PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
JULY 28, 2014

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT	ABSENT
Ms. Wendy Geckeler	
Ms. Merrell Hansen	
Ms. Fay Heidtbrink	
Ms. Laura Lueking	
Ms. Debbie Midgley	
Ms. Amy Nolan	
Mr. Stanley Proctor	
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg	
Chair Michael Watson	

Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner
Mr. Jeff Paskiewicz, Senior Civil Engineer
Ms. Mindy Mohrman, City Arborist/Urban Forester
Mr. Aaron Hrenak, Planning Intern
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Watson acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the July 14, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lueking and **passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Mr. Rusty Saunders, 707 Spirit 40 Park Drive, Chesterfield, MO, representing the Petitioners, stated he was available for questions regarding **Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.) SDSP** and **Schoettler Grove SDP**.

2. Mr. Alan Sumner, ACI Boland Architects, 11477 Olde Cabin Road, St. Louis, MO, representing the Petitioner, stated he was available for questions regarding **Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.) SDSP**.

3. Mr. Randy Clawson, ACI Boland Architects, 11477 Olde Cabin Road, St. Louis, MO, representing the Petitioner, stated he was available for questions regarding **Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.) SDSP**.

4. Mr. Bill Biermann, 1795 Clarkson Road, Chesterfield, MO, representing the Petitioner, stated he was available for questions regarding **Schoettler Grove SDP**.

5. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 275 Chesterfield Business Parkway, representing the Petitioners, stated he was available for questions regarding **Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.) SDSP** and **Schoettler Grove SDP**. He stated he would also be making comments regarding **P.Z. 05-2014 18626 Olive Street Road (Simon Woodmont Development LLC)**.

Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.) SDSP

Councilmember Hurt stated that the ground lighting in the parking area on the north elevation is 4 ½ to 5 feet tall. He questioned whether the height of the lighting could be right at someone's eye level, particularly women, which may cause "night blindness" for someone walking into the parking lot, which raises safety/security concerns.

Commissioner Geckeler asked if the lighting is LED and whether it is colored.

Mr. Stock then asked Mr. Sumner to respond.

Mr. Sumner stated that the lights being proposed are small cylinders, 3 ½ to 4 inches in diameter and 4 ½ to 5 feet tall, and are designed to be ambient lighting for the front of the building. The site also includes parking lot lights and classic bollard lighting from the parking area to the front of the building. Further information will be provided to Staff on the cylinder lights and if there is still a safety concern, they are agreeable to changing them.

Commissioner Geckeler asked if the proposed cylinder lighting could be easily broken. Mr. Sumner replied that the lights are not made of glass – they are a type of poly-resin.

Councilmember Hurt stated that the lighting may require a shade to address his safety concerns.

P.Z. 05-2014 18626 Olive Street Road (Simon Woodmont Development LLC)

Mr. Stock responded to comments made at the earlier Work Session meeting regarding the proposed *restaurant, drive-thru* use. He noted that they had submitted a letter on June 11, 2014 whereby they had removed seven (7) uses they had originally requested, but they are asking that the *drive-thru restaurant* use be permitted. They feel this use is

appropriate for the site since there is a cross access easement to the east across the Chesterfield Fence property, which ties into the intersection of Premium Way and Olive Street Road. This intersection will be fully-signalized and while not yet constructed, a permit has been issued for it. Since the subject site fronts on the road and has the inter-connection with the traffic signal, they feel there is a potential for the *drive-thru restaurant* use.

Since June 11th, four (4) additional heavier industrial-type uses have been removed, which they agree are not appropriate for the site. However, they do ask for the Commission's consideration to allow the *drive-thru restaurant* use.

6. Mr. Dean Wolfe, 7711 Bonhomme Avenue, Clayton, MO, representing the Petitioner, stated he was available for questions regarding **P.Z. 05-2014 18626 Olive Street Road (Simon Woodmont Development LLC)**.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

A. Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.) SDSP: A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Tree Stand Delineation, Tree Preservation Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 6.06 acre tract of land zoned "C-8" Planned Commercial District located on the north of the intersection of Swingley Ridge Road and Conway Road.

