

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

**CITY OF FLORISSANT**



**Planning and Zoning Commission  
Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes**

May 15, 2023

**Table of Contents**

**Page Number**

1 Flower Valley Shopping Center  
(Brite Worx)

Page 1-

Adjournment

Page 4

35

36

CITY OF FLORISSANT



37

38

39

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Florissant in the Council Chamber at 955 rue St. Francois on Monday, May 15, 2023 at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman Olds presiding.

41

**Roll Call**

43

44

On Roll Call the following members were present: John Martine, Dan Sullivan, Lou Jearls, Lee Baranowski, Allen Minks (acting Chairman), Robert Nelke. Steven Olds excused absence. Also present was Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, and Jacquelyn George, Recording Clerk. A quorum being present the Planning and Zoning Commission was in session for the transaction of business.

48

**Approval of Minutes**

50

51

Chairman Minks moved to approve Meeting Minutes of May 1<sup>st</sup> , 2023, after three minor changes to lines 72, 73 ( h missing in the words wash and with) and 116 add “*and provide the percent of masonry*” following the line starting on 115 and ending on line 116; Move the proposed building one lane over to allow for better traffic flow off Halls Ferry, move the monument sign closer to the setback. Seconded by Mr. Jearls. Motion passed.

56

**LHDC Business:** Phil Lum sent the commission a site plan of the intersection Howdershell/Shackelford where the Quick Trip is. They’re wanting to know if a cell tower would impose anything on a historic resource there and there is no historic resource there. Sent for Commissions information.

**Old Business**

**Item 1 1 Flower Valley Shopping Center (Brite Worx)**

**PZ050123-2 Approved – Ward 9**

Request Recommended Approval of a rezoning to ‘B-5’ to allow for development of a Car Wash in a ‘B-3’ Extensive Business District.

Phil Lum stated Commission should have a staff report dated May 11<sup>th</sup> revised with numbered lines. The changes noted on the staff report are in bold print. On page 2: C000, C001, C200, C300,

66

67 C700 are now updated with the revision date of 5/10/23. The lighting plan LO155229-1 are dated  
68 5/8/23. The Vehicle Maneuver Exhibit dated May 2023, as well as color photos of an identical building  
69 in Crestwood and Sign Package dated 4/10/23. On line 65, site acreage shown is changed to 1.55 acres  
70 for the carwash. Phil Lum's comment on line 101; Updated proposed with a full depth masonry stone  
71 base and masonry walls as well as brick. Suggested motion on line 112 thru 120, Chairman Minks  
72 requested line 107 and 108. C should be stricken. Nothing on page 4 to report. Line 205 thru 207  
73 noted the signs shown on the plan. On the the sign package dated 4/10/23, the base sign is +/- 30 feet  
74 tall called a ground sign and +/- 32.6 ft from the right of way and then there is a 4-foot-tall directional  
75 sign that is +/- 25 feet from the right of way. Mr. Jearls asked about the required parking, should it be 4  
76 or 6 spaces. Phil Lum stated that 4 are required but they are 6 on the plan. Plan shows 4 parking spaces  
77 on the side and 2 close to the building for accessibility. It was suggested last meeting that St Louis  
78 County Highway approval be a requirement. Chairman Minks stated that the commission voted against  
79 an amendment at the last meeting. Mr. Jearls stated that they voted on a motion for St. Louis County  
80 Highways & Traffic to review and approval prior to vote. With a new driveway approach, St. Louis  
81 County Highways & Traffic may want sidewalks and they may want a right-turn in and out only at the  
82 new entrance. The project is required to have permit approval from St. Louis County Highways &  
83 Traffic. Chairman Minks stated that yes, review is required, but that the amendment had failed. Phil  
84 Lum said it could be be part of the suggested motion that St. Louis County Highways & Traffic  
85 approval be obtained which is a standard procedure and can be part of the ordinance. Mr. Jearls  
86 suggested a correction to line 276 that it should read "*an amendment to the B-5*" shall be required Mr.  
87 Jearls asked for clarification of the "B-5 also asked Phil Lum for clarification on any changes, minor  
88 changes and major changes. Phil Lum stated that every "B-5" ordinance has all the permitted uses and  
89 other restrictions written into the ordinance. If a motion is made and recommendations sent to the  
90 council, (Lines 122 – 126) the Permitted Uses for this property could be limited to a car wash and  
91 those uses (107 listings) in the zoning code under a "B-3" without a Special Use Permit. Within the  
92 "B-3" Extensive Business District there are 107 Permitted Uses without a Special Use Permit being  
93 required and there are 57 Special Uses in the "B-3" Extensive Business District. It's common for these  
94 "B-5" ordinances to have all 107 listings as Permitted Uses within the Ordinance, but not the 57 list of  
95 Special Uses, e.g. a car wash, which is ordinarily a Special Use in a "B-3" District. This request is to  
96 re-develop the site and build something new. The City requires the petitioner to request a re-zoning to a  
97 "B-5" to build the new building. If proposed later, any of the other 57 uses that are ordinarily Special  
98 Use in a "B-3" would require amending the list of Permitted Uses in the ordinance. Case in point, when  
99 Planning and Zoning approved, for instance, an auto repair to be an added use at the former Lowes site

