PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
APRIL 27, 2020

VIRTUAL MEETING

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT	ABSENT
Commissioner Allison Harris	Commissioner Gene Schenberg
Commissioner John Marino	
Commissioner Debbie Midgley	
Commissioner James Rosenauer	
Commissioner Jane Staniforth	
Commissioner Guy Tilman	
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg	
Chair Merrell Hansen	

Mayor Bob Nation
Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Council Liaison
Mr. Michael Lindgren, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning
Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

Chair Hansen acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Council Liaison; and Councilmember Michael Moore, Ward III.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS –

Commissioner Wuennenberg read the "Opening Comments" for the Public Hearing.

A. P.Z. 03-2020 Downtown Chesterfield (Wildhorse Village LP): An ordinance amending City of Chesterfield Ordinance 3023 to amend the legal description and development criteria for an existing PC&R Planned Commercial and Residence District for a 99.6 acre tract of land located west and southwest of the intersection of U.S. Highway 40/I-64 and Chesterfield Parkway West (18T620185, 18T620206, 18T620053, 18T630272, 18T630195, 18T640248, 18T640260, 18T640271, 18T620174, 18T640183, 18S410240, 18S410206, 18S430259, 18S430282, 18T640336, 17T320158, 18T640237, 18T640259, 18T620064, 17T320169).

STAFF PRESENTATION:
Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area. Mr. Knight then provided the following information about the subject site:

Comprehensive Plan
The subject site falls within Ward 2 of the City of Chesterfield, with a land use designation of *Urban Core*. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates appropriate land uses of the Urban Core as *high-density residential, retail, and/or office*. The proposed uses and densities are consistent with the uses and density approved in the PC&R zoning district.

Mr. Knight reviewed the Comprehensive Plan Policies related to the Urban Core, highlighting the following points of the various policies:

- The urban core should serve as the physical and visual focus for the City.
- Higher-density residential should be in or near the Urban Core.
- Horizontal and vertical integration of uses is encouraged.
- There should be the development of a "City Center" and attention should be given to providing first-floor pedestrian activities and architectural design.
- There should be a variety of motorized and non-motorized transportation choices.
- The use of parking structures is encouraged.

History of the Site

Historical Date	Approved Ordinance	Description	Result
March 2008	2449	Consolidation of six zoning districts into one PC&R district creating Downtown Chesterfield	Subsequent site plans were never submitted under zoning regulations of Ordinance 2449
February 2018	2990	Text amendment removing 2.9 acres and adding 3.4 acres	Provided necessary legal description change to facilitate the development for the Aventura development to the north
November 2018	3023	Incorporated (0.4) acres into the PC&R district and amended development criteria	Allowed for separate concept plans north of Wild Horse Creek Road (Category C) and south of Wild Horse Creek Road (Categories A&B).

Request
The Petitioner's request is twofold:

- Add land into the PC&R district; and
- Change the development requirements in the existing ordinance

No changes are being requested in regards to the types of uses or density.

Performance Standards
Mr. Knight reviewed the Minimum Standards of Design, as outlined in the Unified Development Code, and then explained the Performance Standards defined in the site's governing ordinance. It was noted that the governing ordinance has performance standards defined by three categories – A, B and C. These standards are used to create development patterns, such as:

- Category A – Main Street
- Category B – Mixed Use
- Category C – Area north of Wild Horse Creek Road

Mr. Knight also explained that the different categories each have specific requirements defined in the ordinance regarding items such as: building placement, building volume, floor height, façade, outdoor space, building function, and streetscape.

Request 1
The first request is to incorporate the 0.6 acre tract of land zoned 'PC' into the 'PC&R' District. When the 98 acres were originally zoned to the 'PC&R' District, this parcel was under a separate ownership group and therefore not included in the 2008 zoning request.

Request 2
The second request proposes amendments to the development criteria, as noted below:

- **Remove** spacing requirement of 6-15 feet between buildings.
- **Change** building floor heights from 12-25 feet to 30 feet for first story height.
- **Change** building floor heights from 8-18 feet to 30 feet for upper story height.
- **Exclude** perimeter roads (*Wild Horse Creek Road, Burkhardt Place Drive, and Chesterfield Parkway West)* from the street façade requirement of "65% of the buildings in the Main Street category shall be to the build-to line".
- **Remove** requirement for commercial on the first floor and allow stand-alone residential, office, parking garage and commercial buildings.
- **Replace** Exhibit 1 with a new Exhibit showing separate streetscapes for Burkhardt Place, Lake Front Street, Wild Horse Creek Road, and Chesterfield Parkway, and showing connecting roads from Lake Front Street to Wild Horse Creek Road and Chesterfield Parkway.

