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RESOLUTION

ADOPTING THE HIGHWAY 72 CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1996 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR ROLLA, MISSOURI.

WHEREAS, RSMo Chapter 89.300 through 89.490 grants third class cities the power to prepare, adopt, and amend a comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 42, Section 42-5 through 42-7 of the Rolla City Code, known as the Planning and Zoning Code, authorizes the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to make and adopt a comprehensive plan for the physical development of the City; and

WHEREAS, Section 42-7 authorizes the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to consider amendments or extensions of the comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission officially presented the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan to the public on December 12, 2000 and made copies available for review at certain locations in the City and inviting comments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing for the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan, as required by Section 42-7, on February 13 and March 13, 2001;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Rolla Planning and Zoning Commission hereby adopts and recommends to the City Council for adoption EXHIBIT A attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference thereto as the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan an element of the Comprehensive Plan for the development of the City of Rolla, Missouri and repealing hereto those portions of said 1996 Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the same subject matter and location that are inconsistent with the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan.

DATE: March 13, 2001

Paul Stigall, Chairman

ATTEST: Kathy S. Reese

[Notary Public - Notary Seal]
Kathy S. Reese
State of Missouri
Pettis County
My Commission Expires Feb 26, 2004
ORDINANCE NO. 3449

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLA, MISSOURI AS
FOLLOWS:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 1996 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE CITY
OF ROLLA, MISSOURI BY ADOPTING THE HIGHWAY 72 CORRIDOR
DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS AN ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY.

WHEREAS, RSMo Chapter 89.300 through 89.490 grants third class
cities the power to prepare, adopt, and amend a comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 42, Section 42-5 through 42-7 of the Rolla City
Code, known as the Planning and Zoning Code, authorizes the Planning and
Zoning Commission and City Council to make and adopt a comprehensive plan
for the physical development of the City; and

WHEREAS, Section 42-7 authorizes the Planning and Zoning Commission
and City Council to consider amendments or extensions of the comprehensive plan;
and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing
for the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan, as required by Section 42-7, on
February 13 and March 13, 2001 adopting said plan by resolution. A copy of
said plan and resolution is designated as EXHIBIT A and is on file in the office
of the City Clerk, City Hall, Rolla, Missouri, and the same is hereby adopted and
incorporated by reference as if set out at length herein; and

WHEREAS, Section 42-7 provides that no plan or part thereof shall be
considered adopted until approved by the City Council after a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, after due notice, this Council has received public comment at a
public hearing held on May 21, 2001.

WHEREAS, if any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this
ordinance is for any reason held invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity
of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council hereby declares
that it would have adopted the ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence,
clause or phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections,
subsections, sentences, clauses, or phrases be declared invalid.

3449
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLA, MISSOURI, as follows:

Section 1: That the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan as an element of the 1996 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Rolla, Missouri, which is on file with the City Clerk, is hereby adopted as an amendment to said plan.

Section 2: That by enacting the Highway 72 Corridor Plan, those portions of the 1996 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Rolla, Missouri inconsistent therewith, pertaining to the same subject matter and location, are hereby repealed.


APPROVED:

[Signature]
MAYOR

ATTEST:

[Signature]
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]
CITY COUNSELOR
Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan

Introduction

The Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan includes an irregularly shaped study area containing over 407 acres or about 10 percent of the total land area in Rolla as of 2000. The study area begins at the intersection of Bridge School Road and Kings highway, concluding at the City Limits southeast on Highway 72, a distance of approximately four miles. The factors used in defining the corridor’s spatial limits were those areas adjoining the corridor that can be seen from, or will likely have an impact on, future development along the corridor. In other words, the corridor study area was defined based on a “zone of influence” determined by existing or potential land use and traffic circulation systems.

The plan was initiated to address the challenges and opportunities that future development proposals along the corridor may bring for City policy makers with respect to new development, redevelopment, or neighborhood conservation strategies. It was the intent of the planning effort to establish clear policy guidelines to assist public and private sector development decisions. Six corridor segments or “panels” were defined to facilitate the analysis process and provide a specific application for the policy guidelines described on more general terms in the plan. Specific recommendations were presented for sub-areas within each panel. A total of 18 sub-areas were identified and analyzed.

Study Area Overview

Twenty five percent or 101.5 acres in the Highway 72 corridor study area are undeveloped. Virtually all of the vacant land area is located to the southeast of the State Highway O and Highway 72 intersection shown on Panels 5 and 6. As would be expected, almost 44 percent of the total developed land area was dedicated to low-density residential use. The land use map, pie chart, and table illustrate the remaining use amounts and percentages.

Highway 72 Corridor Study Area

Land Use

(As of October 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area in Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Corridor Land Use
- Low-density
- Vacant
- Commercial
- Public
- Office
- Multi-family
Mapping and analyzing the zoning pattern for the study area is another method to understand and interpret future land development possibilities. Re-zoning requests are often one of the first indications that development may occur at a given location. Some property owners, and the Highway 72 corridor study area is no exception, have been granted re-zoning requests without a specific development plan programmed for implementation. This type of action is referred to as “speculative zoning” and should be avoided whenever possible as being contrary to sound land use planning practices by public policy makers.

Sixty percent of the study area is zoned for either rural residential, single-family, or two-family development (228 acres). The land use table, however, indicates that only 178 acres are actually devoted to low-density residential development in the study area. In essence, it could be assumed that the study area has 50 acres of land zoned for low-density residential development, either vacant or not used for residential purposes. At present, 60 acres of land have been developed for commercial uses while nearly 144 acres are actually zoned for this type of use. It would appear that a reserve of 84 acres exists for future commercial development without requiring additional re-zoning. The flaw in this analysis, however, is that the land zoned for commercial use may not be located properly to attract investment or may be developed for non-commercial uses making commercial development infeasible or undesirable. This type of zoning pattern is a product of speculative zoning practices that, in turn, place additional pressures on public policy makers to re-zone more property for commercial use to meet actual market demands.

The discrepancy between land use and zoning calculations may reflect the fact that under the original cumulative structure of the zoning code single-family and two-family residences were permitted in commercially zoned districts. Likewise, commercial uses could be located on lots zoned for manufacturing activities. Significant acreage in the study area is zoned for commercial use but developed as low density residential (refer especially to Panel 2). Additional acreage facing Highway 63 in the study area is zoned M-1 (light manufacturing district) but developed for commercial or office uses.

