

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
OCTOBER 12, 1992**



=====

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

PRESENT

ABSENT

Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Jamie Cannon
Mr. Dave Dalton
Mr. Bill Kirchoff
Ms. Barbara McGuinness
Ms. Pat O'Brien (arrived after roll call)
Mr. Walter Scruggs
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Chairman Mary Domahidy
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney
Councilmember Betty Hathaway, Ward I
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Senior Planner
Ms. Toni Hunt, Planning Technician
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

INVOCATION: Commissioner Victoria Sherman

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

PUBLIC HEARINGS - Commissioner Bill Kirchoff read the opening comments.

- A. P.Z. 21-92 City of Chesterfield Planning Commission; a change of zoning from "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District, "FPR-2" Flood Plain "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District, and "R-6" 4,500 square foot Residence District to "NU" Non-Urban District and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban District for a 136.844 acre tract located on the north side of Wild Horse Creek Road, at the west side of Santa Maria Drive (Locator Number 18T530116).

Director Duepner presented slides of the site and surrounding area, and then spoke on behalf of the request as follows:

- P.Z 21-92 was initiated by the Planning Commission, due to the expiration of a previously approved Planned Environment Unit Procedure which authorized a total of 735 dwelling units on the site.
- Upon the expiration of a Planned Environment Unit Procedure, a public hearing is to be held to consider reversion of the zoning of the property to its prior classification (i.e., prior to the granting of the Planned Environment Unit Procedure).
- The rezoning of this tract was originally requested by Musterman Development in 1976. The request was for rezoning from the then "NU" Non-Urban and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban Districts to an "R-2" Residence District and "R-7" Residence District with a Planned Environment Unit, and rezoning to "C-8" Planned Commercial District. At that time the petitioner was requesting approval for 922 multi-family and single-family units, and 61,000 square foot commercial building. Subsequent to hearing of those petitions by the County, the petitioner submitted revised petitions in 1977. Via P.C. 59 & 60-77, Musterman Development dropped their request for the "C-8" Commercial District zoning, and revised their petition to request rezoning to residential with a Planned Environment Unit Procedure. They proposed 735 dwelling units, of which 264 were to be single-family, 159 town houses, and 312 multi-family units.
- Both the rezoning request and the Planned Environment Unit Procedure were approved by St. Louis County in 1977. Over the years, the original Planned Environment Unit Procedure Ordinance was amended several times. In May of 1988, the ordinance was amended and a requirement was established for an eighteen (18) month time period for submittal of a site development plan. There was provision for one (1) eighteen (18) month extension where due cause was shown. That extension was granted, but a site development plan was never submitted to the City of Chesterfield. Subsequently, the Planned Environment Unit on the site has terminated.
- Under the provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance, the zoning on the property, under its current classification of "R-2" and "R-6" remains; however, no building permit can be issued on the property until this property is the subject of a rezoning to revert it back to its prior classification, and there is final action on that petition by the City Council.

- The Planning Commission, in initiating the petition for consideration of reversion of the zoning, did so by a Resolution of Intent. After taking that action, the owner of the property was notified of the Commission action, and the response was the filing of petitions to be heard later this evening (i.e., P.Z. 22, 24, 25, & 26-92).
- P.Z. 21-92 seeks rezoning of the property back to its prior classification (prior to 1977) of "NU" Non-Urban and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban Districts.

NO SPEAKERS

SHOW OF HANDS

IN FAVOR 1

IN OPPOSITION 1

- B. P.Z. 22-92 Chesterfield Village, Inc., Jones Custom Homes and Mayer Homes, Inc. (Wild Horse Creek Place); a request for a change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-6" 4,500 square foot Residence District for a 5.9 acre tract of land located approximately 1,250 feet north of Wild Horse Creek Road (Locator Number 17T220157); **AND**

P.Z. 24-92 Chesterfield Village, Inc., Jones Custom Homes and Mayer Homes, Inc. (Wild Horse Creek Place); a request for a change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-6" 4,500 square foot Residence District for a 5.7 acre tract of land located approximately 1,250 feet north of Wild Horse Creek Road (Locator Number 18T530116); **AND**

P.Z. 25-92 Chesterfield Village, Inc., Jones Custom Homes and Mayer Homes, Inc. (Wild Horse Creek Place); a request for a change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District for a .1 acre tract of land located at the existing intersection of Santa Maria Drive and Wild Horse Creek Road (Locator Numbers 18T540061 and 18T540072); **AND**

P.Z. 26-92 Chesterfield Village, Inc., Jones Custom Homes and Mayer Homes, Inc. (Wild Horse Creek Place); a request for a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in an "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District, "FPR-2" Flood Plain "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District, and "R-6" 4,500 square foot Residence District for a 147.9 acre tract of land located north of Wild Horse Creek Road, at the west side of Santa Maria Drive (Locator Numbers 18T530116, 17T220157, 18T540061, and 18T540072).

