

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  
35  
36  
37  
38

CITY OF FLORISSANT



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

January 21, 2020

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Roll Call/Minutes	Page 2
Planet Fitness	Page 3
Florissant Brewing LLC	Page 4
La Patisserie	Page 6
AVIS	Page 7
Florissant Oaks	Page 9
Sign Code	Page 10

39  
40  
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

**CITY OF FLORISSANT**



**Planning and Zoning Commission**

**Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes**

January 21, 2020

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in Council Chambers at Florissant City Hall, 955 rue St. Francois on Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman Olds presiding.

**Roll Call**

On Roll Call the following members were present: Steve Olds, Robert Nelke, David Smith, Tim Lee, Lee Baranowski and Allen Minks. John Martine was excused. 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.

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Smith moved to amend the minutes of January 6, 2020 Mr. Smith asked to change line 97 remove the second word “*and*” from the full sentence. Mr. Smith also asked to get clarity on line 158, item #5 “2) *Four (4) spots to the west deemed staying*”. Mr. Lum stated that should state four (4) spots to the west, the places that cars are staying while they are being worked on. Line 157 should say 25 feet tall or 25 feet in height per Phil Lum. Chairman Olds moved to approve the amended Meeting Minutes of January 6, 2020, Motion carried.

73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105

**New Business**

**Item 1 Planet Fitness**  
**PZ010620-1 175 Flower Valley SC**

**Postponed from 1/6/2020 - Ward 9**

This is a request for approval of a wall sign of 80 s.f. in an existing ‘B-3’ Zoning District. The proposal of Fitness Centers over 2000 s.f. is a Special Use with restrictions noted in Ord. No 8563, attached.

Phil Lum presented the new staff report for this request. He stated that the motion has been amended to reflect the new sign package. Originally proposed much larger; it is now proposed as an open letter sign, a parallelogram of at 120 sq. ft. which has a result square foot of 80 sq. ft. per the sign code. The application was changed to asking for approval instead of recommended approval. Last time on the agenda it was a requested amendment to a special use. The request was changed to requesting an approval instead of a recommended approval because Planning and Zoning can approve a sign up to 100 sq. ft. and the proposed sign is 80 sq. ft. and then note in the file that this is substitute for a sign that is in the special use ordinance so there will be no sign on the highway facing side of the building.

Mr. Baranowski commented the amount of letters on the name could make the sign go over 100 square feet.

Tom Kumpis, representative for Mason and Atlantic Sign Company was present. No questions from the commission. Mr. Kumpis asked Mr. Lum about putting a banner on the building. Phil Lum stated for grand opening purposes exclusively and for one week only. It is free of charge but must be approved by the Building Commission once two sets of plans are submitted for review.

Chairman Olds moved to approve the wall sign as presented and further described by drawings by the Atlantic Sign Company dated 1/7/20, in a ‘B-3’ Extensive Business District, subject to the regulations of the B-3 “Extensive Business District” with the following additional requirements:

For clarification, this sign will be installed in lieu of sign ‘B’ under Special Use, Ord. No. 8563 at 175 Flower Valley Shopping Center (Planet Fitness), as depicted in the ordinance, by Atlantic Sign Company dated 8/26/19 seconded by Mr. Smith. Motion carries.

106

107 **Item 2 Florissant Brewing LLC**

108 **PZ012120-2 1545 N. Highway 67**

109 **Recommended Approval - Ward 6**

110 This is a request for recommended approval of Special Use to allow for a Brewpub at  
111 1545 N. Highway 67 in a 'B-1' Local Shopping District.  
112

113 Phil Lum presented the staff report for this request. The request is to use the property formally  
114 known as Pool King, a .9 acre and a building of approx. 8280 square feet (per county website)  
115 surrounding properties to use for a Brew Pub in a "B-1" zoning District (a "B-1" is a local shopping  
116 district). The general purpose is to have nice quant little shops to serve a neighborhood. There are  
117 several located on Lindbergh. You can have a brew pub in any B district. The property behind is a B-3  
118 and the property on either side is a B-3 including a church which was in question due to the location of  
119 a drinking establishment near a church. The city attorney has stated that the rule for licenses with  
120 alcohol establishments is door to door not property line to property line. Therefore the use would be  
121 permissible if it was granted a Special Use permit. Under staff analysis under line 36 there is a sight and  
122 floor plan. Item 1 is identified as the existing Pool King sign, no change other than a face change.  
123 Revisions of parking spaces because the 11 x 17 showed fewer parking spaces the smaller plans show  
124 more clearly. The number of parking spaces will drive how many people can be in the building because  
125 the parking code is one regulation and the international building code is another regulation. Typically  
126 architects look at a table in chapter 10 of the building code will say one the maximum number of people  
127 you can have in here is this number per square foot. The parking code will say this many seats shown  
128 will determine how many parking spaces will be required. Parking will drive maximum occupancy load.  
129 The plan was revised to show more parking spaces. Per parking calculations submitted: Total number  
130 of 44 per tasting room and patio and staff, office 3 spaces brewing area 3 spaces and the loading zone.  
131 Required 50 spaces and there is 50 spaces provided. Furnishing layout shows certain number of chairs  
132 that corresponded with the parking calculations. It is equivalent to a cocktail lounge.

