MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning

SUBJECT: Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting Summary
June 21, 2007

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, June 21, 2007 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Connie Fults** (Ward IV)**; Councilmember Jane Durrell** (Ward I); **Councilmember Bruce Geiger** (Ward II); and **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III).

Also in attendance were Mayor John Nations; Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); Maurice L Hirsch, Jr., Planning Commission Chair; Wendy Geckeler, Planning Commissioner; Mike Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning; Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the June 7, 2007 Planning and Zoning Committee Meeting Summary

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of June 7, 2007. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

II. PROTEST PETITION HEARING

Chair Fults opened the Protest Petition Hearing for P.Z. 02-2007 The Estates at Upper Kehrs Mill (Miceli Construction).

A. <u>P.Z. 02-2007 The Estates at Upper Kehrs Mill (Miceli Construction):</u> A request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban to "E" One Acre District for a 10.2 acre tract of land located on the eastern side of Kehrs Mill Road, 4,100 feet south of its intersection with Wild Horse Creek Road. (19U530062, 19U530392)

<u>SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION:</u>

1. <u>Mr. George Dove</u>, Country Place Subdivision, 1467 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO read a letter dated June 21, 2007, which was submitted for the public record. In his letter, Mr. Dove stated the following:
   - His property is adjacent to the subject development.
   - The residents encourage the responsible development of the City and their neighborhood.
   - They feel the topography of hills, slopes, and woods cannot adequately support the proposed density of the proposed development.
   - The high density of numerous homes on the hills requires major grading to create the eight building sites.
   - The extensive grading requires many of the trees to be removed or buried. The destruction of the woods provides an eyesore of exposed homes on the ridges surrounding their neighborhood.
   - Because so much hardscape is planned in a small area, an additional retention pond is required.
   - Speaker noted his professional experience in facility and site development in terms of topography management, flood water drain-offs, drain water drain-offs, etc.
   - They feel the above-noted actions will destroy the native topography; will create substantial erosion problems; and will put their down-slope neighborhood at risk.
   - Speaker noted that a past development, at the other end of their neighborhood, stripped the woods, re-graded the land, and completely covered a creek. Country Place lost all its natural buffers.
   - Speaker expressed concern that commercial interests are being considered at the expense of the City's citizens.
   - The residents urge the Commission to make responsible decisions regarding the development of their neighborhoods.
   - Speaker noted that trees are the symbol of Chesterfield and one of the reasons the City incorporated and a primary reason that many choose to live in Chesterfield.

2. <u>Ms. Dana Golio</u>, 1483 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that she agrees with the comments made by Mr. Dove. Her home is south of proposed Lot 5. She noted that Mr. Miceli has met with her about his plans for the development but she still has the following concerns:
   - Run-off from the hill onto her property;
   - The amount of trees that will be removed;

- The view from her home after the trees are removed; and
- The proposed detention pond.

Referring to Ms. Golio's concerns about the run-off, Councilmember Hurt did not feel the run-off would affect her property noting that her property is near the detention area. He stated that a berm could possibly be run across the property line from the detention area over to her property to channel any run-off into the detention basin.

Mr. Geisel, Acting Director of Planning, stated that current City code requires any new development to meet both the City's and the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District's standards with respect to management of stormwater run-off.

3. Ms. Sandy Sommers, 1423 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that her property is directly behind proposed Lot 3. Speaker stated the following:
   - She has the same concerns outlined by the previous speakers.
   - She has concern about water run-off causing damage to her property. She noted that her back yard already has a lot of water coming into it when it rains.
   - She has concern about possible damage to the subdivision's lake.

4. Mr. Bill Quinn, 1427 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that his property is between proposed Lots 3 and 4 and in front of Country Place's lake. He stated the following:
   - He feels the proposed development is inappropriate because of the elevation of the land, which is dramatic from the surrounding area.
   - In some cases, the elevation is 30 feet, or more, above the surrounding land making a steep slope and creating peril for the surrounding properties in the form of:
     - Erosion;
     - Silting of the subdivision's ponds;
     - Possible added pressure on the major dam;
     - Potential sinkholes; and
     - Potential landslides.
   - There are also visual issues:
     - A significant change in how their neighborhood will look because of the proposed development;
     - A change in the uniformity of the vistas along Kehrs Mill Road;
   - There is the issue of the absence of a Letter of Credit for $2 million to protect the current property owners.
   - There is the issue of the proposed detention pond.
   - Speaker recommended that the zoning be changed to E-Two Acre to address the density issue. He felt that a less dense development would alleviate the issues enumerated.