Mr. Al Michenfelder, Attorney, spoke on behalf of the petition noting the following:

- He identified the petitioners, noting that Jones Custom Homes and Mayer Homes, Inc. will purchase from Chesterfield Village, Inc., the land which is to be developed for single-family homes. The land which is to be developed for multi-family homes is to be retained by Chesterfield Village, Inc.
- The 5.7 acre tract and 5.9 acre tract are proposed to be "R-6" Zoning. The .1 acre tract is proposed to be "R-2" Zoning.
- He described the proposed tract and surrounding area, noting the subject tract is largely agricultural. The largest amount of trees and foliage exist on the north line along the bluff, and on the west line near Caulk's Creek. The MSD pumping station is located in the northwestern portion of the property, close to Caulk's Creek.
- The request is for 359 single-family lots, and 243 multi-family units.
- Access is proposed via Wild Horse Creek Road on what will be the Baxter Road extension.
- Baxter Road currently terminates due south of the proposed entrance to the project on Wild Horse Creek Road, and it is ultimately anticipated that that connection will be made.
- The multi-family units will be concentrated in the eastern and northeastern portions of the site, and will consist of two (2) and three (3) story buildings. One building in the eastern portion (Building A) will contain fifty-six (56) units in a three (3) story building, with garage, basement and parking for that structure. The remainder will consist of two (2) story structures.
- Parking for the multi-family units are based on the formula of 1 1/2 spaces per unit, as required by the ordinance.
- Single-family lots would begin with Village A, then B, C and D. The concept is that the more dense portion of the single-family development would be located closer to the multi-family, and the larger lots are to be located in the western portion of the tract.
- Common ground consists of a total of eighteen (18) acres.

- Along the north line, along the bluff of the Missouri River, no grading will be permitted north of any lot line, and to the extent possible, grading will be held south of the north lot line.
- No building will be closer than eighty (80) feet to the north perimeter, and no lot line will be any closer than sixty (60) feet.
- The common ground along Caulk's Creek will be a minimum of 160' from any lot line.
- There will be a twenty-five (25) foot landscape area along the south property line, abutting the residences located between this property and Wild Horse Creek Road.
- A recreational center for the single-family portion is proposed in the southern portion of the property. This will consist of a swimming pool, two (2) tennis courts, a changing room, a snack bar, and a permanent water body, which also doubles as a detention basin.
- There will be three (3) detention basins.
- The multi-family units will have their own swimming pool and recreational center, located on the east side of the Baxter Road extension.
- Three (3) entrances to the Baxter Road extension are proposed on the west side, and two (2) on the east side, as it runs through the project.
- Sanitary sewers are available to the entire tract.
- Prices will range from \$150,000 for those located in the more dense portion of the development, to \$180,000 for houses on the western portion of the tract. The homes will be one (1), one and one-half (1 1/2), and two (2) stories.
- The average lot size of all four (4) Villages will be 9,173 square feet.
- The multi-family units could be a mixture of condominium development and rental apartments, or all rental, or all condominium. It is not clear what the market will require at the time of development. Assuming it will be a combination, the condominium price ranges for the low-rise (2-story) will be \$225,000 to \$250,000. The mid-rise (3-stories) will be in the range of \$200,000. For garden rental apartments, or other rental units, the price will be \$1600.00/month.

- Photographs or renderings of the types of structures proposed were presented to the Planning Commission for review.
- A small vacation of Santa Maria Drive will be requested at the conclusion of the process in which the developer is now engaged. This is a section of Santa Maria Drive which was never built.
- The original proposal approved by the County in 1977, was for "R-5" density. This was a logical continuation already arrived at, and approved by Chesterfield Village. Because of its unique characteristics, this property will not negatively impact the surrounding area.
- This property has not yet been developed due to the previously planned long-range development of Chesterfield Village.
- Utilities necessary for the project have just recently been made available.
- The petitioner has downsized the original proposal by approximately eighteen percent (18%), or 131 units.
- The balance of the multi-family and single-family development has been changed, with the request being for more single-family development.
- No more than fifteen percent (15%) of the existing tree cover will be removed. It is anticipated that eight hundred and thirty (830) trees will be planted on the project in the course of development.

