PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
MARCH 10, 2014

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT	**ABSENT**
Ms. Wendy Geckeler	Mr. Robert Puyear
Ms. Merrell Hansen	
Ms. Laura Lueking	
Ms. Debbie Midgley	
Ms. Amy Nolan	
Mr. Stanley Proctor	
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg	
Chair Michael Watson	

Mayor Bob Nation
Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director
Ms. Purvi Patel, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Watson acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bob Nation and Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the February 24, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0** with 1 abstention from Commissioner Nolan.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. P.Z. 15-2013 & P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Rd.)

Petitioners:
As members of the Petitioner's development team, the following individuals asked if they could provide their comments during the discussion portion of the meeting after Staff's presentation. The Commission agreed to this request.

1. Mr. Mike Doster, DosterUllom, 16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Chesterfield, MO.
2. Mr. Mike Falkner, 5055 New Baumgartner Road, St. Louis, MO.
3. Mr. Rusty Saunders, Loomis Associates, 707 Spirit 40 Park Drive, Chesterfield, MO.
4. Mr. Christopher DeGuentz, Fischer & Frichtel, 695 Trade Center Blvd., Chesterfield, MO.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS - None

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 15-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road): A request for a zoning map amendment from an "NU" Non-Urban District and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban District to an "E-1" Estate One-Acre District for 50.5279 acres located on the south side of Wild Horse Creek Road west of its intersection of Long Road and east of its intersection with Arbor Grove Court (18V330035).

Project Planner Purvi Patel stated that a Public Hearing for this project was held on November 25, 2013 at which time there were no issues identified by the Planning Commission or the Public. The only outstanding issue at that time was obtaining comment letters from outside agencies. Since that time, Staff has received all necessary letters.

Change of zoning requests to a straight zoning district, such as "E-1" Estate One-Acre District, only require an Outboundary Survey which was included in the Planning Commission's packet. Furthermore, an Attachment A is not prepared for a straight zoning district because the development must meet all of the City of Chesterfield Municipal Code requirements without exception or modification.

Ms. Patel pointed out that one of the requirements for all "E" Districts is the provision of a 30-foot landscape buffer around the perimeter of the site. This buffer cannot be counted towards the minimum lot size.

This "E-1" Estate One-Acre District request is a separate project from the "PUD" request and should be considered based upon its own merits. Staff has no further comments for this petition and the Commission may vote on the project if it so chooses.

Discussion

Commissioner Geckeler referred to the Staff Report which shows the density (units/acre) of Wilmas Farm at 0.95 and questioned whether this is for 50 lots or the amended plan of 48 lots. Mr. Patel confirmed that the 0.95 density relates to 48 lots.

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve the rezoning to "E-1" Estate One-Acre District for P.Z. 15-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nolan.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Nolan, Commissioner Proctor, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Geckeler, Chair Watson

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

B. P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road): A request for a zoning map amendment from an "E-1" Estate One-Acre District to a "PUD" Planned Unit Development for 50.5279 acres located on the south side of Wild Horse Creek Road west of its intersection of Long Road and east of its intersection with Arbor Grove Court (18V330035).

Project Planner Purvi Patel stated a Public Hearing for this project was held on November 25, 2013 followed by an Issues Meeting on January 13, 2014. A summary of the issues discussed during these meetings include:

- Concentration of common open space
- Minimum lot size
- Number of proposed lots
- Provision of two public access points
- Street length for the proposed cul-de-sac

The Petitioner has submitted a formal response to each of the items discussed during the January 13th Issues Meeting and this response was included in the Planning Commission's packet.

