

#### **Plan Commission**

6801 Delmar Boulevard ·University City, Missouri 63130 ·314-505-8500 ·Fax: 314-862-3168

## MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION (PLAN COMMISSION WORK SESSION) VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE Wednesday, September 27, 2021 6:00 p.m.

## IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING & PARTICIPATION

#### Plan Commission will Meet Electronically on September 27, 2021

On March 20, 2020, City Manager Gregory Rose declared a State of Emergency for the City of University City due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Due to the current order restricting gatherings of people and the ongoing efforts to limit the spread of the COVID-19 virus, the September 8, 2021 meeting will be conducted via videoconference.

Observe and/or Listen to the Meeting (your options to join the meeting are below):

#### Webinar via the link below:

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89273763299?pwd=a2xFWUIXb3ppUWdIT0cxazhnRmwrUT09

Passcode: 740660

### **Audio Only Call**

US: +13126266799,,89273763299#,,,,\*740660# or +19292056099,,89273763299#,,,,\*740660#
Or Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or 888 788 0099 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5247 (Toll Free)

Webinar ID: 892 7376 3299

#### **Citizen Participation**

Those who wish to provide a comment may provide written comments to the Director of Planning & Development ahead of the meeting. Please specify which case and portion of the agenda you wish to comment.

ALL written comments must be received <u>no later than 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting</u>. Comments may be sent via email to: <u>bsmith@ucitymo.org</u> or mailed to the City Hall – 6801 Delmar Blvd. – Attention Brooke A. Smith, Assistant City Manager. Such comments will be provided to the Plan Commission 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 <u>name and address must be provided</u>. Please also note if your comment is on an agenda or non-agenda item, and a name and address are not provided, the provided comment will not be recorded in the official record.

The City apologizes for any inconvenience the meeting format change may pose to individuals, but it is extremely important that extra measures be taken to protect employees, residents board/commission members and elected officials during these challenging times.

## **AGENDA**

## **PLAN COMMISSION**

- 1. Roll Call
- 2. Approval of Minutes August 26, 2021
- **3.** Public Comments (Limited to 3 minutes for individual's comments, 5 minutes for representatives of groups or organizations.)
- 4. Old Business
  - Final Development Plan PC 21-02
     Crown Center Senior Living
     Applicant Council Apartments, LLC
     Request Approval of NEW Final Development Plan for 8348-8350 Delcrest Drive
     Address: 8348 8350 Delcrest Drive
     (VOTE REQUIRED)
- 5. New Business
  - a. Extension Policy for Development Plans (Discussion Item)
- 6. Other Business
  - a. Community Visioning Process Updates
- 7. Reports
  - a. Council Liaison Report
- 8. Adjournment



## **Department of Planning and Development**

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8500, Fax: (314) 862-3168

## PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

Via Video Conference 6:00 pm; Thursday, August 26, 2021

The Plan Commission held a special called meeting via video conference on Thursday August 26, 2021. The meeting commenced at 6:00 pm and concluded at approximately 7:08 pm.

#### 1. Roll Call

**Present** 

Margaret Holly (Portion of Meeting)
Mark Harvey (Portion of Meeting)
Patricia McQueen
Charles Gascon
Ellen Hartz
Al Fleischer Jr.

### **Absent**

Victoria Gonzalez

## **Staff Present**

Clifford Cross, Director of Planning and Development

- 2. Call to Order (6:00 pm.) Chairwoman Holly called the meeting to order.
- **3. Approval of Minutes –** July 28, 2021 The minutes were approved as presented at 6:03 pm.

#### 4. Public Comments

There were no public comments for non-agenda items from the public

#### 5. Old Business

a. None

#### 6. New Business

a. Conditional Use Permit – PC 21-15
PUBLIC HEARING

**Applicant:** Quick Trip Corporation

**Request:** Approval of a Conditional Use Permit For the Establishment and Operation of a Convenience Store / Gas Station at the property commonly known

as 7579 Olive Boulevard. **Address:** 7579 Olive

(VOTE REQUIRED)

Consideration of the proposed request began at approximately 6:05 pm. Mr. Cross briefly introduced the proposed request and provided a power point presentation to the Commission. At approximately 6:20 pm. Chairwoman Holly opened discussion pertaining to the proposed project. Ms. Gwen Kean was present on behalf of QT Corporation and addressed the specific questions of the Commission. Commissioner Gascon made a motion to recommend approval of the Conditional Use permit contingent upon 1) An approved lighting plan be provided as part of the permitting process, 2) a Traffic Commission review be completed and 3) a lot consolidation be completed prior to Building Permit Approval. Commissioner Fleischer Jr. seconded the motion which passed by a 5-0 vote at approximately 6:56 pm.