In conclusion, he requested denial of P.Z. 21-92, and approval of P.Z. 22, 24, 25 & 26-92.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Clarification was requested of the proposed lot sizes. The average lot size will be 9,153, the smaller lot size will be 7,350 square feet and 8,750 square feet.
- It was suggested that consideration be given to smaller lot sizes and more open space which could provide walking trails, and other amenities considered a plus.

- The recreation area of the entire single-family area will be under the control of the trustees of the subdivision, paid for on the basis of assessments, or membership, and are for the use of the residents only.
- Concern that the proposed location of the recreation area could present a nuisance to abutting property owners.

Tom Krull, of Volz Engineering, addressed the issue of stormwater drainage as follows:

- The recreation site was selected for function. The main drainage for the site channels through the area proposed on the site plan.
- A combination of the drainage and the street system dictated the location of the recreation facility.
- There will be a lake formed on the site.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The adequacy of the twenty-five (25) foot landscape buffer along the perimeter of the subject tract that abuts the "NU" Zoned parcels was questioned and preference expressed for additional common ground area.

Mr. Krull stated that he believes the presently zoned "NU" Non-Urban parcels will be developed with smaller lots. He noted the potential for a natural walking trail along the bluff area.

- Concern was raised about impact to adjoining properties of the lighting and noise of the proposed recreational area.
- The appropriateness of the multi-family units close to Wild Horse Creek Road was discussed.
- Villages A & B will contain lots of a minimum of 7350 square feet, and 8350 square feet for the less dense portion of the development. The average lot size is 9153 square feet, overall, for the four villages.
- No attention has been given, at present, by the developer to development of walkways along the bluff area, nor to safety issues. The objective of the developer is to preserve the scenic walkways.

- The existing tree cover is eighty (80) feet from the closest multi-family building. From the rear lot lines of the single-family lots, the closest tree cover would be sixty (60) feet.
- The existing MSD station is located within the common area.
- Eighty-five percent (85%) of the existing trees will remain. Most of these are located along the bluff.
- The developer has no plans to provide a formal walking trail along the bluff.
- Concern was expressed about the volume of traffic (2400 cars/day) that would come in and out of the Baxter Road extension. This would mean approximately six (6) cars per minute traversing through this area.
- The developer is not asking for any changes to the standard side yard setbacks, as currently required.
- The traffic pattern was discussed. Mr. Michenfelder stated that, ultimately, the Baxter extension will be connected to Chesterfield Airport Road.
- No timetable has been established for the extension of Baxter Road.
- A Trust Fund has been established and a Traffic Generation Assessment will be imposed on this development. The funds from that money will be devoted, Mr. Michenfelder presumes, to the extension of Baxter Road.
- The street plan was discussed. It was noted that there was one entrance on to Wild Horse Creek Road via Baxter Road Extension. On Baxter Road Extension, the current proposal depicts two (2) entrances on the east side into the multi-family area, and three (3) entrances on the west side, two (2) into the single-family area and one (1) into the multi-family area.
- The naming of the loop roads was discussed. It was noted that the Post Office will have the final say on the names.
- No comments have been received from the County Department of Highways and Traffic. Mr. Michenfelder noted that their comments will have a direct bearing on the development.

- It was noted that since 1977 the growth of Spirit Airport has changed dramatically. It was suggested that the developer advise potential buyers of the location of the Airport.

Commissioners McGuinness and Scruggs left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Michenfelder stated that Mr. Duepner has discussed this matter with him, and the three (3) developers would be willing to accept the condition that any prospective purchaser be advised that there is a lot of overhead air traffic from Spirit Airport.

City Attorney Beach suggested that additional insulation could be required due to the noise level created by the air traffic patterns.

Mr. Tom Krull stated that all the lines of air traffic fall below the bluff.

- Due to the fact that the Baxter extension plans indicate its termination into some empty lots, it was suggested the developers consider purchasing this lot in order to provide two (2) entrances to the development.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

1. Dan Layton, 205 Hi Point Drive, Chesterfield, Missouri 63005, as an individual.
 - He expressed concern about the location of the proposed recreational facility to his adjoining property to the west.

