

MEMORANDUM



TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, April 19, 2012

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, April 19, 2012 in Conference Room 102/103.

In attendance were: **Chair Randy Logan** (Ward III); **Councilmember Matt Segal** (Ward I); **Councilmember G. Elliott Grissom** (Ward II); and **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bruce Geiger; Councilmember Barry Flachsbart (Ward I); Councilmember Derek Grier (Ward II); Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); Planning Commission Chair Amy Nolan; Planning Commissioner, Wendy Geckeler; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Mara Perry, Senior Planner; Kristian Corbin, Project Planner; and Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the March 8, 2012 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of March 8, 2012. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Selection of Officers and Committee Assignments

- Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee/Planning Commission Liaison

Councilmember Fults made a motion to select Councilmember Logan as Chair of the Planning & Public Works Committee/Planning Commission Liaison. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

- Vice-Chair of Planning & Public Works Committee

Councilmember Fults made a motion to select Councilmember Grissom as Vice-Chair of the Planning & Public Works Committee. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Segal and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

- Chesterfield Historic and Landmarks Preservation Committee

Councilmember Segal made a motion to select Councilmember Fults as Liaison to the Chesterfield Historic and Landmarks Preservation Committee. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

- Board of Adjustment

Councilmember Grissom made a motion to select Councilmember Segal as Liaison to the Board of Adjustment. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Logan and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

Rombachs Farm Report

Before proceeding with discussion related to the Chesterfield Blue Valley project, Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director explained to the audience that the reports of a stormwater channel going through Rombachs Farm are false. There are no plans at this time as to how the stormwater will be addressed for the proposed outlet mall. It is a requirement of the developer to address positive stormwater drainage, either to the east or to the west of the development. It is a private matter between the developer and the property owner from whom he will need easements. The City is not condemning any property or requiring that it go through Rombachs Farm. She added that Staff met with the Rombachs and they are aware of the situation.

The Committee then agreed to change the agenda order and place discussion of Item F. next on the agenda.

F. Ladue Road acceptance

STAFF REPORT

Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer presenting on behalf of Mike Geisel, stated that St. Louis County is requesting that the City assume responsibility for Ladue Road within Chesterfield City Limits. In conjunction with this transfer, the County would accept the remainder of South Woods Mill Road, that section which is currently maintained by the City of Chesterfield which runs from Brooking Park south to the Town and Country city limits. This segment of Ladue Road is approximately 1.3 miles in length.

Purchase of additional equipment for snow removal

Directly related to the addition of Ladue and as well as the recent acceptance of Schoettler Road, is the need to address the snow removal response for collector roadways as priority routes. Roads such as Ladue and Schoettler are wider, require more frequent attention and consume larger quantities of deicing materials. As such, it is imperative that such roads be addressed with equipment that is heavier and has a larger payload. In this case, we recommend that such routes be addressed with a tandem axle dump truck. The City currently has one tandem truck in the fleet. Staff finds it necessary to purchase a second tandem dump truck, plow and salt spreader for maintenance of Schoettler Road and Ladue Road. Typically, the City replaces such trucks on an 8-year interval. A tandem dump truck costs approximately \$145,000 equipped with a snow plow and salt spreader. Under the present five year budget scenario, replacement is scheduled for 2014. For analysis purposes, the annualized cost for adding the second tandem dump truck is approximately \$18,000.

Additional maintenance costs

The City faces nominal additional annual operations cost for things such as; deicing materials, sign repair/replacements, street sweeping, and related costs. Staff projects the cumulative annual increase in operating expenditures to be less than \$10,000.

Funding

Ladue Road is scheduled for a federally funded \$1.75 million pavement rehabilitation project in 2014 funded by St. Louis County. St. Louis County is willing to assign the \$1.4 million in federal project funding from the East/West Gateway Council as well as the \$350,000 local match funding as a part of the transfer to the City of Chesterfield. The City would simply prioritize the work segments and incorporate the roadway into the capital reconstruction program. The City is staffed and equipped to manage the federally funded road project with existing project managers. Ladue Road qualifies for federal transportation funds; therefore, we could expect a 20% local match for future long-term capital replacement or reconstruction work.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Herring stated that he fully supports the recommendation. With St. Louis County securing the grant funds and the agreement to provide a local match, there is no cost to the City to complete \$1.75 million worth of upgrades upon acceptance of the road.

