

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
MEETING SUMMARY
SEPTEMBER 23, 2024**

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

ABSENT

Commissioner Walter Bilgram
Commissioner Gail Choate
Commissioner Khalid Chohan
Commissioner Allision Harris
Commissioner John Marino
Commissioner Debbie Midgley
Commissioner Jane Staniforth
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Guy Tilman

Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Council Liaison
Mr. Nathan Bruns, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning
Ms. Shilpi Bharti, Planner
Mr. Shane Streiler, Planner
Ms. Erica Blesener, Recording Secretary

Chair Tilman acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Council Liaison; and Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Choate made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the August 26, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Staniforth and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0. (*Commissioners Bilgram and Chohan abstained*)

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Long Road Crossing

1. Ty Gramling, Civil Engineer, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Pkwy, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions
2. Robert Meurer, 14784 Thornhill Terrace, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions

B. Long Road Crossing, Lot B-2

1. Ty Gramling, Civil Engineer, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Pkwy, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions
2. Robert Meurer, 14784 Thornhill Terrace, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions
3. Craig Horstmann, 13106 Barrett Circle Ct, Ballwin, MO – available for questions

C. Windsor Crossing Community Church, Sign Package

1. Joe Phillips, Piros Signs, 1818 Old State Road M, Barnhart, MO – available for questions
2. Lauri Sharp, 114 N Eatherton Road, Chesterfield, MO – available for questions

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, PLATS, AND SIGNS

- A. Long Road Crossing: An Amended Site Development Concept Plan for Long Road Crossing subdivision located on a 22.99-acre tract of land located at northwest intersection of Chesterfield Airport Road and westbound Long Road, zoned “PC”- Planned Commercial.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Amended Site Development Concept Plan, for Long Road Crossing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Harris and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Choate gave an update regarding the Site Plan Committee Meeting that took place prior to the Planning Commission Meeting. She explained that due to the number of issues and questions pertaining to **Long Road Crossing** and **Long Road Crossing, Lot B-2** the commission made the decision to table the motion.

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning asked the Commissioners if they would be open to discussing the Concept Plan and Section Plan with the applicant. He expressed concerns regarding the potential complications that may arise if one (1) project moves through and one (1) project is delayed. He noted that the scheduling could pose challenges for anyone that may be from out of town. He suggested discussing **Long**

Road Crossing, Lot B-2 first to see what the resolution is. If held, see if the applicant would like to hold the Concept Plan as well, or move forward independently.

Chair Tilman directed the Planning Commission to move forward with the discussion of **Long Road Crossing, Lot B-2**.

Mr. Wyse gave a brief summary of concerns that were raised pertaining to a couple of items. A lot of the concerns were generally revolving around outdoor storage and the visual impact both today, as well as, the current effort that the City is working on to improve the interchange at Long Road and Interstate 64 to a full access interchange.

Located on the western side of the subject site is a screen wall enclosure for wrecked vehicles. The location raised concerns that from Long Road it didn't provide any screening due to configuration of the site. In addition, there was a question regarding the east elevation and having similar elements around all four (4) sides of the building. He explained that the meeting ended with discussion regarding the items he just mentioned and the compliance regarding the concerns, and how the commission wanted to handle the request. Did they want to have a discussion for a motion with recommendations, or hold the project for a later date if the potential for changes can be made to the site design.

Councilmember Hansen stated that the Planning Commission asked for clarification of severely damaged vehicle. Additionally, she would like to know how the City is expected to manage the promise that a vehicle stays on site for only three (3) days.

Chair Tilman questioned who sets the standard for how damaged a car is.

Commissioner Choate explained that she attended the ARB meeting for the project and based on the discussions her interpretation was that all vehicles remaining on the site would be parked inside the building during the evening, and the wrecked or immobile vehicles would be parked in the ten (10) spaces for a maximum of 72 hours.

Chair Tilman explained the need for the business to be in the location where auto dealerships and "like" kinds of businesses are located. He explained the issues are not centered around if this is the right location, but how to set the business up in a way that is forward looking in terms of Long Road getting widened, expanded, and moving closer to the east property line. What will people see, how does it fit with the neighboring businesses, and to allow the business to operate and co-exist with the surrounding community.

Commissioner Marino felt that this location is also a major entrance to the City. Both Commissioners Wuennenberg and Choate agreed the site lacks sufficient landscaping.

Mr. Robert Meurer petitioner for **Long Road Crossing, Lot B-2** described that this is a first-class project and there is no other facility in town like this. He added that attention was made to ensure that the building did not have the appearance of a salvage yard. They pride themselves on their presentation and its critical to the business. He explained in the lot there is approximately 80 to 100 spaces that will be used for work in process with minor vehicle damage. The corral is designated for vehicles that will be sent to salvage; these vehicles are substantially damaged and will not be fixed. The reason for enclosing the corral is to give them a space that's out of sight while the process is

completed. The vehicles come in at night and on the weekends so the lot will be cleared daily, with the exception of the salvage vehicles located in the enclosure. While driving on Long Road and Interstate 64 he doesn't feel that there will be a discernable difference between their facility versus Jim Butler Kia.