100 the petitioner had to come back especially to add that Use. Or, in the case of the Goodwill Excel Energy  
101 Center at the Lowes site, this is a Use that's on neither list and that's important in a "B-5". In a "B-3"  
102 permitted use is 107 and Special Use is 57. to re-develop something then you can request re-zoning to  
103 "B-5" and add that Use that's on neither list or nowhere in the zoning code and that's what we did with  
104 the Goodwill Excel Energy Center at the Lowes, the Use is on neither list and that's important in a "B-  
105 5" and another reason for a "B-5", to consider those Uses that are unusual. Point two: Mr. Jearls asked  
106 to amend the site and exterior building plans once this "B-5" ordinance is adopted. Answer: If City  
107 Council approves the "B-5" then Mr. Kamp must record the final result at the St. Louis County  
108 Recorder's office. Once recorded, then (line 264) any changes to the approved plans must be presented  
109 to and reviewed by the Building Commissioner. Once reviewed, the changes are deemed major or  
110 minor. If the changes were not reviewed Planning and Zoning or at the Public Hearing or if a Minor  
111 Change fails, then staff informs the petitioner, in this case, Mr. Kamp, that he would need to apply for  
112 an amendment to the "B-5" to change the Site Development Plan. There are 2 possible results for a  
113 Minor Change; if the ordinance is passed (hypothetically speaking) and the 107 Permitted Uses become  
114 Permitted Uses and if a self-storage facility wants to occupy a portion of the K-Mart building, the cost  
115 to renovate the existing building considered, and to add a Self-storage facility, a Self-storage is on the  
116 list of 57 Uses in 'B-3' and ordinarily require a Special Use Permit (SUP) it's not on the list of 107, so  
117 they would have to amend the ordinance. If the petitioner were to find, say, a large department store to  
118 put into a portion the of K-Mart building and those 107 Permitted Uses are already in the ordinance,  
119 then they don't have to come back to amend the ordinance unless there is a change in the exterior or the  
120 parking lot. So, if there are no exterior changes they may not have to amend the Site Development Plan.  
121 It is feasible that they could put a permitted use in there with no need to change the ordinance.  
122 Mr. Jearls asked if volume wise, dollar wise, or percentage of masonry changed would be an issue in  
123 the need to amend the ordinance. Phil Lum explained that it would cause need for the P & Z  
124 Commission to at least vote on a minor change. Once approved, then changes can be made. The  
125 petition complies with the Comprehensive Plan because this corner has always been commercial.  
126 Kevin Kamp, PE petitioner, then proceeded to explain the changes to the plans after presenting a video  
127 of Brite Worx Car Wash illustrating the belt conveyor, interior brightness and overall operation.  
128 Mr. Jearls asked how much water is recycled. Mr. Kemp explained the energies and chemicals needed  
129 to clean the water far outweigh the return on that investment but that modern equipment reduces water  
130 usage.  
131 The parking lot will be re-stripped to be 90-degree spaces to allow for two-way traffic and the drive aisle  
132 will be made wider.

133 The overall number of vacuums was reduced from 41 to 33 and consolidated into two rows. The site  
134 will stay roughly the same size as before while still shifting that one lane into the site. Mr. Kamp  
135 presented the maneuvering based on an F-350 (largest truck vehicle possibly using the car wash) to  
136 demonstrate how a large based truck would maneuver through the site. In addition, everything was  
137 moved back about 12 feet further off the right-of-way, which put all pavement inside the building  
138 setback line and that allows for a larger turn radius at the entrance off Halls Ferry. Mr. Kamp continued  
139 plan changes include a new drive aisle where a tractor trailer could maneuver for deliveries. The  
140 entrance design does need approval from the St. Louis County Highways and Traffic Department.  
141 There are elements that can be considered if St. Louis County Highway does not approve as presented.  
142 Mr. Jearls asked about the possibility of a requirement of a sidewalk all the way down Halls Ferry. Mr.  
143 Kamp assured that they address that if necessary. Phil Lum noted that line 195 of the Staff Report  
144 could state that “St Louis County Highway and Traffic approval shall be required prior to issuance of  
145 building permits”. Mr. Minks stated that he would include that statement in a motion.

