

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

CITY OF FLORISSANT



Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes

December 7, 2020

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Roll Call/Minutes	Page 2
3500 Patterson (Hucks)	Page 2
1700 N. Highway 67 (Florissant Police Station)	Page 6
3170 N. Highway 67 (Club Carwash)	Page 7
3 Flower Valley Shopping Center (AutoZone)	Page 8
2895 N. Highway 67 (Chase Bank)	Page 9
Planning and Zoning Meetings for 2021	Page 10

36
37
38
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

CITY OF FLORISSANT



Planning and Zoning Commission
Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes

December 7, 2020

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Florissant met in a remotely conducted meeting through a Zoom platform on Monday, December 7, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman Olds presiding.

Roll Call

On Roll Call the following members were present via Zoom Conferencing: Steve Olds, Tim Lee, Robert Nelke, Allen Minks, Lee Baranowski and John Martine. David Smith was excused. Also present was Phil Lum, Building Commissioner 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

Chairman Olds moved to approve the minutes stand as they are. Motion carried.

New Business

Item 1 3500 Patterson (Hucks)

PZ120720-1 Continued - Ward 4

Request for recommended approval of changes to the recorded development plan in an existing B-5, to allow for an addition, exterior changes and signage.

Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, presented the staff report for this request. Mr. Lum explained this was generated from a proposed walk in cooler addition on the back of the store. But it's

71 an unusual property because there is no city ordinance connected with this 'B-5' and that this property
72 was an annexation from St. Louis County into the City of Florissant some time ago, although it was
73 then deemed to be a 'B-5'. The first page of the staff report shows a request for a recommended
74 approval. The 'B-5' has to have a public hearing with the city council for changes to the exterior; this
75 would definitely change the exterior because this is a facelift proposed, including the cooler addition.
76 According to county records it was built around 1993. The existing size of the building is listed at
77 County is 3321 s.f. and with a large fuel canopy (photos provided by the petitioner to commission) then
78 the only adjacent property is 3524 Patterson in a 'B-5' District which includes a private drive easement
79 along the fuel canopy side. The rest of the property is bounded by Patterson Road and Greenway Chase.
80 The City did receive a permit application from Tebberson Architects dated June 22, 2020. Since it was
81 an annexed property Mr. Lum visited the site to check out the brick. It was found not to be "masonry"
82 as defined by the masonry ordinance. In the masonry ordinance, see lines 85 and 86 for the staff report,
83 ceramic glazed facing bricks are specifically excluded from this definition of "masonry". It is
84 speculated that since the masonry ordinance was adopted long ago it was thought that the ceramic
85 glazed facings may not age or weather like a clay fired face that is vapor-permeable. The masonry
86 ordinance is required for review here because the building therefore is zero percent (0%) masonry as
87 defined in the masonry ordinance, Because the brick faces are ceramic. they are excluded from the City
88 definition. The definition of masonry under para. 'c' of the "Masonry Ordinance (City code section
89 500.040), is that it must meet ASTM designation C-216 for standard clay fired brick, i.e. that it be
90 about ¾ solid clay which the glazed units probably are; they also have a minimum thickness of about 3
91 and 5/8 inches and is a clay fired brick. This meets all those characteristics except what appears to be a
92 hard, shiny ceramic face. To see them up close, they appear to be a ceramic faced brick. We received a
93 number of submissions from the petitioner, however the 'B-5' submission is incomplete. The petitioner
94 requested a meeting anyway with planning and zoning in order to get some direction on materials
95 proposed. The staff report that lists all the attached documents and the materials that were received,
96 presented in pictures for the meeting for commission to review. Mr. Lum went on to describe the
97 different materials. Also included the construction set, see lines 129 to 152 of the staff report. The City
98 did also receive some installation instructions for 'faux stone' and 'metal panels' (not included in the
99 packets). Mr. Lum shared the photos of the building plans, elevations, pictures showing colors of brick
100 and ceramic faced brick that cannot be called masonry brick according to City ordinance.

