PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
June 14, 1999

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

I. **PRESENT**

Mr. Fred Broemmer
Mr. Charles Eifler
Mr. Robert Grant
Ms. Stephanie Macaluso
Mr. John Nations
Mr. Jerry Right
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Chairman Dan Layton, Jr.
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney
Councilmember Mary Brown, Council Liaison
Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Assistant Director of Planning
Ms. Reveena Shook, Planner II
Mr. Todd Streiler, Planner II
Ms. Annissa McCaskill, Planner I
Ms. Kathy Lone, Executive Secretary/Planning Assistant
Mr. Brian Horton, Intern

ABSENT

Ms. Rachel Nolen

II. **INVOCATION**: Commissioner Nations

III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**: All

Chairman Layton welcomed newly appointed Planning Commissioner John Nations. He recognized the attendance of Councilmember Jane Durrell (Ward I), Councilmember Larry Grosser (Ward II), Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III) and Councilmember Mary Brown (Ward IV).

Chairman Layton called Mr. Robert Grant and Mr. Allen Yaffe to the podium and, on behalf of the City of Chesterfield, presented them with plaques and thanked them for serving on the Planning Commission and doing an outstanding job for the City.

IV. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

A. **P.Z. 14-1999 City of Chesterfield:** A proposal to amend Section 1003.150 "PI" Planned Industrial District of the City of Chesterfield Zoning Ordinance to allow

dry cleaning drop-off and pickup stations and to read as follows:

4. (2)(bb) Laundries and dry cleaning plants, **which include dry cleaning drop-off and pickup stations.** (Additional language has been provided in bold.)

Assistant Director of Planning Laura Griggs-McElhanon stated that an ordinance amendment is required because the "PI" Planned Industrial District allows for dry cleaning plants, but to allow for drop-off and pick-up from the dry cleaners it would have to be done in the "PC" Planned Commercial. The "PC" District does not allow the dry cleaning plant, so petitioner would like to do both uses on the same piece of property. The petitioner is asking to amend the "PI" Planned Industrial District and to add an additional permitted use.

B. **P.Z. 15-1999 Beckmann Bros., Inc./Alexander Reed Cleaners:** A request for a change in zoning from "C-7" General Extensive Commercial District to "PI" Planned Industrial District for a 2.67 acre tract of land located on Chesterfield Airport Road, 450 feet East of the Baxter Road extension. (Locator Numbers: 17T31-0214 and 17T31-0379)

Proposed Uses:

- Business service establishments;
- Cafeterias for employees and guests only;
- Laundries and dry cleaning plants, which include dry cleaning drop-off and pickup stations:
- Offices or office buildings
- Plumbing, electrical, air conditioning and heating equipment sales, warehousing and repair facilities;
- Restaurants, sit down
- Sales, servicing, repairing, cleaning, renting, leasing and necessary outdoor storage of equipment and vehicles used by business, industry and agriculture;
- Service facilities, studios or work areas for antique salespersons, artists, candy makers, craftpersons, dressmakers, tailors, music teachers, dance teachers, typists and stenographers, including cabinet makers, film processors, fishing tackle and bait shops and souvenir sales. Goods and services associated with these uses may be sold or provided directly to the public on premises;
- Warehousing, storage or wholesaling of manufactured commodities, live animals, explosives or flammable gases and liquids
- Or other uses which may be sought under the Chesterfield Zoning Ordinance after future public hearings

Assistant Director of Planning Laura Griggs-McElhanon gave a slide presentation of the subject site and surrounding areas.

1. Mr. Bruce Beckmann, 2012 Emerald Crest Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017, petitioner, stated the following:

- Retail sales are permitted in the "PI" Planned Industrial District;
- Property has been leased;
- Petitions are for all three buildings on the property, but front building would be for dry cleaning;
- Other businesses on property are: Missouri Wholesale Door Corporation and a landscape company.

