

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
MARCH 28, 2011**

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

ABSENT

Mr. David Banks
Mr. Bruce DeGroot
Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Ms. Amy Nolan
Mr. Stanley Proctor
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Michael Watson
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg
Chairman G. Elliot Grissom

Councilmember Connie Fults, Acting Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works & Parks
Mr. Shawn Seymour, Senior Planner
Ms. Susan Mueller, Principal Engineer
Mr. Justin Wyse, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – All

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Grissom acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Connie Fults, Acting Council Liaison; Councilmember Matt Segal, Ward I; and Councilmember Bruce Geiger, Ward II.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Geckeler made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 14, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Proctor and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 with 1 abstention from Commissioner Puyear.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. P.Z. 11-2010 & P.Z. 12-2010 Chesterfield Senior Living (Plan Provisions, LLC):

Petitioner:

Mr. Brandon Harp, Principal at Civil Engineering Design Consultants representing the Petitioner, 11402 Gravois Road, St. Louis, MO addressed questions raised during the preceding Workshop Session:

- **Why is there an area of the bluff currently cleared in the vicinity of the storm water detention on the northern part of the property?**

This area was a natural drainage path of a larger tributary area that was heavily eroded. There was a concentrated flow in this heavily wooded area causing trees to fall and exposing roots. The property owner did some grading of the area to try and stabilize it. A permit was granted by the City to anchor and stabilize the slope. They will be re-foresting as many areas as possible throughout the whole bluff area.

- **Why is the walking trail not a paved surface?**

This trail has always been planned as a mulched walking/hiking nature trail. The residents of the independent living facility (Building B on the west side of the site) will be able to utilize the trail.

They had previously proposed connecting this trail to a future City trail to be used as a possible trailhead. After discussions with City Staff, it was determined that the subject trail is not an ideal area for crossing the railroad tracks. Subsequently, the Petitioner no longer plans on connecting the trail to a future City trail system.

- **Parking on the property:**

The Site Plan shows 120 parking spaces, which meets the City's parking requirement of one (1) parking space per unit for the proposed 120 units. The office complex currently approved for this site also has 120 parking spaces for the 30,000 square feet of office.

- **Residential-look of the facility:**

The residential-look of the proposed facility is very important and the Owner is committed to this idea.

Speakers in Opposition:

Ms. Renee Heney, 1513 Honey Locust Court, Chesterfield, MO stated she is speaking on behalf of all the homeowners of the Wild Horse Creek Road Association, which represents ten subdivisions starting at the corner of Long Road and Wild Horse Creek Road with Windridge Estates and going west to Tara and Wilderness – Phases 1 and 2. The Association includes about 750 homeowners:

- They are still very concerned about the proposed density of the site.
- In 2008, City Council approved 30,000 square feet of office for the site vs. the proposed petition of over 100,000 square feet.
- She asked the Commission to recall that this is not the only parcel in the bowtie area. If the petition is approved at 100,000 square feet, it could be “times ten for the rest of the bowtie if this is approved at this amount of density”.

City Attorney Heggie asked if the Association favors a residential-type use such as this in the bowtie area vs. a commercial use such as the neighborhood office. Ms. Heney replied that they “definitely favor residential use – they think it is a very viable use of that property”.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND SIGNS - None

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 11-2010 Chesterfield Senior Living (Plan Provisions, LLC):** A request for a change of zoning from a “PC” Planned Commercial District to an “R-4” Residence District for an 8.04 acre tract of land located north of Wild Horse Creek Road and west of Long Road (18V510138).

Mr. Justin Wyse, Project Planner gave a history of the site noting that the site was originally zoned “NU” Non-Urban District by St. Louis County in 1965. Since then, the following petitions have been filed for this site:

- **P.Z. 13-2004 Vision Ventures LLC (Wildhorse Executive Center)** was submitted in 2004 requesting a change of zoning from “NU” Non-Urban to “PC” Planned Commercial for 10.243 acres, which included the current subject site as well as the parcel immediately to the south. That petition proposed six, single story office buildings (two buildings on front phase and four on rear phase) with a 56,544 square foot gross floor area and 61% open space. The Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 5-3 and forwarded it on to the Planning & Zoning Committee. At that time, the Planning & Zoning Committee expressed concerns over the future development of the area and ultimately denied the request citing issues of compatibility and traffic impact.

