V

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
March 12, 1990

==========

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

PRESENT	ABSENT
Chairman Barbara McGuinness	Ms. Kimberly Burnett
Ms. Mary Brown	Mr. Charles Bryant
Mr. Jamie Cannon	
Ms. Mary Domahidy	
Mr. Lester Golub	
Mr. William Kirchoff	
Dr. Alan Politte	
Mr. Doug Beach, City Attorney	
Councilmember Dick Hrabko, Ward IV	
Acting Mayor Charles Fawcett	
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning/Economic Development	
Ms. Anna Kleiner, Planning Specialist	
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary	

INVOCATION: The Reverend John Stein, Green Trails United Methodist Church

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of February 26, 1990 were approved.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Comprehensive Plan Committee - None

Ordinance Review Committee - None

OLD BUSINESS

A. P.C. 120-84 Queatham House, Ltd.; request to amend LPA in "NU" Non-Urban District Ordinance; north side of Olive Boulevard, at Westernmill Drive.

Director Duepner presented the request and the Department's recommendations.

A motion to approve the Department's recommendation was made by Mr. Golub and seconded by Mr. Kirchoff.

Comments/Questions from Commission Members:

? Dr. Politte - Have adjacent property owners been informed of this petition?

A. Mr. Duepner - No formal notice has been posted on the property or published in the newspapers, however, some neighbors are aware of this amendment request.

? Ms. Domahidy - Has a report from the Historic Commission been received?

A. Mr. Duepner - Not as yet.

? Ms. Domahidy - Is a report from the Historic Commission required before revision is made to the LPA Ordinance?

A. Mr. Duepner - This is correct.

? Ms. Domahidy - Would any action, before receipt of this report, be premature?

A. Mr. Duepner - It could be, or it could be acted upon with the provision that the report be submitted and presented to the Planning and Economic Development Committee and the City Council prior to any action. An amendment would require an ordinance change which, in effect, would mean that the Council would have to amend the current ordinance. The Historic Commission comments are requested for consideration by the Department upon submittal of its report to the Planning Commission, but there is nothing in the provisions that require their comments be acted upon.

? Mr. Kirchoff - Has the Historic Commission had been given sufficient time to react? At what point did they become aware of this petition.

A. Mr. Duepner - No. (Mr. Duepner will check into the time-frame).

? Ms. Domahidy - It concerns me that we are trying to evaluate this particular request at the same time that we have other fluid situations before us, as well. Both are tied into the Comprehensive Plan and what we have outlined as our vision of Olive Street Road.

A. Mr. Duepner - The Department's report recommended an increase in the number of seats, however, the overall area of the use within the structure would not be expanded; nor would the parking area on the site be expanded appreciably beyond what is there now, with the exception of allowing the spaces at the rear of the structure. The Department is not recommending the expansion to sixty (60) seats, nor expansion of the hours to 9:00 p.m. Our recommendation is to retain the current hours of operation, until 4:00 p.m.

? Mr. Golub - What concerns me is the increase in seating from twenty-five (25) to forty-five (45). From the tone of their letter, they are not doing well. Will that increase be sufficient. If they do close their operation, what happens?

A. Mr. Duepner - I am not certain whether the increase in seating would provide them with a viable use. The concern expressed is that the current tenant will be leaving shortly, and that people they have spoken to as possible replacements have indicated both the desire for an increase in the seating and an increase in the hours of operation. We are looking at the use of the property, and its impact. If they don't make it as a restaurant, their option would be to seek amending of the Ordinance to allow other uses under the LPA.

? Mr. Kirchoff - Would the portion of the building presently identified as the historic preservation area, under the Department's recommendations, remain unchanged?

A. Mr. Duepner - Yes.

? Acting Mayor Fawcett - Is drainage field septic tank on the east side an existing field?

A. Mr. Duepner - Yes. That would be to the east of this structure, and in front of the existing parking area.

? Acting Mayor Fawcett -Have calculations been made of field to determine if it is sufficient to handle the additional sewage load, and are there sewers along Olive Street Road if that isn't the case?

A. Mr. Duepner - There has not been any survey or calculations performed on the drainage field, but there has been indication by the operator's of the facility that they might consider trying to hook-up with the sewer trunkline in the area.

? Mr. Cannon - This is a building not on the Historic Register. It is a candidate?

A. Mr. Duepner - It is not on the National Historic Register, but it has been identified by the St. Louis County Historical Commission and the Parks Department as a Historical Structure. The County Parks Department, in conjunction with the Historical Commission of the County, prepared a survey of historical structures and sites within St. Louis County. Many of these sites are not on the Register, or are not candidates for the Register, but for various reasons have historical significance.