2. Mr. Rock VonDras, Epoch Design Group, 7803 Clayton Road, Clayton, MO 63117, architect for petitioner, stated the following:

- Intent is for customers to enter one-way drive, stop at door, attendants will come out and take care of dry cleaning;
- Estimates are that it will take three (3) minutes per car for transaction;
- There is room for approximately five (5) cars in driveway.

3. Mr. Glenn DeWees, #4 Sir Ryan Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017, petitioner, stated the following:

- Traffic estimates were based on their second store which has approximately 300 customers per week;
- Cleaners is open 90 hours per week;
- Wants convenience and speed;
- Wants island to be landscaped with low shrubs and flowers.

Commissioner Macaluso stated that the driveway is approximately 12 feet wide so cars would not be passing others. If driveway was widened to 18 feet, cars could pass others if, for instance, one car was held up for any reason.

Mr. VonDras stated that there are specified setbacks for the property.

Mr. DeWees stated that there is separate parking for walk-ins, 1 handicapped and five (5) spaces for employees and customers.

Commissioner Eifler asked petitioner to eliminate "explosives or flammable gasses and liquids" from the list of uses.

Mr. DeWees stated that the plant will service all of the cleaner's locations. A loading dock will be on the east side.

Mr. Glenn stated that perchloroethylene (perc) is classified as a hazardous waste. All

equipment is state-of-the-art. No fumes or liquids should escape machines. If they do, machinery is completely enclosed.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR - None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION - None

SPEAKERS - NEUTRAL -

Mr. Mike Schmidt, 1929 Cedarmill Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63017, Chairman of the Chesterfield Historical Commission, speaking neutral to P.Z. 15-1999 Beckmann Bros., Inc./Alexander Reed Cleaners;

- Wants the Commission and petitioner to consider the historical significance of the area;

Councilmember Brown stated that Mr. Schmidt might consider attending the Architectural Review Board meeting when this petition will be on the agenda to express his concerns. Councilmember Brown stated that the lighting and the facade could be adapted in a way that would fit into the character of the neighborhood.

REBUTTAL - None

Commission Layton read the last portion of the "Opening Comments."

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

A motion to **approve** the May 24, 1999 Meeting Minutes was made by Commissioner Grant and seconded by Commissioner Eifler. The motion **passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Mr. Mike Casey, 1925 Claymills Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63017, Councilmember from Ward III;

- Stated his appreciation to Mr. Robert Grant for serving on the Planning Commission.

2. Mr. Doug Bruns, Stock & Associates, 425 N. New Ballas Road, Suite 165, St. Louis, MO 63141, petitioner for P.Z. 10-99 Chesterfield Corporate Park;

- Speaker is available to answer questions concerning the above petition.

3. Mr. Torsten Bjerregaard, President of Lipton Realty, 1600 Wooden Road, St. Louis, MO, petitioner for P.Z. 10-99 Chesterfield Corporate Park;

- Speaker is available to answer questions concerning the above petition.

4. Mr. Steve Koslovsky, attorney, speaking in favor of P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Presented plan to the Planning Commission members;
- Speaker stated that following Planning Commission meeting of May 24, 1999, when this petition was denied, speaker sent a letter to Commission members which further elaborated on items petitioner felt had been overlooked or needed clarification;
- Speaker stated the issues of height:
  View from Highway 40 – The purpose of the sky exposure plain was to address the question of the sky exposure and the view of high-rise buildings from major arterial or interstate highway and how that would appear and its impact on the visual view of Chesterfield in major developments. Petitioner feels that they meet the most current policy adopted by the City;
  View from Conway Road– even without the Vitt development, the visual impact and the ability to see the building from those subdivisions is minimized by the existing trees, and even with the Vitt proposal, the visual impact again of the building is minimized both by existing and remaining trees in the buffer as well as by the height of the Vitt building themselves;
- Speaker is asking the Commission to reconsider their decision and to re-evaluate a favorable recommendation to the Council.

Commissioner Grant stated that even if the Commission would vote to reconsider, it would not be addressed tonight. Commissioner Grant asked that if it were to be reconsidered, has the petitioner considered in any way reduction of the height of the building or reduction of the square footage of the development or any other changes that were addressed in the Staff report and were subject matters of discussion at prior meetings.