The public hearing was opened at 6:25 p.m. and closed at 6:59 p.m. as there were no comments from the public other than the written ones submitted, which are attached.

#### 7. Other Business

Mr. Cross updated the Commission on the need to work on future amendments that would need to be considered. He indicated that he would be working with the subcommittees on updates and proposals as previously mentioned to the Commission.

Mr. Cross informed the Commission of a need to appoint members to fill current vacancies on the Commission. He indicated that this was needed due to the vacancy of the Vice Chair position. He indicated this became vacant when former Commission member Moran left the Commission. Commissioner Hartz made a motion to nominate Commissioner McQueen as the Vice Chair. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

#### 8. Reports

There was no Council Liaison Report.

### 9. Adjournment

Chairwoman Holly adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:08 pm.

From: Donna McGhee <donnarmcghee@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2021 8:28 AM

**To:** Clifford Cross **Subject:** Case # PC 21-15

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up **Flag Status:** Flagged

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

University City City Hall

Attn: Clifford Cross, Director of Planning and Development

I am a long time resident of University City's Third Ward. I have matriculated through the University City schools and I continue to be a proud resident of the city.

Although I am aware that University City has aspirations relating to Vision 2040, the reinvestment interests come with some concerns for residents. Although I am interested in the city's road to reinvigorating the Third Ward, my concerns are with the application of Quick Trip Corporation for a Conditional Use Permit for the establishment and operation of a convenience store/gas station with the property commonly known as 7579 Olive Blvd.

#### My concerns include:

- 1) The impact of pollution and environmental factor from Construction
- 2) The need for a very high wall between the homes of residents and the establishment to avoid trespassing, crime, and to facilitate the safety and respect of property of homeowners/residents; environmental aesthetics is a concern
- 3) The needs for clarification and parameters of working hours for the construction site (some residence within 185 feet of the Project area (and nearby) and work in the area/work at home and need time free of noise and elements from the construction)
- 4) Residents would like more detailed clarity on how the proposed (or likely 'already confirmed' establishment) will impact the property and property value of those homeowners that will literally have a Quick Trip in their backyards; the proposed establishment will bring 24 hours/day of activity

Thank you and respectfully submitted, Donna McGhee, U.City Homeowner 7584 Melrose Avenue St. Louis, MO. 63130

Frank and Jane Ollendorff <jane.franko@charter.net>

**Sent:** Thursday, August 26, 2021 11:53 AM

**To:** Clifford Cross **Cc:** Jeff Hales

**Subject:** Citizen Comments Plan Commission Meeting 26 August 2021

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

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

Citizen Comment Plan Commission 8/26/2021 Frank Ollendorff 8128 Cornell Court University City, MO 63130 314.791.6466

U City did not spend \$ millions on the Olive Central TIF District only to attract a convenience store/gas station.

- QuikTrip Plan does not comply with many provisions of Zoning Code, Comp Plan, Olive Central TIF, Olive Design Standards, Historic Preservation Ordinance, 2012 Comp Plan Update, or the 2021 Economic Development Plan
- Your format skips HPC and Traffic Com review among others.
- Plan also ignores and fails to meet State and County highway requirements.
- This sale of two plus acres eliminates one of our top priority development sites.
- You need to go back to the drawing board on this one.

Olive has two open gas stations and eight closed. Some are vacant eyesores, others are being used for other purposes like auto repair.

The owner of the Phillips Station plans to rehab, upgrade and enlarge his convenience operation, however he will be forced to close and vacate if another gas station, such as QuikTrip is approved.

