

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
APRIL 9, 2012**

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

ABSENT

Mr. Bruce DeGroot
Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Ms. Laura Lueking
Ms. Debbie Midgley
Mr. Stanley Proctor
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Michael Watson
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Amy Nolan

Mayor Bruce Geiger
Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner
Mr. Jeff Paskiewicz, Civil Engineer
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Nolan acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bruce Geiger; Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison; Councilmember Derek Grier, Ward II; and Councilmember Randy Logan, Ward III.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 26, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 with 1 abstention from Commissioner DeGroot.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Chesterfield Blue Valley, Proposed Lot 10 (Premium Outlets)

Petitioners:

1. Mr. Rusty Saunders, Landscape Architect for the project, Loomis Associates, 707 Spirit 40 Park Drive, Chesterfield, MO stated he was available for questions related to the Landscape Plan.

Discussion

Landscaping

Commissioner Geckeler referred to the storm water culvert running along Highway 40 and asked if the Petitioner would consider adding landscaping as a buffer between the highway and the culvert. Mr. Saunders replied that this is the area closest to the new bridge and noted that the grading in this area is undetermined at this point because the bridge and bridge approaches have not yet been designed. He added that there is landscape material in the area on the development side of the swale but they cannot commit to anything on the highway side at this time because they do not know how the area will grade out.

Commissioner Lueking stated that there is an additional right-of-way that has been withheld until the plans for the bridge come through and asked if the Petitioner would consider doing “something to dress up” this area after it is determined whether the right-of-way is needed. Mr. Saunders indicated that the Petitioner will have to review the situation at that time taking into consideration the design of the bridge and the approach of it. Since this is a MoDOT right-of-way, MoDOT will have to permit whatever is proposed. In addition, there are potentially some significant grade changes that could prohibit anything in this area. He understands the issue expressed but cannot offer any comment without having the final design.

2. Mr. Matt Pastula, Architect for the project, The Collaborative, Inc., 500 Madison Avenue, Toledo, OH stated he was available for questions.

Discussion

Pedestrian Access

Commissioner Watson referred to the levee side of the parking and asked why there is no pedestrian access in that area. Mr. Pastula replied that, in general,

the walk access is defined in those areas where ADA parking is proposed in order to cross over the loop road. Most of the time, visitors will be walking perpendicular from the parking areas down to the roadway to cross at that point. In addition, there will be a posted speed limit of 20-25 mph and the sign package will include signage indicating pedestrian crossing areas, which is basically the entire loop road.

Commissioner Watson pointed out that The Commons has pedestrian crossing areas designated through the use of cobblestone material and stop signs. Mr. Pastula stated that the walkways will be defined by either a stamped concrete or asphalt, or there will be a painted area in the walkway itself. In addition, the signage package will have potentials for stop signs and pedestrian areas.

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director clarified that sign packages do not include internal circulation traffic markings. She felt that the Planning Commission is asking whether the Petitioner would be opposed to adding a couple more areas of stamped concrete or pedestrian pavers to encourage safe circulation and crossing for pedestrians from the parking area to the sidewalk of the inner ring road. Mr. Pastula stated that the development would not be opposed to this.

Lighting

Commissioner Watson asked where the *Exhibitor Series* lights will be located. Mr. Pastula stated that these lights are in multiple areas. They are on the exterior of the buildings by the food court area at a lower pedestrian scale to give a “glowing effect”. They are also in the promenade area – where in some places the lights are located in the open, and in other areas there are roof overhangs. Ms. Nassif added that this lighting is all located internal to the buildings or within the pedestrian areas – they are not located around the exterior perimeter of the building or in the parking lot areas.

Commissioner Geckeler inquired as to the number of lighted towers proposed. Mr. Pastula stated that most of the towers above 35 feet (approximately 5 or 6) have a semi-transparent, glowing backlit effect and are internally lit. He noted that the towers have large overhang eaves of approximately 5-6 feet.

Service Courts

Chair Nolan expressed concern about the trash enclosure areas and wants to insure that they are not visible to pedestrians.

