IV.A.

# Board of Adjustment Staff Report 

Variance Type: Area or Bulk<br>Meeting Date: July 7, 2011<br>From: Aimee Nassif, AICP Planning and Development Services Director<br>Location: 1500 Baxter Lane Court<br>Applicant: James and Marilyn Simpson<br>Description: B.A. 01-2011 1500 Baxter Lane Ct (James \& Marilyn Simpson): A request for a variance from St. Louis County Ordinance Number 13939 for a residential lot in the Estates at Baxter Lane subdivision to maintain an eleven (11) foot rear yard setback in lieu of the fifteen (15) foot required setback. (19S531889)

## PROPOSAL SUMMARY

James and Marilyn Simpson are requesting an eleven (11) foot rear yard setback in lieu of the fifteen (15) foot required setback established in the site specific ordinance for this subdivision. The purpose for this area variance request is to accommodate construction of a deck in the rear of this residential structure.

An application submitted by James and Marilyn Simpson is attached hereto which includes an explanation of the above referenced request, statement of unnecessary hardship, description of the effect or impact on neighboring properties. Also attached for your reference is a copy of the Municipal Zoning Application which was rejected by the Department on April 14, 2011.

Section 2-216 of the City of Chesterfield Municipal Code states that the Board of Adjustment shall have the following powers:
"To permit a variation in the yard requirements of any zoning district or the building or setback lines from major highways as provided by law where there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships in the carrying out of these provisions due to an irregular shape of the lot, topographical or other conditions, provided that such variance will not seriously affect any adjoining property or the general welfare of the public."

## SITE HISTORY

The Estates at Baxter Lane Subdivision was originally zoned "R-2" Residence District with a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) by St. Louis County in 1988 just prior to the incorporation of the City of Chesterfield. This subdivision is approximately 13 acres in size and consists of 26 single family residential lots. 1500 Baxter Lane Court is an approximately 14,400 square foot lot and is depicted as lot 8 on the section of the record plat below.


The structure setbacks for interior lots in this development, as required in Ordinance 13,939 are:

1. Minimum front yard setback of 25 feet
2. Minimum side yard setback of 6 feet
3. Minimum rear yard setback of 15 feet (variance being requested)

You will note on the plat there is reference to an additional, more restrictive set of structure setbacks. These minimum yard setbacks were established by and enforced by the subdivision indentures. Subdivision indentures are a private matter amongst each residential subdivision. The City of Chesterfield does not create, draft, or enforce indentures. Therefore, the area variance being requested for your consideration from the rear yard setback requirement is from the Ordinance requirement only.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Estates at Baxter Lane Subdivision was platted in 1991 and the Simpson's home was built in 1992. As you can see from the photo below, the rear yard of the subject site abuts to common ground.


In April 2011 the Simpson's submitted a Municipal Zoning Application (or MZA) to the Department for construction of a new deck at the rear of the structure. The deck was shown to encroach in the rear yard setback by 4 feet and was therefore rejected. The purpose of the application was to construct a new deck which would replace an existing one. The proposed deck is larger in size from the existing deck; an exact size difference is unknown because the existing deck was built by the previous property owners without obtaining the necessary permits and approvais from the City of Chesterfield or St. Louis County.

View of the Front of 1500 Baxter Lane Court


Views of the side yard for 1500 Baxter Lane Court



## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT POLWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In making your decision to grant a variance, the Board of Adjustment is required to follow State Statute and City Code requirements. Missouri Revised Statute Chapter 89.090 requires that a Board of Adjustment may only grant variances when the applicant has established the necessary "practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship" and when "the spirit of the ordinance shall be observed, public safety and welfare secured and substantial justice done".

Chapter 2-216 of the Chesterfield City Code states that the Board can grant variances to yard requirements when practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships exist in carrying out the provision due to an irregular lot shape, lot size, topography or other related matter.

In determining if a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship has been established by the Applicant, the Board must determine if relief is necessary due to an unusual or unique character of the property or lot. The burden of proving this is on the Applicant and an individual cannot create a situation and then claim he needs a variance. (Wolfner v. Board of Adjustment of City of Warson Woods, 114 S.W.3d 298 Mo.App.E.D., 2003).

## APPLICANT REQUEST

The Applicant has stated in the application that practical difficulties do exist because the lot is pie shaped. In addition, access to the deck from the home is located on the rear of the property, therefore the deck must be located in this area. In addition, the stairs to the deck must be located to the north due to the slope of the rear yard. Locating the stairs in another section of the deck would render the deck unusable for the Applicant due to outstanding medical issues. Please refer to the attached application for full statement from the Applicant and letters of support from adjacent property owners and subdivision trustees.