- He feels the City should “discard the short-term policies of immediacy and raise policies that are environmentally-friendly and responsive to the desires of the citizens of Chesterfield”.

5. Ms. Joanna Wagner, 1440 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that her property does not immediately back up to the subject development but is right across the street from the lake. She agrees with Mr. Quinn’s suggested E-Two Acre zoning and stated her concern about the following issues:
    - Density of the proposed site;
    - The proposed tree removal;
    - Run-off into Country Place’s lake and onto the property at the lower end of their development.
    - Noise pollution as a result of the tree removal.

6. Mr. Mark Becker, 1419 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that his property is directly behind proposed Lot 2. He expressed concern about the following issues:
    - Run-off
    - The aesthetics of how his property will be affected with respect to the view behind his property. He has concerns that the plan shows no tree buffering, which will allow him to look right into the back of the home on Lot 2 and will allow the property owner to look down on him.
    - Density of the development
    - Speaker stated that he is not opposed to the property being sold but he is opposed to any development affecting Country Place subdivision.
    - He noted that he has had several conversations with Mr. Miceli regarding his concerns and Mr. Miceli has been accommodating.

7. Ms. Barbara Dove, 1467 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that her property does not come up to the proposed development – it is part of the hill between proposed Lots 3 and 4.
    - She expressed concern about the deer problem in Chesterfield. Speaker noted that a female deer is raising her young in her back yard. It has gotten to the point that she is not able to use her yard because the deer is becoming defensive and has attacked a neighbor’s dog.
    - She feels that consideration needs to be given to the safety and health issues with respect to the number of deer that will be displaced by the proposed development.
    - She feels that the City needs to re-think the number of trees that will be removed.

8. Ms. Sally Piper, 1471 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that her property will not be directly affected by the proposed homes. She also stated the following:
   - The existing vegetation is very dense screening the house at the top of the hill.
   - After a storm, her sump pump runs constantly for a long time pumping 30 gallons a minute.
   - She has concern that if the existing vegetation is removed, it will cause erosion issues.
   - She suggested that when trees are re-planted on the site that they not be white pines and Bradford pears as these types of trees have very small root bases, which will not hold hilltops together. She noted that the existing trees are huge sycamores and are 50-75 years old.

9. Mr. Frank Kimball, 1487 Carriage Crossing Lane, Chesterfield, MO stated that his property is located right next to Dana Golio's property and he has lived on the site for 15 years. He stated the following:
   - When there is a heavy rain, the water rushes across his yard.
   - He does not oppose the sale of the property, but he feels some changes need to be made to provide protection from the run-off.
   - He requested that the detention area be screened with trees.
   - He requested that there be liability insurance for any potential damage to the Country Place properties.

10. Ms. Sheila Mabes stated that her property is between proposed Lots1 and 2 and stated the following:
    - She is a volunteer for the Department of Conservation.
    - She will retain the trees behind her house but this will not help the wildlife because wildlife needs a full corridor to survive.
    - Removal of trees will affect the barred and horned owls in the area. Deer will move into people's back yards.
    - She feels that the proposed development is inconsistent with the City's stand on encouraging wildlife in the area.
    - She requested that the site be kept at two-acre zoning as a minimum.

Petitioner's Presentation:

1. Mr. David Volz, 10849 Indian Head Industrial Boulevard, St. Louis, MO discussed the following:

   Changes to the Plan based on the Public Hearing:
   - The cul-de-sac has been shortened by approximately 65 feet, which now allows a buffer adjacent to Mr. Quinn's property.
   - An additional 20-25 feet of trees will be saved by the detention area, by moving the detention basin up the hillside slope.