Mr. Koslovsky stated that they have been considered; in fact, this has been the subject of discussions at prior Commission meetings at which Commissioner Grant was Chairman. They feel that an eight-story building is appropriate under the Comprehensive Plan for an area designated for major office use. They believe that it is perfectly consistent with that, and therefore, an eight-story building, including the square footage according to their plan, is consistent with that and that is their position.

Chairman Layton stated that the material presented tonight shows a sight block of existing trees to remain between their property and Conway Road. It is Chairman Layton's understanding that if that section of Conway Road went residential, the developer could remove as much as 70% of those trees. How do they know those existing trees will remain?

Mr. Koslovsky stated that the assumption is that the existing trees would remain under the Vitt proposal (bottom site line elevation), if the Vitt proposal was approved with that as a condition of the proposal. If the Vitt proposal were denied and the area went residential, the tree masses would be changed in some way.

5. Ms. Laura Lueking, 15021 Conway Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- It was her understanding that the petitioner could not request consideration until the Council level;
- Speaker understands that there has never been an eight-story building approved in Chesterfield. The Doubletree Hotel is eight-stories but it was approved by the County.

6. Mr. Lee Wall, 14759 Plumas, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.,

- Feels a mockery has been made out of the fairness element to the citizens of Chesterfield;
- Urged the Commission not to reconsider.

Commissioner Grant stated that during his tenure on the Planning Commission, there have been several occasions on which the Planning Commission has reconsidered prior votes. No mockery of the citizens is intended. If there is a motion to reconsider, there will be no discussion tonight. The citizens would be notified prior to the next meeting.

7. Mr. John McDonald, 1332 Amherst Terrace Way, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.,

- Asked Commission if they have ever reconsidered an 8 to 0 vote;
- If Commission does vote to reconsider, speaker hopes the Staff is instructed to study the traffic from the west.

8. Mr. Hefty Hoffman, 14308 Conway Meadows Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.,

- Traffic is a serious situation. Conway Road is a narrow road with children and busses;
- Speaker asked Commission to listen to the citizens.

Chairman Layton requested a suspension of the rules of order.

City Attorney Beach stated that if there is a motion to reconsider, it would come after Site Plans and before Committee Reports. A Commission member may move to suspend the rules then, and if approved, the questions would be whether or not there is any kind of motion. If there is no

motion, the Commission goes back to the regular business and that would be the end of the motion for reconsideration.

Commissioner Right made a motion to suspend the rules. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant **and passes by voice vote of 8 to 0.**

Commissioner Right made a motion to reconsider P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant.

Commissioner Broemmer asked that the Commission not make any motion until Commissioner Nolen was present.

City Attorney Beach stated that a vote for reconsideration had to be at this meeting.

Chairman Layton stated that Commissioner Nolen could still vote since the discussion and voting would be at the following meeting.

Commissioner Sherman stated that Commissioner Nolen had her say at the last meeting and voted the proposal down. She is only missing the opportunity to bring it up again, if she wished to change her mind and wished to reconsider the way she voted.

Commissioner Eifler asked if there was any justification to reconsider.

Commissioner Grant stated that he feels that this is a major proposal and that some of the points in Mr. Koslovsky's letter should be given full consideration by both the Staff and the Planning Commission before the matter is forwarded to the City Council either by vote of approval or disapproval. Commissioner Grant feels that it is better for the Commission and the City, as a whole, to thoroughly consider the issues raised. Traffic issues have been discussed many times, however, Commissioner Grant does not feel that some of the issues that were in the letter were given full consideration, and since the Commission is delaying the vote on the Vitt proposal and asking for more information with regard to traffic, the traffic from this proposal will have similar if not the same considerations that should be given to it. Commissioner Grant feels that it is better to continue to look at this matter and not to forward to the City Council with a disapproval vote at this time.

Commissioner Right agreed with Commissioner Grant.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Broemmer, no; Commissioner Eifler, no; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, no; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, no; Chairman Layton, no; Commissioner Nations abstained.