## DEPARTMENT REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

Upon review of this Application, Staff does not find that a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship has been established by the Applicant. First, the lot is approximately 14,400 square feet in size which is comparable in size and shape to all other residential lots in the subdivision. The existing lot size, lot shape, and topography are such that it is possible to construct a deck within all required yard setbacks. The existing deck, while permits were never pulled, does appear to meet the yard setback requirements. The Applicant has been advised that they would be permitted to replace the existing deck with a new one provided all yaid requirements are met.

From the drawings submitted to the Department for review, it appears that the design of the deck itself is causing the issue with the rear yard setback. If the deck were to be reconfigured, it could maintain the same size and fit within all required yard setbacks. The location of the stairs and entrance to the deck do not impact the ability to meet the yard requirements because they are each located in the side yard, not rear yard. It is the half circle (or hexagon) bump out of the deck which causes the issue which is being proposed to accommodate a table and allow for the flow of traffic on the deck.

Because it is an issue with the deck design, it appears as though the Applicant is creating the situation and then claiming the need for a variance. As stated previously in this report, an Applicant cannot create a situation then claim the need for a variance because of it. (from Wolfner vs City of Warson Woods on previous page)

The other question which Staff reviews and the Board must consider when granting a variance is whether or not the granting of the variance will have a detrimental effect to the public, health, safety, or welfare of the general public. An analysis of this point becomes moot since it is our determination that a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship has not been established. However, it can be noted that this property abuts to a large tract of common ground in the rear of the lot and the subdivision trustees and adjacent property owners have submitted letters of support for this variance request.

## Attached please find a copy of the Application along with all supporting documentation provided by the Applicant.

Staff has reviewed the request for B.A. 01-2011 and recommends denial of the request as submitted.

Respectfully submitted,


Aimee E Nassif, AICP
Planning and Development Services Director
Exhibits

1. City of Chesterfield Zoning Ordinance (not in packet)
2. Notice of Publication
3. Affidavit of Publication (not in packet)
4. Staff Report
5. Petitioner's Application
a. Application to Board of Adjustment
b. Rejected Application
c. Photos of site from Applicants
d. Letters of support from neighbors and subdivision trustees
6. St. Louis County Ordinance Number 13,939

## Notice of Public Hearing City of Chesterfield Board of Adjustment

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Board of Adjustment of the City of Chesterfield will hold a Public Hearing on Thursday, July 7, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at the City of Chesterfield City Hall, 690 Chesterfield Parkway West, Chesterfield, Missouri 63017.

The Board will consider the following:
B.A. 01-2011 1500 Baxter Lane Ct (James \& Marilyn Simpson): A request for a variance from St. Louis County Ordinance Number 13939 for a residential lot in the Estates at Baxter Lane subdivision to maintain an eleven (11) foot rear yard setback in lieu of the fifteen (15) foot required setback. (19S531889)


All interested parties are invited to appear and be heard at the hearing.
Copies of the request are available for review at City Hall Monday through Friday, from 8:30 a.m. to $4: 30$ p.m. If you should need additional information about this project, please contact Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director by telephone at 636-537-4749 or by email at anassif@chesterfield.mo.us.
City of Chesterfield
Aimee Nassif, AlCP
Planning and Development Services Director

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS


The Board of Adjustment is a local body consisting of volunteers appointed by the Mayor. The Board hears requests for variances and appeals of administrative determinations. A variance is deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements for a specific parcel. The types of variances heard before the Board of Adjustment are Use, Area, and Bulk Variances. A variance is granted only upon demonstration of a hardship such as lot size, topography, or other issues not created by the lot owner. For questions about this application, please contact the Department of Planning and Public Works at 636-537-4746. For information about this and other projects under review by the Department of Planning and Public Works, please visit "Planning Projects" at www.Chesterfield.mo.us.
Check $(\checkmark)$ the type of variance for which you are applying:
$\checkmark$ Area or Bulk variance: A request to allow deviation from the dimensional (i.e. height, bulk yard) requirements of a zoning district.

Sign variance: A request to allow Appeal of Administrative Determination deviation from dimensional/quantity regulations

Please note areas in gray will be completed by the Department of Planning and Public Works.

STATE OF MISSOURI )
)
BOA M MBER:
LHARHNCBAMH

## CITY OF CHESTERFIELD )

Petition for Appeal from Zoning Regulations


Owner(s) of record of the hereinafter described property according to St. Louis County Assessor's Record: James D. and Marilyn M. Simpson
Address: 1500 Baxter Lane Ct.
City: Chesterfield .
Tel.:


State:
MO
Zip: 63017
Fax: $\qquad$

Petitioner, if other than owner(s):
Address:
City:
$\qquad$

Tel.:


Fax:
Zip:

Legal Interest:
(Provide date of contract and date of expiration of contract)
*Attach additional sheets as necessary for other Parties of Interest (Architect, Engineer, etc.)