101 Mr. Olds asked for clarification as to the main issue with this building being the brick. Mr. Lum went
102 on to explain the use of glazed brick and why it was used 100 years ago and they were full thickness
103 brick and white ceramic faces were sometimes used to reflect light. The concern that breakage of the

104 face as a problem may have existed when the masonry ordinance was drafted. On a brick, when the
105 brick face breaks off it is often that a similar color clay is underneath, however if a glazed brick breaks
106 it is always a different color underneath. The bottom line is that it's currently a non-compliant existing
107 building 100%. Mr. Lum presented photos of the three panels of material submitted and explained what
108 they are made from. Faux Stone and faux brick materials are cement products and metal panel material
109 with faux wood grain. He also presented and explained a portion of the plans with metal trim pieces
110 that hold the stone to the building. Mr. Olds asked if they are going to cover all the white brick with
111 the glazed brick. Mr. Lum presented the plans of the building to show where the glazed brick would be
112 installed and construction plans. Mr. Lum then showed photos to the Commission of similar completed
113 buildings as is proposed with a completely new appearance.

114 Mr. Olds reiterated that it was all fake brick, no real brick. Phil confirmed that it is all fake so it will
115 not meet the masonry ordinance any more than it currently does in this 'B-5'. Therefore, the request in
116 appearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission is to get a read from the commission of their
117 impression of this type of a proposal, that is proposed to not comply with the masonry ordinance,
118 compared to the existing condition that also does not comply with the masonry ordinance.

119 Mr. Olds asked what the life span of the new materials.

120 Mr. Lum responded that the petitioner would be the one to ask that question.

121 Mr. Olds talked about the main concern being the maintenance free life span of the product.

122 Mason Olson from Tabberson Architects along with Leonard Weber from Hucks presented their overall
123 goals.

124 Mr. Olson stated that they want to give the building a full facelift therefore giving the building a more
125 contemporary design in a cost-effective way. The materials being mainly concrete based give it a long
126 life span. A lot of the mortar and tuck pointing takes place once the panels are hung so you won't see
127 the joints visible in samples.

128 Mr. Weber explained that the panels are interlocking set in grooves that does not require tuckpointing.
129 This is not a weather type system. You have to have a weatherproofed type base underneath.

130 Mr. Olds asked about life span of materials.

131 Mr. Weber stated that the brick panels have a 25 year life span and the stone panels have 25-30 year.

132 Mr. Olds asked for documentation to this for the next meeting.

133 Mr. Nelke read the warranty document stating a 50-year limited warranty and a 15 year warranty on the
134 finish on the brick.

135 Mr. Olds stated his understanding as to why the City has the masonry ordinance on the buildings,
136 therefore the city doesn't have to go back to the businesses to ask them to paint. That the Commission

137 should consider hitting a 25 year maintenance free goal. The Commission is somewhat flexible on
138 materials as long as it can hit the 25 year maintenance free mark. Mr. Olds asked about documentation
139 on the life span of the stone.

140 Mr. Weber stated that he would look into it.

141 Mr. Olds asked that if it can be shown that these materials are 25-year maintenance free that would be
142 sufficient.

143 Mr. Lee was very happy with the appearance of the proposal at this time.

144 Mr. Minks was in agreement with Mr. Olds on documentation of 25-year maintenance free life span.

145 Mr. Olds asked for more documentation on 25-year maintenance free life span on stone and brick in
146 order to make a decision.

147 Mr. Lum stated staff will have to revise and rewrite a suggested motion and that we will need additional
148 civil drawings and signage drawings to come up with a new report for commission to consider.

149 Mr. Weber discussed the difference in cost between real brick and getting the documentation on the 25-
150 year maintenance free life span.

151 Mr. Lum shared the two-page signage drawings with commission and that he still needs on civil and
152 landscape plans.

153 Mr. Lum and Mr. Olds discussed the 40-foot set back line which should appear on Civil plans and
154 overall size of signs for signage.

155 Mr. Baranowski commented that the houses made of brick haven't changed in 50 years and questioned
156 the 25-year life span.