Commissioners McGuinness and Scruggs returned to the meeting at this time.

SPEAKERS - NEUTRAL

1. Valerie Gerst, 16686 Chesterfield Airport Road, Chesterfield, Missouri 63017, as an individual.
 - She expressed concern that neither she, nor her neighbors, have been contacted regarding the extension of Baxter Road.
 - Mr. Krull indicated that this issue cannot be addressed until the County Department of Highways and Traffic comments are received.

- Mr. Michenfelder stated the point at which the current plan shows the Baxter extension going down towards Chesterfield Airport Road, is not a plan which arises out of the proposed development; but, rather, out of long term plans developed over the years by St. Louis County and, more recently, by the City of Chesterfield.
- Ms. Gerst expressed her belief that the safety issue of the bluff should be addressed.
- 2. Mr. Jim Gerst, 16686 Chesterfield Airport Road, Chesterfield, Missouri 63017, as an individual.
- He expressed concern that their property is located below the proposed development. He would like guarantees that he will not be washed-out.
- Mr. Krull stated that all stormwater issues will be addressed, and will be available for Mr. Gerst to review. He further noted that the plans will be prepared by Volz, forwarded to the City of Chesterfield and the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District for approval.

REBUTTAL

Mr. Michenfelder responded that no rear lot line will be closer, on the south property line, than one hundred and seventy (170) feet from adjoining properties. The distance between Mr. Layton's property line and the proposed recreational structure is two hundred and ten (210) feet.

HANDS IN FAVOR 15 HANDS IN OPPOSITION 8

- C. P.Z. 23-92 Hahn/Montgomery; a request for a change in zoning from "R-1" One-Acre Residence District to "NU" Non-Urban District for a 41.96 acre tract of land located on the north side of Wild Horse Creek Road, approximately 5,000 feet from the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road and State Highway C (Eatherton Road) (Locator Number 18W310036).

Director Duepner presented slides of the subject site and surrounding area.

Mr. J. Charles Hahn spoke on behalf of the petition noting the following:

- The proposal is for development of large tract home sites of three (3) acres and above.
- Water and sewer are not available on the property.

Director Duepner pointed out to the Commission that this site was rezoned by the City in 1988, to "R-1" One Acre Residence District with a Planned Environment Unit. The Planned Environment Unit that was approved for the site is about to terminate. Rather than wait for the City to initiate the petition to rezone it back, Mr. Hahn has filed the petition to take it back to the Non-Urban District.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The developer will only remove a small number of trees to provide for private roads and septic systems.
- The petitioner was unaware of a requirement for three percent (3%) grade restrictions.
- Twenty-three (23) acres have already been sold, and a house is being built along Wild Horse Creek Road.
- There will be an additional twelve (12) lots, but plans for these are still very preliminary.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR - None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION - None

REBUTTAL - Waived

SHOW OF HANDS

IN FAVOR 5

IN OPPOSITION 0

Chairman Domahidy called for a five (5) minute recess.

Chairman Domahidy re-convened meeting to order at 8:45 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes from the meeting of September 30, 1992, were approved.

OLD BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 12 & 13-92 Grasse Properties, Incorporated; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-1A" 22,000 square foot Residence District and a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in the "R-1A" Residence District; east side of Straub Road, north of Clayton Road.

Chairman Domahidy noted this item was tabled at the last meeting.

Commissioner McGuinness moved to take this item off the table. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon presented the revised request, comments from the Department of Public Works, the Fire Protection District, etc. She further noted that the Department recommends approval of both P.Z. 12 & 13 and P.Z. 14 & 15, subject to conditions in Attachment A and Attachment B contained in the attached staff report.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- It was suggested that those parties in attendance for this petition be given copies of correspondence referred to by the Department in its report.
- Clarification of how the Ballwin Fire Department would access P.Z. 12 & 13-92.
- If P.Z. 12 & 13-92 were approved there would not be a need for the upper portion of Straub to be vacated. The only need would be for vacation of the portion of Straub where the stub street is proposed. There is currently a stub street in the Brook Hill Subdivision which, when platted, would allow for emergency vehicle access to the stub street into Brook Hill (adjacent to P.Z. 14 & 15-92).
- In order to vacate Straub Road, anyone who has access to Straub Road would have to grant approval of the vacation. If Lot 18 of Greenberry Baxter Estates has access to Straub Road, they would have to be a party to agreement of the vacation.
- Straub Road is currently an easement for properties on the west side. No portion of Straub Road is on the Brook Hill development. It is a private road established by Deed, or easement, some years ago, and is recorded in the County Recorder's Office.