690 Chesterfield Parkway West, Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760
Ph. (630)537-4746 Fax (636)537-4798 www.chesterfield.mo.us

Project Address: 1500 Baxter Lane Ct.
Locator Number(s): Unk.
(List additional locator numbers on separate sheet and attach to petition)
Acreage: . 33 (To the nearest tenth of an acre)
Subdivision Name (If applicable): Estates at Baxter Lane
Current Zoning District: Unk
Legal Description of Property: See attached.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
(Attach additional sheets as necessary)
Rerkermen

Unique physical characteristics of the lot (e.g., size, slope, etc.): Gently downwards sloping pie-shaped lot. Home sits far to the back of the lot, less than 22 feet from the common ground to the back wall.
(Attach additional sheets as necessary)

Description of the necessity of the proposed improvement: Existing deck is aging.
Steps are too steep for owner, as she has a medical condition, patellofemoral syndrome, and has been advised to minimize the use of stairs. Re-configuration of the deck reduces the number of stairs to six.
(Attach additional sheets as necessary)

Ordinance Number and section to which a variance is sought: 13939
(Attach additional sheets as necessary)

Do deed restrictions or subdivision trust indentures for the property prohibit the use or construction which is requested by this petition? Check $(\checkmark)$ one $\checkmark$ Yes No

690 Chesterfield Parkway West, Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760
Ph. (636)537-4746 Fax (636)537-4798 www.chesterfield.mo.us

## Statement of unnecessary hardship, practical difficulty or other information warranting action by the Board:

The small size and steep step configuration of the existing deck make it unusable. The existing deck is also showing signs of age and will soon need to be replaced.

The lot configuration and location of the existing residence creates practical difficulties in locating the replacement deck within the City's 15 foot set back. The lot is pie shaped opening to the rear of the property. The property abuts common ground and there are no abutting residences to the rear property. The homeowner maintains (mows, fertilizes, plants) the ground between the property line and the fenced common ground. The fence is located approximately 29 feet behind the home. The existing residence is located approximately 21 feet from the rear property line. The door opening to the deck is located on the rear (east) wall of the property, thereby requiring entry of the deck from that location. With the existing set back requirement, the deck at the entry point from the house would be insufficient to accommodate the flow of traffic. Further, the slopoof the property lend itself to the stairs being located to the north.

The proposed design is for an L-shaped deck with steps on the northeast corner. This reduces the number of steps to six (6). Not only is this less expensive to construct, it is desirable to the homeowner who has knee issues (patellofemoral syndrome). The homeowner's physician has advised her to minimize or avoid stairs. The bump out on the deck will accommodate a table and allows for the free flow of traffic from the only entry point onto the deck from the residence to the stairs. The existing bay window on the residence in the breakfast room inhibits the traffic flow already. The proposed deck would be approximately 10 feet from the back wall on the property and leaves approximately 19 feet to the fenced common ground area.

[^0]Description of the effect or impact on neighboring properties:
None. Both adjoining neighbors and each of the Trustee's for the subdivision have provided letters of support for the proposed improvement. See attached. Further, the setback in question is to a common ground area. No residential property directly abuts the subject property.
(Attach additional sheets as necessary)
For Area or Bulk Variance Requests, complete the following section:

## A. Setbacks/Height:

| The Petitioner(s) request | City of <br> the following setback(s): |
| :--- | :--- |
| Regulations require the <br> following setback(s) for this <br> site: |  |

## Front Yard:

Side Yard:
Rear Yard:
11 '
$15^{\prime}$

## Height:

## Provide the following:

1. A $\$ 70.00$ fee. (Checks/money orders to be made payable to the City of Chesterfield)
2. Two completed copies of this application with original signatures. Please note: A copy with the Chairman's signature and the Board's decision will be returned to you.
3. Twenty-five (25) copies of the following for inclusion in the packet:
$\square$ A site plan showing the dimensions and location (including distance from property lines) of all existing and proposed buildings and structures.
$\square$ Letters from abutting property owners stating their position.
$\square$ Copies of the completed application.
a- The City of Chesterfield rejection or denial.

- Any other information as required by the City of Chesterfield

For Sign Variance Requests, complete the following section:
B. Signage:

| The Petitioner(s) request |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| the following : | City of <br> Regulations allow <br> following for this site: |

Number of attached business
signs:
Size of attached business
signs:
Number of freestanding business signs:
Size of freestanding business
signs:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Explain why the sign variance request would not cause a public health or safety concern to the neighborhood or the public welfare.

## Provide the following:

1. A $\$ 70.00$ fee. (Checks/money orders to be made payable to the City of Chesterfield.)
2. Two completed copies of this application with original signatures. Please note: A copy with the Chairman's signature and the Board's decision will be returned to you.
3. Twenty-five (25) copies of the following for inclusion in the packet:

A site plan showing:

- The subject property with adjoining streets, existing buildings, major parking lot, and distance to property lines.
- The location of proposed signs.
- If attached wall signs, the cross section of wall on which sign is to be placed with dimensions and total square feet (or portion of total wall that will contain petitioner's business)

A detail sign plan indicating:

- Dimension of signs with detail sign lettering layout.
- Total square feet of signs. If attached, what percent of wall.
- Light detail, if any.