Towers

Commissioner Watson asked if there is a reason why some of the towers are so tall (50 feet and 65 feet high). Mr. Pastula replied that the height takes into consideration the signage that will eventually be placed on them. The height also is an architectural element to provide interest and appeal.

Commissioner Watson expressed concern that when the fog rolls in off the river, the light from the towers will illuminate the whole valley area. Mr. Pastula pointed out that their Ordinance allows for a maximum height of 65 feet, which is why the main tower is being proposed at that height. The lighting within the tower is very subdued and is meant to have a dim, glowing effect behind frosted glass. There will not be a projection of light shooting out towards anything.

Commissioner Lueking asked for clarification on the number of towers at 65 feet in height. It was noted that there is only one (1) tower at 65 feet; three (3) at 50 feet with the remainder of the towers being at 45, 38, and 34 feet.

Towers/Signage

Commissioner Watson asked whether all the towers will have signage upon them. Mr. Pastula stated that most of the towers will include signage. Ms. Nassif clarified that signage is not being approved at this time – the sign package will be submitted to the Department for review and then provided to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Watson asked for the height of the bridge at its exit compared to the 65-foot tower. Ms. Perry replied that the height of the bridge exit is 470 feet. Compared to the 65-foot tower, the bridge height is five (5) feet above the finished floor elevation of the buildings.

Commissioner Geckeler asked for clarification about lighting for wall signage. Ms. Nassif stated that any lighting added to signs will be part of the sign package. She noted that the original architectural renderings included all the areas where signage is proposed. At the Architectural Review Board meeting, she asked that these be removed because the sign package had not yet been submitted and approved. The color, size, location, and height of signage, along with any illumination, will be subject to review by Staff and the Commission. It was noted that the Light Plan does not propose any exterior wall lighting for uplighting signage; however, there is proposed uplighting for the architectural elements of the towers. It was also clarified that the Petitioner can request uplighting on the wall for signage as part of the sign package.

If signage is not approved for the tower, Councilmember Fults asked whether the Petitioner would still want a 65-foot tower. Mr. Pastula stated that he could not fully answer that question at this time. However, chances are there would still be a need for it for identity purposes from the highway.

Maximum Height

Councilmember Fults pointed out that the maximum height allowed was granted when the Blue Valley project was originally submitted with the idea of hotels being constructed. Ms. Nassif clarified that the Ordinance states that *the maximum height of buildings in the development shall be four stories or 65 feet*

as measured from existing grade. This was granted under the assumption that hotels would be built but there was no restriction placed on the use in coordination with the height. Senior Planner Mara Perry added that the Ordinance allows a couple of other lots in the development to go as tall as 75 feet, which was tied to what was assumed would be developed.

Towers/Lighting

Commissioner Watson expressed concern that the lighted, glassed towers will have a lighthouse effect.

Mr. Pastula confirmed that the towers will be lit, but would not be lit like a lighthouse. The fixture types proposed for the towers are not of a lighthouse type as they do not beam out. In addition, not all the towers have glass on all four sides, but it was confirmed that the 65-foot tower does have frosted glass on all four sides.

Speakers in Opposition:

Dr. Michael V. Garvey, Greenway Networks, Inc., 208 Pitman Hill, St. Charles, MO.

Dr. Garvey expressed concern about developing in the floodplain as he felt this is putting the City's "citizens and their property at risk". He stated that as a direct result of all the levees on the St. Louis County side, St. Charles is being flooded. He feels that the proposed development is being considered out of "pure greed".

City Attorney Heggie responded to Dr. Garvey's comments by stating that the City feels it has made some very wise investments in the infrastructure in the Valley. Dr. Garvey's characterization that what the City has done is "for greed" is incorrect. The City will generate very little in the way of sales tax revenue from the subject property and there is no property tax that comes to the City from this project so there is no element of greed in the City's decision.

Petitioners (cont'd.)

3. Mr. Stephen Coslik, CEO of Woodmont Company, 2100 West 7th Street, Fort Worth, TX stated he was available for any questions regarding the development.

