



Plan Commission

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

AGENDA

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

University City, Missouri City Hall - 5th Floor Council Chambers

6801 Delmar Avenue., University City, MO 63130

6:30 pm; Wednesday, November 20, 2019

- 1. Roll Call**
- 2. Approval of Minutes** – October 23, 2019 Plan Commission meeting
- 3. Hearings** - None
- 4. Old Business**
 - a. None
- 5. New Business**
 - a. **Text Amendment** – PC 19-11
Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements Text Amendment pertaining to Section 400.2140 – Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Space Requirements.
(VOTE REQUIRED)
- 6. Other Business**
 - a. Comprehensive Plan – Parkview Gardens Neighborhood Plan Discussion
- 7. Reports**
 - a. Council Liaison Report
- 8. Adjournment**

PLAN COMMISSION

Heman Park Community Center

975 Pennsylvania Ave., University City, MO 63130

6:30 pm; Wednesday, October 23, 2019

The Plan Commission held their regular meeting at Heman Park Community Center located at 975 Pennsylvania Avenue, University city, Missouri on Wednesday, October 23, 2019. The meeting commenced at 6:34pm and concluded at 9:42pm.

1. Roll Call

Voting Members Present

Michael Miller

Judith Gainer

Cirri Moran – Chair

Ellen Hartz

Cynthia Head

Mark Harvey

Voting Members Absent

Margaret Holly

Non-Voting Council Liaison

Paulette Carr

Staff Present

Gregory Rose, City Manager

John Mulligan, City Attorney

Clifford Cross, Director of Planning and Development

Adam Brown, Planner

2. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Hartz moved to approve minutes (with noted corrections) from Aug 28, seconded by Mike Miller. The motion passed unanimously.

3. New Business

- a. PC 19-06 – CUP for GBG Transportation LLC – request for a used car sales and vehicle service facility at 8550 Olive.

Mr. Cross introduced the application for the CUP at 8550 Olive Blvd, which he explained was two CUPs built into one request (two uses requiring a CUP). The primary proposed use was a vehicle service facility, and the accessory use was for used auto sales. Mr. Cross presented the underlying zoning, the former use (gas station), surrounding zoning, and reviewed the plan commission process and review criteria.

Mr. Cross stated that he had received one verbal concern about the request and its impact, and staff had concerns regarding landscape buffering between the business and the abutting residential properties.

Mr. Cross stated a staff recommendation which noted concerns for outdoor operations and outdoor sales as this was not the design of the original property. Staff did not recommend auto sales without further action to mitigate these activities. Mr. Cross described the Plan Commission's charge to use findings of fact to make their determination about the case.

Ms. Hartz clarified whether two CUPs were needed for this case, and Mr. Cross said they would both be included in a single action. Mr. Harvey asked if there were any businesses that were similar in uses that had been approved through CUP process. Mr. Cross said he was not aware of any that had passed through the process. There was discussion about the ability to recommend only one of the uses. There was discussion of the parking requirements for the two uses. Ms. Moran asked if there would be parking spaces set aside, and Mr. Cross pointed them to the applicant's sketch of the number of spaces. Mr. Cross recommended that if auto sales were approved the CUP could lock the number of cars for sale based on the number of spaces.

George Hopkin spoke on behalf of GBG Transportation. Mr. Hopkins said that the business would offer minor repairs that would not require overnight storage of vehicles on the lot. He said that the auto sales portion of the business was based on his passion for auto sales.

Mr. Hopkins said hours of operation will be from 8-5, 7-4, 8-6, 6 days a week and closed on Sundays. Ms. Moran asked about the auto sales portion and how many cars would be stored on the lot for sale. Mr. Hopkins replied that about 10-15 cars would be stored on the lot, and he would be selling 10-15 cars per month, which would generate an

estimated \$10,000 per month in taxes for University City. GBG would be doing emissions and safety inspections. Mr. Hopkins said that he is motivated to provide these services to the community. Mr. Hopkins stressed that only the kind of repairs that could be completed in one day would be performed. He said that cars for sale could be prepared for sale in the facility.