Letters from abutting property owners stating their position.
Copies of the completed application.
The City of Chesterfield rejection or denial.
Any other information as required by the City of Chesterfield

Is property in compliance with all previous conditions of approval of all applicable Ordinance requirements?
$\checkmark$ Yes $\qquad$ No. If no, please explain:
$\qquad$

Is property in compliance with all Zoning, Subdivision, and Code requirements?
$\checkmark$ Yes $\qquad$ No. If no, please explain: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
[THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

## STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I hereby give CONSENT to $\qquad$ (type, stamp or print clearly full name of agent) to act on my behalf to submit, this application and all required material and documents, and to attend and represent me at all meetings and public hearings pertaining to the application (s) indicated above. Furthermore, I hereby give consent to the party designated above to agree to all terms and conditions which may arise as part of the approval of this application.

I hereby certify I have full knowledge of the property and I have an ownership interest and/or am the owner under contract in the subject of this application. I further certify the statements or information made in any paper or plans submitted herewith are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that any false, inaccurate or incomplete information provided by me or my agent will result in the denial, revocation or administrative withdrawal of this application, request, approval or permits. I acknowledge that additional information may be required to process this application. I further consent to the City of Chesterfield to publish, copy or reproduce any copyrighted document submitted as a part of this application for any third party. I understand this application, related material and all attachments become official records of the City of Chesterfield, Missouri, and will not be returned. I further agree to all terms and conditions which may be imposed as part of the approval of this application.

## OWNER/CONTRACT PURCHASER INFORMATION:

I am the $\quad \checkmark$ owner ___ contract purchaser. (check ( $\checkmark$ ) one)
Marilyn Simpson + James D Simpson.
(Name- type, stamp or print clearly)
(Name of Firm)


Note: Attach additional sheets as necessary.
NOTARY PUBLIC INFORMATION: STATE OF MISSOURI, CITY OF CHS $\quad c h a r l i s$
The foregoing instrument was subscribed and sworn to before me this

day of
 20 1/ $\qquad$ .


Signed
 Print Name:
 Seal/Stamp:

My Commission Expires:


REGINA K. STONEBRAKER My Commission Expires February 3, 2012 SI. Charles County Commission 108415211

## 690 Chesterfield Parkway West, Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760

 Ph. (630)537-4746 Fax (636)537-4798 www.chesterfield.mo.us
## 

INSTRUCTIONS: To be completed by individual submitting application (property owner, petitioner with consent, or authorized agent).

Project Name: Deck replacement, 1500 Baxter Lane Ct. Submittal Date: 6-16-2011

## STATEMENT OF COMPLETION AND ACCURACY

I hereby certify the statements or information made in any paper or plans submitted herewith are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and that all property owners have full knowledge that the property they own is the subject of this application. I understand that any knowingly false, inaccurate or incomplete information provided by me will result in the denial, revocation or administrative withdrawal of this application, request, approval or permit and further certify that all owners and petitioners have been provided a complete copy of all material, attachments and documents submitted to the City of Chesterfield relating to this application. I acknowledge this application, related application material and all attachments become official records of the City of Chesterfield, Missouri and will not be returned. I further acknowledge that additional information may be required by the City of Chesterfield to process this application. No arrangement has been made to pay any commission, gratuity, or consideration, directly or indirectly, to any official, employee, or appointee of the City of Chesterfield with respect to this application.

Check $(\checkmark)$ one: $\quad \checkmark$ I am the property owner. __I am the contract purchaser.
I am the duly appointed agent of the petitioner.

Marilyn Simpson James D. Simpson
(Name- type, stamp or print clearly)
(Name of Firm)
Note: Attach additional sheets as necessary.


1500 Baxter Lane Ct., Chesterfield, MO 63017
(Address, City, State, Zip)

## StChares

NOTARY PUBLIC INFORMATION: STATE OF MISSOURI, CITY OF CHESTEPEHELD
The foregoing instrument was subscribed and sworn to before me this 2011 11 $16 H$ day of $0 \operatorname{lon} 2$ Signed $\qquad$ Print Name: Seal/Stamp:

My Commission Expires: $\qquad$


REGINA K. STONEBRAKER My Commission Expires February 3; 2012 St. Charles County Commission tocest15211

[THIS PAGE FOR INTERNAL USE]

## STAFE/BOA USE ONLX

Intake Date:

This petition is granted / denied (circle one) on the

Signed:

## [THIS PAGE FOR INTERNAL USE]

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION

LOT 8 OF THE ESTATES AT BAXTER LANE, A SUBDIVISION IN ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 303, PAGE 73 OF THE ST. LOUIS COUNTY RECORDS