Councilmember Grissom asked why St. Louis County requested that the City accept responsibility of Ladue Road. Mr. McGownd responded that the 141 extension initiated the project.

Councilmember Segal stated that City maintained roadways are kept to higher standards for snow removal and street maintenance than roads maintained by St. Louis County. He felt that acceptance of Ladue Road is a “home run” and would give back to the residents.

Mr. Herring clarified Staff’s recommendation that City Council authorize an appropriation of \$145,000 from General Fund – Fund Reserves to cover the cost of purchasing an

additional tandem truck. The additional annual maintenance cost of a \$10,000 increase would be discussed in the 2013 budget.

Chair Logan asked 1) when the City would be accepting the responsibility of Ladue Road, and 2) if the City is prepared to accept a road that is in poor condition. Mr. Herring replied that Staff did not have any concerns with the conditions of the roadway. He added acceptance of the roadway is subject to approval by City Council. Upon approval by City Council, Staff would then notify St. Louis County that the City is in favor of moving forward with the project.

Councilmember Flachsbar felt that since Ladue Road is a critical “collector road”, he fully supports the recommendation.

It was noted that the improvements will occur in 2014 upon funding approval. Mr. Herring further explained the process and timeline to complete the project. It was noted by Chair Logan that by moving forward any and all road repairs would be the responsibility of the City. Mr. McGownd pointed out that Ladue Road qualifies for Federal Funding.

Councilmember Segal made a motion recommending that the City accept transfer responsibility from St. Louis County of Ladue Road and authorizes the purchase of one (1) additional tandem dump truck, snow plow and salt spreader at an estimated cost of \$145,000 from General Fund – Fund Reserves and to forward to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks, for additional information on Ladue Road acceptance].

- B. P.Z. 03-2012 Lungo Estates (1458 Kehrs Mill Rd):** A request for a zoning map amendment from “NU” Non-Urban District to “E1” Estate One-Acre District for a 3.01 acre tract of land located on the east side of Kehrs Mill Road south of Country Side Manor Parkway (18U120035).

STAFF REPORT

Kristian Corbin, Project Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and the surrounding area. Mr. Corbin stated the following:

The purpose of this request is to utilize the “E1” Estate One-Acre District minimum lot size requirement to allow for the lot to be reduced to two (2) acres in size by a Boundary Adjustment Plat that will be submitted in the future. The Boundary Adjustment Plat will not create any new lots; it will only shift the existing property line.

This property is surrounded by compatible zoning districts.

- “E2” Estates Two Acre District is to the north
- “R1” Residence Districts are to the east and south
- “NU” Non-Urban District is located to the west.

Currently, there is a house on the structure that was built in 1977. This petition is a typical straight zoning. All requirements will come from the "E1" District regulations with no modifications or exceptions.

This project was on for Public Hearing on March 26, 2012 and had its vote meeting the same evening. There were no outstanding issues from that meeting and a recommendation for approval was approved by a vote of 9 - 0 by Planning Commission.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Chair Nolan stated that there were no issues brought forth to the Planning Commission relative to the zoning request.

Councilmember Grissom made a motion to forward P.Z. 03-2012 Lungo Estates (1458 Kehrs Mill Rd) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0.**

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the May 7, 2012 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, for additional information on P.Z. 03-2012 Lungo Estates (1458 Kehrs Mill Rd)].

- C. Chesterfield Commons Seven, Lot 2 (Valvoline):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for a 0.977 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the north side of Chesterfield Airport Road, one-half mile west of the corner of Chesterfield Airport Road and Boone's Crossing.

STAFF REPORT

Mara Perry, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and the surrounding area. Ms. Perry stated the following:

The property was rezoned in 2008 and included three (3) lots. During the rezoning process, City Council requested Automatic Power of Review.

The plan was reviewed at the Planning Commission meeting held on March 26, 2012. At that meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 9 – 0 with no amendments or recommendations.

Traffic/Access and Circulation

There are no vehicular access points allowed from Chesterfield Airport Road. Access is located along Arnage and runs along a new connection with Arnage Boulevard. Cross access to the adjacent lot to the east, that is yet to be developed, is being provided for ease of circulation.