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Tree Stand Delineation, Tree Preservation Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Herman Stemme Office Park (MiTek USA, Inc.). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lueking.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Nolan, Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Heidtbrink, Chair Watson

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

B. Schoettler Grove SDP: A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Tree Preservation Plan, Tree Stand Delineation Plan, and Architectural Elevations for a 17.0 acre tract of land zoned "PUD" Planned Unit Development located northwest of the intersection of Clayton Road and Schoettler Road.

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Tree

Preservation Plan, Tree Stand Delineation Plan, and Architectural Elevations for Schoettler Grove. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.

Discussion

Councilmember Hurt noted that Power of Review has been called on this project so it will be addressed at the Council level.

Gate

Councilmember Hurt stated that the gate detail shown on the drawing is not appropriate for the site. He asked Mr. Stock to meet with the area residents to develop something appealing to them.

Left-Hand Turn off Schoettler Road into the Development

Councilmember Hurt inquired into the stacking length for the left-hand turn off Schoettler Road into the development. If the stacking length is not adequate, he has concerns that the traffic will back up onto Clayton Road.

Mr. Stock replied that the Lochmueller Group studied the left-turn lane and determined that it was of a sufficient length. Mr. Stock further stated that the traffic study was reviewed by Staff and they were satisfied with the findings of the study. Mr. Boyer confirmed that the City's engineering staff did review the stacking length.

Councilmember Hurt asked for information on the actual length of the lane and how many cars the lane would accommodate. Mr. Boyer indicated that this information would be provided.

Landscaping

Councilmember Hurt asked if the developer has been in contact with the residents regarding the landscaping.

Mr. Stock stated that they had customized the landscape plan during the rezoning process, and had met with the residents on several occasions at that time. He noted that everything on the plans is consistent with what was discussed with the residents.

Mr. Boyer added that Staff emailed notification of tonight's meeting to the Trustees of the Gascony and Westerly subdivisions. In addition, all the plans are available to review through the City's website.

Cemetery Fence

Councilmember Hurt stated he agrees with the comments made by the Commission at the earlier Site Plan Committee meeting regarding the proposed cemetery fence. While a split-rail fence may be conducive to the area, Councilmember Hurt stated that they are looking for a material that would have better longevity. Councilmember Hurt thought anodized aluminum may be appropriate, but also pointed out that aluminum is being stolen quite frequently these days. He indicated that a vinyl fence would have the desired longevity, but may take away from the aesthetics of the site.

Chair Watson stated that the cemetery on Long Road and Wild Horse Creek Road has a wrought iron fence surrounding it.

Monarch Trees

Commissioner Geckeler stated that out of 47 monarch trees on the site, only three (3) are being saved. She expressed her extreme disappointment to Mr. Stock about the number of monarch trees being clear cut noting that the City delineates the monarch trees in an effort to preserve them. She does not feel that any attempt has been made to save the monarch trees on this site, except for the one (1) in the boundary area and the two (2) located in the preservation area.

Chair Watson then called for a vote on the motion to approve. Before the vote, Mr. Boyer asked if the Commission wanted to amend the motion to address any of the concerns raised. City Attorney Heggie advised that the Commission not vote on making any changes to the gate without something first being presented from the Petitioner; he added that this could be done at the Council level.

Comments on the Fencing

Councilmember Hurt stated he would welcome comments from the Commission regarding the type of fencing they would like to see around the cemetery.

Commissioner Heidtbrink stated she lives next door to a cemetery near the Kendall Bluff subdivision, which has a black metal fence. She feels that it "lends a sense of respectfulness to the cemetery".

Commissioner Lueking stated that the fence on August Hill is "wrought iron-like". She noted that there is fencing available that resembles a split wood fence, which she thought may be appropriate for the subject site, as well as in the area of the fire entrance. She thought this type of fencing could look historical but also be maintenance free. She added that the fencing comes in different colors and thought brown would be appropriate.

Commissioner Geckeler agreed that color is important and noted that a brown color would be attractive as it would "disappear" into the trees.

Chair Watson did not feel a vinyl fence or aluminum fence would be appropriate for the site; and noted that the cemeteries he has visited utilized wrought iron fences.