Shortly after this denial, the City passed a moratorium on any development in the bowtie area. The Planning & Zoning Committee directed the Comprehensive

Plan Committee of the Planning Commission to clearly define the *Office Campus* designation, along with defining criteria for the *Office Campus* designation. T

A large study was then undertaken, which focused on land use, noise and traffic in the area. After a lengthy process, the Comprehensive Plan was amended with amendments to the Future Land Use Map with a recommendation for:

- *One-Acre Residential* on the eastern part of the bowtie;
- *Neighborhood Office* for all properties within 1,920 feet of the runway on the western part of the bowtie; and
- *One-half Acre Residential* for all properties outside of the 1,920-foot designation on the western part of the bowtie.

The Plan Policies were amended and created a special sub-area for the Wild Horse Creek Road area. The Zoning Ordinance was also amended with the creation of the “WH” Wild Horse Overlay District, which incorporated the goals of the Comprehensive Plan into the zoning regulations.

- **P.Z. 10-2006 Plan Provisions, LLC (Wildhorse Child Care Center)** was submitted in 2006 requesting a change of zoning for the southern portion of the property from “NU” Non-Urban District to “E 1/2”-Acre Residence District. That petition proposed a 12,000 sq. ft. single story child care center. The request was approved and the site is currently constructed.
- **P.Z. 28-2006 Chesterfield Neighborhood Office Park (17665 Wildhorse Creek Rd)** was submitted later in 2006 requesting a change of zoning for the northern portion of the property from “NU” Non-Urban to “PC” Planned Commercial with the ‘WH’ Wild Horse Overlay for 8.04 acres. That petition proposed four, single-story office buildings of 12,000 sq. ft. each (48,000 total sq. ft.) with 57% open space.

The Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 8-1 with the following modifications:

- Up to 10,000 sq. ft. per building (40,000 total sq. ft.); and
- Modification to the parking requirement of the “WH” Wild Horse Overlay District

The Planning and Zoning Committee recommended approval by a vote of 3-1 with the following modifications:

- Maximum 5,000 sq. ft. footprint per building; and
- Maximum 30,000 total sq. ft. for the development

The City Council approved the petition as recommend by the Planning & Zoning Committee.

A Summary of the Zoning Requests was shown as in the table below:

Project	Use	DENSITY		Open Space	F.A.R.	
		Requested	Approved		Requested	Approved
P.Z. 13-2004*	Office	56,544 s.f.	Request denied	61%	0.127	n/a
P.Z. 10-2006	Daycare	12,000 s.f.	12,000.s.f.	51%	0.123	0.123
P.Z. 28-2006	Office	48,000 s.f.	30,000 s.f.	57%	0.145	0.091
P.Z. 11-2010	Residential	15 du/acre	---	---	---	---
P.Z. 12-2010**	Senior Living	120 du	---	55%	0.32	---

*F.A.R. does not remove the proposed right-of-way dedication.

**F.A.R. removes the proposed right-of-way dedication.

Mr. Wyse then explained the requests under the current petitions:

P.Z. 11-2010 Chesterfield Senior Living (Plan Provisions, LLC) originally requested a change of zoning from “PC” to “R-4” but has been subsequently amended to a request for “R-2”. If the Petitioner utilizes the “PUD” District, a senior living facility in an “R-2” District would be permitted a maximum of 120 units on the subject site, which is 15 units per acre.

The current action required for this petition is to determine whether the “R-2” designation is appropriate for the site.

The subject site is generally located in a residential context, which includes single-family residential homes with a few churches and schools in the area. The Landings at Spirit Valley Golf Course is located to the north of the site at the bottom of the bluffs.

The following table outlines the **Zoning Designations** of surrounding subdivisions compared to the proposed Chesterfield Senior Living project:

Subdivision	Zoning	Distance from Subject Site	Gross Density Permitted per Governing Ordinance (du/acre)
Wildhorse	R-1 PEU	~ 525 ft.	0.73
Greystone	R-1 PEU	~ 850 ft.	0.86
Tara at Wildhorse	R-1 PEU	~ 2,175 ft.	0.88
Windridge Estates	R-1 PEU	~ 2,400 ft.	0.69
Tara Estates	E-1	~ 3,075 ft.	0.81
Westland Acres	E ½	~ 4,450 ft.	0.97
Westchester Manor	E-3	~ 8,700 ft.	1.34
Wildhorse Springs	R-1 & R-2 PEU	~ 12,000 ft.	1.88
Chesterfield Senior Living (proposed)	R-2	n/a	2.90 *

* Maximum density permitted with minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates this site as *Neighborhood Office*, which includes *General, Dental, and Medical Office, excluding Surgical Centers* as appropriate uses.