### Highway 72 Corridor Study Area

**Zoning**

(As of October 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area in Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-O Office</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.01 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1 Neighborhood Business</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>.20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2 General Retail</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>.20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3 Commercial</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>.04 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1 Light Manufacturing</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>.03 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>.04 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-R Rural Res.</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>.10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1 Single-Family</td>
<td>183.3</td>
<td>.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 Two-Family</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.01 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3 Multi-Family</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.01 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Corridor Zoning

- C-3 - Office District
- C-1 - Neighborhood Retail District
- C-2 - General Retail District
- C-3 - Commercial District
- M-1 - Light Manufacturing District
- PAR
- PUBLIC
- R-1 - One Family District
- R-2 - Two Family District
- R-3 - Apartment District
- R-R - Rural Residential
Housing

There are 626 housing units of all types in the study area. The vast majority, however, are single-family units. Occupancy rates for all units appeared very high based on the land use and housing conditions survey completed in September 2000. The survey found an overall 96 percent occupancy rate for the corridor, indicating a strong demand for the affordable housing located throughout the study area. Population in the study area is estimated to be 1,502 persons living in 601 dwellings, based on the occupancy rate and an average household size of 2.5 persons per unit. Study area population should remain fairly stable until the properties located southeast of State Highway O begin to develop.

Transportation

MoDOT conducted a traffic count survey in 1999 to measure average daily traffic (ADT) throughout Rolla. Four measurements were taken within the Highway 72 study area at: (1.) Highway 63 south of 2nd Street, (2.) Highway 72 @ Rucker Avenue, (3.) Highway 72 @ Southview Drive, and (4.) Highway 72 @ Osage. Highway 63 south of 2nd Street had an ADT count of 31,580 vehicles making it the highest traffic volume location in Rolla not on Interstate 44. The Highway 72 / 63 intersection, just south of this point, accommodated this traffic, most of it traveling north or south on Highway 63. Highway 72 at Rucker Avenue east of the intersection carried an ADT total of 12,378, indicating significantly less traffic activity than on Highway 63, but still one of the highest ADT locations in Rolla. The two additional measurement points on Highway 72 reflected a gradual decline in ADT to 11,934 at Southview Drive to a 5,420 ADT at Osage as Highway 72 entered a more rural area. It is important to note that many travelers going through Rolla to Interstate 44 will turn north on State Highway O to avoid traffic congestion at the Highway 72 / 63 and the Highway 63 / Kings highway intersections.

Highway 72 was recently widened to five lanes from Commercial Drive (southeast of the State Highway O intersection) to its current terminus with Highway 63. This development impacted properties abutting Highway 72 by significantly reducing setback for some structures and causing many driveways to be redesigned with steep angles. At several locations the Highway 72 roadbed lies five to six feet above grade level for the adjoining structures. Future improvement plans call for the widening and realignment of Highway 72 to a point beyond the current City Limits. Highway 72 is also programmed to be extended to Bridge School Road and Kings highway from the Highway 72 / 63 intersection as a limited access facility.

Improvements to Highway 72 will increase accessibility and traffic, which may drive up land values that can spur development or redevelopment. As development occurs, traffic volume will continue to increase. More business development along Highway 72 may bring more driveways, more traffic congestion and potential land use conflicts. Eventually, unless access is managed, additional public investment will be required to further expand traffic capacity. The Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan has been prepared to address the issues brought forward by these anticipated changes and to provide a framework of goals and policy guidelines for public decision makers.
Highway 72 Corridor Goals And Policy Guidelines

The following Goals and Policy Guidelines are intended to apply to the Highway 72 study area with respect to development, redevelopment, and conservation areas as delineated in the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan.

**Goals**

**New Development:** Encourage efficient development or redevelopment with regard to land use and public facility investment.

a. **Development proposals should emphasize compact growth and infill on land already served by City infrastructure.** Efficient development in the context of this statement means cost-effective growth that does not promote premature development or land speculation, particularly in undeveloped rural areas.

b. **Development should take advantage of and be consistent with the existing and planned public investment in sewer, water, streets, and other utilities.** Location, density, and related design factors should be coordinated with the capacities of public facilities without incurring increased public expense and inconvenience.

c. **The annexation of all remaining Highway 72 frontage should be pursued as a means to prevent inappropriate and uncoordinated development.** The lack of development regulations in Phelps County may threaten the long-term efficiency of Highway 72 if subdivisions and inappropriate land uses are permitted to locate with direct access to the roadway using multiple driveways.

d. **Full advantage should be taken of the public’s investment in highways and arterial streets.** Major highway or arterial street frontages should be viewed as valuable and limited community resources. These frontages should be reserved for compatible land uses that require the visibility and access afforded by a highway or major street location. Conversely, the efficiency of the highway and arterial street system must be simultaneously maintained.

e. **All development regulations should be sensitive to housing costs and should assist developers in holding down costs.** Zoning and particularly subdivision regulations should encourage housing patterns that minimize street and utility costs, reduce per unit land costs through increased densities and more efficient land use, and utilize natural drainage rather than structural solutions to storm water management where feasible.
Implementation of the Highway 72 Corridor Development Plan should, were possible, be based on positive incentives for quality development and redevelopment rather than relying only on regulations.

Existing Development: Protect existing private and public investments, especially regarding the preservation of affordable housing, established neighborhoods, commercial areas, community services and other public facilities.

a. The conservation of existing residential neighborhoods is of high priority. The integrity of residential neighborhoods should be protected through the improvement and continued maintenance of public facilities and services and through the discouragement of encroachment by incompatible uses.

b. The viability of existing commercial development should be reinforced were appropriate and redevelopment encouraged were commercial areas have become physically or economically obsolete. The continued development or redevelopment of commercial areas for compatible and complementary uses should be encouraged. The City should use appropriate incentives to support improvements to existing commercial development or to encourage redevelopment where designated in the plan.