Mr. Knight explained that one of the most significant changes in the streetscapes relates to the build-to line. The build-to line on Lake Front Street is similar to the existing exhibit with a build-to line of 0-15 feet; the other three streetscapes have much larger build-to lines of 0-125 feet for Burkhardt Place; and 0-200 feet for Wild Horse Creek Road and Chesterfield Parkway.

Preliminary Plan
The Preliminary Plan submitted is essentially an Outboundary Survey of the 99 acres.

Updated Narrative
The Applicant has provided an updated narrative since meeting packets were prepared. Mr. Knight noted some of the highlights from the narrative:

- A dynamic engaging landscape of boardwalks, trails and gathering places is planned around the lake edge.

- The northwest lake edge will be activated by multi-family residential buildings that evolve into a collection of commercial spaces on the North Lake Edge; a mixed-use innovation hub will build off the lakefront amenities.
- Office buildings animated at the ground level by active uses such as cafés, shops, and fitness facilities.
- On the Southeast Lake edge will be a town center, along with Residential hills populated with townhomes and live-work units in a diverse set of sizes and configurations.

Summary

- The Applicant has met all filing requirements and has two requests to the existing ordinance.
- Staff will continue to coordinate with the Applicant on the red-line changes in Category A, and how they impact Categories B & C.
- Staff will continue to coordinate with the Applicant on the interaction with the Riparian Trail.
- Staff will continue to work with the Applicant on updating the narrative in the zoning request.

Staff also proposes a change to remove the sign package requirement for every lot. It was noted that the requirement for each lot to have its own set of signage rules and regulations would be time extensive and counter-productive.

Discussion

Responding to questions, Mr. Knight stated that for both Categories A and B the maximum height allowed is 150 feet and the minimum height is 25 feet.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Stock gave a PowerPoint presentation providing the following information:

Master Development Statement

Mr. Stock read the entire Master Development Statement highlighted in Mr. Knight's presentation regarding the updated narrative.

Site Plan

The site plan shows the 99 acres governed by Ordinance 3023 PC&R District, and includes:

- The Wildhorse Development of 20,000 sq. ft. of small shop retail, Ruth Chris Steak House, and multi-family residential, and is the first phase of the master plan mixed-use development;
- The proposed AC Hotel;
- Areas 2 and 3 of the PC&R Ordinance 3023, currently undeveloped; and
- Area 1 of the PC&R Ordinance 3023 consisting of 77.835 acres with a 12.5 acre lake.

Request

The request is to add approximately 0.6 acres to Area 1 for a total area of 78.412 acres.

Topography
The existing topography presents challenges to developing the site with a high point elevation of 574 feet at the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road and Chesterfield Parkway. This 574 elevation is:

- 63 feet above the lake;
- 26 feet above the access coming in at Chesterfield Parkway (*elevation 548*); and
- 84 feet above Burkhardt Place Drive and the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road (*elevation 490)*.

Street Network Exhibit
Mr. Stock presented an exhibit showing the proposed street network and noted the following:

- Wild Horse Creek Road is an east-west minor arterial road with some sections 5-6 lanes wide.
- Chesterfield Parkway West is a circulatory major roadway of 4-5 lanes wide.
- Burkhardt Place is currently a 2-lane road proposed as a 3-lane road.
- Old Chesterfield Road is a north-south 2-lane minor collector road.

The exhibit depicts the proposed Urban Main Street, Urban Mixed-Use Street, the Burkhardt Place extension, and the internal street round-about serving the Wild Horse and AC Hotel developments.

Site Development Concept Plan
Mr. Stock stated that the Site Development Concept Plan previously submitted to the City shows a network of roads. There has been a fundamental change since the plan was submitted with respect to the placement of Main Street. The road has been moved further away from the lake with buildings proposed between Chesterfield Parkway and the lake. Mr. Stock provided details regarding setbacks, access points, signalized intersections, and development challenges regarding the elevation differences on the site.

Renderings
A color rendering was presented reflective of a mixed-use development with retail and activated uses on the first floor with residential above. Streetscapes show bi-directional single lanes divided by landscaped medians with parallel parking, pedestrian walkways, and lush landscaping.

The rendering of the Main Street development shows a series of sitting walls, terraced topography, large walkways, accessibility around the lake, and engagement with the buildings beyond the lake.

Text Amendments Requested
<u>Category A – Urban Main Street Development Pattern</u>
The requested text amendments are shown in **bold**, as follows:

- Build to Line location: as defined by the streetscape shown in Exhibit 1 **& Exhibit 2**

- Space between buildings: attached or ~~6-15 feet if detached.~~ Not yet defined, but *Not less than 6 ft. but greater than 15 ft. may be necessary in certain areas of the development.*

- Building floor heights:

- First story height shall be 12~~-25 feet~~ **30 feet.**
- Upper story height 8~~-18 feet~~ **30 feet.**

(Allows for greater flexibility in building design and implementation of unique architectural design.)

