

**Minutes of Meeting  
Ladue Stormwater Sub-Committee  
City of Ladue, St. Louis County, Missouri  
Wednesday, August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016. 10:00am**

Chairman Potter called the meeting to order at 10:10am. The following members were present:

Ray Potter – Chairman  
Ann Carter  
Trae Meyr  
Patrick Hensley  
Robert Watt  
Will Penney  
Andrea Sukanek  
Anne Lamitola

Minutes from the July meeting were approved.

The next item on the agenda was to discuss the impervious coverage limits.

Andrea Sukanek reported findings from research conducted by Will Penney regarding impervious coverage percentages of recent building projects in Ladue. For most of the building permits considered, the coverage proposed in the permit would be permitted if the current proposed standards were implemented. A few projects were slightly over the maximum coverage proposed and one outlier was 20% over the proposed maximum. The Committee determined that these maximum coverage limits, as proposed, seemed about right, based on the information given.

The next order of business was to attempt to define the term “green space.” Ann Carter brought a definition of green space from the Greenwich Municipal Code that was very thorough and the Committee discussed whether Ladue should adopt a similar definition. The committee determined that green space should include the following: undisturbed natural areas, rain gardens, landscaped grass and gardens. The committee determined that green space should not include the following: buildings, driveways, decks and patios, sidewalks and paths (except stepping stone paths), any other paved areas (sports courts, etc), pools, permeable pavement of any kind.

There was some discussion regarding whether pervious pavement could be included as at least a portion of the green space requirement. Will Penney asserted that pervious pavers would not need maintenance like pervious asphalt would and therefore could potentially be a useful alternative. Ms. Lamitola brought up the fact that gravel driveways were fairly common in Ladue and these could be considered pervious pavement, also. Mr. Potter and Ms. Carter felt strongly that green space should be vegetation and that the regulation would be simpler and easier to enforce if permeable pavement was not included in green space. The committee decided to leave permeable pavement out of green space.

The next item on the agenda was to discuss whether stormwater in E1 zoning should be required to flow directly into storm sewers. The advantage to this would be that flooding issues could be diminished in those areas with dense development. Ms. Lamitola argued against making storm sewer connection a

requirement for E1 zoning. She suggested that the goal should be to maximize infiltration on each parcel such that streams are not overloaded. A better option would be to make sure down spouts and sump pump discharge pipes do not drain such as to cause problems on neighboring property. Bioswales and rain gardens should be encouraged to hold and direct water such that it infiltrates and/or drains appropriately.

Mr. Potter brought up a suggestion that he had discussed with other trustees from his subdivision that, to the extent practical, all impervious surfaces must drain to the street. The committee discussed this suggestion, but were concerned that there may frequently be situations in which drainage to the street would not be the best course of action. Drainage to the street may be one option, but is not always the best option. The committee determined that during the building permit process, the builder needs to consult with the City to define a storm water strategy for the property. Stormwater should not flow onto neighboring properties such that it may cause damage or hazardous conditions on those properties. Stormwater may drain to the street, designated swale, or other stormwater management device, as practical.

The committee also discussed options for sump pump discharge. Mr. Potter had another suggestion, as discussed among his subdivision trustees, that sump pumps should drain directly to storm sewers. The committee was not overly supportive of this idea because they felt that infiltration should be encouraged. It was suggested that the location of sump pump discharge pipes should be restricted to being no more than 5 feet into the setback line. This could be a problem, however, in areas where there is a small side setback.<sup>1</sup>

The next item on the agenda was to discuss how small area land disturbances should be handled. The erosion control regulations for Frontenac were considered as a model. The committee determined that small area land disturbances should not necessarily require a thorough plan, but some erosion control should be required. The solution determined by the committee was that all construction projects must install silt fences and that they should be shown on a plan submitted with the building plans. It was suggested that some of the language from the Frontenac Regulations could be added to the Ladue Regulations – specifically, the idea that surface water runoff should be controlled to ensure that soil and sediment is contained on the site during any land disturbance or other development activities.

Patrick Hensley also suggested that mud tracked onto streets should be required to be cleaned daily. This would make a rule like this easier to enforce.

The next item discussed was the stream buffer ordinance. Andrea Sukanek suggested that the committee re-evaluate the stream buffer ordinance to consider whether it should continue to require 50-foot buffers for only solid blue line USGS streams and smaller (25-foot) buffers for dashed USGS streams. Ms. Lamitola informed the committee that most cities require buffers based on the USGS streams because this was included in a sample ordinance suggested by MSD, however, this is not required and cities can use whatever criteria they choose for stream buffers. The committee was reluctant to expand the stream buffer requirements and felt that the current requirements seemed

---

<sup>1</sup> After the meeting, Mr. Potter suggested that instead of using the setback line as a reference, it might be better to require the discharge to be a certain distance from the property line. Mr. Potter suggested a distance of 20 feet from the property line.

adequate. The committee also felt that the effects of a new stream buffer ordinance would not be very substantial because it is unlikely that a lot of new construction will occur near streams.

The committee also discussed how the invasive species ordinance should be developed and whether it should be the responsibility of the stormwater committee. Several committee members felt that this should be a part of the landscape guidelines ordinance instead of part of the stormwater ordinance. Trae Meyr and Ann Carter were interested in having input into the invasive species ordinance when it is being developed.

The committee discussed next steps for the stormwater recommendations. Bob Watt explained that the meeting of the Stormwater Committee would be on September 8<sup>th</sup> and that would be a good time to further discuss and refine the recommendations from the Sub-committee. Ms. Lamitola and Mr. Watt encouraged the committee to have something ready to present to the City Council at the September meeting. Ms. Sukanek stated that she thought she could prepare something for the meeting and would distribute to the Sub-Committee prior to the meeting. The Sub-Committee could potentially meet briefly before the Stormwater Committee meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss any final revisions.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30am.

Approved this 5 day of OCT., 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ray Potter, Committee Chair

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_