



MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor  
6801 Delmar Blvd.  
University City, Missouri 63130  
**May 22, 2017**  
**6:30 p.m.**

**A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**D. PROCLAMATIONS**

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. May 8, 2017 Study session minutes
2. May 8, 2017 Regular session minutes

**F. APPOINTMENTS to BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

1. Lauren Masterson-Rodriguez is nominated to Arts and Letters by Mayor Welsch

**G. SWEARING IN to BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

**H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)**

**I. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Zoning Code Text Amendment pertaining to multi-family residential developments and attached single-family dwellings.

**J. CONSENT AGENDA**

**K. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

1. Traffic Signal Maintenance Agreement Renewal  
*VOTE REQUIRED*

**L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

*BILLS*

1. **Bill 9315** – AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A RETAINER AGREEMENT FOR CITY ATTORNEY SERVICES.

**M. NEW BUSINESS**  
*RESOLUTIONS*

*BILLS*

1. **Bill 9316** – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 400.030, 400.210, 400.220, 400.260, 400.280, 400.320, 400.340, 400.380, 400.390, 400.400, 400.1110, 400.1120 AND 400.1125 OF CHAPTER 400 - ZONING CODE, OF THE UNIVERSITY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TO REVISE CERTAIN ATTACHED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS AS PROVIDED HEREIN.

**N. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS**

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business
  - a. **Removal of Sign Prohibiting Flyers in Council Chambers**  
*Requested by Councilmembers Smotherson and McMahon*  
Discussion and Vote
  - b. **City Manager Search – Setting the Agenda**  
*Requested by Councilmembers Carr and McMahon*  
Discussion and Vote
  - c. **Storm Water Issues: Task Force or Master Plan?**  
*Requested by Councilmembers Carr and Smotherson*  
Discussion and Vote

**O. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)**

**P. COUNCIL COMMENTS**

- Q.** Roll Call Vote to go into a Closed Executive Session according to Missouri Revised Statutes 610.021 (1) Legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys and (2) Leasing, purchase or sale of real estate by a public governmental body where public knowledge of the transaction might adversely affect the legal consideration.  
*Requested by Councilmembers Carr and Smotherson*

**R. ADJOURNMENT**

**UNIVERSITY CITY COUNCIL  
STUDY SESSION**

5th Floor of City Hall  
6801 Delmar  
May 8, 2017  
5:30 p.m.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

The City Council Study Session was held in Council Chambers on the fifth floor of City Hall, on Monday, May 8, 2017. Mayor Welsch called the Study Session to order at 5:31 p.m. In addition, the following members of Council were present:

Councilmember Rod Jennings  
Councilmember Paulette Carr  
Councilmember Steven McMahon  
Councilmember Terry Crow  
Councilmember Michael Glickert  
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also in attendance was Interim City Manager, Charles Adams, Community Development Director, Andrea Riganti, Recreation Deputy Director, Lynda Euell-Taylor, and Recreation Specialist, Jessica Prichard.

Hearing no requests to amend the agenda, Mayor Welsch proceeded as follows:

**AGENDA**

**1. Heman Park Pool - Pool Operations/Lifeguards**

Mr. Adams stated that Ms. Riganti would be presenting Council with proposed changes to the contract for Lifeguard's Unlimited, and the rationale behind those changes.

Councilmember McMahon stated that his son is applying to be a lifeguard, so he would recuse himself from participating in the discussion and vote.

Community Development Director, Andrea Riganti introduced Lynda Euell-Taylor, Deputy Director of Recreation and Jessica Prichard, Recreation Specialist to members of Council. Ms. Riganti stated she had made an error; for which she would apologize, in the drafting of an unintentionally ambiguous contract that resulted in the misinterpretation of rates identified on the contract. Council noted that the hourly pay rate being offered was different than the rate presented in the bid document. This discrepancy was brought to staff's attention, wherein it was determined that the rates staff had conceived as hourly rates were actually billable rates. Ms. Riganti noted that although the bid document had not specified that the City was looking for a billable rate it is customary for applicants to do so.

Staff met with Lifeguard's Unlimited for clarification on this issue and to determine if the hourly rates could somehow be adjusted to honor the not-to-exceed amount of \$214,220, approved by Council. Lifeguards Unlimited estimated that an additional \$30,000 to \$40,000 would be needed to accommodate the rates presented in the contract and was not amenable to adjusting the rates to meet the City's dollar amount. As a result of these circumstances, Ms. Riganti presented Council with the following options, which were outlined in the Study Session background materials:

1. Honor the hourly rates presented to the public by providing an additional \$30,000/\$40,000 to Lifeguards Unlimited. The City's budget for the operation of aquatics has always spanned two fiscal years and there is approximately \$44,000 in salaries and operational costs remaining in the FY17 budget. The proposed budget for FY18 included contractual funds to cover the entire amount of \$212,220 for Lifeguards, so there is adequate funding between the two fiscal years for this option.
2. Proceed with Lifeguards Unlimited's bid as executed; the billing rate of \$15.50 for managers, \$13.00 for assistant managers, and \$10.65 for lifeguards. The hourly pay rate range is Manager - \$11.00-\$15.00, Assistant Manager - \$10.00-\$14.00, Lifeguard - \$8.50-\$10.50
3. Terminate the bid acceptance contract with Lifeguards Unlimited and proceed with in-house operations. The City has the authority to terminate the contract for any reason within a 30 day period. The City's hourly rates of \$9.55 - \$11.09 for managers, \$8.33 - \$8.84 for assistant managers, and \$7.76 - \$8.53 for lifeguards. Since the hourly rates are established in the City's Pay Ordinance, any suggested increase would first have to be presented to the Civil Service Board and then to Council, which presents an approximate three-month delay.

Ms. Riganti stated she would also like to note that the bid, as presented, also does not indicate that Lifeguards Unlimited will cover the following training costs as previously presented to the public: \$180.00 for new certifications; \$90.00 for recertification, and the \$29.00 refundable fee for a half day skills review. To honor this representation and avoid any impact on the City's youth, it would cost the City approximately \$5,000 for the certifications and an additional \$5,000 to hire a certified instructor to administer the training. Both of these expenses can be covered under the pool's FY17 budget.

The pool is scheduled to open at the end of May, therefore, to ensure that it is fully staffed and operational staff is seeking guidance from Council.

Councilmember Carr questioned whether the billing rate of \$10.65, under Option No. 2, would be the same for all of the senior lifeguards? Ms. Riganti stated that it would be.

Councilmember Carr questioned whether the City had the manpower to fully staff the pool at this point in time? Ms. Riganti stated although the City does have enough staff to open the pool, it could be problematic. Fourteen persons are needed on a daily basis which is the exact number of employees currently available. So the City would have to start recruiting and training additional guards in order to reduce the number of hours that will be required by the initial crew and ensure that subsequent weeks of operation are fully covered. Councilmember Carr asked Ms. Riganti if Lifeguards Unlimited had included swimming in their contract?

Ms. Riganti stated it had been included and still remains as a part of the contract. Councilmember Carr stated that at this point, she does not see a disadvantage to proceeding with Lifeguards Unlimited, as long as the City has the funding to absorb the costs for training. In her opinion, the utilization of Option No. 2 eliminates additional stressors placed on staff, offers lifeguards a higher rate of pay, and will provide a basis for the City to determine whether this company is a good fit going forward.

Councilmember Jennings stated although he would agree that the City should proceed with Lifeguards Unlimited, he is concerned that under Option No. 2 there are no safeguards to ensure that lifeguards will be paid \$10.65.

Councilmember Carr stated her assumption is that Lifeguards Unlimited would have a broader net of applicants that will allow the City to keep the pool open until Labor Day if that is the City's intent? Ms. Riganti stated that it was.

Councilmember Jennings stated his concern is based on the sliding scale presented in Option No. 2 which ranges from \$8.50 to \$10.50. And based on that scale the company could decide to pay the City's youth \$8.50 rather than the \$10.50 pay rate suggested by the City in order to boost their profits.

Councilmember Crow concurred with Councilmember Jennings' assessment that there was a potential for lifeguards to be paid two dollars less under Option No. 2. So, unless a specific rate of pay could be determined the City should put money into the kitty to ensure they receive the salary that was promised to them.

Councilmember Jennings noted that the same scenario presented in Option No. 2 would hold true for the assistant manager and manager.

Councilmember Crow questioned whether the City had already advertised the rate of pay as being \$10.65? Ms. Riganti stated that they had not.

Councilmember Jennings stated since this rate of pay has been a topic of discussion by members of the community, his belief is that it must have been advertised at some point in time.

Mayor Welsch stated she believes that the position, along with the anticipated rate of pay, had been disseminated throughout the high school.

Ms. Riganti agreed that the rate had been discussed publicly, however; the City had never placed this rate in any of their advertisements.

Councilmember Jennings stated while he understands that a mistake was made, some of these issues have been made public. As a result, the City should bear some of the blame and proceed with Option No. 1, especially given the fact that the additional funding needed to execute this option is available in the FY17/18 budgets.

Councilmember Glickert asked Ms. Riganti if she could provide an explanation for the sliding scale on the pay rate in Option No. 2? Ms. Riganti stated that \$10.65 would be the actual rate billed since there was no intent on the part of Lifeguards Unlimited to have a sliding scale. The sliding scale refers to the hourly pay rate.

Mayor Welsch asked Ms. Riganti if she could explain the difference between the pay rate and the billing rate illustrated by the two boxes under Option No. 2? Ms. Riganti stated that the first box, entitled "*Pay rate*," is an example of what the company would pay employees hourly as per the bid.

Councilmember Glickert asked if under Option No. 1, a first-year lifeguard would receive the same pay rate of \$10.65, as a lifeguard with four years of experience? Ms. Riganti stated that they would. Councilmember Glickert asked if the City had any employees who were already certified by the Red Cross? Ms. Riganti stated that they did. Councilmember Glickert asked if the City had any pending applications for lifeguards, and if so, whether they had been reviewed to determine what qualifications they possessed? Ms. Riganti stated they had received approximately twenty applications consisting of fourteen who are already certified and six that need to be trained. Councilmember Glickert stated that Councilmember Carr's suggestion to give this company a chance in order to determine what they can do was a good idea. So, although this does appear to be a really sloppy job on the City's behalf, he would be willing to go with Option No.1.

Councilmember Crow asked if any of the applicants had been informed about what they could expect to earn as a lifeguard? Ms. Riganti stated some applicants had received an offer letter with the rate included and that is when it was brought to staff's attention that the rate being offered by the contract was less than what the City had anticipated.

Councilmember Crow stated the question in his mind is whether \$8.50 or \$10.50 is competitive. If the City has been paying \$7.76, it would seem to make sense to go with Option No. 2, which at a minimum pays \$8.50; unless it contradicts what these applicants have already been told they would get paid. He stated that the City is really in kind of a gray area as far as what's right and what's wrong. And if staff needs to come back to Council in July and say we've got to sweeten the pot in order to attract more applicants, then he believes Council would be obligated to increase the rates. Councilmember Crow asked Ms. Riganti if Lifeguards Unlimited had a separate applicant pool? Recreation Specialist, Jessica Prichard stated that all of the City's applications had been forwarded to Lifeguards Unlimited. Deputy Director, Lynda Euell-Taylor informed Councilmember Crow that Lifeguards Unlimited did have its own pool of applicants, and is continuing to receive applications in preparation of staffing the Heman Park pool.

Mayor Welsch stated she is in favor of Option No. 2 as long as there had been no promises of a higher rate. However, she does not believe it is fair to pay a trained guard the same as a new guard. She stated what she does not understand is the billing rate in Option No. 2, where it lists the top rate of pay for an assistant manager as \$14.00, and yet their billing rate is only \$13.00.

Ms. Riganti stated that since the rate of pay is commensurate with an applicant's experience, the company's belief is that the profit received from the lower end of the pay range will compensate for any losses.

Mayor Welsch stated that since staff has confirmed that no promises had been made regarding the higher rate this appears to be the best option, especially because starting off at a higher rate is something the City would have to live with that could become problematic going forward.

Councilmember Jennings asked Ms. Riganti if she had any knowledge of what other municipal pools were paying their guards? Ms. Riganti stated that Lifeguards Unlimited uses these same rates for all of their locations.

Councilmember Smotherson stated he would agree to proceed with Option No. 2, in spite of the fact that he had the same concern as Councilmember Jennings; will they hire experienced guards when there's less money to be made by doing so? Councilmember Smotherson asked if the references provided by Lifeguards Unlimited had been verified? Ms. Euell-Taylor stated that they had been verified.

Mayor Welsch asked whether anyone from Lifeguards Unlimited would be working at the pool in the event of any problems? Ms. Riganti stated although there will be a City staff contact person with Lifeguards Unlimited; the lifeguards are actually employees of the company.

Mr. Adams questioned whether the City was going to be responsible for the cost of certifying residential guards? Council all agreed that that was correct.

Mayor Welsch asked Councilmembers Jennings and Glickert if they were okay with approving Option No. 2? Both Councilmembers stated that they were.

A consensus was reached by all members of Council to proceed with Option No. 2, and pay the Red Cross certification for U City youth.

## **2. Olive/I-170 Corridor Update**

Ms. Riganti stated a Study Session was conducted in February, wherein Council authorized staff to issue an RFP in conjunction with this proposed development. After Council's review and comments, an RFP was issued on March 29th, with a submittal return date of May 1st. Direct copies of the RFP were distributed to 41 national and regional developers, the real estate community, property owners within the area, and the City of Olivette. A press release was also issued, and a copy was posted on the City's website and the Real Estate Developer's website.

Staff received one response from Novus Development Company, a local developer. To date, Novus has developed more than 1 million square feet of commercial space. Their mission is to transform ordinary locations into unique spaces.

All of their work is accomplished in-house, which allows them to retain ownership of their projects. Some of their projects that Council might be familiar with are the Market at McKnight and Manchester, which includes the Lucky's Supermarket; the Shoppes at Old Webster, and the Terraces in Kirkwood. All of these projects were accomplished with a combination of public and private financing.

Ms. Riganti stated that although no drawings have been provided at this stage, Novus' proposal consists of 280 thousand square feet of retail space that will be developed in three phases.

- **Phase I:** Development of 200,000 square feet for an anchor store. At this point in time, Novus has only received a tentative commitment from the retailer and therefore, no name has been disclosed. This phase will be conducted primarily on the south side of Olive between 170 and McKnight. It will also include several properties located on the east side of McKnight, as well as the strip center located at the northwest corner of McKnight and Olive, and Mayflower Court, which is a residential area. The estimated completion time for Phase I is 24 months. A firm commitment by the anchor tenant is necessary prior to the commencement of this phase.
- **Phase II:** Development of an additional 70 thousand square feet of commercial space to be identified at a later time. This phase is anticipated to start twelve to twenty-four months after Phase I is open.
- **Phase III:** Development to be determined, but may include apartments. This site encompasses the storage center.

Ms. Riganti stated the proposal also includes; architectural renderings, artistic elements, bike-ped connections linking Ruth Park to the rest of the development, and the revitalization of adjacent neighborhoods by assisting residents in the relocation process. The public benefit noted is the transformation of Olive Boulevard, additional economic development, and the creation of 400 jobs. No potential taxable sales were disclosed.

The key element of this proposal that is lacking is financing, and additional due diligence will be needed to determine if the project benefits the City. Novus proposes that the City engage with a third party consultant, under a confidentiality agreement, who will discuss and make recommendations on potential financial mechanisms; their impact to the City, and whether or not they think the development is a good return on the City's investment. Based on their recommendations, Council would then make a determination with respect to the developer. Ms. Riganti stated her recommendation is that Council proceeds in this manner after additional information is provided.

Councilmember Carr asked Ms. Riganti if staff would have to issue an RFP to find a redevelopment consultant?

Ms. Riganti stated that although staff is able to provide Council with names of several firms who engage in this work, at this point in time, they are trying to ascertain what the cost would be in order to determine which category it would fall under per the City's purchasing policy and the type of bidding process required.



Councilmember Jennings asked Ms. Riganti if Novus had provided any characteristics about the anchor tenant?

Ms. Riganti stated what she can say is that the anchor store would consist of approximately 200,000 square feet. Councilmember Jennings stated he is a little concerned about the fact that this RFP was sent out to 41 national and regional developers and only one response was received. So first, he would like to gain a better understanding of why and whether additional steps could be taken to attract more interest in the project.

Second, he would like to see a project that identifies, enjoins and promotes minority involvement; either in the area of construction or joint ventures and is a true reflection of the people who live in the 3rd Ward.

Councilmember Smotherson asked Ms. Riganti if she could provide Council with the names of the firms referenced? Ms. Riganti stated her preference would be not to provide any names at this time, in the event the purchasing policy requires that the contract be placed out for a bid.

Councilmember Glickert asked Ms. Riganti if she could reiterate what was being proposed for the area east of McKnight? Ms. Riganti stated businesses located to the east of McKnight; which include a Mexican Restaurant and an auto repair shop, are to be included in Phase I of the project. Councilmember Glickert asked if Phase II was proposed to extend further east? Ms. Riganti stated Phase II would start to the west of Nobu's, and will extend all the way down to the storage facility. Phase III would include the storage facility and Torah Prep.

Councilmember Glickert acknowledged Councilmember Jennings' concerns and reminded him that the City does have an Ordinance which requires 20% minority participation.

