stated the following:

- There is a tract (referred to as the residual tract) that was part of the larger "C-8" tract zoned for Sullivan-Hayes. In the event that P.Z. 1 & 2-93 Rezoning and Special Procedure is approved by the City Council, the City will have to go back and look at the commercial zoning on the residual "C-8" tract. The ordinance that approved the Sullivan-Hayes rezoning established uses for a larger tract with setbacks, etc. The Department will be addressing this issue in its report. If the current request is approved, it will probably warrant consideration of a petition to consider zoning of the property **back** to a prior classification, or amending the commercial classification for same. The process to initiate this change has yet to be determined. The Department would recommend contacting the owners of the property to advise them that the "C-8" zoning on the residual tract, although still in force, was approved for setbacks and a roadway. Therefore, there aren't any specific commercial uses approved for that portion of the site. The owners of this "C-8" portion would be encouraged to come forward to issue a petition for rezoning. It would **appear** they have a piece of ground zoned commercial, for which the uses would be setbacks and a roadway. This assumption is based upon the Ordinance and the plan approved in conjunction with the "C-8" zoning for Sullivan-Hayes.

- Chesterfield Fire Protection District has not discussed their comments on the length of the cul-de-sac and the width of the West Drive entrance with City staff.

Director Duepner stated that he believes the cul-de-sac length meets the City's criteria.

- Configuration of the internal road from East Drive has yet to be determined.
- The Department was requested to address the issue of a traffic light in its report.
- The Department was requested to review whether there is adequate room for a thirty (30) foot landscape buffer, in view of the location of the proposed units and the topography of the site.
- There would be a change in grade downward from Olive on the site; therefore, units would be at a lower elevation than Olive Boulevard.
- Ninety-four (94) units proposed in this development. Wellesley Place has approximately sixty-eight (68) units.
- It is assumed that a gate would be provided at the emergency access from West Drive.
- If the emergency access remains from West Drive, the petitioner would be required to improve both sides of West Drive from Olive back to the northern portion of their site. Since this is within a Trust Fund Area, the City can request that the County give the petitioner credit toward their Trust Fund contributions for improvement of 1/2 of West Drive.

Director Duepner noted that the petitioner's initial submittal showed access from West Drive. Subsequently, in response to requests of residents, the main access is to be via East Drive.

- The petitioner is proposing one (1) detention area in the mid-portion of the site.
- Access should be full to both East and West Drives, with one of them being signalized at Olive.
- The two-story units should be located somewhere other than on the perimeter of the site, with the possible exception of the two (2) buildings on the northeast corner (east perimeter).
- The developer did not submit a site analysis to address vegetation, drainage characteristics of the site, and other development issues.

- The Department was requested to provide the Commission with a copy of the preliminary site plan and preliminary plan for handling of stormwater and sanitary sewers.

- Driveways should be combined, wherever possible, to lessen the number of curb cuts.

- Commission would like to have an analysis of the site (i.e., amount of grading necessary, existing terrain compared to when development is completed) and the resulting view of residents adjacent to Olive).

- Sidewalks are to be provided by developer along the Olive portion of the site.

Director Duepner noted that in recent conversations with the State Highway Department, they indicated a willingness to consider sidewalks within their right-of-way (where they have not in the past). It is possible the sidewalks will not be on the site nor buffer strip (landscaped area). The State will not provide nor maintain sidewalks.

- Interior sidewalks should connect to both East and West Drives. In addition, it would be preferable that the sidewalks be continued along East Drive to Olive.

- Provision of a sidewalk is preferred between Friendship Village and the shopping center on Olive.

- The Department was requested to address the issue of street trees along the perimeter of the site in its report.

A motion to hold the matter was made by Commissioner Brown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon **and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

B. Memorandum from the Director of Planning concerning Boundary Adjustment Plats.

Director Duepner summarized the new policy, as defined in the memo presented to the Commission. He noted that, henceforth, Boundary Adjustment Plats will be reviewed by the Department of Planning and forwarded directly to City Council.

The matter was received and filed by the Commission.

C. Memorandum from the Director of Planning concerning revision of Section 1003.181 Conditional Use Permits, and 1003.300 Procedure for Amending the Zoning Ordinance.

Director Duepner summarized the memorandum from the Department, noting the Planning and Zoning Committee has directed the Commission to take-up consideration of amending the Zoning Ordinance relative to Conditional Use Permits, and the Procedures for Amending the Zoning Ordinance. He further stated that the Department recommends that the Planning Commission direct a public hearing be scheduled for a petition seeking to amend Sections 1003.181 and 1003.300.

A motion to direct the Department to prepare an amendment and schedule a public hearing was made by Commissioner Kirchoff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman **and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

A. P.Z. 18-92 Fischer & Frichtel, Inc. (Wilson View Estates); Planned Environment Unit in "R-2" Residence District Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan and Architectural Elevations; east side of Wilson Road, northwest of existing intersection of Wilson and Clarkson Roads.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, and Architectural Elevations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon **and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

B. Chesterfield Plantation; Subdivision Record Plat; south side of Olive Boulevard, at the terminus of Hitchcock Road.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the proposed Record Plat. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Commission directed the Department to request that the Planning and Zoning Committee give some attention to the Record Plat, from the standpoint of the original intent of the Planning and Zoning Committee's review of the Preliminary Plat, with respect to tree preservation.

