

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator

FROM: James Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer *JE*

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, July 19, 2018



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, July 19, 2018 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Michelle Ohley** (Ward IV), **Councilmember Barry Flachsbart** (Ward I), **Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos** (Ward II), and **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III).

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bob Nation; Chris Graville, City Attorney; Planning Commission Chair Merrell Hansen; Jim Eckrich, Director of Public Works/City Engineer; Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner; Cassie Harashe, Planner; Mike Knight, Planner; and Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the June 21, 2018 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of June 21, 2018. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt.

Chair Ohley stated that in the Public Comment section speaker number four's name should be spelled "Ganahl."

Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of June 21, 2018 as amended. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Architectural Review Board Nominee Interview

Chair Ohley introduced Jessica Stoll and thanked her for volunteering to serve.

In response to questions, Ms. Stoll stated that she grew up in the St. Louis area. She and her husband lived in Belgium for approximately four years and then moved to Chesterfield in 2016. She has an extensive background in architecture, and specializes in interiors, residential renovations and new construction.

Councilmember Hurt asked Ms. Stoll if she was aware that the Architectural Review Board reviews the exterior design of buildings and she indicated that she is comfortable with that as her background is architecture and not interior design.

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

- B. P.Z. 05-2018 Edison Crossing (Buttry & Brown Development):** A request to amend Ordinance 2448 to establish new permitted uses for 11.1 acres of land within an existing “PC” Planned Commercial District located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Edison Road and Long Road. (17U120287, 17U120298). (Ward 4)

STAFF REPORT

Cassie Harashe, Planner, presented the request for an amendment to Ordinance 2448 to establish two new permitted uses in an existing “PC” Planned Commercial District. The Applicant is requesting to add Day Care Center and Kindergarten or Nursery School uses. As part of that request, the Applicant is bringing this Ordinance and the uses into the current language in the Unified Development Code.

The site is located on the southeast corner of Edison Avenue and Long Road. There is a large stormwater and utility easement in the southern portion of the site. There is a recreation easement to the east that provides access and parking to the Levee Trail. The landscape buffer does comply with the current Ordinance. Ms. Harashe pointed out the existing full access point and the two proposed buildings. This plan matches the preliminary development plan submitted in 2008.

The petition was discussed at the June 25, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. After considerable discussion regarding the setbacks, hours of operation, and the number of permitted uses, the Planning Commission amended the hours of operation to 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. They also discussed uses, but ultimately made no changes to the uses and recommended approval of the request by a vote of 7-1.

DISCUSSION

Chair Ohley stated that the list of permitted uses is very extensive and now they are requesting to add two more. Ms. Harashe responded that the list was taken from their previously approved uses under the 2008 Ordinance. Those uses were updated to fit into the current Unified Development Code language and as a result, some of the uses have been separated whereas they were previously grouped together under one use. So it does appear that the list of uses has grown.

Councilmember Flachsbart agreed that the list of uses is extensive and asked why the Petitioner did not eliminate some of them. He also asked for an explanation as to why a daycare center would be open until 11 p.m. Ms. Harashe stated the original hours of operation under the Ordinance were from 5 a.m. to 2 a.m. and that the hours of operation are for the

whole site, not just for a specific use. She stated that the Planning Commission reduced the hours of operation for the whole site but the hours of operation are limited to retail uses only. Planning Commission Chair Hansen stated that the Planning Commission looked at the hours of operation for the whole site. They also discussed the uses and decided that it was not necessary to reduce the permitted uses.

Councilmember Hurt stated that if an automobile dealership is a term used for a general use, then he would object as the concept of an automobile dealership has changed. Chair Hansen stated that the Planning Commission looked at many of the uses and due to the shape of the lot, many of the uses, including an automobile dealership, would not meet the space requirements.

Mayor Nation stated that he does not understand why the City would want to be so restrictive and not allow flexibility so that a landowner can change tenants, change the type of use, etc. Of course, if the use is objectionable or not compatible with the area, then that would be a reason to deny a use. Councilmember Flachsbart stated that if they want to add uses, they should also remove uses. Rather than allowing a long list of possible uses, he felt the City should have a more focused set of uses so there is a better understanding of what is likely to go in. He believes that the automobile dealership, as well as the outdoor theater, should be eliminated from the list. Councilmember Hurt stated that he would want to restrict drive-throughs, especially if a daycare center would go in, as drive-throughs encourage traffic, which is not suitable around a daycare center.

Councilmember Mastorakos asked if there would be any restrictions with regard to the levee trail. Chair Hansen stated that the Planning Commission was concerned with the view of the trail. However, there is a limit to the type of plantings that can be used along the trail as some plantings may affect the efficiency of the levee. The Planning Commission's concern was not centered around the uses, but with regard to those using the trail. Rather than being overly-restrictive, Councilmember Mastorakos suggested restricting uses only where the trail is located.

