

**Plan Commission**  
**September 12, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

The Plan Commission held a meeting at City Hall, 6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri, on Wednesday, September 12. The meeting commenced at 6:35pm

**1. Roll Call**

**Voting Members Present**

Cirri Moran  
Margaret Holly  
Michael Miller  
Ellen Hartz  
Cynthia Head  
Judith Gainer

**Voting Members Absent**

**Non-Voting Council Liaison Present**

Paulette Carr

**Staff Present**

Gregory Rose, City Manager  
John Mulligan, City Attorney  
Rosalind Williams, Acting Director of Planning and Development

**2. Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Miller noted that the minutes should include a draft watermark, since they have not been approved. July 25, 2018. Ms. Holly seconded. The motion to approve the September 12, 2018 minutes was carried unanimously.

**3. Public Hearings**

There were no public hearings.

**4. Old Business - none**

**5. New Business**

**A. Proposed development relating to accommodating development consistent with the prevailing pattern in neighborhoods.**

Chairperson Moran asked Planning Commissioners if they had any comments on the proposed amendment. Mr. Miller questioned the need for the phrase, "In the event" under Section 400.3080-A-1, since the original paragraphs 1 and 2 are to be eliminated. Everyone agreed, and the phrase was deleted.

Ms. Williams informed the Commission that after re-reading subsection B of Section 400.1020, she was no sure that the wording conveys the intent of this amendment. If the city is acknowledging that the prevailing area and width of the subdivisions on the list included in this amendment should become the dimensional requirement for that subdivision, then it does not need to be “granted by the Zoning Administrator” as stated in Subsection A. Subsection A is only needed to address an individual non-conforming lot in a subdivision not listed in the proposed amendment and that currently complies with the area and lot width requirements in the SR and LR Districts.

By the next Code Review Committee meeting, staff will redraft the introductory sentence to clarify that the area and width dimensions provide for each subdivision on the list are the minimum buildable lot dimensions for that subdivision. This change will allow lots of record that meet those minimums to be used to construct a single family structure as long as is meets the setback requirements of the SR or LR districts.

In the interim staff plans to produce maps that show the potential infill development that could result from this change and will invite comments from private subdivision on how these proposed changes would affect their indentures, if any.

**B. Proposed Text Amendment relating to the accessory structures in residential districts. (Sections 300.3090, 400.3100, and 400.1090)**

The proposed text amendment would accomplish two objectives: set a new 2 ½ ft. side and rear yard setback requirement for garages and carports; and allow for the reconstruction of a garage or car port on the existing footprint of the former garage or carport. Ms. Holly expressed her concern that the word “footprint” in # 4 was too restrictive and proposed that it be replace with the same provision as in #1 above. “...provided however, that no such reconstruction shall either create any additional non-conformity or increase the degree of existing non-conformity.”

Ms. Williams asked the Commission members if they understood that the new 2 ½ ft. side and rear yard setbacks proposed in this amendment would apply to all new garages and carports? Ms. Moran said that at the Code Review Committee meeting, they did not discuss this, only the non-conforming garages and carports. Mr. Rose suggested that this section go back to the Code Review Committee for further consideration.

**6. Other Business**

There were no public comments or other business.

**7. Reports:**

**A. Code Review Committee:** There were no other reports by the committee.

**B. Staff Report:** None

**C. Council Liaison Report:** Ms. Carr stated that the City Council will be bringing back the City/Washington University Study that was completed several years ago. The Council is giving serious consideration to implementing some of the recommendation in the report. Mr. Miller asked a question about the phasing of the Oliver/ 170 TIF project. How is the City assuring the redevelopment of the south side of Olive Boulevard? Mr. Rose could not talk in specifics because the redevelopment agreement is still being negotiated, but that the TIF Commission included a requirement that monies for the south side had to be available for Phase 2, before Phase one is begun.

**Adjournment:**

Meeting was adjourned at 7:02pm.