- Lot 4 has been switched from a left-hand house to a right-hand house, which allows the removal of the proposed 8-foot retaining wall.
- The right-of-way has been changed to 40 feet and the proposed sidewalks have been removed.

Conservation Easement:

- The developer is concerned that a required conservation easement will hurt his ability to sell his lots because other developers are not required to have a conservation easement.
- If the City is requiring a conservation easement, the developer will comply. Mr. Volz suggested that the Subdivision Ordinance be changed so that all developers have the same requirements.

Tree Removal:

- The City Ordinance requires 30% tree preservation. The existing plan shows 30-35% tree preservation. An exact number cannot be determined until a final plan is done.
- The petitioner is requesting that the ordinance require 30-35% tree preservation vs. the current 40%.

Drainage on to Mr. Becker's Property:

- Mr. Miceli has met with Mr. Becker regarding drainage concerns. The developer is willing to do whatever Mr. Becker and the City desire to remedy the issue.
- They are willing to provide either riprap or an inlet in his yard.
- Mr. Volz noted that if an inlet and sewer pipe are put in, the swale will be disturbed but the developer is willing to do this if this is what the City and Mr. Becker want. Mr. Geisel felt that the inlet would be the better solution but would require the granting of an easement to allow connection to the sewer. He noted that riprap is effective but is not particularly attractive.

Visual Impact along Kehrs Mill Road:

- Mr. Volz displayed three cross-sections showing the view motorists would have of the proposed development along Kehrs Mill Road.
- The elevation from the road to the finished floor of homes ranges from 50 feet to 35 feet to 27 feet depending upon where a car is along Kehrs Mill Road.
- There will be a landscape buffer on top of the hill to preserve the visual integrity of Kehrs Mill Road.
- Mr. Volz does not feel the homes on Lots 1 and 8 will visually impair Kehrs Mill Road.

Detention Basin:

- The developer will be putting a 2% grade on the bottom of the detention basin to address concerns about it having a wet, mushy bottom.
- The location of the basin is in the lowest portion of the site.
- The discharge will be piped into an existing manhole, which goes into a smaller pond in Country Place. The developer has a concern about this pond as it currently is only 2-3 feet deep and appears to have some siltation issues. Mr. Geisel stated that the downstream detention pond must be designed to hold a 100-year-old storm. The detention basin will be designed to a standard that is approximately three times more rigorous than the detention lake in Country Place.

Run-off:

- The existing drainage to the north is about 1.6 acres; the proposed drainage is slightly less at about 1.4 acres. The net sheet water going to the north will be less than what currently sheets to the north.
- Drainage to the south will be managed by a swale and a series of inlets. The water from the street will be piped to the detention basin.
- It is expected that there will be less run-off after the site is developed than the current run-off.

Density:

- The petitioner feels the proposed density of the development complies with the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- The site is comprised of 10.5 acres with 8 homes proposed.
- Except for Lots 2 and 3, all the lots are over one acre in size.
- The proposed lots are larger than the lots surrounding them.

Deer Problem:

- Mr. Volz agreed that there is an issue with the deer population.

Buffer along Lots 1 and 2:

- Mr. Volz stated that there will be a buffer along Lots 1 and 2. Ms. McCaskill-Clay clarified that a buffer is required contiguously around the site. Mr. Geisel pointed out that, under the Tree Manual, there is a required landscape buffer even in the disturbed areas. The buffer will be part of the landscape plan.
- Chair Fults stated that she would prefer that the existing trees be left with all of the ground cover rather than ripping it out and re-planting it.
- The current property owner stated that there aren't many existing trees in the area of Lots 1 and 2.

Mr. Quinn's Property:

- The proposed retaining walls have been removed near Mr. Quinn's property.
- The ridge will be cut down about 5 feet near the cul-de-sac.