Does your vision 2040 include attracting new fossil fuel (gas stations)? I prefer Costco's electric charging stations. Which is the best investment for U City?									
2									

From: Donna McGhee <donnarmcghee@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2021 8:28 AM

**To:** Clifford Cross **Subject:** Case # PC 21-15

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up **Flag Status:** Flagged

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

University City City Hall

Attn: Clifford Cross, Director of Planning and Development

I am a long time resident of University City's Third Ward. I have matriculated through the University City schools and I continue to be a proud resident of the city.

Although I am aware that University City has aspirations relating to Vision 2040, the reinvestment interests come with some concerns for residents. Although I am interested in the city's road to reinvigorating the Third Ward, my concerns are with the application of Quick Trip Corporation for a Conditional Use Permit for the establishment and operation of a convenience store/gas station with the property commonly known as 7579 Olive Blvd.

#### My concerns include:

- 1) The impact of pollution and environmental factor from Construction
- 2) The need for a very high wall between the homes of residents and the establishment to avoid trespassing, crime, and to facilitate the safety and respect of property of homeowners/residents; environmental aesthetics is a concern
- 3) The needs for clarification and parameters of working hours for the construction site (some residence within 185 feet of the Project area (and nearby) and work in the area/work at home and need time free of noise and elements from the construction)
- 4) Residents would like more detailed clarity on how the proposed (or likely 'already confirmed' establishment) will impact the property and property value of those homeowners that will literally have a Quick Trip in their backyards; the proposed establishment will bring 24 hours/day of activity

Thank you and respectfully submitted, Donna McGhee, U.City Homeowner 7584 Melrose Avenue St. Louis, MO. 63130

Frank and Jane Ollendorff <jane.franko@charter.net>

**Sent:** Thursday, August 26, 2021 11:53 AM

**To:** Clifford Cross **Cc:** Jeff Hales

**Subject:** Citizen Comments Plan Commission Meeting 26 August 2021

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

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

Citizen Comment Plan Commission 8/26/2021 Frank Ollendorff 8128 Cornell Court University City, MO 63130 314.791.6466

U City did not spend \$ millions on the Olive Central TIF District only to attract a convenience store/gas station.

- QuikTrip Plan does not comply with many provisions of Zoning Code, Comp Plan, Olive Central TIF, Olive Design Standards, Historic Preservation Ordinance, 2012 Comp Plan Update, or the 2021 Economic Development Plan
- Your format skips HPC and Traffic Com review among others.
- Plan also ignores and fails to meet State and County highway requirements.
- This sale of two plus acres eliminates one of our top priority development sites.
- You need to go back to the drawing board on this one.

Olive has two open gas stations and eight closed. Some are vacant eyesores, others are being used for other purposes like auto repair.

The owner of the Phillips Station plans to rehab, upgrade and enlarge his convenience operation, however he will be forced to close and vacate if another gas station, such as QuikTrip is approved.

Does your vision 2040 include attracting new fossil fuel (gas stations)? I prefer Costco's electric charging stations. Which is the best investment for U City?									
2									



## **Department of Planning and Development**

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8500, Fax: (314) 862-3168

## STAFF REPORT (Plan Commission)

MEETING DATE: October 27, 2021

FILE NUMBER: PC 21-02

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 1

Location: 8348-8350 Delcrest Drive

Applicant: Douglas McElvain with Rosemann and Associates on

behalf of Council Apartments, LLC (property owner)

Property Owner: Council Apartments, LLC

Request: 1) NEW Final Development Plan Approval

Existing Zoning: PD-M – Planned Development – Mixed Use

Existing Land Use: Senior living facility (multi-family residential) with

associated offices and accessory uses

Proposed Zoning: PD-R – Planned Development – Residential

Proposed Land Use: No change

Surrounding Zoning and Current Land Use:

North: CC: Core Commercial East: CC: Core Commercial

South: HRO: High Density Residential/Office

West: CC: Core Commercial

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE [x] Yes [] No [] No reference

PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

[ ] Approval [ x ] Approval with Conditions [ ] Denial

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Application Packet

### **Existing Property**

The proposed development is located at 8348/8350 Delcrest Drive. The two (2) parcels were recently subdivided into three (3) parcels that total 2.76 acres. The subject property is located on the west side of Delcrest Drive, approximately 350 feet south of Delmar Boulevard. The subject property currently consists of two buildings. The northern building, ("Tallin Building") is a 126-unit multifamily affordable housing complex constructed in the mid 1960s. It is 10 stories in height. The southern building was constructed in 1995 and is 8 stories in height.

