



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

6:30 pm; Wednesday, December 14, 2022

The Plan Commission held its regular session via video conference on Wednesday, December 14, 2022. The meeting commenced at 6:31 pm and concluded at approximately 9:42 p.m.

Call to Order – (6:31 pm.) Chairwoman Holly called the meeting to order.

1. Roll Call

Present

Al Fleischer Jr.
Charles Gascon
Ellen Hartz
Mark Harvey (joined at 6:49)
Margaret Holly
Patricia McQueen
Jeff Hales, City Council Liaison

Absent

Victoria Gonzalez

Staff Present

John Wagner, Director of Planning and Development
Mary Kennedy, City Planner
John Mulligan, City Attorney

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from August 24, September 28, and October 26 Plan Commission Meetings were approved with no changes.

3. Public Comments

None.

4. Other Business

a. Comprehensive Plan Update – Planning NEXT

Shelby Oldroyd of Planning NEXT presented the draft vision, goals, and the key takeaways from listening and learning sessions with key stakeholders, as well as two cross-cutting themes that are applicable to all goals: equity and sustainability. These draft statements were shared with the Plan Commission. Shelby asked the Plan Commission for their feedback so that they can begin getting public input on the statements.

Ms. McQueen, Mr. Fleischer, and Ms. Hartz all stated that these statements resonated.

Mr. Gascon motioned to allow Planning NEXT to proceed and solicit public input. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Old Business

a. 7701 Canton Avenue – Informal review of revised site plan

Notes: Dr. Wagner gave the staff report presentation. LR zoning is what the

applicant would still like to request. The proposed development was initially proposed as a 119-unit development and has since been reduced to 100 units.

Fernando Cepeda joined the meeting and thanked the PC for their consideration. Cepeda stated that they have been working to revise the plan to address the PC's concerns and would like to hear their feedback.

Ms. Hartz asked a question about on-street parking and was concerned with there being sufficient space for emergency vehicles. Cepeda clarified that they widened the street to the City's 30' standard and added a cul-de-sac for vehicles to turn around.

Dr. Wagner stated that next steps would be for applicant to formally submit a REZ and CUP application.

Ms. McQueen stated her appreciation for renderings showing many trees and sought confirmation that the applicant provided more space between each unit. Cepeda confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Gascon stated he would like the applicant to provide additional information on building layout and building material to ensure this development is of good quality to last.

Cepeda – 3 bedroom, 2.5 bath units, 1,800 square feet. Standard construction meeting code, French modern style that is popular. Cost savings from having to do less site work, which will require fewer trees to be torn down.

Mr. Fleischer was interested in how the west side of the property with significant elevation drop will be treated in regards to drainage and aesthetics. Cepeda responded that they are improving that part of the site to address drainage issues that neighbors have been experiencing.

Ms. Hartz asked whether these units will be rental units. Cepeda confirmed they are rental units and that one of the units will be designated as a full-time rental office.

Ms. Holly reiterated Mr. Harvey's concerns about topography of the site and reminded the applicant of preliminary site development plan submittal requirements includes site cross-sections.

Mr. Mulligan clarified that since this project will not involve a PD, it will go through Site Plan Review, and that the applicant would provide drawings that meet the SPR requirements along with their CUP and REZ applications. Dr. Wagner confirmed.

6. New Business

a. Final Development Plan – FDP-05.

Applicant: U-City, LLC

Request: Approval of a Final Development Plan for Lot B, Market at Olive North, Plat 4

Address: Lot B, Market at Olive North, Plat 4

(VOTE REQUIRED)

Notes: Ms. Kennedy presented the staff report.

The applicant, George Stock, clarified that the additional striping for pedestrian crossings has been provided in the presented drawings.

Ms. Holly asked for a motion to recommend the FDP with the conditions in the staff report. Ms. McQueen motioned.

A discussion ensued about pedestrian safety between the subject property and the future Lot C development. The applicant/owner, Larry Chapman stated that they are open to providing and funding pedestrian improvements on Woodson Road as long as the County permits it.

