

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator

FROM: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning

JW

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, May 5, 2022



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, May 5, 2022 in Conference Room 101.

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

Also in attendance were: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning; Chris Dietz, 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 March 10, 2022 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of March 10, 2022. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Monachella and passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS None.

III. NEW BUSINESS

At the request of Chair Hurt, it was agreed to move New Business Item III.A. to the end of the agenda.

B. Selection of Officers and Committee Assignments

Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee/Planning Commission Liaison
Vice Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee
Chesterfield Historic and Landmarks Preservation Committee
Board of Adjustment

Councilmember Monachella made a motion recommending the following appointments:

Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee – Councilmember Hurt
Planning Commission Liaison – Councilmembers Hurt and Hansen
Vice Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee – Councilmember Monachella

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

- C. P.Z. 19-2021 2030 Clarkson Road (Srilakshmi Properties, LLC):** A request for a zoning map amendment from the “NU” Non-Urban District to “R5” Residential District for 2.84 acres located on the north side of Old Clarkson Road and southeast side of Clarkson Road (20T640517). (Ward 3)

STAFF PRESENTATION

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, presented the request for a zoning map amendment from the “NU” Non-Urban District to “R5” Residential District. The applicant intends to build four or five single-family residential homes on the property.

A Public Hearing was held on February 14, 2022 at which time the Planning Commission raised multiple issues regarding the following:

- Legal description
- Storm water
- Buildable area
- Traffic generation

These issues and the applicant’s response to each were discussed at the April 11, 2022 Planning Commission meeting where the request was unanimously approved 7-0.

All rezoning requirements have been met and Staff has no further comments.

DISCUSSION

Chair Hurt indicated that his concerns are related to site plan issues and not the rezoning itself. He noted that the 30’ buffer is very important to the residents. They are concerned with water run-off on the western side. That area is currently draining well and, therefore, they request that the current configuration is maintained and not altered in any way. The other area of concern is related to the addition of the required sidewalk on the southern edge of the buffer. Since the sidewalk would not connect to any other sidewalk, they would prefer to eliminate the requirement. If it were to be installed, it would interfere with the 30’ landscape buffer.

There was some discussion regarding cleaning up the underbrush on the western end and replacing the honeysuckle with other vegetation.

Councilmember Hansen made a motion to forward **P.Z. 19-2021 2030 Clarkson Road (Srilakshmi Properties, LLC)** to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the May 16, 2022 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 19-2021 2030 Clarkson Road (Srilakshmi Properties, LLC).]

- D. P.Z. 02-2022: River Crossings (Holman Motorcars St. Louis):** A request to amend development criteria within a site-specific ordinance for a 15.841-acre tract of land zoned “PC”—Planned Commercial District located northeast of the intersection of Chesterfield Airport Road and Public Works Drive (17U24066; 17U240077; 17U240088; 17U52006; 17U520072; 17U520171; 17U520182; 17U520193). (Ward

STAFF PRESENTATION

Chris Dietz, Planner, presented the project request for an Ordinance Amendment to the Sign Criteria embedded within the Governing Ordinance of the River Crossing subdivision (Ordinance 2566). While this Ordinance amendment affects the entire River Crossings development, the request is intended specifically for Lots 7 and 8.

The applicant is seeking to amend Ordinance 2566 as follows:

1. Increase the size and height limits of the Monument Signage allowed along I-64.
2. Increase the wall signage quantity and size allowance, specifically for Lots 7 and 8.
3. Remove the total square footage limit for all combined monument signage.

A Public Hearing was held on March 14, 2022, during which the Planning Commission raised the issue of impact and appropriateness of the requested monument sign along I-64. The applicant provided a response letter which was discussed in detail at the April 11, 2022 Planning Commission meeting. At that time, the request was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0 with the following amendments:

1. The proposed criteria for Building Signage is to be amended to apply only to Lots 7 and 8 (9 and 1 Arnage Boulevard, respectively).
2. The proposed criteria for the I-64 Monument Sign is amended to permit a sign that shall not exceed 50 square feet in outline area and 6 feet in height.**

**This is currently permitted in the Ordinance, however, the applicant initially requested a height of 100 square feet in outline area and 20 feet in height.

