

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE
Monday, July 13, 2020
6:30 p.m.

A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

At the Regular Session of the City Council of University City held via videoconference, on Monday, July 13, 2020, Mayor Terry Crow called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

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

Councilmember Stacy Clay
Councilmember Aleta Klein
Councilmember Steven McMahon
Councilmember Jeffrey Hales
Councilmember Tim Cusick
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also, in attendance were City Manager, Gregory Rose; City Attorney, John F. Mulligan, Jr., and Planning & Zoning Director, Clifford Cross.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilmember Smotherson moved to approve the Agenda as presented, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.

D. PROCLAMATIONS

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. June 15, 2020, Study Session – FY21 Budget & Public Hearing were moved by Councilmember Cusick, it was seconded by Councilmember Klein and the motion carried unanimously, with the exception of Councilmember McMahon who abstained due to his absence.
2. June 22, 2020, Regular Meeting Minutes were moved by Councilmember Hales, it was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson and the motion carried unanimously.

F. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

1. Kristen Sobotka is nominated for **reappointment** to the Urban Forestry Commission by Councilmember Hales. It was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.
2. Malik Johnson is nominated as a fill-in to the Urban Forestry Commission, replacing Irving Logan's expired/vacant seat by Councilmember Stacy Clay. It was seconded by Councilmember Hales and the motion carried unanimously.
3. Michael Hart is nominated as a fill-in to the Library Board, replacing Rubina Stewart-McCadney's unexpired term by Councilmember Stacy Clay. It was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.
4. Thomas Jennings is nominated for **reappointment** to the Pension Board by Councilmember McMahon. It was seconded by Councilmember Hales and the motion carried unanimously.
5. Tim Dugan is nominated for **reappointment** to the Green Practices Commission by Councilmember Cusick. It was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson and the motion carried unanimously.

Procedures for submitting comments for Citizen Participation and Public Hearings:

*ALL written comments must be received **no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.** Comments may be sent via email to: councilcomments@ucitymo.org, or mailed to the City Hall – 6801 Delmar Blvd. – Attention City Clerk. Such comments will be provided to City Council prior to the meeting. Comments will be made a part of the official record and made accessible to the public online following the meeting.*

*Please note, when submitting your comments, a **name and address must be provided.** Please also note if your comment is on an agenda or non-agenda item. If a name and address are not provided, the provided comment will not be recorded in the official record.*

G. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Mayor Crow stated Council appreciates the citizens who have taken the time to contact them via email or letter. All comments have been reviewed and will be made a part of this record.

H. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Map Amendment – Rezone 711 Kingsland Avenue (Tru Hotel)

Mayor Crow opened the Public Hearing at 6:35 p.m. He noted that Council had received two comments from citizens regarding this matter, and closed the hearing at 6:35 p.m.

I. CONSENT AGENDA

1. U City in Boom Landscape Maintenance Agreement
2. Set Public Hearing on the Crown Center for Senior Living – 353 Redevelopment Plan

Councilmember Clay moved to approve both items on the Agenda, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.

J. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

1. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) – Construct & Operate a Proposed Total Access Urgent Care Medical Office

Mr. Rose stated staff is recommending that a CUP for the construction and operation of a Total Access Urgent Care Medical Office be considered for approval by Council.

Clifford Cross, Director of Planning & Zoning stated the proposed site for this office is the Old Pasta House building located in a Limited Commercial Zoning District. And while it is a permitted use, the City's Supplemental Regulation requires that any use over 3500 square feet go through the CUP process. This allows Council with an opportunity to review these types of in-fill developments that are typically located adjacent to Residential Districts.

The applicant appeared before the Planning Commission where a Public Hearing was conducted. Hearing no opposition to the proposal, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval with the following conditions: that an Application for a Building Permit be submitted within six months after the current tenant has vacated the premises, and the CUP be extended for a period not to exceed three years.

Mr. Cross stated the issue prompting these conditions is that the current tenant has a two-year lease which they would like to terminate early. So by waiving the one-year CUP restriction, the Commission's intent was to provide the applicant with the flexibility they needed to control their demolition and construction schedule.