Discussion

Hours of Operation

Commissioner Lueking noted that the original ordinance for Blue Valley does not include any hours of operation and asked for clarification regarding this. Ms. Nassif confirmed that there are no hours of operation restrictions, but the developer has the option of limiting the hours if so desired. The City cannot require any hour limitations through the City Code or through the site-specific ordinance.

4. Mr. Rhein Dabler, Senior Civil Engineer with Clayton Engineering, 11920 Westline Industrial Drive, Maryland Heights, MO stated that they are the civil engineers on the project and he was available for any questions regarding the development's streets, grading, storm and sanitary sewers, water and infrastructure.

Speakers in Favor

Mr. Dean Wolfe, Owner of Wolfe Properties, LLC – Manager of Chesterfield Blue Valley, LLC, 7711 Bonhomme Boulevard, Clayton, MO stated that Wolfe Properties has the balance of the 137 acres outside of the proposed project. He stated he was available to answer any questions which may relate to that.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- A. **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.

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 **Chesterfield Blue Valley, Proposed Lot 10 (Premium Outlets)**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Puyear.

Discussion

Commissioner Watson made a motion to amend the motion (1) to add additional pedestrian markings to insure safe pedestrian path from the parking area to the inner ring road at the north side of the building closest to the levee; and (2) that additional plantings be considered after bridge construction design is completed by MoDOT to be reviewed by Staff in accordance with the City Code.

Commissioners Proctor and Puyear accepted the amendments to the motion.

Commissioner DeGroot stated he wants to vote for the project, but will be voting "no" because of the height of the towers. He does not know if there is any reason for the height other than for signage.

Commissioner DeGroot then made a motion to amend the motion to limit the tower heights to 45 feet.

Noting that there are no restrictions on the hours of operation, Commissioner Geckeler inquired as to the hours of operation for the outlet mall located in

Orlando. Mr. Coslik replied that the typical hours of closure are between 9:00-10:00 p.m. but there are extended hours over the Thanksgiving weekend.

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked for clarification on the connection to the levee trail and whether a connection can be added. Mr. Jeff Paskiewicz, Civil Engineer, stated that access points to the levee are provided at Howell Island, the athletic complex, and the ice complex. Ms. Nassif added that when the trail was being designed with Great River Greenways, great care was taken as to the location and number of cuts into the levee, along with the distance between the cuts. At this point, Staff would recommend against any additional cuts into the levee.

Commissioner Wuennenberg feels that the development could become a “great gathering place” and expressed concern about safe passage from Howell Island to the development. It was noted that Howell Island is only about one-half mile from the development; however, Mr. Paskiewicz did not feel that a lot of people would be walking from the trailhead at Howell Island to the center. Ms. Nassif stated that if this does become an issue in the future, Staff could re-consider a cut into the levee. Mr. Paskiewicz added that as development progresses, the City will be requiring sidewalks along both sides of Olive Street Road and Eatherton Road.

Ms. Nassif then referred to the amendment to the motion made by Commissioner DeGroot regarding the height of the towers. She suggested that Staff be allowed to review the matter and work with the Petitioner before the next Planning & Public Works Committee meeting, which would allow further discussions at that time.

Commissioner DeGroot explained that he has concerns about the height and the appearance of the towers with signage on them, which he feels is out of character. Further, if signage isn’t included on the towers, he doesn’t feel they need to be that tall.

Chair Nolan asked for a second to Commissioner DeGroot’s motion to amend the motion to limit the height of the towers to 45 feet. Commissioner Wuennenberg seconded the motion. Commissioner Proctor did not accept the amendment to the motion.

City Attorney Heggie then explained that a separate vote is now needed for this amendment to the motion.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

**Aye: Commissioner Watson, Commissioner Wuennenberg,
Commissioner DeGroot, Commissioner Geckeler,
Commissioner Midgley, Chair Nolan**

**Nay: Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Proctor,
Commissioner Puyear**

The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 3.

The vote on the motion to approve, as amended by three amendments, was as follows:

**Aye: Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner DeGroot,
Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Lueking,
Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Proctor,
Commissioner Puyear, Commissioner Watson,
Chair Nolan**

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS - None

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS- None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Michael Watson, Secretary