



CITY OF CREVE COEUR
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
DRAFT UPDATE II

GOVERNMENT CENTER
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
300 NORTH NEW BALLAS ROAD
NOVEMBER 7, 2016
6:30 PM

Call to Order

Chair Beth Kistner called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. by welcoming the public to the Commission meeting.

Roll Call

The following members were in attendance in addition to the chairperson: Mr. Tim Carney, Ms. Muriel Hall, Mr. Matthew Schuh, Mr. Don Magruder, Mr. Gene Rovak, and Ms. Heather Silverman.

Creve Coeur Staff present: City Attorney Carl Lumley, Director of Community Development Jason Jaggi, City Planner Whitney Kelly, and Planning Assistant Jessica Stutte.

Acceptance of the Agenda

A motion was made by Mr. Rovak, seconded by Mr. Magruder, and the agenda was unanimously approved.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Silverman, seconded by Mr. Carney, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Public Comment

None

New Business

Chair Beth Kistner re-opened the public hearing and gave a few introductory remarks. All who intended to testify were sworn in by the court reporter, then Ms. Kistner next asked Tim Breihan with H3 Studio provide his opening comments.

1. Public Hearing Application #16-028 Comprehensive Plan Update Adoption

Tim Breihan of H3 studio asked the Commission for comments regarding the revisions from Chapters 1-3.

There were none.

Mr. Breihan started his presentation on Chapter 4 by talking about more specific geographic places based on the plan. He said there are more community place type districts, 11 in total: 5 residential, 2 civic campus, and 4 commercial.

He then moved on to the key items that had been revised:

Mr. Breihan went over the East Olive corridor and Lindbergh Boulevard and said they had been split into separate sections.

He showed the separate central business district and the downtown area boundaries.

Planning and Zoning Commission
November 7, 2016

He also showed the campus- suburban and campus urban have been combined in a single campus type.

Mr. Breihan went over the key issues in Residential districts.

He spoke about the vision statement regarding the residential districts, then gave a series of recommendations based on lot development standards; storm water and runoff mitigation, tree coverage standards, & green space preservation.

He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Schuh asked about the sidewalks.

Mr. Breihan said in terms of how they would be implemented it would go with the zoning code, and street improvements. They want to set parameters to help match the place types.

Mr. Jaggi added that they would tweak the ordinances to allow new homes to be built, but would recommend certain standards in grades, for example.

Ms. Kistner asked if there were lot development standards used to determine height and that would be to relate them to existing grades and nearby height.

Mr. Rovak said the rationale would be good in the document and said Mr. Breihan's presentation was a good bridge.

Mr. Breihan said the information he summarized was on page 64 of the draft plan.

Mr. Carney said the community center district and the mixed use district look similar.

Mr. Klierman, a resident, was sworn in then said he wanted to know about the emergency response time in neighborhoods.

Mr. McCoy of the Parks and Rec Committee said it should be mentioned to allow for thru ways on residential streets

Mr. Schuh pointed out it was in section 9.

Mr. Lumley said it was on page 71 in the plan.

Mr. Breihan said not everything is represented on the slides.

He moved on to the downtown and central business district (CBD), which has 4 commercial and mixed use community place type districts. There are 3 street functional classifications.

He said the goal is to begin to establish an identity for the main thoroughfares throughout the city.

Mr. Lumley asked about the word "maximum" as to the number of frontage characteristics.

Mr. Breihan said it allows for 12 frontage types.

He said significant revision had been done to the boundaries of the downtown boundary. He showed the downtown area and said there is feasibility of an adjacent site for town center development.

Mr. Carney said he was concerned about the residential area. He said it looked like the only thing that could change would be landscaping and site work.

Mr. Breihan said where the boundary goes is up to the Commission.

Mr. Carney asked what Mr. Breihan considered mixed use/multi-family

Planning and Zoning Commission
November 7, 2016

Mr. Breihan said it could take a variety of forms, but could be multi-unit homes, condos, and town homes.

Ms. Kistner asked what the benefit was of including the area west of New Ballas.

