

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Teresa J. Price, Director of Planning

DATE: May 8, 2006

SUBJECT: Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting Summary – **May 4, 2006**

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, May 4, 2006 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Mary Brown** (Ward IV); **Councilmember Barry Streeter** (Ward II); and **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III).

Also in attendance were Councilmember Bruce Geiger, Ward II; Councilmember Mike Casey, Ward III; Stephanie Macaluso, Planning Commission Chair; Mike Herring, City Administrator; Teresa Price, Director of Planning; Aimee Nassif, Senior Planner; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

### I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

**Councilmember Streeter made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of April 27, 2006.** The motion was seconded by **Councilmember Hurt** and **passed** by a voice vote of 3 to 0.

### II. OLD BUSINESS - None

### III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 02-2006 Manors at Schoettler Valley (Taylor Morley) (1527 and 1523 Schoettler Road.)**: A request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban to "R2" Residence District for 8.85 acre tracts of land located east of Schoettler Valley on Squires Way Dr. (19S340027, 19R130021)

*And*

- B. **P.Z. 03-2006 Manors at Schoettler Valley (Taylor Morley) (1527 and 1523 Schoettler Road.)**: A request for a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure within an "R2" Residence District for 8.85 acre tracts of land located east of Schoettler Valley on Squires Way Dr. (19S340027, 19R130021)

## **Staff Report**

Senior Planner Aimee Nassif stated that the Public Hearing was held on February 27, 2006. Open space for the site is 85%. All of the issues from Planning Commission have been addressed.

Planning Commission recommended approval with one amendment to Section I.K.7. of the Attachment A to allow an island in the cul-de-sac.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Cul-de-Sac Island**

Chair Brown pointed out that Public Works has recommended that no island be permitted in the cul-de-sac. Public Works has noted that there are no homes around the island, which raised a concern about maintenance.

Ms. Nassif stated that the developer requested a variance to the street matrix. Public Works approved the variance request with the condition that no island be permitted. Because the street is a public street, Public Works felt the maintenance of any island would be the City's responsibility.

The Planning Commission did not feel the maintenance of the island would be an issue. Planning Commission was told at its meeting that the Homeowner's Association would be responsible for maintaining an island cul-de-sac.

Mr. Rob Epstein, representing Taylor, Morley, developer of the proposed project, stated that the developer is agreeable to the cul-de-sac with or without an island. In the past, Taylor, Morley has passed maintenance obligations on to the Homeowners Association even though the island is located in a dedicated right-of-way. The maintenance requirement could be accommodated in the Subdivision Declaration.

**Councilmember Streeter made a motion to amend Section I.K.7. of the Attachment A as follows: (Changes in green)**

**~~An~~ No island shall be permitted in the proposed cul-de-sac.  
and that will be the property of the Trustees of the subdivision.**

The motion was seconded by Chair Brown and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

### **Material to be Used for Emergency Access**

Councilmember Streeter asked what material will be used for the emergency access going to the Pierce property. Mr. Epstein replied that they are waiting for comments from Staff and the Fire Department with respect to their requirements. The material for the emergency access will be shown at the Site Plan stage.

### **Maximum Height of the Buildings**

Councilmember Streeter expressed concern about the allowable maximum height of 35 feet, as stated in the Attachment A. It was noted that the Zoning Ordinance allows 45 feet maximum height.

Councilmember Hurt suggested that the Attachment A be changed to allow the maximum height to be the height of the tallest building, plus 1-2 extra feet. It was requested that the information on their tallest building be provided by the next meeting of the City Council.

### **Retaining Walls**

Councilmember Streeter pointed out that there are retaining walls located exclusively on lots 3 and 5. Because of the 8' height of the walls, he expressed concern about the high maintenance costs of the walls.

The developer stated that the retaining walls are proposed in order to maintain the required percentage of the existing tree stand.

Discussion was held on who would be responsible for maintaining the walls. The developer reported that it is their intention that the maintenance of the walls be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association. The Association will be given an easement for access purposes. Specific language would be included in the Subdivision Declaration to provide that both walls are the responsibility of the Association to maintain. Anyone buying a lot will be buying subject to the terms of the Subdivision Declaration. Since the tree stand is being preserved for the benefit of all the lot owners, it was felt that the retaining walls should be an obligation of the Association.

