

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
MAY 28, 2014**

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Ms. Laura Lueking
Ms. Debbie Midgley
Mr. Stanley Proctor
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Michael Watson

ABSENT

Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Ms. Merrell Hansen
Ms. Amy Nolan

Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director
Mr. Jonathan Raiche, Senior Planner
Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Watson acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison; Councilmember Bruce DeGroot, Ward IV; and Councilmember Connie Fults, Ward IV.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road):** A request for a zoning map amendment from a "E-1" Estate One-Acre District to a "PUD" Planned Unit Development for 50.5279 acres located on the south side of Wild Horse Creek Road west of its intersection of Long Road and east of its intersection with Arbor Grove Court (18V330035).

Chair Watson announced that the Petitioner for P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm has requested that the petition be held until the June 9, 2014 meeting.

Commissioner Proctor then made a motion to hold **P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road)** until the **June 9, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and **passed** by a voice vote of 6 to 0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – Commissioner Wuennenberg read the “Opening Comments” for the Public Hearing.

A. P.Z. 05-2014 18626 Olive Street Road (Simon Woodmont Development LLC): A request for a zoning map amendment from an “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).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Senior Planner Jonathan Raiche stated the Applicant has indicated there is no user identified for the subject site. He also noted that all Public Hearing notification requirements have been met.

Mr. Raiche then gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area. The City’s Comprehensive Plan places the site within an industrial low-intensity land use, which would allow for uses compatible with assembly, distribution, research and development, and corporate campuses.

Site History:

- The site was incorporated into the City of Chesterfield under an “NU” Non-Urban District from St. Louis County.
- The site previously contained one residential structure, along with two out-buildings that were demolished in 2013.

Requested Uses:

The Applicant is requesting the following 69 uses of the 109 Planned Industrial District uses. The requested uses are compatible with those uses allowed in the other adjacent Planned Industrial Districts.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Administrative office for educational or religious facility. | 17. Commercial service facility. |
| 2. Animal grooming service. | 18. Cultivation and sale of plant crops, commercial vegetable and flower gardening as well as plant nurseries and greenhouses. |
| 3. Automatic vending facility. | 19. Day care center, adult. |
| 4. Automotive detailing shop. | 20. Day care center, child. |
| 5. Automotive retail supply. | 21. Device for energy generation. |
| 6. Bakery. | 22. Donation collection bin. |
| 7. Bar. | 23. Dry cleaning establishment. |
| 8. Brewery. | 24. Dry cleaning establishment, drive-thru. |
| 9. Brewpub. | 25. Education facility--Specialized private schools. |
| 10. Broadcasting studio. | 26. Education facility--Vocational school. |
| 11. Car wash. | 27. Education facility--Vocational school, outdoor training. |
| 12. Car wash, industrial. | 28. Farmers market. |
| 13. Car wash, self-service. | |
| 14. Check cashing facility. | |
| 15. Church and other place of worship. | |
| 16. Club. | |

- | | |
|---|---|
| 29. Filling station and convenience store with pump stations. | 49. Professional and technical service facility. |
| 30. Financial institution. | 50. Public safety facility. |
| 31. Financial institution, drive-thru. | 51. Research facility. |
| 32. Gymnasium. | 52. Restaurant, fast food. |
| 33. Industrial sales, service, and storage. | 53. Restaurant, take out. |
| 34. Kennel, boarding. | 54. Restaurant, with drive-thru window. |
| 35. Kennel, private. | 55. Self-storage facility. |
| 36. Laboratories-professional, scientific. | 56. Sheet metal shop. |
| 37. Laundromat. | 57. Shooting range, indoor. |
| 38. Local public utility facility. | 58. Storage and repair garage for public mass transit vehicles. |
| 39. Lodge. | 59. Substance abuse facilities--Outpatient. |
| 40. Lumbeyard. | 60. Substance abuse facility--Inpatient. |
| 41. Mail order sale warehouse. | 61. Telecommunications structure. |
| 42. Manufacturing, fabrication, assembly, processing, or packaging facility. | 62. Telecommunications tower or facility. |
| 43. Office, dental. | 63. Transit storage yard. |
| 44. Office, general. | 64. Transit transfer station. |
| 45. Office, medical. | 65. Trucks, trailers, construction equipment, agricultural equipment sales, rental, leasing, outdoor storage. |
| 46. Oil change facility. | 66. Union halls and hiring halls. |
| 47. Pawnshop. | 67. Vehicle repair and services facility. |
| 48. Plumbing, electrical, air conditioning, and heating equipment sales, warehousing and repair facility. | 68. Veterinary clinic. |
| | 69. Warehouse--General. |