Representing the owner, Brandon Harp of CDEC stated that the site itself is fairly restrictive. The developable area is approximately three acres which includes setbacks, parking requirements, and a height restriction. Anything that goes in will not be a grand project. The client who is developing the daycare center will not close on the property until the Ordinance is amended. He agreed that the uses were expanded quite a bit due to conforming to the new Code, and acknowledged that a few of them could be removed. He also pointed out that the Planning Commission did not ask that any of the uses be removed knowing that the site would not support many of them anyway.

Scott Baum, the landowner, agreed that due to the size of the lot, there is not much room to build. He is amenable to removing some of the uses, however, he would need to confer with the other owners.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to forward P.Z. 05-2018 Edison Crossing (Buttry & Brown Development) to City Council with a recommendation to approve with the stipulation that the Petitioner will eliminate some of the permitted uses. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart.

Discussion on the Motion

With regard to recommendations for uses to eliminate, Councilmember Flachsbart stated that the outdoor theater, automobile dealership and drive through dry cleaning uses could all be eliminated.

The above motion failed by a voice vote of 1-3 with Councilmembers Ohley, Flachsbart and Mastorakos voting nay.

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission will be needed for the August 6, 2018 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services, for additional information on P.Z. 05-2018 Edison Crossing (Buttry & Brown Development).]

- C. POWER OF REVIEW - 18385 Chesterfield Airport Road (Chesterfield Hockey Association):** A Site Development Concept Plan and Conceptual Landscape Plan for a 15.67 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located north of Chesterfield Airport Road and northeast of its intersection with Olive Street Road and northwest of its intersection with Wings of Hope Boulevard. (Ward 4)

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, stated that Power of Review has been called for this petition. Chesterfield Hockey Association has submitted an application for a Site Development Concept Plan and Conceptual Landscape Plan. Ms. Henry displayed an aerial of the subject site depicting the proposed lots. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the request on July 9, 2018 by a vote of 9-0.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Mastorakos stated that she called Power of Review because she is concerned about the ingress and egress of the private road. Ms. Henry stated that there was discussion at the Planning Commission regarding use of the private drive. The owner of Comfort Inn Suites spoke at the Planning Commission meeting and stated that it would not be a problem for him as the road is not a primary traffic route and the primary access leading into the parking lot is utilized by patrons of the hotel.

Chair Ohley stated that she called Power of Review because of Lot B. There was prior discussion about that lot being used as a possible construction entrance/exit. However, Stock & Associates sent a letter today clarifying that the lot will be utilized for open space, drainage and stormwater, utility and pedestrian easements.

At the request of Councilmember Hurt, Ms. Henry explained that there is a conceptual alignment of an Olive Street Road extension that would connect to Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard. Even though this is a conceptual alignment, the City requires the dedication of right of way to make that improvement possible in the future. The Ordinance states that when the connection is made to either Chesterfield Airport Road or Spirit of St. Louis Boulevard, the interim access road connecting the development to the south shall be restricted at either its northern or southern access point. When that occurs, the exact nature of that restriction will be determined and it will most likely happen in conjunction with other future developments in the area.

Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to forward 18385 Chesterfield Airport Road (Chesterfield Hockey Association) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt and **passed** by a voice vote of 4-0.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services, for additional information on 18385 Chesterfield Airport Road (Chesterfield Hockey Association).]

- D. POWER OF REVIEW - 18385 Chesterfield Airport Road, Lot A (Chesterfield Hockey Association):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 10.12 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located north of Chesterfield Airport Road and northeast of its intersection with Olive Street Road and northwest of its intersection with Wings of Hope Boulevard. (Ward 4)

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, stated that this petition is the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Chesterfield Hockey. Power of Review has also been called for this petition.

The project was reviewed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) on June 14, 2018. The ARB recommended approval of the project by a vote of 3-0 with the following recommendations: 1) provide additional landscaping to soften the front façade of the building; and 2) provide traffic calming measures near the front drop off area. The Applicant has met both of these conditions and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the request on July 9, 2018 by a vote of 9-0.

DISCUSSION

Chair Ohley expressed concern with the one-way bus lane located at the rear of the building. Ms. Henry stated that one-way traffic is a more direct traffic pattern. One-way traffic provides a clearer direction for the buses as they will not have to worry about two-way traffic. The buses can enter at the northern portion and exit at the southern terminus. An auto-turn analysis was completed to make sure that the buses can maneuver the turns. Staff also made sure that the proper traffic control devices will be put into place and in particular, for the future when the cross access easements come through along the east-west and southernmost cross access points.