Testing of Water Bodies:

- Mr. Geisel pointed out that the current Attachment A includes specific language, along with the Grading Ordinance, requiring a pre- and post-construction survey of any downstream water body and a surety bond. The amount of the bond cannot be determined until the City receives the engineered improvement plans to determine what the potential exposure is.
- Chair Fults expressed concern that the developer intends to run water to a pond that already has some problems. Mr. Geisel stated that adding water to the pond does not present a problem – the issue is that the pond already has some siltation problems. He noted that ponds need to be maintained. All the City can do is insure that preventive measures are applied prior to construction and to insure that a surety is available to remedy any damage to the pond - the pond would need to be restored to its prior existing condition. The developer would not be responsible for correcting a problem that existed prior to construction. Councilmember Hurt stated that sheet flow during construction can cause siltation, which needs to be managed. However, once water is piped to a pond, it usually helps with siltation issues.

2. Mr. Mike Miceli, 2207 Sycamore Drive, Chesterfield, MO stated the following:
   - He has walked the subdivision and spoken to the neighboring residents and is surprised by some of the comments made during the Protest Hearing.
   - He feels that 8 lots on 10.5 acres is appropriate for the site and complies with the City's Comprehensive Plan and guidelines.
   - He intends to resolve all of the issues.
   - He noted that the Tree Manual requires 30% tree preservation and the proposed development is required to have 40% tree preservation.
   - He stated that he is agreeable to a conservation easement but feels all other developers need to have the same requirements.
   - He has lived in the area for 35 years and his family has built in the St. Louis area for over 50 years. He feels it is unfair that standards are being put on his development that are not required by other developments in the City.
   - He feels that the proposed plan is a good plan and he will work with the neighboring residents. But he did not feel the neighbors should be dictating the grades, etc.

- He has built other subdivisions in the City and has taken care of any problem that has arisen.

Chair Fults then declared the Protest Hearing closed.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 02-2007 The Estates at Upper Kehrs Mill (Miceli Construction): A request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban to "E" One Acre District for a 10.2 acre tract of land located on the eastern side of Kehrs Mill Road, 4,100 feet south of its intersection with Wild Horse Creek Road. (19U530062, 19U530392)

Staff Report

Ms. Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning, stated that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the subject petition at its May 14th meeting. At the meeting, the Planning Commission added language to the Attachment A requiring a 25-foot undisturbed buffer adjacent to the north and east out-boundary of the property. The language includes the allowance of one perpendicular penetration within the undisturbed buffer, not to exceed 25 feet in width, for utility connections.

After the Planning Commission meeting, a protest petition was filed and the hearing date scheduled.

At its May 24th meeting, the Planning & Zoning Committee directed Staff to propose language addressing:

- the preservation of trees on the site;
- the appearance of the detention basin to insure that it did not become mushy at the bottom; and
- the setback issue concerning visibility along Kehrs Mill Road.

The Attachment A currently includes 40% preservation of trees on the site. The 40% was used based upon the revised Preliminary Plan submitted by the petitioner, which showed 40% tree retention. Since final engineering has not been done, the petitioner is requesting that the Attachment A require maintaining 30-35% of the tree mass on the site.

DISCUSSION

Conservation Easement

Discussion was held on the following proposed language for the Attachment A:

> The location of trees to be preserved shall be shown and approved on the record plat for the subject development. In addition, tree

preservation information shall be provided on plats provided to owners upon sale of individual lots.

Mr. Geisel stated that the intent is to restrict the removal of trees during construction and to prohibit any future lot owner from removing the trees from the lots. This information will be included on plats and in the subdivision indentures.

Mr. Herring asked why this restriction would be perceived as a "negative". Ms. McCaskill-Clay replied that maintaining the tree mass could prevent homeowners from adding a pool or other type of improvement to the property. Mr. Volz indicated that there could be problems in trying to explain the language – especially when it is unique to this development. It was then noted that there are a couple of other developments that have similar "do-not disturb zone" requirements – such as in Chesterfield Hills and Westerly.

It was noted that a "do-not-disturb zone" restricts the developer only. But once the lot is developed, the restriction no longer applies, which is why a "conservation easement" is being proposed.