Director Duepner confirmed that this message would be carried straight to Council.

Commissioner McGuinness stated her objection to the use of the word "Plantation" in naming subdivisions. She believes it is outdated, outmoded and insensitive.

Director Duepner noted that the Department would include a memorandum, or a cover letter, with the Bill submitted to Council indicating the concerns raised by the Planning Commission. It would be in the Council's packet for discussion at its meeting on February 16, 1993.

Commissioner Brown noted that she would like the Council to consider **retention** of existing trees.

The motion to approve the Record Plat passed by a voice vote of 7 to 1, with Commissioner McGuinness voting no.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Director Duepner handed out a letter received by the Department from Mr. Jim Meyer, dated February 5, 1993.

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Committee Chair Brown reported that the Sign Ordinance is ready to go to public hearing on March 8, 1993.

B. Architectural Review Committee

Committee Chair O'Brien reported that she will be unable to attend the February 10, 1993 meeting scheduled, and requested Director Duepner to poll the Architectural Review Committee members to set another meeting date.

C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee

Committee Chair Kirchoff reported that, on behalf of the Landscape Sub-Committee, he would like to make a motion that the Landscape Guidelines be adopted as policy. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

Director Duepner suggested the following for consideration:

- Some flexibility be given in item number 12 of the Landscape Guidelines, Commercial Development, regarding the requirement that landscape plans must be the product of a Missouri Landscape Architect, whose name and seal must be on the plan. Perhaps a nurseryman, or some other qualified

individual, could submit a landscape plan. He believes the Guidelines would ensure the type of landscape plans submitted would meet established criteria.

- The time period in which a landscape plan is to be submitted to the Planning Commission bears review and consideration by the Commission. He believes it may be more appropriate for review and approval of a landscape plan prior to, or in conjunction with, a grading plan. Currently a landscape plan is submitted and approved in conjunction with submittal of a site development plan, or a site plan. It may be more appropriate for the landscape plan to be considered at a later date.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

Commissioner Kirchoff noted that the Committee would like the landscaping, as described in the document, to occur in some fashion, and doesn't believe the Committee should be dealing in a procedural issue. This should be reviewed by the Procedures Committee or the Ordinance Review Committee. He further stated that he feels that paragraph number 12 should remain as is.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes: Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Domahidy, yes. **The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.**

Commission Chair Domahidy referred the matter of the timing of submittal of a landscape plan to the Procedures Committee for review.

D. **Comprehensive Plan Committee**

Committee Chair McGuinness noted the following:

- A letter was received from the City Administrator, on behalf of the Mayor and City Council, in regard to Resolution #126 (Comprehensive Plan).

- Councilmembers Clarke and Levinson objected to the changes the Planning Commission made to the plan in regard to development/zoning along Conway Road. Commissioner McGuinness noted that she also objected, on record, to the changes, and felt it was tested many times (the Comprehensive Plan Committee hearing, the Planning Commission hearing, etc.).

- The Council Liaison conveys to the Council, all information from various meetings, hearings, etc.

Commission Chair Domahidy noted that the Commission could look into the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Liaison Hathaway noted that the Councilmembers did attend the various meetings of the Comprehensive Plan Update and heard all the various comments, proposals, etc. She noted that they would like to have more input into the Update process.

Commissioner McGuinness noted that, even if the update process were changed, she did not think the result would be different. However, she does not want to respond to City Council that the Committee is not interested in what it has to say.

Council Liaison Hathaway suggested that, before the Comprehensive Plan is presented to City Council for final approval, a copy be given to them for review.

Commissioner McGuinness noted that the State Statutes give the responsibility of the Comprehensive Plan to the Planning Commission.

Commission Chair Domahidy referred the matter of Comprehensive Plan Update to the Procedures Committee for review. She further noted that Commissioner McGuinness will receive notice of all meetings to review this process.

E. **Procedures Committee** - No report

F. **Quarterly Meeting**

Director Duepner stated that since March has five (5) Mondays, March 29, 1993, would be a good time for the meeting. The purpose of the meeting would be to refresh memories on the procedures and some of the terminology used; and the point at which Planning Commission becomes involved, since we got into discussion tonight about Preliminary Plats and Record Plats.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

Commissioner Brown requested the following be discussed:

The Commission performs too much site planning at the time of rezoning (i.e., the width of every landscape buffer, the height of every berm, etc.). It is difficult to make a decision on a major rezoning while, at the same time, trying to deal with so many other issues. The Commission should know what has to be decided specifically at the time of zoning She believes that site plans occasionally become a rubber stamp in regard to tree issues.

Director Duepner noted that, within the past few weeks, three (3) petitions were filed. It is very likely that, if we don't take up three (3) petitions at the public hearing on March 22nd, we might be forced to have a hearing on the 29th. At this point he is not certain this will occur, because two (2) of the sites have been accepted for public hearing on the 22nd. The third has not re-submitted a response to the comments from the Department, but it is possible that it could be accepted. The Zoning Ordinance mandates that we schedule a public hearing within forty-five (45) days of acceptance.

Commissioner Kirchoff noted that he will be unable to attend the next scheduled Landscape Committee meeting of February 24, 1993. He requested this be rescheduled.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Walter Scruggs, Secretary

[MIN2-08.093]