

**Plan Commission
July 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, July 26, 2017. The meeting commenced at 6:30 pm.

1. Roll Call

Voting Members Present

Cirri Moran (Chairperson)
Rosalind Williams
Michael Miller
Andrew Ruben
Cynthia Head
Judith Gainer (arrived at 6:50 p.m.)

Voting Members Absent (excused)

Ellen Hartz

Non-Voting Council Liaison Absent (excused)

Rod Jennings

Staff Present

Andrea Riganti, Director of Community Development
Raymond Lai, Deputy Director of Community Development
Andrew Stanislav, Planner

2. Approval of Minutes

2.a. April 26, 2017 Plan Commission meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Miller to approve the April 26, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Williams and carried unanimously.

3. Public Hearings - None

4. Hearings – None

5. Old Business – None

6. New Business

6.a. Zoning Map Amendment PC 17-04 – Proposed zoning map amendment of existing two-family and multi-family buildings from “MR” Medium Density Residential District to “PA” Public Activity District – Our Lady of Lourdes Parish – 7128-7138 Forsyth Boulevard

Mr. Lai explained the proposal and showed slides of the site and surrounding properties. The proposal was for a rezoning of parcels occupied by four two-family and multi-family buildings abutting the Our Lady of Lourdes Church and Elementary School property from “MR” Medium Density Residential District to “PA” Public Activity District. The proposed rezoning would provide additional space for accessory uses of the church and elementary school to include parking, a playground, dumpster enclosure, and access drive. In tandem to this is PC 17-05, the next rezoning request.

The applicant, Pastor Hanneke, provided a description and background of the proposed rezoning, including the parish’s presence in the community for over 100 years. This proposed rezoning would allow the church to provide universal accessibility to the facilities, increase the educational space, add additional gathering spaces beyond the cafeteria and gymnasium, and additional parking. It would also meet the space needs of the future of the parish and that it would alleviate current traffic issues for the neighborhood. A meeting with neighbors initiated by Our Lady of Lourdes was held about the proposal with no reported opposition.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission:

- Any issues with historic preservation given the construction dates of the buildings in the 1920s, and also if the church congregation size was decreasing as with the trend of other parishes? Pastor Hanneke stated that the parish size has remained consistently between 800 and 850 parishioners and that the student body of the elementary school has remained between 230 and 270 students since 1971, although the number of baptisms has gradually increased. He further stated that many new parishioners are young families with children.
- Are the buildings currently occupied? Pastor Hanneke stated that all tenants have a one-year lease and are aware of the parish’s long-term plans. A one-year notice to tenants will be provided before they must vacate. He also stated that the properties subject to a related zoning map amendment application (PC 17-05) along Northmoor Drive are currently vacant.

The Commission asked staff’s opinion on the proposed rezoning. Mr. Lai stated that staff recommended approval as the proposed “PA” District is reasonable with the surrounding uses and continued to note that design issues would be addressed at a later stage in the process.

The Commission inquired if the site plan provided with this application for information purposes only will be reviewed by the Commission at a later date. Ms. Riganti stated that the site plan will not be reviewed by Plan Commission but will be presented to City Council.

Public Comment – None

A motion was made by Ms. Williams to recommend approval of the proposed Zoning Map Amendment. The motion was seconded by Ms. Head and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0 (Ms. Gainer not yet arrived). The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for a public hearing and consideration of final approval.

6.b. Zoning Map Amendment PC 17-05 – Proposed zoning map amendment of existing single-family residences from “SR” Single-Family Residential District to “PA” Public Activity District – Our Lady of Lourdes Parish – 7135-7139 Northmoor Drive

Mr. Lai described the proposal and showed slides of the site and its surrounding properties. The proposal was for a rezoning of two single-family residences abutting the Our Lady of Lourdes Church’s Elementary School property from “SR” Single-Family Residential District to “PA” Public Activity District. Mr. Lai further explained that this proposed rezoning was in tandem to the previous proposed rezoning agenda item (PC 17-04).

