

**Plan Commission  
March 28, 2018 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, March 28, 2018. The meeting commenced at 6:30 pm.

**1. Roll Call**

**Voting Members Present**

Margaret Holly (Designated Alternate)  
Ellen Hartz  
Cynthia Head  
Judith Gainer  
Cirri Moran

**Voting Members Absent (excused)**

Michael Miller

**Non-Voting Council Liaison Present**

Rod Jennings (arrived at 6:43 pm)

**Staff Present**

Gregory Rose, City Manager  
John Mulligan, City Attorney  
Rosalind Williams, Acting Director of Community Development  
Andrew Stanislav, Planner & Zoning Administrator

**2. Approval of Minutes**

**2.a. February 28, 2018 Plan Commission meeting**

A motion was made by Ms. Hartz to approve the February 28, 2018 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gainer and carried unanimously.

**3. Hearings – None**

**4. Old Business – None**

**5. New Business**

**5.a. Site Plan Review – SPR 18-05 – Site Plan approval for the proposed addition to the existing Cintas facility in the “IC” – Industrial Commercial District – 6200 Olive Boulevard**

Mr. Stanislav introduced the proposed Site Plan by providing background and contextual information. He stated that this application was subject to Site Plan Review per Section 400.2950.A.4 of the Zoning Code for additions to non-residential buildings when the addition exceeds 1,000 square feet in gross floor area. He also stated that Site Plan Reviews are not required to be considered by the Plan Commission; however, staff requested a vote of recommendation prior to City Council’s consideration.

Patrick Hagen, applicant with ARCO Construction, provided a summary of the proposed project. He explained that the addition was for an enclosed loading dock space to be located on the southern side of the existing building.

Questions / Comments / Discussion by Plan Commission:

- As the first Site Plan Review, Ms. Moran thanked staff for bringing the application to the Plan Commission for recommendation. She stated that although this required one extra step of the applicant, she believed it was necessary and valuable for City Council.

Ms. Holly requested staff's comments. Mr. Stanislav stated that staff recommends approval with the provision that the previously approved landscape plan from a former Site Plan Review in 2007 (P007041) to expand the parking lot be brought into compliance.

It was asked how compliance of this landscape plan will be monitored. Ms. Williams stated that the site will be inspected after the addition has been constructed.

Public Comments – None.

A motion was made by Ms. Moran to recommend approval of the Site Plan Review subject to the provision of bringing the formerly approved landscape plan into compliance. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gainer.

Ms. Holly called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Ms. Holly stated that the next step was for this item to be considered by City Council and staff would follow up with the applicant.

**5.b. Site Plan Review – SPR 18-03 – Site Plan Approval for the proposed 21-unit garden apartment development in the “HR” – High Density Residential District – 6321 Cates Avenue**

Mr. Stanislav introduced the proposed Site Plan by providing background and contextual information. He stated that this application was subject to Site Plan Review per Section 400.2950 of the Zoning Code as a new development that did not meet any one specific exception exempting it from Site Plan Review. He also stated that Site Plan Reviews are not required to be considered by the Plan Commission; however, staff requested a vote of recommendation prior to City Council's consideration.

Nels Rosvall, applicant with RREAC, LLC, provided an overview of the proposed project and described various features of the development. He noted that challenges faced in developing the project in order to meet the dimensional and density requirements of the City's Zoning Code, which is why 21 one-bedroom units are proposed. He stated that the proposed units are a type of micro-unit of approximately 580 square feet each and they will be available at market rate rents.

Questions / Comments / Discussion by Plan Commission:

- What is the feeling for market rate one-bedroom units in this area? Mr. Rosvall stated that they hope to achieve rents between a range of \$900 and \$1,050.
- What is the intended demographic for this development? Mr. Rosvall stated that he is hoping the development will be occupied by a mix of Washington University and other local university staff, graduate students, and millennials.
- The Commission inquired about the programming of the development. Mr. Rosvall stated that there were limitations with the density requirements and resulting footprint of the

proposed buildings. He stated that some of the first floor spaces of each building will be used for storage space and lobby areas. He also stated that the oversized luxury unit is due to the density requirements not allowing a 22<sup>nd</sup> unit and he did not want to pursue a variance to increase the number of allowed units.

