

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator

FROM: Justin Wyse, Director of Planning **JW**

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, March 21, 2024



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, March 21, 2024 in Conference Room 101.

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

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bob Nation (Mayor Nation arrived at 6:13pm); Alyssa Ahner, Senior Planner; Theresa Barnicle, Recording Secretary; and George Stock, Engineer for Applicant.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the February 22, 2024 Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Mastorakos made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of February 22, 2024. The motion was seconded by **Councilmember Monachella** and **passed** by a voice vote of 3-0 with Councilmember Moore abstaining.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 01-2024 Carshield F.C. (Stock & Associates)**: An ordinance amendment to add an additional 16.32-acre tract land zoned "NU" Non-Urban District to an existing 16.58-acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District and modify development criteria (Ward 4).

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Alyssa Ahner, Senior Planner presented the proposal from Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers Inc., on behalf of Carshield F.C., for an ordinance amendment to add an additional 16.32-acre tract land zoned "NU" Non-Urban District to an existing 16.58-acre tract of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District and modify development criteria for a proposed indoor/outdoor athletic facility with accessory uses.

The subject site is currently zoned “PI” Planned Industrial under governing Ordinance 3258 and the land is designated as “Industrial” in the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is proposing combining 530 N. Eatherton (16.58 acres zoned “PI”) and 550 N. Eatherton (16.32 acres zoned “NU”) into one “PI” Planned Industrial District. The properties would share the majority of development criteria that was approved via Ordinance 3258 for 530 N. Eatherton in 2023. The applicant is proposing one modification to the existing development criteria which is revising the allowable maximum building height from forty (40) feet to sixty (60) feet. The permitted uses, floor area ratio building/parking setbacks, and openspace requirements would all remain the same.

It should be noted that the governing ordinance for 530 N. Eatherton currently allows a maximum lighting pole height of seventy (70) feet. If approved, the seventy (70) foot lighting pole height would also apply to 550 N. Eatherton. The applicant has received conceptual approval from the Spirit of St. Louis Airport and the lighting would continue to be evaluated during the Site Development Plan review process which would follow the rezoning.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

A Public Hearing was held on February 12, 2024 at which time the Planning Commission discussed the proposed request. The increase in building height from forty (40) to sixty (60) feet was questioned. A representative explained that this is due to the increased width and depth of proposed larger building thus requiring a greater pitch.

The traffic impact on Eatherton was also discussed. The representative confirmed that a traffic impact study is currently underway and will be provided during the Site Development Plan review process. It was also mentioned that roadway improvements include a three (3) lane section of road and a continuous left-turn lane into the site.

DISCUSSION

The council questioned why there weren’t two buildings, one for soccer and one for hockey.

The answer, explained by George Stock, Engineer for the Applicant, was a mix of economics and building design. He stated the original proposal was solely for soccer fields, but when the Carshield Hockey Club was able to acquire the land, they decided to move their hockey program to the site as well from the St. Peters RecPlex where they currently operate out of. Since the ice rinks were added, the building design would no longer work being designed with columns for support. This caused a need for the building to grow, and the building design had to accommodate this change, therefore trusses on the roof needed to span wider and grow taller. As it is now currently designed, there will be four half youth-sized soccer fields and two Division I-sized ice rinks located inside.

Councilmember Mastorakos had concerns about the allowed lighting for the plan. The tallest lights are planned to be 70 feet tall, and there will be eight lights of that size for the two of the outdoor soccer fields. Ms. Ahner assured the Councilmember if it is not field lighting, it has to adhere to the 20ft constraint per the City’s requirement. And regardless of the height, all lights will be downward focusing, as the city requires cutoff shielded lighting; anything different would most likely not fly with the nearby Spirit of St. Louis Airport. Furthermore, during the site development process, all entities affected by the project such as utility companies or the airport, etc., would have to submit approvals for the plan before it could proceed.

The committee also had concerns about the usage of the small diamond of land across the street. The property is part of the City of Wildwood, and is zoned industrial. It was stated that Wildwood is not as sensitive as Chesterfield about the usage of their land. Concerns were raised about what future development may occupy it. Mr. Stock assured it was mainly levee and not much could be done with that land due to easements and the like.

Councilmember Monachella raised the question if having two curb cuts instead of three would be sufficient to handle the anticipated traffic volume. She was concerned in case of some sort of emergency situation, would patrons occupying the site be able to quickly exit. She brought up the idea of having a separate third entrance solely for emergency vehicles and personnel.

Councilmember Monachella made a motion to amend section III in the attachment A, to require a third entrance be added as previously designed at the northeast corner of the site to accommodate emergency vehicles. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hansen and passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

After the amendment was passed, **Councilmember Monachella made a motion to forward P.Z. 01-2024 Carshield F.C (Stock & Associates) to City Council with a recommendation to approve with the amendment of adding a third entrance with an emergency gate.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Mastorakos and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

[Please see the attached report prepared by Alyssa Ahner, Senior Planner, for additional information on P.Z. 01-2024 Carshield F.C. (Stock & Associates).]

B. “The Valley” Sign Discussion (Councilmember Hansen):

Councilmember Hansen brought up a discussion item regarding installing signage at entry points into Chesterfield Valley and referencing its establishment – perhaps by Native American tribes, the Louisiana Purchase, or even several benchmark events of Chesterfield Valley in its early history.

Brief discussion ensued regarding a proposal to install signage as motorists enter Chesterfield Valley to identify it as “Chesterfield Valley” or “The Valley” as it is informally known. Councilmember Moore questioned who has the naming rights of the entity that is Chesterfield Valley. He believed the issue warranted further discussion in a future committee, but wanted to address the issue of branding.

Councilmember Mastorakos questioned if the idea behind the signage was not so much the idea of “The Valley”, but to also identify the Native American heritage in the area. She stated that the City has a unique opportunity to display the historical heritage of previous inhabitants of the Chesterfield area. Councilmember Hansen agreed and felt it was in the potential best interest to primarily utilize the signs as more of historical markers. Overall, she posed the question to the committee of whether or not the issue merits consideration to be placed on a future agenda for further discussion, to which all agreed and would be amicable to further discussion of the topic.

IV. OTHER

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.