146 Mr. Jearls discussed approval from MSD.

147 Mr. Baranowski asked about Highway Department approval of a change in the right of way.

148 Mr. Kamp asked for further questions on the site plan. (No further questions)

149 Mr. Kamp proceeded to discuss the masonry and elevations. He gave clarification on the percentage of  
150 masonry and the percentage of glass. Masonry and glass elements comprise 74% of the building while  
151 masonry alone is 46%. Other elements are 26% that are not masonry and glass are dedicated to the  
152 entrance areas. The use of the materials is the exact same as what is used in Florissant already, Very  
153 similar to the one in the Crestwood photos.

154 Mr. Jearls asked if the masonry elements were an increase in the use of masonry over the first Brite  
155 Worx. Mr. Kamp stated it was an increase from the original one in Florissant with the addition that the  
156 stone travels all the way to the entrance area which is not so on the original. Mr. Jearls asked if the 46%  
157 masonry meets the ordinance. Phil stated that on a “B-5” the masonry ordinance is “excepted”, which  
158 doesn’t mean it’s thrown out, it doesn’t mean it has to be 100% masonry as in a “B-3”. It means that  
159 this Commission recommends a percentage of masonry to the Council and the Council makes the final  
160 decision on amount of masonry used. Since masonry is excepted in an “B-5” the petitioner can propose  
161 any amount of masonry and then this Commission makes a recommendation to Council. The material  
162 that is shown on the revised plan is a full wythe thickness brick and a full wythe thickness stone both  
163 materials meet the masonry ordinance.

164 Mr. Minks asked if there was a change to the plans two weeks ago for masonry. Phil Lum stated that  
165 the plans two weeks ago noted ‘simulated stone’ which is now proposed as ‘natural stone’. That is also

166 where the percentage of masonry increased. Mr. Jearls stated “So 46% meets our masonry ordinance”  
167 Phil responded that that 46% of the material is proposed to meet the masonry ordinance. The masonry  
168 ordinance reads “as you go around the walls you can have a door or window in the wall below 3 feet  
169 that is not masonry.

170 Mr. Minks asked for questions regarding masonry. (no questions)

171 Mr. Kamp addressed the sign revisions. Last meeting it was requested that the main Shopping Center  
172 sign, a little less that 15 feet of the right of way, be placed further from the street. Mr. Kamp said the  
173 new location is basically for visibility from the intersection of New Halls Ferry and N Highway 67. He  
174 explained the placement of the sign in anticipation of future parking that could go there. Sign was  
175 moved to where to the edge of where the dry tower would be. The distance of that sign would then be  
176 offset 32 1/2 feet off the right of way. This allows that drive isle to be 40 feet off the right of way which  
177 the driveway itself would be behind the building setback.

178 There is a small directional sign that will be 25 foot off the right of way. (Entrance only) This sign is  
179 not big enough to cause a sight obstruction. It is a way to make people feel comfortable driving through  
180 and able to see where they come in.

181 Mr. Baranowski asked why the sign wouldn’t be moved over by the building. Mr. Kamp described how  
182 the sign placement works with the development of the site.

183 Mr. Sullivan asked about signs for customers to channel through. Mr. Kamp showed the overhead  
184 canopy signs.

185 Mr. Jearls asked how many tenant signs can be added to the ground sign. Mr. Jordan explained that for  
186 now the only signs that will be on there are shown on the sign package, however, if a large anchor retail  
187 store comes, it’s possible they would have to tear down the sign and build a new one.

188 Phil Lum explained that code states a height restriction for a ground sign and according to the design,  
189 one more sign may be able to be added.

190 Mr. Jearls asked how many ground signs can a shopping center have. Phil Lum explained that there is  
191 only one according to the sign code, but that it could be considered under a ‘B-5’ amendment.

192 Discussion ensued prompted by Mr. Baranowski’s question regarding petitioner’s concern with the  
193 other properties. Petitioner explained that without consent of the other businesses they can’t build the  
194 car wash because Brite Worx redevelopment affects the other businesses in regards to access and  
195 parking.

