

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



Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes

April 19, 2021

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Roll Call/Minutes	Page 2
1790 N. Highway 67 (Clement Olympic Motors)	Page 2
13955 New Halls Ferry Road (Marshall's)	Page 5
1075 N. Highway 67 (Together Credit Union)	Page 6

35
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

CITY OF FLORISSANT



Planning and Zoning Commission
Unofficial Planning & Zoning Minutes

April 19, 2021

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Florissant met for a remotely conducted meeting through a Zoom platform on Monday, January 4, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman Olds presiding.

Roll Call

On Roll Call the following members were present via Zoom Conferencing: Steve Olds, John Martine (absent), Robert Nelke (excused absence), Allen Minks, Tim Lee, Lee Baranowski, David Smith. 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 from April 5, 2021 with one change seconded by Mr. Minks. Motion carried.

Comment from Phil Lum regarding the email sent planning and zoning packets sent in a different way, electronically. This meeting’s materials consisted of a 9 mb attachment to the email sent. Discussion to be at the end of the meeting or another time. The proposal is to send electronically predominately via email and if hard copy desired, pick up at City Hall.

Old Business

- Item 1 1790 N Highway 67/1645 N. New Florissant Rd. (Clement Olympic Motors)**
- PZ040521-3 **Recommended Approval Ward 6**

68 Request **recommended approval** of an expansion of a Special Use, located at 1645 N. New Florissant
69 Rd. (Clement Olympic Motors) in a 'B-3' Extensive Business District.

70
71 Chairman Olds requested the staff report given by Phil Lum, Building Commissioner. The
72 request is for a recommended approval. Phil presented agenda and staff report electronically that was
73 sent via email to commission. This is a revised report. The bolded items are the revisions to this
74 report. Mr. Lum received revised plans dated April 12 from the architect. Compliant parking must be
75 met so the petitioner sent photos of the existing customer parking areas which can also be found in the
76 packet. The suggested motion was changed in this way for recommended approval. Staff changed the date of
77 the referenced drawing to April 12 and the site development plan shall be amended in this way. The amended
78 stipulations:

- 79 1. A compliant landscape plan will be submitted.
- 80 2. Lighting on the sight shall be directed down and within the property lines to avoid causing glare.
- 81 3. A compliant ADA van space customer, staff, and sales parking shall be striped and receive appropriate
82 signage.
- 83 4. Obtain a land disturbance permit from the city engineer.
- 84 5. Amendment to the Olympic Motors ordinance effectively vacates ordinance 8542, no longer going to be
85 a daycare center.

86 Mr. Lum showed photo of customer parking areas on screen. The 8-foot loading space is not striped for a van so
87 they may lose one space. For ADA parking to be legal you have to have a physical post sign and striping of the
88 loading zone for van and the customer parking must be marked in some way. That would be the preferred
89 method so they would be identified on the Special Use. Mr. Lum showed the revised plan (April 12) showing
90 how the existing curb cuts worked with the revised parking area. Mr. Lum pointed out the two parking lot lights
91 that still remained on the plan.

92 Chairman Olds asked about the vagueness of the statement about the lighting on the plan. Don't we normally
93 require more detail? Mr. Lum stated that a similar statement is used on ordinances for some Special Use Permits.
94 When the lighting is unidentified but the question should really be directed to the petitioner. There is no
95 particular standard in the building code about the amount of light. The County standard is ½ foot candle
96 everywhere on the site is minimum for a parking lot. Predominately the standard is not necessarily for storage of
97 vehicles for sale and security, but for people to find their keys and negotiate a key hole on their vehicle, it's for
98 general lighting of parking lots. The standard here could be ½ foot candle perhaps. The zoning code does say
99 you must contain light on the sight so it doesn't cause glare and a safety hazard.

100 Chairman Olds requested Mr. Lum pull up photos again. Asked if signs were still in the window. Mr. Lum
101 confirmed that they are in fact still up. Chairman Olds stated there are a lot of window signs. Mr. Lum stated
102 that they were requested to remove the signs. Mr. Lum stated that they should have been removed with the
103 approval of the wall signs. Mr. Smith asked if they would change the language of the ½ foot candle or leave as