Mr. Dietz identified the proposed changes in building signage:

Lots 1-6 – Existing Sign Criteria

- Any tenant, or sole building occupant shall be permitted one wall sign on any two exterior walls. The wall sign shall not exceed 5% of the wall area on which it is attached. No business sign shall exceed 300 square feet.

Proposed Sign Criteria for Lots 7 and 8

Lot 7

- **North Elevation**—Maximum of two (2) signs, **when combined**, not to exceed 5% of the area of that elevation.
- **South Elevation**— Maximum of two (2) signs, **when combined**, not to exceed 5% of the area of that elevation.

- **West Elevation**— Maximum of two (2) signs, **when combined**, not to exceed 5% of the area of that elevation.
- **East Elevation**— Maximum of two (2) signs, **when combined**, not to exceed **8%** of the area of that elevation.

Lot 8

- **North Elevation**— Maximum of two (2) signs, **when combined**, not to exceed 5% of the area of that elevation.
- **South Elevation**—Maximum of two (2) signs, **when combined**, not to exceed 5% of the area of that elevation.
- **East Elevation**—Maximum of two (2) signs, **when combined**, not to exceed 5% of the area of that elevation.
- **West Elevation**— Two (2) signs per elevation, whose cumulative area is not to exceed **8%** of that elevation. Additionally, five (5) logo signs will be permitted at the vehicle service entrance. The areas of each of these signs shall count toward the 8% maximum area requirement for this elevation.

Mr. Dietz clarified that an error was made in the Committee's packet regarding wall sign criteria area calculation for Lots 7 and 8 and confirmed that the packet's proposed criteria should read as listed above.

DISCUSSION

Since the Planning Commission voted to not change the criteria for the monument sign, Chair Hurt stated that he would like to address the petitioner's request in two parts: the monument sign, and the proposed building signage.

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to approve the Planning Commission's acceptance of the monument sign as written in the Ordinance 2566. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Monachella and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

In response to Councilmember Monachella's question, Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, clarified that the current Governing Ordinance permits one sign on any two facades. He stated that the applicant is not the original owner. They acquired the property about two years ago with all the current signage on the building. They have since learned that one of the signs on Lot 7 does not appear to have been approved by the City. Their intent in modifying the sign criteria is to ensure they are compliant with City code, and to request additional signage for other brands who want their identity on the buildings.

Councilmember Monachella inquired as to why the east elevation on Lot 7 is not to exceed 8% of that elevation instead of 5%. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, stated that Lamborghini has changed their sign criteria, which requires a larger sign that would exceed the 5%. The applicant is attempting to meet Lamborghini's new sign criteria requirement. They will be replacing the existing sign with a new one. With regard to Lot 8, the increase from 5% to 8% on the west elevation is to accommodate the five logo signs and future automobile brands.

Councilmember Mastorakos expressed her belief that there are too many signs. She counted six car brands that are sold and serviced on Lot 8, and with the signage that fronts the interstate on both Lots 7 and 8, she feels there are more than enough signs. If they are trying to attract drivers

on the interstate, the six-foot monument sign should suffice. She also stated that the proposed signs on the eastern façade of Lot 8 would be totally blocked by a wooded area and would not be visible to the public. However, she does understand the need for directional signs for the service entrance.

Councilmember Hansen stated that the Planning Commission's decision was predicated not on content but for the ease of locating a particular brand of car. Informational signs are helpful to find the service entrance and these signs are not intended for the general public on I-64, but only for the users of this site. This property is unique given the fact that it is sequestered on its own. The Planning Commission felt that the number of signs were appropriate considering that some individual car brands require a certain amount of brand recognition.

Chair Hurt stated that he feels the request is too much. Directional signs are needed for the service area but these types of cars are not an impulse buy. If you want to purchase one of these high-end vehicles, you will seek out the dealership. The City recently approved a sign package for Land Rover/Jaguar which is located to the west of this property. Their sign package follows the Code. They are allowed 5% of signage for each of two facades, however, they are allowed to split the 5% between two signs on one façade, which is acceptable. The City needs to treat everyone the same. In this instance, the applicant could not submit a Sign Package because it would be in violation of the Governing Ordinance so they are requesting an Ordinance amendment.