Mr. Breihan said in some ways it is moot because of what is there.

Mr. Magruder asked what was back there now.

Mr. Breihan said there is strip development, support for Plaza, and other low intensity development.

Mr. Jaggi said it's important to understand that we have a larger central business district area. To have some housing types mixed in, a downtown core and high commercial area. There is still potential. The plan seeks to clarify the CBD and give more direction in development for the bigger picture.

Mr. Breihan moved on to the golf course and the future use of the land should it no longer function as a golf course.

Mr. Jaggi said the commission should discuss the future plans for the golf course, but the proposition tomorrow in the election could have an effect.

Ms. Kistner asked the commission if they would like to defer discussion of the golf course until after the election.

Mr. Breihan continued with the frontage requirements for the central business district
He covered primary and secondary frontage, as well as signage and lot development standards.

Mr. Rovak said everything has been general, but the tone of this section has been more specific.

Mr. Breihan said signage is a more immediate issue

Mr. Jaggi said it is specific, but the concept is place type and standards are a little lax now.

Ms. Silverman said the general feeling would be nice with less specifics.

Mr. Jaggi said it could be reexamined and reworded

Mr. Rovak said it would be good to show examples of other cases that were successful to show those who disapprove of moving forward.

Mr. Jaggi said every city is unique, but in terms of examples, there are lists that have been successful. Not many are here in this area, but we need to nurture it and bring it forward. There are challenges because it is different from what is currently here. Mr. Jaggi said people like to have walkability and we need to build to attract those elements that draw people in. Some of the concepts have been tested and have been successful.

Ms. Kistner said she went to two Trader Joes yesterday. The one in Chicago had no frontage and she said it was interesting to see how it works the other way. She wanted to know how to think about Olive Blvd.

She asked if the should be thinking separately about Olive and the build-to line.

Mr. Breihan said functionality is the goal, not to make Olive a main street because it is a state highway. But it could be improved.

Ms. Kelly said the maximum setback in the CBD currently is 80 ft. along Olive and 15 ft. elsewhere.

Planning and Zoning Commission
November 7, 2016

Mr. Jaggi said Olive is an urban thoroughfare it would have landscaping and treatment along the road, but a Main Street is more intimate and walkable.

Ms. Campbell said she would like to see things connected since they are fairly close to each other. She said it would be nice to have them all within walking distance.

Mr. Hilton of Creve Coeur Plaza said he has extensive history in Creve Coeur. He said his concerns are regarding the setback lines in commercial areas. He said what is being proposed is not the answer.

Ms. Kistner asked what he would like to see.

Mr. Hilton said retail is dying.

Mr. Schuh asked about situations where the town center has worked.

Mr. Hilton said the Leawood Town Center is a great example, but it was developed on raw land. He said it was planned and here we don't have that option. If Monsanto moves to Chesterfield, then a huge lot of land would open up.

Mr. Jaggi said the daytime population is very different from Kirkwood and Wildwood, and asked Mr. Hilton if that changed the demographic and market in Creve Coeur.

Mr. Hilton said restaurants want a crowd for both lunch and dinner. He spoke about the land across from the Galleria. He said that land isn't working because there isn't enough synergy to keep people there to make it work. He said density plays into that as well.

Mr. Magruder asked what changes he recommended in the plan.

Mr. Hilton said he didn't like moving the frontage to the street and the storied parking garages.

Ms. Kistner asked if he was speaking in general or specifically about his frontage.

Mr. Hilton said specifically where he is, but he doesn't think it will work elsewhere either.

Mr. Rovak asked if the difference was parking.

Mr. Hilton said it creates logistical issues.

Mr. Breihan moved on to West Olive & Large Commercial Properties. He said the geographical areas are designed to maintain high vehicular access. He pointed out a proposed revision.

Mr. Jaggi said it was originally a planned development, but the designation was a mixed-use and based off the comment they received, a change to suburban multi-family district would keep with the vision of the comprehensive plan. He said he wanted to explain why it was designated mixed-use to begin with.