157 Mr. Lum suggested the Commission consider if the type of building should matter for different life
158 cycle costs, some building types perhaps may be there longer than another.

159 Suggested Motion:

160 Chairman Olds moved for continuance to the next meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission, as
161 scheduled for 2021, (currently proposed for January 4, 2021). With the following recommended
162 exterior materials:

163 Additional information on life span of materials and possible location and size of signage.

164 Nichiha faux brick – a 5/8” thick, cement-based product.

165 Versetta Stone – a cement-based product hung on clips.

166 Western States Metal Wall panels – a pan metal with wood grain finish

167

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

170 **Item 2 Florissant Police Station**

171 **PZ120720-2 1700 N. Highway 67**

172 **Approved- Ward 6**

173

174 Request Approval of a fence at 1700 N. Highway 67, in an 'R-4' Single Family Dwelling district.

175

176

177 Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, presented the staff report for this request. Randy Boden also
178 presented on behalf of Police.

179 This is a request for approval of a fence expansion adding to the existing wrought iron fence located on the
180 property. One of the functions of the fence will be to replace temporary barriers used during civil unrest the past
181 year and police want to complete fencing around the entire property. The property is about 3 1/2 acres built in
182 1982 about 16000 square feet. There is some residential property surrounding. From line 37 – 55 of the staff
183 report: The fence regulations are always referred to in section 405 fence regulations. Commercial fences are
184 “only as approved and directed by the Planning and Zoning Commission”. City received a memoranda from the
185 police department and color photos. This is an attractive alternative to temporary concrete barriers. There is a
186 suggested motion drafted to approve a wrought iron fence.

187 Mr. Lee asked about the current setback. Phil Lum said there are actually two things to discuss. Current
188 ordinance says a fence cannot be placed in the front yard. This is located in an 'R-4' district and under the
189 fencing regulations cannot be placed in the front yard with the exception of approval from the Planning and
190 Zoning Commission. Fence can be no taller than 6 feet. The good side on the outside and the structural
191 supporting posts facing in towards the property. Phil went over the rules for fences and items for the
192 Commission to review.

193 Chairman Olds asked about color, the color proposed will be black. This fence is proposed to connect to an
194 existing fence that did not need P & Z approval.

195 Mr. Martine asked about height and warranty. Phil said the height is 6 ft.

196 Mr. Baranowski asked exactly where the fence is going to go. Proposal does not show dimensions.

197 Mr. Olds asked the distance of fence from the street.

198 Phil showed on the drawings where the fence will be placed. 25 to 30 feet from the side walk, where the property
199 line appears on County GIS.

200 Mr. Baranowski discussed the location of the sign. The sign is proposed to remain outside of the fence line.

201 Major Boden explained where the fence will be located running parallel to Lindbergh. Built to protect the
202 building and the employees from civil unrest.

203 Mr. Lee commented that he has a hard time voting yes, however he will to protect the city building and
204 employees. He said it might project a bad message.

205 Chairman Olds moved to approve the 6 foot black wrought-iron fence as presented, with no
206 additional requirements.

207
208 The motion was seconded by Martine. On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke
209 yes, Martine yes, Lee yes, Smith absent, Baranowski yes and Minks yes. Motion carried.

210
211

212 **Item 3 Club Carwash**
213 **PZ120720-3 3170 N. Highway 67**
214 **Approved- Ward 9**

215

216 Request Ratification of Conditional Approval for a minor change in the Development Plan,
217 eliminating easements, in a 'B-5' Planned Commercial District.

218
219

220 Phil Lum, Building Commissioner, presented the staff report for this request. He stated that this is
221 deemed to be a minor change which consists only of eliminating easements on the final development
222 plan. Asked the petitioner to present a little more information on the type of easements. This Club
223 Carwash was recommended for approval at this one-acre out lot. Verification was received that the
224 address change from St. Louis County to 3170 from 3180 N. Highway 67. Staff analysis includes the
225 excerpt from the code about ratifying minor changes. The small and large size paper submissions were
226 both included in the packets. Mr. Lum said again, they are just eliminating easements that would have
227 made the property shared with regard to landscape.