Transportation: Develop an adequate and balanced transportation system to facilitate the movement of people and goods into, out of, and within the study area.

a. Planned highway and thoroughfare improvements should proceed on a timely schedule and receive high priority in the City’s and MoDOT’s transportation improvement programming. The construction of Lions Club Drive is critical to the development of the study area southeast of State Highway 0. State funded improvements to Highway 72, particularly its extension through to Kings highway, should be encouraged as a top priority for MoDOT planners.

b. The integrity and function of the area’s highway and major street system should be protected and enhanced as development or redevelopment proceeds. Highway and arterial streets are primarily intended to move large volumes of traffic throughout the City, not to provide direct access to abutting properties. Generally, access to arterial and higher classification roadways should be restricted to intersecting public streets or major traffic generators (i.e., shopping centers) with a minimum of curb cuts. Less restrictive spacing may be allowed where fragmented lot patterns and multiple ownerships exist or a precedent has been previously established. Spacing standards should nonetheless be adopted to balance the need for access with the intent of this goal.
c. **Pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems should be provided as development or redevelopment proceeds.** Housing areas should be accessible via pedestrian and bicycle circulation facilities to recreation areas, community facilities, and other institutions. The construction of a pedestrian and bicycle path should be encouraged along the Highway 72 right-of-way.

**Utilities:** Provide an adequate primary services system, i.e., water and sewer, to support projected development, redevelopment, and conservation efforts.

Sewer and water services are generally available to the area immediately east of the State Highway O and Highway 72 intersection. New development further to the southeast will require the extension of services. Careful planning should assure that service capacities are not exceeded by premature development. Where water and sewer services are not presently available, the extension of these utilities should be a prerequisite for the approval of urban level housing or commercial development.

**Environment:** Enhance the urban and natural environment of the study area and minimize the impact of environmental hazards.

a. **Development should either not be located in or near environmentally sensitive areas, or should be designed to reduce hazards.** Flood plains, flood ways, and steep topography should be preserved in their natural state or only developed in a manner that preserves their function or eliminates hazards to development.

b. **Development should be designed insofar as practical to utilize natural drainage systems for storm water management.** Natural drainage systems are in most instances less costly, have less impact on area-wide drainage problems, preserve the natural environment and provide more open space amenities. Developers should be encouraged to utilize natural drainage systems.

c. **Areas of unique natural character should be preserved.** Particular attention should be placed on preserving topographic features, stream beds, forest areas, and vistas of unique character wherever feasible.

**Capital Improvements Financing:** Provide adequate and timely financing of capital improvements and the equitable distribution of improvement costs between the public and private sectors.

Development and redevelopment in the study area may require additional investment in major streets and utility trunk lines, along with the significant cost of extending service to individual parcels. This implementation process will mandate a coordinated and comprehensive effort by all parties.
a. **The cost of extending major sewage collection and water distribution systems should be distributed in proportion to benefit.** Some of this system cost will undoubtedly be public, e.g., oversized sewer lines serving large developed areas, major water distribution mains; etc. Much of the cost, however, must be assumed by private development. Direct costs exclusively benefiting particular developments should be borne by that development. Insofar as practical, improvements benefiting multiple properties should be financed in proportion to benefit received. The City and RMU should utilize the full range of government powers, e.g., subdivision regulations, eminent domain, special assessment districts, etc. to achieve the equitable and proportionate financing of needed improvements.

b. **The construction of collector and local streets should be absorbed by adjoining development.** Collector and local streets provide abutting property direct access and should be constructed to City standards with their costs being borne by the private developer. Efforts should be made to review City street construction standards to reduce costs without sacrificing function.

c. **The City should participate with private development to finance the over sizing of facilities when dictated by larger public interest.** Significant cost savings along with substantial service benefits can be achieved by constructing facilities to meet anticipated capacity demands.

d. **The City should participate with private redevelopment proposals to finance public infrastructure investments using Tax Increment Financing and other public redevelopment tools.** Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is based upon the premise that public improvements spur redevelopment that can produce an incremental increase in property and sales taxes that, in turn, can be dedicated to finance specific infrastructure investments.
Policy Guidelines

Policy Guideline #1

PROTECT RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS FROM ADVERSE IMPACTS OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE CHANGES.

Intent: To protect people’s living environment. To ensure that new land uses are not detrimental to residential areas. To recognize the vulnerability of certain residential areas to encroachment by incompatible uses. This policy does not mean that every non-residential land use is automatically inappropriate in residential areas. Rather, it states the primary concern of the plan - THE PRESERVATION OF RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

Policy Guideline # 2

ENCOURAGE THE LOCATION OF MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL USES ALONG MAJOR STREETS.

Intent: To locate higher residential densities adjacent to major streets, thereby promoting complementary land uses. To ensure that development of this density is located on streets with adequate capacity to manage the traffic volumes generated.

Higher residential densities should be located on or near arterial streets or highways to prevent the disruption of significantly lower density areas from excessive through-traffic. If access is not possible from an arterial street, it may be provided on a lower street classification as long as traffic problems are not created.

Policy Guideline # 3

ENCOURAGE CONCENTRATION, RATHER THAN STRIP DEVELOPMENT, OF COMMERCIAL USES NEAR INTERSECTIONS OF MAJOR STREETS.

Intent: To promote the development of compact groupings of commercial uses designed as a single unit that:

1. Share vehicular access points and circulation patterns;

2. Cluster commercial uses together to share utility hook-ups, service entrances and other building systems; and

3. Provide adequate landscaping, consistent signage, and pedestrian access routes.
To maintain the integrity and function of the thoroughfare system. To avoid or minimize isolated development commonly referred to as “strip commercial”.

Strip commercial development occurs when a series of small individual business buildings are established on separate lots usually located along arterial streets or highways. There exists no planned relationship or sharing of access between adjacent uses. This type of development can create nuisances and confusion for drivers because each individual business must attract attention through the liberal use of signs, lights, bright colors, etc.

This guideline is not intended to mean that strip commercial development is automatically inappropriate; it does state that concentrated commercial development around major intersections will be viewed more favorably by City Council.

Policy Guideline # 4

ENCourage THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNAL OR SECONDARY VEHICULAR CIRCULATION TO SERVE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Intent: To maintain the capacity and integrity of the major street system by providing alternate circulation within commercial areas.

Policy Guideline # 5

ENCourage THE EFFECTIVE USE OF SCREENING, BUFFER-YARDS, AND LANDSCAPING TO PROTECT NEIGHBORHOODS FROM THE IMPACT OF LIGHTS, TRAFFIC NOISE, VISUAL CLUTTER, AND OTHER FACTORS.