Mr. Cross pointed out that per code there is a distinction between vehicle service and vehicle repair facilities, and so the code makes a distinction between these uses.

Mr. Hopkins described plans to beautify the property, as well as the means by which waste materials would be disposed of. He said any cars that needed to stay overnight would be kept in the bays. He also pointed out that Honest Repairs in University City sells used cars.

Public Hearing

Richard Lacey, 1109 N McKnight Road, spoke on behalf of himself and his wife. They are unhappy with the amount of traffic on McKnight Road in the last ten years. He asked for a vote "no" on the auto sales portion of the business. He felt that traffic would be increased by the auto sales use, due to the tendency to test drive cars fast and loudly.

Roberta Stewart, 1107 Midiron Avenue spoke and expressed concern about increased traffic due to the business. She was specifically concerned about the number of cars on the lot and the size of the lot not allowing for customers to get service on the lot. She said she spoke on behalf of several neighbors, and she believes the tanks are still in the ground because she has not seen any construction.

Donovan Henry, 8441 Crixdale, spoke and said his concern was the TIF and the resulting traffic from that project in addition to this business, and that he also concerned about the stacking of tires on the property, and asked about enforcement of the CUP conditions.

Mubeen Mahmoud, 6800 Olive Boulevard, he stated that because it was a Shell gas station, there is a very good chance the Phase 1, Phase 2 would have been performed and that the disposal for old oil, etc, was most likely there.

Diana Schaefer, 20 Allen Ave, Webster Groves, spoke on behalf of Novus Development. She felt that this use would not be an appropriate, highest and best use for the property, because it would be in the view of the \$200 million development planned for that corner.

Ms. Moran asked, in light of the Novus speaker, how to relate this project to a comp plan from 2005, which did not have the Novus plan involved. Mr. Cross said that the Plan Commission must make a judgement based on the information that is available.

Mr. Miller asked if this had gone before the traffic commission, and Mr. Cross said it has not been. He stated that the Plan Commission could refer this to the Traffic Commission if they wished to.

Mr. Hopkins addressed the concerns about test driving. He said in 25 years he has not allowed people to drive alone on a test drive and would not allow people to do anything unsafe in the vehicle. He also noted that his business plans to cut off two of four entrances to the lot to help prevent traffic incidents.

Ms. Moran asked if there was a current buffer between the site and residential properties. Mr. Cross said there was limited buffering in place. Ms. Moran asked what buffer would be required, and Mr. Cross described the traditional buffer. Mr. Cross felt that a proper buffer would be possible based on the layout of the property.

Mr. Miller stated he preferred to state as two separate motions. Mr. Cross stated that this would be a decision between two uses on one lot or a primary and accessory uses.

Ms. Hartz said that used car sales are not always a bad use but asked if the business could do without the Used Car Sales sign. Mr. Hopkins stated that they would like to be in for a three-year lease with an option to buy, and Mr. Hopkins stated that if they bought this property, they would look into the issues that the Plan Commission brought up.

Mr. Harvey made a motion to separate the CUPs, and Ms. Hartz seconded. Mr. Miller amended the motion to approve the CUP for vehicle repair and deny the vehicle sales portion of the CUP. Mr. Harvey ceded to Mr. Miller's motion. Mr. Cross said he recommended the applicant could withdraw his application for both. Ms. Head asked for clarity about staff's recommendation not to allow the vehicle sales was based on the ordinance that requires new car sales along with used car sales.

Mr. Miller's motion with Ms. Hartz's second was voted on and passed unanimously. The amended CUP is approved unanimously.

- b. PC 19-07 – CUP for Green to Cure, Inc. – a request to open a medical marijuana dispensary at 6800 Olive Blvd.