The motion to reconsider the petition fails by a vote of 5 to 2.

City Attorney Beach stated that during the Public Comment portion of the meeting, the public is free to speak on any topic that they choose. Under Parliamentary Procedure Rule, as adopted by the City of Chesterfield, if a matter is passed or defeated by Planning Commission or City Council, a vote for reconsideration can be brought by that same body within one meeting. If a member of the Planning Commission or City Council were to make a motion for reconsideration, then that motion must pass by a majority vote. If that happens, the matter would be reconsidered but would not be heard until the following meeting of the Planning Commission or City Council. This gives the opportunity for everyone to be notified and attend the meeting. A member of the Planning Commission who voted in favor of defeating the petition must put that motion before the Planning Commission. If motion is seconded, then it can be debated and voted upon. At that time, it would go to the next meeting and there would not be any additional comments by the Planning Commission on the project itself, only the issue of reconsideration. Since the Planning Commission meets an average of once every two weeks, the meeting subsequent to the original vote would be the only time a vote for reconsideration could be brought up. If the motion is not seconded and ruled on tonight, then the matter would proceed in the rezoning process to the Planning and Zoning Committee level with the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial. A favorable vote could also be reconsidered at the subsequent meeting. The rules say that as long as a person has acted based on the favorable vote to some detriment, then they might have some other standing. In this particular case, since it was voted down by 8 to 0, any of those eight (8) members [except Commissioner Nations, (new Commissioner)and Commissioner Macaluso (absent for vote)] could move for vote for reconsideration.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 10-99 Chesterfield Corporate Park; A request for a change in zoning from "M-3" Industrial District to "PI" Planned Industrial District for a 20-acre tract of land located on the north side of Chesterfield Airport Road, approximately 820' west of Long Road. (Locator Number: 17W 41 0038)

Proposed uses:

- Animal hospitals, veterinary clinics, and kennels;
- Broadcasting studios for radio and television;
- Broadcasting, transmitting, or relay towers, studios, and associated facilities for radio, television, and other communications;
- Business service establishments;
- Cafeterias for employees and guests only;
- Child care centers, nursery schools, and day nurseries;
- Financial institutions;
- Filling stations, including emergency towing and repair services;
- Gymnasiums, indoor swimming pools, indoor handball and racquetball courts (public or private), and indoor and unlighted outdoor tennis courts (public or private);
- Hotels and motels;

- Mail order sale warehouses;
- Manufacturing, fabrication, assembly, processing, or packaging of any commodity except:
  - (i) Facilities producing or processing explosives or flammable gases or liquids;
  - (ii) Facilities for animal slaughtering, meat packing, or rendering;
  - (iii) Sulfur plants, rubber reclamation plants, or cement plants, and
  - (iv) Steel mills, foundries, or smelters;
- Medical and dental offices;
- Offices or office buildings;
- Outdoor advertising sign (additional to provisions of Section 1003.168);
- Parking areas, including garages, for automobiles, but not including any sales of automobiles, or the storage of wrecked or otherwise damaged and immobilized automotive vehicles for a period in excess of seventy-two (72) hours;
- Permitted signs (See Section 1003.168 'Sign Regulations');
- Plumbing, electrical, air conditioning, and heating equipment sales, warehousing and repair facilities;
- Printing and duplicating services;
- Research facilities, professional and scientific laboratories, including photographic processing laboratories used in conjunction therewith;
- Restaurants, fast food;
- Restaurants, sit down;
- Service facilities, studios, or work areas for antique salespersons, artists, candy makers, craftpersons, dressmakers, tailors, music teachers, dance teachers, typists, and stenographers, including cabinet makers, film processors, fishing tackle and bait shops, and souvenir sales. Goods and services associated with these uses may be sold or provided directly to the public on the premises;
- Stores, shops, markets, service facilities, and automatic vending facilities in which goods or services of any kind, including indoor sale of motor vehicles, are being offered for sale or hire to the general public on the premises;
- Union halls and hiring halls;
- Vehicle service centers;
- Vehicle washing facilities;
- Welding, sheet metal, and blacksmith shops.