228 Mr. Baranowski expressed concern regarding the easements for utilities. Phil assured him that utility
229 easements were not included. Landscape easements were, not utility easements.

230 Eric Kirchner representative for Cochran to present this request. The preliminary development plan was
231 approved a few months ago. The lot that was approved was 1.08 acres and had a 14 ½ foot landscape
232 easement on the south side of the lot in an open space area that would have been grass to maintain for
233 their own aesthetics. Since that time the seller has come back to Club Carwash wanting Club Carwash
234 to purchase that landscape easement area that is 14 ½ foot wide. They have adjusted the lot size to go
235 from 1.08 acres to 1.13 acres in order to incorporate that landscape easement. That is the only change
236 proposed. The utility easements and everything will be exactly the same. All other easements and
237 accesses are the same. No other comments or questions.

238

239 Mr. Olds moved to ratify the conditional approval of the Building Commissioner as stated in the
240 suggested motion, seconded by Mr. Nelke,

241

242 On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke yes, Martine yes, Lee yes, Baranowski yes and
243 Minks yes. Motion carried.

244

245 **Item 4 3 Flower Valley Shopping Center (AutoZone)**
246 **PZ120720-4 Ward 9**
247 **(Recommended Approval passed with stipulations)**

248

249 Request Approval of change in the Development Plan for construction of a new building, a Permitted Use
250 (AutoZone) Located at 3 Flower Valley Shopping Center, in a 'B-3' Extensive Business District.

251

252 Mr. Lum presented the staff report, explaining that an Auto Parts sales establishment is a Permitted Use
253 in this district, but when given the alternatives, the petitioner proposed to remain a 'B-3' District
254 instead of rezoning to a 'B-5'. Mr. Lum reported the shopping center of about 10.3 acres and about 16,
255 470 s.f. from County record and the surrounding properties.

256 The application was accompanied by plans that included 100% masonry (being brick). The lease lot is
257 shown as lot boundaries, but remains part of 3 Flower Valley, not unlike other shopping centers such as
258 Dierberg's. The shopping center has plenty of parking, even if the former Shop & Save were
259 completely occupied.

260 Screening was discussed, (see lines 51-55 of the staff report) describes past unsuccessful in discussion
261 with the property manager, to install a screen behind the shopping center. Staff recommends
262 landscaping of the lease property and installation of the screen along the north property line, since this
263 represents an expansion to the development plan. P&Z has authority to approve projects and review for
264 zoning code compliance including screening which the expanded development plan should comply.

265 The petitioner's drawings were reviewed on zoom. A landscape plan was recently received not
266 included in packets but was found in compliance with the plantings in islands and the landscape
267 minimums. Elevations were revised several times to include 100% masonry of 2 different colors. A set
268 of plans were received including civil plans in the packets.

269 Mr. Olds said that the screening is far away from the actual location of the Auto Zone building
270 proposed and is the only odd item in the suggested motion. Mr. Baranowski said that the time to
271 require the screen is now, Mr. Nelke and Minks agreed. Mr Nelke asked if the signs complied with the
272 sign code. Mr. Lum said that all signs were under 40 s.f.

273 Matt Murphy with Treanor HL, Civil engineer of record and Mr. Kevin Murphy from Auto Zone
274 presented the petition. Mr. Kevin Murphy stated that internally, Auto Zone does not have a problem

275 installing the screen, but will amend the contract to have the screen installed and work it out. Mr. Lum
276 stated that the zoning code required a 6 foot heavy duty vinyl screen is required, although the bank
277 installed a fence that was approved at 8 foot. Mr. Kevin Murphy explained that they would install the
278 screen and work it out with the landlord and include the screen in their bid and work it out with the
279 owner.

280 Mr. Minks stated that he was excited about coming into this location versus the other location in
281 Hazelwood which is very hard to enter and exit.

282 Mr. Olds asked if there was any post sign. Mr. Matt Murphy stated that there was no sign proposed on
283 the plans. Mr. Olds moved to approve the changes to the development plan as stated in the suggested
284 motion, seconded by Mr. Baranowski.