- The Commission also questioned the safety of the development in terms of shelter for tornados since no basement was proposed. Mr. Rosvall stated that a basement was not proposed due to costs which would contribute to making the project not viable. Costs associated with the development were questioned, and Mr. Rosvall stated that there would be a difference of about \$60,000 with a basement. He further stated that the development construction costs are estimated to not exceed \$1.7 million plus the soft costs associated with the development. He stated that he did not want to increase the project costs as to avoid charging \$2,000 rents for the units.
- Commission members recommended looking into designing a designated area of the development as a tornado shelter, such as the proposed storage area. It was noted that the Zoning Code does not require this provision, and both the Fire and Police departments did not provide comments. It was suggested that the Code Review Committee may look into this if the Commission feels it should be a requirement within the Zoning Code. Mr. Rosvall stated that he would look into this possibility, or a small basement if viable, and he is also concerned for the safety of the potential residents.
- Drainage of the site was questioned. Mr. Rosvall stated that the proposed project has been reviewed by MSD and it is a formality now in terms of receiving final approval. Mr. Stanislav also noted that the grading and storm drainage plan included in the agenda packets is a requirement of the Site Plan Review procedure.
- How is the boundary along the east and west sides of the property going to be? Mr. Rosvall stated that there will be landscaping along the proposed parking area on the eastern property boundary. Mr. Stanislav also stated that the proposed landscaping in these areas either meets or exceeds what is required.
- The trees proposed for removal were discussed by the Commission. Mr. Rosvall stated that he would love to save as many trees as possible; however, it was not viable to save them all. He stated that he has been working with the City Forester on this issue and he will be required to pay the maximum amount for reimbursement into the tree fund as compensation.
- Will the parking area be secured? Mr. Rosvall stated that the parking area is not proposed to be gated and that not all properties along Cates Avenue have gated parking areas as well.

Ms. Holly requested staff's comments. Mr. Stanislav stated that staff recommends approval with the provision that 77 square feet of additional landscaping be added to the west of the proposed parking area to compensate for the deficiency of interior parking area landscaping, to be made up partially by the 383 square feet of proposed landscaping to the east.

Mr. Rosvall stated that he had a revised landscape plan including additional landscaping in the areas recommended by staff although he did not have time to submit prior to the meeting.

Public Comments – None.

A motion was made by Ms. Gainer to recommend approval of the Site Plan Review subject to staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Moran.

Ms. Holly called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Ms. Holly stated that the next step was for this item to be considered by City Council and staff would follow up with the applicant.

### **5.c. Conditional Use Permit – PC 18-05 – Amendment of an existing Conditional Use Permit for the proposed expansion of the existing BP gas station – 6700 Olive Boulevard**

Mr. Stanislav introduced the proposed Conditional Use Permit (C.U.P.) by providing background and contextual information. He stated that this application was subject to the Conditional Use Permit procedure considering that amendments to existing C.U.P.'s, with the exception of minor changes, require the submission of a new C.U.P. application as per Section 400.2790 of the Zoning Code. He provided information on the original C.U.P. (#238) and briefly described the project, including the intention to expand upon the abutting parcel to the west at 6714 Olive Boulevard. Mr. Stanislav also noted the findings of fact for which the application was to be reviewed as per Section 400.2720 of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Stanislav stated that since the staff report was issued, the applicant has revised the site plan to address various concerns, including an increase in the amount of pervious pavers to meet the 80 percent maximum site coverage allowed through a C.U.P. when used in the calculation, the addition of one parking space to the northeast to meet the minimum off-street parking requirements, and the depiction of the 15 space bike rack on the eastern portion of the site plan. Mr. Stanislav also noted that this application will be presented to Traffic Commission on April 11, 2018, both Olive Boulevard and Kingsland Avenue are County roads in this portion of the City, the Olive Boulevard Design Guidelines and Standards have been triggered and are depicted on the site plan, and also that all signage proposed will be reviewed through the sign permit process.

Representative of the applicant Southside Property, LLC, Civil Engineer Lorenzo Thompson provided an overview of the proposed project and described the enhanced aesthetics as part of the project. He noted that the property owner purchased 6714 Olive Boulevard for the expansion which increased the existing site coverage. He stated that the applicant made strong efforts to comply with the Design Guidelines and described a few of these elements noted on the site plan. He further noted that he has been working with Public Works to meet their requirements as well as the County, including a study of truck maneuverability that produced no issues. Mr. Thompson led the Commission through various plans provided in the agenda packets.

#### Questions / Comments / Discussion by Plan Commission:

- It was noted that there is a committee for stormwater in University City and adding to it may be a challenge. Mr. Thompson stated that he did not view this as a challenge as the pre- and post-development drainage will be released at the same rate as the current system per MSD requirements. It was noted that a zero increase may not necessarily be helpful if there currently exists an issue. Mr. Thompson stated that the system is developed to handle any additional water coming off of the subject site. He stated that MSD has reviewed and looked at downstream complaints and issues and a detention system will be installed if needed as to not surcharge anyone's system.
- Mr. Thompson provided a detailed explanation of the system and how it is designed to maintain pre-development drainage rates.
- It was questioned whether the tube as part of this system could be designed to lessen the rate from the current condition. Mr. Thompson stated that this would cause a backup on the subject property.