Ms. Moran stated that the applicant did not need to describe the proposal as it is similar to the preceding agenda item (PC 17-04).

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission:

- Some Commission members were concerned with the preservation of mature trees. Pastor Hanneke stated that only three trees were proposed for removal.
- Commission members asked for an explanation for the location of the alternate “loop” access drive in the site plan away from the elementary school building. Pastor Hanneke stated that the location of the access drive nearest the building has the potential to become a safety hazard as it is near the entrance to the gym, and the alternate location further from the entrance to the gym is preferred.
- Has there been a traffic review yet? Pastor Hanneke stated that this has not been completed yet. He further noted that traffic can be controlled for drop-off and pick-up times during school hours but would encourage parishioners to be mindful at other times. The parish would prefer those exiting east to use Forsyth and those exiting west to use Northmoor to the traffic light at Asbury Avenue and Forsyth Boulevard. Ms. Riganti stated that traffic systems would be presented to the Public Works and Parks Department for review.
- The condition and grading of the proposed greenspace was a concern as it related to the current grading and the frontage along Northmoor. Mark Ditch, civil engineer for the Church, stated that there would not be much grading at the property lines.

Public Comment - None

Mr. Lai stated that staff recommended approval as the proposed “PA” District is reasonable and compatible with the surrounding uses and continued to note that design issues would be addressed at a later stage in the process.

A motion was made by Mr. Miller to recommend approval of the proposed Zoning Map Amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruben and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0. The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for a public hearing and consideration of final approval.

6.c. Zoning Map Amendment PC 17-06 – Proposed zoning map amendment of vacant elementary school building from “PA” Public Activity District to “HR” High Density Residential District – Screaming Eagle Development, LLC – 1351 N Hanley Road

Mr. Lai explained the proposal and showed slides of the site and its surrounding properties. The proposal was for a rezoning of the former Nathaniel Hawthorne Elementary School from “PA” Public Activity District to “HR” High Density Residential District. The site plan provided with the application is solely for informational purposes and is not a requirement for rezoning. Mr. Lai noted that at their meeting on July 20, 2017, the University City Historic Preservation Commission endorsed the nomination of the existing school building to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The applicant, Matthew Masiel of Screaming Eagle Development, provided a description and background of the proposed rezoning. The proposed rezoning would allow for an adaptive reuse of the now vacant school building into market-rate apartments and new townhomes, as well as preserve a historic building. Mr. Masiel explained that the subject property is currently under contract and that the proposed redevelopment includes 37 one- and two-bedroom units in the former school building with ten new townhomes to be located on the northern portion of the site, all of which will be market-rate units. He mentioned that the amount of impervious parking surfaces in total will be reduced from its current condition while the remaining parking surfaces will be resurfaced with added accessibility to the proposed new townhomes. Mr. Masiel also described his intention to connect with the community by proposing to extend the walking trail in Millar Park around the subject site.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission:

- Will asphalt be removed from behind the school as well as the circle drive in the front? Mr. Masiel stated that asphalt will be removed behind the school, while the circle drive near the east property line will remain as it is a financial burden to remove and it will help ease traffic from the neighboring church. There is an easement with the neighboring Lutheran Church on the circle drive.
- Will the mosaics in the school remain or be removed, specifically those near the water fountains? Mr. Masiel stated that he intends to preserve as much as possible.
- There was discussion regarding the existing playground equipment and if it was to be retained for the playground present on the site plan or removed and donated. Mr. Masiel stated that he does not intend to keep the existing playground equipment and that some portions are damaged, although he would be happy to donate the existing equipment. He further stated that upon considering the lack of three-bedroom units in the plan, the presence of families with children residing at the subject is not expected. The space on the site plan occupied by the playground would probably become an outdoor kitchen or pavilion amenity.
- Some Commission members questioned the intent of seeking a nomination for the National Register of Historic Places per the staff report. Mr. Masiel stated that this designation would help to preserve the historic character of the building with historic tax credits. He noted that his business frequently utilized the federal historic tax credit incentive to financially help offer a higher-quality product and to provide decreased rents. It was also stated that the timeline of the project is dependent on the designation on the National Register of Historic Places in order to receive tax credits.
- Is the front driveway loop in the right-of-way or privately owned? Mr. Lai and Ms. Riganti explained that it is not a public street and is under the school district, although it may appear public because of the intersection and similar pavement as North Hanley Road. Mr. Masiel