Councilmember Hales asked if the applicant would be purchasing or leasing the property? Mr. Cross stated the applicant's primary goal is to demolish the building and construct a new building in its place. And this step is to ensure that they have everything in place before executing the Purchase Agreement. Councilmember Hales questioned whether his assumption that the contractor was also on board with these optional timeframes, was correct? Mr. Cross stated that is correct.

Councilmember Smotherson asked whether the existing tenant had identified a new location?

Mr. Cross stated to his knowledge, they have not, and he is also unaware if any incentives or discussions to help them with relocating has taken place.

Councilmember Smotherson asked Mr. Rose if the City had approached Pasta House about relocating within U City? Mr. Rose stated to date, they have not, but it is certainly a conversation they plan to have with them in the future.

John Mulligan, City Attorney stated his notes reflect that the Pasta House lease expires in June of 2023; which is roughly three years. And while the Applicant did mention their intent to commence negotiations regarding the early termination of their lease, there was no discussion about the tenant's plans to relocate.

He stated he would agree that what makes this application a bit unusual is the Code requirement that substantial construction or operations be completed within a year. And if those requirements have not been met by the designated timeframe then Council has the authority to grant an extension. So in this instance, the Applicant is asking Council to grant that extension upfront rather than coming back at the end of that one year.

Mayor Crow stated over the last ten years this faction of healthcare has changed dramatically and the desire of these urgent care facilities seems to be to establish their footprint in as many places as possible. However, the nature of this business makes it pretty capital intensive, so he can understand why they would request this type of extension. He stated while it's too early in the game to make a determination as to whether this industry will be sustainable, there could be a risk associated with allowing the influx of too many facilities in one area.

Mr. Rose stated from a development perspective, he thinks the Applicant's request is based on their desire to minimize their exposure prior to purchasing this property, in the event Council does not grant their request or they are unable to reach an amenable agreement.

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

Councilmember Hales questioned whether the Code recognizes these kinds of facilities or any potential conflicts that might arise as they continue to evolve in the future? Mr. Cross stated this is the type of insight covered in a Comprehensive Plan and the reason why they should be reevaluated every five years; to reflect industry shifts and trends. The City's Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan are relatively old and identifies permitted uses for traditional land use classifications like Commercial, Industrial, Residential, Institutional, and Governmental. In this case, the Code generically identifies these facilities as medical offices and stipulates that any use over 3500 square feet in a Limited Commercial District shall require a CUP. Mr. Cross stated he hopes that the new Comprehensive Plan will focus on character areas that allow you to build and drive future uses that fit into a neighborhood, rather than the current blanket land use designations.

Voice vote on Councilmember Smotherson's motion carried unanimously.

2. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) – PC 20-01 – Approval of a Conditional Use Permit to establish and operate a proposed “Medical Marijuana Dispensary”.

Mr. Rose stated staff is recommending that Council approve a CUP to establish and operate a proposed Medical Marijuana Dispensary.

Mr. Cross stated in January of 2019, the State adopted legislation for medical marijuana in the following categories: Dispensaries, Infused Manufacturing Centers, Testing Centers, and Cultivation Centers. And while regulations regarding the operation of these entities fall under the authority of the State, this legislation allows local municipalities to establish standards concerning the location of these businesses.

So, in April of 2019. Council approved a text amendment allowing for medical marijuana dispensaries in core Commercial and general Commercial Zoning Districts, with these conditions:

- That applicants apply for a CUP;
- That dispensaries not be located within 500 feet of a church or school, and
- That dispensaries not be located within 150 feet of a residentially zoned lot

Applicants interested in operating these facilities must first be approved by the State, and in February of 2020, U City received its first application for 6662 Delmar. The application was reviewed by the Planning Commission and although the use appeared to be appropriate, the major concern was that the site did not have the required number of parking spaces for this business, so the item was tabled. Mr. Cross noted that the current structure consists of 2,000 square feet of suites with approximately 50 parking spaces and that the requirement for the dispensary is 10 spaces.