285
286 On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke yes, Martine yes, Lee yes, Baranowski yes and
287 Minks yes. Motion carried.

288
289 Mr. Kevin Murphy asked if he could contact Mr. Lum for code questions and thanked the Commission.

290

291 **Item 5 2895 N Highway 67 (Chase Bank)**
292 **PZ120720-5 Ward 9**
293 **Request recommended approval of a 'B-5' Planned Commercial District, to allow for redevelopment of a**
294 **new bank located at 2895 N. Highway 67 (Chase Bank) in a 'B-5' Zoning District.**
295 **(Recommended Approval passed)**

296

297 Chairman Olds requested the staff report. Mr. Lum stated that the item returned to P&Z after denial by
298 the Council who cited problems with aesthetics and the masonry ordinance. The proposal is not
299 different in site configuration. Proposed Elevations and rendered elevations are dated 11/2/20. The s.f.
300 is incorrect on one of the plans and should be corrected by the petitioner. The exterior is proposed now
301 to be cultured stone and thin brick. Mr. Lum pointed out (stated on line 41-42 of the staff report) that
302 the new proposal is no more compliant with regard to the masonry ordinance because the thin brick and
303 cultured stone both do not meet the masonry ordinance. The before/after type elevations were shared
304 which shows a 100% thin brick elevations and the base is a more traditional cultured stone. The
305 contemporary design was criticized after visiting the Chesterfield site. The council at the hearing
306 requested a similar design to Chesterfield. The Acme brick company makes both full thickness brick
307 and thin brick, both clay fired. Mr. Olds asked if the Chesterfield building was thin brick also. Mr.
308 Lum responded that the Chesterfield design also had the top 1/3 of the building as EIFS which has been

309 replaced by thin brick in this proposal, giving the appearance of a 100% brick building, but the building
310 in actuality is zero percent (0%) “masonry” as the City ordinance defines it, therefore, is not complaint
311 with the masonry ordinance, although it would appear so.

312 Mr. Lum explained that some explanation is necessary regarding thin brick and how this proposal
313 differs from the previous. The site design and landscape is the same. If you review the masonry
314 ordinance closely, brick must have a minimum thickness of 3 5/8” and meet ASTM C-216. The
315 masonry ordinance is found in the staff report, stating “2. Buildings specifically **excepted** from such
316 requirement under the provisions of a special Permit or a ‘B-5’ zoning ordinance granted by the
317 Council...” The term “excepted” mean here does not mean exempt, it is instead “left out”. Why? The
318 code states except, because the process is set up to be looking at the materials to be recommended by
319 P&Z, deliberated in public hearing, and finally drafted into Ordinance that would include provisions for
320 the degree of compliance to the masonry ordinance. The code doesn’t say zero percent or 100 percent,
321 it says that it should be looked at separately. So, looking back at the drawings, the two designs are
322 aesthetically drastically different and that difference was requested by the City Council. The petitioner
323 has delivered exactly what was requested aesthetically. On the other hand, both designs are identical
324 when it comes to the masonry ordinance. Both designs are still non-compliant with the masonry
325 ordinance, although completely different looking. Mr. Olds stated that he like the more modern design.
326 The Council voted unanimously against that design. Mr. Olds asked the petitioner what the benefit was
327 with regard to thin brick versus full thickness bricks. Mr. LaSurs responded that the benefit is not cost,
328 but weight. That his building as designed would not be possible in this seismic zone without diagonal
329 bracing that might interfere with the current window locations. Mr. Olds asked the thickness of the
330 ‘thin brick’. Mr LaSurs said the think brick is approximately 7/8” thick instead of the 3 5/8”. Below
331 windows is a four inch thickness cultured stone material. Mr LaSurs suggested that full thickness brick
332 veneer older buildings are not seismically reinforced. Mr. Lum said the rule of thumb was 12-14 feet
333 tall before seismic restraint is more difficult. Also, seismic design has been a further made safer and
334 heavier for structures based upon seismic design categories being determined not only by geographic
335 location, but also by the soils type on the site. Mr. Olds questioned why it is more prohibitive sincer
336 their existence of other full thickness brick buildings. Mr. Lum brought up the example of the former
337 Lowe’s building. Mr Lee asked about the height of the Auto Zone Building. Mr. Lum stated that there
338 are very few openings in the Auto Zone building which helps in seismic design. Mr. LaSurs said he has
339 a building proposed that has many window openings in which he fears would lead to tube steel
340 diagonals across some of his window openings if he kept the same plan and had to include full
341 thickness brick veneer. Mr. LaSurs stated the percentage of solid wall is easier to support loads. Mr.

