

CITY OF FLORISSANT



Planning and Zoning Commission Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes

August 7, 2017

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Roll Call/Minutes	Page 2
Dollar General 15275 New Halls Ferry Rd	Page 3
Long John Silver's / A&W 1232 Graham Rd	Page 3
Rezoning 22 Floweridge Ln	Page 4
St. Sophia 936 Charbonier Rd (preliminary subdivision)	Page 6
St. Sophia 936 Charbonier Rd (final subdivision)	Page 6
Villa Del Cresta S/C 428 Howdershell Rd	Page 7
Auto Spa 2040 N Hwy 67	Page 9

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73

CITY OF FLORISSANT



Planning and Zoning Commission Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes

August 7, 2017

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in Council Chambers at Florissant City Hall, 955 rue St. Francois on Monday, August 7, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman Stock presiding.

Roll Call

On Roll Call the following members were present: Lee Baranowski, Allen Minks, John Luttrell and Paul Stock. John Martine, Robert Nelke and Steve Olds were excused. Also present was Building Commissioner, Phil Lum and Jacque George, Recording Clerk. A quorum being present the Planning and Zoning Commission was in session for the transaction of business.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Luttrell moved to change name "Chairman Stock" to "Vice Chairman Olds" on line 168. Mr. Baranowski moved to change "Mt." Luttrell to "Mr." Luttrell on line 155. Chairman Stock moved to approve the amended Meeting Minutes of 7/17/2017, seconded by Luttrell. Motion carried and the Meeting Minutes were approved.

74 **Old Business**

75

76 **Item 1 Dollar General**

77 **PZ071717-1 15275 New Halls Ferry Road**

78 **Postponed to 8/21/2017 – Ward 4**

79

80 **Request recommended approval to amend a B-5 Ordinance to allow**
81 **for a retail establishment (Dollar General) located at 15275 New**
82 **Halls Ferry Road.**

83

84 Phil Lum informed the Commission that the petitioner was not present and he had not
85 received the requested plans.

86 Chairman Stock moved to postpone the B-5 amendment for Dollar General to
87 8/21/2017, seconded by Minks. Motion carried.

88

89 **New Business**

90

91 **Item 2 Long John Silver’s / A&W**

92 **PZ080717-2 1232 Graham Rd.**

93 **Recommend Approval – Ward 5**

94

95 **Request recommended approval to amend provisions of a B-5 to**
96 **allow for exterior alterations including a blade sign in a B-5 Zoning**
97 **District.**

98

99 Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, presented the staff report for this request. He
100 explained that the petitioner had applied and was approved for two sign permits that were face
101 change items. The new logo, the A & W signs and branding changes, are shown on the sign
102 renderings and include an orange sign blade of EIFS, orange copings, awnings and entry
103 canopy. The blade sign proposed, per the rendering, is 19’ – 6 ½” in overall height and 9’-3” in
104 width. The post sign location shall not change but includes a new digital sign.

105 In response to Mr. Mink’s question, Jim Sill, petitioner, explained that the term “brown
106 bubble graphic” meant that they will be trading out the decorative blue tinting on the bottom of
107 the windows to brown. There will be no digital sign and the drive-thru sign will be smaller
108 than the existing one.

109 Chairman Stock moved to recommend approval of the alterations presented, by
110 amending the Ordinance for the property, according to the proposal prepared by the petitioner as
111 described in related documents and incorporating the sign drawings dated 7/25/17 for the
112 proposed changes. Approval is subject to the regulations of the City of Florissant building code,
113 and the following additional requirements.

114 Amend B-5 Ordinance No.7582 as follows:

- 115 1. There shall be one “blade sign” as depicted on the sign drawing dated 7/25/17.
- 116 2. There will be A & W signs, orange copings, awnings and entry canopy as depicted on
117 the sign drawing dated 7/25/17.

118

119 1. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS.

120 Unless, and except to the extent, otherwise specifically provided, the alterations shall be
121 effected only in accordance with all ordinances of the City of Florissant.

122

123 2. PROJECT COMPLETION

124 Construction shall start within 30 days of issuance of building permits for the project
125 and shall be installed in accordance of the approved construction plan within 180 days of
126 start of construction.

127

128 The motion was seconded by Minks. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Martine
129 absent, Baranowski yes, Minks yes, Olds absent, Luttrell yes, Stock yes and Nelke absent.
130 Motion carried.