On June 8th the Commission met again and recommended approval subject to the applicant's ability to meet the requirements of Section 400.2130, Subsection C of the Zoning Code which gives Council the authority to approve an off-site lease agreement located within 500 feet of the business. Mr. Cross stated the Applicant has indicated their willingness to enter into a long-term lease agreement with the City for 10 spaces on Parking Lot #4, which must be executed before the issuance of an Occupancy Permit.

Councilmember Cusick asked whether those 10 spaces would be designated for this business only? Mr. Rose stated these spaces would not be exclusive to the business and parking would remain on a first-come, first-serve basis. He stated the reason for that decision is twofold. One, a first-come, first-serve precedent has already been established with Wash U who currently leases spaces in the garage. And two, staff's recommendation to Council will be that portions of the revenue received from these leases go towards the expansion of Parking Lot #4. Councilmember Cusick questioned whether a rate had been established for leasing those 10 spaces? Mr. Rose stated the market analysis regarding parking spaces identified \$100 a month per space as the going market rate.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Mulligan if he had quoted the right dollar amount? Mr. Mulligan stated the Code indicates that the fee must be based on a pro-rata share of the cost of constructing and maintaining the parking facility. And for Wash U, Public Works determined that cost to be \$175 a month per space, which included a non-exclusive clause for each space. He stated a similar analysis will be performed for this surface lot, which could end up being \$100 a month per space, although the final determination will have to be presented to Council for approval.

Councilmember Cusick asked if the dispensary's analysis would be based on the current market rates for constructing and maintaining the garage? Mr. Rose stated typically, that's how it is done, however, the situation with Wash U was a little unique. Their agreement included the going market rate for parking spaces, as well as the cost of maintaining the garage.

Councilmember Cusick asked whether this precedent would jeopardize the potential to charge the market rate for any designated parking spaces that might be required for the proposed motel? Mr. Rose stated while the intent would be to recommend the use of Parking Lot #4 to meet the parking requirements of the hotel; should it materialize, the precedent for public parking to be on a first-come, first-serve basis has already been established. But keep in mind that any revenue derived from these leased spaces would be needed for the expansion of Parking Lot #4.

Councilmember Clay asked how many dispensaries are in the hopper? Because his understanding is that a second one is also anticipated for Olive Boulevard. Mr. Cross stated at this point, the State has only approved two applicants for this area. However, the Applicant associated with the second site has not applied for the required CUP, and based on his recollection, to avoid a penalty from the State, this dispensary must be up and running by the first of 2021.

Councilmember Hales stated although he appreciates the opportunity to expand Parking Lot #4 in order to take care of the City's current needs, he is curious to know how many spaces are currently available for lease in Lot #4 and the Municipal Garage? Mr. Rose stated staff's basic desire would be to not lease any of these spaces but as a result of the new parking standards, new developers; like this one, would be unable to meet those requirements in some of the City's Commercial Districts. So, from a practical standpoint, staff has taken a case-by-case approach when deciding on an Applicant's request to lease spaces. He stated the old parking standards were grandfathered in for the previous occupant of this suite, but new tenants must adhere to the new standards.

Councilmember Hales stated he has two concerns; is The Loop an area where these new parking standards will start to create a problem for new businesses, and at what point, if any, will there be a need to start thinking about placing a limit on the number of leased spaces? Mr. Cross stated prior to the enactment of the new Code, a change of use; regardless of the type of business was exempt from these new parking standards. But today, the City has a lot more control than it did twelve months ago because the new standards provide staff with the opportunity to evaluate uses that are consistent with the Ordinance and permit non-conforming parking requirements to remain; especially in core Commercial Zoning Districts. So when you come across uses that increase the demand for parking, staff now has the option to review them on a case-by-case basis to determine if there are any exceptions; like the one in this case, where parking is permitted within 500 feet of the business.

Mr. Rose stated what enables staff to make this recommendation today is the potential to expand Parking Lot #4. So, in the future when Council is being asked to review similar requests, he will also include whether there is a potential to create additional parking to augment these leases in his recommendation.