Green to Cure Inc. requested a CUP for Medical Marijuana Dispensary at 6800 Olive Boulevard. Mr. Cross summarized the application from Mubeen Investment Group. He described the surrounding zoning, noting that the building is multi-tenant, and that surrounding zoning includes residential. He described the property with improvements and included the fact that there are 26 parking spaces, which is the exact number of parking required for retail space of this size. Mr. Cross reviewed the standards for medical marijuana uses adopted by ordinance for University City, which requires 500 feet to church, school, or daycare, and a 150-foot separation from residential properties from entrance of business to lot line of the residential lot.

Staff's primary concern is that the location does not meet buffer requirement for 150 feet to residential property, and Mr. Cross reminded the Commission that a precedent could be set by this case. Staff would consider this as another retail use and would not administratively add landscaping based on the use. He said staff would want to see some mitigation of the 150-foot buffer. Mr. Cross also noted that CUP approval is only

part of the state licensing process, and approval by University City may not lead to the use being approved by the state.

Ms. Gainer asked about buffering – what the intent of buffering would be, whether to physically prevent access or as a visual barrier. Mr. Cross stated that landscaping is used to make incompatible uses less incompatible – it is to separate two incompatible uses.

Takir spoke on behalf of Health to Cure, the applicant. He stated that the reason they are applying here in U City is because the ordinance has been passed. He stated that the medical use of marijuana would improve the community.

There was discussion among the commissioners about the regulations around sale and use, which Mr. Cross explained was clearly regulated as part of the state's regulations.

Public Hearing:

James Jordan, 6809 Vernon Ave, lives within the 150-foot buffer, and said he surveyed some other neighbors, and none of them want this business in the neighborhood. He said that he didn't have a problem with the marijuana, but that the people who frequent that area are thugs and that something bad could happen and the store will get broken into.

The building owner, Mubeen Lamude, 6800 Olive Boulevard, spoke to security concerns, and that the dispensary is highly regulated, and that it is not their job to educate the "thugs", and the dispensary would bring more security than what the area already has (a security guard).

Mr. Cross clarified that the state buffer was 1000 feet between the use and residential properties. 150 feet was University City's requirement. Mr. Harvey asked what the logic of the 150-foot limit was. Mr. Cross stated that the logic on the 150 feet was that it was within the 185-foot public notice area required by ordinance.

Ms. Gainer moved to deny the CUP application, Ms. Head seconded.

Ms. Moran agreed with the motion, and discussed the fact that making an exception on the first application would be inappropriate.

The motion passed unanimously.

- c. PC 19-08 – application by Sprint to install new wireless equipment on an existing facility at 7547 Olive Boulevard.

Mr. Cross described the conditions of the property, and the surrounding zoning uses. Mr. Cross explained that the new antennas would go on the exterior of the flagpole and may change the look of the flagpole. This made it ineligible for the fast track portion and required a CUP.

Staff concerns were matching the color of the pole and whether it affects use of the flagpole. No public input was given to staff. Staff does not feel this would significantly change the look of the flagpole and have no opposition to this request.

Tim Moya, 1339 Palm Ridge, from Sprint, explained that the three new antennas would greatly expand the service to the community. Mr. Miller asked how much the antennas weigh, and Mr. Moya said they are several hundred pounds each. The antennas will be at 75 feet. Mr. Miller's concerns were in high winds and ice. Mr. Moya said poles only fall due to debris from major weather events. Mr. Miller asked about other safety concerns such as radiation. Mr. Moya said the FCC regulates those concerns.

Public Hearing opened and closed with no speakers

Ms. Gainer moved to approve the CUP, seconded by Mr. Miller with condition that no advertising would be on the pole, and paint would match the pole. Ms. Gainer amended the motion to include the conditions. Mr. Harvey seconded the amended motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- d. PC 19-09 – request by ALP Acquisition - CUP to amend map at 8400 Delmar to be rezoned as a Planned Development, and for preliminary site plan approval.