Chair Fults made a motion to amend Section E of the Attachment A as follows:

> **4. The location of trees to be preserved shall be shown and approved on the record plat for the subject development. In addition, tree preservation information shall be provided on plats provided to owners upon sale of individual lots.**

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Discussion was held on the definition of a "conservation easement". Mr. Geisel indicated that Staff will have to work with the City Attorney on a definition. Councilmember Hurt stated that most definitions prohibit the removal of anything living – including ground cover, poison ivy, vines in trees, and mineral matter. According to such a definition, a boulder would not be permitted to be removed.

Mr. Geisel stated that the language in the Attachment A, as defined by all of the motions made, will refer to maintaining and preserving the living tree canopy only.

Appearance of the Detention Basin

Discussion was held on the following proposed language for the Attachment A:

> The detention basin for the subject site will be constructed and designed in such a way to prevent retention of water/materials which may attract vectors and create other nuisances.

Mr. Geisel noted that the language does not require that the basin be designed at 2% grade. The proposed language is a result-oriented requirement.

Chair Fults made a motion to amend Section M of the Attachment A as follows:

> **5. The detention basin for the subject site will be constructed and designed in such a way to prevent retention of water/materials which may attract vectors and create other nuisances.**

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Retention of the Tree Mass

Chair Fults noted that the petitioner is requesting that the requirement for tree retention be reduced from 40% to 35%. She asked if any Committee member would like to make such a motion. No motion was made.

Sheet Run-off

Councilmember Hurt stated that language was included in Squire Way's Attachment A requiring swale and berming to insure that all of the run-off from the development went to the detention basins or storm water inlets. Mr. Geisel said such language would require a berm around the perimeter of the site, which would not be possible because of the required tree retention.

Councilmember Hurt suggested that Chair Fults meet with the residents to discuss the possibility of allowing the undisturb zone to be disturbed to allow a berm that would improve the run-off situation.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion requiring the post construction sheet runoff leaving the site to be less than the pre-existing sheet flow; and requiring water from disturbed areas to be managed so as to reduce the sheet flow from the site. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Non-Disturb Area

Mr. Geisel stated that there is provision for one penetration, which is specifically located between Lots 2 and 3. It can be no more than 25 feet wide and it must be perpendicular to the buffer.

Mr. Geisel noted that if there is an existing 15-foot wide easement on a Country Place resident's property, the penetration cannot be wider than that. However, some of the easements grant adjacent property for working room.

Twenty-five foot Undisturbed Buffer
It was noted that the current Attachment A does not require a 25-foot undisturbed buffer along the eastern property line.

Chair Fults made a motion to amend Section E.3. of the Attachment A as follows:

> **A twenty five foot undisturbed buffer is to be retained adjacent to the north and east outboundary with the following bearings: Starting at the east limits of the 30 foot landscaped buffer parallel to Kehrs Mill right of way and extending north eastwardly along the line bearing S 70 degrees 08 minutes 00 seconds W, thence S 01 degrees 05 minutes 16 seconds W, thence S 88 degrees 50 minutes 07 seconds E, thence S 76 degrees 29 minutes 43 seconds E, thence S 58 degree 08 minutes 40 seconds E, thence N 85 degrees 17 minutes 24 seconds E. One perpendicular penetration will be permitted within said undisturbed buffer, not to exceed 25 feet in width, to allow for utility connections.**

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to forward P.Z. 02-2007 The Estates at Upper Kehrs Mill (Miceli Construction), as amended, to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 1.** Chair Fults voted "no" and explained that she feels this area along Kehrs Mills Road needs bigger lots, which she feels would alleviate a lot of the issues expressed.

> **Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the July 16, 2007 City Council Meeting. See Bill #**

[Please see the attached report, prepared by Mike Geisel, Acting Director of Planning, for additional information on P.Z. 02-2007 The Estates at Upper Kehrs Mill (Miceli Construction).]

(The Committee took a five-minute recess at this point.)

B. Evaluation/Discussion of the area west of Long Road, located within the Chesterfield Valley, in the context of "PI" vs. "PC"

Staff Report

Mr. Geisel stated that Staff was asked to review prior policies, policy statements, ordinances and commentary on whether there was some agreement as to whether or not land uses or zoning categories had been previously determined. In reviewing Ordinances, the Comprehensive Plan, and the Land Use Map, it has been determined that sub-areas were created west of Long Road.