DISCUSSION

In terms of gross density, City Attorney Heggie asked that Staff prepare calculations showing the number of units that could be approved to help lower the gross density number closer to 2 or 2.5. He also requested the same gross density calculation for some of the other senior living facilities within the City's boundaries.

Commissioner Geckeler asked for clarification on the height of the approved office buildings. Mr. Wyse replied that the height limitation approved by City Council was 45 feet (three stories) vs. a proposed one two-story building and a one three-story building.

- B. P.Z. 12-2010 Chesterfield Senior Living (Plan Provisions, LLC):** A request for a change of zoning from an "R-4" Residence District to a "PUD" Planned Unit Development District for an 8.04 acre tract of land located north of Wild Horse Creek Road and west of Long Road (18V510138).

The petition proposes a senior living facility with a maximum of 120 units in two buildings. One building is proposed to be two stories (Bldg B.) and one building is proposed to be three stories (Bldg A). The proposed maximum square footage is 105,000 square feet. Building A includes 11,000 square feet of a future building addition that is included in the 105,000 square feet. Building A includes the independent living beds and Building B includes the assisted living and nursing facilities.

Based off input from the last two meetings on this petition, the Petitioner has amended the request for permitted uses by omitting two of the uses and now only includes the following:

Permitted Uses

- (2)(i.) Nursing Homes and Group Homes for the Elderly

As laid out in the PUD District, the Petitioner also included several commercial uses, which Staff recommends be included as ancillary uses. As such, exterior entrances would not be allowed and all uses would have to be oriented towards the residents at the proposed facility. In the event that the nursing facility was no longer in business, the ancillary uses would not be permitted to operate independently. The following ancillary uses are being requested:

Ancillary Uses

- 6.A.(1.) Barber or Beauty Shops
- 6.A.(2.) Day Care Centers, Child
- 6.A.(3.) Drug Stores and Pharmacy
- 6.A.(4.) Grocery, Neighborhood
- 6.A.(5.) Laundromat and Dry Cleaning Establishment
- 6.A.(6.) Newspaper Stands
- 6.A.(7.) Restaurants, Sit Down and/or Outdoor Customer Area

Roadway Improvements

Roadway improvements include a plan for an east west loop road from Wildhorse Parkway to Greystone Manor Parkway.

Preservation of the Bluffs & Trail

The Petitioner has made significant changes regarding preservation of the bluffs. They have disbursed the storm water management and quality areas throughout the site.

The original trail was connected to the City's future levee trail but has been removed because the City is limited in the number of areas where ADA access across the railroad tracks can be provided. The trail is now shown as a private trail for the enjoyment of the residents of the proposed facility. This will not cause any disturbance to the bluff.

Open Space

The PUD District requires a minimum of 30% open space. The Petitioner is proposing 58% open space, which is approximately 45% if the bluffs are excluded in the open space calculations.

Buffer

The site includes a minimum 30-foot perimeter buffer around the entire site.

Density

The requested P.Z. 11-2010 is for an R-2 designation, which would allow a maximum of 15 dwelling units per acre totaling 120 dwelling units for a senior living facility. The PUD District has the ability to restrict the density if warranted.

Floor Area Ratio

The proposed plan shows a maximum of 105,000 square feet of building area, which far exceeds most of the other developments in the area. It was noted that Gateway Academy has 171,887 square feet of floor area; however, those buildings are located on nearly 32 acres of ground, which helps dissipate the building massing on the property.

The following table outlines the Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) of surrounding developments compared to the proposed Chesterfield Living Facility and compared to the subject site as presently approved.

Development	Land Use	Total Floor Area	Total Acres	F.A.R.
Bowtie (west of Deep Forest Dr.)	Residential & Non-Residential	70,919	85.42	0.02
Chesterfield Elementary and Park	School	61,629	22.59	0.06
Full Gospel Church	Church	16,460	4.16	0.09