Mayor Welsch asked Ms. Riganti what she anticipated the City's investment in this project would be since none of the property is owned by the City? Ms. Riganti stated her comment regarding, "*Our investment*," pertained to the community's investment. The Mayor asked Ms. Riganti if she could provide answers to the following questions:

1. How does a public/private partnership work?
2. Has anyone reached out to the business owners in this area regarding the City's redevelopment efforts?
3. Is the City basically going to be asking a developer to come in and try to make this work, since there is no City-owned land being offered?
4. Why wouldn't a developer try to buy these properties on their own?

Ms. Riganti stated that the RFP was issued because with any kind of redevelopment of this nature there will be some type of request for public financing. The TIF process calls for the submittal of a Redevelopment Plan, so the RFP was issued in anticipation of garnering a Redevelopment Plan that could later be used if Council elected to proceed with this process.

Mayor Welsch stated she also shared Councilmember Jennings' concern regarding the number of responses received. Moving forward, the Mayor encouraged everyone to be very respectful of the businesses and homeowners who have been emotionally and fiscally committed to U City for years. She stated that this type of redevelopment can create a lot of uncertainties and has the potential to make everyone who may be impacted a little nervous. Councilmember Jennings stated two things mentioned by this developer during the Study Session was that the time for development is now and that they had talked to other developers who were interested in this project. So again, it just seems a little suspect that no one else responded. He stated there was something else that Council has talked about in the past, and he hopes his colleagues will be committed to, is that no consideration would be given to the use of eminent domain for the acquisition of any properties.

Councilmember Carr stated Council has been given a mandate to redevelop Olive and if this option is not at least explored, in a sense, they would be dropping the ball on the directive handed out by this community. So, while she hopes she is not sticking her neck out by saying the wrong thing, in her opinion, the reason why other developers are not knocking at the City's door is because most of them would prefer to work with property that was owned by the City. Asking a developer to acquire the property is unique, and a much harder task to fulfill because it usually means offering more than fair market value. That's why it's her belief that this one developer, who seems to have the potential to bring in a large retailer, is worth investigating. Councilmember Carr reminded Council that what happened in Olivette was a result of financial institutions who were not interested in lending because of the economic downturn, as well as the fact that the City had absolutely no plans for redevelopment. This, on the other hand, is kind of like a leading edge, so she is in favor of hiring a consultant to advise the City on where they should go from here.

Councilmember Crow stated although he too would have loved to see greater participation from the development community, he does think this is probably a little more unique than most redevelopments. But on the other hand, he would remind his colleagues that Gateway was the only company that responded to the City's RFP for emergency medical services and no spoke up or shared his concerns about that fact.

Councilmember Crow stated he would respectfully disagree with the notion that this section of the Olive/I-170 corridor is an economic hub because the demographics of the area do not support this conception. So he thinks that Council must be candid about their thought process and recognize that any developer is going to be looking at the spending power of the surrounding communities, which from their perspective, may not make this an attractive piece of land.

Councilmember Crow asked his colleagues to recall that there were countless starts and stops that encompassed several years before the developments along Hanley and Dale were complete. And today, it has progressed to the point where new retailers must pay the highest price per square foot to get into this area than any retail location in St. Louis. So these kinds of developments are challenging. And in order to achieve total redevelopment of Olive, that development may have to resemble the same process undertaken by Richmond Heights.

Councilmember Crow reassured Councilmember Jennings that everyone would be respectful of the need to honor or exceed the City's minority participation requirements. Consequently, he thinks it would be interesting to see what the developer has in mind and Council should allow staff to move forward with the next steps.

Councilmember Smotherson stated something interesting he had learned at one of the 3rd Ward meetings is that many of the residents who live on Mayflower are actually ready to move. So although he understands that this is an ugly area and there is a need to respect the businesses and homeowners who have remained loyal over the years, the redevelopment of Olive Boulevard should not be premised on these individuals, it should be premised on the future of this City. This is an area that has been completely underserved and it's time to do something about it.

Councilmember Jennings stated although no deals have been consummated, the fact that some of these residents have already been offered money for their property was a little disconcerting. And based on his definition, he would beg to differ with respect to whether or not this location should be considered as an economic hub. But more importantly, this is his Ward, as well as his home, and no significant development has taken place in over fifty years. He stated that in spite of the fact that he is still not totally satisfied with only one response, he would agree that this just might be their only shot at the apple.

A consensus was reached by all members of Council to proceed with the next step to engage a third party consultant.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no additional questions or comments, Mayor Welsch adjourned the Study Session at 6:17 p.m.

Larette Reese  
Interim City Clerk

DRAFT

## City Council Study Session Agenda Item Cover

---

**MEETING DATE:** May 8, 2017

**AGENDA ITEM TITLE:** Heman Park Pool – Pool Operations/Lifeguards  
(Discussion, recommendation)

**BACKGROUND REVIEW:**

On March 27, 2017, City Council approved the Lifeguards Unlimited bid to manage Heman Park Pool for a not-to-exceed amount of \$214,220. A letter of acceptance was subsequently signed by both parties. It was brought to the City’s attention that the hourly pay rate offered to the lifeguards was different than that presented in the bid document and accepted by City Council. Secondly, that lifeguards were being asked to pay for training.

Community Development Department staff met with Lifeguards Unlimited Friday, April 28 to seek clarification. It was determined that portions of the bid submitted were interpreted differently by Lifeguards Unlimited and Community Development Department staff. Below is the section in question:

CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY  
 BID PROPOSAL FORM --- PART II  
 "SALARY BUDGET"

The undersigned, having examined and being familiar with the conditions affecting the service desired to be performed as outlined in the specifications and other contract documents relating to University City Pools hereby proposes and agrees to perform everything required and to provide and furnish any and all labor, including: manager, assistant managers, lifeguards, shallow water guard certification for: top of slide, bottom of slide, and children’s pool; to operate the Pools in a safe and efficient manner in strict accordance with aforementioned contract document for the sum hereafter specified.

MAXIMUM BASE SALARY

	2017	2018	2019
Maximum Base Salary for Season	\$ <u>See Addendum A</u>	\$ <u>See Addendum A</u>	\$ <u>See Addendum A</u>

SALARIES FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS/SPECIAL EVENTS

Contractor shall provide cost to furnish staff (guards and managers) for other activities, i.e. aquatic programs, swim lessons, rentals, special events when the facility would otherwise be closed to the general public.

Manager	\$ 15.50	_____	per hour
Assistant Manager	\$ 13.00	_____	per hour
Lifeguard	\$ 10.65	_____	per hour
Shallow Water Guard	\$ 10.65	_____	per hour

*Note: the rates above are for recreation programs/special events AND regular operations.*

Staff learned that the number above is actually a “billing rate” rather than an hourly rate. The billing rates include: Worker’s Compensation, FICA, Professional Liability Insurance, payroll processing expenses, overhead and profit. It is industry standard to provide a billing rate on bid documents, and all other responses included one billing rate.

Staff asked Lifeguards Unlimited to analyze various scenarios to determine if the publicly stated hourly rates could be honored within the \$214,220 not to exceed bid amount. It cannot. Lifeguards Unlimited estimates that an additional \$30,000-\$40,000 would be needed to accommodate those rates.

At this time, we are seeking City Council direction and propose three options for consideration:

1. Provide an additional \$30,000-\$40,000 to Lifeguards Unlimited so that the rates presented to the public as hourly rates are honored. Aquatics operations has always spanned two fiscal years. There is approximately \$44,000 in Salaries, part-time and Temp funds remaining in the FY17 Aquatics budget. The proposed FY18 aquatics budget included contractual funds to cover the entire \$212,220 for Lifeguards Unlimited. There is adequate funding between the two fiscal years for this option.

The pay rate and the billing rate would be:

	Pay Rates	Billing Rates
Manager	\$15.50	\$18.29
Assistant Manager	\$13.00	\$15.34
Lifeguard	\$10.65	\$12.57

2. Proceed with the Lifeguards Unlimited bid as executed with the hourly rate of:

	Pay Rates	Billing Rates
Manager	\$11.00-\$15.00	\$15.50
Assistant Manager	\$10.00-\$14.00	\$13.00
Lifeguard	\$8.50-\$10.50	\$10.65

3. Terminate the bid acceptance (must provide thirty day notice) and proceed with pool operations management in-house. Our hourly rates are established by pay ordinance and are:
  - Lifeguard - \$7.76/hr - \$8.53/hr
  - Assistant Pool Managers - \$8.33/hr - \$8.84/hr
  - Pool Manager - \$9.55/hr - \$11.09/hr

Separately, the bid did not indicate that Lifeguards Unlimited would cover the training costs. There is actually a \$180 fee for new certifications, \$90 for re-certification and \$29 refundable fee for a half day skills review. The City used to cover the cost of certifications for in-house lifeguards as well as conduct the certification testing in-house. To honor what was publicly stated about lifeguards not paying for certifications, it would cost the City approximately \$5,000. This too can be covered with FY17 funds, if City Council desires.

If the City were to manage the pool operations in-house, a certified instructor would need to be hired on a contractual basis and training scheduled. The approximate cost for in-house certifications is also \$5,000.

**REQUESTED CITY COUNCIL ACTION:**

The pool will open on May 27. Recruitment and training of lifeguards, regardless of whether the pool management is outsourced or performed in-house, needs to occur as soon as possible to ensure Heman Park Pool opens fully staffed. We are seeking a decision on the options outlined above.

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor  
6801 Delmar Blvd.  
University City, Missouri 63130  
**May 8, 2017**  
**6:30 p.m.**

**A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

At the Regular Session of the City Council of University City held on the fifth floor of City Hall, on Monday, May 8, 2017, Mayor Shelley Welsch, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**B. ROLL CALL**

In addition to the Mayor, the following members of Council were present:

Councilmember Rod Jennings  
Councilmember Paulette Carr  
Councilmember Steven McMahon  
Councilmember Terry Crow  
Councilmember Michael Glickert  
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also in attendance was Interim City Manager, Charles Adams.

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Hearing no requests to amend the Agenda, Councilmember Glickert moved to approve the Agenda as presented, it was seconded by Councilmember Jennings and the motion carried unanimously.

**D. PROCLAMATIONS**

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. April 19, 2017, Study Session Minutes were moved by Councilmember Jennings, it was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson and the motion carried unanimously.
2. April 24, 2017, Regular Session Minutes were moved by Councilmember Jennings, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.
3. April 26, 2017, Special Session Minutes were moved by Councilmember Jennings, it was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson and the motion carried unanimously.

**F. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

1. Aleta Porter Klein is nominated to the Library Board by Councilmember Carr, seconded by Councilmember McMahon and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Andrew Ruben is reappointed to the Plan Commission by Councilmember Jennings, it was seconded by Councilmember Glickert and the motion carried unanimously.

**G. SWEARING INTO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

**H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15minutesallowed)**

**DON FITZ, 720 Harvard, UNIVERSITY CITY, MO**

Mr. Fitz discussed some of the issues that in his opinion have plagued this City's Government for the last several years:

- Linking National politics to what is going on in U City;
- The Trump Administration's efforts to privatize everything since Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal;
- U City's attack on its Emergency Medical Services;
- U City's failure to defend City-owned buildings;
- Councilmember Glickert's failure to provide a genuine apology to citizens for his violent behavior against Bart Stewart;
- Mayor Welsch's failure to provide a genuine apology to citizens for the actions she took against Andrew Roberts, her acceptance of Councilmember Glickert's behavior, and all of the taxpayer dollars wasted on the pursuit of frivolous lawsuits, and
- Councilmember Jennings' failure to provide an apology for his de facto encouragement of Councilmember Glickert's behavior

Mr. Fitz stated that if the desire is to prove sincerity, then all three of these individuals should resign from their current positions. And if they fail to resign, then everyone should keep a close eye on them to make sure they never get elected to a public office again. He then requested that Mayor Welsch use her own wealth to pay back the City for all of the lawsuits that have occurred over the last two years. Mr. Fitz concluded by stating that all of these patterns; although occurring at different times and places, fit into one overall pattern of attack on the rights and social welfare that everyone holds collectively. And until everyone starts to look at what's happening around the country, they will never be able to understand what is happening in their own community.

Mayor Welsch stated there are two requests to speak during the Council Comment section of the agenda which is typically not allowed. However, due to the subject matter of tonight's discussion, these requests will be honored.

**I. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**J. CONSENT AGENDA**

**K. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

1. Approve Conditional Use Permit Application 6655 Delmar Karaoke Entertainment.

Councilmember Jennings moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.



2. Approve Conditional Use Permit Application 6662-D Delmar Food and Beverage Establishment.

Councilmember Glickert moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Jennings.

Mayor Welsch announced that she would be unable to vote in support of approving this permit because one; she does not feel she has the legal authority to do so, and two; she is concerned about the ratio of retail versus restaurants that currently exists in The Loop. She stated she has always been told that the best practice is to have more retail than restaurants because it generates foot traffic that supports all of the businesses. Mayor Welsch asked Mr. Adams if the Department of Community Development, and perhaps, the Plan Commission, could provide Council with their expertise and guidance on what guidelines, if any, they follow with respect to encouraging or restricting businesses interested in locating within The Loop, because she thinks that currently, this area is a little out of balance.

Voice vote on the motion to approve carried unanimously, with the exception of Mayor Welsch.

3. Approve Fogerty Park Phase I Improvements Change Orders 1 through 3 for Spencer Contracting Company in the amount of \$29,380.27.

Councilmember Glickert moved to approve, seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Approve Asphalt Rejuvenation Project for Corrective Asphalt Materials, LLC, in the amount of \$53,000

Councilmember Jennings moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.

## **L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### ***BILLS***

1. **BILL 9311** – An ordinance authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract between the City of University City and the Missouri Highway and Transportation Commission providing for the Kingsland Ave. Alley Bridge reconstruction over NE branch of River Des Peres. Bill 9311 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Carr moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Glickert.  
Roll Call Vote Was:

**Ayes:** Councilmember Carr, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Crow, Councilmember Glickert, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Jennings and Mayor Welsch.

**Nays:** None

2. **Bill 9312** - An Ordinance amending Chapter 340, Section 340.160 of the City of University City Municipal Code to add no passing of Loop Trolley cars. Bill 9312 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Jennings moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson.

Roll Call Vote Was:

**Ayes:** Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Crow, Councilmember Glickert, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Jennings, Councilmember Carr and Mayor Welsch

**Nays:** None

3. **Bill 9313** - An Ordinance amending the Traffic Code creating a new Chapter 367 of the Municipal Code of the City of University City, Missouri enacting and adopting "*Unauthorized stopping and parking along Trolley track*". Bill 9313 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember McMahon moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr. Roll Call Vote Was:

**Ayes:** Councilmember Crow, Councilmember Glickert, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Jennings, Councilmember Carr, Councilmember McMahon and Mayor Welsch

**Nays:** None

4. **Bill 9314** - An Ordinance amending Schedule III of the Traffic Code to revise traffic regulations as provided herein. Bill 9314 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember McMahon moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Jennings.

Roll Call Vote Was:

**Ayes:** Councilmember Glickert, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Jennings, Councilmember Carr, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Crow and Mayor Welsch

**Nays:** None

## M. NEW BUSINESS RESOLUTIONS

### BILLS

*Introduced by Councilmember Crow*

1. **BILL 9315** - An ordinance authorizing the execution of a retainer agreement for City Attorney Services. Bill 9315 was read for the first time.

## N. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed  
Mayor Welsch made no appointments at tonight's meeting
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions

3. Boards, Commissions, and Task Force Minutes

Mayor Welsch thanked Mr. Adams for the minutes that had been included in Council's packets.

4. Other Discussions/Business

**a) Apology of the City of University City to Andrew Roberts pursuant to Consent Judgment approved by United States District Judge Audrey G. Flessing.**

*Requested by Councilmember Carr and seconded by Councilmember Smotherson*

Citizen's Comments

**JoAnn Roberts, 940 Alanson, University City, MO**

Ms. Roberts congratulated her son, Andrew Roberts and the ACLU, for the successful lawsuit brought against Mayor Welsch, to defend every citizen of U City's First Amendment Rights. She also thanked the dedicated members of this community for their voices and courage to speak truth to power. Ms. Roberts expressed her thoughts about the actions taken by Mayor Welsch, and reminded her of this statement found in the minutes of September 24, 2015; *"Mayor Welsch obtained a legal opinion from the City's Attorney on the limits that she, as the presiding officer of these Council Meetings could impose and that U City staff and members of Council are not subject to personal attacks. She further stated she will be more forcible in calling residents out of order and will reserve the right not to call those individuals to the podium at future meetings"*.

Ms. Roberts continued her recitation of various excerpts from past meeting minutes and then asked the Mayor; what greater personal attack could there be then claiming she is not responsible for Mr. Roberts' removal from this Chamber? She stated that when the Mayor makes such statements she is using the language of abuse and the power of her position. However, now that this community knows the truth it will not tolerate more lies at any level of their government.

**Andrew Roberts, 940 Alanson Drive, University City, MO**

Mr. Roberts stated he had hoped that the Judge's Order compelled by the intervention of the American Civil Liberties Union would have served as a message to the Mayor and that she might simply have recognized that she was in the wrong, acknowledge that fact, and move on. So he was astonished when he learned of the Mayor's denial of having any responsibility. He then cited Article 13, Section 73 of *Roberts Rules of Order*, which state, *"When the assembly either by a rule or by a vote decides that a certain person shall not remain in the room, it is the duty of the chairperson to enforce the rule of order using whatever force is necessary to eject the party"*. Mr. Roberts stated he has never objected to Council right to have citizens removed or silenced in certain limited cases, but Roberts Rules and those of the United States require that there must be a written rule or a vote to do so and that it cannot be done by an executive whim. Section 73 also states, *"The chairman can detail members to remove the person without calling upon the police,"* and stresses that only force which is necessary should be employed. He stated he was not disposed of in a manner which would suggest to anyone that he would not have left the podium if ordered to do so, and no force was required to remove him.