The buildings are currently used as a multi-family residential facility for senior living. The complex also includes accessory uses such as a cafeteria, fitness facility, gardening areas, offices associated with the operation of the facility, and other activity areas and meeting rooms.

Off-street parking is provided to the north, west, and south of the buildings including 134 total parking spaces. Access to the subject property from Delcrest Drive is currently provided by two curb cuts, located at the north and south ends of the off-street parking areas.

#### **Background**

Conditional Use Permit (1991) – The subject property is currently operating under a Conditional Use Permit that was approved in 1991 to allow for the construction of the southern building to be integrated with the existing building to the north and that the facility would operate as a senior living facility. The original proposal was for 262 units with a floor area ratios of 1.45 and 124 off-street parking spaces. However, the development was completed with 244 units and a floor area ratio of 1.34

Zoning Variance (2013) – A variance to allow a reduction in the width of the required landscape buffer between the proposed parking and public right-of-way along Delcrest Drive was granted by the Board of Adjustment on October 21, 2013. The variance was approved to allow a five-foot landscape buffer in lieu of the ten feet required per the Zoning Code.

PD-M – Planned Development Mixed Use (2014) – The property was re-zoned from HRO – Hight Density Residential/Office District to PD-M in 2014. Planned Development Districts are attached to a parcel and may only be development in accordance with an approved development plan.

Preliminary Development Plan Approval (2014) – A preliminary development plan was approved by the City Council limiting the permitted use to a multi-family residential development for senior living with associated accessory uses including, but not limited to offices related to the operation of the facility, a café and dining area, a demonstration kitchen, a fitness are, and an outdoor gardening area which may be open to the public. The total number of residential units approved was not to exceed 244 and a minimum of 134 off-street parking spaces were to be maintained.

Final Development Plan Approval (2014) – A final development plan was approved in 2014.

Amended Final Development Plan Approval (2017) – The final development plan was amended in 2017.

Extension Request #1 Approved (2019) – The City Council granted a one-year extension to the previously approved Amended Final Development Plan. The extension was requested and granted with no proposed changes or alterations to the previously approved plan.

Extension Request #2 Approved (2020) – The City Council granted a second one-year extension to the previously approved Amended Final Development Plan. The extension was requested and granted with no proposed changes or alterations to the previously approved plan.

Public Easement Vacation (2021) – The City Council vacated and surrendered the public easement west of Delcrest Drive, East of a Private Road platted as St. Louis Belt & Terminal Railroad right-of-way and extending northeastward 123.22 feet from said Private Road.

Major Subdivision of 2 Parcels into 3 Parcels (2021) – The City Council approved the subdivision of the two (2) parcels located at 8348 – 8350 Delcrest Drive into three (3) parcels.

## <u>Applicant's Request</u>

The applicant's second extension expired on October 9, 2021. Applicant, by and through David S. Lang of Rosenblum Goldenhersh requested a third one-year extension on September 23, 2021. Staff recommended against another extension for two reasons: 1) ambiguity as to whether the code allows for multiple one-year extensions and 2) due to major changes that have occurred, the current plan no longer resembles the Amended Final Development Plan that was approved in 2017.

**Section 400.900(C)** states that "At such time as the period of validity of an approved final development plan lapses, the final development plan and all uses, terms and conditions thereof may be declared null and voided and the City Council may initial processing to rezone the site to its original or other appropriate zoning districts."

Applicant was advised to submit new final development plan for approval. Applicant was advised by staff to separate Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the 2017 Amended Final Development Plan into two separate projects for faster processing. This request is for Project #1.

Applicant intends to construct a new, 5-story mixed-use building containing office and resident amenity space on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor with 52 apartments on the top 4 floors. After construction of the new building, the existing Tallin Building will be demolished. Approval of the site plan layout and parking provided is requested.