Intent: To ensure that commercial uses creating nuisances provide adequate buffering and are not detrimental to adjacent land uses. To protect existing development from noise and other nuisances.

Policy Guideline # 6

ENCourage OFFICE AND MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AS A TRANSITION BETWEEN COMMERCIAL AND NEIGHBORHOOD AREAS.

Intent: To ensure compatibility between land uses. To promote a “step-down” concept of land uses by utilizing office and medium density residential uses as buffers in addition to required landscaping and buffer-yards.

Policy Guideline # 7

MINimize POTENTIAL TRAFFIC CONFLICTS BY CONTROLLING THE FREQUENCY AND LOCATION OF ACCESS TO HIGHWAY 72 AND ARTERIAL ROADWAYS.
Intent: To improve safety by controlling the frequency and manner of access. To avoid permitting too many access points that have the potential to disrupt traffic flow and increase congestion.

The proper design, location and spacing of access points depends on the type, volume and speed of existing or anticipated traffic. Adequate sight-distance and travel lanes for vehicular traffic movement are of concern whenever new road access points are developed. No new direct access should be allowed from any property to Highway 72 or Lions Club Drive, unless it provides the only access available. All other properties should be required to take access from local, collector, or arterial streets that intersect these roadways.
SITE-SPECIFIC POLICY APPLICATIONS
HIGHWAY 72 CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN
POLICY APPLICATIONS
Panel 1

**General Comments:** The area encompassed by Panel 1 consists primarily of the Cowan’s and the Ridgeview Additions. The area developed for single-family use between 1910 and 1940. Long standing commercial development patterns along Highway 63 on the area’s eastern edge and the more recent Wal-Mart Supercenter project on the southern edge have resulted in continuing pressure to re-zone properties for commercial and office uses. It has been the intent of the City Council to acknowledge this pressure, but also to establish a reasonable transition zone between the residential and expanding commercial properties to the south. The planned extension of Highway 72 west through the area, however, represents the most significant potential influence on the long-term viability of the single-family neighborhood adjoining the proposed right-of-way.

The Panel 1 map illustrates the general location of the Missouri Department of Transportation’s (MoDOT) Alternative 4 for the Highway 72 extension project. At this point Alternative 4 appears to be the preferred option. Alternative 4 calls for the removal of 17 homes, primarily south of Ridgeview Road, and the clearance of three business properties near the intersection of the extended Highway 72 and Kings highway to the west. Direct access to Highway 72 would be limited to public roads. The proposal would establish cul-de-sacs on Walker Street (not needed south of Ridgeview unless converted to two-way traffic) and Adrian Avenue. Ridgeview Road west of Walker Street would be preserved as a parallel local street to provide internal traffic circulation for the neighborhood and to create a buffer area for the homes facing Highway 72 on the north side of Ridgeview. Access to Highway 72 would be available at the intersections of Spilman Street, Bryant Road, and Bridge School Road. An extension of Fairgrounds Road from Highway 72 would connect to Kings highway.

MoDOT has indicated that variations from Alternative 4 may be considered. One variation might be to eliminate Spilman Avenue as an intersection because of its close proximity to the Highway 72 / 63 intersection. The steep slope at the intersection may also cause traffic visibility problems. Walker Street could form a “T” intersection with Highway 72 from the north to allow better neighborhood access. It would also be desirable to provide a landscaped buffer strip between Highway 72 and Ridgeview west of Walker Street to improve the appearance of the area and reduce noise pollution.

**Sub-Area 1 - Redevelopment Area (Commercial)**

Sub-Area 1 should become an attractive location for commercial redevelopment once the Highway 72 extension project is completed (regardless of which alternative plan is ultimately selected by MoDOT). The sub-area’s attractiveness for private investment will be enhanced by its location between two intersections; one serving Highway 72 at Bridge School Road and a second supporting Kings highway at Fairgrounds Road. New development could have two points of ingress and egress - a decided advantage on a restricted access facility.
Panel 1

Three existing businesses in this sub-area are programmed for demolition. A fourth commercial building and a residential structure, along with some out-buildings located in the sub-area south along Bridge School Road, are generally in poor condition. Several junk vehicles and other refuse are also clearly visible in Sub-Area 1, but a significant portion of the site is undeveloped. Topography may become an issue the further south a redevelopment project extends, but should not impose undue site improvement expenses. The site has all utilities available and is zoned for commercial use.

Sub-Area 2 - Conservation Area (Residential)

Sub-Area 2 is an attractive, well established residential neighborhood consisting primarily of single-family detached dwellings zoned R-1 (single-family district). Although most properties appeared to be in good condition, approximately 23 (estimated at about 25 percent) of the total 93 dwelling units might require significant exterior rehabilitation of at least two major structural components (e.g. roof, windows, foundation, porch, etc.). These statistics are based on a land use and exterior housing conditions survey conducted in September 2000.

The sub-area is targeted as a residential conservation area because of the quality and affordability of the existing housing inventory. Housing occupancy is close to 100 percent, reflecting the growing need and scarcity of the affordable housing found in this sub-area. Homes in the sub-area sold for an average of $45,000, according to recent neighborhood sales statistics. The desirability of Sub-Area 2 and, consequently, its attractiveness for private reinvestment from new homeowners may be adversely impacted by pressures for commercial encroachment resulting from the extension of Highway 72. The City should consider targeting this neighborhood for housing rehabilitation grants/loans and continued infrastructure upgrades to provide a competitive advantage for new homebuyers. Any effort of this type should be based on an Urban Conservation Plan for the sub-area. No re-zonings for commercial, office or multi-family use should be approved beyond the rear property lines of the lots facing Adrian Avenue from the east.