Mr. Roberts expressed numerous concerns associated with the Mayor's actions and concluded by stating that he will continue to speak so that other people know they are not alone and that their voices should also be heard. He will continue to speak to let those members of Council who demonstrate fealty to supremacy of the citizen over the ruler know they will always have supporters.

And he will continue to be the face in the crowd at these meetings to ensure that the Mayor knows citizens are still watching, will not forget, and have justice on their side.

**Jeff Hales, 7471 Kingsbury, University City, MO**

Mr. Hales stated based on his recollection, up until 2014; probably around the time that the firefighters were suspended, citizens were always allowed to speak during the Council Report/Business segment of the agenda.

Items of interest are discussed during this portion of the agenda, and for citizens to be asked to reserve their comments until after Council has taken its vote is not acceptable in his mind. Therefore, he would ask that Council revisits its rules on whether or not citizens can be allowed to participate during this segment.

Mr. Hales expressed his views on partisan politics and the standards that have been adopted by Council, noting that this chapter of the City's history needs to end. He then thanked the four members of Council who are working very hard to make that happen, and Mr. Mulligan, for his willingness to act as Special Counsel and his attendance at these meetings.

Council's Comments

Councilmember Crow stated earlier this evening Council held a closed Executive Session, for the purpose of crafting an apology on behalf of the City. Council voted to have the Mayor Pro Tem deliver the apology, which was approved by a vote of 5 to 2.

This is the apology of the City of University City, to Andrew Roberts, pursuant to the Consent Judgment approved by United States District Judge Audrey Flessing. *"Actions speak louder than words. On January the 11th, 2016, Andrew Roberts was removed from the University City Council Meeting by order of the Mayor as presiding officer, while he was speaking during the public comment portion of the meeting. The City of University City through its City Council wishes to apology to Mr. Roberts for the way in which he was treated by his own municipal government. As a presiding officer, the Mayor's decision to remove Mr. Roberts was in violation of his First Amendment and due process rights. It was inconsistent with Council Rule 14, where citizen participation sections of the Agenda are designed to allow members of the general public time to express their thoughts and concerns to members of Council, staff, and the community-at-large, and further, does not represent the values of University City. To assure that this will never happen again, the City Council has agreed to take the following actions:*

- 1. The City of University City will cease making the public statement at City Council Meetings that personal attacks on Councilmembers will be ruled out of order;*
- 2. The City of University City will cease making the public statement at Council Meetings, that Councilmember's motives may not be called into question;*
- 3. The City of University City wishes to extend an invitation to Mr. Roberts to attend and speak at any future City Council Meetings without regard for the content of his speech;*
- 4. The City of University City will no longer allow its presiding officer to remove citizens from a City Council Meeting based on the content of their speech;*
- 5. The City of University City will no longer allow its presiding officer to ban citizens from attending and speaking at City Council Meetings as punishment for the content of their speech, and*
- 6. The City of University City will develop, implement, and enforce a written policy prohibiting content-based restrictions on speech during the public comment period at City Council Meetings*

*The City of University City wishes to express its appreciation for Mr. Roberts' efforts in protecting his First Amendment Rights. Our City prides itself on its openness, inclusivity, and respect for its citizens. Clearly, the actions taken on January the 11th do not reflect those values.*

*Mr. Roberts has shown that once again, one person can make a difference. We apologize and thank you."*

**b) GovHR-USA contract amended proposal**

*Requested by Councilmember Carr and seconded by Councilmember McMahon*

Councilmember Carr stated the City received an amendment of the contract, per the request of Council, that meetings shall be conducted with all seven members of Council. Council also had a desire to ensure there is robust participation by its citizens, and \$25,000 was set aside to accomplish this portion of the contract. As a result, the consultant for GovHR-USA has agreed to conduct a meeting with the general public immediately following any meetings held with Council and members of City staff. However, in the event Council believes these public meetings are inadequate and do not provide the level of engagement deemed necessary, Councilmember Carr asked Council if they would give consideration to making an amendment to the contract at the point in time it becomes apparent? *(All members expressed their concurrence with the proposal.)*

Councilmember Carr made a motion that Council authorize any additional public meetings they deem necessary to ensure robust participation, as long as doing so does not impact the initial costs allocated within the contract. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Glickert and the motion carried unanimously.

**O. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)**

**Gloria Nickerson, 7576 Blackberry, University City, MO**

Ms. Nickerson posed the following questions to Council and staff:

- Does the City still have a phone number citizens can call when they experience flooding?
- Does the City have any records to determine how many citizens have a grinder top in their yard furnished by MSD? *(Ms. Nickerson stated that Thursday, May 4th represented her eighth experience with flooding.)*
- Does the City have any records to determine the number of homeless people living in U City?
- Does U City offer any type of services for the homeless?

Ms. Nickerson stated she had been provided with a list of missing persons and was amazed to learn that there were nineteen people from U City who have been reported missing from 2014 through March of 2017. She then questioned whether there was anyone she could contact to determine whether these individuals have been found of if they are still missing?

**Bobette Patton, 8639 Spoon Drive, University City, MO**

Ms. Patton stated last week she received a message from Councilmember Carr, who even though she was out of town, cared enough to contact her and ask whether U City had experienced any flooding. She stated that she used to live in Ward 2, and never saw or heard from Councilmember Glickert when residents in that area experienced flooding in their homes.

Ms. Patton stated that she purchased another home in U City because she wants to live here, but Council has to do better because these people need to be protected and helped.

**P. COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Councilmember Jennings stated he has been pro-development on Olive for many years and actually runs a small construction company that completed two projects in this area. Council voted to move forward with this development through the issuance of an RFP to 41 developers which yielded only one response. This is concerning to him, especially in light of all the development taking place in St. Louis. He stated although he would certainly like to see the City move forward with this project, he would ask everyone to be very cautious when reviewing this proposal. This is his home; his community, and while he is excited about the possibilities, there is also a need to make certain that this redevelopment provides the best outcome for all involved.

Councilmember Jennings stated that after discussing this idea with Councilmember Smotherson, he believes they are in agreement with asking the Interim City Manager and the Department of Community Development to investigate the possibility of issuing an RFP for the corner of Midland and Olive, with a goal of bringing other interested parties to the table.

Councilmember Jennings invited everyone to come out and support the juniors and seniors of U City High School who are sponsoring a gun violence prevention panel discussion at the Joylynn Pruitt Media Center on Saturday, May the 13th, at 10 a.m.

Councilmember Smotherson stated the reason he agreed to the RFP for Midland is because he thinks it is important to publicly announce what is being offered with respect to this property, which hopefully, will lead to further development.

Councilmember Smotherson stated since this is a public meeting, his belief is that public information should be allowed. So, in light of the new directions that have been outlined at tonight's meeting, he would like to ask Council and the Interim City Manager to give consideration to removing the sign which restricts what can and cannot be placed on the counter here in Chambers.

Councilmember Smotherson stated he would also like Council to give consideration to revisiting the Ordinance associated with the young man who found \$500 and turned it in. He stated that while conducting research on this issue he determined that several cities maintain the same policy of holding unclaimed money for a year and then transferring it into the city's general fund. And so his question is why do cities get to take advantage of monies that are found in these types of situations?

Councilmember Crow thanked everyone for their attendance at tonight's meeting, and in particular, Mr. Roberts and his family. He stated that he hopes everyone knows how much Council appreciates their presence, and wants to make sure there are no surprises with respect to where this Council is headed. When you look at the members of this Council who were either currently elected or reelected to serve, what stands out is that the majority ran on similar platforms, and all won their elections by double digits. So to those residents who expressed a desire for change, he is pleased to note the following accomplishments:

- An Interim City Manager;
- An Interim City Clerk;
- A new City Attorney;
- An ongoing process to select a new City Manager;

- Impending deliberations on a budget that reflects the priorities identified by the residents of this City, and
- An impending review of EMS Outsourcing

In response to citizens' comments, Councilmember Crow stated he agrees wholeheartedly that not everyone on this dais has been treated fairly. He also believes that after all of the things he had outlined are completed, Council must next work to make certain that everyone who comes into this Chamber is treated with respect, and every member of this Council is held to the same standards. Mayor Welsch has made it very clear that *"Since November 2016, the City Manager, and the City Clerk, and the City Attorney, have been dismissed. I have not supported any of these dismissals and I believe they have not been done in the best interest of the residents of the City of University City."* A majority of citizens have also spoken on this issue. Therefore, with the support and encouragement of its citizens Council will be implementing the changes that have been requested in a methodical and professional manner.

Councilmember McMahon stated it would have been great to get more than one response from the RFP. Nevertheless, he is excited because this proposal represents a developer who sees the opportunity that exists at this interchange. So now is not the time to throw roadblocks into exploring this opportunity and doing what needs to be done to make this work. This is an area where the three Wards are the most connected, so it's not just one Ward's issue to get Olive up and running as the next economic engine for U City, it's everybody's issue.

Hopefully, the apology issued on behalf of the City can help heal wounds and bring everyone together as a community that supports the free expression of ideas and the right of people to address their elected officials without fear of being silenced. And hopefully, the City won't be facing further litigation involving someone at a public meeting being silenced when trying to express their political thoughts. Councilmember McMahon stated he would personally like to thank Andrew Roberts for taking action. He didn't just protect his rights he was protecting every citizen's rights; be it the smallest or the most repugnant voice in this community, to ensure they are heard. That's what the First Amendment protects. He stated it is his belief that this Council should make the podium in this Chamber a safe place to speak, where every resident is not worried that their comments might offend someone on this dais or their ideas might put them in jeopardy of being arrested. So thank you, Mr. Roberts, for helping us do our job of making the free debate of ideas strong in U City. As elected officials, he and his colleagues may miss the mark from time to time, but the words, ideas, and opinions uttered by the folks who live here can help get them back on track.

Councilmember Carr stated she too would like to express great excitement about the redevelopment firm who has presented their proposal. Council was given a mandate several years ago, to redevelop Olive, so this is a game-changing opportunity. And hopefully, over the next few months, as additional details are disclosed, the residents of this City will become equally as excited.

Councilmember Carr stated that she also would like to thank Mr. Andrews, who reminded her of something she tries constantly to be reminiscent of; that liberty is something that is very fragile; very fugitive, and dependent upon your leaders, it can disappear in a moment's time. Councilmember Carr stated she is sorry that she did not stand up in Andrew's defense, and would like to apologize for not doing so.

She stated that she, along with several of her colleagues have been subjected to some very harsh critiques. And while she may not like to hear it, she will absolutely defend the right of any citizen to make such an assessment. Councilmember Carr thanked everyone who has continued to come to these meetings in spite of what they have observed, and thanks God, that none of these actions have deterred them from coming back again.

**Q. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Welsch thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the City Council meeting at 7:28 p.m.

LaRette Reese  
Interim City Clerk

DRAFT



Apology of the City of University City to Andrew Roberts pursuant to Consent Judgment approved by United States District Judge Audrey G. Flessig

**Actions Speak Louder Than Words.**

On January 11, 2016 Andrew Roberts was removed from University City Council meeting by order of the mayor, as presiding officer, while he was speaking during the public comment portion of the meeting.

The City of University City, through its City Council wishes to apologize to Mr. Roberts for the way in which he was treated by his own municipal government. As the presiding officer, the mayor's decision to remove Mr. Roberts was in violation of his First Amendment and due process rights, was inconsistent with the Council rule 14, where "Citizen Participation sections of the agenda are designed to allow members of the general public time to express their thoughts and concerns to members of Council, staff and the community at large," and, further, does not represent the values of University City.

To assure that this will never happen again, the City Council has agreed to take the following actions:

The City of University City will cease making a public statement at city council meetings that personal attacks on councilmembers will be ruled out of order.

The City of University City will cease making a public statement at council meetings that councilmembers' motives may not be called into question.

The City of University City wishes to extend an invitation to Mr. Roberts to attend and speak at any future city council meetings without regard for the content of his speech.

The City of University City will no longer allow its presiding officer to remove citizens from a City Council meeting based on the content of their speech.

The City of University City will no longer allow its presiding officer to ban citizen's from attending and speaking at City Council meetings as punishment for the content of their speech.

The City of University City will develop, implement, and enforce a written policy prohibiting content-based restrictions on speech during the public comment period at city council meetings.

The City of University City wishes to express its appreciation for Mr. Roberts' efforts in protecting his First Amendment Rights. Our city prides itself on its openness, inclusivity and respect for its citizens. Clearly, the actions taken on January 11<sup>th</sup> do not reflect those values. Mr. Roberts has shown that once again, one person can make a difference.

Thank you.

I had hoped that the judge's order, compelled by the intervention of the American Civil Liberties Union, would have served as a message to the Mayor. I thought that, finding herself in opposition to the great protector of the right to free speech, the Mayor might simply have recognized she was in the wrong, acknowledged the fact, and moved on. In retrospect, I'm not sure why I thought that. It has become clear to me that the Mayor will never change.

I was astonished when I read that the Mayor now denies any responsibility for having me removed, under police escort, in retaliation for criticism she just could not handle. It is infuriatingly absurd that she should try to tell us that we did not see what we saw, we did not hear what we heard, and we do not know what is true. Given the Mayor's reverence for Robert's Rules of Order, I thought I'd cite the relevant article.

Article Thirteen, section seventy three, states that, "...when the assembly, either by a rule or by a vote, decides that a certain person shall not remain in the room, it is the duty of the chairperson to enforce the rule of order, using whatever force is necessary to eject the party." I have never objected to allowing the Council to have citizens removed or silenced in certain limited cases, but Robert's Rules (and those of the United States) require that there must be a written rule or a vote to do so: it cannot be done by the executive's whim. It is also clear through Robert's Rules and the rules of common sense that the chairperson (in this case, the Mayor) bears responsibility for removing anyone. If the City Manager did have me removed, he would have been in violation of Robert's Rules.

Furthermore, section seventy three states, "The chairman can detail members to remove the person without calling upon the police." It stresses that only force which is necessary should be employed. I was not disposed in a manner which would suggest to anyone that I would not have left the podium if ordered to, and no force was required to remove me. Instead, the police officers (whose attendance we genuinely appreciate and respect) were summoned to escort me from the premises. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

Sometimes, I wonder why I still make public statements. I clearly cannot change anything about the Mayor's behaviour. I can't get her to see that what she does in local government does not comport with the larger political views of liberalism she supposedly holds. Despite symbolic electoral losses, judicial decrees, and the outrage she is faced with every fortnight, the Mayor clings to her belief that we are the rabble-rousers, the malcontents, and, bafflingly, Tea Party communists. Perhaps it's a defense

mechanism: if she were to admit to herself how wrong she's been, the public humiliation and personal doubt she would experience would be difficult to bear. I have come to the realization that I do not make these statements for the Mayor to hear.

I am speaking simply to be heard by anyone who will listen. I'm speaking so that the other people who resist this strange autocracy know they are not alone, and that their voices should be heard, too. I am speaking to let the Council know that those members who demonstrate fealty to supremacy of the citizen over the ruler will always have supporters. I started speaking at meetings to protest the outsourcing of emergency services to a for-profit company, but I knew that night that speaking once or twice would not be enough. So I come to Council meetings. I am a face in the crowd to let the Mayor know that we are still watching. We will not forget. And we have justice on our side.

Madam Mayor and Councilmembers,

I want to congratulate my son, Andrew Roberts, and the ACLU for the successful lawsuit brought against Mayor Welsch to defend our 1st Amendment rights in University City. (As a life long member of this community I still find it incredulous that such action was ever necessary!) I want to thank Lisa Hummel and the other dedicated members of this community for their voices and courage to speak "truth to power".

I am, however, shocked that Mayor Welsch is now publicly stating that she did not have Andrew removed from chambers and that she only wishes she had acted more quickly (presumably to prevent his removal). She has placed the blame for this action on Lehman Walker.

Ms. Welsch I would like to remind you of your own words found in the minutes of multiple Council meetings:

Sept 24, 2015

Mayor Welsch obtained a legal opinion from the city's attorney on the limits that she, as the presiding officer of these Council meetings, could impose.....and that U City staff and members of Council are not subject to personal attacks....

She further stated that she will be more forceful in calling residents out of order....and will reserve the right not to call those individuals to the podium at future meetings.

March 28,2016

Mayor Welsch reminded residents and members of Council, that she was the chair of this meeting, and has the authority on whom to call to the podium. She stated that she has repeated these rules meeting after meeting, and Ms. Hummel, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Roberts, have all chosen to ignore them.

April 11, 2016

(Mayor Welsch stated that under her procedure announced at the start of each meeting, Andrew Roberts' actions have excluded him from being allowed to return to the podium

May 23,2016

Study Session meeting

Councilmember Glickert noted that as of late there have been two situations where the chair had to remove two people from the Chamber. He stated the Chair has the right to remove anyone that he or she thinks is disruptive to the meeting.

She said that there was only one time that she actually asked for someone's removal from the Chamber.

Mayor Welsch said that she has only asked one person to be removed so what is being talked about is how willing a speaker is to respect the order of the Chair. Once they are told that personal attacks are not allowed most have changed the way they speak to the Council. She said she has only addressed three speakers; one for going over the time limit and two for personal attacks.