noted that he is under contract for two parcels, the subject parcel of the former Nathaniel Hawthorne School and the parcel of the driveway directly east of the subject parcel.

- Commercial use development was suggested for this driveway parcel as the neighborhood is lacking commercial space. Mr. Masiel stated that he does not believe this parcel is large enough to accommodate commercial development.
- Concerns regarding the extended Millar Park walking path around the subject site were discussed, specifically regarding safety, crowding, traffic and parking, and operational hours. Mr. Masiel stated that there is an existing sidewalk from Carleton Avenue north through the subject site and the proposed expansion of the walking path would link with this sidewalk. The proposed parking areas would also be gated to prevent public parking. Mr. Masiel also noted that the “dusk” closing time for Millar Park and the walking path was a valid point to consider and that additional options for handling this matter would need to be developed.

Public Comment - None

Mr. Lai stated that staff recommended approval as the proposed “HR” District is appropriate at this location along a major arterial roadway (North Hanley Road) and would provide a transition between “SR” and other “PA” zoned properties nearby. The current “PA” zoning for the site was established most likely due to the former school.

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

6.d. Final Development Plan Amendment PC 17-07 – Proposed amendment to the final development plan for a partial redevelopment of a property in the “PD” Planned Development District – Rosemann & Assoc. – 8348-8350 Delcrest Drive (Crown Center for Senior Living)

Ms. Riganti explained the significance and procedure associated with the “PD” Planned Development zoning classification through a flow chart. She stated that this zoning classification was designed to allow for flexibility in the site plan and design so the development can better fit a property. Additionally, the “PD” District zoning and the preliminary plan cannot exist without the other.

Ms. Riganti described the uniqueness of the application in that the proposed site plan is to be considered an amendment to the previous Final Development Plan per the Zoning Code. The existing “PD” District zoning is still in place although the development plan has changed. Ms. Riganti further explained the proposal and showed slides of the site and its surrounding properties.

The applicant, Jarrett Cooper with Rosemann and Associates, was present, along with Nikki Goldstein with Crown Center and David Lang, their legal counsel, to provide a more detailed description and background of the proposed rezoning. Ms. Goldstein explained that the subject property currently has 275 senior residents aged 62 and above. She described the

services Crown Center provides as an independent senior living facility to its residents as well as other seniors in the community. She stated that the purpose of this redevelopment is to remain relevant in the realm of senior living as the proposed building for demolition is obsolete. Residents of Crown Center are of limited income as the property operates with a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) agreement.

David Lang, a former volunteer board member of Crown Center and legal counsel for the proposed redevelopment, explained that the Tallin building, proposed for demolition, has existed for 50 years under a HUD Section 202 loan while the more recent Weinberg building has Federal Housing Administration (FHA) financing. He further explained that the renovation cost of the Tallin building was more significant than anticipated, rendering the new construction of a replacement building more feasible after review by a consultant. The proposed new building could also accommodate safety concerns and more modern living amenities, including a sprinkler system, air conditioning, updated mechanical systems, and universal accessibility. Mr. Lang explained that the new building was to be constructed in phases around the existing Tallin building to minimize the relocation of current residents and the disruption of services to this senior community.