Sub-Area 3 - Redevelopment Area (Mixed Use-Residential)

The extension of Highway 72 across the northern boundary of Sub-Area 3, with its limited access, will isolate this area from the neighborhood to the north creating an opportunity for property owners to take further advantage of the sub-area’s proximity to the Wal-Mart Supercenter and the Highway 63 / 72 intersection. Lots fronting on Strobach Street and Spilman Avenue have become attractive locations for commercial and office uses. The City should continue to grant re-zoning requests for C-1 (neighborhood business district) and C-O (office district) along this frontage. The half-block fronting Spilman is now zoned entirely for commercial use and the few remaining houses there will certainly, over time, be removed or converted for business activities.
Panel 1

The interior lots facing Walker Street, once Highway 72 is extended, will become less attractive for continued single-family use because of increased traffic volumes and noise. Some of the small, frame homes in the sub-area have reached the end of their economic life and will become physically and financially less feasible to rehabilitate. A redevelopment strategy should be followed that encourages new construction on the sub-area’s interior lots for duplex or multi-family use with densities not to exceed 10 dwelling units per acre. This strategy will not adversely impact the adjacent single-family neighborhood, but will provide for a gradual transition between the Wal-Mart Supercenter and Highway 63 / 72 intersection toward the residential conservation area to the north and west.

Sub-Area 4 - Redevelopment Area (Commercial)

Sub-Area 4 has frontage on the west side of Highway 63 between Black Street and Ridgeview Road. This sub-area has a mixture of land use types ranging from commercial and office establishments to apartments and single-family uses. At least four important issues impact any redevelopment projects for the commercial and office uses along this portion of the Highway 63 frontage:

1. Shallow lots (125 feet depth on average) that were originally platted for residential use make it difficult to provide adequate parking and on-site traffic circulation for the seven businesses currently operating here;
2. The large number of curb cuts made necessary by the strip commercial development pattern established here create traffic conflicts and congestion (there are eight driveways from Black Street and Ridgeview Road) thereby reducing the capacity of Highway 63 to move traffic through Rolla, particularly near the intersection of Highway 72 and 63;
3. The sub-area’s topography makes redevelopment more difficult. There is at least a 40-foot drop in topography from Ridgeview Road to Black Street and an estimated 20-foot drop between Spilman Avenue and the Highway 63 frontage.
4. Numerous large freestanding and attached signs distract drivers and create a cluttered, uncoordinated appearance for this commercial area.

Redevelopment appears to be the best option to upgrade Sub-Area 4 to take advantage of the opportunities available from the Highway 63 and 72 improvements and may be the only practical solution to address some of the development issues listed above. The issue of inadequate lot depth could be addressed by permitting property owners with businesses fronting Highway 63 to utilize lots facing Spilman Avenue for parking or expansion. It would not be advisable to vacate the Spilman right-of-way to provide additional lot depth because of the terrain and concentration of utilities in the right-of-way. The City should require that any parking areas permitted in the half-block west of Spilman Avenue are paved and landscaped, using buffer-yards and/or screening between parking lots and residential uses as prescribed in the zoning ordinance. Any re-zoning of the Spilman Ave.
frontage should be limited to multi-family, C-O (office district), or C-1 (neighborhood business district). Multi-family or office/commercial zoning should not be permitted to the west of the alley behind the Spilman Avenue properties. Limiting driveway access to Highway 63 and reducing the number of detached off-premise signs should be a priority for the City in any redevelopment program for Sub-Area 4.
Panel 2

**General Comments:** The planned extension of Highway 72 east from its intersection with US Highway 63 should also influence property owners with holdings in the Panel 2 area to consider potential commercial redevelopment opportunities, at least for the western one third of the area included in the panel. Most of the Highway 72 frontage has been zoned and developed for commercial uses for many decades. With a few notable exceptions, the style, quality, and condition of the structures in the area reflects this history. Commercial /office uses have gradually replaced many of the single-family homes that once bordered Highway 72. The remaining homes fronting on Highway 72 in Panel 2 are generally in poor condition reflecting years of deferred maintenance.

By contrast, however, there are single-family residential areas that have been adequately maintained and remain attractive locations for home investment. The houses in these areas represent a supply of affordable housing that require consideration when determining future land development patterns along the corridor. It is important that the City, through its zoning and other powers, protect these areas from excessive through traffic and encroachment by incompatible land uses.

**Sub-Area 5 - Redevelopment Area (Commercial)**

Sub-Area 5 lies across Highway 63 from Sub-Area 4 and should also be considered an attractive location for potential redevelopment opportunities. Steep terrain is not a significant concern for the redevelopment of this sub-area. Adequate lot depth exists to support most stand-alone commercial establishments between Highway 63 and Faulkner Avenue. In all instances, the individuals owning the lots fronting Highway 63 also own the rear lots behind facing Faulkner Avenue. Only one freestanding billboard is located in Sub-Area 5 near the Highway 72 / 63 intersection. Current zoning patterns will permit all forms of retail or office development without additional review.

The possible vacation of Faulkner Avenue between Black Street and Highway 72 may be desirable to support an approved redevelopment program for Sub-Area 5. However, the concentration of utilities in the right-of-way and the number of properties taking access from Faulkner Avenue will make the possible vacation of this right-of-way infeasible for all but a comprehensive redevelopment proposal in this sub-area. The City should recognize, however, that the Faulkner / Rucker Street block will not be an attractive residential area if large-scale redevelopment occurs. The current C-1 (neighborhood business district) zoning pattern for the Faulkner / Rucker Street block should be increased to support private investment in the sub-area.
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Sub-Area 6 - Redevelopment Area (Commercial)

Sub-Area 6, when compared to the other potential commercial redevelopment locations previously identified, stands out as having the best combination of factors that are favorable for successful redevelopment.

1. The sub-area is owned by only two entities which lessens uncertainty and should reduce site assembly expenses.
2. The sub-area consists of 6.5 acres in a rectangular configuration and would be large enough for a neighborhood-scale shopping center or a single occupancy retailer (store size between 80,000 to 100,000 square feet).
3. Existing structures do not, for the most part, represent an obstacle for redevelopment because of their condition or value, although occupancy rates are high in the area. Approximately 60 percent of the property is undeveloped.
4. The site has excellent visibility from and accessibility to Highway 63 and 72.
5. Topography is not a significant issue, although fill will be needed toward the south end of the sub-area across from Williams Road. The southern portion of the sub-area was excavated to provide fill for the commercial buildings fronting Highway 72.
6. All utilities are readily available to the sub-area.
7. The sub-area is not subject to flooding.
8. Although parts of the sub-area has been used for the storage of construction equipment and other materials, including demolition waste, there does not appear to be any clear evidence of the disposal of hazardous substances that might require environmental mitigation.