Councilmember Hurt noted that if the developer was allowed to remove more trees, the retaining walls would not need to be so tall.

**Councilmember Streeter made a motion to add the following language to Section I. P. of the Attachment A:**

**A note shall be included on the Site Development Plan and Record Plat stating the Homeowners Association will maintain the proposed retaining walls. Similar language shall be included in the Subdivision Declaration.**

The motion was seconded by Chair Brown and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

### **Highland Forest Subdivision**

It was noted that the Trustees of Highland Forest are not interested in having their subdivision join the proposed subdivision.

## **Storm Water Drainage**

Councilmember Hurt referred to Section I.M.8. of the Attachment A which states in part: *“There is to be no water runoff across the south property line other than from the downstream face of any berm constructed adjacent to the southern property line. . .”*

Councilmember Hurt feels the language is acceptable but does not feel that the exhibits are drawn to insure this requirement – especially in the southeast corner. He intends to meet with the Director of Public Works regarding his concerns.

**Councilmember Streeter made a motion to forward P.Z. 02-2006 and P.Z. 03-2006 Manors at Schoettler Valley (Taylor Morley) (1527 and 1523 Schoettler Road.), with its Green Sheet amendments, to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Chair Brown and passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

**[Please see the attached report, prepared by the Director of Planning for additional information on P.Z. 02-2006 and P.Z. 03-2006 Manors at Schoettler Valley (Taylor Morley) (1527 and 1523 Schoettler Road.)]**

### **C. Discussion regarding whether to move Committee Meetings to another day/time**

Discussion was held on the possibility of changing the Committee meetings to Monday mornings at 7:30 a.m. It was agreed to keep the meeting dates and times as scheduled at this time.

It was noted that the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting would only have two Committee members in attendance. Discussion was held on the possibility of changing the policy to allow the other Councilmember from the same Ward to vote in the absence of a Committee member, subject to the Committee member’s agreement. Mr. Herring suggested that a limitation be imposed on how many times a Committee member could transfer his/her voting rights. The Finance & Administration Committee would have to recommend any such changes to City Council for its review and approval.

## **IV. PENDING PROJECTS/DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE**

### **A. Planning Process Part 1**

Ms. Price gave a PowerPoint Presentation reviewing Part 1 of the current Planning Process.

Discussion was held on the following points of the Planning Process:

**Preliminary Plan:** It was noted that the Preliminary Plan is not required by Ordinance to include a lot of detailed information. However, because of questions raised by Planning Commission and City Council, some developers are including more information on their Preliminary Plan that would generally not be included until the Site Plan stage.

Mr. Herring stated that developers are not always ready to answer detailed questions at the Preliminary Plan stage. He noted that more costs are involved to the developer when submitting a Site Plan as opposed to a Preliminary Plan. If the Planning Commission and City Council are expecting detailed plans and answers, then the process has to be changed.

Councilmember Hurt suggested requiring all “PC” and “PI” districts to submit a “Preliminary Site Plan”.

**Public Hearing Notification Requirements:** Chair Brown felt that the information regarding notification requirements should be included in the PowerPoint presentation given at Public Hearings.

It was noted that the City notifies all property owners within 225 ft. of the subject site – including property owners outside of Chesterfield.

**Site Development Notification:** Discussion was held on whether to notify property owners regarding site development changes – especially on property previously zoned by St. Louis County.

**Comments from Architectural Review Board:** It was noted that after the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission can request an item be sent to the Architectural Review Board – however, this seldom happens.

Councilmember Hurt requested that City Council be given a copy of the ARB minutes on any items that the Planning Commission forwards to ARB after the Public Hearing stage.

The above items will be reviewed to determine if any changes to policies and procedures need to be made.

## **B. Vacation Schedules**

Ms. Price requested that the Committee members forward their vacation schedules to her to determine if there are any conflicts with future meeting dates.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.