Mayor Welsch said that she was uncomfortable with removal. One of the problems was the speaker continued to speak after being warned of the time expired and that speaker was not removed. She noted that she has only removed one speaker from the Chamber.

Madam Mayor, I ask you what greater personal attack could there be than claiming you are not responsible for Mr. Roberts removal from this Chamber?

The language and tactics used by Donald Trump during the recent Presidential election caused many survivors of physical and emotional abuse to relive their past traumas. The language, authoritarian behavior, attitude and lies were immediately recognized by abused women all over this country.

Mayor Welsch I am one of those women and while my experience took place more than 40 years ago I know abusive behavior when I see or hear it. When you say I didn't hear what I heard or I didn't see what I saw you aren't just lying you are using the language of abuse and the power of your position.

This community knows the truth now and we will not tolerate more lies from any level of government.

Jo Ann Roberts  
940 Alanson Dr.  
U. City, Mo 63132

## Notice of Public Hearing

Notice is hereby given that the City Council of University City will hold a public hearing on **Monday, May 22, 2017 at 6:30 pm** in the 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Council Chambers of City Hall, 6801 Delmar Boulevard, to consider the proposal for Text Amendments to the Zoning Code related to multi-family residential developments and attached single-family dwellings in the LR – Limited Residential District, MR – Medium Density Residential District, HR – High Density Residential District, and HRO – High Density Residential/Office District in Sections 400.030, 400.210, 400.220, 400.260, 400.280, 400.320, 400.340, 400.380, 400.390, 400.400, 400.1110, 400.1120, and 400.1125 of the Zoning Code. Please contact Raymond Lai at 314-505-8502 with questions about the proposed text amendments. Persons with disabilities who require special arrangements to attend the public hearing should contact LaRette Reese at 314-505-8531 at least 5 days prior to the meeting. All interested parties are invited to attend.

CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY  
LaRette Reese  
Interim City Clerk







## Council Agenda Item Cover

---

**MEETING DATE:** May 22, 2017

**AGENDA ITEM TITLE:** Traffic Signal Maintenance agreement

**AGENDA SECTION:** City Manager's Report

**CAN THIS ITEM BE RESCHEDULED? :** Yes

---

### **BACKGROUND REVIEW:**

The City of University City owns and maintains eight (8) traffic signals. Since St. Louis County Highways and Traffic terminated their maintenance agreement in 2015 with the City, CBB Transportation Engineers has been providing maintenance services on these signals under a maintenance agreement signed in 2016.

In March of 2017, CBB Transportation Engineers submitted a renewal proposal to the City to cover not only maintenance services, but traffic engineering services for the signals, as needed. The agreement includes the following services:

1. Annual Maintenance Services
2. Scheduled maintenance Services
3. Emergency Maintenance Services
4. Signal Timing and Programming
5. Signal Locate Services

The costs associated with the maintenance operations are comparable with the previous agreement including minimal industry costs increase.

The traffic signal maintenance services are budgeted under the General Revenue Fund 01-40-32\_6410 Traffic Signal Maintenance account.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

To authorize the Interim City Manager to execute the agreement between CBB and University City to provide Traffic Signal Maintenance Services.

### **ATTACHMENT:**

- Renewal Agreement



March 3, 2017

Errol Tate  
Senior Project Manager  
City of University City  
6801 Delmar Blvd  
University City, MO 63130

RE: Renewal for On-Call Traffic Signal Maintenance Services  
City of University City  
CBB Proposal No. P17-045

Dear Mr. Tate,

As requested, we are submitting the following proposal for renewal of the on-call traffic signal maintenance services. The original on-call traffic signal maintenance services agreement was executed on February 1, 2016.

For these proposed services, we have teamed with Gerstner Electric in order to provide a single solution for all services required to properly maintain each traffic signal. The attached scope of services outlines the proposed annual maintenance and on-call services. CBB will serve as the point of contact for these services and will coordinate all work. The project manager will be a licensed Professional Engineer (PE), certified Professional Traffic Operations Engineer (PTOE) and certified IMSA Traffic Signal Level III Senior Field Technician. Furthermore, CBB is an approved consultant on MoDOT's LPA pre-qualification list.

The annual maintenance items would be performed annually, bi-annually or as directed. Finally, the response time for on-call services has been identified within the attached scope of services.

The projected timeframe for these services would extend the current contract for a period of one year. The agency would have the option to renew this contract on an annual basis pending the approval of an updated fee schedule.

At the start of the project, we will provide you with a list of contact numbers and email addresses. We anticipate having a primary contact person for normal business hours and a separate contact person for emergency off-hours work.

We propose to perform these services based on the attached proposed fees. The attached proposed fees outlines the cost for each task. We will invoice you monthly and you agree to pay for these services within 30 days of the date of the invoice. You agree to pay all reasonable



March 16, 2017

Page 2 of 7

expenses incurred by CBB including but not limited to attorney fees, court costs and interest at the legal rate to collect any amount due under the terms of this agreement. Further, you agree to limit our liability to you due to any negligent act, errors, or omissions such that the total aggregate liability of our firm shall not exceed \$50,000.

If the proposed scope of services, schedule, fees, payment conditions and limits of liability described above meet your approval, please sign and return this contract for final execution in our St. Louis, Missouri office. We will return a fully executed copy for your files.

We look forward to working with you on this project. Should you have any questions or comments concerning this proposal, please contact me in our St. Louis office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael J. Dolde".

Michael Dolde, P.E., PTOE  
Senior Traffic Engineer



THE UNDERSIGNED HEREBY COMPLIES WITH ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS SET FORTH IN THIS AGREEMENT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Entity

AUTHORIZING FOR GEORGE L. CRAWFORD & ASSOCIATES, D/B/A CBB, SIGNED AND EXECUTED IN ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, ON THE FOLLOWING DATE:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

CBB Proposal No.: P17-045  
Contact: Mr. Errol Tate  
Office No.: 314-505-8571  
Email: [etate@ucitymo.org](mailto:etate@ucitymo.org)



## Scope of Services

### **I. Annual Maintenance (once per year)**

- a. Conflict Monitor Testing – The consultant will perform routine conflict monitor testing using an ATSI certified tester and will maintain testing records. For monitors that are found to be faulty, the consultant will arrange for repairs or replacement upon authorization from the agency.
- b. Cabinet Preventative Maintenance – The following tasks will be completed on a routine basis. If issues are found during preventative maintenance the agency will be notified of each issue and proposed solutions. However, no repairs would be completed until receiving authorization from the agency.
  - i. Vacuum cabinet and replace air filter
  - ii. Check and repair all wiring and connections and proper ground
  - iii. Inspect power supply
  - iv. Verify properly working detection

### **II. Scheduled Maintenance (5 day response time)**

- a. Customer Service Requests – The consultant will investigate and troubleshoot signal related concerns received from agency staff and the general public. The consultant will respond within two working days and will attempt to resolve issues within five working days. If the issue is determined to be critical to traffic management or safety, the work will be considered emergency maintenance (Scope Item IV)
- b. Repair detection – Vehicle and pedestrian actuation will be repaired within five working days. The controller programming will be modified as necessary until the repairs are completed.
- c. Replace bulbs – Burnt out bulbs will be replaced within five working days.

### **III. Emergency Maintenance**

**(1 hour response time Mon-Fri 7:00am-3:30pm)**

**(2 hour response time 3:30pm-5:30pm)**

**(4 hour response time for after hours and weekends)**

- a. Signal Malfunctions
- b. Detector Malfunctions
- c. Damaged Equipment



#### **IV. Signal Timing and Programming**

- a. Maintain database of controller programming – The consultant will maintain an updated database of controller programming for each location. The database will be updated following timing adjustments and/or signal modifications.
- b. Respond to signal timing related customer concerns – The consultant will respond to and investigate signal timing related concerns within two working days. As needed, the consultant will perform timing adjustments following authorization from the agency.
- c. Evaluate vehicle and pedestrian clearance intervals – As authorized, the consultant will measure intersection geometrics and pedestrian crosswalks. These measurements will be used to calculate vehicle and pedestrian intervals per MUTCD standards. This task is recommended following intersection improvements and/or MUTCD revisions.
- d. Signal timing adjustments as needed – The consultant will adjust signal timing plans in order to accommodate changes in traffic patterns, intersection improvements, or construction activity.

#### **V. Signal Locate Services**

- a. Upon notification, the consultant will locate and mark underground conduit and signal equipment within two working days.

#### **VI. Additional Services**

- a. Signal Training Sessions
- b. Signal Plan Review
- c. Data collection
- d. Inspection services
- e. Miscellaneous traffic engineering services



## **Exhibit B - Proposed Fees**

### **I. Annual Maintenance (annual or bi-annual)**

- \$405 per signal cabinet location
- Additional costs would be required for video detection
- Flasher and beacon locations without a signal cabinet would not be included in this task

### **II. Scheduled Maintenance (5 day response time)**

- 1 Man & Bucket Truck - \$105/hour (1 hour minimum)
- Additional Man - \$75/hour

### **III. Emergency Maintenance**

- 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM (1 hour response)
  - o 1 Man & Bucket Truck - \$105/hour (1 hour minimum)
  - o Additional Man - \$75/hour
- 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM (2 hour response)
  - o 1 Man & Bucket Truck - \$155/hour (2 hour minimum)
  - o Additional Man - \$110/hour
- After Hours & Weekends
  - o 1 Man & Bucket Truck - \$200/hour (2 hour minimum)
  - o Additional Man - \$149/hour

### **IV. Signal Timing and Programming**

- Pay item will be paid on an hourly basis using the attached billing rates

### **V. Signal Locate Services**

- \$115 per location

### **VI. Additional Services**

Negotiable based on attached billing rates





**2017 FEE SCHEDULE\***  
For Contracted Services

<u>Classification</u>		<u>Hourly Rate</u>
Senior Engineer	Level II	\$155.00
Senior Engineer	Level I	\$150.00
Project Engineer	Level V	\$135.00
Project Engineer	Level IV	\$130.00
Project Engineer	Level III	\$125.00
Project Engineer	Level II	\$120.00
Project Engineer	Level I	\$115.00
Staff Engineer	Level IV	\$105.00
Staff Engineer	Level III	\$100.00
Staff Engineer	Level II	\$95.00
Staff Engineer	Level I	\$90.00
Jr. Engineer		\$85.00

Other Direct Costs (ODC)

Mileage	IRS Standard Rate/Mile
Xerox Copies	\$ 0.12/Copy
Plan Sheets (Standard)	\$ 1.25/Sheet
Plan Sheets (Color or Enlarged)	Varies
Overnight Mail/Express	Actual Cost
Miscellaneous	Actual Cost

\* Note: Effective January 1, 2017  
 Rates subject to change January 1 of each calendar year.





## Council Agenda Item Cover

---

**MEETING DATE:** May 22, 2017

**AGENDA ITEM TITLE:** AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A RETAINER AGREEMENT FOR CITY ATTORNEY SERVICES.

**AGENDA SECTION:** Unfinished Business

**CAN THIS ITEM BE RESCHEDULED? :** Yes

---

### **BACKGROUND REVIEW:**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**ATTACHMENTS:** Retainer Agreement  
Bill 9315



INTRODUCED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

BILL NO.: **9315**

ORDINANCE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A RETAINER AGREEMENT FOR CITY ATTORNEY SERVICES.**

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

Section 1. A Retainer Agreement with John F. Mulligan, Jr. is hereby approved in substantially the form attached hereto and incorporated by reference, and the Interim City Manager is authorized to enter into and execute on behalf of the City of University City, Missouri the Retainer Agreement, and he and his successors may take such further action as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the intent of this ordinance.

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

PASSED and ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_ day of May, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY ATTORNEY



## **RETAINER AGREEMENT**

The City of University City, Missouri (the "City") hereby retains John F. Mulligan, Jr. (hereinafter "City Attorney") to provide city attorney services as may be requested by the City and accepted by City Attorney. City Attorney may, but is not obligated, to prosecute the violation of any City ordinance.

City Attorney shall be compensated at the rate of \$250.00 per hour, measured in increments of one-tenth of an hour. In addition, City Attorney shall be reimbursed for any customary costs or expenses incurred in advising and representing the City, including but not limited to filing fees, fees for service of process and subpoenas, expert witness fees, consultant fees, stenographer fees, paralegal fees, associate counsel fees, travel and lodging expenses, and copying charges. City Attorney will submit periodic invoices to the City for all fees, costs and expenses.

The City agrees to make full and honest disclosures to City Attorney of all relevant facts. The City understands that its employees, officials and representatives may have to appear in court, to attend depositions, to produce documents and/or provide information, and it will assist and cooperate with City Attorney to the fullest extent in all legal matters undertaken by City Attorney.

City Attorney agrees to advise and represent the City competently and diligently, and to exercise professional judgment. The City understands that it is free to terminate this Retainer Agreement upon written notice to City Attorney executed by a duly authorized City representative. Similarly, City Attorney may, upon giving written notice to the City, terminate this Retainer Agreement for any reason, in accordance with the Missouri Rules of Professional Conduct.

The City acknowledges that City Attorney has been appointed class counsel for numerous Missouri municipalities, including the City, in pending class action lawsuits. City Attorney may represent the City as a class member in pending or future class actions, in his capacity as class counsel, if the City has not requested exclusion from the class. The City understands and agrees that such class action services are not covered by this Retainer Agreement, and the City may enter an appearance in any class action through an attorney it may retain for that purpose.

The City recognizes that no result has been or will be guaranteed by City Attorney in any legal matter, and that this Retainer Agreement is not based upon any such promise or anticipated result. This Retainer Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with regard to the subject matter contained herein, and all prior and contemporaneous negotiations and understandings between the parties shall be deemed merged into this Retainer Agreement.

City of University City, Missouri

City Attorney

By: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Mulligan, Jr.

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_





## Council Agenda Item Cover

---

**MEETING DATE:** May 22, 2017

**AGENDA ITEM TITLE:** Text Amendments to Sections 400.030, 400.210, 400.220, 400.260, 400.280, 400.320, 400.340, 400.380, 400.390, 400.400, 400.1110, 400.1120, and 400.1125 of the University City Zoning Code (pertaining to attached single-family dwellings and multi-family residential developments)

**AGENDA SECTION:** New Business

**COUNCIL ACTION:** Passage of Ordinance required for Approval

**CAN THIS ITEM BE RESCHEDULED? :** Yes

**BACKGROUND REVIEW:** Attached are the documents for the above-referenced Text Amendments to the University City Zoning Code.

The proposed text amendments would allow attached single-family dwellings and provide clarity to existing terms and definitions currently used for attached single-family dwellings and multiple-family residential developments.

The Plan Commission considered the matter at their April 26 meeting and recommended approval of the proposed Text Amendments by a vote of 6 to 0.

This agenda item requires a public hearing at the City Council level and passage of an ordinance. The public hearing and first reading should take place on May 22, 2017. The second and third readings and passage of the ordinance could occur at the subsequent June 12, 2017 meeting.

**Attachments:**

- 1: Transmittal Letter from Plan Commission
- 2: Materials for April 26, 2017 Plan Commission meeting
- 3: Draft Ordinance

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

ATTACHMENT 1:  
Transmittal Letter from Plan Commission



**Plan Commission**

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 862-6767, Fax: (314) 862-3168

May 10, 2017

Ms. LaRette Reese  
Interim City Clerk  
City of University City  
6801 Delmar Boulevard  
University City, MO 63130

RE: Zoning Code Text Amendment –  
Attached single-family dwellings and multiple-family residential developments

Dear Ms. Reese,

At its regular meeting on April 26, 2017 at 6:30 pm in the Heman Park Community Center, 975 Pennsylvania Avenue, the Plan Commission considered a Zoning Code Text Amendment proposal related to attached single-family dwellings and multiple-family residential developments in certain residential zoning districts.

By a vote of 6 to 0, the Plan Commission recommended approval of the proposed Text Amendment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Cirri Moran", is enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Cirri Moran, Chairperson  
University City Plan Commission

ATTACHMENT 2:  
Materials for April 26, 2017 Plan Commission meeting



## Department of Community Development

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 862-6767, Fax: (314) 862-3168

# MEMORANDUM

TO: Plan Commission members

FROM: Zach Greatens, Planner

DATE: April 21, 2017

SUBJECT: April 26, 2017 Plan Commission meeting – Proposed Text Amendments (PC 17-03) related to multi-family residential developments and attached single-family dwellings

---

At the upcoming Plan Commission meeting on April 26, the Plan Commission will consider Text Amendments to the Zoning Code pertaining to multi-family residential developments and attached single-family dwellings. At their meeting on March 22, the Code Review Committee (CRC) recommended approval of the proposed Text Amendments. The proposed Text Amendments are shown in Attachment A.

Recently, there has been interest from developers for the City to allow attached single family dwellings with each dwelling unit on individual, subdivided lots in certain residential zoning districts. Further, among the goals of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update and the recommendations from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Sustainable Code Audit conducted in 2012 called for housing opportunities that are available to all with a diversity of scale, price, style, and are located in safe areas; flexibility in land use regulations so that a variety of developments are more feasible; and housing diversity by providing a range of housing size and price choices.

On review, "attached single family dwellings" is defined in our Zoning Code as "*one of a series of two to eight attached dwelling units, each of which is located on its own subdivided lot of record.*" They are currently allowed as a conditional use in the "HRO" – High Density Residential/Office District and as a permitted use in the "PD" – Planned Development District. This type of residential use is not allowed in any other zoning districts, nor are there any development standards. Staff recognizes there is a demand for this type of development in the area and allowing it would add to the diversity in housing choices in the City, as recommended in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update and the 2012 EPA Sustainable Code Audit.