The motion to approve the Department's recommendation was withdrawn.

Mr. Duepner stated that the petitioners were asked if they wanted to go the route of a public hearing, and they indicated that they were not willing to do so.

A motion was made by Dr. Politte to require a public hearing on the request and ask the Historical Committee for its report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cannon.

Comments/Questions from Commission Members

A. Mr. Duepner - If the amendment is determined to be a substantial departure from what was originally requested, then a public hearing would be in order. The Department does not see the request to meet this criteria. Therefore, the Department does not believe that a public hearing is necessary.

? Ms. McGuinness - Can we insist upon a public hearing?

A. Mr. Duepner - We can insist, however, the question becomes one of who is to pay for the normal filing fee ($380 - $400) for the public hearing.

? Ms. Brown - Why we are asking for a public hearing? If we are seriously considering expansion of the evening hours, we should have a public hearing; however, if we are going to accept the Department's recommendation, I don't think it is necessary.

? Dr. Politte - Is the petitioner still liable for those costs?

A. Mr. Beach - If you pass the motion they have two choices: 1) to pay the price and have it done, or 2) to withdraw the petition.

o Dr. Politte - It seems to me that they lose either way.

? Mr. Golub - Would it be appropriate for the Director of Planning to call for a meeting between the petitioner and present more thoughts?

A. Mr. Duepner - I have discussed it with the petitioner and he indicated he was not desirous of doing that.

o Mr. Kirchoff - I don't see the grounds for a public hearing. I believe we should wait for a report from the Historical Commission, but do not think there is a significant enough change to warrant a public hearing.

o Mr. Hrabko - I believe the Department of Planning recommendation is an insignificant change to the present use of the property, but I want to remind the Commission that under our new policy in the Planning and Economic Development Committee, we do allow for people to speak and give information about a particular issue before the Committee. This might alleviate some of your fears that the residents would not have the chance to be heard. The P & E Committee would not pass the recommendation on to the Council until it had reviewed the report from the Historical Commission.

? Dr. Politte - Could we waive the requirement that the petitioner pays for the public hearing, in this case?

A. Mr. Beach - It could put the Commission in the position of setting a precedent for anyone else who chose to come before the Planning Commission, but not file for a public hearing. We could get into some financial difficulties.

The previous motion was withdrawn.

A motion to hold the request and refer the matter to the Chesterfield Historical Committee was made by Ms. Domahidy. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown, and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

NEW BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 2-90 City of Chesterfield Planning Commission; a proposal to establish a Commercial Service Procedure within the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Chesterfield relative to commercial uses within single-family structures.

Mr. Duepner stated that in keeping with Department policy, there will be a report on this matter presented to the Commission at the next meeting.

B. P.C. 177-86 Pointe Development Company (Atrium Office Building); request for amendment of "C-8" District Ordinance; north side of Swingley Ridge Drive, east of Chesterfield Village Parkway.

Mr. Duepner presented the request and the Department's recommendation.

A motion to approve the Department's recommendation was made by Ms. Brown, and seconded by Mr. Cannon.

The motion was amended by Mr. Kirchoff to approve the Department's recommendation, while requiring the addition of a minimum of six (6) trees at both the south end and the northeast corner of the parking structure, with a revised landscape plan to be submitted to the Planning Commission for review.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

C. Correspondence from the Director of Planning/Economic Development concerning items for referral to the Ordinance Review Committee.

Mr. Duepner presented the request that three (3) matters - Sign Regulation Section of Ordinance, satellite dishes, mortuary or funeral home zoning, as stated in the report, be referred to the Ordinance Review Committee.

The matters were referred to the Ordinance Review Committee, with no action necessary by the Commission.

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

A. P.C. 22-88 Charles Hennemeyer, Inc. (Drew Station); "C-8" District Business Sign; east side of Clarkson Road, north of Baxter Road.

Mr. Duepner presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval of a sixty (60) square foot sign.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, to approve the Department's recommendation, but to limit the overall height of the sign to twelve (12) feet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown, and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

B. King of Kings Lutheran Church; "R-2" Residence District Amended Site Plan and Building Elevations; north side of Olive Boulevard, west of River Valley Drive.

Ms. Anna Kleiner presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, to approve the Department's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown, and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

C. Stonebriar Subdivision Plat II; Subdivision Record Plat; north side of Kehrs Mill Road, east of Clarkson Road.

Mr. Duepner presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval as stated in the report.

A motion was made by Mr. Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, to approve the Department's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown, and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

_____

Mr. Charles Bryant - Secretary