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director stated that the large number of uses being requested relates to the fact that a tenant has not yet been identified for the site. Staff would be interested in hearing any questions or concerns that the Commission may have regarding the requested uses.

Preliminary Plan:

The Preliminary Plan depicts the setbacks, access points, and structures. There is no access being requested from Olive Street Road. Ms. Nassif added that while the Applicant has not requested access off Olive Street Road, such access would not be permitted. Access will be required off the internal drive identified as Spirit Valley East.

Items under Review by Staff include:

- Cross access across the property from east to west.
- Outstanding agency comments.
- Consideration of the list of uses.
- Minor updates to Preliminary Plan.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

1. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO stated the following:

- The subject property at 18626 Olive Street Road is zoned Non-Urban and was purchased in 2013 by Simon Woodmont Development. The request is to rezone the site to Planned Industrial. Mr. Dean Wolfe has an agreement with Simon Woodmont Development regarding the subject site.
- The Blue Valley Development, along with Simon Woodmont Development, has made significant improvements to the property across the street from the subject site – including improvements to Olive Street Road, an inner-connected storm water drainage system contiguous to the property, and culverts underneath Olive Street Road.

- The Petitioners do not have any users for the property at this time but they envision the property being developed consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and consistent with the uses constructed within the Spirit Valley Business Park.
- There are several buildings within the Spirit Valley Business Park. Chesterfield Fence Company owns the property to the south and east; and Vermeer is to the west of the site.
- The requested number of uses is nearly equivalent to the number of uses that the Spirit Valley properties to the west and south have, along with the number of uses that Chesterfield Fence has to the east.
- Access is not being requested to Olive Street Road. Access is being provided along the Spirit Valley East Drive – the Preliminary Plan contemplates the drive being aligned with the drive that serves Vermeer. Cross access is also provided along the site's south property line, which is a drive that is shared with Chesterfield Fence Company. It is also probable that access may be provided from the adjoining property to the east.
- During the past year, Simon Woodmont Development and Mr. Wolfe invested a lot of capital to improve the subject site by removing the dilapidated buildings and re-vegetating the property. In order to develop the property, they are requesting the rezoning to Planned Industrial from Non-Urban.

Discussion

Commissioner Lueking asked if *drive-thru restaurant* is an allowed use in the Planned Industrial District. Ms. Nassif replied that several years ago, many of the commercial uses were removed from the Planned Industrial District; however, restaurants are an allowed use to serve employees who work in the area. The allowed types of restaurants are take-out, fast food, and drive-thru; sit-down restaurants are not permitted.

Commissioner Lueking expressed concern about a drive-thru restaurant for this two-acre site with no access to Olive Street Road. Mr. Stock pointed out that a signalized intersection will be constructed at Premium Way – the driveway to the east that is serving the Chesterfield Fence property and the Blue Valley development. Commissioner Lueking indicated that the signalized intersection could alleviate some of her concern.

City Attorney Heggie asked that the Petitioners review "Uses 61 and 62", *Telecommunications structures* and *Telecommunications tower or facility*, and to inform the Commission as to whether there are any immediate plans for these uses.

Chair Watson expressed a concern about the *Gymnasium* use being requested and asked for the total square footage of the site. Ms. Nassif replied that the site is 2.391 acres in size, which is large enough to accommodate a gymnasium if it is the only use on the site.