104 is. Chairman Olds stated it would be left as is since it is a County standard. Mr. Lum confirmed this standard has
105 been required before. Mr. Baranowski asked about removing the existing signage.
106 Mr. Skip Dufour, attorney, representative for the petitioner, pointed out that the statement on line 61 of the staff
107 report “*The architect response was that no new lighting is planned*” is incorrect. He stated that on the April 12
108 drawing it is showing two new parking lights that are to be installed. This is essentially an inventory lot to be in
109 conjunction with the main location of the car lot. The two lights will be installed. Petitioner is ok with condition
110 number 2 regarding the lighting. A landscape plan will be a landscape with be submitted to Mr. Lum, the
111 drawing shows adequate setback. Regarding the ADA van spacing the striping shown in pictures was done after
112 the April 5th meeting. Photos were taken between meetings. Mr. Dufour stated that they will add the loading
113 space, post the handicap sign and mark customer spaces. He stated that a civil engineer will be working with the
114 City Engineer on the land disturbance permit. Regarding the existing signs, Mr. Clement stated that the large
115 Olympic Motor sign will be taken down. He has submitted multiple sign permits for smaller signs. Mr. Dufour
116 reiterated. Chairman Olds suggested under 40 square foot signs would not have to be approved thru Planning
117 and Zoning if they wanted to go that route. Chairman Olds also explained that if they wanted a larger than 40-
118 foot sign they would have to explain why the want and/or need and larger sign.

119 **Suggested Motion:**

120 Chairman Olds moved for **Recommended Approval** to expand a Special Use in a ‘B-3’ Extensive Business
121 District as shown on attached site plan A-1 by Ballmann Architects, dated April 12, 2021 with the following
122 revisions as part of the record:

123 **Site Development Plan shall indicate:**

- 124 1. A compliant landscape plan shall be submitted for approval by the Building Commissioner.
- 125 2. Any lighting on the site shall be directed down and within the property lines as to avoid causing
126 glare and meet county regulations.
- 127 3. A compliant ADA van space, customer, staff and sales parking shall be striped and receive
128 appropriate signage.
- 129 4. A Land Disturbance Permit shall be obtained **as regulated and approved** by the City Engineer,
130 Tom Goldkamp, PE.
- 131 5. The approval of the Special Use **amendment** vacates the Ordinance No. 8542 for Child Day Care
132 Center.

133 Seconded by Mr. Minks. On the vote: Olds yes, Baranowski yes, Minks yes, Martine NA, Nelke NA, Lee yes.
134 Smith yes.

135 Council Meeting May 10, 2021

136
137
138

139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174

Item 2 13955 New Halls Ferry Rd. (Marshalls)

PZ041921-2

Ratified- Ward 9

Request **ratification of a minor change** to amend a site development plan for a ‘B-5’, Ord. No 6669 as amended to infill glass block and relocate signage.

Chairman Olds requested the staff report, given by Mr. Lum. The request is also for ratification of conditional approval. The zoning code for a ‘B-5’ planned commercial district says that the Building Commissioner can deem a project such as this to be a minor change and consistent with the original site development plan as presented in the original public hearing for the Shoppes at Cross Keys Shopping Center. Since this is only one store front change and not a drastic change to the overall site development plan Mr. Lum deemed it a minor change. This is staff conditional approval, but needs ratification by the Planning and Zoning Commission, if ratification is not given it will need a full amendment to the planned commercial development. The project description, the original Ordinance is #6669 which contained elevations from Home Depot to the Ross Clothing Store. The building has predominantly masonry on the front but some EIFS. And the change is to add EIFS area. Mr. Lum presented the existing site conditions on screen. Petitioners clarified the infill area for EIFS is not a glass block area but is glazed with spandrel glass. Mr. Lum pointed out the list of surrounding properties. He shared the excerpt from the code regarding minor change. Archimages drawing is included. Mr. Lum shared a photo of the existing plan and said he did receive some additional photos. There is an additional request to change the color to a more Marshalls white from a bone white. Chairman Olds pointed out that the entire complex contains bone white. The general proposal is to make a portion Marshalls white after removing the glass area and moving the sign up to where the window area was. A later request was made by Marshalls asking that the rectangular area be Marshalls white and the rest of it be bone white. The signage size will stay the same. Roy Mangan, the architect with Archimages, explained how they wanted to take out the glass and frame and fill that with EIFS material to match the rest and move the sign upwards. The signage size would not change. He explained how they wanted to make the banded area a whiter Marshall’s white which is a shade whiter than the bone white. The rest of the bone white in the feature area would remain the same. It’s just a slight accent more in that the sign band area. The major request is to remove the glass and move that sign up. Chairman Olds asked Mr. Mangan if he had a mock-up of what the color would look like due to his concern over how the brighter white would affect the overall look. Mr. Mangan said it is just a shade brighter, he does not have a mock up. Mr. Minks asked if the glass lets light into the building. Mr. Mangan said it did not. Mr. Smith has reservations regarding the color because being so white may change the identity of the space. Mr. Baranowski asked if when removing the glass would it affect the structure. Mr. Lum said that filling that space with a light weight panel

175 and leaving the existing lintel would not affect structure. Mr. Mangan also assured him that the structure would
176 be sound.

