

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator
FROM: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning *sw*
SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, July 20, 2023



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, July 20, 2023 in Council Chambers.

In attendance were: **Chair Merrell Hansen** (Ward IV); **Councilmember Mary Monachella** (Ward I); and **Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos** (Ward II) and **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III).

Others in attendance were: **Mayor Bob Nation**, **Councilmember Aaron Wahl**, **Councilmember Gary Budoor**, Director of Planning **Justin Wyse**, Assistant City Planner **Petree Powell**, Planner **Isaak Simmers** and **Christine Dorough**, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the June 22, 2023 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of June 20, 2023. The motion was seconded by **Councilmember Monachella** and **passed** by a voice vote of 4-0.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Architectural Review Board Nominee Interview - John Lavrich

DISCUSSION

Chair Hansen thanked Mr. Lavrich on behalf of the City for his willingness to serve on the Architectural Review Board and allowed him an opportunity to expand on his background which was provided to the Committee.

Councilmember Monachella made a motion to forward the nomination of Mr. John Lavrich to the Architectural Review Board to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by **Councilmember Hurt** and **passed** by a voice vote of 4-0.

B. P.Z.06-2023 Chesterfield Village Mall (TSG Downtown Chesterfield Redevelopment, LLC): A request to rezone an existing C-8 Planned Commercial District to a "PC&R"- Planned Commercial and Residential District for 96.017 acres located west of Clarkson Road/MO 340, south of S. Outer 40 Road, east and north of Chesterfield Parkway.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Assistant City Planner, Petree Powell

Ms. Powell made a presentation concerning the process that led to the rezone request including the 2020 Comprehensive Plan, the development of a master plan by the Applicant to assess the economic viability of bringing a downtown to the mall site, the relationship between the master plan (one scenario) and the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) to finance public improvements on and off site, and the parking study now under review. The master plan is essentially a guide and not meant to depict exactly where buildings will go and what uses will be in them. Ms. Powell discussed the PC&R Zoning District and how the performance standards are not required at this stage. As part of the rezone, however, performance standards for density, height, open space, parking are dictated. Landscaping, signage, lighting, architectural design in the public realm is to be flushed out in the Site Development Concept Plan and Section Plans as projects come in. Ms. Powell then addressed concerns raised at the Planning Commission process and since the Planning Commission voted to approve the rezone request. She addressed density, mix of uses, traffic, open space and connectivity with surrounding uses.

DISCUSSION

The first issue that arose was why the Applicant did not use the programming in the master plan as the Preliminary Development Plan proposed. Mr. Tim Lowe, representing the Applicant, stated that the master plan was simply a guide and that the developer does not want to be constrained by hypothetical building outlines and density in that plan. It was an exercise to see if a downtown concept was economically viable. He stated that the Applicant would not agree to the master plan becoming the Preliminary Development Plan. He was then queried about the blue dotted lines on the Preliminary Development Plan as an indication of proposed building outlines. Mr. Lowe stated that those are just conceptual and are lot lines. He again reiterated that to dictate at this stage, before even one project comes in, what will go onto the lots would unnecessarily constrain the developer in seeking projects. The Applicant is committed to the street plan, the amenities in the plan and what development happens around the central park. The Applicant does not want to have to come in for a rezone with each minor deviation from the building outlines and densities prescribed in a Preliminary Development Plan.

There was a discussion regarding the proposed Attachment A. The first major issue addressed is whether the language in Section I.A.2. concerning the mix of uses around the park was strong enough. Committee members debated strengthening the language to "require" a mix of pedestrian oriented commercial/retail" uses on the ground floor of buildings that flank the central park labelled as Park Area R 2. Mr. Tim Lowe, speaking on behalf of the Applicant, agreed to the language.

The Committee then began discussion of the density requirements. Mr. Lowe explained in detail how the Applicant arrived at the 30 units per acre metric including travelling the country and seeking input from successful downtowns and suburban town centers. He explained that, universally, successful suburban town centers had high density at 30-50 units per acre. He

explained that to attract office uses back, businesses are seeking amenities within walking distance of the offices. He also stated that retail will not be successful without a critical mass of people. When approaching potential high-end retailers, their first question asked is “how much residential density will there be?”

Mr. Lowe also discussed the optimum percentage of the space that would be sellable from the developer's perspective. He stated that the rule of thumb is that 70% of the site should be sellable versus spaces for roads, sidewalks, parking structures, green space, parks etc. In this case the developer has only reached about 57% sellable land because of all the amenities they have agreed to construct including the central park, the pedestrian bike and walking path, the land that will be dedicated to the City at the bottom of the Grand Staircase and all the green space around the development.

Mr. Lowe also explained why there is a difference between the density in the master plan and the rezone request, with the latter being about 600 units higher. He stated that first, the master plan is one scenario and that the allocation of density by parcel in the master plan was just a guide. Secondly, he stated that the rezone figure is higher to give the developer flexibility in the event the office market does not come back. They want the ability to modify their uses so that there is not huge swaths of vacant land.

At this juncture, Ms. Kelli Unnerstall, representing a citizens group, was allowed to come to the podium to discuss the objections to density. She stated that the amount of density requested was too high and that her group would prefer 1000 units. She was asked is there a number her constituents would accept. Mr. Lowe then responded and said that for economic viability, including financing of the TIF, they were unwilling to reduce the residential density. Without sufficient density, the project would not be successful.

The next major discussion was over the maximum height of buildings. After some discussion, Mr. Lowe agreed to lower the maximum height to 200 feet as long as 15 stories would be permitted.

The Committee then went through most provisions of Attachment A. Questions were raised about provisions that differed from the Attachment A for Wildhorse Village. In many circumstances, the UDC addresses the issues raised. Mr. Wyse agreed to look at each provision and bring them back to be reviewed. There was discussion of the terminology phrase “substantially conform”. Councilmember Hurt suggested that the phrase was too vague. Ms. Powell stated that planners routinely assess whether there is substantial compliance between plans and that they are comfortable with what that means.

The Committee then addressed whether there should be automatic power of review. It was decided that City Council should have automatic power of review of the Site Development Concept and Section Plans.

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to postpone P.Z.06-2023 Chesterfield Village Mall (TSG Downtown Chesterfield Redevelopment, LLC). The motion was seconded by Councilmember Monachella and passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

IV. OTHER – None.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.