Ms. Patel then provided a PowerPoint Presentation showing slides of three different Preliminary Plans submitted throughout the review process. Below is a table comparing these three plans:

Description	Initial Prel. Plan reviewed at Public Hearing Nov. 25, 2013	Amended Prel. Plan reviewed at Issues Meeting Jan. 13, 2014	Amended Prel. Plan reviewed at Commission Mtg. March 10, 2014
No. of Lots	50	50	48
Min. Lot Size	22,000 sq. ft.	19,000 sq. ft.	20,000 sq. ft.
Required 30' Landscape Buffer	30' buffer shown on private property on 21 lots	30' buffer shown outside of all private lots and dedicated as Common Open Space	30' buffer dedicated as Common Open Space for all perimeter lots - except for Lots 46-48
Access	One full access point off Deep Forest Drive; Emergency access off Wild Horse Creek Rd.	One full access point off Deep Forest Drive; Emergency access off Wild Horse Creek Rd.	One full access point off Deep Forest Drive; Emergency access off Wild Horse Creek Rd.
Common Open Space	33.6% concentrated in the floodplain and floodway portions of the site	41% concentrated in the floodplain and floodway portions of the site	42.1% 21.24 acres of the site
Cul-de-Sac Length ***Note: City Code allows a maximum length of 800 ft.***	1,100 ft. Exceeds the maximum length for a cul-de-sac	1,100 ft. Exceeds the maximum length for a cul-de-sac	N/A Loop street provided
Sidewalk along Wild Horse Creek Road	None	Meandering sidewalk along Wild Horse Creek Rd	Meandering sidewalk along Wild Horse Creek Rd connects to the garden & walking trail
Garden	None	None	One-acre garden centrally located on the site
Trails	None	None	Walking trail near the proposed lake/detention area on the southern portion of the site

Additional Notes about the Amended Preliminary Plan submitted for review at the March 10th Meeting:

- A secondary full access off of Wild Horse Creek Road is not possible due to the location and existence of the water line and an easement by Missouri American Water. Therefore, an emergency gated access is proposed. However, to improve internal site circulation, the Applicant has provided a loop street layout for the development. Due to the issues beyond the developer's reach and inclusion of a loop street, Staff has no concerns regarding the site circulation as proposed.
- The length of the proposed loop street is approximately 3,500 feet and exceeds the maximum length as set forth in the Street Matrix within the Subdivision Ordinance. This is typically a separate variance request handled during the site plan review. However, with PUDs, the request is made during zoning; so if the Preliminary Plan is approved, you will be also approving this request.

Ms. Patel then noted that the general requirements for a PUD, as well as the minimum design features, are detailed in Staff's report. In addition, City Code lists the following **12 Design Features** suggested to be utilized by developers when applying for PUD Zoning:

- Placement of structures on most suitable sites with consideration of maintaining existing site topography, soils, vegetation, slope, etc.;
- Preservation of natural and cultural areas as well as creation of open space;
- Preservation of existing mature trees;
- Enhanced landscaping, deeper and opaque buffers, and increased planting along public rights-of-way, open space/recreational areas, and the overall perimeter to protect and ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses;
- Utilization of mixed use buildings;
- Utilization of Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) techniques;
- Architecture which exceeds typical building design;
- Segregation of vehicular traffic from pedestrian/bicycle and other traffic mitigation measures;
- Incorporation of Transit Oriented Development (TOD);
- Affordable Housing;
- LEED construction practices;
- Community facilities.

Ms. Patel also pointed out that the City Code states that satisfaction of all or any of these design features is not mandatory, but the approval of "PUD" zoning will be predicated on the use of the above list, or any other design feature deemed desirable by the City of Chesterfield.

Staff has reviewed the requested zoning map amendment by the Applicant as it pertains to the "PUD" request and has prepared an Attachment A reflecting this request for consideration by the Planning Commission. Staff has no further comments for this petition and the Commission may vote on the project if it so chooses.

Discussion

Commissioner Nolan noted her concern that the Petitioner is proposing an 8-foot side yard setback for Wilmas Farm while the adjacent Arbors at Wildhorse Creek subdivision has a 10-foot side yard setback. She feels that the setbacks should be consistent.

Commissioner Hansen stated her appreciation for the effort that has been put into the design since the last meeting; however, she still has concerns that *exceptional design* is still missing from the plan. She suggested opening the lots in front of the lake so that the whole neighborhood could enjoy it; making the lot sizes more diverse; or paying homage to the farmland history of the site.

Commissioner Wuennenberg agreed that the plan design has progressed. He noted his appreciation for the proposed park and trails but has concerns about the 8-foot side yard setback and the minimum lot size of 20,000 sq. ft.