Up until the late-1990s, attached single family dwellings were permitted in the "LR" – Limited Residential District and the "MR" – Medium Density Residential District. However, there is no detailed information available regarding their removal from these two zoning districts. They were allowed as a permitted use, subject to Site Plan approval, and meeting the regulations for townhouses in place then.

For reference, the current definitions for two-family dwellings, townhouse apartment dwellings and other types of multi-family residential development from the Zoning Code are included below:

*Dwelling, Two-Family* – A dwelling containing two (2) dwelling units on a single lot of record.

*Dwelling, Apartment* – A building, or portion thereof, designed for occupancy by three (3) or more families living independently of each other. This definition does not include "attached single-family" dwellings.

*Dwelling, Town House Apartment* – An apartment dwelling, two (2) or three (3) stories in height,

and containing three (3) to eight (8) dwelling units, which are separated by partition walls, extending from basement to roof without openings, and where each dwelling unit is not located on its own subdivided lot of record.

*Dwelling, Garden Apartment* – A two- or three-story apartment dwelling containing not more than twelve (12) dwelling units that are individually rented or owned, with common access to all units typically provided by open or enclosed stairways and hallways.

*Dwelling, Elevator Apartment* – An apartment dwelling of more than three (3) stories in height and containing more than twelve (12) dwelling units that are individually rented or owned, with primary access to each floor, above the first (1st) floor, provided by means of an elevator.

There are three developments in University City where attached single family dwellings were included, two of which were developed within the last 30 years. One is in the Village of University Place, on Hanley Road, just west of University City High School, built in multiple phases between 1991 and 1998. The other is on Swarthmore Court, southwest of the intersection of Olive Boulevard and 81<sup>st</sup> Street, north of Brittany Woods Middle School, built in multiple phases between 1989 and 2006.

In staff's opinion, allowing attached single family dwellings would benefit University City by providing an additional option for low to medium density multi-family residential development, adding to the variety of housing choices in University City. Attached single family dwellings would be compatible with the uses currently permitted in the "MR", "HR", and "HRO" Districts since they could be similar in appearance to townhouse apartment dwellings, which are currently allowed in all multi-family residential districts, except they are individual subdivided lots. The same setbacks and landscape buffering requirements as the currently permitted multi-family residential uses would apply. It should also be noted that although attached single family dwellings are permitted in "PD" – Planned Development Districts, one acre is the minimum required for a "PD" District site. As a built-out community, most sites in University City that become available for residential infill development are often much smaller than one acre, thus making it unlikely that a property owner would be able to take advantage of the Planned Development process for attached single family dwelling development. Rather, it may entice redevelopment on smaller lots in dense areas such as the northeastern part of the City.

In conjunction with the proposed amendments, in order to provide more clarity, staff also recommends that some of the existing terms and definitions currently used for multi-family residential developments be revised. Currently, the Zoning Code uses the term "apartment dwelling" for multiple family dwellings, which are then further classified into "townhouse apartment dwellings", "garden apartment dwellings", and "elevator apartment dwellings". The use of the term "apartment" generally has the connotation for rental units. However, while many existing multi-family developments in University City contain rental units, there are many that are individually owned as condominiums. Thus, to clarify, staff is proposing changes to some of the definitions and terms. A synopsis of the proposed Text Amendments is included in Attachment B.

Attachment C includes a summary of staff research of other St. Louis area communities that allow attached single family dwellings and some general regulation information. It should be noted that in some communities, the terms "townhouse" and "rowhouse" are used interchangeably with "attached single family dwellings" and similarly defined as in University City.

Based on the preceding considerations, staff recommends the Plan Commission make a recommendation for approval of the proposed Text Amendments as set forth in Attachment A. The Plan Commission's recommendation would be forwarded to City Council. A formal public hearing would be held at the City Council level.

ATTACHMENT "A"

Proposed Text Amendments pertaining to certain types of multi-family residential developments

Proposed deletions are shown as ~~red strikethrough~~. Proposed additions are shown as blue underlined. Staff comments are shown in italics.

**Chapter 400 – Zoning Code**

**Article II – Definitions**

Section 400.030 Definitions

*Some of the definitions included below are not proposed to be amended, but were included for reference.*

Dwelling – A building, or portion thereof, used exclusively for residential purposes, except for hotels, motels, house trailers or major recreational equipment.

Dwelling, Attached Single-Family – ~~One (1) of a series of t~~Two (2) ~~to eight (8)~~ attached dwelling units sharing common wall(s), with each ~~of which is located~~ unit on its own ~~subdivided~~ individual lot of record.

Dwelling, ~~Apartment~~ Multiple-Family – A building, or portion thereof, designed for occupancy by three (3) or more families living independently of each other. This definition does not include "attached single-family" dwellings.

Dwelling, Detached Single-Family – A dwelling unit which is entirely surrounded by open space on its own subdivided lot of record.

Dwelling, Two-Family – A dwelling containing two (2) attached dwelling units, both on a single lot of record.

Dwelling, Elevator-~~type Apartment~~ type Apartment – ~~An apartment type of multi-storied, multiple-family~~ dwelling of more than three (3) stories in height ~~and or~~ containing more than twelve (12) dwelling units ~~that are individually rented or owned,~~ with primary access to each floor, above the first (1st) floor, provided by means of an elevator.

Dwelling, Garden-~~type Apartment~~ type Apartment – A type of two- or three-story ~~apartment multiple-family~~ dwelling containing not more than twelve (12) dwelling units ~~that are individually rented or owned,~~ with common access to all units typically provided by open or enclosed stairways and hallways. Access to the second (2nd) and third (3rd) floors may be provided by means of an elevator.

Dwelling, Town-~~H~~ouse ~~Apartment~~ type of multiple-family dwelling, ~~two (2) or three (3) stories in height, and~~ containing three (3) to eight (8) contiguous dwelling units, which are separated by ~~partition~~ common wall(s), extending from basement to roof without openings, and where each dwelling unit ~~is~~ may or may not be located on its own ~~subdivided~~ individual lot of record.

## ATTACHMENT "A"

Dwelling Unit – One (1) or more rooms located within a dwelling, forming a habitable unit designed for one (1) family.

*It should be noted that all references to apartment dwellings, town house apartment dwellings, garden apartment dwellings, and elevator apartment dwellings that are not included below will be amended to reflect the revised terminology in the definitions above.*

### Article IV. District Regulations

#### Division 2. "LR" Limited Residential District

Section 400.210. Conditional Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments may be permitted in the "LR" district, subject to the issuance of a conditional use permit in accordance with the procedures and standards contained in Article XI "Conditional Uses":

1. Convents and rectories, in connection with a place of worship and located on the same or adjacent lot;
2. Dormitories;
3. Dwellings, garden ~~type apartments~~;
4. Dwellings, town-house ~~apartments~~;
5. Dwellings, attached single-family;
- ~~5-6.~~ Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is one thousand (1,000) feet or less from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
(re-number remaining items accordingly)

Section 400.220. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Single-family detached and two-family dwellings. Except as provided for in Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Section 400.1020, the minimum lot area and width for single-family detached and two-family dwellings shall be as follows:
  - a. Minimum lot area. Six thousand (6,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width. Fifty (50) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, attached single-family, and garden ~~type apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, 400.1125, or 400.1130 as applicable.

B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Single-family detached and two-family dwellings. Except as provided for in Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 2, the following setback requirements shall apply to single-family detached and two-family dwellings in the "LR" district:
  - a. Minimum front yard setback. Twenty (20) feet.
  - b. Minimum side yard setback. Five (5) feet.
  - c. Minimum rear yard setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, attached single-family, and garden ~~type apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, 400.1125, or 400.1130 as applicable.



### Division 3. "MR" Medium Density Residential District

Section 400.260. Permitted Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments are permitted in the "MR" district. In addition to the land uses permitted in this district, certain other land uses may be conditionally allowed per Section 400.270.

1. Accessory uses (see Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 3);
2. Dwellings, two-family;
3. Dwellings, garden-~~type~~ [apartment](#);
4. Dwellings, town-house ~~apartment~~;
5. [Dwellings, attached single-family](#);
- ~~5.~~ [6.](#) Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is more than one thousand (1,000) feet from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
(re-number remaining items accordingly)

Section 400.280. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Dwellings, single-family and two-family.
  - a. Minimum lot area. Six thousand (6,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width. Fifty (50) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family](#), and garden-~~type~~ ~~apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), or 400.1130 as applicable.

B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Dwellings, single-family and two-family.
  - a. Minimum front yard setback. Twenty (20) feet.
  - b. Minimum side yard setback. Five (5) feet.
  - c. Minimum rear yard setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family](#), and garden-~~type~~ ~~apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), or 400.1130 as applicable.

### Division 4. "HR" High Density Residential District

Section 400.320. Permitted Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments are permitted in the "HR" district. In addition to the land uses permitted in this district, certain other land uses may be conditionally allowed per Section 400.330.

1. Accessory uses (see Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 3);
2. Dwellings, elevator-~~type~~ [apartment](#), up to a F.A.R. of one (1.0);
3. Dwellings, garden-~~type~~ [apartment](#);
4. Dwellings, town-house ~~apartment~~;
5. [Dwellings, attached single-family](#);
- ~~5.~~ [6.](#) Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is more than one thousand (1,000) feet from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
(re-number remaining items accordingly)

ATTACHMENT "A"

Section 400.340. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Dwellings, two-family.
  - a. Minimum lot area. Five-thousand (5,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width. Fifty (50) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family](#), garden-type ~~apartment~~, and elevator-type ~~apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Dwellings, two-family.
  - a. Minimum front yard setback. Twenty (20) feet.
  - b. Minimum side yard setback. Five (5) feet.
  - c. Minimum rear yard setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family](#), garden-type ~~apartment~~, and elevator-type ~~apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

**Division 5. "HRO" High Density Residential/Office District**

Section 400.380. Permitted Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments are permitted in the "HRO" district. In addition to the land uses permitted in this district, certain other land uses may be conditionally allowed per Section 400.390.

1. Accessory uses (see Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 3);
2. Dwellings, elevator-type ~~apartment~~, up to a F.A.R. of one (1.0);
3. Dwellings, garden-type ~~apartment~~;
4. Dwellings, town-house ~~apartment~~;
5. [Dwellings, attached single-family](#);
- ~~5-6.~~ [6.](#) Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is more than one thousand (1,000) feet from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
(re-number remaining items accordingly)

Section 400.390. Conditional Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments may be permitted in the "HRO" district, subject to the issuance of a conditional use permit in accordance with the procedures and standards contained in Article XI, "Conditional Uses":

1. Auditoriums and other places of public assembly;
2. Convalescent and nursing homes;
3. Day care centers;
4. Dormitories;
- ~~5.~~ [Dwellings, attached single-family](#);
- ~~6-5.~~ [5.](#) Dwellings, detached single-family;
- ~~7-6.~~ [6.](#) Dwellings, elevator apartment, with a F.A.R. between one (1.0) and three (3.0) (see Section 400.400(D));  
(re-number remaining items accordingly)

## ATTACHMENT "A"

### Section 400.400. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

#### A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Mixed-use (residential/non-residential) buildings.
  - a. Minimum lot area. Thirty thousand (30,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width and depth. One hundred fifty (150) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, attached single-family dwellings, garden-type apartment, and elevator-type apartment dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, 400.1125, 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

#### B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Mixed-use (residential/non-residential) buildings.
  - a. Minimum right-of-way setback. Thirty (30) feet.
  - b. Minimum property line setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.  
Where a property line abuts a "SR" or "LR" district, then minimum building setbacks shall be in accordance with Section 400.1140(C)(3), Article V "Supplementary Regulations".
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, attached single-family dwellings, garden-type apartment, and elevator-type apartment dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, 400.1125, 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

## ARTICLE V. Supplementary Regulations

### Division 4. Supplemental Residential Development Standards

#### Section 400.1110. General.

The following standards are intended to provide for adequate daylight, open space, and privacy for occupants of town-house ~~apartments~~, attached single-family, garden-type apartments, and elevator-type apartments dwellings. Deviation from the strict application of these standards shall only be permitted for developments approved under the provisions of a "planned development" (see Division 11, Article IV of this Chapter).

#### Section 400.1120. Town-~~H~~ouse ~~Apartments~~ Dwellings.

A. Development Location. Within the "LR" district, town-house ~~apartment dwelling~~ developments shall be located on a "major street", as specified in the motor vehicle and traffic regulations of the University City Municipal Code (Title III). At least thirty percent (30%) of the development's boundary shall be coterminous with the right-of-way of the major street.

#### B. Vehicle Access.

1. Eight (8) or fewer dwelling units. Access may be provided directly to the individual dwelling units from a public street right-of-way, except as prohibited in Subsection (B)(3) of this Section.
2. Nine (9) or more dwelling units. Access to the individual dwelling units shall be provided by internal access drives (public or private). The internal access drive(s) shall intersect with a major or secondary street, but not closer than one hundred fifty (150) feet to an existing street intersection (measured from the centerline of the existing street intersection to the centerline of the access drive).
3. Access to Big Bend Boulevard, Delmar Boulevard, Hanley Road, and Olive Boulevard limited. There shall be no direct access to/from individual town-house ~~apartment~~ dwellings and these major streets. Only an internal access drive serving the development shall be permitted to intersect with these major streets.

ATTACHMENT "A"

C. Density And Dimensional Regulations – when all units are on same lot.

1. Minimum lot area.

a. Minimum.

(1) Per development. Twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, except:

(a) "MR" zoned property. Eight thousand (8,000) square feet.

(b) "HR" zoned property. Six thousand (6,000) square feet.

(2) Average per dwelling unit. Fifteen hundred (1,500) square feet.

b. Minimum lot depth. One hundred (100) feet.

c. Minimum lot width. Seventy (70) feet.

d. Minimum unit width. Fifteen (15) feet.

e. Minimum/maximum unit groupings. Three / eight (3/8).

f. Minimum building setbacks.

(1) From street right-of-way. Twenty (20) feet.

(2) From rear property line. Twenty (20) feet.

(3) From private drives or parking areas. Ten (10) feet.

(4) Adjacent to "SR" zoned property. Twenty-five (25) feet.

(5) Adjacent to "LR" zoned property. Twenty (20) feet.

(6) Adjacent to property in the same zoning district. Five (5) feet.

(7) Adjacent to all other properties. Ten (10) feet.

g. Minimum distance between buildings. All buildings within the development shall be separated by a distance of not less than fifteen (15) feet.

D. Density and Dimensional Regulations – when each unit is on its own individual lot.

1. Minimum lot area. Two thousand (2,000) square feet.

2. Minimum lot width. Twenty (20) feet.

3. Minimum lot depth. Eighty (80) feet.

4. The same setbacks as specified in Section C above shall apply. A side yard setback of zero (0) feet shall be allowed along property lines where units are attached.

5. Minimum distance between buildings. All buildings within the development shall be separated by a distance of not less than fifteen (15) feet.

Section 400.1125. Attached Single-Family Dwellings.

A. Density and Dimensional Regulations

1. Minimum lot area. Two thousand (2,000) square feet

2. Minimum lot width. Twenty (20) feet

3. Minimum Building width. Twenty (20) feet

4. Maximum number of attached units. Two (2)

5. Minimum building setbacks

(1) From street right-of-way. Twenty (20) feet

(2) From rear property line. Twenty (20) feet

(3) From side property line. Five (5) feet, except:

(a) Where units are attached along a shared common wall. Zero (0) feet.