Councilmember Hurt requested clarification on access for the site. Mr. Nassif stated that access will not be allowed from Olive Street Road; the ordinance will require that cross access be provided to the east, west, and south.

2. Mr. Dean Wolfe, Wolfe Properties, 7711 Bonhomme Avenue, Ste. 901, Clayton, MO stated he was available for questions.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION: None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL: None

ISSUES:

The following issue will be added to the list of issues noted by Staff:

1. Uses
 - Obtain more information on whether there are any immediate plans for *uses 61 and 62* (telecommunications).
 - Review the *drive-thru* use.
 - Review the *gymnasium* use.
 - Review the list of uses to determine if the number can be reduced.

Chair Watson asked that the Petitioners verify there will be cross access to the west, south, and east. Ms. Nassif confirmed that such access will be required in the Attachment A.

Commissioner Wuennenberg read the Closing Comments for the Public Hearing.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Midgley made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the May 12, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg and **passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. P.Z. 04-2014 Chesterfield Blue Valley (Simon Woodmont Development, LLC/Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC):

Petitioner:

1. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO stated he was available for questions.
2. Mr. Dean Wolfe, Wolfe Properties, 7711 Bonhomme Avenue, Ste. 901, Clayton, MO stated he was available for questions.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- A. **Wings Corporate Estates, Lot 5:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and an Architect's Statement of Design for a 1.32 acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located on the east side of Eatherton Road, north of Wings Corporate Drive.

Commissioner Proctor, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for **Wings Corporate Estates, Lot 5**. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Lueking** and **passed** by a voice vote of 6 to 0.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road):** A request for a zoning map amendment from a "E-1" Estate One-Acre District to a "PUD" Planned Unit Development for 50.5279 acres located on the south side of Wild Horse Creek Road west of its intersection of Long Road and east of its intersection with Arbor Grove Court (18V330035).

Chair Watson noted that a motion was approved earlier to hold **P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road)** until the June 9th meeting.

- B. **P.Z. 04-2014 Chesterfield Blue Valley (Simon Woodmont Development, LLC/Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC):** A request for an amendment to Ordinance 2612 to modify development criteria for 137.6 acres zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the north side of Olive Street Road, west of its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road (17W630058, 16W220010, 16W210044, 17W530190, 17W540111).

Project Planner Purvi Patel stated that the specific request is for a text amendment to Section 1.C.2.(e) of Ordinance 2612 to remove the requirement for a ten-foot parking setback from internal lot lines, while leaving all the other setback requirements unchanged.

The Public Hearing for this request was held on April 28, 2014 at which time the Planning Commission raised concerns regarding the potential for a "sea of asphalt" if the request to remove the requirement for a ten-foot parking setback from internal lot lines was approved. In order to address this concern, the Planning Commission requested that the Applicant provide a visual example of a site layout with, and without, the parking setback. The Petitioner's exhibit was included in the Planning Commission's meeting packet.

The Planning Commission had also requested that Staff provide examples of other properties within the City that maintain a zero-foot parking setback from internal lot lines, which were provided in the Staff Report. **Ms. Patel** then reviewed the photos of these examples as noted below:

- Chesterfield Commons – Bandana’s and Dobbs Tire & Auto Center: The parking between the two lots is separated by a continuous landscaped island; however the island is not centered along the property line. This layout is seen in several of the Chesterfield Commons Outlots and Chesterfield Commons East. All these lots have zero-foot parking setbacks, which granted the property owners some flexibility in developing their sites more effectively and allowed better traffic flow and parking fields between lots.
- Walmart: The parking occurs head-to-head and immediately adjacent to the property line, allowing for a shared row of parking. The landscape islands in this case are placed interior to the site.
- River Crossings - Retail Center (Espino’s) and Villa Farotto: The parking area is not centered along the lot line. The landscaped islands are shifted to one side of the property allowing parking to occur immediately adjacent to the property line. Additionally, the landscape islands are broken up to allow parking in between the islands.