Councilmember Smotherson stated while he has some concerns about patients walking back and forth across the street to make a purchase, what worries him is that in a few short years there will be legislation for recreational marijuana. And without the knowledge of what this company's long-term goals are, he is a little uneasy about the future of this site with respect to its potential to generate additional traffic and parking. Mr. Rose stated while there will be a need to make preparations for the eventual legislation of recreational marijuana sales, what they are focused on at this point is the legislation that allows for medical marijuana. And according to that legislation, marijuana should not be consumed on-site. So the hope is that patrons will abide by that restriction.

Councilmember Cusick asked if there were any concerns about the proximity of handicapped parking spaces for patients utilizing the dispensary? Mr. Cross stated there are ten on-site spaces and one ADA space, and since the Applicant only needs ten spaces there is no requirement to provide additional ADA parking. However, the use of that one on-site space will have to be coordinated with the other tenants since it serves the entire building. Mr. Cross noted that the Applicant would be required to meet any other ADA standards during the site plan review process.

Mayor Crow stated his understanding is that the ADA parking space is located in the rear.

Mr. Cross stated ADA standards are tricky to enforce from a new construction/re-occupancy perspective because even though the language talks about reasonable accommodations it's written with the understanding that some existing adaptive reuses may not be able to meet the letter of the Code. That said the change in occupancy provides staff with an opportunity to encourage and work with the Applicant to make improvements to these accommodations.

Mr. Mulligan stated since the City has control of Delmar Boulevard one option could be to create a handicapped parking space in front of the facility.

Councilmember Cusick moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Site Plan Review – 6669 Washington Ave (Garden Apartment Development)

Mr. Rose stated staff is recommending that Council consider a Site Plan Review of 6669 Washington Avenue known as the Garden Apartment Development. He then asked Mr. Cross if he would highlight the research staff conducted on the adjacent property in his presentation.

Mr. Cross stated per Section 400.2590, larger developments and expansions of existing residential developments that encompass more than a single or double family unit must go through a site plan review process. This process allows staff and Council to take a hard look at the plan to ensure it is compatible and consistent with the neighborhood.

This development is being proposed as a nine-unit garden apartment on a standalone lot within a high-density Residential District. In reviewing this request, staff determined that the .278 acres were sufficient to house the number of units being proposed and that as defined in the supplemental regulations, the development met all of the on-site requirements, i.e., setbacks, parking, height, floor area ratio requirements, and density. He stated the only issue is that this development will abut another multi-family residential development that has no parking. But because of its longevity, it is clearly a legal non-conforming entity.

Mr. Cross stated staff's major concern was whether the existing parking lot could be used by the tenants from the adjacent complex to the west. And after a review of the applicable documents, and working with the Applicant, staff concluded that there was no documentation of a parking agreement or dedication of land that would give the adjacent complex the authority to utilize the lot. Therefore, it was staff's opinion that they had no basis to deny the Applicant's proposal based on the deficiencies of the property it abuts which the Applicant had no legal connection to.

Councilmember McMahon asked if the existing parking lot was owned and maintained by the residential development located to the west of this proposal? Mr. Cross stated that it was. Councilmember McMahon stated there appears to be a red and white sign on the Google Map that says, "*This is reserved for tenants*". So did anyone check the tenant's leases to see if it indicated that they had any guaranteed parking spots? Mr. Cross stated when he talked to the owner of the adjacent property he informed him that not only were there no such agreements but that are constantly removing illegally parked vehicles from the lot. However, he had not obtained a copy of anyone's lease. Councilmember McMahon asked Mr. Cross if he knew who was allowed to park there? Mr. Cross stated based on his consultation with Mr. Mulligan, this was a standalone lot with no legal ties. As a result, staff had no legal basis to deny the petition and thus made a recommendation based on the fact that the proposal met the requirements for the highest and best use of the lot.

Councilmember McMahon stated each unit has been allotted two parking spaces. However, since this development is designed for student housing there will probably be a minimum of three students in each unit. So, if each tenant owns a car and you compound that with their friends or students who might frequent these apartments, residents are going to be constantly fighting for parking. He stated in his mind, this does not pass the smell test. And without additional information about how this lot will be monitored or controlled, his gut reaction is that this parking situation is going to create more problems for residents who live in this area.

Mr. Rose stated his understanding of staff's research is that there were two separate owners of the parking lots and that the owner of the proposed development had no legal ties to the apartment complex located to the west.