ATTACHMENT "B"

<b>Synopsis of Proposed Text Amendments</b>	
<b>Current Regulations</b>	<b>Proposed Changes</b>
Definitions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apartment Dwelling</li> </ul>	- Change Apartment Dwelling to Multiple-Family Dwelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elevator Apartment Dwelling</li> </ul>	- Change Elevator Apartment Dwelling to Elevator-type Dwelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garden Apartment Dwelling</li> </ul>	- Change Garden Apartment Dwelling to Garden-type Dwelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town House Apartment Dwelling</li> </ul>	- Change Town House Apartment Dwelling to Townhouse Dwelling and revise to allow dwelling units on individual subdivided lots
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attached Single-Family Dwelling</li> </ul>	- Revise Attached Single-Family Dwellings to allow as two attached dwelling units and remove maximum of eight dwelling units
LR – Limited Residential District	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town House Apartment Dwellings and Garden Apartment Dwellings – conditional uses</li> </ul>	Add Attached Single-Family Dwellings as conditional use
MR – Medium Density Residential District	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town House Apartment Dwellings and Garden Apartment Dwellings – permitted uses</li> </ul>	Add Attached Single-Family Dwellings as permitted use
HR – High Density Residential District	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town House Apartment Dwellings and Garden Apartment Dwellings – permitted uses</li> </ul>	Add Attached Single-Family Dwellings as permitted uses
HRO – High Density Residential/Office District	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town House Apartment Dwellings and Garden Apartment Dwellings – permitted uses</li> <li>• Attached Single-Family Dwellings – conditional use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete Attached Single-Family Dwellings from conditional uses</li> <li>• Add Attached Single-Family Dwellings to permitted uses</li> </ul>
Supplementary Regulations – Supplementary Residential Development Standards	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides development standards for multi-family residential developments – Town House Apartment Dwellings, Garden Apartment Dwellings, and Elevator Apartment Dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise development standards for Town House Apartment Dwellings to allow dwelling units on individual lots                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimum lot size = 2,000 sq. ft.</li> <li>- Minimum lot width = 20 ft.</li> <li>- Minimum unit width = 20 ft.</li> <li>- Setbacks same except no setback where units are attached</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Add development standards for Attached Single-Family Dwellings                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimum lot size = 2,000 sq. ft.</li> <li>- Minimum lot width = 20 ft.</li> <li>- Minimum unit width = 20 ft.</li> <li>- Setbacks – similar to existing two-family dwelling regulations except no setback where units are attached</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ATTACHMENT "C"

Research Summary - Zoning requirements for attached single family dwellings in the St. Louis area			
Municipality	Permitted/Conditional Use?	Zoning Districts	Notes
City of St. Louis	Permitted	C and D - Multi-family residential districts	C District = 1,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area per dwelling unit D District = 850 sq. ft. minimum lot area per dwelling unit Code uses term "townhouse" with same meaning as attached single family dwellings as in U City Code
St. Louis County	Permitted	R-5, R-6, R-6A, R-6AA, R-7 (multi-family residential districts with varying allowable densities); MXD (mixed-use district); Form Based District	Minimum lot size range - 1,750, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 6,000 sq. ft. per unit Code uses terms "attached single family dwelling" and "rowhouse" as same meaning
Clayton	Conditional	R-4, R-5, R-6, R-7 (multi-family residential districts)	Use terms attached single family dwellings and town house; subject to minimum lot size requirements per district regulations
Brentwood	Permitted	AR - Attached Single Family Residential District; MR - Multi-Family Residential District	AR District - 2,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size, 2,500 sq. ft. if only two units MR District - Maximum density of 20 units per acre Code uses terms townhouse and two-family dwelling similarly
Maplewood	Permitted	LR and MR - Multi-family residential districts	2,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size Code uses terms townhouse and attached single family dwelling similar to current University City Zoning Code
Chesterfield	Permitted	R-4, R-5, R-6 - Multi-family residential districts; PUD - Planned Unit District	R-4, R-5, R-6 - 4,500 sq. ft. minimum lot area per dwelling units PUD - Minimum lot area established through PUD process
Olivette	Permitted	AR - Attached Single Family Residential District; PASF - Planned Attached Single Family District	AR District = 4,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size PASF District = 3,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size

ATTACHMENT 3:  
Draft Ordinance





**INTRODUCED BY:**

**DATE:**

**BILL NO.**\_\_\_\_\_

**ORDINANCE NO.**\_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 400.030, 400.210, 400.220, 400.260, 400.280, 400.320, 400.340, 400.380, 400.390, 400.400, 400.1110, 400.1120 AND 400.1125 OF CHAPTER 400 - ZONING CODE, OF THE UNIVERSITY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TO REVISE CERTAIN ATTACHED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS AS PROVIDED HEREIN.**

**WHEREAS**, Chapter 400 of the Municipal Code of the City of University City, Missouri divides the City into several zoning districts and regulates the uses on which the premises located therein may be put; and

**WHEREAS**, said Chapter 400 also establishes definitions, regulations, and standards for attached single-family dwellings and multiple-family developments in certain residential zoning districts; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Plan Commission, in a meeting held at the Heman Park Community Center located at 975 Pennsylvania Avenue, University City, Missouri on April 26, 2017 at 6:30 pm, recommended approval of amendments of Sections 400.030, 400.210, 400.220, 400.260, 400.280, 400.320, 400.340, 400.380, 400.390, 400.400, 400.1110, 400.1120, and 400.1125 of said Code; and

**WHEREAS**, due notice of a public hearing to be held by the City Council in the 5<sup>th</sup> Floor City Council Chambers at City Hall at 6:30 pm, May 22, 2017, was duly published in the St. Louis Countian, a newspaper of general circulation within said City on May 6, 2017; and

**WHEREAS**, said public hearing was held at the time and place specified in said notice, and all suggestions or objections concerning said amendments of the Zoning Code were duly heard and considered by the City Council.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, MISSOURI, AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1.** Sections 400.030, 400.210, 400.220, 400.260, 400.280, 400.320, 400.340, 400.380, 400.390, 400.400, 400.1110, 400.1120 and 400.1125 of Chapter 400 of the Zoning Code, of the University City Municipal Code are amended as provided herein. Language to be deleted from the Zoning Code is represented as ~~stricken through~~; language to be added to the Code is shown as underlined. This Ordinance contemplates no revisions to the Code other than those so designated; any language or

provisions from the Code omitted from this Ordinance is represented by an ellipsis and remains in full force and effect.

**Section 2.** Chapter 400 of the University City Municipal Code is hereby amended to allow attached single-family dwellings and provide clarity to existing terms and definitions currently used for attached single-family dwellings and multiple-family residential developments as follows:

*(Some of the definitions included below are not proposed to be amended, but were included for reference.)*

## **Chapter 400 – Zoning Code**

### **Article II – Definitions**

#### Section 400.030 Definitions

Dwelling – A building, or portion thereof, used exclusively for residential purposes, except for hotels, motels, house trailers or major recreational equipment.

Dwelling, Attached Single-Family – ~~One (1) of a series of t~~Two (2) ~~to eight (8)~~ attached dwelling units sharing common wall(s), with each ~~of which is located~~ unit on its own ~~subdivided~~ individual lot of record.

Dwelling, ~~Apartment~~ Multiple-Family – A building, or portion thereof, designed for occupancy by three (3) or more families living independently of each other. This definition does not include "attached single-family" dwellings.

Dwelling, Detached Single-Family – A dwelling unit which is entirely surrounded by open space on its own subdivided lot of record.

Dwelling, Two-Family – A dwelling containing two (2) attached dwelling units, both on a single lot of record.

Dwelling, Elevator-~~type~~ Apartment – ~~An apartment~~ type of multi-storied, multiple-family dwelling of more than three (3) stories in height ~~and~~ or containing more than twelve (12) dwelling units ~~that are individually rented or owned,~~ with primary access to each floor, above the first (1st) floor, provided by means of an elevator.

Dwelling, Garden-~~type~~ Apartment – A type of two- or three-story ~~apartment~~ multiple-family dwelling containing not more than twelve (12) dwelling units ~~that are individually rented or owned,~~ with common access to all units typically provided by open or enclosed stairways and hallways. Access to the second (2nd) and third (3rd) floors may be provided by means of an elevator.

Dwelling, Town-~~H~~ouse Apartment – ~~An apartment~~ type of multiple-family dwelling, ~~two (2) or three (3) stories in height, and~~ containing three (3) to eight (8) contiguous dwelling

units, which are separated by ~~partition~~ common wall(s), extending from basement to roof without openings, and where each dwelling unit ~~is~~ may or may not be located on its own ~~subdivided~~ individual lot of record.

Dwelling Unit – One (1) or more rooms located within a dwelling, forming a habitable unit designed for one (1) family.

*(It should be noted that all references to apartment dwellings, town house apartment dwellings, garden apartment dwellings, and elevator apartment dwellings that are not included below should be amended to reflect the revised terminology in the definitions above.)*

## **Article IV. District Regulations**

### **Division 2. "LR" Limited Residential District**

Section 400.210. Conditional Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments may be permitted in the "LR" district, subject to the issuance of a conditional use permit in accordance with the procedures and standards contained in Article XI "Conditional Uses":

1. Convents and rectories, in connection with a place of worship and located on the same or adjacent lot;
2. Dormitories;
3. Dwellings, garden-type ~~apartments~~;
4. Dwellings, town-house ~~apartments~~;
5. Dwellings, attached single-family;
- ~~5.~~ 6. Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is one thousand (1,000) feet or less from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
*(re-number remaining items accordingly)*

Section 400.220. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Single-family detached and two-family dwellings. Except as provided for in Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Section 400.1020, the minimum lot area and width for single-family detached and two-family dwellings shall be as follows:
  - a. Minimum lot area. Six thousand (6,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width. Fifty (50) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, attached single-family, and garden-type ~~apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, 400.1125, or 400.1130 as applicable.

B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Single-family detached and two-family dwellings. Except as provided for in Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 2, the following setback requirements shall apply to single-family detached and two-family dwellings in the "LR" district:

- a. Minimum front yard setback. Twenty (20) feet.
  - b. Minimum side yard setback. Five (5) feet.
  - c. Minimum rear yard setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family](#), and garden-~~type apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), or 400.1130 as applicable.

### **Division 3. "MR" Medium Density Residential District**

#### Section 400.260. Permitted Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments are permitted in the "MR" district. In addition to the land uses permitted in this district, certain other land uses may be conditionally allowed per Section 400.270.

1. Accessory uses (see Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 3);
2. Dwellings, two-family;
3. Dwellings, garden-~~type apartment~~;
4. Dwellings, town-house ~~apartment~~;
5. [Dwellings, attached single-family](#);
- ~~5.~~ [6.](#) Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is more than one thousand (1,000) feet from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
(*re-number remaining items accordingly*)

#### Section 400.280. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

##### A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Dwellings, single-family and two-family.
  - a. Minimum lot area. Six thousand (6,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width. Fifty (50) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family](#), and garden-~~type apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), or 400.1130 as applicable.

##### B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Dwellings, single-family and two-family.
  - a. Minimum front yard setback. Twenty (20) feet.
  - b. Minimum side yard setback. Five (5) feet.
  - c. Minimum rear yard setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family](#), and garden-~~type apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), or 400.1130 as applicable.

### **Division 4. "HR" High Density Residential District**

#### Section 400.320. Permitted Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments are permitted in the "HR" district. In addition to the land uses permitted in this district, certain other land uses may be conditionally allowed per Section 400.330.

1. Accessory uses (see Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 3);
2. Dwellings, elevator-[type apartment](#), up to a F.A.R. of one (1.0);
3. Dwellings, garden-[type apartment](#);
4. Dwellings, town-house [apartment](#);
5. [Dwellings, attached single-family](#);
- ~~5.~~ [6.](#) Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is more than one thousand (1,000) feet from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
*(re-number remaining items accordingly)*

Section 400.340. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Dwellings, two-family.
  - a. Minimum lot area. Five-thousand (5,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width. Fifty (50) feet.
2. Town-house [apartment](#), [attached single-family](#), garden-[type apartment](#), and elevator-[type apartment](#) dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Dwellings, two-family.
  - a. Minimum front yard setback. Twenty (20) feet.
  - b. Minimum side yard setback. Five (5) feet.
  - c. Minimum rear yard setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.
2. Town-house [apartment](#), [attached single-family](#), garden-[type apartment](#), and elevator-[type apartment](#) dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

## **Division 5. "HRO" High Density Residential/Office District**

Section 400.380. Permitted Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments are permitted in the "HRO" district. In addition to the land uses permitted in this district, certain other land uses may be conditionally allowed per Section 400.390.

1. Accessory uses (see Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Division 3);
2. Dwellings, elevator-[type apartment](#), up to a F.A.R. of one (1.0);
3. Dwellings, garden-[type apartment](#);
4. Dwellings, town-house [apartment](#);
5. [Dwellings, attached single-family](#);
- ~~5.~~ [6.](#) Group homes for the disabled, small, where the group home dwelling unit is more than one thousand (1,000) feet from any existing group home dwelling unit;  
*(re-number remaining items accordingly)*

## Section 400.390. Conditional Uses.

A. The following land uses and developments may be permitted in the "HRO" district, subject to the issuance of a conditional use permit in accordance with the procedures and standards contained in Article XI, "Conditional Uses":

1. Auditoriums and other places of public assembly;
2. Convalescent and nursing homes;
3. Day care centers;
4. Dormitories;
- ~~5. Dwellings, attached single-family;~~
- ~~6. 5. Dwellings, detached single-family;~~
- ~~7. 6. Dwellings, elevator apartment, with a F.A.R. between one (1.0) and three (3.0) (see Section 400.400(D));~~  
(re-number remaining items accordingly)

## Section 400.400. Density and Dimensional Regulations.

### A. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Mixed-use (residential/non-residential) buildings.
  - a. Minimum lot area. Thirty thousand (30,000) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot width and depth. One hundred fifty (150) feet.
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family dwellings](#), garden-~~type apartment~~, and elevator-~~type apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

### B. Building Setback Requirements.

1. Mixed-use (residential/non-residential) buildings.
  - a. Minimum right-of-way setback. Thirty (30) feet.
  - b. Minimum property line setback. Twenty-five (25) feet.  
Where a property line abuts a "SR" or "LR" district, then minimum building setbacks shall be in accordance with Section 400.1140(C)(3), Article V "Supplementary Regulations".
2. Town-house ~~apartment~~, [attached single-family dwellings](#), garden-~~type apartment~~, and elevator-~~type apartment~~ dwellings. See Article V "Supplementary Regulations", Sections 400.1120, [400.1125](#), 400.1130, or 400.1140 as applicable.

## ARTICLE V. Supplementary Regulations

### Division 4. Supplemental Residential Development Standards

#### Section 400.1110. General.

The following standards are intended to provide for adequate daylight, open space, and privacy for occupants of town-house ~~apartments~~, [attached single-family](#), garden-~~type apartments~~, and elevator-~~type apartments~~ [dwellings](#). Deviation from the strict application of these standards shall only be permitted for developments approved under the provisions of a "planned development" (see Division 11, Article IV of this Chapter).

Section 400.1120. Town-~~H~~ouse ~~Apartment~~ Dwellings.

A. Development Location. Within the "LR" district, town-house ~~apartment~~ dwelling developments shall be located on a "major street", as specified in the motor vehicle and traffic regulations of the University City Municipal Code (Title III). At least thirty percent (30%) of the development's boundary shall be coterminous with the right-of-way of the major street.

B. Vehicle Access.

1. Eight (8) or fewer dwelling units. Access may be provided directly to the individual dwelling units from a public street right-of-way, except as prohibited in Subsection (B)(3) of this Section.
2. Nine (9) or more dwelling units. Access to the individual dwelling units shall be provided by internal access drives (public or private). The internal access drive(s) shall intersect with a major or secondary street, but not closer than one hundred fifty (150) feet to an existing street intersection (measured from the centerline of the existing street intersection to the centerline of the access drive).
3. Access to Big Bend Boulevard, Delmar Boulevard, Hanley Road, and Olive Boulevard limited. There shall be no direct access to/from individual town-house ~~apartment~~ dwellings and these major streets. Only an internal access drive serving the development shall be permitted to intersect with these major streets.

C. Density And Dimensional Regulations – when all units are on same lot.

1. Minimum lot area.
  - a. Minimum.
    - (1) Per development. Twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, except:
      - (a) "MR" zoned property. Eight thousand (8,000) square feet.
      - (b) "HR" zoned property. Six thousand (6,000) square feet.
    - (2) Average per dwelling unit. Fifteen hundred (1,500) square feet.
  - b. Minimum lot depth. One hundred (100) feet.
  - c. Minimum lot width. Seventy (70) feet.
  - d. Minimum unit width. Fifteen (15) feet.
  - e. Minimum/maximum unit groupings. Three / eight (3/8).
  - f. Minimum building setbacks.
    - (1) From street right-of-way. Twenty (20) feet.
    - (2) From rear property line. Twenty (20) feet.
    - (3) From private drives or parking areas. Ten (10) feet.
    - (4) Adjacent to "SR" zoned property. Twenty-five (25) feet.
    - (5) Adjacent to "LR" zoned property. Twenty (20) feet.
    - (6) Adjacent to property in the same zoning district. Five (5) feet.
    - (7) Adjacent to all other properties. Ten (10) feet.
  - g. Minimum distance between buildings. All buildings within the development shall be separated by a distance of not less than fifteen (15) feet.

D. Density and Dimensional Regulations – when each unit is on its own individual lot.

1. Minimum lot area. Two thousand (2,000) square feet.

- 2. Minimum lot width. Twenty (20) feet.
- 3. Minimum lot depth. Eighty (80) feet.
- 4. The same setbacks as specified in Section C above shall apply. A side yard setback of zero (0) feet shall be allowed along property lines where units are attached.
- 5. Minimum distance between buildings. All buildings within the development shall be separated by a distance of not less than fifteen (15) feet.

Section 400.1125. Attached Single-Family Dwellings.

A. Density and Dimensional Regulations

- 1. Minimum lot area. Two thousand (2,000) square feet
- 2. Minimum lot width. Twenty (20) feet
- 3. Minimum Building width. Twenty (20) feet
- 4. Maximum number of attached units. Two (2)
- 5. Minimum building setbacks
  - (1) From street right-of-way. Twenty (20) feet
  - (2) From rear property line. Twenty (20) feet
  - (3) From side property line. Five (5) feet, except:
    - (a) Where units are attached along a shared common wall. Zero (0) feet.

\* \* \*

**Section 3.** This ordinance shall not be construed so as to relieve any person, firm or corporation from any penalty heretofore incurred by the violation of the sections revised by this amendment nor bar the prosecution for any such violation.

**Section 4.** Any person, firm or corporation violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be punished in accordance with the provisions of the University City Municipal Code.

**Section 5.** This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage as provided by law.

PASSED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2017

---

MAYOR



ATTEST:

---

INTERIM CITY CLERK

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT AS TO FORM:

---

CITY ATTORNEY





**Traffic Commission**

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

**CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC COMMISSION  
March 8, 2017**

At the Traffic Commission meeting of University City held in the Heman Park Community Center, on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, Chairman Jeff Hales called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. In addition to Chairman Hales, the following members of the commission were present:

- Bart Stewart
- Eva Creer
- Curtis Tunstall
- Derek Helderman
- Jeffrey Mishkin

Also in attendance:

- Errol Tate(non-voting commission member – Public Works Liaison)
- Sinan Alpaslan (Public Works Director)
- Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson (non-voting commission member—Council Liaison)
- Police Department Sergeant Shawn Whitley (non-voting commission member – Police Department Liaison)

Absent (excused):

- Jeff Zornes

**3. Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Tunstall moved to approve the agenda and was seconded by Mr. Helderman. The motion carried unanimously.