Commissioner Geckeler indicated her agreement with both Commissioners Hansen's and Wuennenberg's comments. She still has concerns about the density of the site when compared to Windridge Estates noting that Windridge Estates has the least density while Wilmas Farm has the most density – she does not feel this is a comparable arrangement. She stated that City Council has always emphasized the importance of infill being comparable to what has already been established in the surrounding area and noted that the surrounding neighborhoods are all less dense than the proposed development. She suggested that some of the lots be removed, or that the side yard setbacks be maximized.

Petitioner's Response

Side Yard Setback

Mr. Doster first addressed the concern of the 8-foot vs. 10-foot side yard setback. He stated that there are three different ways to present a garage on a house – 1) garage doors facing the street; 2) side entry garages; and 3) courtyard garages where only one door is seen from the street but the other two are side entry garages. The homebuilders for Wilmas Farm want the flexibility of having all side entry garages and in order to do that, a smaller setback is required to accommodate the turnaround area.

Commissioner Lueking stated that when a third-car garage option was requested by another developer, they included a wing wall for that specific elevation. She noted her concern about the proposed 8-foot side yard setback and stated that if a 10-foot side yard setback is required, it allows for 20 twenty between the neighboring houses.

Mr. DeGuentz of Fischer & Frichtel explained that with three-car entry garages, there may be an 8-foot side yard required for one side of the lot, which is usually the side of the lot opposite the garage. This allows the developer "to hug the house to that setback line" so that the other side of the lot has the appropriate space to build the turnaround. The garages are typically held to the high side of the lot because of grading for drainage and proper swales. Relative to the PUD, they appreciate the precedents of what has occurred around their site, but they are trying to promote the exemplary nature of their design – they are open to looking at a variable side yard that is held to 8-feet minimum but no less than 20 feet between structures.

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director stated that this has been done in the past under old ordinances where the structure side yard setback was written from the property line with an additional minimum structure requirement between structures. If it the Commission's direction, Staff will work with the Petitioner on this issue.

Commissioner Geckeler felt it would be difficult to make the required tight turn to enter the first garage on a three-car garage – she feels that larger lots would be better.

Lot Sizes

Discussion was then held on the different lot sizes being proposed for the development. The lots range in size from 20,022 to 29,296 sq. ft. with the following smallest lot sizes being noted by the Commission:

Lot 48A	20,022 sq. ft.
Lot 40B	20,034 sq. ft.
Lots 14A thru 20A	20,500 sq. ft.
Lot 21A	21,008 sq. ft.

Mr. Doster pointed out that Lots 14A-21A are adjacent to the church property and common ground. Lot 48A is adjacent to common ground at the entrance to the site.

Commissioner Proctor questioned how many lots are less than 22,000 square feet, which is the minimum lot size of the adjacent properties. Commissioner Lueking replied that 28 of the 48 home sites are less than 22,000 square feet.

Density

Mr. Doster referred to the density calculation used to compare Wilmas Farm to the adjoining subdivisions. He stated that based upon the conditions of the site, they are most comparable to Arbors at Wildhorse and Wildhorse. He noted that Wilmas Farm's' density of 0.95 compares favorably to Arbors at Wildhorse at 0.94. Wildhorse's density is at 0.73 because it has a lot of waterway and floodplain property in its development. He does not feel the Petitioner's objective is to be the same as every surrounding development, but to be similar to those developments that have comparable conditions to Wilmas Farm.

Mayor Nation stated that at Arbors at Wildhorse, the developer met the side yard requirements for the side-entry garages and then asked for a fourth garage that was forward-facing. But the side lot requirements of 10 feet were still met. He went on to say that Wildhorse has a minimum lot size of 22,000 square feet – 2,000 square feet larger than the minimum lot size proposed for Wilmas Farm. He pointed out that one difference between Arbors at Wildhorse and Wilmas Farm is the fact that the Arbors development doesn't have unusable land towards the creek as in Wilmas Farm. If there were three less lots on Wilmas Farm, it would allow an additional 60,000 square feet to be disbursed among the remaining lots, which may alleviate the side yard setback issue.