- Each owner of parcels abutting Straub will have the choice to agree, or not to agree, to vacate Straub.
- Concern was expressed about the clarity of the letter received from John King.
- An engineering plan would be necessary to determine whether a combined detention plan would be possible.
- Concern was raised relative to the resolution of the present detention problem in Greenberry Baxter Estates Subdivision.

City Attorney Beach stated that the conditions would require the resolution of the stormwater issues before there can be any development. The problem, from a legal standpoint, is that the Greenberry Baxter is already developed and privately controlled, whereas the others are in the control of the City. The City has some ability to require the developers of ongoing developments to perform certain actions. The conditions would require some action which were not part of the Brook Hill Estates development. The siltation problem has occurred as the result of the Brook Hill development, and was not created by the current developer of the Grasse sites.

- It was suggested that the City should make sure the new development does not add to the existing stormwater problem.
- A Bond would be posted and not released until the problem is resolved.

Director Duepner stated that the condition, as recommended by the Department and reviewed, on a preliminary basis, by the Public Works Department, recommends the three (3) detention areas be combined into one (1) - i.e., the two (2) Brook Hill Estates Additions and the Brook Hill Estates detention basin be combined. If it was determined that it couldn't be done, they would have to request an amendment to the condition as it is currently written. That condition is recommending that it be done in conjunction with a site development plan to be submitted to the Planning Commission.

- Concern was raised about the City's ability to perform the engineering study.
- It was suggested that the results of the engineering study, performed by a certified engineer, be received prior to the Commission making its decision on this subdivision.

Commissioner McGuinness moved to table the item and request an engineering study of the hydrology of the site. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dalton.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The question was raised as to who would conduct the engineering study.

Director Duepner noted that no one has performed the detailed hydraulic computations to determine whether it can be done or not. He further stated that in the past, it has not been a requirement to do detailed engineering studies for rezoning petitions.

Commissioner McGuinness temporarily withdrew her motion to table.

- It was suggested the study be made by a certified engineer, and paid for by the petitioner.
- It was suggested that the residents be provided with the results of this study and be given opportunity to give input.
- It was suggested that this project is a complex, unusual situation and, therefore, the Commission would not be setting a precedent by requiring an engineering study.

Director Duepner requested some direction from the Commission to report back to the petitioner what is required.

The Commission noted the following requests:

- What will be acceptable to the Commission in terms of a study?
- Is a preliminary study that seeks to follow the condition that has been recommended of combining the four (4) detention areas into one (1); and, if that can't be done, at least the three (3) detention basins in the Brook Hill and Brook Hill Additions into one (1); and a report that would be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and comment back to the Commission.?

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Concern was expressed that these detention basins are not, generally, maintained like they should be.

- It was requested that the benefits to the petitioners and community of having a combined detention system, one (1) for each petitioner, or combinations thereof, be identified.
- A cost/benefit analysis to the community, the residents along Straub Road, and the petitioner, of these various alternatives, was requested.

Commissioner McGuinness moved to table the request until such time as this report has been submitted and reviewed by the Department of Public Works and brought back to the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

It was noted that the residents would be notified of the date/time this petition would be brought back to the Commission for review.

The motion to table passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

- B. P.Z. 14 & 15-92 Grasse Properties, Incorporated; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District and a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in the "R-2" Residence District; west side of Straub Road, north of Clayton Road.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to move the request from the table. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to table the request subject to the conditions of the motion for P.Z. 12 & 13-92. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 1, with Commissioner Brown voting no.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Memorandum from the Director of Planning concerning the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Director Duepner noted this was presented for information only, and does not require any formal action by the Planning Commission.

Chairman Domahidy noted the item was received and filed.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

Commissioner Brown asked, as a point of information - because there was a motion to table, she was unable to state that she believes there are other problems connected to P.Z. 14 & 15 in addition to stormwater to be addressed. She inquired as to whether we are telling the petitioner that the only thing holding back approval of P.Z. 14 & 15 is the completion of the stormwater study? She further noted that she will not vote for the second petition based solely on the engineering study, as she still has a problem with the access and the roads.

Chair Domahidy asked if there were others on the Commission who have additional issues regarding P.Z. 14 & 15, that they state same to the Director.

Commissioner Scruggs stated that he would not vote based solely on the engineering study.