Jarrett Cooper stated that the development team felt that this proposed redevelopment approach is the best option among the many options studied to achieve what they need without relocating tenants and disrupting the Crown Center community. He further described the phasing of the new buildings as well as the existing conditions of the site. Mr. Cooper noted staff's comments from the preceding Sketch Plan meeting on July 10, 2017 at City Hall addressing the proposed setbacks, especially on the north and west sides of the property, including the amount of space available to serve as a buffer and suggestions of landscaping.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission:

- The Commission asked about the height of the proposed new building and why it was lower than the current building. Mr. Cooper stated that the proposed building would be four stories of residential above one level of parking, which is lower than the existing building so that it fits better with most surrounding buildings of similar height and is more comfortable for seniors.
- The Commission inquired about the financing of the redevelopment given the history of federal funding sources. Mr. Lang stated that the HUD Section 202 loan is expiring, which requires subsidized rents, but the new building will have some market-rate units.
- How many current residents are in the Tallin building? Ms. Goldstein stated that there are 126 apartments in the Tallin building with 15 units currently vacant. There are 118 apartments in the Weinberg building. It was decided not to fill the vacant units until the plans for the future of Crown Center are finalized. Mr. Lang and Ms. Goldstein further explained that with the proposed new building, their intention would be to have 64 units occupied within the next two years in order to transition residents to the new building.
- Will the monthly rent for the apartments increase or will it remain the same? Mr. Lang stated that this was still being considered in regards to a Section 8 contract although no significant increase is expected.

- Will the unit types and amenities remain similar to what is being proposed? Mr. Land stated that they are still considering the unit mix but anticipate mostly one-bedroom units with some two-bedroom units. He added that new amenities would include covered parking and updated common and outdoor areas.
- Is there an age restriction? Mr. Lang stated that all units, including the proposed market-rate units, are restricted to seniors of age 62 and above.

Ms. Riganti stated that staff recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the Final Development Plan with conditions. She stated that the height, massing, and use are appropriate, while staff has concerns regarding the buffering and screening along the north property limits. A larger buffer than proposed is required between zoning districts but this issue can be reconciled. She further stated that a variance would not be approved because there is no topographical hardship presented by the site, and from a land use perspective there is no hardship endured by relocating residents to render a variance.

- If the property to the north is redeveloped in the future, is there an opportunity to recommend larger buffering on that property? Ms. Riganti stated that while this is a possibility, the property owner to the north may also request a decreased buffer like Crown Center and that this redevelopment should not bind the future development potential of the north property. She further stated that the ordinance requires a 30-foot buffer in this instance; however, the “PD” District zoning classification could have some allowance through recommendation by the Plan Commission to City Council for final determination.
- The Commission determined that since the property boundary of the subject is the southern edge of the service drive to the north, and since the ground level will be parking, there would not be a lack of privacy although they recommended conifer type trees in company of deciduous trees to provide a thick green visual buffer.
- Commission members discussed the quality of life for the residents in this proposed building, and that any screening on the ground level would only affect the parking space and service drive.
- Some Commission members were concerned with safety in relation to the practicality of construction. Mr. Cooper explained that the means and methods of construction is not in their firm’s scope for this proposal although they have spoken to some construction managers that approved a tighter workspace of 10 feet.
- Why is the proposed building to the west so far back? Mr. Cooper stated that this was to maximize the efficiency of the proposed parking and residential spaces. A central court space will be created while the existing amount of parking will be maintained.

The Commission asked for staff’s recommendation. Ms. Riganti briefly restated staff’s opinion and concerns with the proposal and invited Mr. Cooper to explain their decision on this orientation of the site plan. Mr. Cooper stated that moving the west building to the south would result in the loss of a few parking spaces, re-orienting the buildings into a “T” shape as opposed to the proposed “L” shape, and that this proposed orientation was most efficient. The close proximity to the Weinberg building and resulting sight lines were also less desirable.