Project #1 will create new 1-bdrm/1 bath units and several 2bdrm/1 bath unites located in

a 4 story building over a podium which will contain offices for Crown Center staff and amenity spaces for the residents. The new building would be constructed adjacent to the exiting Tallin Building, which will remain occupied during construction to avoid the need for extended off-site relocation of the exiting residents.

Applicants are proposing 130 parking spaces for Project #1

### **Analysis**

Zoning – Article 14, Section 400.3180 of the Zoning Code requires the Plan Commission to review a request for a map amendment and forward its recommendation to the City Council. A public hearing will be conducted at the City Council level. Because there is no change in the intended use for this project, the zoning will remain PD-M. The 2017 Amended Final Development Plan was approved with the following conditions:

- 1. Permitted uses shall be limited to a multi-family residential development for senior living with associated accessory uses, including but not limited to, offices related to the operation of the facility, a café and dining area, a demonstration kitchen, a fitness area, and an outdoor gardening area which may be open to the public. The hours in which the café is open to the public shall be limited to 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Any changes to the hours of operation shall required written approval from the Department of Community Development.
- 2. The existing building height, number of stories, mass, floor area ratio, and setbacks shall be maintained as depicted in the preliminary development plan and shall not be exceeded.
- 3. The total number of residential units shall not exceed 238
- 4. Parking and the drive aisle layout shall be as generally depicted on the Preliminary Development Plan. A minimum of 131 off-street parking and garage spaces shall be maintained. The location of the proposed curb-cut for ingress/egress shall be as approved by the Department of Public Works and Parks.
- 5. Along the north property limits, Department of Community Development staff shall seek a landscape plan from the developer that provides a visual screening from the adjacent service drive with a combination of evergreen and deciduous trees.
- 6. A final landscape plan shall be submitted to the Department of Community Development for its review and approval, in conjunction with a review by the City Forester. Said plan shall be submitted prior to the submittal of a demolition/building permit. Landscaping shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.
- 7. Any proposed signage shall be in strict compliance with the Sign Regulations set forth in Article 8 of the Zoning Code.

- 8. Lighting of all exterior areas shall comply with the requirements of Section 34-93.7 of the Zoning Code, and shall be designed to be compatible with surrounding areas by shading to direct light downwards and away from abutting uses.
- 9. All work in the public right-of-way shall be located, constructed, and maintained as approved by the Department of Public Works and Parks.
- 10. A detailed construction traffic control and parking plan should be submitted to the Department of Community Development for approval, in conjunction with review by the Department of Public Works and Parks. Said plan shall set forth details pertaining to worker and resident parking during all phases of the proposed construction. It shall further detail solutions to public property maintenance issues such as street cleaning and traffic diversion. Said plan shall finalize prior to the issuance of a building permit. It shall be applicant's responsibility to obtain those approvals in written form in a timely manner prior to issuance of the building permit.
- 11. Approval of the Amended Final Development Plan must be obtained by City Council.
- 12. Except as noted herein, other codes and regulations of the City of University City shall apply.
- 13. Address the comments from the Department of Public Works and Parks Attachment B of Staff report memorandum of July 11, 2017.

*Use* – There are no changes proposed to the use at this time.

Minimum Site Size - The minimum site size for developments in any planned development district is one (1) acre. The Code states that the minimum site size may be waived by the City Council upon report by the Plan Commission; if it is determined that the uses proposed is desirable or necessary in relationship to the surrounding neighborhood; or, if the city council should determine such waiver to be in the general public interest. There is no need for a waiver based upon the site containing more than one (1) acre.

Density and Dimensional Regulations – The number of new residential units for Project #1 is 52. At the conclusion of Project #1, there will be a total of 170 residential units. The building height for the new construction is 5 stories, as compared to the exiting 8 story building. IT is staff's opinion that the density and massing proposed are appropriate.

The 2017 Amended Final Development Plan included a northern setback of 30' from the property on the north. The southern setbacks varies but were approximately 35' and the eastern setbacks varies from 25' to approximately 40'. The western setback varied to a smallest distance of 10'. For the most part, these setbacks remain the same, but because the 2 lots were subdivided into 3 lots, there are now two additional property lines that have zero setback. There are also egress doors that actually open onto the adjacent

property.