Mr. Cross explained that the applicant needs a zoning verification letter, and reassurance that the plan is being reviewed favorably to obtain property. He described the conditions of the site, three lots that would be consolidated into one lot. He clarified it is a 50,000 square foot office building. He described the surrounding zoning. Mr. Cross explained the process of a rezoning request. The second request is for a resolution by Council for preliminary plan approval.

Mr. Cross outlined the specifics of the proposal in terms of square footage and uses of the buildings, including indoor parking spaces (338 spaces total). He explained again the two actions needed; a zoning map amendment recommended to Council, and recommendation of a preliminary plan review to go to council.

Staff Concerns/Criteria; Mr. Cross stated that the density of the use is in the ball park of the Crown Center. The floor area ratio, for a multi-family district is 2.0, and a waiver would be needed for FAR of 3.68. Staff calculated parking including shared parking ratios, which would be 502 required spaces. Shared parking is about a 10% decrease in parking requirements. A waiver would be needed for the proposed 338 parking spaces. Lot consolidation would be required prior to permitting. Staff also recommends approved engineering plans and landscaping plans as part of plan review process. He reviewed the comprehensive plan intention for this area. This was identified as redevelopment area 9 in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, which called for mixed use concept (the plan is consistent with the redevelopment area). He described the surrounding zoning for the site.

Mr. Cross concluded that the parking waiver would need to be a 32.5% reduction, the waiver for FAR would be an increase of 1.68, and that lot consolidation required prior to any permits.

Ms. Carr asked about Council's ability to reduce parking, which Mr. Cross said would not be applicable because it is a new use. Ms. Carr clarified that this would have to be a waiver. Mr. Cross explained that the applicant would need to demonstrate the manner by which the parking requirement would be met in some way. Ms. Carr asked if the ordinance could have a contingency based on the project not moving forward. Ms. Carr asked if the landscape buffers between Crown Center and this project could be combined. Ms. Carr asked about storm water run-off. Mr. Cross explained this would be part of the engineering, but this project is actually reducing impervious surface. The applicant has already started a traffic study, and Sinan is working with St. Louis County to get comments. Mr. Miller asked if police and fire have been notified. Mr. Cross said they had, and he has not received comment back. Mr. Cross stated he would seek a positive response from Fire and Police.

Vic Allston spoke on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Allston described the project and why his group had chosen this location in University City. He commented on their reason for the parking ratio based on other developments, and the quality of the hotel as well as the size and typology of the apartments they are seeking to develop.

Mr. Miller asked if the apartments would be purchased or leased. Mr. Allston said they would be leases. Mr. Miller asked about parking – whether one to one is needed. Mr. Allston said about 10% would not have a car, and others who needed a second space could purchase that. Mr. Miller asked about the restaurants, Mr. Allston said they have not decided on the use, but described several options including QSR (quick service restaurants), or a grocer/market, which would be amenities for the development and the neighborhood. There would be parking reserved for the retail. He said there are 30-40 stalls extra on top of the 1 to 1 parking.

Mr. Miller asked if the parking would be paid parking even for retail spaces. Mr. Allston explained that the parking would be monetized one way or another. He said they intend to have parking prices included in hotel and apartment.

Mr. Miller expressed concerns about the ingress and egress to the development based on the proximity to I 170 and to other developments. Ms. Moran reiterated that this would be a preliminary plan approval, but that these questions would be addressed as part of plan review. Mr. Miller suggested that there could be an Uber or taxi bay in the hotel area.

Ms. Gainer asked if it was possible to reduce the number of units to reduce the parking, and the applicant responded that this could make the project financially infeasible.

Mr. Cross stated that staff needed to review exception to parking and the possibility of a waiver needed to be reviewed.

Mr. Harvey asked about the use of the hotel for meetings and what the parking requirements would be for that space, and Mr. Allston stated that it would be used for small presentations, sales meetings, etc, and that the users would be staying in the hotel.

