

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, Acting Co-City Administrator

FROM: Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, May 19, 2016



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, May 19, 2016 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Dan Hurt** (Ward III), **Councilmember Barbara McGuinness** (Ward I), and **Councilmember Bruce DeGroot** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Planning Commission Chair Stanley Proctor; Wendy Geckeler, Planning Commission Member; Merrell Hansen, Planning Commission Member; Mike Geisel, Acting Co-City Administrator/Director of Public Services; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Jessica Henry, Project Planner; and Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the May 5, 2016 Committee Meeting Summary

Planning Commission Chair Stanley Proctor pointed out that his name was misspelled on Page 4 of the meeting minutes under the Planning Commission Report.

Councilmember McGuinness made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of May 5, 2016 with the above noted correction. The motion was seconded by **Councilmember DeGroot** and **passed by a voice vote of 3-0.**

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

The Committee agreed to discuss Item B under New Business first.

III. NEW BUSINESS

B. Transportation Development District Board Designee

STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Acting Co-City Administrator, stated there are two Transportation Development Districts (TDD) that meet quarterly: The Chesterfield Valley Transportation District and the North Outer 40 Transportation Development District. Former City Administrator Michael Herring was the designee for both Districts and **Mr. Geisel** stated that he is currently the Executive Director of

the Chesterfield Valley TDD. A new individual must be designated to assume Mr. Herring's prior seat on the two TDDs. Mr. Geisel asked Council to consider designating himself for the replacement and further stated that Council has the ability to identify a different representative at any time.

Councilmember DeGroot made a motion to designate Mike Geisel to serve as the City's representative on both the Chesterfield Valley Transportation Development District and the North Outer 40 Transportation Development District. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGuinness and **passed by a voice vote of 3-0.**

Chair Hurt recommended that Mr. Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director/City Engineer, accompany Mr. Geisel to future TDD meetings in order to familiarize himself with the proceedings.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services for additional information on the Transportation Development District Board Designee.]

- A. POWER OF REVIEW: St Luke's Hospital Northwest Campus, Sign Package:** A request for a Sign Package to establish sign criteria for the St. Luke's Hospital Northwest Campus development located northwest of the intersection of South Woods Mill Road and Brookings Park Drive.

STAFF REPORT

Jessica Henry, Project Planner, stated the request is for a sign package for the St. Luke's Hospital Northwest Campus, which is a 38.28 acre campus with two existing buildings known as Building A and the Resource Center. The building currently under construction, Building B, is actually attached to the existing Building A and is therefore considered a single building under the Unified Development Code (UDC). In order to distinguish the two buildings, the Applicant is requesting to have signage on both buildings, as well as several directional signs throughout the site.

Ms. Henry gave a PowerPoint presentation depicting the existing signage and proposed signage for the site and discussed the following types of signage:

Attached Wall Signage

The Applicant proposes the following:

- Two signs for Building B: St. Luke's Outpatient Center Building B.
- The two existing signs on Building A will have an additional line of text denoting "Building A."
- Two "informational" wall signs are proposed at the main entry to each building.
- One future donor wall sign is proposed for Building B.

The additional line of text on Building A signs will increase the total size to 383 sq. ft. which exceeds the maximum outline area of 300 sq. ft. permitted under the UDC. However, proportionally, this is only approximately 2% of the building façade, which is significantly less than the typical sign allowance of 5% of a building elevation.

Monument Signage

There are two existing monument signs on the campus. The Applicant is proposing an additional sign at the intersection of St. Luke's Center Drive and South Woods Mill Road. This sign would identify the entrance drive to the new Building B and would match the other two large monument signs on the site which were approved by the City Council in 2007.

Directional Signage

The applicant is proposing six new 4 ft. directional signs for the site. The UDC allows directional signs to be up to 6 ft. tall and does not limit the number of directional signs allowed for a site.