131

132 **Item 3 22 Floweridge Lane**

133 **PZ080717-3 Postponed to 8/21/2017 – Ward 3**

134 **Request recommended approval to rezone from an R-4 Single Family**
135 **Dwelling District to R-6 Multiple Family Dwelling District.**

136

137 Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, presented the staff report for this request. He gave
138 the Commission a background update on the Zoning Code and the Comprehensive Plan in
139 relation to rezoning of properties. Furthermore, on occasion, properties predate the city’s
140 zoning code. The city’s Comprehensive Plan was last updated in 2004 and needed to be
141 updated. This being said, Florissant is a “built out” community and there are few sites to build
142 upon.

143 Mr. Luttrell had asked Mr. Lum, prior to the meeting, if the Commission were to
144 recommend this rezoning, would the Commission be setting a precedent for the future that
145 would force the city to allow a person to purchase a vacant lot in a residential neighborhood and
146 build a duplex, which is basically rental property?

147 Mr. Lum responded that when considering a rezoning, it was important to consider what
148 the property would be rezoned to “for the rest of its days.” Mr. Lum also informed the
149 Commission that the city attorney, John Hessel, had informed him that every rezoning must be
150 determined based upon the particular facts applicable to the site, which would include the
151 surrounding properties. In this case, a number of properties in the area of 22 Floweridge are
152 zoned R-6 and a number are being used as R-6 even though they appear to be zoned R-4 on the
153 map that was sent to him (if the map is accurate). He suggested that they are legal non-
154 conforming uses. That being said, in regard to Mr. Luttrell’s question, if #22 Floweridge were
155 to be rezoned to R-6, it would not set a legal precedent.

156 Mr. Baranowski stated that he would like to hear from the surrounding neighbors as to
157 their feelings on the construction of a duplex so close to their homes. Mr. Luttrell stated that
158 this property was very deep. Chairman Stock stated that, if the property was rezoned to R-6,
159 the petitioner could change his mind from constructing a duplex to constructing an apartment
160 building.

161 Mr. Luttrell said the surrounding properties were four family apartment buildings, not
162 duplexes. He also agreed with Mr. Baranowski, that he would like to see information that
163 proved that the surrounding neighbors had been talked to and were comfortable with the
164 rezoning. Mr. Lum added that the petitioner planned on canvassing the neighbors for their
165 opinion and support, but he has yet to find out the results.

166 Mr. Minks asked Mr. Lum if the Commission could restrict the rezoning to a duplex as
167 part of the motion. He too was concerned that there would be space enough for an apartment
168 complex if the petitioner changed his mind.

169 Since the petitioner was not in attendance, Chairman Stock moved to postpone the
170 rezoning of 22 Floweridge to 8/21/2017, seconded by Minks. Motion carried.

171
172
173
174
175

176 **Item 4** **St. Sophia**
177 **PZ080717-4** **936 Charbonier Road**
178 **Approval – Ward 3**
179
180 **Request approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat, located at 936**
181 **Charbonier Rd in an R-4 Zoning District.**
182

183 Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, presented the staff report for this request. He stated
184 that St. Sophia is proposing to subdivide the property into 2 lots and the zoning will remain the
185 same. Lot 1 is 6.89 acres and Lot 2 (vacant) is 5.89 acres for a total of 12.78 acres. The plans
186 have been reviewed by the City Engineer.

187 Mr. Michael Woodard, petitioner, explained that the sole purpose of subdividing the
188 property was a financial one. There are no plans to develop the property.

189 Chairman Stock moved to approve the preliminary plat as presented, per the Preliminary
190 Plat drawing 1 of 1 dated 6/27/17 and recommend that a Final Plat be presented to the Planning
191 and Zoning Commission, seconded by Luttrell. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Martine
192 absent, Baranowski yes, Minks yes, Olds absent, Luttrell yes, Stock yes and Nelke absent.
193 Motion carried.

194
195 **Item 5** **St. Sophia**
196 **PZ080717-5** **936 Charbonier Road**
197 **Recommended Approval – Ward 3**
198
199 **Request recommended approval of a Final Subdivision Plat, located**
200 **at 936 Charbonier Rd in an R-4 Zoning District.**
201

202 Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, stated that the plans for the final subdivision were
203 identical to the preliminary one. (See prior comments and discussion from Item 4).