Commissioner Hansen agreed that a wrought iron fence would be the best and look the most respectful.

Commissioner Proctor stated that the cemetery fencing needs to be respectful and needs to be consistent with the age of the cemetery. He is not opposed to a split rail fence except for the maintenance issues it would present. He does not think plastic or white aluminum are appropriate.

Mr. Stock stated that the church's desire is for a split wood fence but noted that the church will not own the property long-term, so there is competing interest between what the church and Commission desire. Mr. Stock added that they are fine with anodized aluminum or steel noting that these materials have a very similar appearance. He pointed out that aluminum is more susceptible to damage from fallen tree limbs while steel would be resistant; steel requires painting while aluminum doesn't; and wrought

iron is very labor-intensive when having to paint over rusted areas. He stated they understand what the Commission desires – a decorative fence respectful to the cemetery - so they will review different options and incorporate it into their plans.

Chair Watson then stated he would entertain an amendment to the motion that would require the Petitioner to continue working with Staff to develop a fence material for the cemetery consistent with the Planning Commission's discussion. As the maker and seconder of the original motion to approve, Commissioners Proctor and Midgley accepted the amendment to the motion.

Discussion

Discussion was then held on whether the motion should address changes to the gate. City Attorney Heggie advised against it since no alternatives for a gate design have been submitted at this time for review. He noted that it is very clear that the gate will have to be re-worked by the time it reaches Council. Councilmember Hurt then asked if any of the Commission members like the currently-proposed pipe gate; none of the Commissioners indicated that they were in favor of the current gate design.

Upon roll call, the vote to approve, as amended, was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Nolan, Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Heidtbrink, Chair Watson

Nay: Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Lueking

The motion passed by a vote of 7 to 2.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 05-2014 18626 Olive Street Road (Simon Woodmont Development LLC): A request for a zoning map amendment from a "NU" Non-Urban District to a "PI" Planned Industrial District for 2.391 acres located southeast of the intersection of Olive Street Road and Spirit Valley East Drive (17W510060).

Senior Planner Jonathan Raiche stated that the subject site is sandwiched between two existing Planned Industrial-zoned subdivisions and sits across from Chesterfield Blue Valley. The Public Hearing for this petition was held on May 28, 2014 at which time the main issue discussed was the need to re-evaluate the list of requested uses.

The original list of uses has been reduced from 69 to 58 from the larger master list of 109 uses. The Petitioner has removed many uses that could include outdoor storage; yet two uses of specific concern of the Commission remain as requested uses – the *gymnasium* and *restaurant with drive-thru window* uses. Staff believes that these two uses could be accommodated on the site and are compatible to surrounding uses.

A modification request has also been made to the openspace requirement from 35% to 30%, which would require a separate vote by the Commission.

Staff has reviewed the request for the zoning map amendment and has found that the requests are in compliance with City code and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion

Gymnasium

Commissioner Lueking feels that the *gymnasium* use should be considered and commented that it could be a gym similar to Skyzone, or the elite football training gym for quarterback throwing. She also noted that the subject site is not near any residential areas but is in a planned industrial area.

Drive-thru Restaurant

Commissioner Lueking thanked Mr. Raiche for the clarification in his report with respect to other drive-thru restaurants in the Chesterfield Valley area that have been accommodated on sites smaller than the subject site – such as Wendy's, Lion's Choice, and Panera Bread, all of which have cross access but are not necessarily signalized.

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve P.Z. 05-2014 18626 Olive Street Road (Simon Woodmont Development LLC). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Geckeler.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Nolan, Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Heidtbrink, Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley

Nay: Chair Watson

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 1.

Commissioner Nolan then made a motion to allow a modification to the openspace requirement from 35% to 30%. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lueking.

Commissioner Wuennenberg clarified that 30% openspace is similar to other sites in the area.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Heidtbrink, Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Nolan, Chair Watson

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Nolan announced that the Ordinance Review Committee will meet on **Thursday, August 7th at 9:00 a.m.** in Conference Room 101 regarding the Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay District. She invited all Commissioners to attend but noted that only Committee members are allowed to vote.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

_____

Steve Wuennenberg, Secretary