Chair Tilman asked what is the likelihood that they will need more than ten (10) spaces, and in terms of the location are they open to the idea of moving the corral to achieve visibility. Mr. Meurer explained the current location was a joint effort with ARB and any place it's located will have pros and cons. They would object to putting it on the north side because they would like to have some visibility, but are willing to work with the commissioners on any suggestions they may have. Councilmember Hansen stated the clearing of the lot every day seems to be counterproductive to the concerns of the visibility of it and was confused by the intent.

Craig Horstmann, the Chief Financial Officer of B Street Collision explained the business operations. In the evening, the vehicles are stored inside for liability purposes.

Commissioner Marino asked for clarification regarding the average turnaround time, the maximum number of employees they will have, what the process is for handling immobile vehicles, and how are the parts going to arrive on site.

Mr. Horstmann explained on average it takes ten (10) days for the repairs to be completed. They run two (2) teams and employee around 30 employees. There is usually up to ten (10) immobile vehicles on site, but clarified they don't want these vehicles. The process of handling immobile vehicles is to get them off site as soon as possible. He clarified that parts will arrive daily and on smaller trucks.

Commissioner Wuennenberg suggested they use the building to help shield the wrecked vehicles and by moving them south. Additionally, if the trash dumpster was located to the north and the vehicles parked to the south that would probably suffice. Mr. Horstmann was not opposed to the stipulation.

Nathan Bruns, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville, explained to the Commission that they are making a recommendation that will go to City Council as a Power of Review. If there are no additional questions, make the recommendation, make it clear on the record what they find to be compliant with the ordinance. If they don't find that they comply with the ordinance of moving the enclosure to then allow City Council to have their take on it.

Landscape and Architectural Discussions

Chair Tilman asked the petitioner if they were open to adding blue to the east side of the building since it's currently only on three (3) sides. He requested a follow-up proposal to the change. Mr. Horstmann agreed to the changes.

Commissioner Choate noted that the landscaping on the southern two-thirds of the site, along the eastern border, looks great. The northern half of the site has no landscaping, except a retaining wall. The northern boundary along Highway 40/64 also has no landscaping due to the storm water easements. The landscaping along the Highway 40 corridor and the northern one-third of the Long Road side is considered too minimal.

Mr. Wyse explained the concern is that the City is currently pursuing an exit ramp at this location if successful, it's anticipated to be an entirely new interchange that will provide access from all four (4) sides, making the location highly visible. He added that it will be necessary for timber below the 100-year high water level within the stormwater channel will need to be removed.

The discussion continued regarding the landscaping issues that had been previously identified. A range of recommendations were discussed to tackle the landscaping concerns. The petitioner understood the importance of improving the visual appeal and acknowledged the expectations set forth by the City.

- B. Long Road Crossing:** An Amended Site Development Concept Plan for Long Road Crossing subdivision located on a 22.99-acre tract of land located at northwest intersection of Chesterfield Airport Road and westbound Long Road, zoned "PC"- Planned Commercial.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Amended Site Development Concept Plan, for Long Road Crossing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Harris and **passed** by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

- C. Long Road Crossing, Lot B-2:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan and Architectural Elevations for a vehicle repair facility located on a 4.6-acre tract of land located east side of Long Road Crossing Drive, zoned "PC"-Planned Commercial.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for Long Road Crossing, Lot B-2, with the adjustment of the architectural elevation on the east side, adding blue color, shifting the wrecked vehicles enclosure south so that the trash enclosure is the northern terminus of the screening, and adding additional landscaping on the north and northeast corner of the lot. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and **passed** by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

Commissioner Marino emphasized the purpose is not to obstruct the beautiful signage, but rather to block the damaged vehicles.

- D. Windsor Crossing Community Church, Sign Package:** A request for a Sign Package for a 38-acre tract of land zoned "NU" Non-Urban located east of North Eatherton Road and north of the Missouri Pacific Railroad tracks.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Planner Shane Streiler gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area. Then provided the following information about the subject site:

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Piros Signs Incorporated, on behalf of The Crossing Church, has submitted a request to amend their Comprehensive Sign Package for the Windsor Crossing Community Church

subdivision (a.k.a. The Crossing) to allow ten (10) free-standing directional signs, up to 11 attached wall directional signs, and one attached wall identification sign. Given that these proposed signs exceed the maximum height and minimum setback requirements for free-standing and attached wall signs through the standard sign requirements outlined in the Unified Development Code (UDC), submitting a Comprehensive Sign Package is necessary "to allow for specialized review of signs and flexibility from standard signage requirements."