04/19 15:31
FAX NO. /NAME
DURATION
PAGE (S)
RESULT
MODE

3146157085
อ0.00:39
$\square 2$
OK
STANDARD
EM

## Fed ${ }_{2} \mathrm{x}_{3}$ Office

## Fax Cover Sheet

FedEx Kinks's is now FedEx Office


Number of pages (including cover page)

## From:

To:
Name Reseat ch Request Personnel 1 company Dept of Public Clerks
Telephone $314615-2528$
Fax $\qquad$ 314-615-7085

Comments $\qquad$
Name Marilyn Sunpscon Company $\quad N / \Delta$

Telephone 6365.320424

St. Louis County Department of Public Works

Date of Request: $\qquad$ $\frac{4-19-11}{\text { dene Simpson }}$
Name: Marly Company: $\qquad$ N/A
Address of Requester of information: 1500 Baxter Lane Pt Adesterteld MO 13017 Chesterfield, MO 63017 636532.0424 $\qquad$ $314602-2386$

Address of Property to Research: $\qquad$ 1500 Batter Lane Ct.
$\qquad$ 6317
Permit Number: $\qquad$ Locator Numbers) [on Tax Bill]: $\qquad$ 195531889

Is the property Residential Commercial? (circle one)
State specifically the information you are requesting, such as: permits on a specific address, building plans for a house, electrical plans, etc. Include approximate date of research requested.
hooking for permit for ackck built on this property printer to December 2000 .
us need to replace deck. (Le purchased the house in June 2001 )
No record in chesterfield ore in the automated ollystem at county. Was directed to thur service by the person who checked your on-line system.
RESEARCHIDUPLICATION FEES

Duplication Fees:

Clerical Research:
$\$ 25.19$ per hour plus

- 10 cents a page, up to $11^{\prime \prime} \times 17^{\prime \prime}$
- Plans larger then 11 " x 17 " start at $\$ 2.50$ per page, depending on plan size
- $\$ 1.05$ per CD for Electronic Records
$\$ 25.19$ per hour
Special Computer Program Development:
$\$ 97.00$ per hour (price may vary depending on our vendor contract)
Please be informed, permits issued more than 5 years ago and building plans older than 10 years, may not be available.
$I$, the undersigned and requestor of this information, understand the above research fee amounts and agree to proceed with this research request.


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Revenoded April void - No pummel casuid Recons } \\
& \text { chocked beck } 1019.87
\end{aligned}
$$






## Rejected

MZA_111455
Date: 4/14/2011

| Property Address |  | Subdivis |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 BAXTER LANE CT |  |  |  |
| Locator \# | Ward | Date Received | Flood Plain |
| 19S531889 | 2 | $4 / 13 / 2011$ | NO |

## Zoning Class Type <br> R2 <br> Porch/Patio/Deck

| Property Owner | Tenant |
| :--- | :--- |
| James \& Marilyn Simpson | Deck |

## Applicant

California Custom Decks

## Comments

4/13/2011 - Complete - Kkelley - A copy of the Trustee email included with the application. Returned trustee email will receive mail notification.

Assigned to Kristian.
4/13/2011 - Cleared - BNiesen -
4/14/2011 - Rejected - kcorbin - Proposed deck encroaches into the rear yard structure setback of 15 feet. Must move deck out of setback.
Status Rejected $\quad 4 / 14 / 2011 \quad$ by Kristian Corbin, Project Planner

## ADVISORY:

Applications for Municipal Zoning Approval that are not approved may be resubmitted once changes have been made. Please note that relief from some requirements, in the form of a variance, may be requested via application to the Board of Adjustment; please call the Department of Planning and Public Works at (636) 537-4746.



AERIAL VIEW OF STREET "A" IS RESIDENCE, 1500 BAXTER LANE COURT


THERE IS AN EXISTING 9'8" SQUARE DECK BUILT BY PREVIOUS OWNER 2000 OR OLDER


HERE IS A VIEW FROM THE NORTH OF THE EXISTING DECK


PHOTO IS AT BASE OF STAIR CASE WHICH EXTENDS 14 ' BEYOND THE BACK WALL OF THE HOUSE


THIS IS THE VIEW FROM THE BACK OF THE RESIDENCE OVER THE CHAIN LINK FENCE INTO THE COMMON GROUND. (29 FEET FENCE TO HOUSE).


April 16, 2011
City of Chesterfield Missouri
Department of Planning and Public Works
690 Chesterfield Parkway West
Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760
Dear Board of Adjustment Members:
I have met with my neighbor, Marilyn Simpson, and discussed the Simpson's plans to replace their current deck with a composite deck. The deck will permit them to exit through their home from their sliding glass door off their main level to their back yard. The builder's drawing shows that the deck will wrap around the northwest corner of their house and fits within their property lines.

We have very limited visibility of the back of their property from our backyard due to the lot layout on our cul-de-sac. Their plans have no adverse effect on us as a neighbor and we have no objection to their building request. Directly behind their yard is a fenced common ground, with a storm retention area.