- Would keeping the eight-story Weinberg building negate the logic of the proposed new five-story building? Mr. Cooper stated that they wished to transition to a newer, more contemporary development and that the second tower is still in compliance and would not be demolished for many years.
- The Commission stated that the site design and cost of relocating residents are the present issues, especially regarding the tension on the proposed ten-foot setback to the north. Ms. Riganti stated that these issues are why this development was presented to the Plan Commission, as but for the yellow portion of the site plan (indicating existing buildings on the site) there would be no issue to accommodate the proposed building within the required setbacks.
- Why can't the building in phase II be constructed first and moved south of its current position? Mr. Lang stated that relocating 125 residents would be a significant expense and they were concerned that residents and other users of their services would no longer feel connected to the Crown Center community.
- Some Commission members questioned the number of residents to be relocated as a result of the proposed buildings. Mr. Cooper stated that the numbers would differ depending on if the Tallin building was emptied during construction.
- Is it possible for the displaced residents to return upon completion? Ms. Goldstein stated that she appreciated the Commission's attention to the aesthetic aspects of the proposed buildings but noted that the bigger concern is relocating seniors. She stated that the amenities such as a new stove for example and overall newer unit finishes would increase the quality of life for the seniors.

Public Comment - None

A motion was made by Ms. Williams to recommend approval of an additional condition to staff's recommendation that staff seek a landscaping plan that provides a visual screen from the service drive to the north that is to include a combination of evergreen and deciduous trees. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller and carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Ruben to recommend approval of the proposed Final Development Plan Amendment including the additional condition of a landscape plan as stated. 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.

6.e. Major Subdivision – Preliminary Plat - PC 17-08 – Proposed subdivision of a 0.518 acre tract of land into five lots in the “MR” Medium Density Residential District for attached single-family and townhouse dwellings – Magnolia Townhomes, LLC – 7634 Delmar Boulevard and 565 N Central Avenue

Mr. Lai explained the proposal and showed slides of the site and its surrounding properties. The proposal was for the subdivision of a 0.518 acre tract of land into five lots in the “MR” Medium Density Residential District for attached single-family and townhouse dwellings. The proposed subdivision would allow for each of the five dwellings on individual lots. Mr. Lai also noted that a recent text amendment approved by City Council allows for this type of

subdivision. The ongoing construction is based on the site plan previously approved by City Council with all dwellings on one large site without individual lots.

The applicant, Mark Mehlman with Magnolia Townhomes, LLC, was present, while the project surveyor, Eric Kirby, provided a more detailed description and background of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Kirby stated that given the project has previously been approved for construction, this process for the proposed subdivision is more procedural in nature. He stated that they would like to take advantage of the new opportunity that the new text amendment provides for selling the units as individual condominiums.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission:

- Would you have changed your site plan in hindsight? Mr. Kirby stated that they probably would not have made any changes given the tight nature of the current site plan.

Lot lines on the site plan were difficult to identify. Mr. Lai demonstrated the proposed lot boundaries for each of the five lots for the Commission members.

- The Commission inquired about the individual lot sizes, particularly in reference to the previously vacated alley to west of the subject as well as in terms of real estate taxes. Mr. Kirby stated that this additional land to the subject site has been incorporated into the proposed area of lot one and that the alley would no longer be active. He further explained that they are currently working on the tax aspect to the lots since some lots are larger and are crossed by an easement for driveway space and parking.

The setbacks and attached nature of the dwellings were verified for some Commission members by Mr. Kirby.

Public Comment - None

A motion was made by Mr. Ruben to recommend approval of the proposed Major Subdivision – Preliminary Plat. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller and carried unanimously. Mr. Lai explained that the next step would involve the improvement plans to the Department of Public Works and Parks for review and approval before having the Final Plat presented to the Plan Commission.