Landscaping

The Landscape Plan meets all requirements of the City of Chesterfield Tree Preservation and Landscape Requirements. As part of the Metropolitan Sewer District requirements, water quality features, such as rain gardens, are being included.

Architectural Elevations

The project was reviewed by the Architectural Review Board on March 8, 2012 with minor recommendations. Those issues were identified and addressed prior to submittal to Planning Commission.

Lighting

No architectural or decorative fixtures are proposed for the development.

Signage

Signage is approved under a separate process and will be reviewed against the approved Sign Package for the development.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Chair Nolan stated that there were no issues brought forth to the Planning Commission relative to the request.

Councilmember Segal made a motion to forward Chesterfield Commons Seven, Lot 2 (Valvoline) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 - 0.**

Note: This is a Site Development Section Plan which requires a voice vote at the May 7, 2012 City Council Meeting.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, for additional information on Chesterfield Commons Seven, Lot 2 (Valvoline)].

- D. Chesterfield Blue Valley:** A Second Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Conceptual Landscape Plan and Conceptual Lighting Plan and Tree Preservation Plan for a 137.6 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the north side of Olive Street Road, west of its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road.

Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director then explained the separation of the two projects on the Agenda related to Chesterfield Blue Valley:

- Chesterfield Blue Valley is simply a Conceptual Plan for the overall area with no architectural details, signage, etc. The Concept Plan requires approval before a Site Development Section Plan.
- Chesterfield Blue Valley, Proposed Lot 10 (Premium Outlets) is the first Site Development Section Plan for the development which includes all the site details for that lot.

Ms. Nassif then commended Ms. Perry on her exemplary work on the presentation and requested that questions be held until completion of each presentation.

STAFF REPORT

Mara Perry, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and the surrounding area. Ms. Perry stated the following:

Land Use and Zoning History of Subject Site

The site was zoned “NU” Non-Urban District by St. Louis County prior to the incorporation of the City of Chesterfield. The areas located north of the Chesterfield Monarch Levee also included a “FP” Flood Plain Overlay in addition to the “NU” Non-Urban District zoning classification. The 55.8 acre, western portion of the Chesterfield Blue Valley development south of the levee was zoned “PC” Planned Commercial District in February of 2006 by the City of Chesterfield.

The development was originally zoned in two (2) pieces and then combined. In 2010, an additional six (6) acre tract of land was requested to be added to the overall site.

A Site Development Concept Plan for the roadways only was approved by City Council in 2008. This plan did not include the lots or landscaping. Additional amendments to that roadway plan were administratively approved in 2010.

Ms. Perry then pointed out that the Second Amended Site Development Concept Plan before the Committee is for the entire Concept Plan with all of the requirements being met for a concept plan.

Traffic/Access

The site is accessed by four (4) proposed entrances from Olive Street Road. Two (2) of those entrances will be signalized should it be warranted and two (2) will not be signalized. The main boulevard (Outlet Boulevard) in the development, which is one of the proposed signalized intersections, runs northwest through the development between the lots with a proposed future connection to the land to the west. The primary changes since the amendment of the original roadway are to the curvature of the road.

There is a dedication area proposed for the future right-of-way to accommodate the reconstruction of the Daniel Boone Bridge as provided by the St. Louis County Department of Highways and Traffic and the Missouri Department of Transportation traffic study. The traffic study identified where the dedication would be located.

Landmark Designation

A Chesterfield Landmark Designation has been identified on the plan in a conceptual location and can be escrowed with the subdivision improvements because the location cannot be specifically identified until the bridge design is completed.

Lighting

A Conceptual Lighting Plan identifies the required street lighting fixtures along the roadways in the development.

Landscaping

A Conceptual Landscape Plan identifies the preservation of a tree that was required per ordinance where a potential park would be located.

The development was approved for a modification to the Tree Manual for a 30-foot landscape buffer along Interstate 64 – Highway 40. The modification was approved based upon the Chesterfield Valley Master Stormwater Plan required conveyance ditch locations and the additional requirements to engineer the site to meet City Codes. Detailed landscape plans for each lot will be reviewed as the individual Site Development Section Plans are submitted.