- Following further discussion, Ms. Williams stated that this project requires MSD approval and noted that the current site coverage of 98 percent is now proposed to be reduced to 80 percent with the use of pervious pavers.
- How much runoff is there from the pavers? Mr. Thompson stated that he was not sure at this time but that there is a certain quantity of water that would go into this area and the property owner would maintain the pavers to avoid any issues.
- The design and location of the fuel tank was questioned. Mike Jabbar, property owner of 6700 and 6714 Olive Boulevard, provided a sufficient description of the fuel tank design and functionality.
- It was confirmed that there would not be a carwash at this location.

Public Hearing – The public hearing portion of this agenda item opened at 7:40 pm.

- 1) Tom Sullivan, 751 Syracuse Ave. – stated that he would like the Plan Commission to delay this agenda item since this information was provided to the public including the agenda for this evening’s meeting on the City’s website. He stated that there is currently poor management of the gas station and that the site is not maintained, specifically noting the existing landscaping and advertisements on the western property fence. He stated that this gas station provides poor service to the public and has complained to BP in the past. He stated that he did not know who operates or owns the property and that the proposed expansion was not spelled out well.

Mr. Jabbar stated that he purchased 6714 Olive Boulevard approximately one year ago after multiple attempts over the years in an effort to expand this gas station. He stated that he purchased 6700 Olive Boulevard approximately ten years ago and there was not much he could do given the limitation of the size of the property to make improvements. He stated that the party who leased this property will be no longer and that he runs 42 stores and operates them efficiently and well. He acknowledged that the property looks in poor condition currently but noted that he intended to invest money on redeveloping and expanding the entire site to better conditions.

Once asked, Mr. Jabbar noted three local gas stations he has, including 701 Russell, 1187 South Kingshighway, and another location in Webster Groves at Big Bend and Murdoch. He stated that the current management leases the property month to month and that he has tried to purchase the abutting property for years. He also confirmed that the existing building on 6714 Olive Boulevard would be demolished and rebuilt as a new convenience store.

Hearing no further comments, the public hearing was closed at 7:49 pm.

Ms. Holly requested staff’s comments. Mr. Stanislav stated that staff recommends approval along with the conditions as identified in attachment “A” and the consideration of the recent revisions to the site plan presented earlier that bring the proposal into compliance and considering the pervious pavers as calculated into the site coverage.

There were no further public comments or questions of the Commission.

A motion was made by Ms. Head to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit along with the conditions as identified in attachment “A.” The motion was seconded by Ms. Gainer.

Ms. Holly called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Ms. Holly stated that the next step was for this item to be considered by City Council and staff would follow up with the applicant.

## **6. Other Business**

### **6.a. Public Comments (Limited to 3 minutes for individual's comments, 5 minutes for representatives of groups or organizations)**

There were no further public comments.

### **6.b. Discussion of Plan Commission member retreat/orientation session**

Ms. Williams noted that a retreat or training session would be a good idea given the number of relatively new members on the Plan Commission. She stated that she would like to establish an initial session to discuss items including the powers and duties of the Plan Commission, items felt to be in need of review, and types of training. It was noted that the session is intended to be about two hours.

It was also noted that the more detailed staff reports from this meeting provided more analysis to help the Commission members understand staff's position better which can also be discussed during the session, along with the Parkview Gardens Plan implementation, subscriptions and literature, and other examples of similar communities and their planning efforts. Staff will poll the Commission members for their availability.

## **7. Reports**

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

### **7.b. Comprehensive Plan Committee Report – None**

### **7.c. Council Liaison Report**

Mr. Jennings stated that this would be his last Plan Commission meeting and that it was a pleasure to serve with the Commission members. The Commission members thanked Mr. Jennings for his time and efforts.

### **7.d. Department Report**

Ms. Williams stated that the former Director of Community Development had resigned and that she has stepped in as Acting Director of Community Development effective March 12, 2018 for the interim. She stated that she is resigning from the Plan Commission but intends to help the Plan Commission get oriented and look into Zoning Code items to be revised as well as future planning projects.

It was asked if the position of Deputy Director of Community Development would be filled since the former Deputy Director resigned last year. Mr. Rose stated that he presented on Monday to the Mayor and City Council a proposed restructuring of the organization that would move Economic Development to the City Manager's Office. He also stated that he held a strategic

planning session with staff today at City Hall. The Comprehensive Plan update is proposed for FY19 with City Council's approval for additional funding.

Mr. Mulligan addressed the Commission stating that Ms. Williams was appointed as Acting Director on March 12, 2018, and per the Charter a member of the Plan Commission shall not hold any other office or position with the City, and she has effectively resigned and terminated her membership as of March 12, 2018. He stated that there is now a vacancy on the Commission. He also noted that the Plan Commission entertained a couple Site Plan matters this evening and recognized that staff noted this was not a requirement. He suggested that if the Plan Commission would want a more formal role there should be a Text Amendment stating what criteria they would like to review the site plans. He further included that the Plan Commission does have general supervisory authority although it is not required in the Zoning Code. He stated that he believes Council will appreciate this additional layer of review.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 pm.