Mr. Cross stated at this time, the continuous lots are under common ownership. He stated his understanding is that they were never purchased to accommodate parking for the complex located to the west, and staff found no agreements to indicate otherwise.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Cross if his understanding that there are two separate owners was correct? Mr. Cross stated that both lots were owned by one individual.

Mr. Rose stated based on that clarification he would ask that this item be continued. Mayor Crow asked Mr. Rose if he would like Council to continue their discussion? Mr. Rose stated to avoid any further confusion, he would like the discussions to cease and for the item to be continued. Mayor Crow stated since there is no pending motion on the floor nothing is needed to further Mr. Rose's request to continue. He suggested that any additional questions be addressed to Mr. Rose.

Councilmember Hales thanked Councilmember McMahon for his comments which reflected many of his concerns about this proposal.

Councilmember Klein asked if the single owner of these lots was trying to sell them to the Applicant in this proposal? Mr. Cross stated that he was. Councilmember Klein questioned whether a Purchase Agreement had already been executed? Mr. Cross stated that it had not.

Mr. Mulligan stated he had also talked with the current owner of these lots, as well as his attorney, and they assured him that the lots were owned by two different individuals. However, the gentleman who owns 6675 Washington; the apartment building to the west, no longer has any interest in the lot. But when you look at St. Louis County's records two individuals are listed, so it is confusing. Mr. Mulligan stated the explanation they provided was that at one point there had been shared ownership which no longer exists. So, the current owner closed the lot off to ensure that no one from 6675 Washington could use it. He stated the owner also informed him that the owner of the apartments at 6675 Washington has been renting spaces from COCA.

Mr. Cross stated initially the property was owned by Big Lou Properties and they sold it to two separate entities. So, at one point, it was commonly owned for the purpose of establishing parking for the apartment.

Mr. Rose stated there is clearly a lot of confusion on the issue of ownership; therefore, he intends to bring this proposal back to Council once all of these matters have been resolved.

K. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 1. BILL 9407 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 400.070 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, MISSOURI, RELATING TO THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP, BY AMENDING SAID MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE CLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY AT 711 KINGSLAND AVENUE FROM PUBLIC ACTIVITY ('PA') TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-COMMERCIAL ("PD-C") DISTRICT, AND ESTABLISHING PERMITTED LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENTS THEREIN; CONTAINING A SAVINGS CLAUSE AND PROVIDING A PENALTY.** Bill Number 9407 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Cusick moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Hales.

Roll Call Vote Was:

Ayes: Councilmember Klein, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Clay, and Mayor Crow.

Nays: None.

- 2. BILL 9408 - AN ORDINANCE FIXING THE COMPENSATION TO BE PAID TO CITY OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES AS ENUMERATED HEREIN FROM AND AFTER ITS PASSAGE, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 7120.** Bill Number 9408 was read for the second and third time.

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

Roll Call Vote Was:

Ayes: Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Clay, Councilmember Klein, and Mayor Crow.

Nays: None.

L. NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTIONS

Introduced by Councilmember Smotherson

- 1. Resolution 2020-7:** A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY PLAN CONCEPT FOR THE PROPOSED TRU HOTEL DEVELOPMENT AT THE PROPERTY COMMONLY KNOWN AS 711 KINGSLAND AVENUE. The Resolution was seconded by Councilmember Klein.

Voice vote on the motion carried unanimously.

Introduced by Councilmember Clay

- 2. Resolution 2020-8:** A RESOLUTION SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING DATE TO CONSIDER A PETITION TO ESTABLISH THE MARKETS AT OLIVE COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT. The Resolution was seconded by Councilmember Hales.

Councilmember Cusick asked if The Markets were associated with the Olive/1-70 Development? Mr. Rose stated that it was.

Voice vote on the motion carried unanimously.

BILLS

Introduced by Councilmember Smotherson

- 1. BILL 9409** - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 215.720 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, MISSOURI, RELATING TO OBSTRUCTING PUBLIC PLACES. Bill Number 9409 was read for the first time.