Planner II Todd Streiler stated that the petitioner has submitted two (2) plans: Preliminary Plans A and B. Since this is a rezoning petition, petitioner is not sure of the actual tenant spaces, so they will be submitting two (2) plans for 185,796 square feet with the option of also having 12 buildings. Mr. Streiler stated that Staff recommends approval of P.Z. 10-99 Chesterfield Corporate Park, subject to conditions in Attachment A. This recommendation allows the petitioner to consider both Preliminary Plans A and B.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Macaluso stated that there is a congestion problem with the fast food area.

Mr. Streiler stated that Attachment A requires a traffic study to resolve any interior circulation problems and cross access between the two lots.

Director of Planning Teresa Price stated that a condition could be placed in Attachment A stating that fast food circulation is to be reviewed at the Site Development Plan stage.

Mr. Streiler stated that the dedicated right-of-way is a Department requirement whether they go with Plan A or B, and it would ultimately provide the cross access.

City Attorney Beach stated a standard right-of-way is 40 feet. If there were a sidewalk, the seven foot shoulder would become 2 feet wide with a 5 foot sidewalk.

Commissioner Sherman stated that the plan did not depict any sidewalks directing people from the hotels to the restaurants.

Mr. Streiler stated that Attachment A, page 8, "p" requires sidewalks.

Commissioner Macaluso suggested that there be the possibility of a compromise with the petitioner and have the center portion of the development no more than 30,000 square feet.

Commissioner Macaluso made a motion to approve the Department of Planning report for P.Z. 10-99 Chesterfield Corporate Park but that there be an amendment to Attachment A that traffic studies for fast food restaurants shall be required. Studies shall include information specifically on drive-thru queuing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Right.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to approve the amendment passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

Commissioner Broemmer made a motion for an amendment to limit any size building in the center area to 20,000 square feet.

Motion fails due to the lack of a second.

Commissioner Eifler made a motion for an amendment to prohibit chemical processing plants in the development. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Macaluso.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to approve the amendment passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

Commissioner Grant made a motion for an amendment to limit a single building to 30,000 feet in the center. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer.

Commissioner Eifler asked the petitioner if there would be some screening since this was why some of the Commissioners objected to the possible size of the buildings. Perhaps this was so that buildings would not be seen from outside of the development.

Petitioner stated that if the building was larger than 30,000 square feet, he would provide screening for the rear of the building.

Commissioner Grant made a motion for an amendment to limit a single building to 30,000 square feet in the center portion of the development. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Right, no; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, no; Commissioner Grant, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to approve the amendment passes by a vote of 6 to 2.

Commissioner Grant made a motion for an amendment to require the construction of one (1) sidewalk on the east/west right-of-way in accordance with plans of the Department of Public Works. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer.

Commissioner Sherman made a motion to add to the amendment that the sidewalk continue from the center portion to the front part of the development. Commissioner Grant and Commissioner Broemmer accepted this amendment to their amendment.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to approve the amendment passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

Upon a roll call the vote on the original motion as amended was as follows: Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to approve passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

B. **P.Z. 11-99 Swingley Ridge Development II, L.L.C. (Nardin Tract)**; A request for a change in zoning from "R-2" Residence District to "PC" Planned Commercial District for a 4.6 acre tract of land located on the west side of Nardin, approximately 300 feet north of Swingley Ridge Road. (Locator Numbers: 18S-51-0229, 18S-51-0021 and 18S-23-0158)

Proposed uses:

- Office or office buildings, stores, shops, markets, service facilities, and automatic vending facilities in which goods or services of any kind are being offered for sale or hire to the general public on the premises, restaurants - sit-down;

The uses of stores, shops, markets, service facilities, and automatic vending facilities in which goods or services of any kind are being offered for sale or hire to the general public on the premises shall be ancillary to the office uses and shall be focused to the interior of the office building, with the exception of the use – restaurants – sit-down.