Sincerely,


## 1504 Baxter Lane Ct

Chesterfield, MO 63017
April 19, 2011
City of Chesterfield Missouri
Department of Planning and Public Works
690 Chesterfield Parkway West
Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760

## Board of Adjustment Members:

I have met with my neighbor, Marilyn Simpson, and discussed the Simpson's plans to replace their current deck with a composite deck. The deck will permit them to exit through their home from their sliding glass door off their main level to their back yard. The builder's drawing shows that the deck will wrap around the northwest corner of their house and fits within their property lines.

We have limited visibility of the back of their property from our backyard due to the lot layout on our cul-de-sac and landscaping in our yard. Their plans have no adverse effect on us as a neighbor and we have no objection to their building request. Directly behind their yard is a fenced common ground, with a storm retention area.

Sincerely,
Toni Sharlow
Carlos or Toni Sharlow

```
33 Baxter Lane
Chesterfield, MO 63017
```

May 5, 2011
City of Chesterfield Missouri
Department of Planning and Public Works
690 Chesterfield Parkway West
Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760
Board of Adjustment Members:
Marilyn Simpson, home owner of 1500 Baxter Lane Court, called me to discuss the Simpson's plan to replace their current deck and the need for a variance of the easement setback on the west side, rear of their building lot.

As a member of the Trustees of the Estates of Baxter Lane, I have been asked for my opinion of their plan. The deck they're proposing sits entirely within their property. Additionally, the property backs up to a fenced storm-sewer area. Their plan to extend the deck 10 feet to the rear of the house (on the bump out only), will allow approximately 19 feet to the fenced common area. The common ground abutting their property and not enclosed by the fence is maintained (mowed, fertilized, etc) by the Simpson's. I support their request for variance as it does not adversely affect any other homeowner.

The deck will permit them to exit through their home from their sliding glass door off their main level to their back yard.

Sincerely,

Rick Roberts
Trustee

3 Baxter Lane
Chesterfield, MO 63017
May 5, 2011
City of Chesterfield Missouri
Department of Planning and Public Works
690 Chesterfield Parkway West
Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760
Board of Adjustment Members:
I am one of three trustees for the Baxter Lane Estates subdivision. Marilyn Simpson, home owner of 1500 Baxter Lane Court, called me to discuss the Simpson's plan to replace their current deck and the need for a variance of the easement setback on the rear of their building lot.

As a member of the Trustees of the Estates of Baxter Lane, I have been asked for my opinion of their plan. Their property backs to a storm retention area and their backyard is very isolated from other residences. The deck they're proposing sits entirely within their property. Their plan to extend the deck 10 feet to the rear of the house (on the bump out only), will allow approximately 19 feet to the fenced common area. The common ground abutting their property and not enclosed by the fence is maintained (mowed, fertilized, etc) by the Simpson's. I support their request for variance.

The deck will permit them to exit through their home from their sliding glass door off their main level to their back yard. The house is a look-out atrium ranch; the sliding glass door is approximately 6 feet off the ground.


29 Baxter Lane
Chesterfield, MO 63017
April 21, 2011
City of Chesterfield Missouri
Department of Planning and Public Works
690 Chesterfield Parkway West
Chesterfield, MO 63017-0760
Board of Adjustment Members:
Marilyn Simpson, home owner of 1500 Baxter Lane Court, and I discussed the Simpson's plan to replace their current deck and the need for a variance of the 15 foot easement on the west side, rear of their building lot. The deck will permit them to exit through their home from their sliding glass door off their main level to their back yard. The builder's drawing shows that the deck will wrap around the northwest corner of their house and fits within their property lines.

As a member of the Trustees of the Estates of Baxter Lane, I have been asked for my opinion of their plan and to provide any additional information that you may not have. First, their plans have no adverse effect on the neighborhood. The eastern segment of the fenced storm-sewer area sits approximately 29 feet from the back wall of the Simpson's home. Their plan to extend the deck 10 feet to the rear of the house (on the bump out only), will allow approximately 19 feet to the fenced common area. The common ground abutting their property and not enclosed by the fence is maintained (mowed, fertilized, etc) by the Simpson's. Incidentally, access to the common ground is on the south side of the common ground. I have reviewed their plan and support their request for variance.