Mr. Stock stated that they are planning internal signage between the three lots for pedestrians. Mr. Chapman reiterated that they want this to be a safe environment for all and that they are willing to what is needed to ensure it is safe. All agreed that the applicants, city staff, and Plan Commissioners will need to advocate for these improvements when approaching the County.

Ms. Hartz referenced concerns on page L2 in the packet: maintenance procedures (#4: we should only allow pruning in the spring, #8 mowers should not be allowed in the bioretention basins, unless it's a weed wacker, it should not be something with weight that you sit on and drive). Mr. Stock agreed and said he would share these with their landscape architect. Mr. Chapman reiterated that they should verify with MSD.

Mr. Chapman addressed concerns about delivery vehicles blocking traffic by stating that the majority of deliveries will occur outside of business hours.

Motion to approve the Final Development Plan. Vote passed unanimously.

b. Map Amendment – REZ-22-11

PUBLIC HEARING

Applicant: U. City, LLC

Request: Map Amendment to rezone 7.81 acres of land near 8601 Olive Boulevard, Phase IV of the Market at Olive development, from "PD-C" Planned Development Commercial District and "SR" Single-family Residential District to Planned Development Commercial District (PD-C), and to further consider approval of a Preliminary Site Development Plan for the proposed commercial development.

(VOTE REQUIRED)

Ms. Kennedy presented the staff report and explained the rationale for staff's recommendations.

Mr. Gascon noted, in regard to the bicycle parking requirements, the Applicant can refer to recently approved Planned Developments, such as Costco, for a precedent on the appropriate amount of parking. Mr. Gascon also advised the applicant to show the additional sidewalk and the crosswalk on Woodson Road in the Final Development Plan, as recommended by staff.

Ms. Hartz asked to clarify a 15-foot dimension shown at the northeast corner of

the site plan. Staff and the applicants clarified that this dimension is from the northeast corner of the building to the property line.

Ms. Holly opened the public hearing at 7:42 pm. No one spoke, and the public hearing was closed at 7:43 pm.

Ms. Hartz motioned to recommend the Map Amendment application, REZ-22-11. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Fleischer then motioned to recommend the Preliminary Development Plan associated with REZ-22-11. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Conditional Use Permit – CUP-22-13 – Informal Review

Applicant: Washington University – St. Louis

Request: Allow “Schools, private; including college or university-level facilities” in the University City Civic Complex Historic District on lots less than 0.45-acre in area.

Ms. Holly introduced the informal review of CUP and reminded the Plan Commission of conditional use permit review criteria.

Mr. Hales asked whether the CUP would go to the Historic Preservation Commission and Traffic Commission before officially coming to the Plan Commission. Mr. Wagner confirmed.

Stacey Wehe, architect and representative for the applicant, Washington University in St. Louis, presented the renovation plans and CUP application.

Ms. Holly asked if any members of the public had comments.

Ben Ellermann (6911 Washington Avenue) expressed a few concerns. Option 2 restricts and narrows access to the roundabout and doesn't relate to the historic nature of the site. Option 1 crosswalk needs more attention. General concerns in the neighborhood are related to parking, particularly when the applicant's building at 560 Trinity hosts concerts or events, there is insufficient parking in the COCA Garage and creates overflow parking issues in the neighborhood. Mr. Ellermann emphasized the need for a traffic study.

Ms. McQueen asked a site plan would be presented for Option 1. Mr. Wagner and Ms. Holly clarified that these plans are still in-process and that when it comes to the Plan Commission for official action, the applicants will have incorporated recommendations from the completed traffic study.

Mr. Gascon asked if staff anticipates any additional conditions in the forthcoming CUP.

Mr. Harvey asked whether they have considered long-term planning for the area. He also applauded the applicant's decision to reuse the church.

Mr. Fleischer asked if bike racks will be required.

Ms. Holly asked whether the university will provide shuttle transportation to the site, and reiterated that most students will travel to the site by bicycle, foot, or

shuttle. Ms. Wehe confirmed.

Mr. Mulligan asked whether the parking requirements have been reviewed for 560 Trinity. Mr. Wagner clarified that 560 will need to be sufficiently parked. Ms. Holly added that. Mr. Mulligan added that the parking garage is not completely available to the 560 Building—more than 100 spaces are reserved for COCA’s parking needs. He also recommended that the CUP and SPR be submitted simultaneously.