The plan was reviewed at the Planning Commission meeting held on March 26, 2012. At that meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 9 – 0. This development has Automatic Power of Review.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Chair Nolan stated there were no concerns brought forth to the Planning Commission relative to the Concept Plan.

DISCUSSION

Chair Logan asked for confirmation that all of the changes presented are to the interior road only and not to any location of intersections. Ms. Perry responded that there is only a slight shift to an interior roadway. The interior road requirement of the cross section that was required for the traffic study is still in place.

Councilmember Segal made a motion to forward Chesterfield Blue Valley to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

Note: This is a Site Development Concept Plan which requires a voice vote at the May 7, 2012 City Council Meeting.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, for additional information on Chesterfield Blue Valley].

- E. Chesterfield Blue Valley, Proposed Lot 10 (Premium Outlets):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for a 50.72 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District in the northeast corner of the development located on the north side of Olive Street Road, west of its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road.

STAFF REPORT

Mara Perry, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and the surrounding area. Ms. Perry stated that new submittals from the Applicants have been received since the Planning Commission and are included in Staff's Report.

Proposed Lot 10 has frontage along Interstate 64/Highway 40 and is located just south of the levee. There will be no points of access onto the Interstate from the subject site.

The primary boulevard into the development will have two points of access; shared access and cross access will also be provided with the lot to the south of the site, as well as with one of the lots slightly to the west of the site. The request proposes 390,098 square feet in gross floor area.

Parking

Retail Center calculations were used to calculate the required parking for the site. The parking meets the City's requirements for *Retail Center* and does not exceed the City's maximum parking requirements. Some of the parking is located in an area that includes a seepage berm, which is 150 feet from the levee. Within the seepage berm, landscaping is not allowed to penetrate more than 18 inches so this area has less landscaping than other areas of the site.

Signage

The sign package is not being submitted at this time but the location of the monument signs are required to be shown on the plan, which are reviewed against the standard sign requirements. The plan shows two monument signs – one at each entry location, along with a third sign facing the Interstate. The plan also identifies the approximate location of the Chesterfield Landmark entrance sign.

Pedestrian Circulation

Sidewalks are required on both sides of all of the internal streets within the development. In order to meet ADA requirements, connections have been provided from the public sidewalk along the roadway into the development. A series of crosswalks have been included to allow shoppers to move from key locations in the development into the building pad.

Planning Commission had requested additional connections to the north area of the parking lot. Since the Planning Commission meeting, the Applicants have added five additional crosswalk locations to include: two (2) new pedestrian crosswalk locations along the north side of the development from the parking lot; one (1) additional crosswalk on the east; one (1) additional crosswalk on the west; and one (1) additional crosswalk on the south.

Landscape Plan

The Applicants were approved for a modification to the Tree Manual requirements for the 30-foot buffer. As a result, the Applicants had to demonstrate how they would provide other elements to the landscaping as part of the landscape plan modification.

The Landscape Plan was presented showing bushes along the edge of the parking lot; trees internal to the site; two trees in each parking lot island; rain garden and storm water elements down the spines of some of the parking areas; and a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees along the edges of the ring road.

A sight distance study was performed and due to the curvature of the road, along with the required speed on the road, it was determined that some of the street trees would present a sight distance issue. In order to prevent sight distance issues and still meet landscape requirements, the Applicants proposed decreasing the distance between the street trees which allows them to still provide the number of required trees along the frontage of the site.

The Ordinance requires 30% open space and the site provides 32% open space. In addition to the 32% open space, there is an internal hardscape area of 8%, along with areas within the pedestrian promenade that are open with a small roof structure, which is 1%.

The Architectural Review Board suggested that additional trees be planted inside the pedestrian promenade areas. The Applicants have provided additional ornamental trees within the requested areas. In addition, there are a number of rain garden water quality features scattered throughout the site, both in the parking lot area and building pad area.

Each of the service courts will have landscaping to buffer the 8-foot tall screen wall of the service courts.

Elevations

The exterior building materials will be comprised of brick and stone veneer, EIFS, smooth-face architectural metal, painted masonry wall with textured finish, metal trellis, vision glass in the aluminum storefronts and curtain walls, backlit decorative glass, canvas and metal awnings, and a metal roof.