There was considerable discussion regarding future cross access. Councilmember Hurt expressed concern about the aggregate operation to the west as he does not want aggregate trucks driving through the hockey arena site. Ms. Henry explained that this site plan shows ultimately how the traffic pattern will function. City Attorney Chris Graville stated that cross access will be required to allow all types of traffic once future development comes in. If issues arise in the future, there are ways to control that access.

Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to forward 18385 Chesterfield Airport Road, Lot A, (Chesterfield Hockey Association) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt.

Discussion after the Motion

In response to Councilmember Mastorakos' question regarding greenspace, Ms. Henry stated that the Ordinance requires 35% open space and the site currently has 44%. Lot B, which is undevelopable, is included in the open space calculation. There is an area on the site where an additional rink may be built in the future. If the rink is developed, the open space will be closer to the required 35%. Proposed Lot C will have to meet its own open space and tree preservation requirements.

The above motion passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning and Development Services, for additional information on 18385 Chesterfield Airport Road, Lot A (Chesterfield Hockey Association).]

- E. POWER OF REVIEW - Summit-Topgolf Lot A (Residence Inn):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.7 acre tract of land located north of North Outer 40 Road and east of Boone's Crossing. (Ward 4)

STAFF REPORT

Mike Knight, Planner, stated that the proposal is to construct a four-story, 128-guest room hotel with an indoor pool and an outdoor sport court. The site is zoned "PC" Planned Commercial and is governed by Ordinance 3012. The proposal is for development on Lot A of the Summit-Topgolf subdivision, which is also governed by Ordinance 3012.

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed the project on May 10, 2018. A motion was made to forward the Site Development Section Plan to the Planning Commission with a recommendation for approval by a vote of 5-0 with the following conditions: 1) replace the off-white siding with white, 2) add a row of hedges along the parking that faces I-64 to avoid headlights that may shine on the highway, and 3) research pedestrian connectivity to the parcel located to the west. The Applicant has fulfilled all of these conditions.

The Planning Commission recommended approval of the request on July 9, 2018 by a vote of 7-2. At that meeting, there was discussion regarding materials and color and their relation to neighboring sites. On July 10, Power of Review was called. Since the Planning Commission meeting, the applicant has supplied alternate elevations and renderings for review that have been included in the meeting packet.

DISCUSSION

For clarification purposes, Mr. Knight presented an illustration of the original rendering that was approved by ARB and the updated elevations submitted by the Petitioner in response to the Planning Commission's discussion regarding material and color. He confirmed that ARB has not seen the updated elevations. Planning Commission Chair Hansen stated that she believed that ARB would be happy with the updated elevations even though they have not seen them.

Councilmember Mastorakos stated that this property is strategically located and very visible as one travels west on I-64. It will be sandwiched between two entertainment venues, Topgolf to the east and the proposed entertainment district to the west. The hotel should do very well as guests can walk from one venue to another. She expressed her opinion that the structure is not very attractive even with the revision and would expect that Residence Inn can come up with an

exceptional design. She feels that there is no style to the back of the northeast elevation, and that it lacks definition.

Mayor Nation questioned whether Council should be involved in building design beyond what ARB and the Planning Commission have already done. He expressed concern that this project is being reviewed on a subjective basis and going beyond the written guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code. He agrees that “color” is something that can be taken into consideration; however, the term “exceptional” standards need to be met for a Residence Inn in the Valley next to Topgolf is not written in the Code.

City Attorney Chris Graville responded that there is language in the code that deals with color. At the Planning Commission meeting, there were some Commissioners who wanted the colors brighter and others who wanted the colors more muted. The developer has since provided alternate elevations. Mr. Graville explained that while Committee members may not feel that the elevations are of an exceptional design, they are not providing any concrete feedback as to what would make it more acceptable.

Councilmember Hurt stated that it is difficult to articulate what the Committee is seeking and suggested that it be sent back to ARB for further review. Mr. Graville advised that either the full Council could send it back to ARB, or the developer could request that ARB review the project again. Councilmember Mastorakos stated she would feel more comfortable if ARB looked at it again as the “rear elevation looks like a barracks.”

Ms. Henry pointed out that the project was well received by ARB with the original colors and building form. The building footprint has not changed, just the materials and colors. Councilmember Mastorakos stated that the color is not her main issue. Ms. Henry further stated that hotels often look different from their renderings after they are built. Architectural Elevations depict a flattened image, which makes it difficult to visualize the final built product for structures like hotels that tend to be big, blocky structures with lots of windows. Chair Ohley stated that the whole area should be considered a district or a destination, with the expectation that the hotel’s design would fit in line with what is proposed for the outlet mall and Topgolf.