- Building's street façade: **Exclude Wildhorse Creek Road, Burkhardt Place, and Chesterfield Parkway West.** *(The design intention is to place buildings meeting this façade requirement along Urban Main Street and urban Mixed-Use Street, similar to the design modification granted in 2019 for Area 2.)*

- Building function:
  - Retail commercial: ~~required on first story~~; permitted on upper stories. *(Allows flexibility to provide retail and active uses on certain buildings, not 100% of all buildings throughout the 78 acres.)*
  - Office commercial: permitted on ~~upper~~ **all** stories.
  - Residential: permitted on ~~upper~~ **all** stories.

Category B – Urban Mixed-Use Development Pattern

- Build to Line location: as defined by the streetscape shown in Exhibit 1 **& Exhibit 2**

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Stock outlined how the proposed plan is consistent with the following Plan Policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Urban Core: *The Master Plan Development will provide the physical and visual focus as defined by Urban Core.*
- Higher Density Residential in Urban Core: *The development will provide integrated and diverse new multiple-family residential.*
- Mixed-Use Development: *This development will provide and meet the policy for Mixed-Use Development.*
- City Center: *This development, along with the lake, its associated amenities, architectural design, art/sculptures provides for the 'City Center Component'.*
- Multi-modal Transportation Choices: *This development will provide for the multi-modal transportation choices along with the emphasis on pedestrian connectivity.*
- Parking Structures: *This development will provide multiple integrated parking structures.*

Discussion

Responding to questions, Mr. Stock provided the following information.

Burkhardt Place Drive

The Applicant will continue to work with Staff regarding the development of Burkhardt Place Drive with respect to parking and sidewalks.

Lake Area

The lake and the immediate land around it will be available for public use. There will be boardwalks, walkways, and/or bike paths around the entire lake.

Parking

There will be parking structures integrated into the development to provide public parking, along with parallel parking, and perpendicular parking along the streets. Councilmember Moore stated that he had the desire for the Downtown concept to be

less auto-centric than what the proposed plan appears to be; that we should be creative with parking vs. an abundance of surface parking.

First-Floor Retail
Chair Hansen stated that while she acknowledges there won't be first-floor retail in all buildings, there is a desire to see a higher percentage of first-floor retail structures than large commercial office buildings. Mr. Stock pointed out that not every building can have retail – some ground-level businesses may be cafes or fitness centers rather than the conventional small retail shop. He added that they will continue to work with staff to establish what the retail threshold will be.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR:
1. Ms. Jan Misuraca, 1414 Sycamore Manor Drive, Chesterfield, MO – representing the Citizens for Developing Downtown Chesterfield.

Ms. Misuraca stated that the Citizens for Developing Downtown Chesterfield is a group of approximately 130 members formed to support the responsible development of the area known as Downtown Chesterfield and the Mall. She noted that the developer met with their leadership group to discuss the project and shared their updated narrative.

They support the developer's narrative with all the proposed amenities, but do not support all the requested ordinance revisions. They have concerns that while what the developer is describing in the narrative could be built using the proposed revised ordinance, other types of developments could also be built, most of which their organization would oppose.

2. Ms. Kelli Unnerstall, 14649 Summer Blossom Lane, Chesterfield, MO - representing the Citizens for Developing Downtown Chesterfield.

Ms. Unnerstall outlined the group's concerns regarding the following six revisions to the existing ordinance:

1. Under "building placement", the developer wishes to delete the requirement that there be 6-15 ft between buildings if detached. *They would support this revision except on Lake Front Road. Exceptions could be made for parks or public gathering spaces.*
2. Under "building function", the developer wishes to delete the requirement that there be retail commercial on the first story. *They support this change except on Lake Front Road.*
3. Under "building function", the developer wants to remove the requirement that parking structures must have ground floor retail commercial along street frontage. *They do not support this change on Lake Front Rd. They would only support this change for other roads if the ordinance spells out that surface parking lots in front of buildings are not permitted and that parking structures be placed behind buildings or that they are designed in such a way that they blend in with the architecture of the area. An example of this would be the type of parking structures found at Country Club Plaza in Kansas City.*
4. Exhibit 1 dated 4/3/20. *They do not support a build to line going out to 125 feet on Burkhardt Place and 200 feet on Wild Horse Creek Road and Chesterfield Parkway. They are concerned that this could lead to a development pattern that had surface parking lots facing Burkhard Place, Wild Horse Creek Road, and Chesterfield Parkway. They want to be flexible with the build to line so the*

topography can be accommodated, but want the ordinance to be written in such a way that surface parking in front of buildings is prohibited or, at minimum, severely restricted.