342 Baranowski and Mr. Lee questioned the seismic performance of older buildings in the City. Mr. Olds
343 stated that the petitioner gave the Council exactly what they asked for. Mr. LaSurs will correct the
344 drawing showing the s.f. of the proposed building to 3465 s.f. Mr. Minks asked if there was a
345 difference between thin brick and brick veneer performance. Mr. LaSurs stated that the material is the
346 same, only thickness. The setting or laying of brick does affect the life span. The mortar in each
347 performs differently. Thin brick does not require concave tooled joints in the mortar. Tooled joints can
348 affect the performance of the thin brick and the substrate makes a difference also. Mr. Nelke was
349 dropped from the meeting and rejoined later. Mr. Lum reminded the Commission the petitioner was
350 previously asked to prove performance of the materials submitted, but was not required to submit
351 compliance with the masonry ordinance and all EIFS was eliminated from the Chesterfield prototype.
352 Mr. LaSurs said he was glad to change to thin brick and that the assembly is said to be a 25-30 year
353 lifespan and the manufactured stone the manufacturer believes the product is 50-100 year life span but
354 the material has only been available 15-20 years. He said he does not know of industry data to support
355 this projection. Mr. Olds had some difficulty not having industry data.

356 A photo of the Frontenac/Chesterfield photo was shared to illustrate the base cultured stone material
357 along the base. The brick are a mix of full thickness and the brick higher on the building is thin brick.
358 The Frontenac building is also in a lesser seismic category, Category C. The Florissant soils makes this
359 a Category D, which adds 40 psf lateral load, which makes any loads above 3 feet more difficult to
360 resist. Mr. LaSurs requested that the post sign be withdrawn from this proposal. The shingles are
361 lifetime warranty, but algae resistance is only 15 years. Mr. Minks stated that he does not agree with
362 the city masonry code since the structural dynamic has been increased over the years. Mr. Nelke
363 rejoined the meeting. Mr. Lum stated that line section f. Sign requirements, paragraph (1) should be
364 stricken from the suggested motion. Mr. Baranowski stated that such an aesthetic might be more
365 suitable to the Historic District, not so much where this building is proposed.

366 Mr. Olds made the motion to amend the 'B-5' as stated in the suggested motion, with the changes
367 discussed, omission of "section f. Sign requirements, paragraph (1)". Motion seconded by Mr. Martine.

368
369 On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke yes, Martine yes, Lee yes, Baranowski yes and
370 Minks yes. Motion carried. Council will likely meet Monday January 11, 2021 for the public hearing.

371
372 **Item 6 Planning & Zoning Meetings for 2021**
373 Mr. Olds made the motion to approve the meetings for 2021 of the Commission. Motion seconded by
374 Mr. Lee.

375

376 On Roll Call the Commission voted: Olds yes, Nelke yes, Martine yes, Lee yes, Baranowski yes and
377 Minks yes. Motion carried.

378

379 Mr. Baranowski asked about sign inspections. Mr. Lum responded that inspectors check signs under
380 building permits. Mr. Baranowski objected to the wall sign in the gable of 1200 Graham Rd. The sign
381 was approved by P&Z, but both this sign and the Siteman Cancer facility sign is the same 100 s.f.

382

383 Mr. Lee moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Baranowski. Motion carried. Meeting
384 adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

385

386

387

Jacque George, Recording Clerk