Mr. Allston introduced Lee Cannon with CBB, who will be leading the parking study and traffic study. Mr. Cannon described the parking factors that his company would examine in a

parking study, including peaking hours, as well as traffic conditions that would be examined in collaboration with MODOT, St. Louis County, and University City's Department of Public Works.

Mr. Cross recommended that we table the request in order to clarify the possibility of parking exceptions. Mr. Miller moved to table the request, Mr. Harvey seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Mulligan asked Mr. Cannon about when the traffic study would be completed. Mr. Cannon said that may depend on the next meeting. Mr. Cross stated that a meeting in November on the last Wed of the month, and Mr. Cannon stated he could have that study ready before that meeting.

- e. PC 19-10 – a text amendment to strike an amendment in the parking code which allowed new construction to avoid parking requirements.

Ms. Hartz noted a typo in the summary of amendment 2.

Mr. Miller moved to strike amendment, Ms. Gainer seconded, the motion carried unanimously.

4. Other Business

Mr. Cross told the Commission there were four submittals for the Comprehensive Plan Update, and these would be shared with the Commission. He said staff was still evaluating when a Plan Commission retreat would be possible.

Mr. Miller asked about the signatures on applications. Mr. Cross explained that we verify ownership, etc. on these applications. Mr. Miller expressed that it is good to know who has signed. Mr. Cross said staff would look at processes.

5. Council Liaison Report

Ms. Carr noted the City's logo had been changed back to the previous design. There was discussion about progress on the Olive/170 development.

Ms. Moran asked about the Delmar Harvard Building. Ms Carr said it has been purchased by a developer, who is designing what they put in, and they are considering a hotel. She said the consultant completed study on annex and whether a police station could go in the annex. Now a needs analysis is being done for all city buildings. She also noted that EMS has been reinstated in control of the Fire Department.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42pm.

Prepared by Adam Brown



Department of Community Development

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

DRAFT M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Plan Commission Members

CASE: PC 19-11

FROM: Clifford Cross, Director of Planning

DATE: November 13, 2019

SUBJECT: November 20, 2019 Plan Commission meeting – Proposed Text Amendment relating to the schedule of off-street parking requirements (*SECTION 400.2140 – Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Space Requirements*)

CC: Gregory Rose, City Manager
John Mulligan, City Attorney

At the upcoming Plan Commission meeting, members will consider a text amendment to the zoning code pertaining to the parking schedule associated with off-street parking requirements *SECTION 400.2140 – Off-Street Vehicle Parking Space Requirements*.

This code revision is a proposed solution as part of a continuous effort to address concerns to appropriately allow for continued adaptive re-use of commercial buildings that have limited on-site parking. Furthermore, as with prior amendments, this revision is also intended to better meet the Zoning Code's intent that provisions are in place to accommodate adaptive reuse of existing buildings while requiring new development or substantial development to meet on-site or shared parking requirements. The intent, of this proposed amendment, is to effectively address limited parking obstacles associated with established multi-unit commercial buildings while preventing excessive on street parking demands that result from new developments that do not provide the appropriate number of approved on-site or off-site parking spaces. Staff believes this amendment appropriately regulates the parking requirement schedule to accommodate Barber/Beauty Shops, Nail Salons and Spas that are established within existing retail businesses or multi-unit buildings while still requiring more intense parking standards associated with standalone Barber/Beauty Shops, Nail Salons or Spas.

Summary of Amendment. This amendment pertains to the schedule of parking demands pertaining to Barber/Beauty Shops, Nail Salons and Spas as a secondary use or within an existing multi-unit building. Specifically, the intent of this ordinance is to account for these retail related uses that are commonly utilized in conjunction with associated businesses or an accessory to a primary business. Therefore, staff has evaluated other communities, that address the parking schedule associated with these types of businesses, and they are predominately regulated based upon square footage instead of the number of stations. Based upon staff findings, associated with their research, the proposed amendment proposes to regulate accessory or multi-unit building shops, salons and spas based upon square footage insuring we are consistent with the industry trends. Lastly, this amendment also removes the principal use delineation but would still require the 3 space for each station requirement for Barber/Beauty Shops, Nail Salons and Spas when associated with standalone facilities or structures.