Faulkner Avenue bi-sects the sub-area and, under most redevelopment scenarios, would have to be vacated to permit the full utilization of the site. Utility lines located in the right-of-way could be relocated or eliminated without difficulty during redevelopment.

Sub-Area 6 represents an excellent opportunity for the City to encourage redevelopment that would clearly be in the public interest. Redevelopment would result in an upgrade of the function and appearance of this strategic corner in Rolla-adding to the community’s tax base and employment levels.

Sub-Area 7 - Conservation Area (Residential)

Sub-Area 7 is a relatively small enclave of 28 single-family residences fronting Southbrook Drive in the Rolla 2nd Addition. Most of the homes were constructed in the late 1950’s and 1960’s. The exterior structural condition of the units, based on the land use and housing conditions survey conducted for this plan, appeared to be excellent to good with only four to five residences requiring significant exterior rehabilitation. Owner occupants made up 50 percent of the occupied units.
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Zoning changes approved by City Council along the northern tier of lots in the subdivision have established a precedent for commercial and office land uses adjacent to the sub-area. There will continue to be pressure to introduce additional commercial zoning in order to provide for parking or room for business expansion. From a commercial development perspective, the lack of adequate lot depth has remained an on-going deterrent to upgrading the quality of development around the Highway 63 / 72 intersection. Evidence of this problem can be seen along the Highway 63 and 72 corridors. The problem typically occurs where commercial development locates on lots originally platted for residential use (e.g., the 7,000 sq. ft. residential lot as seen here).

The City also has an objective to protect stable single-family areas from commercial encroachment that may damage property values, induce urban blight, and reduce the quality of the living environment for the remaining residents. The solution to this dilemma is to establish a zoning boundary in Sub-Area 7 beyond which commercial zoning will not be approved. Panel 2 depicts a zoning boundary that provides for limited commercial / office expansion while preserving the residential integrity of the sub-area.

Sub-Area 8 - Conservation Area (Residential)

Perhaps the most remarkable fact about the status of Sub-Area 8 is that, despite long term commercial and multi-family zoning patterns, the integrity of the area as a single-family residential neighborhood has not been seriously impacted through the introduction of incompatible development. It is a fairly common zoning practice for communities to zone low density residential areas that are adjacent to the Central Business District for multi-family, commercial, and even industrial use despite the existence of large numbers of single-family residences. This zoning philosophy does a tremendous disservice for property owners by permitting commercial or apartment uses to spread through what had been solid single-family neighborhoods and by introducing uncertainty for owners planning to make investments in their homes or for financial institutions considering loans. One half of the sub-area is zoned for C-1 (neighborhood business district) and R-3 (multi-family district) uses.

Sub-Area 8 has 92 residential structures of which only four are two-family or duplex units. One four-plex unit is located on Walnut Street. The dominant land use in the sub-area remains the single-family home. The land use and housing conditions survey found that only 12 (10 percent) of the structures required significant exterior repair. Part of the Conservation Area strategy for this sub-area should be a comprehensive re-zoning to single-family or two-family district. The City should extend the re-zoning effort north beyond the boundaries of Sub-Area 8 to include properties abutting 3rd Street. Short of this action, no lots should be re-zoned for C-2 (general retail district) or above in the sub-area.
Panel 3
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HIGHWAY 72 CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN
POLICY APPLICATIONS
Panel 3

**General Comments:** Panel 3 had the highest concentration of single-family housing units in the study area with 237. One duplex unit located at 62 Rose Court was recently re-zoned R-2 (two-family district). Sixty percent of the homes found in Panel 3 are located in the Rolla Gardens and Green Acres Additions, which were platted in the early 1940’s and developed during that decade. The structures range in size between 975 to 1,000 square feet on lots averaging 7,500 square feet. Current sale values range on average from the low to mid $40’s for units that have not been extensively updated. The Southview, Frost, and Elmwood Additions were developed in the 1960’s. Homes here are larger ranch-style units (adding a third bedroom) on bigger lots that currently sell in the mid to upper $50’s.

A commercial node exists at the intersection of Southview and Highway 72 consisting of a convenience store and an older commercial structure in good condition. Included in the node is a small 8,800 square foot lot that is the only highway frontage in the Panel 3 area available for new development. The tract is zoned C-1 (neighborhood business district) and this zoning is appropriate for the type of development that would be attracted to this lot, given its size and configuration.

**Sub-Area 9 - Conservation Area (Residential)**

Sub-Area 9 is targeted as a residential conservation area primarily as a strategy to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood for single-family use, the large number of affordable housing units located here, and because the City wants to preserve the ability of Highway 72 to efficiently move traffic across Rolla. Two facts pose a challenge for the implementation of this strategy. The recent widening of Highway 72 directly impacted several properties in the sub-area by reducing the front yard separation from the roadway; thereby requiring steep, short driveways to access the property from the highway. Secondly, the large number of driveway cuts made necessary by the orientation of some homes, especially in the Green Acres Subdivision, that face Highway 72 also creates potential problems for the conservation strategy. Some property owners, particularly those who might speculatively purchase homes fronting Highway 72, will claim that the only viable use for their property now is commercial because of the structural orientation and the traffic that makes the homes less desirable as residences.

This pattern of commercial encroachment is typical having occurred elsewhere in Rolla and, for that matter, across the United States. Commercial re-zoning along the Highway 72 corridor in Sub-Area 9 should not be approved because, once commercial or office uses are permitted:

1. A pattern of speculation will develop that may discourage owners from maintaining their properties for residential use, consequently reducing property values and the attractiveness of the homes for sale as residences;
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2. It will be virtually impossible to keep the entire highway frontage in Sub-Area 9 from being re-zoned once a precedent is established, thereby encouraging more speculation and dis-investment by residential property owners;

3. Additional interior lots may need to be re-zoned to provide adequate depth for parking or business expansion, thereby introducing incompatible land uses and traffic into the interior of the neighborhoods - spreading urban blight and more land speculation;

4. Increased commercial traffic using the existing multiple driveway access points for ingress and egress will dramatically expand the potential for traffic accidents and will reduce the capacity of Highway 72 to efficiently move traffic across Rolla, possibly requiring additional lane widening, more land acquisition, and public expense; and

5. The appearance of this portion of Rolla will be degraded as new commercial establishments introduce signs, lighting, and dissimilar architecture from what is currently present in the sub-area.