Setbacks are designed to provide physical separation, transition and buffering between uses and developments. Buffering regulations in planned districts are set fort in Section 400.780. PD-M developments are to consider buffering regulations established for PD-R and PD-C regulations. The perimeter buffering for PD-R is 30' from a commercial use or district and 50' for a PD-C when adjacent to a residential area.

As it relates to this application, the proposal meets the buffering requirements at the north.

Parking – The current Final Development Plan proposes 130 parking spaces for Project #1. The proposed modifications and the realignment due to the MSD Easement conflict will result in a decrease in parking spaces.

There are a daily maximum number of Crown Center employees of 20 people. With 170 apartments anticipated upon the completion of Project #1, the current zoning code would require 148 spaces. However, the applicant argues that the true parking load of Project #1 is 99 spaces. Their rational is that the current property has a total of 242 apartments across two buildings, with the daily maximum of 20 employees. Less the employees, the residents have a car ownership rate of 40%.

The required number of spaces for a senior living facility, per the zoning code, is 0.75 spaces per dwelling unit.

## **Conclusion/Recommendation**

Based on the preceding conditions, staff is of the opinion the New Final Development Plan is reasonable in terms of use, density, massing, site coverage, setbacks, and parking.

Staff recommends approval with the same or similar conditions as imposed in 2017.



## **Department of Community Development**

6801 Delmar Boulevard · University City, Missouri 63130 · 314-505-8500 · Fax: 314-862-3168

APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR: 8348/8350 DELCREST

**CROWN CENTER FOR SENIOR LIVING** 

PROJECT #1

Address / Location / Site of Building

1. Zo	oning District (C			HRO _	IC	LC	LR	MR	PA	X	_PD	SR
2. Sta	ate proposed use	e: To main	tain the cur	rent functio	n as an ind	ependent s	senior livin	g facility.				
3. De	escribe existing	premises: C	Crown Cent	ter is an inde	ependent se	enior living	facility.					
amen	escribe proposed ity spaces on 1 ct scope.											
	ate applicant's n						***************************************					
6. Ap	pplicant's interes	st in the pro	perty (checl	k one):								
X	OwnerOther (specify	Tenant	t	Inder contrac	t to purchas	se	_Under con	tract to lease	2			
	ate name and ad IER IS APPLIO		aytime telep	phone numbe	r of owner,	if other tha	n applicant	:				
8. Ch	eck type of autl	norization(s	s) required:									
3) cur (this c existing government M	New Develop Substantial A er than 25% of the cuts are requided to an opicies: Can parking or si Tax Exemption	addition: A the existing red; or 4) we single or to anopies congnificantly on: Person, as exempt fit 5.04.210. rard Design	dditions to principal burhen such no wo-family distructed over modifies ex association from paymen	buildings, or nilding; 2) the ew constructi (wellings). er existing we isting on-site , corporation at of any tax	new accesse e addition of on reduces alkways, lost circulation religious in	ory building r new acces existing para ading docks	gs, when 1) ssory building rking or sig s, or pump in thatity or fo	ng exceeds 1 nificantly m islands, when	1,000 squ odifies ex re such n at has bee	are fexisting	eet in gro g on-site onstruction	ess floor area circulation on reduces by any
floor,	_Other (specif with 52 aparta lished. Approv	nents on th	ne top 4 floo	ors. After co	nstruction	of the new	building, t					
	ndersigned here ties described in		ation.			•			•		•	ed with the
OCT( Date	OBER 22, 2021		- De	Applicant's	Signature a	etro nd Title	u C	These	lev	l	. ,	
Date:	Ар	oplication first re	eceived of		R OFFIC	E USE O	NLY					
	ion fee in the amount											

# Memo



ARCHITECTURE

INTERIOR DESIGN ENGINEERING

**PLANNING** 

Date: October 22, 2021

To: Brooke Smith

City of University City

From: Douglas McElvain

Re: Development Plan

Crown Center for Senior Living

Project #1

Cc: Nikki Goldstein, David Lang, Mark Rubin, Tim Vohsen; Crown Center

Matt Fulson; Fulson Housing Group Jarrett Cooper; Rosemann & Associates Lauren Talley; Cobalt Construction Consulting

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION - NEW BUILDING PHASED DEVELOPMENT

The existing "Tallin Building" is a 126-unit multifamily affordable housing complex constructed in the mid-1960's using the HUD Section 202 Direct Loan Program. All the units in the Tallin Building are income restricted aimed at housing low-income seniors. Council Apartments, Inc., a non-profit 501(c) which owns the Tallin Building, paid off the 50-year HUD 202 loan in 2015. Note that Council Apartments II, Inc. (an affiliate of Council Apartments, Inc.), owns the adjacent Weinberg senior housing building that is part of the same campus.