Temporary Signage

The Applicant is proposing multiple temporary construction signs that will be removed as the project progresses. These proposed signs are already present on the active construction site and they are not illuminated.

Other Signage

All other requested signage that is not specifically called out in the Sign Package will be as allowed as per UDC regulations.

Discussion

Councilmember DeGroot asked what type of patient would be utilizing the facility. The Applicant, Don Miller of St. Luke's Hospital, stated it will be an outpatient facility serving people of all ages and disabilities. When asked about the purpose of the signage, the Applicant stated signage is largely directional and the building signs are for identification purposes.

Councilmember McGuinness introduced residents Donald and Mary Ann Mueth who have expressed concern about the proposed signage.

Mr. Don Mueth, 177 Cedar Bridge Court, stated they live directly east of the new building in Ladue Farm Estates.

Mr. Mueth then stated that the architectural drawings did not depict the true size of the new structure. In previous illustrations, it appeared that Building B and the existing Building A were the same size. In reality, the new building appears larger, taller and closer to 141 than the existing building. As such, it rises above the tree line and is visible from every aspect throughout the subdivision.

Mr. Mueth stated that he realizes there is nothing that can be done about the building now, however, he is concerned about the lighted signage on top of Building B. If the current construction lighting is any indication of what the new lighted signs will be like, the residents "will have to wear sunglasses as they exit their homes in the evening". He believes that the drawings understate the signage just as the drawings understated the building size. He has concerns that any lighted sign at the top of this new structure is going to be "loud, distracting and disruptive for their subdivision and will continue to degrade the natural beauty of the neighborhood".

He pointed out that there is already a large lighted sign marking the campus on both sides of 141 and believes that most people will not be looking to the top of an 80 ft. tall building for directions. He stated that appropriate signage, at eye level, directing patients to Building A or Building B should be enough because once patients turn into the campus, they will only see eye-level signage. He feels that the only purpose for putting a sign up at the top of Building B and increasing the signage on Building A is for marketing purposes, essentially turning buildings into billboards.

Mr. Mueth pleaded with the Committee and Applicant to not allow “another giant, lighted sign on top of the new giant building and to consider the surrounding residents who are forced to live with these structures 24 hours a day, 7 days a week”.

Ms. Henry again explained the location of the existing and proposed building signage. Chair Hurt confirmed that Mr. Mueth’s main concern is with illumination of the two proposed signs on Building B.

A discussion took place regarding the perception that Building B is larger than Building A due to a difference in grade. The Applicant clarified that Building B is identical in height to Building A and is two-thirds the size of the existing building. Mr. Mueth pointed out that Building A is set back and is turned perpendicular to the road so it is not as visible as Building B.

In response to Councilmember DeGroot’s question, Planning Commission Chair Stanley Proctor replied that Mr. and Mrs. Mueth were not in attendance at the Planning Commission meeting nor were any other residents present. He stated the Planning Commission unanimously approved the sign package.

In response to concerns regarding the construction lighting currently present on site, Mr. Geisel stated the current construction lighting is more intense lighting and should not be compared to the proposed lighting because construction lighting is not shielded nor internally lit.

There was further discussion regarding the intended purpose of signage for Building B, illumination of the signage, facility usage, and possible solutions to alleviate Mr. Mueth’s concerns. As a compromise, Councilmember McGuinness suggested recommending the sign package without illumination of the two proposed signs on top of Building B.

Councilmember McGuinness made a motion to forward St. Luke’s Hospital Northwest Campus Sign Package, without illumination of the signage at the top of Building B, to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember DeGroot and passed by a voice vote of 3-0.

Councilmembers DeGroot and McGuinness suggested that Mr. and Mrs. Mueth be present at the June 6, 2016 City Council meeting, as well as other residents from the area, to voice their concerns.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, for additional information on St. Luke’s Hospital Northwest Campus Sign Package.]