133 Commission discussed the amount of parking and the concept of a cross parking agreement.

134 Mr. Lum responded cross parking has to be within a certain amount of feet of the property.  
135 They can negotiate with extra spaces only. Any cross parking agreement must be documented and  
136 reviewed by the city attorney. The zoning code clearly says that it can only be extra spaces can be  
137 shared.

138 The occupancy load for this building and listed on the building and enforceable by the fire marshal is  
139 132. Assembly space is required to be posted.

140 Gabe McKee representative of Brew Pub stated he has been working with Phil Lum to make sure what  
141 was needed was provided to have a code compliant functioning business. They are trying to gauge  
142 whether they can move into this building to purchase it and have looked at it on a schematic level at this  
143 point for the square footage of the actual tasting room. It was calculated at the maximum of what it  
144 could possibly be as far as tasting room versus brewing space because it's kind of a mixed use it's a  
145 tasting room, manufacturing space and also has offices. They are trying to take in all these factors in the  
146 representation. The brewery operations may take over more space than the tasting which could limit  
147 occupancy. In regards to parking the 12 to 1000 was calculated at roughly one spot per 83 sq. ft. A lot  
148 of time they're looking at closer to 1 to 200 in other areas. This was need for change. Just trying to  
149 maximize tasting area as much as possible but realize it may be smaller than that. No food, just beer  
150 was confirmed by Chairman Olds. Possible entertainment in the future was discussed. Mr. Smith asked  
151 about outside seating area. Mr. McKee responded that the 500 square foot outside area has not been  
152 fully developed yet. Mr. Smith also asked about grain bins. McKee responded that they are picked up  
153 by farmers and used to feed livestock rather than ending up in landfills. He is planning on an additional  
154 dumpster enclosure for that purpose. This will operate in the same way as the brewery in Cugino's.

155 Chairman Olds confirmed that they would be moving beer brewing operation would move out of  
156 Cugino's if this is approved. Mr. Baranowski had a few questions regarding space structure of office  
157 and bathroom window. Mr. McKee confirmed it was still in the structure planning stages.

158 Chairman Olds asked Mr. Lum whether we need to mandate something about serving food.

159 Phil Lum read Brew Pub definition dated 4/26/2016 Ordinance number 8220 which states: "A micro-  
160 brewery that brews beer for on and off premise sale and consumption with an annual production of  
161 10,000 barrels or less". There was nothing about food in the code. For a brew Pub that serves food  
162 would need a special use.

163 Chairman Olds asked if they would stay under 10,000 barrels. Mr. McKee assured the commission they  
164 would be staying well under 10,000 barrels.

165 Chairman Olds moved to recommend approval of a Special Use Permit to allow for a Brew Pub  
166 at 1545 N. Highway 67, located in a "B-1" local shopping district as depicted by the attached sight plan  
167 dated 1/15/2020 SK02 and floor plan SK01 dated 1/15/2020 by V3 Studios, Seconded by Mr. Nelke.  
168 On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke yes, Martine absent, Lee yes, Smith absent,  
169 Baranowski yes and Minks yes. Motion carried.

170 This will go before City Council February 10, 2020.

171

172

173 **Item 3 La Patisserie**  
174 **PZ-012120-3 119 Flower Valley Shopping Center**  
175 **Recommended approval - Ward 9**

176 This is a request for recommended approval to allow for a Bakery/Café/Tea  
177 Room/Bistro at 119 Flower Valley Shopping Center (La Patisserie) in an existing 'B-3'  
178 Zoning District. Refer to Plans submitted: drawing: A-01 by MOLA Interiors-  
179 Architect, attached. This is an existing business relocating from a bakery at 2674 N.  
180 Highway 67.  
181

182 Phil Lum presented the staff report for this request. This is a petition for a relocation of a  
183 business expanding from a bakery to a bakery/café/tea room/bistro, basically a restaurant serving food.  
184 The proposal is for 119 Flower Valley Shopping Center accompanied by plans. There are eight  
185 conditions as listed by the County; 10.3 acres, 16,470 square feet, as built in 1971. This tenant space is  
186 shown on the plans as 36.8 x 57.7. This property has about 454 parking spaces for the Former Shop and  
187 Save and shopping center. Surrounding properties are listed. Final development plan had 741 spaces  
188 on this lot. Some are not currently striped. The space is just the right size not to change the parking  
189 intensity at the shopping center. It's about 7 parking spaces as shown. It would not change the required  
190 parking spaces. Plans show café area, kitchen, office, comfort rooms (bathrooms). Suggested motion  
191 listed.