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) had asked for additional materials to be provided, which were provided prior to the Planning Commission meeting. In addition, Staff and ARB asked that all the materials be identified, which has been done.

A brief review of the elevations was then presented.

Lighting

It was noted that the Staff Report to the Planning Commission included a chart identifying all the proposed lighting. Ms. Perry then provided information on all the lighting and the locations where they will be utilized.

It was noted that the parking lot fixtures are 33 feet in height and will be placed within the parking islands. Due to the two (2) trees in the parking islands, it has been determined that fixtures shorter than 33 feet would be blocked by the height and type of the trees required for the islands.

The plan was reviewed at the Planning Commission meeting held on April 9, 2012. At that meeting, a recommendation for approval passed by a vote of 9–0 with three

recommendations for amendments to the plans. The recommendations were as follows:

1. *Add additional pedestrian markings to insure a safe pedestrian path from the parking area to the inner ring road at the north side of the building closest to the levee.*

The Applicants have added 5 pedestrian crossing areas, for a total of 13.

2. *Additional plantings be considered after the Daniel Boone Bridge construction design is completed by MoDOT to be reviewed by Staff in accordance with the City Code.*

The Applicants have submitted a letter stating that they are open to having a discussion with MoDOT and the team that is hired for the Boone Bridge redesign to examine potential opportunities for adding plantings to the right-of-way.

3. *Limit the height of the towers to 45 feet.*

Based on the recommendation to reduce the heights of four (4) of the proposed towers to a maximum of 45 feet, the Applicants reviewed their design and submitted additional information with changes. Eight (8) areas of the elevations which exceeded 34 feet were reviewed and the table below shows the proposed heights.

Building	Tower Height (PC Submittal)	Tower Height (P&PW Submittal)	Height Reduction
1	40'-0"	38'-0"	-2'-0"
2	65'-0"	60'-0"	-5'-0"
3	50'-0"	45'-0"	-5'-0"
3	38'-0"	38'-0"	0
3	34'-6"	34'-6"	0
4	45'-0"	40'-0"	-5'-0"
5	50'-0"	45'-0"	-5'-0"
6	50'-0"	50'-0"	0

The Applicants have provided new architectural elevations which show the buildings in relation to one another along the full north, south, east and west elevations of the site. A review of the new elevations was then presented by Ms. Perry, along with a fly-through aerial perspective of the development.

DISCUSSION

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Chair Amy Nolan stated that the Petitioner has addressed two (2) of the issues raised by Planning Commission and has made an attempt to address the issue related to the tower heights but noted that two (2) towers are still taller than 45 feet.

Right-of-Way Plantings

Discussion was held regarding the language proposed by Planning Commission which states: *that additional plantings be considered after bridge construction design is completed by MoDOT to be reviewed by Staff in accordance with the City Code.*

Councilmember Fults did not feel that the language would require the Applicants to install any additional landscaping – only that they would discuss the matter with MoDOT. Ms. Nassif pointed out that it may not be possible to add any more landscaping depending on the bridge design. She added that City Code requires more plantings in this area than what is currently being proposed.

Ms. Nassif suggested that the motion recommend approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design, as presented to the Planning & Planning Works Committee on April 19, 2012, with the following amendment:

Additional plantings will be required after construction design of the new bridge is complete by MoDOT as described in a letter from the Applicants to the Committee dated April 13, 2012.

Height of Towers

Councilmember Segal indicated that he does not have any issue with a tower height of 65 feet, as long as it meets the aviation guidelines of Spirit Airport. He, however, feels that the amount of signage needs to be limited on any 65-foot tower.

Planning Chair Nolan stated that the Planning Commission's concern was that towers taller than 45 feet could look like beacons resembling a lighthouse. In addition, the Commission wants to reduce the amount of space for signage on the towers.

Councilmember Flachsbart suggested a compromise of accepting the reduced tower heights proposed by the Petitioner; but restricting signs to a height of not more than 45 feet. Ms. Nassif stated that such a restriction could be a part of the Sign Package once it is submitted. It was noted that the Sign Package is approved by Planning Commission but Council can request to see it.

Mayor Geiger stated that he does not have issues with the 65-foot height from a scale perspective and is comfortable with the heights currently being proposed by the Petitioner.