Commissioner Sherman and Cannon concurred with Commissioner Brown and Commissioner Scruggs.

ADDITIONAL TOPICS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PETITIONER REGARDING P.Z. 14 & 15-92

- Concern regarding access.
- Improvement to Straub Road was discussed. The possibility of making Straub a public roadway.
- If any land owner abutting Straub Road is not satisfied with the proposed access through the Brook Hill Subdivision, he may retain his right to access via Straub Road.
- There is a driveway which leads into Greenberry Baxter Estates, but the question has not been answered as to whether it is a legal access.

City Attorney Beach pointed out that the last individuals of control are the Brook Hill Estates and the owners thereof, because Brook Hill Estates Addition will have to deal with the owners to get the stub streets in, to get the streets to the point of whether he can develop, and then forcing the three (3) detention basins all to one (1) place. He noted there are five (5) individual persons with basic veto power over the development. He further noted that the Commission should keep in mind that it has already approved Brook Hill Estates Subdivision which brings up to Straub Road, all of the issues of access. Access issues surrounding P.Z. 12 & 13 have been deemed satisfied by previous action of the Commission,

in general, except for the person who owns the land. P.Z. 12 & 13-92 is on a different access criteria, due to previous action of approval by the Commission, in general.

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

- A. P.Z. 20-90 Donald H. and Margaret Kemner; Commercial Service Procedure in "NU" Non-Urban District Site Development Plan; west side of Olive Boulevard, south of Appalachian Trail.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Clarification of the height of the shrubbery was requested.

Director Duepner noted that our standard landscape requirement relative to evergreens is that all shrubs have a minimum diameter of eighteen (18) inches.

Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to amend the original motion to require the low lying shrubbery have a mature height of eighteen (18) inches. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

The vote on the main motion was passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

- B. P.Z. 21-90 Noel T. Luster and Edward W. Thoman; Commercial Service Procedure in "NU" Non-Urban District Site Development Plan; west side of Olive Boulevard, south of Appalachian Trail.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

- C. Chesterfield Valley Center; Subdivision Record Plat (Plat Four - Lot 6); east side of Goddard Avenue, north of Chesterfield Airport Road.

Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the Subdivision Record Plat. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Committee Chair Brown reported that she will meet with Joe Hanke, Planning Specialist, to schedule the next meeting.

B. Architectural Review Committee

Committee Chair O'Brien inquired whether Director Duepner has received comments from associates who received copies of the Guidelines.

Director Duepner noted that, indirectly, he has heard from the Home Builders Association, and directly, he has a response from a representative of the American Institute of Architects, Mr. Bill Albensen. He noted he will provide copies.

Committee Chair O'Brien requested Mr. Duepner to poll the members of the Committee to set a date/time for the next meeting.

Commissioner Cannon noted he had received a response.

C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee

Committee Chair Kirchoff reported that the Planning and Zoning Committee will review the Landscape Policies, previously forwarded, at its meeting on October 21, 1992. Another meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 10th, at 4:00 p.m.

D. Comprehensive Plan Committee

Committee Chair McGuinness reported the Committee is looking forward to its public hearing on October 26, 1992.

E. Procedures Committee

Committee Chair Scruggs noted the next meeting will be Friday, October 16th, 4:00 p.m., at City Hall.

Council Liaison Betty Hathaway reported on the Planning and Zoning Committee meeting of October 12, 1992, noting the following changes to R J & J Partnership:

- There will be one (1) acre lots bordering Kehrs Mill Road, with a thirty-five (35) foot landscape buffer.
- On the south side there will be 35,000 square foot lots.
- On the west side lots will be 30,000 square feet, with a thirty (30) foot common ground area.
- Reduce the interior lot size to 22,000 square foot minimum.

She noted that the Planning and Zoning Committee felt it kept the integrity of the perimeters and reduced the interior size slightly. It will allow a maximum of fifty-four (54) units.

Council Liaison Betty Hathaway reported on the Planning and Zoning Committee meeting of October 12, 1992, noting the following changes to P.Z. 8-92 John A. and Laverne Reuther (Cybertel):

- This will go to Council on a 2 to 2 tie vote.
- There was concern about the close proximity to surrounding development.
- If it does go through Council, the tower should be painted orange and white with a light on top.

Commission Chair Domahidy requested the Department to poll the Commission regarding a trip to St. Charles.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.


Walter Scruggs, Secretary

[MIN10-12.092]