To implement the proposed conservation strategy, the City should not approve re-zonings for commercial or office use for any properties to the east of Walnut Street (also on a line running south from Highway 72). No commercial or office zoning should be permitted across Pete Avenue to the south or to the west of the Southview and Highway 72 intersection. Development of the vacant 8,800 square foot tract to the west of Casey’s General Store will require that a buffer-yard be established between that property and the residential uses further to the west. Medium density residential uses may be approved for properties fronting Highway 72 not to exceed 10 units per acre. The City should consider targeting future Community Development Block Grant funding for a housing rehabilitation initiative in the Rolla Gardens neighborhood. Street improvements for Rolla Gardens Drive and Green Acres Drive are scheduled for 2003 or 2004.
Panel 4

**General Comments:** Panel 4 may be characterized by its contrasting land uses ranging from solid single-family neighborhoods to a long established mobile home park, from modern office buildings to traditional highway-oriented retail development. The area also has vacant land available for commercial or potential mixed use development. Highway 72 is bisected by Salem Avenue at one of the few signalized intersections along the corridor. Salem Avenue carried over 3,000 vehicles per day near the intersection in 1999, which was similar to Lanning Lane east of Highway 63, adding to the traffic volume in the area. As traffic volume increases on Highway 72, resulting from the future extension of the roadway to the west and as a result of population growth to the south, the opportunity for additional commercial development adjacent to the highway should also increase.

**Sub-Area 10 - Conservation Area (Residential)**

Sub-Area 10 is basically an extension of Sub-Area 9 with respect to land use and development issues. The future stability of the sub-area and its desirability for residential use is subject to land development decisions of the City Council. Commercial or office re-zonings should not be approved west of Sheron Avenue. No additional ground should be zoned for commercial use along King Drive or Salem Avenue than are presently zoned (Lot 13 King Addition and Lot 2 King 2nd Addition). No Highway 72 frontage in this sub-area should be re-zoned for commercial use. Office zoning might be considered for those lots with access to Gano Drive that also face Highway 72. This recommendation is justified by the existence of office development across Highway 72 from this property.

**Sub-Area 11 - Development Area (Mixed Use-Commercial/Office)**

The total area encompassed by Sub-Area 11 is approximately seven acres. The current zoning pattern reflects a mixed use development concept for the sub-area with C-O (office district) for the 1.6 acres adjacent to Newcastle Drive. Most of the sub-area’s frontage on Highway 72 is zoned C-1 (neighborhood business district). The remaining property behind the C-1 frontage is zoned R-1 (single-family district). Sub-Area 11 would be a good candidate for development under the Planned Unit Development provisions of the Rolla City Code. At any rate, the prospect for commercial development will be enhanced with the approval of a higher zoning classification. Probably C-2 (general retail district) would be appropriate in this sub-area if approved with buffer-yard requirements to protect the residential area to the south. Office or medium density residential development would be desirable for the tract adjoining Newcastle Drive.
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Sub-Area 12 - Redevelopment Area (Commercial)

The Highway 72 frontage in Sub-Area 12 is entirely developed, however the buildings are either older commercial structures in poor condition or are residential structures. One of the residential structures is probably best known for the on-going “yard sale” conducted on the property’s front yard every weekend. The Highway 72 frontage in Sub-Area 12 is primarily zoned for C-1 (neighborhood business district), although two lots at the intersection of Johnson Street remain zoned for single-family use. The eastern half of the sub-area is currently used as a combination mobile home park and for service-sales of mobile homes. This tract is zoned C-2 (general retail district).

Sub-Area 12 is targeted as a redevelopment area for commercial uses because of the condition of the buildings, the economic opportunities available near the signalized intersection of State Highway O and Highway 72, and due to the City’s desire to improve the appearance and function of this sub-area for commercial use. The recent widening of Highway 72 has adversely impacted some of the properties by reducing the available front yards, driveway access, and parking. Several buildings are now too close to the Highway 72 roadway to remain attractive for most commercial occupants. Commercial zoning and development should not be extended across Highway 72 to the residential properties located there because of the damaging impact this action would have on the adjacent single-family neighborhood.
HIGHWAY 72 CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN
POLICY APPLICATIONS
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General Comments: Highway 72, from its intersection with Commercial Drive to the end of the area included in Panel 5, is scheduled for widening to upgrade the facility to four lanes. MoDOT has established a policy of access control on this stretch of Highway 72 to minimize traffic conflicts on the improved roadway. Essentially, abutting properties that can access Highway 72 from an intersecting public road will be denied direct access to the roadway via a private curb cut. This policy will undoubtedly impact development plans for area property owners as the tracts that abut Highway 72 in Panel 5 are subdivided for sale. The City should support MoDOT’s access control policy whenever feasible as subdivisions are approved by requiring that lots use public access roads to indirectly channel traffic onto Highway 72.

Most of the Highway 72 frontage in Panel 5, with few exceptions, is zoned for commercial use. At present, 30.9 acres are vacant tracts, or are vacant tracts with individual residual single-family homes, zoned for commercial use. This amount of available, largely vacant land zoned for commercial uses represents a ready supply of property for development over the next decade. This fact should influence any decision to add commercially zoned property to the Highway 72 frontage. The City should work to improve the appearance of Rolla as Highway 72, along with Highway 63, will become an increasingly important entryway into the community.

Sub-Area 13 - Development Area (Residential)

Approximately one-third of this 12.9 acre site is developed as a church and family center visible from on Highway 72. The tract is zoned R-1 (single-family district) and is suitable for development as a low density residential area in keeping with the land uses to the north, east and west should the owner decide to pursue this objective. Access to the rear nine acres may become an issue unless a private road adjoining the church property to the southeast is dedicated for public use. Higher density residential, office, or commercial zoning should not be approved for this property given the established development pattern near the site.