In evaluating the various other communities, the three communities identified included Creve Coeur, Clayton and Maplewood. All these communities regulate Barber/Beauty Shops, Nail Salons or Spas based upon the following;

1. Creve Coeur defined their “Hair, nail and skin care services” based upon the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). After classifying the use, the schedule regulating the use requires *“Four (4) parking spaces per one thousand (1,000) square feet of floor area”*. This provision is identified within Section 405.820, Subsection H (Services) of their zoning ordinance.
2. Clayton appears to classify this type of use within their *“Commercial, business, office, service and industrial buildings except for medical office as defined in Subsection (13)”* provisions of their zoning code. Specifically, they require 1 space for every 300 square feet of gross floor area. Article XXV, Section 405.3620, Subsection A(13) of their code states *“Commercial, business, office, service and industrial buildings must provide one (1) parking space for each three hundred (300) square feet of gross floor area within the building or structure”*.
3. Maplewood classifies this use as *“Retail business developments not otherwise specified”*. Chapter 56 (Zoning Ordinance), Section 56-500(3b) of their ordinance requires 1 space for every 200 square feet. *Their provisions state “Retail business developments not otherwise specified. A parking space shall be provided for each 200 square feet of floor area including basement or other areas useable or adjustable without structural alterations”*. The only exception they have is pertaining to commercial trade schools that require 1 space for each 3 students. However, our current schedule identifies that same requirement per our “Schools, business, professional, or technical schools” use classification.

The proposed amendment is as follows;

Barber and beauty shops and/or nail salons or spas (as a <u>principal use standalone facility/structure</u>)	3 spaces for each haircut or styling station, nail station, or massage room
Barber and beauty shops and/or nail salons or spas (secondary use or within an existing multi-unit building)	<u>1 space for each 200 square feet of floor area</u>

Staff believes the proposed text amendment, to address the specific parking schedule pertaining to Barber/Beauty Shops, Nail Salons and Spas, is consistent with the industry standards and other local communities. Furthermore, the proposal places us with the most restrictive of the 3 communities in that we would ultimately utilize the 1 space for every 200 square feet ratio for multi-unit buildings and still require 1 space per 3 stations for standalone facilities/structures. In summary, the proposed text amendment is intended to insure we are consistent with the industry standard while still providing appropriate restrictions pertaining to new developments that could negatively contribute to increased potential off-site on street parking throughout the City.

INTRODUCED BY: _____

DATE: _____

BILL NO. _____

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 400 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, RELATING TO ZONING, BY AMENDING SECTION 400.2140 THEREOF, RELATING TO OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REQUIREMENTS; CONTAINING A SAVINGS CLAUSE AND PROVIDING A PENALTY.

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

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 and off-street parking on which the premises located therein may be put; and

WHEREAS, the City Plan Commission in a meeting held at the City Council Chambers at City Hall located at 6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri on November 20, 2019, at 6:30 pm recommended an amendment of Section 400.2140 of the University City Zoning Code, and

WHEREAS, due notice of a public hearing to be held by the City Council in the 5th Floor City Council Chambers at City Hall at 6:30 pm, December 9, 2019, was duly published in the St. Louis Countian, a newspaper of general circulation within said City on November 21, 2019; and

WHEREAS, said public hearing was held at the time and place specified in said notice, and all suggestions or objections concerning said amendment 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. That Chapter 400 of the Municipal Code of the City of University City, Missouri, relating to zoning, is hereby amended, by amending the following Section relating to the schedule of off-street parking identified within section 400.2140 – Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Space Requirements; and as so amended shall read as follows (where applicable, underlined text is added text and stricken text is removed):

Section 400.2140

A. Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Space Requirements.