Sub-Area 1 is the area west of the Airport, including Wildwood and is "low intensity industrial".

Sub-Area 2 is the area north of Olive Street Road, west of Chesterfield Airport Road, and south of I-64 and is "low density office/retail".

Sub-Area 3 is north of the highway and is outside of the scope of the discussion.

Most of the uses in PC and PI overlap one another. The Staff Report describes those uses that do not overlap. The most problematic uses pertain to "warehousing and storage" and "manufacturing". "Warehousing" and "manufacturing" are not permitted in the PC district.

Mr. Geisel felt that rather than deciding if something should be zoned PI or PC, Council should specifically define those uses which they either find objectionable or desirable. The mixed use development will not be possible, as defined in Sub-Area 2, if everything is PI or PC.

When it is decided whether "manufacturing" and "warehousing" is wanted in these areas, then a policy statement can be established and applied to any petition submitted.

DISCUSSION

Development Standards

Chair Fults noted the differences in the development standards between PC and PI. For the PI district, there are no standards for open space, maximum building height, minimum lot area, or maximum total building footprint.

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the Ordinance Review Committee is currently reviewing the disparity of the performance standards between the districts. The Committee is also reviewing the uses and the definition of uses.

Chair Fults stated that with the current performance standards, she would not want PI out on Highway 40. Councilmember Hurt stated that the City has the ability to dictate the standards for PI.

Uses

Councilmember Hurt stated that he does not have a concern with the current mix in the Valley as it is currently zoned. His concern is trading the uses of "technical schools", "manufacturing/fabrication", "warehousing and manufacturing", and "sheet metal operations" in the PI and M3 districts for "beauty shops", "amusement parks", "book stores", "barber shops", "dry cleaning establishments" and "riding stables".

Councilmember Hurt went on to say that he wants Chesterfield to be a national, if not global, player. The manufacturing sector in the Valley gives the City global recognition.

The PC areas usually include local and regional operations; the PI and M3 areas usually include regional, national and global operations – such as Mark Andy, Sentrus, ReLiv, and Cambridge Engineering. The modern-day manufacturing operations are highly-technical.

Councilmember Hurt read from the *U.S. Economy & Labor*, which states:

> Many of the new service jobs do not pay as highly, nor do they carry as many benefits, as the manufacturing jobs.

He feels if more areas are zoned PC in the Valley, opportunities are eliminated for manufacturing operations. One of the main points of infrastructure for manufacturing is getting the products in and out with trucks, rail, and aircraft. Chesterfield has the opportunity to provide all of this.

Discussion was held on including some of the PC uses in the PI district so that an area can be zoned PI vs. PC. Such zoning would keep manufacturing, training schools and warehousing uses for the area.

Chair Fults stated that she wants some retail on Chesterfield Airport Road and does not want any large, unattractive buildings facing Highway 40. She felt the Performance Standards should be changed to address these issues.

City Administrator Mike Herring stated that retail-type uses are not going to be appropriate in the middle of the warehouse district or in the manufacturing district around Spirit. They will not survive in these areas because there is no traffic or visibility in this area. They will survive along highly-traveled corridors, which is the Airport Road corridor. The uses need to be complementary in the districts.

Sub-Areas

Mr. Geisel stated that the Sub-Areas were created in 2000, which was prior to the City's partnership to install water, sewer and infrastructure. All the open

space requirements and density requirements were established based on the lack of infrastructure, sewers and water.

The Sub-Areas need to be reviewed and updated.

Councilmember Durrell made a motion directing Staff to review conflicting Performance Standards within the PC and PI districts, especially as they relate to the Valley sub-areas, acceptable Land Use designations within the PC and PI districts and Sub-Areas, and to forward Staff's review and comments to the Planning Commission for review and consideration, with the expectation that recommendations would be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Committee. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.** (Councilmember Geiger was not available for the vote.)

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Stoneridge Office Building

Councilmember Hurt encouraged the Committee members to drive by the Stoneridge development to observe the tanks out in front of the building. This issue was discussed at the last City Council meeting.

V. PENDING PROJECTS/DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.