Assistant Director of Planning Laura Griggs-McElhanon stated that at the last Planning Commission meeting (May 24, 1999), the Commission voted for conceptual approval of P.Z. 11-99 Swingley Ridge Development II, L.L.C. (Nardin Tract) and directed Staff to prepare an Attachment A to allow development of the project as indicated on the Preliminary Plan with the amendment to move the parking structure further back from Nardin Drive by 15 feet.

Commissioner Sherman questioned page 4 of Attachment A "g" to provide four (4) foot sidewalks and the need to have 4 or 5 foot sidewalks.

Assistant Director of Planning Griggs-McElhanon stated that the condition was recommended by the Department of Public Works.

Commissioner Sherman would like to see five-foot sidewalks used even if there has to be a small area that goes from 4-feet to 5-feet at the Hampton Inn area.

Commissioner Eifler made a motion to approve Attachment A as presented by the Planning Department for P.Z. 11-99 Swingley Ridge Development II, L.L.C. (Nardin Tract). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Right.

Commissioner Sherman made a motion for an amendment to change the 4-foot wide sidewalks to 5-feet wide. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner

Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion for an amendment to change the 4-foot wide sidewalks to 5-feet wide passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

City Attorney Beach stated that there has not been a situation in the past where Staff recommended against a project and then the Commission indicated a preliminary conceptual approval to go forward.

There was extensive discussion about how the Planning Commission can benefit from the Planning Department's expertise when the Department recommends denial and the Planning Commission recommends approval.

Assistant Director of Planning Griggs-McElhanon stated that "fine-tuning" is what comes from Staff's analysis. If Staff recommends approval, you would find an explanation for why they supported or did not support the size of building, height of building, setbacks, etc. in the Staff report. That did not happen in this case. We did our analysis based on a recommendation of denial.

Chairman Layton stated that there were certain reasons given by the Planning Department for rejecting this. Basically, as he understands, only one of the reasons has been addressed so the Planning Department's objections that were raised on the original rejection appear untouched.

Commissioner Macaluso asked for clarification on 'conceptual approval.'

Assistant Director of Planning Griggs-McElhanon stated that they could not vote for full approval because there was not any Attachment A prepared. Because this was a Planned District and we recommended denial, we did not prepare an Attachment A. So if the Planning Commission felt that this was a project that should be approved, all they could have done was to vote for conceptual approval and then direct Staff to prepare the Attachment A giving whatever direction they felt appropriate to be included in the Attachment, but they could not grant final approval because there were no conditions to vote on. For the benefit of the person that was not here at the last meeting, the Department does acknowledge that it is urban core, however we also stated that the Comprehensive Plan is not time specific, so we felt that while the development might be appropriate somewhere down the road, it was not appropriate now. As for Attachment A, it is in the standard format, but from the standpoint of Staff, we haven't massaged setbacks. I put a scale down on the Preliminary Plan and that is where the setbacks came from. I did not modify the square footage; I did not modify the height; I did not say the entrance drive needs to be moved. I took other agency comments, inserted them in Attachment A, and that is what you have before you this evening.

Chairman Layton stated his agreement that if this was a normal subdivision, he did not think there would be any question. The message he got was all or nothing at all. I thought there were objections beyond this from the Planning Department that were valid.

Director Price stated that she does not want the Department to redesign projects. Staff will look at an Attachment A and go into more detail on issues that you have pointed out to us that are of concern,like density and setbacks.

Commissioner Broemmer made a motion to table until June 28, 1999, with taking the Attachment back to the Department and having them review it with the surrounding environment. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

Commissioner Nations made an amendment to the motion to hold P.Z. 11-1999 Swingley Ridge Development II, L.L.C. (Nardin Tract) until the meeting of June 28, 1999, and directed Staff to analyze and report on the project relative to issues contained in the Issues Report (density, elevations, setback requirements, the entrance and the effect on the surrounding neighborhood, including the construction phase.)