5. Amenities. *Many amenities are mentioned in the developer's narrative that they would like to see written into the ordinance including trails, a small amphitheater, or other community gathering spot, boardwalks, trails around the lake, and a boathouse.*
6. Lake Front Drive. *They are concerned about having buildings on both sides for the entire length of Lake Front Drive. The amount of building on the lake side of Lake Front Drive should be minimized as much as is feasible. Having the lake as the focal point for everyone, including the citizens, needs to be considered.*

3. Mr. Roy Bosenbecker, 1920 Lanchester Court, Chesterfield, MO - representing the Citizens for Developing Downtown Chesterfield.

Mr. Bosenbecker stated that Citizens for Developing Downtown Chesterfield have several concerns about the development in the area around the lake aside from the requested ordinance revisions. They would like the development to adhere to the following principles:

- Reduced housing density
- Increased percentage of owner occupied housing
- Cap on the number of rental units
- Include a high percentage of green space and public gathering spaces
- Use high-end architecture and materials

Their primary concern is that the ordinance changes could result in a single use, auto-centric development with parking lots fronting buildings, which would not promote public use of the lake and surrounding area. They are committed to ensuring that the intent of the existing ordinance is maintained: this area should include a downtown or town center character with a public use lake at its center. Speaker noted that they fully support Mr. Tegethoff's vision as outlined in the narrative describing Wildhorse Village, and is grateful that the developer is open to input.

Discussion

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked for clarification on the group's concern regarding the Applicant's request to delete the 6-15 foot separation between buildings. Ms. Unnerstall explained that they want to retain the character of what was intended when the ordinance was written. With the 6-15 foot separation requirement being removed, they have concerns that it could potentially take on the character of what already exists along the Parkway rather than a town center with parking behind buildings or integrated parking structures.

Ms. Unnerstall noted that they are not in favor of the revised street layout – they want the streets closer to the lake so the lake can remain open. They would also like to see buildings and residences on only one side of the street, similar to what was drawn up during the master planning process.

Commissioner Wuennenberg pointed out that if buildings are on both sides of the street, a patio could be on the back side of a café overlooking the lake.

SPEAKERS - NEUTRAL:
1. Ms. Maureen Trompeter, 9 Summer Blossom Court, Chesterfield, MO.

Ms. Trompeter expressed her concern about buildings on both sides of Lake Front Street. The master plan, which was a result of the residents' input from the master planning process, depicted all the buildings on one side of the street. She asked that consideration be given to eliminating, or limiting the number of buildings on the lake side of Lake Front Street.

REBUTTAL:
Mr. Jeff Tegethoff, President, Pearl Capital Management, and owner of the subject site.

Mr. Tegethoff thanked everyone for their attendance and input. He explained that while some of the renderings depicted in the master plan were based on input from residents, they were done without geotechnical or topographical studies being done. It was essentially done as if the site were a flat surface. They have been challenged with trying to accomplish the vision laid out in the narrative with the site constraints and the benefits of the site. They do not intend to put buildings on both sides of Lake Front Street all the way around it – but there are areas where they feel it makes sense to engage the lake.

Mr. Stock pointed out that buildings 6-12 feet apart from each other continuously on the site leaves no view corridors into the site; he believes that there needs to be flexibility on the separation between the buildings to allow for view corridors. He also noted that this development is a balance between public and private, and that offices are entitled to lake views. The Applicant will continue to work with the input from the residents, elected officials, Commission, and staff.

Discussion
Commissioner Tilman requested the following items be provided to the Commission:
- A drawing that shows how the proposal will be put together to integrate the A and B-designated areas.
- Drawings or photos depicting typical types of buildings - both the single-use and mixed-use.
- The types of single-use residential buildings being proposed – such as brownstone buildings, lake cottages, etc.
- Examples of live/work units.
- View of what the internal streets will look like – such as width, areas where on-street parking will be incorporated, the design of sidewalks and trails and where they will be located, etc.

Chair Hansen and Commissioner Tilman also requested more time to review such documents, if at all possible.

Commissioner Rosenauer stated that it's premature to prepare a site plan at this time; the Commission should review the information provided to justify the changes the Applicant is requesting. He also pointed out that there was an agreement that the design aspects of this development should tie in with the current development being constructed on the other side of Wild Horse Creek Road.

Commissioner Wuennenberg read the Closing Comments for the Public Hearing.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the April 13, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Staniforth, Commissioner Tilman, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Rosenauer, Chair Hansen

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS - None

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

It was reported that a meeting of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Committee will be scheduled in the near future.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

_____

Gene Schenberg, Secretary