**4. Approval of the Minutes**

**A. January 11, 2017 Minutes**

Mr. Tunstall made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 11, 2017 meeting and was seconded by Helderman. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. Agenda Items**

**a. Restriction of high profile vehicles parking in the westbound lane of Forsyth in-between the entrance and exit of Bethel Lutheran Church at 7001 Forsyth Blvd.**

Mr. Tate presented the request from Bethel Lutheran Church and members Gary Sheetz and Wayne Flesch.

Churchmember Gary Sheetz of 7722 Lyle of Richmond Heights addressed the commission about the issues with the poor visibility from the western exit N-3-1



## Traffic Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

drive from the church. He noted that cars often park right to the edge of the driveway and high profile vehicles block the line of sight for vehicles attempting to exit the church lot. The church operates a nursery school daily with regular pickup and drop-off. He requested a restriction on the height of the vehicles parked between the entry and exit driveways and a parking restriction of 10 to 15 feet east of the western exit.

Mr. Tunstall asked Mr. Sheetz and Mr. Sheetz confirmed that nature of the request is safety related.

Mr. Mishkin asked if the restrictions were to be everyday at all hours of the day. Mr. Sheetz confirmed that they would like the restrictions to be at all hours of the day, every day of the week.

Mr. Tunstall asked if they were seeking no parking in the space between the driveways or if the request was for parking of low profile vehicles. Mr. Sheetz clarified that they sought to restrict all parking for 10 to 15 feet to the east of the western exit drive and restrict the remaining spaces to low profile vehicles.

Mr. Stewart asked about the current no parking restriction in front of the church. Mr. Helderman clarified that the current restrictions restrict parking during certain hours.

Mr. Mishkin asked if the city had any restrictions about parking distance from driveways. Sgt. Whitley stated there were no such restrictions in the code and no such restrictions related low profile or compact cars.

Mr. Hales asked if there was an existing ordinance defining compact cars. Mr. Tate stated that the commission had discussed but no action had been taken.

Mr. Alpaslan stated that the staff would have to review and propose an ordinance to accommodate compact or low profile vehicle only parking restriction.

Mr. Helderman stated he thought it would be best to implement compact car parking in the entire space between the driveways.

Mr. Mishkin asked what the enforcement of a compact car only restriction. Sgt. Whitley stated that a compact car would typically be less than 60 inches and violators would be ticketed. He stated that the police would use common sense on enforcement on the height levels.

Mr. Hales stated that he thought the issue was really related to the height and not necessarily the length. He asked if the commission could consider a restriction of no van, truck or SUV parking.

N-3-2



## Traffic Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

Mr. Mishkin asked if there had been any accidents. Mr. Sheetz stated there were none that he could recall but there have been a number of close calls. Mr. Mishkin asked if the commission could recommend church parking only in those spaces. Mr. Helderman indicated he thought limiting parking to the church would not be enforceable.

Sgt. Whitley stated that the 10 foot parking restriction would reduce the number of cars that could park between the driveway from 3 to 2.

Mr. Hales stated that he thought if a new restriction on van, truck and SUV parking were to be implemented, that it would be helpful if the public works and police department staff could provide a recommendation on the circumstances or instances where such a restriction should be implemented, such as only near commercial driveways. He suggested that the commission could proceed with restricting parking 10 feet to the east of the western driveway for now and continue discussing the new parking restrictions for high profile vehicles in the coming meetings.

Mr. Helderman asked if the current signage restricting parking during certain hours would remain. Mr. Sheetz stated that was not requested to change.

Mr. Mishkin made a motion to recommend restricting all parking for a distance of 10 feet to the eastern edge of the western driveway exit of Bethel Lutheran Church and was seconded by Mr. Tunstall. The motion carried unanimously.

**b. Permanently make Loop South a two way street from Kingsland Avenue to a point four hundred and twenty-four feet to the east.**

Mr. Tate presented the staff recommendation to make this portion of Loop South two-way.

Mr. Hales informed the commission that he also spoke with Jessica Bueler who is the Marketing Director for the Loop Special Business District and she conveyed that the businesses in the loop were strongly in favor of the two way traffic on Loop South. He also indicated that Mr. Edwards had come to the previous meeting at which there was no quorum and expressed his support for the proposal as well.

Boo McLaughlin, Executive Director of Craft Alliance (6640 Delmar) presented a letter signed by representatives of Commerce Bank, McArthurs Bakery and Pitaya in support of the recommended two-way traffic on Loop South. She stated that two-way traffic is more convenient to their customers and will be more convenient to delivery trucks with the opening of the Loop Trolley.

Mr. Tate informed the commission that a traffic engineer would be evaluating the street and that the parking would be moved from the southern side to the northern side of the street.

N-3-3



## Traffic Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

Mr. Stewart asked if the commission was being asked to make a recommendation on the 2-way traffic only or if the commission was to make a recommendation on the parking as well.

Mr. Tate stated that the timing of the implementation of the two way street and new parking on the north side would take place at the same time.

Mr. Mishkin asked if the city would install parking meters. Mr. Tate stated the city would stripe the spaces.

Mr. Helderman asked if the businesses needed to sign a petition. Mr. Hales stated that there is no requirement in the code, bylaws or charter that the commission get a petition except in the case of residential parking permits. He stated that he believed it was completely within the purview of the commission to make a recommendation.

Mr. Hales asked Ms. McLaughlin if the change of allowing parking on only one side of Loop South was known to her and businesses. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she and the Loop Businesses were not aware of the change in parking to the north side, but did not believe it makes a difference.

Mr. Hales asked if staff was concerned about the potential of losing spaces by moving parking from the south to the north side. Mr. Alpaslan indicated that was a concern and he suggested that the parking engineer provide two options to see if it would be feasible to keep parking on the south side.

Mr. Mishkin asked where the majority of the customers park. Ms. McLaughlin indicated that most people park in the lots behind the buildings and on Loop South.

Mr. Helderman made a motion to recommend that Loop South become two-way traffic as recommended by staff and was seconded by Mr. Mishkin. The motion carried unanimously.

### **c. No Parking on west side of North and South Road between Gannon Ave. and Cornell Ave.**

Mr. Hales introduced the petition from Genevieve Kramer of 7732 Gannon Ave. He commented that there were a lot of people who showed up for this issue at the previous meeting at which there was not a quorum. The petitioner did not show up and was not in attendance on this night.

Mr. Tate presented the request from Ms. Kramer and initially requested that the traffic commission make a recommendation to take to St. Louis County



## Traffic Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

but stated that upon further review that staff believed the request should be denied because of the existing parking restriction.

Mr. Hales stated that the road is a county road and the city does not have jurisdiction.

Ms. Natasha Kwon of 622 North and South addressed the commission as a resident and an owner of businesses at North and South and Gannon. She was strongly against the proposed restriction and suggested a stop sign at North and South and Gannon because of the high number of pedestrians and her observations of speeding traffic.

Mr. Mishkin asked what the parking restriction would do to the nearby businesses. Ms. Kwon stated that it would be very negative for the local businesses. Mr. Mishkin asked what the purpose of the four-way stop. Ms. Kwon indicated it was about safety.

Mr. Hales stated that the commission has discussed this intersection and said when he first saw this proposal he was strongly opposed it. He noted that this intersection has very good sightlines from Gannon eastbound looking northbound on North and South because of the 35ft parking restriction for the bus stop. He stated that commission has talked about pedestrian safety at this intersection multiple times in the past and has suggested that city work with the county to install LED solar operated crossing signals at the crosswalk on North and South and Gannon as well as others on Delmar, but the county has not been very receptive to it. He stated that he believes what would really help is if the business community and neighbors contacted the county requesting a signalized crosswalk, it might make a difference.

Sgt. Whitley stated the St. Louis County examined it and decided against crossing signals.

Councilman Smotherson recommended to Ms. Kwon that she contact St. Louis County Councilwoman Hazel Erby with her concerns over the crosswalk safety.

Ms. Mary Adams (6985 Dartmouth) is the Executive Director of the University City Chamber of Commerce and came to speak on behalf of the local businesses. She expressed concern over the potential loss of parking spaces for the local businesses. She emphasized the access to parking being directly related to a business' ability to thrive.

Mr. Hales stated that the floor was open to anyone to make a motion in favor of the proposed restriction. No motions were made. No action was recommended.



## **Traffic Commission**

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

### **d. Senn Bierwerks Site Plan Update for Information Only**

Mr. Alpaslan provided an informational update on the Senn Bierwerks site. He indicated that the traffic patterns on Olive and North and South are still awaiting review and proposals from MODOT and St. Louis County Traffic. He informed the commission that the city has requested the proposed implementation along Olive and North and South which will be brought to the traffic commission as soon as it is received. Mr. Smotherson stated his reason for bringing this to the commission was that the City Council has approved the site plan and he thought the commission should be aware of the proposed changes with the implications to traffic on North and South and Olive which are the jurisdiction of St. Louis County and MODOT respectively.

Mr. Mishkin expressed concern over potential traffic issues related to ingress and egress from the lots. Mr. Alpaslan stated that because Olive is a State road and North and South is a County road that they are responsible for reviewing and making changes to their roads. He indicated that it is possible that one or both agency could recommend changes at which point the commission would be updated.

### **e. Loop Trolley “Do Not Pass” Code Amendment**

Mr. Tate presented the staff recommendation to amend the traffic code to add a do not pass ordinance restricting the passing of the Loop Trolley.

Mr. Hales stated he looked back through the minutes in December of 2012 and Officer Margul indicated that the commission would have to look at whether it wanted to recommend allowing passing of the trolley and asked what considerations went into the recommendation from staff prohibiting passing of the trolley.

Mr. Alpaslan stated that passing of the trolley would violate the rules of the road and the pavement markings because the trolley travels in the traffic lane. He stated that the only area where traffic could pass the trolley would be at Leland where the trolley is in the turn lane.

Mr. Mishkin expressed concern about the trolley travelling in the left hand turn lane while travelling east with through traffic at Leland. Mr. Alpaslan stated that the trolley has its own traffic signal and the traffic has a pre-empt device which will allow the trolley to continue east through the intersection while through traffic heading east will have a red light. He stated that at the Leland intersection, the traffic signal will govern the traffic movement.

Mr. Mishkin expressed concern that the through traffic would proceed when it sees the trolley proceeding through the intersection. Mr. Hales stated he





## Traffic Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

shared Mr. Mishkin's concerns and hoped that the traffic engineers had considered these issues.

Mr. Hales asked what the signage would be like in the loop. Mr. Alpaslan stated that the trolleys will have signs on the rear of the trolley stating "Do Not Pass".

Mr. Hales asked if the ordinance applied to bicycle traffic. Mr. Stewart stated that there is a new bike route, but his understanding was that bikes are not prohibited on Delmar. Mr. Alpaslan stated that there is no prohibition to bicycle traffic on Delmar; the signage discouraging bikes is not regulatory, but he indicated that staff would be looking at that. Mr. Alpaslan stated he understood the concerns of the commission about bicycles.

Mr. Helderman stated that while he shared many of the concerns expressed he made a motion to approve the ordinance as recommended. Ms. Creer seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **f. Loop Trolley "Obstruction Zone" Create Chapter to the Code**

#### **i. The Loop Trolley Track Layout Plans**

Mr. Tate stated that the purpose of this ordinance was to restrict vehicles from stopping on the trolley tracks.

Mr. Mishkin mad a motion to recommend the ordinance as recommended by staff and was seconded by Mr. Stewart. The motion passed unanimously.

### **6. Council Liaison Report**

None

### **7. Miscellaneous Business**

Mr. Tate stated he had one issue that will be coming to the commission at the April meeting related to the study on the school zone speed limit study.

### **8. Adjournment.**

Mr. made a motion to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Mr. Mishkin. The motion unanimously carried and the meeting was adjourned at 8:16pm.

Minutes prepared by Jeff Hales, Traffic Commission Chairman & Secretary



**Plan Commission  
April 26, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

The Plan Commission held their regular meeting at the Heman Park Community Center located at 975 Pennsylvania Avenue, University City, Missouri on Wednesday, April 26, 2017. The meeting commenced at 6:30 pm.

**1. Roll Call**

**Voting Members Present**

Cirri Moran (Chairperson)  
Rosalind Williams  
Michael Miller  
Cynthia Head  
Judith Gainer  
Ellen Hartz

**Voting Members Absent (excused)**

Andrew Ruben

**Non-Voting Council Liaison Present**

Rod Jennings

**Staff Present**

Raymond Lai, Deputy Director of Community Development  
Zach Greatens, Planner

**2. Approval of Minutes**

**2.a. January 25, 2017 Plan Commission meeting**

A motion was made by Mr. Miller to approve the January 25, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Head and carried unanimously.

**3. Public Hearings**

**3.a. Conditional Use Permit PC 17-01 – 6655 Delmar Boulevard – Proposal for a karaoke entertainment establishment, a non-retail use with ground-floor frontage on Delmar Boulevard in the “CC” – Core Commercial District**

Mr. Greatens showed staff slides of the site and surrounding area.

The applicant, Xin Wei, was present. The applicant’s architect, Helen Lee with Tao and Lee Associates, explained the proposal for a karaoke entertainment establishment and presented images of the proposed plans.

- 11 themed rooms proposed with an open bar area which would be typically used by those waiting for their reserved rooms
- Lounge seating for each room with its own restroom
- Similar to karaoke establishments on east and west coasts

- Each room would be sound-proofed
- Customers may order food and bar services
- Hours of operation will be 2:30 pm to 2:30 am everyday
- Intends to apply for liquor license
- Estimating that venue could hold up to 250 people

Dan Wald, property owner of 6655 Delmar Boulevard stated he could have leased the building by now to any restaurant, but waited for the applicant to go through the process because he thinks it will be a success

Xin Wei stated this would be something new to Delmar Loop that is needed here.

Mr. Greatens stated that staff recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit with conditions included in Attachment A of the staff report.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission included:

- Liquor license and available time for minors. (Applicant response –intends to check IDs at the door and would stamp minors’ hands; those under 16 are subject to curfew in University City; business owner would set time limits for minors and provide a safe environment.)
- Room turnover. (Applicant response – would likely charge by the hour; the bar area near the front would be a waiting area for those who’ve reserved private rooms.)
- Doors to the private rooms and see-through windows for rooms, with concern about inappropriate activity in the rooms. (Applicant response – intends to have security cameras and window on each room door, as well as security guards; will make sure there is no inappropriate activity.)
- Kitchen and food service. (Applicant response – limited food service with much food prepared in advance.)
- Adjacent open patio use and noise, etc. (Applicant response – no plans for outside seating and would not have outdoor karaoke and loudspeakers.)

Public Hearing speakers:

- 1) Joe Edwards, 6504 Delmar Blvd. – stated that the proposal was a good concept if done right, but concerned that applicant did not present his proposal at the Loop Special Business District (LSBD) meeting for feedback. He was shown the proposed plans by the property owner only a few days ago. Mr. Edwards suggested that the petition be postponed until after the next LSBD meeting. He was concerned that it would not be meeting food sale requirements for the liquor license and its late hours of operation, but agreed that windows on the door for each room should not be completely covered.

Questions/Comments by Plan Commission: Similar food-serving concept for The Pageant and hours of operation for Blueberry Hill, and the former Gaslight Square entertainment district. (Mr. Edwards stated that alcohol is not served to the underage in these two establishments, and their opening hours are also different.)

- 2) Dan Wald (subject property owner), 8400 Delmar Blvd. – stated that he shared the proposal with many people of the LSBDD and they were enthusiastic about it.

A motion was made by Mr. Miller to recommend approval of Conditional Use Permit PC 17-01 with the conditions in Attachment A of the staff report, and with an additional condition that no outdoor speakers shall be allowed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hartz and carried unanimously. The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for consideration of final approval.

**3.b. Conditional Use Permit PC 17-02 – 6662-D Delmar Boulevard – Proposal for a food and beverage establishment (bubble tea), a non-retail use with ground-floor frontage on Delmar Boulevard in the “CC” – Core Commercial District**

Mr. Greatens showed staff slides of the site and surrounding area.

The applicant, Ms. Ngan Thi, was present to explain the proposal:

- It would be a bubble-tea franchise (“Kung-Fu Tea”)
- No food service except pre-cooked food will be served
- No kitchen hood is proposed
- Hours will be from 11 am to 11 pm daily
- Currently over 100 stores in U.S., but this would be first in St. Louis area and Missouri

**Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission**

- History of the franchise and typical customer base. (Applicant response – franchise began in 1990 in New York; typical customer base is young people, college students, and under 40 years old.)
- Another bubble tea place is across the street. (Applicant response – would be competition but this franchise is different than that existing business.)
- Parking availability (Applicant response – parking lot at the rear and on-street parking along Loop South.)
- Whether no cooking on site is proposed (Applicant response – Yes, no cooking.)
- Outdoor dining (Applicant response – Not proposed)

Mr. Greatens stated that staff recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit with the conditions contained in Attachment A of the staff report.

A motion was made by Ms. Williams to recommend approval of Conditional Use Permit PC 17-02 with the conditions in Attachment A of the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gainer and carried unanimously. The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for consideration of final approval.