Chair Hurt made a motion to amend the Planning Commission's recommendation as follows: The wall sign criteria for Lots 7 and 8 is amended to permit a maximum of two (2) signs on any two (2) facades, when combined, not to exceed 5% of the area of that elevation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Monachella.

Discussion After the Motion

Councilmember Mastorakos inquired as to the number of automobile brands they sell versus how many brands they service.

To provide further input, Chair Hurt requested that a representative from the developer speak.

Matt Kennan, Regional Real Estate Manager for Holman Automotive, stated that they currently sell six brands of automobiles but they service several other automobiles that they do not sell. They provide a very highly-specialized service facility for several different high-end automobiles, and have requested an increase in signage to accommodate for future growth. If they would acquire additional brands in the future, additional signage would be required to accommodate those brands. High-end car manufacturers are very particular about their sign criteria. If the manufacturer cannot have its logo on a building, the dealership could be lost. They have requested 8% in order to accommodate Lamborghini's new sign criteria, which exceeds the 5% maximum. A sign revision for this property is a very cumbersome process and since the Ordinance needs to be amended, they are trying to incorporate for future growth.

Mr. Kennan further stated that Land Rover/Jaguar sells hundreds of one brand while Holman Automotive may sell eight to ten Lotus' and 18 Rolls Royce's' in one year. He compared their dealership to a small strip center for automobiles. If they were a strip center, each tenant would be allowed to have a sign. Each of the manufacturers are not considered separate tenants because they operate as a dealership representing many brands. This is an unusual application and their request for signage doesn't adhere to a big car dealership. They have received consent from the nearby hotel owner and they have not received any negative feedback from any of the

owners in the development. Since they are situated off the main road, he would hope that they are viewed as a boutique strip center for high-end automobiles. They are not comparable to a normal automobile dealership. Their cars are not parked outside due to possible weather damage, vandalism or theft. The five logo signs along the service area on Lot 8 are very small and cannot be seen unless you are on that driveway. They intend for those logo signs to be part of the blanket 8% on that wall and not five individual signs. They do not want to change any signage without permits and that is why they are here.

Councilmember Monachella suggested that only one sign reading "Service" could be used in lieu of several logo signs thus eliminating some of the visual clutter.

Councilmember Hansen stated that she is generally not in favor of multiple signs, however, every situation can be a bit unique. This site is unique and sequestered in its own area. She respects the manner in which they are dealing with it. She does feel comfortable with multiple logo signs, however, one place to limit signage would be in the service area where one sign could be used. However, she hopes that they could maintain the number of individual logo signs for the benefit of the business and the user. She felt it makes sense for this unique property.

The above motion to amend the Planning Commissions' recommendation was **passed by a voice vote of 3-1** with Councilmember Hansen voting nay.

Councilmember Monachella made a motion to forward P.Z. 02-2022: River Crossings (Holman Motorcars St. Louis), as amended, to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Chair Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 3-1** with Councilmember Hansen voting nay.

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the May 16, 2022 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 02-2022: River Crossings (Holman Motorcars St. Louis).]

A. Planning Commission Nominee Interview

Chair Hurt introduced Planning Commission nominee Michael Congemi.

Mr. Congemi stated that he has had a life-long interest in being involved in governmental history. His father was a Berkeley city councilman for 18 to 20 years so he grew up being exposed to local government.

After his retirement from active employment, about a year and a half ago, he began to attend Council meetings and has gotten to know the Mayor and several Councilmembers. Since he attended so many meetings, he was asked if he wanted to participate in a more formal way. So when the Planning Commission opening occurred, he agreed to serve. A few days ago, he met individually with the Mayor and Merrell Hansen to discuss what the job would entail. They each pointed out the great deal of preparation that is required before each Commission meeting and the importance of being prepared for each meeting. He then realized that from a family perspective, he was not in a position to do the preparation work, therefore, he stated he would not be able to accept the position at this time. However, he indicated that he would be open to serving on another Committee that would not require as much preparation work.

Councilmember Hansen spoke highly of Mr. Congemi and stated that he would have been a perfect candidate for the Planning Commission. She also stated that she hoped that he would be able to serve on one of the other citizen committees.

Councilmember Mastorakos concurred and stated that he is a rarity. He is curious and interested, and does not come with any ax to grind or an agenda.

It was the general consensus of the Committee to accept his withdrawal.

IV. OTHER - None

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.