IV. PROJECT UPDATES

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services provided the following Project Updates:

Ward 1:

- Warwick on White Road – Zoned R2. Site Plan for 10 new homes is under review.
- Friendship Village – Conditional Use Permit to increase number of Independent Living & Nursing units, and increase height. Public Hearing was held January 25, 2016. Review continuing with Staff and preparation of CUP

- Monsanto Chesterfield Campus - Zoning map amendment to the "UC" District. Public Hearing was August 10, 2015. Staff is currently working with the applicant, MoDOT and St. Louis County on necessary language for the Attachment A.

Ward 2:

- I-Fly - Proposed at 595 Chesterfield Center. Site Development Plan currently under review with Staff.
- 40 West Luxury Living-KU Development w/Mills Properties - Change of zoning to R-6 (14.2 acres). Public Hearing scheduled for May 23, 2016. This is a straight zoning with no Preliminary Plan or Attachment A required. (See "**Discussion**" below for more information)

Ward 4:

- Brew Hub - On hold per Applicant's request.
- Arbors at Wilmas Farm, a McBride development - Zoned for 47 single family lots on 50 acres. Site Development Plan under review with Staff.

Other development projects under review at various stages (including construction inspection) include, but are not limited to:

Ward 1:

- Brattle Hill improvement plans
- Monsanto
- Spirit Energy – Starbucks SDP
- St Luke's Hospital sign package
- Willows at Brooking Park amended SDP
- Panera Bread-Four Seasons
- 116 S Greentrails

Ward 2:

- Highland on Conway improvement plans/construction inspection
- Bonhomme Presbyterian Church amended site plan
- The Grove in Chesterfield Village
- JCCA amended site plan
- Kraus Farm Center improvement plans
- 40 West Luxury Living

Ward 3:

- Schoettler Grove construction inspection & amended elevations

Ward 4:

- Holiday Inn Express
- Long Road Crossing Ameren Substation
- Bur Oaks improvement plans
- Johnny Y Properties ordinance amendment
- Gander Mountain amended light plan
- Edison Express amended SDSP & grading
- Autozone - SDCP and SDSP
- Arbors at Kehrs Mill

- Kemp Auto Museum ordinance amendment
- Chesterfield Airport Service
- Courtyard by Marriott

Discussion

40 West Luxury Living

Ms. Nassif reported that Staff has received 400 letters of support and 18 letters in opposition for this proposed development. The Comprehensive Plan designates the area to be residential, multi-family. The current zoning districts in the area are R2, R1, and Non-Urban.

Chair Hurt gave background information on the area noting that when the City was first being planned, it was anticipated that most of the area surrounding the proposed 40 West Luxury Living site would be commercial buildings with a phased situation to multi-family. Since that time, residential development has taken place in the area so there may be discussions about density of the proposed site. Chair Hurt noted that the developer is following the Master Plan and asking for only one access on the Outer Road, which has MoDOT's approval.

Ms. Nassif reported that the developer has had numerous subdivision meetings but many residents are still opposed to the multi-family development. She then explained that the May 23rd Public Hearing is for the zoning only. If the zoning is not approved, all the site plan elements are moot – such as parking, lighting, architecture, trees, etc. Because this is a straight zoning, the development conditions are not negotiable as the Code already establishes all of the development conditions and requirements. She stated that with the R6 zoning, the developer would be permitted approximately 309 units on the site but that number does not exclude right-of-way and tree buffers. The developer has indicated that they want approximately 280 units.

Mr. Geisel pointed out that the Land Use Plan and Comprehensive Plan are what property owners and investors reference for their investment decisions. Ms. Nassif added that the Comprehensive Plan was created by the Planning Commission with a lot of input from a citizens committee, and then adopted by Council.

Chair Hurt stated that Schoettler Road includes both Ward 2 and Ward 3 residents and he has been receiving calls from Ward 3 residents expressing concerns about traffic congestion that may be generated from the proposed development.

Kraus Property

Chair Hurt reported that an interior road has been added to the plans without any caveats.

V. OTHER

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.