Upon paying off the loan, The Crown Center (the non-profit parent corporation of both Council Apartments, Inc. and Council Apartments II, Inc.) began to investigate the possibility of renovating the Tallin Building. Unfortunately, the Tallin Building was originally constructed in such a way that to renovate the existing structure and bring it up to current building code compliance is not economically feasible. In addition, the building has many design issues that make the current units functionally obsolete, and unmarketable in the long run.

At the present time, the Tallin Building is fully occupied due to its affordability restrictions. In order to construct a new building to serve the needs of the residents and community (both now and in the future), we plan to construct a new building to replace the existing structure. The Weinberg building will remain with only some interior and exterior entry modifications.

Rosemann & Associates, and the developer, Fulson Housing Group, we have formulated a plan to construct reconstruct 52 housing units on the existing site in Project #1, utilizing both federal and state low-income housing tax credits (LIHTC), Affordable Housing Assistance Program tax credits (AHAP), and low interest loans available for affordable housing.



Project #1 would create new 1-bdrm / 1-bath units and several 2-bdrm / 1 bath units located in a 4-story building over a podium, which will contain offices for Crown Center staff and amenity spaces for the residents. We plan to construct the new building adjacent the existing Tallin Building which will remain occupied during construction to avoid the need for extended off-site relocation of the existing residents away from their homes.

During Project 1 construction, Crown Center will stop leasing any units in the Tallin Building. After completion of Project #1 and all residents of the Tallin Building have been relocated into the new building, the existing Tallin Building will be demolished.

The proposed scope of work illustrated in the attached drawings illustrate our teams solution for creating up to date apartments for Crown Center, while working within the constraints of Property line Setbacks and a large MSD easement that bisects the site. With respect to the MSD easement, no building may be constructed over the easement, and this proposal reflects that. MSD has approved the construction of a small connector from the new building to the existing Weinberg building.

Considering the site restraints, we are **proposing 130 parking spaces** for Project #1. There are a daily maximum number of Crown Center employees of 20 people. With 170 apartments at the conclusion of Project #1, the current zoning code would require 275 spaces.

For context, the current property has a total of 242 apartments across two buildings, with the daily maximum of 20 employees. Less the employees, Crown Center apartments/residents have a car ownership rate of 40%, in lieu of the 150% asked for in the zoning code. In using the current car ownership rate of 40% and adding 20 daily employees, it is reasonable to expect that the **true parking load of Project #1 is 99 parking spaces**.

AS-100 **ПИІЛЕВЅІТУ СІТУ, МО** TOSemann & ASSOCIATES № CROWN CENTER SENIOR -PHASE I DO NOT SCALE DRAWNOGS.
NOTEY ACROSTITET OF ANY DESCREMANCES BETWEEN PROJECT
DOCUMENTS AND EXISTING CONDITIONS. ANY WODINGTHINGS
TO DIMENSIONAL CHANGES SHOULD BE PART OF THE PROJECT
COST. DELCREST DRIVE 1 OVERALL SITE PLAN 808 808 PRIVATE ROAD CENTENNIAL GREENWAY

## Section 400.860. Effect of Approval of Preliminary Development Plan and Period of Validity. [R.O. 2011 §34-40.15; Ord. No. 6530 §1(part), 2005]