Ms. Kate Stock-Gitto, Stock & Associates, stated that they did not receive any feedback from the Planning Commission. There was nothing said about the building footprint itself, only the color. Additionally, they did not receive any negative feedback from ARB relative to the building. She stated that they want to keep the process moving forward. If City Council recommends sending it back to ARB, she asked that Council provide more feedback so that the renderings can be revised prior to ARB’s review.

Mr. Chasen Garret, Architect, stated that if there was a change to the guest room configuration, Marriott would have to approve the design. Some repetition is unavoidable due to the nature of the hotel guest room layout. However, they will do whatever the Council wishes.

There was further discussion regarding possible changes that could be made, and it was ultimately agreed that Chair Ohley, Councilmember Mastorakos, the Architect, Stock & Associates, and Staff would meet prior to the next Council meeting.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to forward Summit-Topgolf Lot A (Residence Inn) to City Council with a recommendation to approve with the stipulation that a meeting take place prior to the August 6 City Council meeting in which changes may occur. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart and passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

F. Parking Stall Dimensions – Discussion

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, stated that per the request of Councilmember Flachsbar, Staff has provided an analysis of the City's requirements for parking stall sizes. The topic was raised at a City Council meeting following an article in the Wall Street Journal citing concern about parking stall sizes in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles requires that parking stalls are to be a minimum of 8 feet 4 inches wide, whereas Chesterfield requires all passenger vehicle spaces to be 9 feet wide.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers has discussed parking stall design extensively over the years and notes that recommended parking space dimensions have varied to adapt to the economy and changing size of the passenger vehicles.

After reviewing Chesterfield's current requirements, national best practices, other local municipalities, and reviewing existing conditions, Staff recommends that no changes be made to the parking stall size requirements. The City's current standards adequately balance the variety of parking facilities in town without unnecessarily increasing the amount of land required to be devoted to parking facilities.

DISCUSSION

There was considerable discussion regarding the actual length and width of larger pickup trucks and whether they were included in the 85th percentile. Ms. Henry stated standardized norms are utilized in all design work. While only a small percentage of the population may drive larger pickup trucks, it should be recognized that on the other end of the spectrum there are also a lot of people who drive smaller cars. The percentile captures the size of most vehicles. She also pointed out that larger parking spaces will increase the amount of pavement on a site but the number of parking stalls would not be reduced.

Councilmember Flachsbar made a motion directing Staff to clarify what vehicles sizes were included in the 85th percentile of the U.S. vehicle fleet. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

Councilmember Flachsbar stated that the additional analysis be considered a low priority.

G. Mixed Use Parking – Discussion

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Assistant City Planner, stated that Councilmember Hurt recently requested that Staff research and provide information on parking requirements for mixed-used developments.

Staff approached the analysis from a reviewer's perspective and considered the parking requirements in the Unified Development Code for that type of development. Information was also gathered from the Streets of St. Charles development as this development has been referenced several times as a regional example of the kind of mixed use that could come to Chesterfield. This type of mixed use is difficult to capture as there is valet parking for some uses, there are redundant trips where, for example, one may dine and then stay for a movie, and there is residential parking that allows residents to walk to the commercial developments rather than drive. Comparing the City's Code Calculation for parking to the City of St. Charles, it is interesting that on a development of 27 acres, the two code calculations are within 47 spaces of each other. This is because standardized data from institutions such as the ITE are often utilized by municipalities to establish use-based parking requirements. However, a simple code

calculation is not sufficient in fully capturing the dynamics of a large mixed-use development. A site specific parking demand study can be utilized to determine the peak hours and unique parking demands generated by the specific use mix. That being said, under parking is not the only potential issue to be considered when reviewing mixed use developments. Over parking can detract from the user experience, creating long walks from attractions to parking areas or weakening the aesthetics of the development. Developers tend to be very focused on the user experience and how to get people on site and how to break up the parking. Through the City's development review process, Staff evaluates where the parking is located and how to establish traffic circulation patterns that will accommodate all types of traffic. This allows for consideration of site-specific conditions, such as the provision of valet parking, use of parking structures, and multi-modal traffic.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Hurt thanked Staff for the report and agreed with Ms. Henry's comments, but he would be interested in seeing how other areas compare. He cited other examples in California, Boston and Austin, Texas. He would like the comparisons to have a similar surrounding traffic pattern, such as Clarkson Road and Highway 40, to see if there is a variable that would help in determining parking requirements for a mixed use development.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion directing Staff to reconsider the analysis and to include a comparison of other developments. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart.

Councilmember Flachsbart expressed his concern that developers may request a parking reduction. He stated that Staff and the Planning Commission need to be careful in justifying a reduction. **The above motion passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

IV. OTHER

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.