Development	Land Use	Total Floor Area	Total Acres	F.A.R.
Gateway Academy	School	171,887	31.90	0.12
Greystone	Residential	650,005	108.85	0.14
Lawns of Distinction	Commercial	7,693	1.20	0.15
Miramonte	Residential	104,583	20.98	0.11
St. Thomas Evangelical Church of Gumbo	Church	3,709	18.35	0.005
Tara at Wildhorse	Residential	177,270	34.37	0.12
West County Christian Church	Church	40,431	14.81	0.06
Wildhorse	Residential	332,295	120.39	0.06
Wildhorse Creek Road Office	Office	2,135	1.47	0.03
Wildhorse Child Care Center	Child Care	12,000	2.26	0.12
<i>Subject Site as Approved by City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2378*</i>	<i>Neighborhood Office</i>	<i>30,000</i>	<i>7.58</i>	<i>0.09</i>
Proposed Chesterfield Senior Living	Senior Living	105,000	7.58	0.32

* Information based off approval, not based on constructed area

Proposed Buffering

In an effort to mitigate the square footage, the Petitioner is providing additional landscape buffering along the east west loop road, which includes a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees, as well as numerous evergreen shrubs. This landscaping will provide screening for the parking area and building.

Comp Plan Analysis

When the City amended the Comp Plan for this area, there were several plan policies created specifically for the Wild Horse Creek Road sub-area. Several of these Plan Policies that pertain to the subject petition are identified below:

- Plan Policy 11.2 *Maintenance of Wild Horse Creek Road Character* – The proposed building is located approximately 400-500 feet off of Wild Horse Creek Road and 10 feet lower in elevation. They have increased the landscaping to try and meet this Plan Policy.
- Plan Policy 11.6 *Preservation of Slopes* – The Petitioner is preserving a significantly more amount of the bluff than previously proposed.

- Plan Policy 11.8.1 *Building Style* – This project will be required to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board prior to construction and will be reviewed under residential standards.
- Plan Policy 11.8.2 *Open Space* – The Petitioner is attempting to meet this goal by providing 58% open space.

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates this site as *Neighborhood Office*.

DISCUSSION

Landscaping

Commissioner Geckeler asked if the Petitioner would be required to landscape the east west access road or whether the Petitioner is providing the proposed landscaping without it being required. Mr. Wyse replied that a 30-foot perimeter buffer, along with street trees, is required. The Petitioner is providing the required 30-foot buffer but is adding more landscaping to the density of the buffer than what is required. The proposal shows 13 trees that include sugar maples, red oaks, bald cypresses, and greenspire little leaf lindens, along with 3 flowering trees and 60 shrubs.

PUD

Commissioner Geckeler asked for clarification on what types of amenities the Petitioner is providing in exchange for the floor area ratio and density being requested. Mr. Wyse replied that this question would be better addressed by the Petitioner.

Senior Planner Shawn Seymour, substituting for the Planning & Development Services Director, then asked Mr. Wyse to read the Purpose Statement for the PUD District. Mr. Wyse read the following:

The purpose of the PUD District is to encourage flexibility to the density requirements and development standards of the zoning ordinance that will result in exceptional design, character, and quality of new homogenous and mixed use developments; to promote the most appropriate use of land; to facilitate the provision of streets and utilities; and to preserve the natural and scenic features and open space.

If the PUD is not appropriate for the site, Mr. Seymour asked if the site could utilize a Conditional Use Permit and whether the restrictive language and design standards included in a PUD ordinance could be written into a Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Wyse replied that a Conditional Use Permit could be utilized with restrictive language and design standards included.

Commissioner Nolan stated that if the PUD request is granted, her calculations show an extra five units per acre and asked for clarification. Mr. Wyse stated that this is due to the Petitioner's proposed dedication to the City of a .56-acre right-of-way. This does not get subtracted from their density calculations.

Walking Paths

Commissioner Nolan noted that within the details of the property, it is stated that there will be “gentle walking paths throughout”. Due to the amount of parking spaces and buildings being proposed, she questioned how walking paths will be incorporated into the plan.

Parking

Commissioner Nolan expressed concern that the amount of parking would increase if two beds are assigned to one room. If an event is scheduled, she does not think there will be enough parking to accommodate Staff and visitors, and has concerns that parking will be done along the east west road. Mr. Wyse stated that parking is not permitted along the east west loop road. He added that parking appears to be adequate based on similar developments in the area.

Commissioner Nolan also had concerns about the distance of some of the parking spaces from the buildings for residents who need assistance. Mr. Wyse stated that these types of issues would be reviewed at the Site Plan review.

Slope/Walking Trail

Commissioner Nolan felt that the slope is too steep for a walking trail. She had concerns that the integrity of the bluffs will be ruined by installing stairs to make the trails accessible to the residents. She suggested leaving the bluffs as they are without any trails.