[R.O. 2011 §34-94.2; Ord. No. 6139 §1(Exh. A (part)), 1997; Ord. No. 6158 §1, 1998; Ord. No. 6989 §1, 4-27-2015]

USE	MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS
Amusement centers (indoor)	1 space for each 50 square feet devoted to amusement devices, virtual reality games, restaurants and bar areas
Amusement centers (outdoor)	1 space for each 200 square feet of enclosed building space devoted to customer service and administration; plus 1 space for every 3 persons that the outdoor facilities are designed to accommodate when used to the maximum capacity
Animal hospitals, veterinary clinics, boarding facilities, and grooming facilities	1 space for each 200 square feet of floor area
Art galleries and studios	1 space for each 500 square feet of floor area
Automobile and truck sales, rental, and leasing	1 space for each 400 square feet of floor area of sales and showroom area
Banks and other financial institutions	1 space for each 200 square feet of floor area (see also drive-through facilities)
Barber and beauty shops and/or nail salons or spas (as a principal use standalone facility/structure)	3 spaces for each haircut or styling station, nail station, or massage room
Barber and beauty shops and/or nail salons or spas (secondary use or within an existing multi-unit building)	1 space for each 200 square feet of floor area
Billiard parlors	(see Amusement centers, indoor)
Bingo halls	(see Places of public assembly)
Bowling alleys	(see Sports and recreation facilities)
Car wash, full-service (as a principal use, with or without automated washing equipment)	8 spaces; plus 10 stacking spaces for each washing bay
Car wash, full-service (as an accessory use, with or without automated washing equipment)	3 stacking spaces for each washing bay
Car wash, self-service	4 stacking spaces for each washing bay; plus 1 parking space per washing bay for drying vehicles; plus 2 stacking spaces for each vacuuming station which is separated from the stacking lanes to the washing bays
Clubs and lodges	1 space for every 3 persons based on design occupancy load per the University City Building Code
Convalescent and nursing homes	1 space for every 3 patients based on designed maximum capacity

Convenience stores	(see Grocery store)
Day care centers	1 space for every 5 individuals cared for as authorized by State licensing
Dormitories	2 spaces for every 3 beds based on the designed maximum capacity
Drive-through facilities (except as otherwise specified in this Section)	5 stacking spaces for each customer service station, including drive-up service windows, drive-up automated teller machines (ATM), drive-up banking service lanes, but not including drive-up public telephones. Parking circulation aisles shall not be utilized to satisfy this requirement.
Dwellings, multi-family (including elevator, garden, and town house buildings)	1.5 spaces for each dwelling unit, except that spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit containing 2 or more bedrooms; plus visitor parking for dwellings with 6 or more dwelling units, at the rate of 1 parking space for each 6 dwelling units or fraction thereof for the first 30 dwelling units and 1 space for each additional 20 dwelling units
Dwellings, single-family (including attached single-family, detached single-family, and patio dwellings)	2 spaces for each dwelling unit
Dwellings, two-family	2 spaces for each dwelling unit, except that 1.5 spaces may be provided for each dwelling unit in unified developments containing at least 8 two-family or attached single-family dwellings and subject to approval under the "Planned Development" procedure
Funeral homes or mortuaries	1 space for each 75 square feet of parlor or chapel area or 1 space for every 5 fixed seats, whichever is greater, but no less than 20 spaces for each parlor or chapel
Furniture or appliance stores	1 space for each 400 square feet of floor area
Gasoline stations	2 spaces; Gasoline stations offering other retail goods for sale, in enclosed space accessible by the customer, shall also comply with the parking requirements for convenience stores. Gasoline stations providing vehicle repair or maintenance services shall also comply with the parking requirements for vehicle repair or service facilities. Gasoline station having accessory car wash facilities shall provide vehicle stacking spaces in accordance with car wash, full service
Gymnasiums	(see Sports and recreation facilities and Places of public assembly)