Introduced by Councilmember Cusick

- 2. BILL 9410** - AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AN AMENDED AND RESTATED PETITION TO ESTABLISH A COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT; ESTABLISHING THE MARKETS AT OLIVE COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT AS A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI; DIRECTING THE CITY CLERK TO NOTIFY THE MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CREATION OF THE DISTRICT; AND APPROVING A DISTRICT PROJECT AGREEMENT IN CONNECTION THEREWITH. Bill Number 9410 was read for the first time.

M. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions, and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business

N. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mayor Crow thanked the School Board and Administration for the action taken last week regarding the return to school plan for 2020-2021. And while he would also like to thank residents for staying at home, wearing masks, and social distancing, he would encourage everyone to continue supporting the City's restaurants and businesses whenever possible.

Mayor Crow sent birthday wishes out to Judy Prange of U City in Bloom, Councilmember McMahon, and Councilmember Smotherson; whose birthday is today.

Councilmember Hales moved to adjourn the meeting, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick, and the motion carried unanimously.

O. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Crow adjourned the Regular City Council meeting at 7:32 p.m.

LaRette Reese
City Clerk

107

LaRette Reese

From: Katie <osigoot@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2020 8:49 AM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: City Council comment 7/13/2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

Please submit the below comment to the city council's meeting today 7/13/2020.

Thank you.

Katie Dionne
6408 Cates Ave Unit 2W
University City MO 63130

I am writing today filled with incredible concern for the environment. We are descending into climate crisis, which will present huge threats to all of us worldwide and here droughts will render american farmlands useless, we will watch american cities flood and american forests and homes burn in wildfires. The impacts of climate change will (and already does) disproportionately hurt people of colour. When we eventually recover from covid we will need to pivot our economy to mitigate climate change. We have run out of time to be timid in our response, it is time for aggressive action.

My question for the council is this: what will you do to reduce and offset the emissions of UCity households, bearing in mind that half of UCity's households are owned by landlords (per 2010 census), in line with a 2050 net-zero target?

121

LaRette Reese

From: Tom Sullivan <tsullivan@sullivanadv.net>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2020 11:42 AM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: City Council Comments, July 13, 2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

July 13, 2020

TO: The University City Council, July 13 Council Meeting
FR: Tom Sullivan, 751 Syracuse Ave, U.City, MO 63130
RE: Non-Agenda Items

I have several matter to relate to the City Council:

- 1.) The Loop Trolley is still attracting few riders despite rides now being free. The trolley is running on Saturdays and Sundays in July but the most riders observed at one time in the last two weeks was five. Most of the time there were either no riders or only a few. Attempts to revive the trolley are not going to be successful.
- 2.) The red light in the north signal lights at Kingsland facing Loop North is out.
- 3.) There is a sizable tree branch laying on a telephone line right at Metcalfe Park behind 6639 Clemens. It is from a tree in the park, therefore it is the city's responsibility. It is a larger gray telephone line rather than the standard line, so it may affect a lot of users if it goes down. City Manager Rose has been told about this months ago but has failed to do anything about it.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Statement to Mayor and Council
University City
July 13 City Council meeting

Regarding proposed hotel construction on site of Delmar School

As a longtime resident, a member and former chairman of the Historic Preservation Commission, I want to express my deep disappointment that the present administration is abandoning their commitment to the preservation of the Civic Plaza Historic District in favor of short-term and speculative financial gain.

When the Historic District was first established, the administration at that time was making a long-term commitment to maintaining this unique ensemble of buildings as a defining asset of the city. It was understood that the uses of these buildings would change over time, as many of them had already changed. But the buildings themselves, their materials and massing, would remain as so artfully created by E. G. Lewis and his successors over a period of about forty years. I'm enclosing a brief review of the creation of the Civic Plaza as a reminder.

The new hotel will not only remove one of the major buildings of the District but will replace it with a building that is out of scale with the rest of the District and that may compromise the dominance of the Magazine Building or present City Hall as the dominant building of the ensemble.

This proposal is so far removed from the original character of the Civic Plaza that I have to wonder if the present city administration plans to abandon the whole concept of historic preservation as cornerstone of the city's character.

Esley Hamilton
7346 Balson Avenue
University City, MO 63130