204 Chairman Stock moved to recommend approval of the final plat as presented, per the
205 drawing 1 of 1 dated 6/27/17 and recommend that a Final Plat be forwarded for consideration
206 by the City Council, seconded by Minks. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Martine absent,
207 Baranowski yes, Minks yes, Olds absent, Luttrell yes, Stock yes and Nelke absent. Motion
208 carried.

209
210
211

212 **Item 6** **Villa Del Cresta S/C**
213 **PZ080717-6** **428 Howdershell Rd.**
214 **Postponed to 8/21/2017 – Ward 3**
215
216 **Request review and approval of façade improvement plans for**
217 **compliance with minimum standards, located at 428 Howdershell**
218 **Rd. in a B-3 Zoning District.**
219

220 Phil Lum informed the Commission that this request was for a renovation to a shopping
221 center located on 428 Howdershell Rd. The existing structure on the property has brick and
222 glass exterior walls and shingle mansard with false metal columns and is in need of the
223 proposed update.

224 The Building Code, Section 500.010, allows for Planning & Zoning to review plans and
225 compare them to minimum standards. Minimum standards in the code refer to the city’s
226 Property Maintenance Code. Therefore, this review is to approve improvement projects
227 proposed without going to Council. The basic shopping center does not change, only the
228 façade.

229 The renderings show a picture of the overall facility, with the removal of all false
230 columns as the roof is currently supported by cantilevered bar joists. All structure proposed is
231 mansard replacement and 3 main towers. Construction proposed is synthetic siding on tower
232 structures, EIFS in gray and tan color for the signage area, backlit polymer sign areas to create a
233 uniform glow, lit on the perimeter of the transparent sign wall with LED lighting.

234 Mr. Minks asked if a detailed sign package was included in the plans. Mr. Lum
235 responded that the Public Works Department would approve the sign permits. If any sign
236 exceeded 40-100 square feet, the petitioner would need to come back before P & Z. Mr.
237 Minks also asked how the new lighting would affect the residents living nearby.

238 Mr. Baranowski expressed concern that if the renovations included covering up the brick
239 with EIFS, would the Commission be able to approve it since it was located in a B-3 Zoning
240 District. He asked if the petitioner was going to repair or replace the fence. Mr. Lum stated that
241 he thought there were no plans for a new fence. He would have an inspector check on the
242 existing wood fence.

243 Brian Ivy, Idea Architects and petitioner, gave a brief overview of the renovation plans.
244 The owner would like to remove the mansard roof and replace it with a more contemporary
245 aesthetic. The owner has quite a few vacancies in the shopping center and would like to attract
246 more national clients. They are proposing a 4 foot, continuously back lit sign band. The

247 recessed LED lighting will emit a soft glow – not a bright glaring light. The lighting will be
248 interchangeable, for example, red lighting at Christmas and red, white and blue lighting on the
249 4th of July.

250 Mr. Ivy stated that there are several options for the materials to be used on the towers,
251 which will be three different heights. Mr. Ivy displayed some of the material possibilities to the
252 Commission. He added that they now make a type of metallic EIFS which is also used by
253 Starbucks. The owner would like to draw in national tenants with a more integrated, marketable
254 and interesting look, and increase the visibility of the shopping center.

255 Chairman Stock stated that he thought the Commission was limited in what it could
256 approve under a B-3 Zoning. Furthermore, he stated that the City’s Code only allowed for
257 masonry and, as a result, the Commission could not approve the composite material for the three
258 walls/towers.

259 Chairman Stock asked why the petitioner planned on staining the masonry. Mr. Ivy
260 responded that they wanted to bring the tone down by knocking out some of the reddish/brown
261 hue. They do want to maintain the brick texture and enable it to blend into the cooler color
262 palate they had in mind. Chairman Stock stated that he really liked their proposal, but since the
263 site was zoned B-3, the Commission could not approve it.

264 Mr. Lum stated that since the plan could not be approved “as is,” the petitioner could
265 withdraw tonight’s request and resubmit it as a rezoning request to a B-5. He informed the
266 petitioner that if he resubmitted the request for a rezoning, more detailed plans, fees, custom
267 designing and a site plan of the location would be required. That being said, a B-5
268 Zoning allows for different types of materials to be considered. Considerable discussion of
269 various material was had.

270 Again, several commission members stated that they truly liked the proposed design and
271 that it would be a great improvement to the shopping center, but unfortunately, they could not
272 approve it in a B-3 Zoning district.