192 Mr. Minks asked about seasonal outdoor seating. Asked at what point are ballads are not  
193 needed. Mr. Lum responded "Historically commission asked for a barrier to protect patrons. He  
194 showed on the plans that there is a long area from the parking lot to the bistro area protected by large  
195 rocks and shrubbery. Mr. Smith wanted to be sure comfort rooms are ADA compliant. Mr. Lum  
196 assured him that they will be according to room size. Mr. Smith also was concerned about outside  
197 seating patron protection. Mr. Baranowski asked about fire department approval. Mr. Baranowski  
198 shared his concern about narrow hallway to the comfort room. Mr. Lum let him know there was enough  
199 room.

200 Marikit Villasis-Corbin, owner/petitioner, asked commission for any questions. She asked if  
201 area is pet friendly. Mr. Olds said that that would be up to the landlord and the health department. The  
202 pastry shop is going to be Asian French pastry, no deep frying, only Danishes, pastries. Seasonal 6  
203 bistro sets will only be out during warmer weather. Mr. Olds asked about concerns regarding safety of  
204 outdoor seating. Everyone is ok with the current protection from the rocks and shrubbery. The drive  
205 lane does not go straight into the front of the bistro. It is off to the side. Commission discussed safety  
206 concerns. It was decided that the double island, veered drive lane (not straight on drive), the distance,  
207 and the rocks/shrubbery is sufficient.

208 Chairman Olds moved to Recommended Approval for a Special Use Permit to allow for a sit  
209 down, carry-out Restaurant (Bakery/Café/Tea Room/Bistro) at 119 Flower Valley Shopping Center (La  
210 Patisserie) in an existing 'B-3' Zoning District, subject to the restrictions of the 'B-3' zoning district.

211  
212 Zoning Commission, seconded by Lee. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke  
213 yes, Martine absent, Lee yes, Smith absent, Baranowski yes and Minks yes. Motion carried.

214

215 **Item 4 AVIS**

216 **PZ012120-4 730 N Highway 67**

217 **Recommended Approval - Ward 8**

218 Request recommended approval for a Special Use to allow for a Car Rental establishment  
219 at 730 N Highway 67 (Avis Budget) in an existing 'B-3' Zoning District.

220 Mr. Lum presented the staff report. This is a petition for a car leasing place in a shopping  
221 center. The petitioner for AVIS and shopping center present. It was formerly occupied by an Auto Tire  
222 and other places before. County record shows that space 5875 sq. ft. in a shopping center that's over  
223 129,000 sq. ft. The surrounding properties are listed, There is a creek behind the property. The parking  
224 spots behind center currently not well striped. The project narrative describes the operation. It  
225 describes the on-site operation. It states that only 15 vehicles on site at a time and only 2 employees.  
226 They state hours of operation and signage is included in packet, it shows proposed face changes. The  
227 sign is done as one sign instead of two because it says AVIS BUDGET. However it is one company so  
228 it only needs one sign. The wall sign proposed is calculated at 64 sq. ft. If they were separate companies  
229 or separate management you could calculate as two signs. The shopping center signs are also proposed  
230 in the sign packet. The interior signs are proposed also. It shows open letter sign and door signage as  
231 well. The main P & Z concern is exterior signs. Zoning map shows adjacent to B-3 and B-5 districts  
232 and historical residential is shown across the creek. Parking calculations indicated parking per bay  
233 showing parking calculations as 24 spaces required, 3 spaces per bay and idle parking. There is  
234 minimal impact to the shopping center. The floor plan shows new finishes and lighting. Some interior  
235 finishes and signs in lobby shown. Suggested recommendation is parking should be clearly striped in  
236 front and rear. Mr. Minks asked about hours of operation. Not in motion. Mr. Baranowski asked about  
237 number of signs and permits required. Mr. Lum assured him it would need a special use permit all  
238 considered at once in the motion. Mr. Baranowski concerned about size of sign.