Hotels or motels	1.1 spaces for every rental unit; plus spaces as required herein for affiliated uses such as restaurants, meeting rooms or banquet facilities
Laundromats, self-service	1 space for each 200 <u>250</u> square feet
Manufacturing, warehousing and wholesale uses	1 space for each 1,000 square feet of floor area or 2 spaces for every 3 employees, whichever is greater; plus 1 space for each vehicle customarily used in the operation of the use or stored on the premises; plus spaces as required herein for affiliated uses such as office or retail sales area
Movie theaters	(see Places of public assembly)
Offices, other than dental and medical offices, or offices associated with banking or other financial institutions	1 space for each 300 square feet of floor area, including the basement if used or adaptable to office use
Offices, dental and medical (including outpatient medical clinics, surgery centers, MRI centers, chiropractor offices, and similar uses)	1 space for each 200 square feet of floor area, including the basement if used or adaptable to office use
Places of public assembly (including auditoriums, banquet halls, gymnasiums with spectator seating, meeting rooms, reception halls, sports facilities with spectator seating, theaters, and similar uses)	1 space for every 3.5 seats in the main assembly room (1 seat equals 2 feet of bench length); or where no fixed seating is provided, 1 space for each 50 square feet of floor area, exclusive of kitchen, restrooms and storage areas; plus spaces as required herein for affiliated uses
Places of worship	1 space for every 3.5 seats in the main assembly room (1 seat equals 2 feet of bench length)
Plumbing, heating, and air-conditioning equipment sales or service	1 space for each 300 square feet of floor area devoted to sales area; plus 1 space for each vehicle customarily used in the operation of the use or stored on the premises
Restaurants, bars, and taverns	1 space for each 75 square feet of gross floor area (GFA)
Restaurants, providing drive-through service only	8 stacking spaces for each service window; plus 2 spaces for each customer service window
Restaurants, providing carry-out service only	1 space for each 200 square feet of floor area
Retail stores, retail specialty shops, grocery, and service establishments not elsewhere specified in this Section	1 space for each 200 square feet of floor area;
Schools, elementary, junior high, and middle schools (public or private)	1 space for every 20 students based on building design capacity
Schools, high schools	1 space for every 7 students based on building design capacity
Schools, business, professional, or technical schools	1 space for every 3 students based on program capacity

Senior living facilities	0.75 spaces per dwelling unit
Sports and recreational facilities:	
Bowling alleys	5 spaces for each bowling lane; plus spaces otherwise required for any additional uses such as restaurants, bars, and indoor amusement centers
Gymnasiums without spectator seating	1 space for each 100 square feet of floor area (not applicable to gymnasiums associated with schools);
Ice and roller skating rinks	1 space for each 100 square feet of skating area; plus spaces otherwise required for spectator seating
Racquet sport courts, including handball, racquetball, squash, and tennis courts	3 spaces for each court; plus spaces otherwise required for spectator seating
Recreation centers, general purpose	1 space for each 300 square feet of floor area
Swimming pools	1 space for each 75 square feet of pool area, including patio areas; plus spaces otherwise required for spectator seating
Vehicle repair or service facilities	4 spaces for each service/repair bay or station; plus 1 space for each vehicle customarily used in the operation of the use or stored on the premises
Warehousing, self-service storage	5 spaces for the first 5,000 square feet of storage area; plus 1 space for each additional 5,000 square feet of storage area

Section 2. This ordinance shall not be construed to so as to relieve any person, firm or corporation from any penalty heretofore incurred by the violation of said Sections mentioned above, nor bar the prosecution for any such violation.

Section 3. Any person, firm or corporation violating any of the provisions of this ordinance, shall upon conviction thereof, be subject to the penalty provided in Title 1 Chapter 1.12.010 of the Municipal Code of the City of University City.

Section 4. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage as provided by law.

PASSED this _____ day of _____, _____.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT AS TO FORM:

CITY ATTORNEY