273 Chairman Stock stated one possibility could be that Mr. Ivy talk to the owner of the
274 shopping center and see what he would like to do. The Commission could continue the request
275 until a decision was made.

276 Mr. Minks moved to postpone the review and approval of façade improvements for 428
277 Howdershell Road to 8/21/2017, seconded by Baranowski. Motion carried.

278
279

280 **Item 7 Auto Spa**
281 **PZ080717-4 2040 N Hwy. 67**
282 **Recommend Approval – Ward 9**
283
284 **Request recommended approval of a Special Use Permit to allow for**
285 **a digital sign, located at 2040 N Hwy 67 in a B-3 Zoning District.**
286

287 Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, presented the staff report for this request. The sign
288 is located in a B-3 District with a car wash facility. The proposed replacement of existing
289 signage is for the name change. The change from the existing post sign to a digital sign
290 required a Special Use Permit. The existing post sign is 29 feet tall. The proposed digital sign is
291 97 ½” x 37 ¾” = 24 square feet.

292 The one digital sign shall have the following restrictions:

- 293 a. Digital sign shall display only static images for a minimum of 10 second intervals.
294 Digital sign shall display no glare, flashing, scrolling or animation.
- 295 b. There shall be no affects between static images displayed.
- 296 c. The sign shall be dimmable at night to prevent glare.
- 297 d. Digital sign shall conform to the City’s ordinance regarding digital sign code once
298 adopted.

299 Also, the existing foundation shall be engineered to withstand any increased lateral loads
300 imposed by the sign as approved by the Building Commission.

301 Mr. Luttrell asked for an explanation of item: “(d) Digital sign shall conform to the
302 City’s ordinance regarding digital sign code once adopted.” Accordingly, Mr. Luttrell asked if
303 the Commission had a draft of a digital sign code at this point. Mr. Lum explained that a
304 digital sign ordinance draft had been previously presented to Planning & Zoning and had been
305 turned down for further review. Mr. Lum added that the administration had not authorized
306 further review.

307 Mr. Lum stated that in absence of a digital sign code, the city attorney had recommended that a
308 special use permit be issued with restrictions attached. Should the city pass a digital sign code,
309 it would not only conform to the digital signs with a special use permit, but also with every
310 other digital sign within the city, including churches. No digital signs would be “grandfathered.”

311 Mr. Baranowski stated that the plans indicate that the existing post sign is 24’ and not
312 29’ as is indicated in the staff report. Mr. Lum agreed that the sign was indeed 24’ 8”.

313 Mr. Garrett Newhouse, Ziglin Sign, stated that the proposed sign is approximately the
314 same size as the existing sign. In response to Chairman Stock's question, the petitioner agreed
315 to all the required stipulations.

316 Chairman Stock moved to recommend approval of the sign presented, according to the
317 proposal prepared by the petitioner as described in related documents and incorporating the site
318 map and sign drawing by Ziglin Signs dated 5/15/17. Approval is subject to the regulations of
319 the City of Florissant Building Code, and the following additional requirements:

320
321 (1) There shall be one (1) digital sign, as shown on drawing by Ziglin Signs that shall have the
322 following restrictions:

323 a. Digital sign shall display only static images for a minimum of 10 second intervals.

324 Digital sign shall display no glare, flashing, scrolling or animation.

325 b. There shall be no affects between static images displayed.

326 c. The sign shall be dimmable at night to prevent glare.

327 d. Digital sign shall conform to the City's ordinance regarding digital sign code once
328 adopted.

329
330 2) Existing foundation shall be engineered to withstand any increased lateral loads imposed
331 by the sign as approved by the Building Commissioner.

332
333 1. **GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS.**
334 Unless, and except to the extent, otherwise specifically provided, the sign shall be
335 effected only in accordance with all ordinances of the City of Florissant.

336
337 2. **PROJECT COMPLETION.**
338 Construction shall start within 30 days of issuance of building permits for the project
339 and shall be installed in accordance of the approved construction plan within 180 days of
340 start of construction.

341
342 The motion was seconded by Minks. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Martine
343 absent, Baranowski yes, Minks yes, Olds absent, Luttrell yes, Stock yes and Nelke absent.
344 Motion carried.

345
346
347

348

349

Miscellaneous

350

351

The next scheduled Planning and Zoning Meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 21, 2017.

352

353

Mr. Baranowski moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Luttrell. Motion carried.

354

Meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

355

356

357

358

Anita Moore, Deputy City Clerk