**4. Hearings** – None

**5. Old Business** – None

## **6. New Business**

### **6.a. Text Amendment PC 17-03 – Multi-family residential developments and attached single-family dwellings**

Staff explained the proposed text amendments:

- Would revise definitions and other sections so that townhouse developments and attached single-family dwellings could be allowed on one lot for the entire development or individual lots for each unit. Would also revise the definition of attached single-family dwellings for a maximum of two dwelling units. Attached single-family dwellings would be added as a conditional use in the “LR” Residential District, a permitted use in the “MR” and “HR” Residential Districts, and moved from conditional uses to be permitted uses in the “HRO” District.
- This would allow for more variety of residential development types in the community
- Attached single-family dwellings and townhouses on individual lots used to be allowed by the University City Zoning Code, but were removed in the mid-90s based on staff records
- Other changes proposed are to the terms used for different multi-family residential development types – removing word “apartment”.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission:

- Asked for some minor clarifications on proposed changes; staff showed pictures of some examples of existing townhouse and attached single-family developments in University City.

Mr. Miller, chairperson of the Code Review Committee (CRC), stated that there was good discussion at the March 22, 2017 Code Review Committee meeting with non-CRC Plan Commissioners in attendance. They discussed that condo and townhouse development would likely continue to become more popular and add population to the City.

A motion was made by Mr. Miller to recommend approval of the proposed Zoning Text Amendments. The motion was seconded by Ms. Head and carried unanimously. The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for a public hearing and consideration of final approval.

## **7. Other Business**

**7.a. Public Comments** - There were no public comments.

## **8. Reports**

**8.a. Code Review Committee Report** – None

**8.b. Comprehensive Plan Committee Report**

Mr. Lai explained for the benefit of the new Plan Commission members that the Comprehensive Plan Update project is in its final stage of the planning process. The consolidated comments of the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee and staff were sent to consultant and the consultant has provided feedback. Staff is preparing a

response. It was noted that the project is a little behind schedule as the consultant had lost some staff members who were involved in this project.

### **8.c. Council Liaison Report**

Council Member Jennings gave an update on the City budget process, the brewery project (Olive Blvd./North & South Road), Request for Proposals (RFP) for Olive/I-170 area redevelopment, search firm selection for city manager opening, and several community events.

### **8.d. Department Report**

Mr. Lai provided an update on the permits for the brewery project and the Washington University's multi-level garage project (behind 560 Music Center and a multi-story student apartment building)

### **9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

DRAFT





**Plan Commission  
January 25, 2017 Meeting Minutes  
(Approved 4-26-2017)**

The Plan Commission held their regular meeting at the Heman Park Community Center located at 975 Pennsylvania Avenue, University City, Missouri on Wednesday, January 25, 2017. The meeting commenced at 6:30 pm.

**1. Roll Call**

**Voting Members Present**

Cirri Moran (Chairperson)  
Rosalind Williams  
Michael Miller (arrived at 6:50 pm)  
Andrew Ruben  
Cynthia Head  
Judith Gainer  
Ellen Hartz

**Voting Members Absent (excused)**

None

**Non-Voting Council Liaison Present**

Rod Jennings

**Staff Present**

Raymond Lai, Deputy Director of Community Development  
Zach Greatens, Planner

Ms. Moran welcomed the three new members Ms. Cynthia Head, Ms. Judith Gainer, and Ms. Ellen Hartz. She expressed her thanks to former members including Ms. Linda Locke, who resigned, and Mr. Rick Salamon and Mr. Samuel Jones, whose first terms had expired and requested not to be reappointed.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

**2.a. September 28, 2016 Plan Commission meeting**

Ms. Williams had two proposed revisions regarding the draft minutes. On Page 2 of 4, under “Questions, Comments, and Discussion by Plan Commission”, the fourth bullet-point, the minutes should have reflected that a Plan Commission member was concerned that the parking requirements for a banquet hall were being misapplied, rather than simply stating that the parking requirements for a restaurant would be more similar to the proposed use. Also, on Page 3 of 4, under “Questions, Comments, and Discussion by the Plan Commission”, before the first bullet-point, a statement should be added to state that a Plan Commission member was concerned that the definition of a banquet hall in the ordinance was being misapplied. A motion was made by Ms. Williams to approve the September 28, 2016 meeting minutes with the proposed revisions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruben and carried unanimously.

**3. Public Hearings** – None

**4. Hearings** – None

**5. Old Business** – None

**6. New Business** – None

**7. Other Business**

**7.a. Discussion – Plan Commission feedback for potential Zoning Code Text Amendment topics. INFORMATIONAL ONLY – NO VOTE REQUIRED**

Staff was seeking feedback from the Plan Commission members regarding Zoning Code Text Amendments suggested by staff. The memo distributed by staff (see Attachment A) included two lists of potential Text Amendment topics that may be addressed in the future, the first list was for topics of higher priority in staff's opinion and the second list was of less priority. The lists had come about through previous discussions with property owners and developers, code enforcement and interpretation concerns, feedback from City Council and Board/Commission members, and updated State and Federal laws.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission

- In addition to the items included in the first list, Plan Commission members discussed concerns about residential infill development and suggested that a review of the effectiveness of the current residential infill development ordinance be added to the bottom of the first list.
- Plan Commission members also discussed the concern about the number of restaurants in The Delmar Loop and the mix of uses. There was some concern about there being too many restaurants and perhaps a limitation should be considered. It had been discussed previously at Plan Commission meetings and there had been a sentiment to let the market decide the mix of uses in The Loop. However, there could be other factors that affect the businesses in The Loop and it should be discussed further. Perhaps a study session could be scheduled for this item and possibly a temporary committee established to research the concept. It could also be discussed at a Code Review Committee meeting. Plan Commission members suggested that this item be added to the bottom of the first list.

**7.b. Annual Report for calendar years 2015 – 2016. INFORMATIONAL ONLY – NO VOTE REQUIRED**

Staff stated that the first annual report (see Attachment B) had been provided as previously requested by the Plan Commission members. This annual report included the past two years in order to provide a broader range of activity. Future Annual Reports would only cover one calendar year. The Plan Commission was generally pleased with this first annual report.

**7.c. Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

#### **7.d. Election of Officers – Nomination and election of Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Designated Alternate**

Ms. Williams nominated Ms. Moran to serve as Chairperson. The nomination was seconded by Ms. Gainer and carried unanimously.

Ms. Moran nominated Ms. Williams to serve as Vice-Chairperson. The nomination was seconded by Ms. Head and carried unanimously.

Ms. Moran nominated Mr. Miller to serve as the Designated Alternate. The nomination was seconded by Ms. Gainer and carried unanimously.

Ms. Moran asked the Plan Commission members to think about which subcommittee they would prefer to serve on, Comprehensive Plan Committee or Code Review Committee, and to discuss their preference with her to help her appoint the two committees.

### **8. Reports**

#### **8.a. Code Review Committee Report – None**

#### **8.b. Comprehensive Plan Committee Report**

Ms. Moran explained the role of the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) for the benefit of the new Plan Commission members. She stated that the CPAC was in the process of reviewing the draft document, prepared by the consultant, and that all review comments from CPAC were now complete and to be sent to the consultant. They had also created a list of next steps. The list will be provided to the Plan Commission for reference. After all comments are provided to the consultants, they will prepare an updated draft of the document for CPAC to review and then go to the public for review. After public review, the Plan would go to the Plan Commission and then to City Council for final adoption. The Plan Commission has a major role in the Comprehensive Plan process and the CPAC acts in advisory capacity to the Plan Commission.

#### **8.c. Council Liaison Report – None**

#### **8.d. Department Report – None**

### **9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm.





## Park Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

### MINUTES OF THE PARK COMMISSION

HEMAN PARK COMMUNITY CENTER (HPCC), 975 PENNSYLVANIA  
TUESDAY, March 21, 2017

The meeting was called to order at 6:34pm.

Present:

Steve Goldstein

Clarence Olsen

Kathy Standley

Luther Baker

Ed Mass, Park Commission President

Ewald Winker, Park Operations Superintendent

Jenny Wendt, Staff Liaison

Chris Kalter, Project Manager

Lynda Euell-Taylor, Deputy Director of Recreation

1. Minutes from February 21, 2017 meeting were approved. Steve Goldstein moved to approve the January 17, 2017 minutes with no changes, Kathy Standley seconded, vote taken – all approved.
2. Citizens' comments:
  - Sandy and Frank W. would like to utilize a tennis court at Flynn Park for pickle ball. They presented a handout showing the standard size of the pickle ball court.
    - Ewald says that we can use tape to create the court within a tennis court without changing the existing markings. This would be a trial to see how much interest the community has.
    - Lynda says that the new Centennial Commons basketball court floor may also include striping for pickle ball. Renting out pickle ball racket and ball an option.
    - The tennis court net is actually mounted higher than the recommended pickle ball height. The presenter did not mind this issue.
    - Luther voted to pilot this pickle ball court use at Flynn Park, Kathleen seconds. Vote taken and approved.
  - Deondre B. would like the pavilion at Ackert Park to be repaired and stained for a more refreshed look. He presented a product called BEHR Premium Wood Coatings – Deck over.
    - Ewald says that there is a minor repair needed to the fascia board at the pavilion. Overall the pavilion could use a touchup to enhance the look. Will look into this product. All work would be done by city staff.
3. Department Reports were given to the commission.
  - Seasonal work underway.
  - Park project update. Fogerty Park ahead of schedule. Kaufman Park ahead of schedule. Both projects will be completed between April-May of 2017.
  - Community Development Update. The mounds art project was selected for the Heman Park Washington University student installation.
  - Blinds installed in Centennial Commons. New lighting on the way for cardio room. Flooring installation in Gym.
  - Lifeguards Unlimited is the preferred contractor for pool. Will bring to council next month. \$30,000 additional cost from last year, but will free up staff for other duties. Outsourcing of lifeguards was used in past.
  - Steve moves to support staff recommendation to use pool management company on N-3-19 a trial basis for one year. Ed seconds. Vote taken and approved.

4. Council Liaison Report:
  - Greenwood South Bridge – land ownership is tying up this project. Forestry approves Wash U. bridge plan.
  - There is a national search underway for a new city manager. Process may take 4-6 months. New interim city clerk.
  - Redevelopment of Olive Corridor a priority. Study session coming.
  - Plans to visit UCity parks on a regular basis to become more familiar. First Park visited was Heman. Concerned with condition of service road which is also used for pedestrian walkway. CO will look at this item and will present at next park commission meeting.
5. Individual Park Reports were provided by the Commission.
6. Old Business:
  - Guiding Principles. No comments given. Chris sent an excerpt from the existing Parks Masterplan. Ed will meet with subcommittee and incorporate into the guiding principles.
  - Budget. Reviewed the proposed project list for upcoming fiscal year. \$130,000.00 budget.
    - Park commission would like to include the golf course clubhouse roof repair. May be able to use general funds and city staff for repair.
    - Include golf course clubhouse roof repair in budget.
  - Mona Dr. repairs needed but costs were not included in this budget because they are difficult to forecast, and we are seeking grants to assist. Permanent stabilization is the goal. Seeking expert guidance.
  - Ash tree removal is an ongoing project with a 5 year projected end goal. \$100,000 annual budget. Includes removal and replacement to get ahead of problem.
  - Ed motion to recommend project recommendations by staff with addition of golf course clubhouse roof repair. Steve seconds. Vote taken and approved.
  - Chris presented a list of proposed projects for future years. Ed mass would like this list broken down in different format. Chris will revise CIP and resend to the commission.
    - We should not spread master plan projects over so many years. Try to complete in successive years (Fogerty Park and Majerus Park).
    - Forecast Heman Park improvements utilizing funds freed up from debt service repayment.
    - How to get Wash U. more involved in park improvements within area used mostly by student community. Town hall meeting upcoming. Master plan available online for Parkview Gardens which was previously approved.
7. New Business:
  - Storybook walk construction underway. Install in mid-April.
  - History of Lewis Park sign mockup presented.
  - Greensfelder basketball improvements. Sinan meeting with city manager. Cost is roughly \$4,000.00. City of Life Church is interested with providing indoor space. Luther will talk with them.
  - Clarence proposed striping the existing outdoor basketball courts at Heman Park. Ewald will provide city staff to stripe as temporary solution.
8. Other Business:
  - How can we best utilize the Park Foundation? Look for individual project donors (swing, bench, etc.). Incorporate into Guiding Principles.
9. Citizens' comments:

- Kevin Taylor. Concerned with baseball fields not having safety fencing, no shade, and no dugouts. Park Commission should be more concerned with use of parks and what amenities are missing or would enhance the overall use of the park.
    - What did the fencing cost at Miller Park? Can use that budget to get an estimate for Heman park fencing.
    - Can we use private donors to finance baseball improvements? - Clarence.
10. The meeting was adjourned at 8:55pm.





## Green Practices Commission

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 862-6767, Fax: (314) 863-9146

### Meeting Minutes – University City Green Practices Commission

#### March, 2017

Location: Heman Park Community Center  
Attendees Present: Jonathan Stitelman (Chairperson), Lois Sechrist, Bob Elgin, Dianne Benjamin, Chris Kalter (Staff Liaison)

Absent: Terry Crow (Council Liaison), Scott Eidson, Richard Juang

1. Meeting Called to Order, Roll Call at 6:01 p.m.
2. Opening Round
  - a. Dianne – What happens to banners used in the City? Are they recycled?
  - b. Lois provided information on the Rocky Mountain Institute's community solar program, glass recycling, and working with Tim Michels on energy projects.
  - c. Bob Elgin – stated that County Council still needed to vote on the building code
  - d. Jonathan Stitelman– stated he attended a town hall meeting about the WashU proposed bridge.
  - e. Chris Kalter – stated this would be his last meeting as staff liaison and Jenny Wendt would return as the liaison starting in April.
3. Approval of Minutes
  - a. February 9, 2017 Meeting Minutes were approved with minor changes. Lois Sechrist motioned, Bob Elgin seconded and passed unanimously.
4. New Business
  - a. Jessica Bueler, Marketing Director for the Loop. Natives in the Loop. – Jessica was unable to make the meeting. Chris Kalter gave a brief description of what she was going to talk about. The commission decided that more information was necessary and would like Jessica to come to another meeting to discuss. The following were questions for Jessica:
    1. Who pays for installation, maintenance of the landscaped containers in the Loop?
    2. General discussion:
      - a. Streetscapes in UCity should use native plants.
      - b. Is it necessary to write an ordinance or resolution, or would the information be lost? Need input from our Council Liaison, who was absent.
      - c. Put in UCity in Bloom contract.
      - d. Plant UCity street medians with pollinator-friendly plants. Need to be no-mow, low-maintenance to be cost-effective. Ewald is concerned about maintenance costs.
      - e. What is Forestry policy for tree species?
5. Old Business
  - a. Sustainability Strategic Plan Update – Jonathan stated that he is recommending the use of quarterly reports to help with the update of the strategic plan. Several items for updating and improving the plan were discussed.
  - b. Quarterly Reporting – Scott Eidson was not present to give his report.
6. Council Liaison Report - Absent
7. Closing Round
  - a. Lois stated that there is an electronic recycling event on March 31<sup>st</sup> at SLU.
  - b. St. Louis Earth Day will be hosting a recycling collection event in Forest Park on April 1 from 10A – 2P
8. Meeting Adjourned at 7:19 p.m.





**Sample Interview Schedules to Develop a Recruitment Profile/Brochure**  
**City of University City, Missouri – City Manager Position**  
**Meetings at U.C. City Hall**  
**Meetings with Gov HR USA – Lee Szymborski**

**OPTION #1 –**

**Monday June 12, 2017**

Stakeholders	Time
Meeting with Mayor and City Council	5:00 PM
Community Forum held during City Council Meeting	6:30 PM – 7:30 PM

**Tuesday June 13, 2017**

Stakeholders	Time
Interim City Manager	9:00 AM
Department Directors Group – Finance, Clerk, Human Resources	10:00 AM
Department Directors Group – Community Development, Public Works & Parks, Recreation	11:00 AM
Lunch	12:00 PM
Department Directors Group – Police, Fire	12:45 PM
Conclude	1:45 PM

**OPTION #2 –**

**Monday June 12, 2017**

Stakeholders	Time
Meeting with Mayor and City Council	5:00 PM
Community Forum held during City Council Meeting	6:30 PM – 7:30 PM

**OPTION #3 –**

**Monday June 12, 2017**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Time</b>
Meeting with Mayor and City Council	5:00 PM

**Tuesday June 13, 2017**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Time</b>
Interim City Manager	9:00 AM
Department Directors Group – Finance, Clerk, Human Resources	10:00 AM
Department Directors Group – Community Development, Public Works & Parks, Recreation	11:00 AM
Lunch	12:00 PM
Department Directors Group – Police, Fire	12:45 PM
Break	1:45 PM
Community Forum	6:00 PM
Conclude	7:00 PM

**OPTION #4 –**

**Monday June 12, 2017**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Time</b>
Interim City Manager	9:00 AM
Department Directors Group – Finance, Clerk, Human Resources	10:00 AM
Department Directors Group – Community Development, Public Works & Parks, Recreation	11:00 AM
Lunch	12:00 PM
Department Directors Group – Police, Fire	12:45 PM
Break	1:45 PM
Meeting with Mayor and City Council	5:00 PM
Community Forum held during City Council Meeting	6:30 PM
Conclude	7:30 PM