Utilities

It was noted that the utilities servicing the site are all underground. In addition, all other items – such as dumpsters, etc. - are within service courts or screened by parapets.

The buildings will be completely sprinkled and will be reviewed as if it were an enclosed mall.

Water Features

Councilmember Flachsbart stated he was very pleased to see water features, which he feels is an excellent addition to the site.

Public Art

Councilmember Flachsbart noted that there is a provision for public art and would like to see a strong commitment to this matter.

Building Materials

Councilmember Fults expressed her concern over the “lack of variable materials”. She felt that there is too much EIFS with no variations to “whole sides of the building”. She will not agree to a 60-foot tower if it is all EIFS.

Ms. Perry stated that ARB had asked for additional identification of materials, as well as some additional articulation. The elevations reviewed by ARB had locations for where potential signage would go. Staff had the Petitioner remove all of the potential locations and identify the materials that would be used should a sign not be approved. These elevations were presented to Planning Commission. ARB was fine with the other mix of materials presented. She noted that the materials include EIFS and a painted masonry wall with a textured finish.

Ms. Nassif stated that the City’s Architectural Review Standards do not allow blank facades. She suggested that the Committee point out specific areas of concern on the renderings stating that if signage is not approved in those areas, additional building materials and colors are to be added to those facades.

(Councilmember Segal left the meeting at this point at 6:43 p.m.)

The Committee then reviewed the proposed elevations and discussed their concerns. Councilmember Fults specifically expressed her concern about the lack of materials utilized.

Councilmember Flachsbart stated he is not opposed to the revised tower heights but agrees that there is a need for more variety of materials on the walls.

Councilmember Grissom agreed with breaking up the walls with a variety of materials but felt that it is difficult to envision without the signage being shown. Ms. Nassif stated that the Petitioner had shown areas for the potential locations of signs but Staff asked that they be removed because there was more signage than she felt would be approved.

After further discussion, Ms. Nassif suggested that the Petitioner work with their Architectural Team to break up the façade either vertically or horizontally on the large stretches of blank facades and towers.

Petitioner’s Response

Steven Dworkin from Simon Property Group stated that they spent a great amount of time with their design professionals to put forth an aesthetically-pleasing design. They will meet with their architects and review the facades to decide where additional materials could be added. They feel there is currently a great amount of articulation with the varying tower heights. Mr. Dworkin stated that if all the towers were at 45 feet the site would be “boring”; and if 45 feet is the highest tower allowed with shorter towers at 25 feet, the scale would “be all off as this is an enormous site”. They feel the proposed tower heights are appropriate and not out of scale.

With respect to the concern expressed about the towers appearing as “beacons”, he noted that the lighting is very soft and will not have a beacon effect.

Mr. Dworkin added that signage is very important and once it is added to the walls, it changes the entire look of the building. The signage will also affect where the requested architectural features can be placed. They are open to showing prospective places for signage since it is an integral part of the architectural design.

Chair Logan then asked about the status of the sign package. Mr. Dworkin indicated that they have asked their design professionals to begin putting a sign package together.

Councilmember Grissom asked the Petitioner if they would leave the tower at 60 feet high if signage is not permitted above 45 feet. It was then noted that the 60 foot tower has glass at the top of it, so the signage will be limited in height. Mr. Dworkin indicated that the tower element is important and acts as the center. He added that after they know the location of the signs, they will come back in and design around those areas where signs will not be located.

Ms. Nassif pointed out that at the ARB meeting she mentioned that all the areas for signage would probably not be approved. At that time, she suggested that the Petitioner “dress up the elevations” so that if signage is not approved for them, there would be some architectural breaks.

Mr. Dworkin stated that they have a vested interest in making sure the buildings look their best, and they will address the Committee’s concerns with their design team.

Councilmember Grissom made a motion to hold Chesterfield Blue Valley, Proposed Lot 10 (Premium Outlets) until the May 10, 2012 Committee Meeting with direction to the Petitioner that the Committee would like to see additional architectural articulation including materials and colors for all facades. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and passed by a voice vote of 3-0.

G. Request to study erosion control issues – Councilmember Flachsbart

Councilmember Fults made a motion to hold the discussion until the next Planning & Public Works Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and passed by a voice vote of 3 - 0.

IV. OTHER

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.