Sub-Area 14 - Development Area (Mixed Use-Commercial/Residential)

This 10.8 acre sub-area was recently re-zoned C-2 (general retail district) to accommodate the location of a new funeral home in the southeast corner of the property. The City should encourage the owner of Sub-Area 14 to consider the property as a potential location for a mixed use development under the PUD provisions of the Rolla City Code. Commercial or office development would be appropriate adjacent to the Highway 72 frontage. Residential uses could be designed for the rear portion of the sub-area, given its considerable depth, with access through the development on a dedicated road. Careful design would be required to permit the blending of these potentially incompatible uses.
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Sub-Area 15 - **Development Area (Mixed Use-Commercial/Residential)**

Sub-Area 15 is an ideal candidate for a mixed use development scenario under the PUD section of the Rolla City Code because:

1. The sub-area is under single ownership;
2. The tract is approximately 16 acres in area with 800 feet of frontage on Highway 72, having excellent depth to accommodate an internal road system as well as separation between residential and commercial uses;
3. The sub-area is zoned C-1 (neighborhood business district), but higher density uses could be permitted under a PUD adjacent to the Highway 72 frontage;
4. There are no apparent man-made environmental restraints on the property and the site is largely open without dense stands of timber or brush that would require extensive clearing or preservation;
5. The sub-area has adequate drainage and a moderate slope. Carter Creek cuts across the southern one-fourth of the sub-area limiting development due to flooding potential. The Carter Creek drainage and floodway could be used to satisfy park dedication requirements when the sub-area is subdivided prior to development; and
6. All utilities are available to the sub-area.

The City should encourage the development of the sub-area as a PUD. Additional property adjoining Sub-Area 15 could be included to increase the size of any proposed development, particularly the three acre tract to the west of the sub-area adjacent to the Maggi Place apartment project.

Sub-Area 16 - **Development Area (Commercial or Residential)**

Sub-Area 16 is an 8.8 acre vacant tract zoned C-2 (general retail district) located east of Sub-Area 15 across Highway 72. The sub-area is suitable for commercial development and might, like its neighbor to the west, become a good location for a small shopping center facility at some point in the future when housing development increases near Highway 72 in and outside of Rolla. Residential development may also be suitable for this sub-area and the City should favorably consider a request to re-zone this property to encourage an appropriate housing development program. Rolla’s sewage treatment facility is located behind the sub-area directly to the east approximately one quarter mile, but this fact should not reduce the attractiveness of the sub-area for commercial or residential development.
HIGHWAY 72 CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN
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**General Comments:** The territory covered by Panel 6 includes land in and outside of the City Limits, with Highway 72 right-of-way serving as the boundary. City Council should address this issue because, given the fact that Phelps County has no zoning or subdivision regulations, development could occur in the unincorporated area that may undermine the adopted land use policies of the City. These policies will guide development on the opposite side of the highway in Rolla. Highway 72 could also be adversely impacted by premature development if the City cannot participate in the development decision-making process to limit driveway access and inappropriate land uses. The City should actively pursue the eventual annexation of those parts of the Highway 72 frontage not presently within the corporate limits of Rolla adjacent to or across from the existing City Limits.

MoDOT’s plans call for the widening and straitening of Highway 72 through the relocation of the right-of-way to the east of the highway along this portion of the corridor. The relocation will directly impact a mobile home park and utility building on the east side, but free up right-of-way for the construction of a pedestrian/bike path on the west side of Highway 72. In addition, the City of Rolla will construct Lions Club Drive, an important future arterial roadway for the southside annexation area, connecting to Highway 72 near the existing Osage Drive intersection (please refer to the diagram on Panel 6). This new intersection may result in the development of a commercial/office node to take advantage of the traffic generated by this improvement.

**Sub-Area 17 - Development Area (Residential/Commercial)**

Sub-Area 17 is proposed as a development area for residential use with approximately 25 acres of vacant land zoned for single-family development in the sub-area. New commercial development should be concentrated on a five acre or so tract near the proposed Lions Club Drive and Highway 72 intersection, in-keeping with commercial development policy. The sub-area must also be considered as partly a conservation area with the 25 existing single-family homes currently located here. Land development decisions on the part of the City Council should be made with the intent to preserve the viability of the sub-area for residential use. Commercial re-zonings should not be approved within the sub-area or along the Highway 72 frontage.

**Sub-Area 18 - Development Area (Mixed Use-Residential/Commercial)**

In April 1999, the property included in Sub-Area 18 was re-zoned from R-R (rural residential district) to a combination C-1 (neighborhood business district), C-2 (general retail district), and C-3 (central commercial district) zoning pattern. The single largest area re-zoned, an 86 acre tract, was designated for C-3 commercial uses - the most intense type of commercial uses normally reserved for major highway locations or in the downtown. This zoning cannot be rationalized under any planning criteria contained in the current Comprehensive Plan. The zoning was premature given the lack of utilities.
in the area and the inability of the City to adequately provide basic services to a development that may occur here in the near future. The zoning appears to be purely speculative in that no realistic development program is conceivable for the area at this time that would justify the C-3 zoning classification. Granting this level of zoning in a rural setting must also make difficult any decision on the part of neighboring property owners to plan for the reasonable use of their land.

The C-3 zoned property should be re-zoned to a residential classification. The C-2 zoned property (approximately 16 acres) may be reasonable for the type of commercial development that may occur on Highway 72, but is still very premature at this location. One option might be to prepare a PUD for the entire 103 acre site to include a mixed use commercial and residential development concept more in line with what will be the ultimate use of the sub-area in the future.
APPENDIX
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Sub-Area 1 – Redevelopment Area

Commercial structures and mobile home near the Bridge School Road and Kings highway intersection suitable for redevelopment once Highway 72 is extended from the east.

Commercial, office, and multi-family uses fronting Highway 63. The photograph illustrates the excessive number of billboards, driveway cuts, and the potential impact of terrain on redevelopment in this sub-area.

Sub-Area 4 – Redevelopment Area
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Sub-Area 6 – Redevelopment Area. View of the tract at Faulkner Avenue.

Sub-Area 8 – Conservation Area. Typical single-family units found in the sub-area.
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Panel 4

Sub-Area 11 – Development Area. Property with excellent Highway 72 frontage.

Sub-Area 12 – Redevelopment Area. Mixed commercial and residential structures.
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Sub-Area 14 – Development Area. Appropriate for mixed use development.

Sub-Area 15 – Development Area. Large, mostly vacant tract for mixed commercial and residential development.
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Sub-Area 18 - Development Area. Appropriate for mixed-use residential and commercial development.