- A. All conditions imposed as a part of any planned development shall run with the land and shall not lapse or be waived as a result of a subsequent change in ownership of any or all of such area.
- B. Approval of the preliminary development plan by the City Council is merely an authorization to proceed with the preparation of the final development plan.
- C. Approval of the preliminary development plan shall be valid for a period of two (2) years from the date of City Council approval. If an application for final plan approval for all or a geographic portion of the preliminary plan has not been filed within the two (2) year period, then a resubmission of the preliminary development plan shall be required if the applicant intends to pursue final plan approval. The City Council, upon recommendation from the Plan Commission, may grant up to a one (1) year extension from the date that the period of validity expired. The Council may reject such resubmission of the same development plan in light of new facts and circumstances relating to the development plan.
- D. In no case shall a building permit be issued prior to final development plan approval.
- E. At such time the period of validity has expired, the resolution approving preliminary development plan shall become null and void. In the event that the development plan involved rezoning all or a portion of the property comprising the development, the City Council may initiate proceedings to rezone the property to its original or other appropriate zoning district in accordance with the procedures and requirements of Article XIV of this Chapter.

## Section 400.870. Final Development Plan Procedure. [R.O. 2011 §34-40.16; Ord. No. 6530 §1(part), 2005]

- A. *Final Development Plan Submittal Requirements*. The final development plan shall include the required information described in Section 405.380 "Final Plat Submittal Requirements" University City Municipal Code, as applicable. In addition to these submittal requirements, the following shall be submitted.
  - 1. The information required for the preliminary development plan, except that it be in its final form;
  - 2. The final landscape plan with specific location of all plant material, specifying size and species.
- B. Compliance With Approved Preliminary Development Plan. The final development plan shall be in substantial compliance with the approved preliminary development plan. Modifications and refinements, resulting from the final design process, may be approved. In no event shall any modification of the development plan result in the following:
  - 1. A change in the use or character of the development;
  - 2. An increase in building or site coverage or increase in building height;

- 3. An increase in the intensity of use (e.g., number of dwelling units);
- 4. An increase in vehicular traffic generation or significant changes in traffic access and circulation;
- 5. A reduction in approved open space or required buffer areas.
- C. *Final Development Plan Review And Approval*. The procedure for reviewing and approving the final development plan shall be in accordance with Section 405.380, "Final Plat Submittal Requirements" University City Municipal Code.

## Section 400.880. Recording of Final Development Plan. [R.O. 2011 §34-40.17; Ord. No. 6530 §1(part), 2005]

After the final development plan (and subdivision plat, if applicable) and other associated documents have been approved by the City Council, the applicant shall record the final development plan in accordance with provisions of Section 405.400, "Recording of Plat" University City Municipal Code.

## Section 400.890. Amendments To Final Development Plan. [R.O. 2011 §34-40.18; Ord. No. 6530 §1(part), 2005]

- A. *Minor Changes*. Minor changes in the location, siting and height of buildings and structures may be authorized by the Zoning Administrator if required by engineering or other circumstances not foreseen at the time the final plan was approved. No change authorized by this Section shall cause any of the following:
  - 1. A change in the use or character of the development;
  - 2. An increase in building or site coverage;
  - 3. An increase in the intensity of use (e.g., number of dwelling units);
  - 4. An increase in vehicular traffic generation or significant changes in traffic access and circulation;
  - 5. A reduction in approved open space or required buffer areas; or
  - 6. A change in the record plat.
- B. *Plan Amendments*. All proposed changes in use, or rearrangement of lots, blocks and building tracts, changes in the provision of common open spaces, and changes which would cause any of the situations listed under Subsection (A) of this Section shall be subject to approval by the City Council. In such event, the applicant shall file a revised development plan and be subject to the requirements of this Section as if it were an entirely new application.

## Section 400.900. Failure To Initiate Construction After Final Development Plan Approval. [R.O. 2011 §34-40.19; Ord. No. 6530 §1(part), 2005]

A. *Period Of Validity*. No approval of a final development plan shall be valid for a period longer than two (2) years from the date of approval unless within such period a building permit is obtained and construction of a development's foundation is

commenced.

- B. *Extension*. The City Council may grant a one (1) year extension upon written request of the original applicant if the application submitted is substantially the same as the initially approved application.
- C. Lapse In Period Of Validity. At such time as the period of validity of an approved final development plan lapses, the final development plan and all uses, terms and conditions thereof may be declare null and void and the City Council may initiate proceedings to rezone the site to its original or other appropriate zoning district in accordance with the procedures and requirements of Article XIV, "Amendments" of this Chapter.