PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
October 22, 1997

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m.

PRESENT
Mr. Michael Casey
Mr. Dave Dalton - arrived later
Mr. Charles Eifler
Mr. Robert Grant
Mr. Dan Layton, Jr.
Chairman Rick Bly
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney
Mayor Nancy Greenwood
Councilmember Mary Brown (Ward IV) - Council Liaison
Teresa J. Price, Director of Planning
Laura Griggs-McElhanon, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

ABSENT
Mr. Fred Broemmer
Ms. Linda McCarthy
Mr. Allen Yaffe

NEW BUSINESS

A. **P.Z. 26-97 City of Chesterfield Planning Commission**; a proposal to amend the City of Chesterfield Subdivision Ordinance relative to work being done by the Character of Neighborhoods Moratorium Panel of the City of Chesterfield.

B. **P.Z. 27-97 City of Chesterfield Planning Commission**; a proposal to amend the City of Chesterfield Zoning Ordinance relative to work being done by the Character of Neighborhoods Moratorium Panel of the City of Chesterfield, which includes creation of the following new zoning districts: E-1 Residence District (2 acre); E-2 Residence District (1 acre); E-3 Residence District (1/2 acre); LLR Large Lot Residential (3 acre); and, AG Agriculture.

Chairman Bly noted we do not have a quorum here tonight, and there will be no votes taken tonight. He further noted the meeting format will be informal.

Ms. Mary Domahidy noted that she and Barry Hogue just received a copy of the 10-16-97 Memorandum from Public Works this evening; however, in speaking with Councilmember Flachsbart, who received the memo earlier in his Council packet, noted concern about a comment on page 4, paragraph E) - grading of slopes. She noted they would concur in cases where the slope is directed downward, but would question whether seven (7) feet is a necessary width, as the Panel would suggest a two (2) *foot* width.

There was lengthy discussion regarding the following:

- memorandum from Public Works dated 10/16/97 - grading issues/slopes, meandering sidewalks, etc;

- legal issues regarding the down grades in public rights-of-way (erosion, stormwater runoff, maintenance of streets);

- clarification was requested of the wording of the Public Works Department comment regarding "slopes" on page 4 paragraph (E) - (memo dated 10/16/97);

Assistant Director Griggs-McElhanon gave an overhead presentation (and handout) depicting the proposed "E" Estate Districts:

1. "E-1" 2 Acre Estate District - PEU
   (a) - not less than 1.4 acre lots
   (b) - not less than 1.2 acre lots
   (c) - not less than 1.6 acre lots

2. "E-1" 2 Acre Estate District - Performance
   (a) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 2 acres)
   (b) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 2 acres)
   (c) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 2 acres)

3. "E-2" 1 Acre Estate District - PEU
   (a) - not less than 0.7 acre lots (30,492 sq. ft.)
   (b) - not less than 0.6 acre lots (26,135 sq. ft.)
   (c) - not less than 0.8 acre lots (34,848 sq. ft.)

4. "E-2" 1 Acre Estate District - Performance
   (a) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 1 acre)
   (b) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 1 acre)
   (c) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 1 acre)

5. "E-3" 1/2 Acre Estate District - PEU
   (a) - not less than 0.35 acre lots (15,246 sq. ft.)
   (b) - not less than 0.30 acre lots (13,068 sq. ft.)
   (c) - not less than 0.40 acre lots (17,424 sq. ft.)

6. "E-3" 1/2 Acre Estate District - Performance
   (a) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 1/2 acre)
   (b) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 1/2 acre)
   (c) - density: gross capacity + 1 (total site area ÷ 1/2 acre)

There was additional discussion regarding the following:

- advantages/disadvantages of the various options available in each of the "Estate Districts;"

- formulas for density calculations - gross/net;
- possible applications of the "E" Districts;
- clarification is needed for the "E-3" Performance Zoning (attached housing);
- clarification regarding buffer areas for "E" districts (i.e., whether the wording should say "collector or arterial" or "right-of-way") in Performance Zoning;
- concerns regarding minimum lot size being too small in the proposed "E-3" Performance Zoning District (i.e., it is smaller than that allowed in the current "R-2" District) - possibility of mobile homes;
- "E-3" Performance Zoning (c) was intended as an incentive for clustering of homes;

Commissioner Dalton arrived at this time.

- concerns regarding the "E-3" Performance Zoning lot size requirement being less than that currently permitted in the "R-2" District;
- buffer area requirements compared to lot size reductions;
- clarification is needed in wording of the Zoning Ordinance regarding "attached" versus "detached" housing as a permitted use; the Panel didn't believe attached housing would be appropriate in the "E-1" or "E-2" Districts;
- incentives regarding tree preservation;
- clarification is needed regarding side yard setbacks in proposed zoning districts;
- after new districts are established the City will need to rezone all existing Residential Districts;
- the West Area Study will be looked at very closely when the City goes back to rezone existing residential districts;
- modification of the West Area Study;
- the process/procedures of the City following passage of the proposed districts, after the moratorium is lifted were discussed;
- after the moratorium ends, new projects will be evaluated based upon the Comprehensive Plan (West Area Study) and new zoning districts;
- if someone would apply for approval of a Site Development Plan, currently in an "R" District, approval would be subject to compliance with the Tree Ordinance, once approved by Council, and all other new Zoning Ordinance regulations;

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 10/16/97 MEMO FROM Mike Geisel:

- Section 1003.187 Planned Environment Unit Procedure (PEU) - text modification.

- Section 1003.105 LLR Large Lot Residential District - clarification of language in first paragraph. The Panel did not intend to require additional infrastructure improvements in the Large Lot Residential district.

- Section 1003.108 Residence District - reference needs to be made to some type of ongoing list of collector/arterial streets/roads (i.e., a list of roads to be updated annually by the Public Works Department);

- Section 1003.108 Residence District (F) - text requiring sidewalks to comply with standards of the ADA was questioned.

- Section 1003.108 E-2 Residence District - Planning Director Teresa Price will clarify with Mike Geisel, Public Works Director (i.e., whether or not he would like the flood plain ordinance to govern all flood plains with respect to lot sizes).

- Section 1003.108 E-3 Residence District - no comments.

Commissioner Casey asked Ms. Domahidy if she has had a chance to read all of the memorandum dated 10/16/97, and whether or not she has additional concerns.

Ms. Domahidy noted she has not had a chance to read it thoroughly.

Chairman Bly gave a copy of the Home Builders Association letter dated October 22, 1997, to Ms. Domahidy and Mr. Hogue.

Mr. Barry Hogue noted the character of development from arterial roadways and surrounding development was driving factor in the Panel's recommendations, and gave examples of same.

Ms. Domahidy noted she respectfully disagrees with the concerns of the HBA, as stated in their October 22, 1997 letter, except for their request for clarification of language in the E-2 District regarding attached single-family housing.

Commissioner Eifler reiterated his concerns about the permitted uses for E-1, E-2, etc., to include commercial (i.e., plant nurseries and green houses); and conditional uses in residential districts to include riding stables, kennels, etc., as they seem to be out of place in a residential area.

Commissioner Layton noted that, when you allow that side yard variation of five (5) feet back from four (4) feet, he has no objection. He wants to make sure that the buyer of the property who has lost this offset is made aware of this at the time he purchases the property.

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Eifler, seconded by Commissioner Casey **and passes by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Michael J. Casey, Secretary

[Amended 11/10/97]

[MIN10-22.097]