239 Jeff Wagner with AVIS BUDGET Group presented his petition along with Gerard Mudd with  
240 Bianco Properties. AVIS expanding foot print throughout the country. The population here dictates

241 they have a market presents. The Automotive base fits in with the proposed use. Not doing repairs in  
242 this space. Mr. Wagner went on the explain brands and their differences. Mr. Olds asked about the  
243 suggested motion on parking lot striping. Mr. Mudd addressed his concerns. He said he had talked to  
244 Mr. Lum and are looking into whether it is marked as AVIS are if they provide a sign for each of those  
245 marked spaces. Mr. Wagner stated that landlords typically don't like it because it dedicates parking and  
246 upsets the other tenants. From AVIS perspective they can do it either way. It's nice to have ready  
247 rental vehicles in dedicated marked spaces for customers. There would have to be pole signs in the  
248 landscaping or in concrete bases that would require maintenance and are hard to see and become  
249 problematic. As far as the cars not in the rental ready area they could be kept it the back. If that needs  
250 to be striped it certainly can be done. Mr. Olds asked about ready cars being kept in front or back. Mr.  
251 Wagner assured him they would be kept in front ready for customer. Mr. Minks asked for further  
252 explanation of rear parking. The rear parking would be used for employee parking only meaning they  
253 have a shuttle staff that brings vehicles form the airport and other areas to fleet it up or down fleet it. It  
254 is transient. You can rent anything you like here. Returns brought in back. There will be no more than  
255 15 vehicles present. It is close to the airport and easy to get vehicles in and out. High volume returns  
256 are minimal and planned for. Mr. Lee asked Mr. Lum about the need for reserved spacing. Mr. Lum  
257 stated it doesn't need to be clearly marked. For traffic wise it is good to have clearly striped spaces. Mr.  
258 Lee feels it is up to the petitioner whether or not they have marked reserved parking. Mr. Lee asked that  
259 it be removed from the motion. Discussion ensued among commission regarding designated parking  
260 followed by a discussion regarding sign size. Mr. Nelke agrees the striping doesn't need to be a park of  
261 the motion but the sign size should be a part of the motion.

262 Chairman Olds moved to recommend approval of a Special Use Permit for a Car Leasing  
263 establishment in a 'B-3' Zoning District, as proposed by the attached plan A1 and A2 by Avis Budget  
264 Group, subject to the regulations of the 'B-3' "Extensive Business District" with the following  
265 additional requirements the included sign package page 5 dated 12/13/2019 for a 64 sq. ft. wall sign on  
266 page 5.

267 seconded by Minks. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke yes, Martine absent, Lee  
268 yes, Smith absent, Baranowski no and Minks yes. Motion carried.

269  
270  
271  
272  
273



274 **Item 5 Florissant Oaks Shopping Center**

275 **PZ012120-5 570 N. Highway 67**

276 **Approval - Ward 5**

277 Request approval for a wall sign exceeding 40 sq. ft. at 570 N. Highway 67 in an  
278 existing "B-3" Zoning District

279  
280

281 Phil Lum presented the staff report for this request. There is a sign in the shopping center that  
282 is in need of being replaced. A larger size is needed due to the number of tenant spaced to be  
283 represented. This is unique circumstances. The location of the tenant space is hidden from the parking  
284 lot located in a breezeway. The proposed sign will need to accommodate six (6) business names. The  
285 suggested motion is to approve. Bill Yount signs present to represent sign.

286 Erin Bielski on Bill Yount signs spoke of the unique situation in that there are more tenants that need  
287 representation so that people can find them safely without looking down at their phones trying to locate  
288 the offices they're visiting. The suites this sign represents are hidden in a breezeway not visible to  
289 drivers traveling thru the parking lot therefore creating the need for signage for these particular suites or  
290 offices. This is a cabinet sign with tenant names being able to slide in and out as tenants change. Mr.  
291 Lee asked whether would be a sign located on the other side of the shopping center near Chimi's. Mr.  
292 Mudd assured him that that is not a part of his shopping center so there is no need for sign considering  
293 there is a fence dividing the two.

294

295 Chairman Olds moved to approve the 60 s.f. wall sign proposed at 570 N Hwy 67, subject to the  
296 drawing submitted by Bill Yount Signs dated 1/08/2020 attached with the conditions set forth below  
297 being part of the record. Sign installation shall be completed upon the issuance of a building permit and  
298 sign shall be installed in accordance with the plans attached with a time limit of 180 days of the  
299 issuance of the permit.

300

301 The motion was seconded by Smith. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke yes,  
302 Martine absent, Lee yes, Smith absent, Baranowski yes and Minks yes. Motion carried.

303

304

305

306

307

308 **Item 6 Sign Code Review**  
309 **PZ102119-4 Postponed to 2/18/2020**

310  
311 Chairman Olds moved to postponed review of the sign code to 2/18/2020, seconded by Lee.  
312 Motion carried.

313 Mr. Lee moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Nelke. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned  
314 at 8:45 p.m.

315  
316  
317  
318

---

Jacquelyn George, Recording Clerk