196 Mr. Baranowski asked if the Highways Department decides to put in a sidewalk does P and Z have to  
197 come back and amend all this.

198 Phil explained that no, that on a “B-5” these plans are considered preliminary and then once the “B-5” is  
199 approved, the preliminary plans are used as a basis for the Final Development Plan. Mr. Kamp has to  
200 develop and record the Final Development Plan. If a sidewalk was never considered it could be an  
201 issue, but St. Louis County Highways has to approve the plans so Mr. Kamp’s Final Development Plan  
202 must show what St. Louis County wants on it before he records it. Once its recorded then it’s set in  
203 stone. Before being recorded, a Final Development Plan. has to be reviewed by Staff to make sure it  
204 doesn’t contain anything not discussed in the Planning and Zoning meeting and in the Pubic Hearing or  
205 that were never on the Preliminary Plan. The Planning and Zoning Commission and Staff have  
206 culpability with the sign at the other Brite Worx in Florissant which was shown on the preliminary site  
207 plan, but may not have been described in detail on the staff report and may not have been discussed at  
208 the Planning and Zoning meeting. If a sign was shown, but not discussed at the Public Hearing and  
209 Brite Worx has a sign on their plans, that particular development is different than this one. To avoid  
210 such confusion, signage package was requested prior to this P&Z Meeting.

211 Mr. Jearls asked about discussing the landscaping, parking lot lighting in a “B-5”, storm water for the  
212 whole development should be for the entire “B-5” not just the 1.5 acres. Mr. Jearls contemplated, will  
213 MSD just look at this 1.5 acres or will they will look at all 9.75 acres. Mr. Kamp explained they are  
214 introducing more green space now and that is reviewed by MSD. Green space will be visited again with  
215 new businesses.

216 Mr. Lum reiterated that this presentation requires a preliminary site plan and storm water concept and  
217 that it still needs to be reviewed by MSD and St. Louis County Highway and whatever other agencies  
218 require must be included in the Final Development Plan. The ordinance is approved prior to such  
219 recording and before the Final Development Plan is completed.

220 Mr. Kamp assured the Commission that they would come back before P & Z as many times as needed  
221 for changes in the ‘B-5’.

222 Mr. Jearls asked about the construction of the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Kamp assured him it would be  
223 built to match the building with matching materials.

224 Mr. Minks suggested to change line 264 of the Staff Report from *“Any changes to the approved plans*  
225 *attached hereto must be reviewed by the Building Commissioner”* to *“Any changes to the approved*  
226 *plans for the entire parcel attached hereto must be reviewed by the Building Commissioner”*

227 Motion carried. This will be added to the motion.

228 Mr. Minks proposed that line 195 of the Staff Report add *St. Louis County Highway approval is*  
229 *required prior issuance of permits*

230 Mr. Minks made a motion to approve the Suggested Motion with the following revisions, for 1 Flower  
231 Valley Shopping Center (Brite Worx): I move to recommend approval to amend the B-5, as depicted by  
232 the attached drawings C000, C001, C200, C300, C700, dated rev 5/10/23, lighting plan LO155229-1  
233 dated 5/8/23, A102 and A202 dated 12/30/20, Figure 1- Vehicle Maneuver Exhibit dated May 2023, as  
234 well as color photos of an identical building in Crestwood and Sign Package dated 4/10/23, subject to  
235 the regulations of the B-5 Planned Commercial District, with permitted uses allowed being a car wash,  
236 those within the “B-3” Extensive Business District without a Special Permit, and the following  
237 additional requirements.

238 Mr. Minks proposed to change line 273 as follows: If the Building Commissioner determines that the  
239 requested amendment is not consistent in purpose and content with the nature of the purpose as  
240 originally proposed or previously advertised for the public hearing then an amendment to the “B-5”  
241 rather than an amendment to the Special Use (originally stated in on line 276 of the Staff Report) shall  
242 be required and a review and recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be  
243 required and a new public hearing shall be required before the City Council.

244 2<sup>nd</sup> by Mr. Nelke.

245 On Roll: Baranowski – yes, Minks – yes, Martine – yes, Sullivan – yes, Nelke – yes, Jearls – yes

246 Motion carried

247 Public hearing will be June 12<sup>th</sup>.

248

249 **Adjournment**

250 Chairman Minks stated the next meeting will be held on Monday, June 5, 2023 at 7:00 p.m.

251 Mr. Baranowski moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Nelke. Motion carried. Meeting  
252 adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

253

254

*Jacquelyn George*

---

Jacquelyn George, Recording Clerk