Examples of other developments which maintain a zero-foot parking setback from internal lot lines include:

Mercy Health Systems
Chesterfield Commons North
Chesterfield Commons Six
Chesterfield Commons Seven

Monarch Center
Drew Station
Long Road Crossing
Chesterfield Crossing

Ms. Patel also pointed out that the City’s Tree Preservation and Landscape Requirements require that sufficient landscaping be incorporated into the parking fields. As with every development, any future Site Development Section Plan will be thoroughly reviewed by City Staff and presented to the Planning Commission for approval. The new criteria being requested by the Applicant can be found on Page 6 of the Attachment A.

One item that was open during the Public Hearing was “Agency Comments”. Staff has since received all outstanding Agency Comments and they have been reflected in the Attachment A.

Discussion

Chair Watson asked for confirmation that 30% green space was required for the Wal-Mart site. Ms. Nassif confirmed that 30% **open space** was required, which is dispersed around the perimeter and includes the landscape islands. It was also noted that different landscaping requirements are now in place than what was required when Wal-Mart was constructed – the majority of Wal-Mart’s open space is behind the building along Edison Avenue. In addition, it is an open space requirement now, not green space, which does include other non-landscaped areas.

Chair Watson then referred to the exhibit provided by the Petitioner showing the proposed zero-foot parking setback compared to the existing ten-foot parking setback. He pointed out that with the zero-foot setback, the site has gone from six to twenty parking spaces. Mr. Stock stated that the zero-foot setback allows for a more efficient parking lot and added that the site would still meet the open space and landscape requirements.

Chair Watson then asked Mr. Stock if he would entertain the idea of a motion restricting the zero-foot setback from all internal lot lines to Lot 1. Mr. Stock replied that a zero-foot setback would not impact the largest lot, Lot 2, where St. Louis Premium Outlet Mall is constructed. Similar to how Lot 1 has been divided into several smaller lots, it is anticipated that smaller lots will also be requested for along Olive Street Road, in the area currently identified as Lot 5. Consequently, they would not want to restrict the zero-foot setback to Lot 1 because they foresee it occurring in some instances on Lot 5. Mr. Stock added that they are complying with ordinance requirements for the open space and landscape.

Chair Watson again expressed his concern about the additional parking spaces that would be added with the zero-foot setback noting that asphalt is being added where it was previously green. He has concerns that all the green space will be on the perimeter of the site. Mr. Stock pointed out that the current regulations require 200 sq. ft. of green space every ten parking spaces. Ms. Nassif added that the landscape requirements require a parking stall within fifty feet of a tree; and 30-40% open space that must be dispersed across the site. There is also a minimum square footage requirement for landscape islands, which also helps to prevent the appearance of a mass of asphalt.

City Attorney Heggie then proposed the following amendment to Section I.C.2.f. of the Attachment A regard Parking Setbacks (page 6): (*amendment shown in **bold***)

Zero (0) foot from the internal lot lines and shared driveways if approved by the Planning and Development Services Director upon a finding that adequate landscaping exists in the immediate area.

Commissioner Wuennenberg stated that he does not see the necessity for such an amendment since guidelines are already in place. Commissioner Proctor indicated his agreement with Commissioner Wuennenberg.

Councilmember Hurt asked Mr. Wolfe if he understands the spirit of what the City is trying to achieve. Mr. Wolfe replied that he does understand and they will comply with all the City's conditions. He noted that the Commission will also have the opportunity to review all the site plans and landscape plans as the different uses come forward. They are asking for the zero-foot parking setback because they are trying to eliminate the situation where people will park in one area and then re-park in another area while visiting the site.

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve **P.Z. 04-2014 Chesterfield Blue Valley (Simon Woodmont Development, LLC/Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC)**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lueking.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

**Aye: Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley,
Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Puyear,
Commissioner Wuennenberg,**

Nay: Chair Watson

The motion **passed** by a vote of 5 to 1.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Report from Nominating Committee

Commissioner Proctor reported that Mr. Watson has agreed to run for Chair and Mr. Proctor has agreed to run for Vice-Chair. Commissioner Proctor did not have final information on the position of Secretary.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Steve Wuennenberg, Secretary