Mr. Harvey asked whether the playground would remain. Ms. Wehe stated that the daycare has ceased operation and that they haven’t discussed the playground, but that they will explore the option of keeping the playground for neighborhood use.

Steve Condrin (6014 Delmar), of Washington University, stated that the university does not have a 50-year plan for the site, in response to Mr. Harvey’s question.

Mr. Fleischer stated that he will be opposed to eliminating green space in front of the music building.

Mr. Hales shared several concerns about the proposed reuse of the subject site, which included impacts on the neighborhood in the long term, considering the university’s growth patterns; the impact of shuttles on the neighborhood; and concerns about adding a crosswalk and narrowing Trinity Avenue, a busy road.

Ms. Holly offered a couple notes for staff’s review of the CUP when the time comes. First, the 560 Building has several event spaces which can be rented out for private events, with a total capacity of more than 1,000 people. Ms. Holly also suggested including a condition that the subject site not be permitted for uses that would host events (auditoriums, music halls, etc.), but only permitted for classrooms and academic offices. Ms. Holly also urged the applicant to continue building trust and work toward solutions with the surrounding neighborhood.

d. Text Amendment – TXT-22-04

Applicant: City of University City

Request: Amend §400.030 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Definitions, to change the definition of “Dormitory.”

(VOTE REQUIRED).

Ms. Holly reminded the Plan Commission of the existing definition of “Dormitory” as well as the proposed definition. Mr. Wagner presented the staff report and added that dormitories are conditional uses in several zoning districts.

Mr. Harvey observed that the proposed definition excludes a number of persons living in the unit. The proposed definition change would require CUP for single-family homes or any other units under the existing threshold.

Ms. Hartz questioned including “accredited” in the definition, because theoretically non-accredited institutions could propose dormitories. She added that in the proposed definition, “and” be changed to “or”.

Mr. Gascon asked what the intent of this amendment is. He believes the definition

is an improvement but still has some grey area.

Mr. Hales provided some explanation that the definition is to provide more oversight on the impact of students, faculty, and staff associated with institutions living in a concentrated area of the City. The proposed definition of dormitories would require that institutional-related housing would be subject to a CUP.

Mr. Gascon raised the issue of privately-owned rental units.

Mr. Fleischer asked what the end game is.

Ms. Holly asked stated that she believes it is to better control for parking issues as well as the sheer number of young people in an environment where permanent residents have conflicting needs and desires in their neighborhood.

Ms. Holly shared again the proposed definition as well as neighboring municipalities' definitions.

Mr. Hales requested staff to research past CUPs, occupancy permits, and inspections for dormitories to determine what is being enforced under the current definition of dormitory.

Mr. Gascon stated that there would be benefits of expanding the definition to have more oversight. He presented a suggested revised definition:

“A building or portion thereof which contains living quarters for students, staff or members of a college, university, boarding school, theological school, hospital, religious order, or other comparable organization. This includes the following types of housing: student housing, fraternity/sorority house, home, or apartment, designed for those residents above.”

Mr. Hales stated that more work is needed on the definition. Ms. Holly agreed and stated that the proposed definition change could be a temporary measure to control for dormitory uses until a larger zoning code overhaul is complete which more comprehensively address the issue.

Mr. Mulligan stated that he and staff will study the definition and its impacts.

The Plan Commission did not act on the item.

7. Reports

a. Council Liaison Report

Mr. Hales stated his appreciation for the conversation on the final business item.

b. Plan Commission By-Laws

Ms. Holly asked the Plan Commission if there is any feedback on the bylaws. Mr. Harvey moved to adopt the presented bylaws.

The motion passed unanimously.

c. Third Ward Housing Task Force Update

Ms. McQueen noted that today, the task force released an RFP for consultants. RFPs are due January 17, 2023.

Mr. Hales confirmed that Ms. McQueen, Mr. Harvey, and Ms. Hartz have all been nominated and unanimously confirmed for an additional term on the Plan Commission. Ms. McQueen and Mr. Harvey will be entering their second terms, and Ms. Hartz will be on her special third term.

Election of officers will happen in January.

8. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 pm.