Commissioner Geckeler asked what the density would be if there were three fewer lots for the proposed development. Ms. Nassif replied that this could be provided at the next meeting if it is not forwarded on tonight, but pointed out that it would be an estimate as the developer could disburse the additional space in a variety of ways.

Commissioner Hansen stated that even with three less lots, she still feels the development does not necessarily capture the spirit and nature of a "PUD".

Councilmember Fults expressed concern about the smaller lot sizes that face Windridge Estates and Arbors at Wildhorse. If extra space were to be gained by removing some

lots, her preference is that it be added to the smaller lots that are up against these larger subdivisions.

ISSUES

Ms. Nassif then summarized the following issues raised by the Commission:

1. Side yard setback.
2. Minimum lot sizes.
3. Number of lots.
4. Too dense for the area.
5. Exceptional design criteria - Proposal has not met the criteria of the desirable conditions to qualify for a "PUD".
6. Internal design – Suggestions were made to: a) reduce the number of lots to increase the lot sizes along the periphery; b) open up the area around the lake to make it more of a public amenity; and c) provide structures setbacks between homes.

Petitioner's Response

Mr. Doster stated the following in response to the issues:

- They would not be able to open up the lake area without losing lots that they cannot afford to lose.
- They have provided a trail.
- They have provided access to the public areas around the lake.
- They will provide some observations points and benches to enjoy the area.

Regarding the design criteria, he feels the first four criteria, noted below, are the most important and which they have addressed in their response to the Issues Letter. They will review their responses again to see if they can "become more creative".

1. *Placement of structures on most suitable sites with consideration of maintaining existing site topography, soils, vegetation, slope, etc.*
   They intend to construct the homes in the open area of the site, which is a relatively flat area.

2. *Preservation of natural and cultural areas as well as creation of open space through active and passive recreation areas to include greenways, landscape gardens, plazas, and walking and cycling trails that serve to connect significant areas and various land uses.*
   They are trying to make use of the area to the south, which consists of floodplain and floodway for the enjoyment of the residents.

3. *Preservation of existing mature trees and trees deemed extraordinary by the City of Chesterfield Tree Specialist due to, but not limited to, the following: size, type, origin, grouping, or number of.*
   They are not removing many trees – the percentage of trees being preserved on the site is approximately 83%.

4. *Enhanced landscaping, deeper and opaque buffers, and increased planting along public rights-of-way, open space/recreational areas, and the overall perimeter to protect and ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses.*

At the right-of-way known as Wild Horse Creek Road, they are providing an enhanced buffer with a berm that will be extensively landscaped. There will not be any break in this buffer except for a small break for the emergency access point. The main entrance into the proposed development will be heavily landscaped and will include a roundabout, water feature, and sculpted monument. They are providing a park accessible from both sides of the loop road. The floodplain and floodway areas are accessible and will include a walking trail, observation points and benches.

Commissioner Lueking stated she agrees that the developer is moving in the right direction but feels the site is still too dense. Putting the park in the middle of the site has, in her opinion, added to the "PUD".

Commissioner Geckeler asked if the trail goes around the lake with an access at both cul-de-sacs. Mr. Rusty Saunders of Loomis Associates explained that there is a trail on top of the dam but there is no access from the lower cul-de-sac. Mr. Doster stated that there is a buffer in this area and asked if a footpath would be permitted in the buffer area. Ms. Nassif stated that structures are not allowed in the buffer area but a footpath would be permitted – depending on the type of material used. Mr. Doster stated that they would review the possibility of adding a footpath in this area.

Commissioner Geckeler then made a motion to hold P.Z. 16-2013 Wilmas Farm (17508 Wild Horse Creek Road). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hansen.

Discussion on the Motion

Commissioner Midgley asked how many lots would be lost in the development if the minimum lot size was 22,000 square feet. Mr. Doster replied that they would lose "too many" from an economic standpoint. He added that they will review the issues identified.

The motion to hold the petition passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS - None

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

_____

Steve Wuennenberg, Secretary