SECTION 2. The preliminarj appron . .
1003.187 SLCRO 1974, as amended, is granted subject to all
ordsnances, rules and regulations and to the conditions recommended
by the Planaiag Comassion in its report dated May 10, 1988, as follows:

## 1. PERMITYED USES

This Planned Enfironment Unit shall authorize the devaloprent of a masimum of twentyosix (26) single family residences on individual lotz.
2. LOT REQUIREMENTS
a. All lots shall be a minimum of 13,000 square feet.
3. SITE DEVELOPMEATT PLAN SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Within eighteen (18) months of the date of approval of the preliminary development plan by the County Council and prior to any site preparation or construction, the petitioner shall submit to the Planning Commission for its review and approval a Site Development Plan. Where due cause is shown by the developer, this time interval may be extended through appeal to and approval by the Plenning Comission. Said Site Development Plen shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
a. A general development plan, including basic arrangement of lot locations, common land areas, sidewalks, setback lines from all internal streets and along the perimeter of the subject tract, roadways on or adjacent to the property in question including roadway righteofoway dimensions, and a street lighting plan.
b. The location and size of all outdoor pericing areas, if any.
c. Existing and proposed contours at two (2) foot intervals.
d. The design, location, and size of all proposed freestanding signs, fences, and other above ground structures, except retaining walls.
e. A landscape plan, including, but not limited to, the location, size, and general type of all plant and other materials to be used.
f. The location of any public utility facilities.
g. All other preliminary plat requirements of the St. Louis County Subdivision Ordinance.
4. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGN CRITERIA

The above Site Development Flan shall adhere to the following specific design eriteria:
Structure Setbacks
a. Structure setbacks shall be as established in the "R-4" Residence District, except front yards shall be a minimum of twenty-Five (25) feet and yards abutting the perimeter of this development shall comply with setbacks of the "Ro2" District.

## Parking Requirements

b. Minimum parking requirements shall be as required by Section 1003.165 of the $S t$. Louis County Zoning Ordinance.

## Access

```
-. Acceas to thi- , ...1.... nt shall fa limited to one (1)
    street approach as approved by the Planning Commission on
    the Site Development Plan.
```

Road Improvements and Sidewalks
-2-
d. If access is proposed via an extcusion of Baster Lane prowide minteannce agreement or other appropriate legal instrumenc verliyiag the devalopar's agreement with the trusteas of Baxter Lane Subdivision to ghare in che mintenance of bastor Lene from which access to this development is derived. Provide a trust indenture or statement on the record plat establishing the method for providiag the developer's share in the perpetuel maintanance of Bexter Lane necessary to serve the subject development. Manntenance of this atreat shall be the sole reeponsibility of the property owners of trustees of these subdivisions Eorevar.
e. Conform to the St. Louis County Subdivision Ordinance regarding right-ofoway, pavement widening, turnaround, etc.

## Landscape Requirements

E. All new deciduous trees shall be a minimum of one and one-half ( $1-1 / 2$ ) inches in caliper. All new evergreen trees shall be a minimum of four (4) feet in height and all shrubs shall have a minimum diameter of eighteen (18) inches.
g. A11 landscaping improvements sall be escrowed along with the other standard subdivision improvements.
Signs
h. Signs shall be erected in accord with the "R-2" Residence District.

## Lighting

i. lighting shall be required in compliance with the $S t$. Louis County Subdivision Ordinaace.
Miscellaneous Design Criteria
j. Exterior trash areas in common ground (if any) shall be surrounded by six foot high sightproof fencing.
$k$. Parking, circulation, and other applicable site design features shall comply with Chapter 1101 . Section 512.4 "Physically Handicapped and Aged" of S.L.C.R.O. 1974, as amended.

1. Except as herein noted, comply with all preifminary plat requirements of the St . Louis Councy Subdivision Ordinance.
m. A common ground buffer shall be established along the western property line as approved by the Planning Commission on the Site Development Plan.

## 5. TRAFFIC GENERATION ASSESSMENT

The developer shall contribute to the Chesterfield Village Road Trust Fund, which contribution shall be used soley for improvements to arterial roads within the area, based upon the follcwing rate schedule:

$$
\text { Type of Development } \quad \text { Required Contribution }
$$

Single Family Residential $\quad \$ 525.80 /$ Parking Space
(Parking space as required by Section 1003.165 of the St .
Louis County Zoning Ordinance.)
The developer dis advised that utility companies heve recently
been requiving compensation from developers for relocation of
e30
their utility facilities within public road right-of-way. legel proceedings may be in process by ochers to determine the legolity of this requirement. Should the court rule in favor of the utility companies and require reimbursement by the developer, credit will not be given for these costs from the developer's trust fund contribution. Trust fund credit will be given where the utility is located on private easement, and payment is required of the developer to relocate or adjust said utility unless the relocation or adjustment is due solely to onssite development. The developer should also be aware of extensive delays in utility company relocation and adjuatments. Such delays will not constitute a cause to allow occupancy prior to completion of road improvements.

The amount of this required contribution, if not submitted by January 1, 1989, shall be increased on that date and on the Eirst day of January in each succeeding year thereafeer in accord with the construction cost index as determined by the St. Louis County Department of Highways and Traffic.

## 6. VERTFICATIONS PRIOR TO APPROVAL

Prior to approval of the Site Development Plan, the petitionar shall:

## Stormwater

a. Submit to the Department of Planning a preliminary engineering plan approved by the Department of Highways and Traffic showing that adequate handling of stormwater drainage is provided.
(1) The developer is required to provide adequate stormwater systems in accordance with St. Louis County Standards.
(2) All storuwater shall be discharged at an adequate natural discharge point.
(3) Detention of differential sunoff of stormwater is required by providigg permanent detention facilities. such as: dry regervoirs, ponds or other scceptable alternatives. The detention facilities shall be completed and in operation prior to issuance of building permits exceeding sixty percent ( $60 \%$ ) of the approved dwelling units.