SITE HISTORY

The subject site was zoned "NU" Non-Urban by Saint Louis County prior to the incorporation of the City of Chesterfield. The original site plan for a 32,183-square-foot church for Windsor Crossing Community Church was approved in 2002. Since that time, there have been several amendments; the most notable were additions in 2005, 2007, 2012, and 2018, which brought the building to its current size of 93,486 square feet. The building contains a large sanctuary space, offices, gathering spaces, and spaces for ministries to meet, including children and youth.

In 2009, Planning Commission approved the existing free-standing monument sign that is located along Eatherton Road.

In 2019, the first version of the Comprehensive Sign Package for The Crossing attained approval from the Planning Commission, which permitted the development of two (2) additional free-standing identification signs and one (1) projecting sign. That same year, one (1) attached wall sign and eight (8) directional signs were approved by the Planning Department through the Municipal Zoning Approval process given they met the criteria to be reviewed by staff through the Unified Development Code sign requirements at that time.

REQUESTED SIGNAGE

The applicant is requesting up to 22 additional signs within the mechanism of the Comprehensive Sign Package, which exceeds what is allowed by the UDC. The request contains up to 20 free-standing directional signs, one (1) attached wall directional sign, and one (1) attached wall identification sign, with the two (2) wall signs intended for a proposed gate at the main drive leading to the family entrance. The applicant states that the primary purpose of the sign package is to maximize the ease of navigating around the large complex while maintaining a visually appealing site, which is consistent with the intent of the 2019 Sign Package.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the proposed Sign Package for the Windsor Crossing Community Church subdivision, and all required items have been included. The UDC provides the Planning Commission discretion in considering this Sign Package as there is no concrete criteria. As such, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take action on this request.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Choate expressed dismay regarding the 25-foot sign still being proposed. Stating it was formally approved at 16 feet in height, and now asking for 25. Chair Tilman stated that the standard maximum height restriction for parking lot pole lights is 20 feet. This means that the current sign, at 25 feet exceeds the height of the pole by five (5) feet.

Commissioner Wuennenberg noted that visibility from the Bluff, or looking from Eatherton Road the proposed sign is not visible. He emphasized that the vast size of the site leads to an underestimation of the visibility of the sign. When observing the building from outside the property, attention is less likely to be drawn to the sign itself. He expressed concern regarding the signs bordering the vacant property. He identified an excessive number of signs leading into the property, specifically highlighting that the four (4) signs labeled "B" that are excessive for this location. Commissioner Marino voiced his agreement with the statements made by Commissioner Wuennenberg.

Commissioner Midgley questioned the need for signs B1, B2, B3 based on the configuration of the road. She requested additional clarification regarding all existing signs on the property and sought details on the proposed signs.

Commissioner Staniforth acknowledged the large size of the property and recognized that the 25-foot-tall sign may not be easily seen due to this factor. She raised a point regarding future requests that may come from other churches asking to have similar signs. She stated there is the need to establish clear guidelines on signage size, questioning at what point a sign becomes "too big".

Chair Tilman referenced the Comprehensive Table that outlines the current signage and UDC requirements. He pointed out the following signs:

- The 25-foot-tall sign exceeds the maximum height requirements by 500%.
- The 3rd free-standing sign exceeds the maximum height requirements by 266%.
- The entrance monument is also 33% over the maximum height requirements.

He expressed the need for standards, and questioned the purpose of having regulations if they are not being adhered to. The proposed signs do not align with the established sign requirements, and this raises significant issues for him.

Commissioner Choate commented on the fact that there are many large campuses in St. Louis County that have to deal with wayfinding and they don't have to do it with height. Whether it's done with wall signage, or multiple signs giving direction.

Mr. Joe Phillips the Petitioner for **Windsor Crossing Community Church, Sign Package** gave a brief summary of the proposed signs. He explained why they are nowhere close to the sign code requirements, referencing the 25-foot sign. When he was on site, he had an engineer stand in the location of where the sign would be placed and was unable to see her, due to the vehicles parked in the lot. They tried to make the 20-foot sign work, but were not successful. He clarified that the verbiage and arrow illuminate in the evening, not the entire sign. The location of the sign is over 1,300 feet from Eatherton Road, and they are another 500 to 600 feet away from the intersection. He explained they added more "B" signs for wayfinding due to the discussion that took place during the last meeting, and to plan for the future as he instructed from the Commission.

Discussion ensued regarding the size, locations, and number of signs proposed for the site.

Ms. Lauri Sharp the Petitioner for **Windsor Crossing Community Church, Sign Package** explained that the monument sign needs to be as large as they are proposing

for visibility when arriving to the church. When arriving to the campus to the family entrance, you make eye contact with the portico, and think that is the main entrance, which it is not.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Sign Package for Windsor Crossing Community Church. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Staniforth.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Wuennenberg

Nay: Commissioner Bilgram, Commissioner Choate,
Commissioner Chohan, Commissioner Harris,
Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley,
Commissioner Staniforth, Chair Tilman

The motion failed by a vote of 1 to 8.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None.

IX. NEW BUSINESS – None.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS – None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.



Gail Choate, Secretary