7. Other Business

7.a. Work Session – Kingsland Walk Senior Living - Proposed Zoning Map Amendment / Development Plan – 6668 Vernon Avenue from PD-M Planned Development – Mixed-Use District to Amended PD-R Planned Development Residential District for an assisted living and memory care facility

Ms. Riganti provided an overview of the proposed development and showed slides of the site and surrounding properties. The Commission was reminded about the “PD” District zoning classification procedure explained earlier. No vote is required this evening.

The applicant, Mr. Paul Boyer with Civil Engineering Design Consultants, Inc., and the project architect, David Mastin, provided a summary of the project for the Plan Commission members. The proposal was for a four-story assisted living and memory care facility with 49 assisted living units. Mr. Boyer explained that a market study had been completed which proved significant unmet demand for this service in this area that allows residents to age in place. He noted that this proposal was lacking from the ordinance requirements by two parking spaces as well as some setback issues. Mr. Boyer continued to explain that these units are intended to be market-rate units and provided more details of the proposal with a presentation.

Questions / Comments and Discussion by Plan Commission

- Will anything occupy the space of the fifth floor dormers? Mr. Boyer stated that the dormers will not be used as a fifth floor.
- Mr. Boyer presented a brick and stone veneer option for the proposed façade to gain the opinion of the Commission. The Commission was split over a preferred preference.
- Mr. Boyer noted that the subject property is 0.96-acre, which is less than the one-acre requirement for a site in the “PD” Planned Development District. Commission members suggested the acquisition of the two derelict properties to the south of the subject property, which are owned by Washington University and the developer of this proposal, respectively. Mr. Mastin stated he would discuss with the developer.
- Has Washington University been approached? Mr. Boyer and Mr. Mastin explained that they were not sure if something could be worked out or the intended use Washington University had anticipated for that property.
- The Commission stated that they favored a contiguous development parcel and asked whether the developer would consider a swap of property with Washington University to achieve this. It was suggested that this may alleviate the tightness of the development on the corner lot. Mr. Mastin stated that this was a good idea and would potentially further investigate this matter. He further stated that the current floorplan fits right given the number of potential residents and probably would not revise even if a property swap was possible. He also noted that the proposed landscaping and improvements would transform this corner of the intersection.
- Some Commission members suggested adding a right-of-way from the property to the Metcalfe Park for resident access.
- The parking issue was a concern and discussed in relation to the number of employees working each day and in terms of visitors and parking capacity for holidays.
- Some Commission members inquired about the occupancy of the property in terms of individuals or couples residing in the 49 units. Mr. Mastin stated that the provider of care recommended individuals for assisted living as it encompasses 99 percent of their business. He further stated that the memory care units will not be offered to couples, and individual occupancy of the property is mostly a marketing decision.
- The Commission recalled the previous iteration of the development plan for the Kingsland Walk development, which was previously proposed as a higher density mixed-use development, and noted the push then for green practices and sustainability (e.g. white roof, native plantings, natural drainage). The Commission suggested to staff that the new Kingsland Walk site plan be reviewed by the Green Practices Commission.

- Some Commission members asked about the pricing for residents to live at the property, which was suggested to be about \$2,500 per month with additional services added, in the mid-range market rate of assisted living. The developer explained this proposed pricing and noted that this proposed development would not receive government subsidies.

The Commission briefly restated the issues of event parking and the suggestion of a property swap with Washington University, but noted that this proposed development would be good for this corner lot.

7.b. 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 that the Comprehensive Plan Update project is in its final stage of the planning process but has been delayed due to staffing capacity reason. He further stated that the project should return to normal once staff responds to the consultant's questions regarding comments of a previous draft and that an updated schedule will become available soon.

8.c. Council Liaison Report - None

8.d. Department Report

Mr. Lai provided an update on the recently approved text amendment to the Zoning Code regarding subdivisions as well as two recently approved conditional use permits on Delmar Boulevard, involving a new karaoke venue and bubble tea location. Mr. Lai and Ms. Riganti also introduced Andrew Stanislav, the new city planner, and Tong Zhang, the planning intern.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.