177

178 **Suggested motion:**

179 Chairman Olds presented the suggested motion:

180 I move to ratify the conditional approval of the Building Commissioner for site development plan of Ordinance
181 6669 to allow for infill of glass block area and to relocate signage according to the proposal prepared by the
182 petitioner and related drawings presented. These minor alterations depict minor changes in the development,
183 which is not in conflict with the nature of the development and meets all the conditions of the ordinance No.
184 6669. Approval is subject to the regulations of the B-5 “Planned Commercial District”, and the following
185 additional requirements:

186 1. EIFS color area is to be Marshall’s White.

187 2. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS.

188 Unless, and except to the extent, otherwise specifically provided in Ordinances of the City of
189 Florissant.

190 3. PROJECT COMPLETION.

191 Sign construction shall start within 30 days of the issuance of the building permits and shall be
192 developed in accordance with the approved changes to the development plan within 180 days of start of
193 construction.

194

195 Seconded by Mr. Lee. On the vote: Olds yes, Baranowski yes, Minks yes, Mr. Smith yes, Martine NA,
196 Nelke NA, Lee yes.

197

198 **Item 3 1075 N Highway 67 (Together Credit Union)**

199 PZ041921-3

200 **Ratified- Ward 6**

201 Request **ratification of a minor change** to amend a site development plan for a ‘B-5’, Ord. No. 7531, as
202 amended, to create fewer drive through lanes.

203 Chairman Olds requested the staff report, given by Mr. Lum. Mr. Lum presented the staff report. This credit
204 union was built as a ‘B-5’ rezoning under Ord. 7531. A ratification of a minor change will apply here much the
205 same as with the last item. It was originally American Eagle Credit Union. The surrounding properties are listed
206 and in an ‘R-4’. Page 2 explains the ratification of a minor change and if it’s defeated it would be a formal
207 amendment to the ‘B-5’. The principal idea is that the credit union’s policies have changed and they want to
208 make the drive thru lanes wider, eliminating one lane, going from 4 lanes to 3 also eliminating one piece of
209 equipment. Mr. Lum saw this as minor change so he gave then conditional approval based on ratification of the

210 change by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Chairman Olds asked commission for any questions. No
211 questions.

212 John Mayaan, representative for the petition. He explained how they want to consolidate the 4 lanes down to 3
213 under the canopy and the equipment will be upgraded. Mr. Minks asked why they were going down to three
214 lanes. Response was it was consistent with credit union policy and makes it easier for customers to get in.

215 Suggested Motion:

216 Chairman Olds presented the suggested motion:

217 I move to ratify the conditional approval of the Building Commissioner for site development plan of Ordinance
218 7531 to allow for removal of a drive through lane according to the proposal prepared by the petitioner and related
219 drawings presented. These minor alterations depict minor changes in the development, which is not in conflict
220 with the nature of the development and meets all of the conditions of the ordinance no. 7531. Approval is subject
221 to the regulations of this B-5 “Planned Commercial District”, and the following additional requirements:

222 1. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS.

223 Unless, and except to the extent, otherwise specifically provided in Ordinance 7531, development shall
224 be affected only in accordance with all ordinances of the City of Florissant.

225 2. PROJECT COMPLETION.

226 Construction shall start within 30 days of the of the issuance of building permits and shall be developed
227 in accordance with the approval changes to the development plan within 180 days of start of construction.

228

229 Seconded by Mr. Smith. On the vote: Olds yes, Baranowski yes, Minks yes, Mr. Smith yes, Martine NA, Nelke
230 NA, Lee yes.

231

232 DISCUSSION

233 Mr. Olds asked Mr. Lum about Hucks. He said that he expects that they will resubmit after talking to the civil
234 engineer. Mr. Lum also let Commission know that Mr. Patel at the liquor store that was denied for bars in the
235 windows had Overhead door Company call, asking questions about how to resubmit. After review of that item,
236 staff will have the Planning and Zoning commission approve any remodeling for changes the exterior of the
237 building, but for any property operating under a Special Use will result in an amendment to a Special Use,
238 resulting in Planning and Zoning making a recommendation to the City Council and they would approve or
239 disapprove bars in windows. In summary, if there is no Special Use, it’s a remodeling and if there is a Special
240 Use it would be an amendment to a Special Use. A letter was written to everyone that had bars in the windows,
241 LED lights, and scrolling lights and sent out. Discussion of bars and how to handle them ensued. Mr. Lum
242 discussed alternatives to actual bars for security.

243 Last item of discussion should packets be sent via email. Concern being once we go back to live meetings how
244 would that be handled. City Council has been doing it for years. Paper packets can be made available for
245 Commission members to pick up if desired.

246 Possibility exists in going live soon. It was agreed that digital packets would be fine and IT could provide a large
247 screen to view plans at meeting. Mr. Olds would like printed suggested motion for live meetings. Mr. Minks
248 reminded everyone that his email has changed and to please note that change.

249 Mr. Baranowski moved to adjourn. Seconded by many, Meeting adjourned 9:07 pm

250

251

252

Jacquelyn George, Permit Inspection Clerk