Roadway Improvements and Curb Cuts
b. Provide verification of approval by the St. Louis County Department of Highways ans Traffic of the location of proposed curb cuts, aress of new dedication, and roadway improvements.

## Geotechnical Report

c. Submit a geotechnical report prepered by a professional engineer ilcensed in the State of Missouri for review and approval by the Department of Highways and Traffic. Said report ahall verify the adaptability of grading and improvements with soil and geologic conditions. A statement of compliance with this study, signed by the Geotechnical Engineer preparing the report, shall be included on all Site Development Plans.
7. RECORDING

Within sixty (60) days of approval of the Site Development Plan by the Planning Commission the approved plan shall be recorded with the St . Louls County Recorder of Deeds.

## 8. VERITICATION PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMITS

Subsequent to approval of Site Development Plan, and prior to issuance of any building permit the following requirements shall be met:

## Trust Fund Constribution

## Q. Trust fund contributions and/or credits for rosdway improvements shall be deposited with St. Louis County through standard escrow procedure prior to the issuance of building permits. If development phasing is anticipated, the developer shall provide the traffic generation assessment contribution and/or credits for roadway improvements through standard escrow procedure prior to issuance of building permits for each phase of development. Any remaining portion of the traffic generation assessment contribution shall be deposited with St. Louis County in the form of a cash escrow.

## Notification to the Department of Public Works

b. Prior to the issuance of foundation or building permits, all approvals from the Department of Planning, the Department of Highways and Traffic, and the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District must be received by the Department of Public Works.

## Certification of Plans

c. Provide verification that construction plans are designed to conform to the requirements and conditions of the Geotechnical Report. The Geotechnical Engineer shall be required to sign and seal all plans with a cereification that the froposed construction will be completed in accordance with the grading and soils requirements and conditions contained in the report.

## OnoSite Conditions

d. The existing pond located on the site will be dewatered at a rate not to asceed a 15 year design storm to protect against erosion and siltation damage to adjacent properties and roads.
9. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS
a. A grading permit is required prior to any grading on the site. No charge in watersheds shall be permitted. Interim stormwater drainage control in the form of sileation control measures is required.
b. Addicional lanes and/or widening, pevement thickness, drainage facilities, granular base, traffic control devices and other improvements may be required to accommodate heavy traffic volumes, unsuitable soil conditions, steep grades, or other conditions not apparent at this time.
c. If cut and fill operations occur during a season not favorable for immediate establishment of a permanent ground cover, a fagt germinating annual such as rye grasses or sudan gresses shall be u :Iized to retgrd erosion. Such areas shall be adpquately mantesined unti: construction occurs.
d. Provide adequste temposmy offortest parking Ear construction employees. Pariking on nonasursaced arass shall be prohibited in urder tu eliminate the condition whereby mud Erom con.iruction and employee vohicles is cracked onto the pavisent causing hazerdous roadway and deiving conditions.

```
    e. If roadways in this petition are to be private roadways,
        these roadways shall remain private forever. Maintenance of private roadways shall be the responsibility of the property owner(s) or crustees forever.
The existence of private roadwrys within the development requires disclosure by the leveloper of responsibility for street maintenance in accordance with the provisions of Section 1005.265 of St. Louis County's Subdivision Ordinance.
E. A copy of the most recently approved Sise Development Plan for this P.E.U. development shall at all times be prominently displayed in all display area sales offices within this development.
g. Failure to comply with any or all the conditions of this ordinance shall be adequate cause for revocation of permits by issuing County Departments or Comissions.
h. The Zoning Enforcement Officer of St. Louis County, Missouri, shall enforce the conditions of this ordinance in accord with the Site Development Plan approved by the Planning Commission.
SECTION 3. The St. Louis County Council, pursuant to
petition of Borman Development Company, requesting the approval of s Planned Environment Unir Development for the tract of land described in Section 1 of this ordinance as an alternative zoning, and pursuant to the recommendation of the Planning Commission that said peticion te granted after public hearing held by the said Commission on April 18, 1988; adopts this ordinance pursuant to the St. Louss County Charter authoriaing the Councll to exaraise legislative power pertaining to planaing and zoning, and returns the application and plan to the St. Louis County Planning Comission for consideration of final development plans pursuant to Section 1003. 187 SLCRO 1974, as amended.
```

ADOPTED: May 26, 1988

APPROVED: May 27, 1988
CARL W. BREIHAN
CAAIRMAN, COUNTY COUNCIL
GENE MCNARY
COUNTY EXECUTIVE


[^0]:    (Attach additional sheets as necessary)