Commissioner Broemmer, maker of the motion, accepts and Commissioner Sherman, who seconded the motion also accepts.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to table P.Z. 11-99 Swingley Ridge Development II, L.L.C. (Nardin Tract) until the June 28, 1999 meeting passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

C. **P.Z. 7-99 Central City Park:** A request for a change in zoning from an "R-5" Residence District to a "PS" Park and Scenic District for a 34.0-acre tract of land located 521.93 feet west of Chesterfield Parkway West. (Locator Numbers: 18T340191, 18T340180 & 18T340058).
Proposed Use:
- City Park and aquatic complex.

D. **P.Z. 8-99 Chesterfield Valley Athletic Complex:** A request for a change in zoning from "C-8" Planned Commercial District and "FPM-3" Flood Plain Planned Industrial District to a "PS" Park and Scenic District for a 103.0 acre tract of land located 210 feet north of Missouri State Highway 40. (Locator Numbers: 16V210056, 16V120076 & 16V140041).
Proposed Use:
- Athletic complex and undeveloped parkland.

E. **P.Z. 9-99 Railroad Park;** A request for a change in zoning from "FPNU" Flood Plain Non Urban District to a "PS" Park and Scenic District for a 33.3 acre tract of land located at the north side of the St. Louis Southwestern Rail Road. (Locator Numbers: 17U210025 & 17U210014).
Proposed Use:
- Passive Parkland

The petitions for the Parks (P.Z. 7-99 Central City park, P.Z. 8-99 Chesterfield Valley Athletic Complex and P.Z. 9-99 Railroad Park) will be considered together.

Planner II Reveena Shook stated that all issues have been addressed and Staff recommends appproval of P.Z. 7-99 Central City Park, P.Z. 8-99 Chesterfield Valley Athletic Complex and P.Z. 9-99 Railroad Park.

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve P.Z. 7-99 Central City Park, P.Z. 8-99 Chesterfield Valley Athletic Complex and P.Z. 9-99 Railroad Park. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Right.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Nations, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Chairman Layton, yes.

The motion to approve P.Z. 7-99 Central City Park, P.Z. 8-99 Chesterfield Valley Athletic Complex and P.Z. 9-99 Railroad Park passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

VIII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND SIGNS:

A. **P.C. 164-83 Chesterfield Executive Park, Inc. (Chesterfield Executive Park Lot 2)**; "M-3" Planned Industrial District Landscape Plan; east side of Cepi Drive, south of Chesterfield Airport Road.

Commissioner Eifler, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Landscape Plan for P.C. 164-83 Chesterfield Executive Park, Inc. (Chesterfield Executive Park Lot 2) with the provision that shrubbery be provided on the east side of the proposed building as determined by the Planning Department. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

B. **Hampton Inn & Suites;** An Amended Site Development Section Plan and Amended Architectural Elevations for a 3.37 acre "C-8" Planned Commercial District site located north of Chesterfield Airport Road and west of Boones Crossing within the McBride & Son's development.

Commissioner Eifler, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to return Hampton Inn & Suites to the Architectural Review Board for review and comment. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Macaluso **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Ordinance Review Committee –

Committee Chairman Eifler, on behalf of the Ordinance Review Committee, made a motion that Staff be requested to prepare revisions to the Sign Ordinance to address the particular needs of large-scale retail development signage. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

Committee Chairman Eifler, on behalf of the Ordinance Review Committee, made a motion that the Department of Planning modify the signage regulations to remove Real Estate Signs from the Temporary Sign Category and to create a third and separate category specifically for real estate signs, and additionally, that the new category include specific criteria for "For Lease" signs. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

Committee Chairman Eifler, on behalf of the Ordinance Review Committee, made a motion that the Planning Department address the PC and PI Districts and change the permitted uses in each district and that the districts be amended to allow ancillary uses with specific criteria. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Macaluso **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

B. Architectural Review Committee – No report
C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee – No report
D. Comprehensive Plan Committee – No report
E. Procedures and Planning Committee – No report
F. Nominating Committee

IX. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Macaluso with a unanimous second. The motion **passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 P.M.

Charles Eifler, Secretary