Construction Equipment

Commissioner Nolan noted that the access point to the site is currently at Chesterfield Academy. She expressed concern that the construction equipment would affect traffic along Wild Horse Creek Road, and questioned how the equipment would access the site and where it would be parked.

Ms. Susan Mueller, Principal Engineer stated that from a construction perspective, she did not foresee any major concerns. Any large equipment and large material items would have to be brought in during non-peak hours of travel. Mr. Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works & Parks added that grading would be the first activity on the site. The overload equipment for the grading is only permitted by the State to come on site during off-hours – typically between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. At that time, they would construct the construction entrance which would allow them to park the construction equipment on-site. City ordinances preclude parking of any construction vehicles on public streets.

Floor Area Ratios

Commissioner Proctor asked Staff to provide a comparison of the floor area ratios with other senior living facilities within the City of Chesterfield. City Attorney Heggie requested that Staff also denote any senior living facilities within the Urban Core.

Mr. Harp was then invited to address any of the issues raised by the Commission.

Mr. Harp gave a comparison of the approved existing ordinance vs. the proposed petition as follows:

Description	Existing Ordinance	Proposed
Maximum Height	45 feet	3 stories/45 feet; 2 stories/30 feet
Open Space	57%	58%
Parking Spaces	120	120
Bluff Disturbance	Less bluff and woodlands are being disturbed under the proposed petition than what was shown on the Site Plan submitted under the existing ordinance. (It was noted that this Site Plan was <u>submitted</u>, but never <u>approved</u> by the City.)	

Mr. Harp noted that the density of a senior living facility is set as “units per acre” - not square footage. Other spaces within the facility help with the units – such as larger shared dining facilities, larger interior mechanical systems, etc – which add volume and square footage to the building. While the proposed buildings are on a larger scale than what would be seen in an office park, the space is used by all the different components in the building.

PUD vs. R-2 with a C.U.P.

The Petitioner is requesting a PUD vs. an R-2 with a Conditional Use Permit. They chose not to go with an R-2 and C.U.P. because it is their understanding that votes on the R-2 zoning and C.U.P. would be at separate meetings with possibly 15-30 days between the votes. They had concerns that the R-2 zoning could be approved and the C.U.P. denied. With the PUD, they can submit the two petitions concurrently and have votes on both at the same meeting.

Through discussions with Staff, they realize that the PUD is held at a higher standard than an R-2 with a C.U.P. so they will be required to give back more for this development. Mr. Harp then pointed out some of the highlights of the petition.

- Buildings have been positioned on the site to be centrally-located.
- Voluntary right-of-way dedication to the south.
- Preservation of the natural resources – the bluff and woodlands to the north.
- Green space has been mixed throughout the buildings – 45% open space excluding the bluff area; 58% open space with the bluff area.
- Requirements of the buffers have been met on the east, west, and south. There is a dramatically-increased buffer to the north due to the woodland area;
- Sixty (60) additional sea green junipers have been added to the 30-foot buffer on the south property line, which grow to about 8'x8'. This will further help minimize the scale of this building.

- The building sits about 10 feet lower than Wild Horse Creek Road. The 6-8' tall evergreen hedge along the front, the variety of different street trees, and the other required landscaping will minimize the presence of the building.
- They feel good residential-type architecture and blending in with the character of the neighborhood could be a "positive for a PUD credit". The building footprint shows a lot articulation – angled points, shadowed points, and creative rooflines.
- The property is next to the child care center, which the Owner feels is a nice environment for interaction between the different age groups of people.
- The walking trail is a private trail but they are agreeable to providing an easement for City use. They are also agreeable to dedicating it as a preservation area that will not be developed.
- Parking requirements of one space per unit is in excess of what is seen in other municipalities and St. Louis County for this type of mixed use. They feel very comfortable that the maximum of 120 spaces will provide adequate parking.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she would still like to see the density, square footage, and F.A.R. decreased. She pointed out the quality of materials used on the surrounding homes and stated that the proposed buildings will have to be in line with these homes with "high standards and high quality".

Mr. Harp stated that he has seen some preliminary sketches and they are of "extremely high quality". They are "more than happy to have additional requirements put into the architectural requirements of the Attachment A". Regarding square footage, the nursing home type component is based on units per acre. This type of use needs additional square footage to support the 120 units. The project would not be viable if the dwelling units/acre are substantially reduced.

Chair Grissom thanked Mr. Harp for working with Staff and noted the headway made on some of the issues. He summarized the Commission's concerns regarding the floor area ratio and density issues.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Michael Watson, Secretary