Mr. Breihan continued with the recommendations regarding primary street frontage and secondary street frontages.

Ms. Schaberg thanked the commission, staff and Mr. Breihan for considering her comments last session regarding Questover and Westlake. She continued by saying the exclusion of monument signs would impact businesses in a negative way.

Planning and Zoning Commission
November 7, 2016

Mr. Lumley said he didn't see that in the plan.

Mr. Breihan said it was a mistake in the presentation.

Mr. Jaggi said it is a different area of Olive and it would be permitted.

Mr. Breihan moved on to the East corridor and went over the vision statement. He said the goal is to better coordinate and maximize building area and parking. He went through the recommendations and showed an example of lots that could be improved.

Mr. Carney said some of the lots may be too small to meet the requirements.

Mr. Breihan said that is true, many lots can fit a standard; lots that don't, will require some flexibility.

Mr. Carney asked if parking was intended to be shared.

Mr. Breihan said shared parking and cross lot access would be good.

Mr. Magruder said the setbacks would improve visibility to have consistency.

Mr. Breihan could have less restrictive parking.

Mr. Magruder mentioned that lots could be purchased behind the commercial property.

Mr. Breihan mentioned annexing and the challenges of purchasing property that falls outside of Creve Coeur.

Mr. Jaggi mentioned Noodles and Company and the cooperation there, but not everyplace has room to meet the requirements they do. He mentioned the Goddard School that has a lot of what they are looking for in that part of the corridor.

Ms. Silverman said the pedestrian zone is critical. The feedback she has received from peers is that Creve Coeur is landlocked and too hard to get around.

Mr. Rovak said long term is important and storm water control is important.

Ms. Kistner drew the Commission's attention to the Greenline Park concept in the previous plan and said it sounded good on paper, but didn't work. She said not everything will work on narrow lots.

Ms. Silverman said she agreed, said narrow lots are a little different.

Mr. Jaggi said the intent is to have landscaped frontage which would include a public sidewalk that is separate from the parking lot. He said it doesn't need to be deep.

Ms. Kistner said it suggests to be more than it is.

Mr. Jaggi said there needs to be some landscaping to keep it pleasant to look at.

Ms. Kistner said consistent landscaping standards and street trees, would seem to fit better.

Mr. Breihan said the dimensions could change and the landscape standards would speak to what goes in that.

Ms. Kistner said she would appreciate them reexamining that area because of the narrow lots.

Planning and Zoning Commission
November 7, 2016

Mr. Breihan said given the existing limited dimensions they could be more specific in this area to lesson confusion.

Ms. Kistner asked for public comment.

Mr. Jaffe said shared parking has been disastrous long term for him. He asked for flexibility with developers.

Mr. Stern said the #1 priority that what is entailed currently in the plan will take away from the revenue. He said that 60 % of the revenue comes from 20% of the land. He passed out copies of a drawing an architect had done to meet the current requirements. He said he had concerns with the frontage lines as well.

Ms. Kistner asked what kind of tenant they would see.

Mr. Stern said it is services that are moving in traditional retail is rare. He said the daytime population would like to see drive-thru's.

Ms. Silverman said in Clayton you see pet stores, things that cater to kids.

Mr. Stern said that block is unusual.

Ms. Silverman said she thinks there is a market, she doesn't want to eliminate it from the plan.

Mr. Stern said based on his experience there aren't a lot of retail tenants along Olive.

Mr. Jaggi said the plan does not prohibit parking along the frontage. He said the location of lots, landscaping, etc. is what they are trying to lock down. He said shared parking is difficult to do but cross access is easier to negotiate.

Mr. Schuh asked about the city providing public parking.

Mr. Jaggi said he did not see any demand for the city to provide parking in this area.

Mr. Breihan moved on to the Plan Sciences Innovation District and the vision for that type district. Mr. Carney asked if the plan was in line with the plan of those in the Plan Science District.

Mr. Breihan said it was.

Ms. Kistner asked if they should take a break, power through or break for the evening.

Mr. Jaggi said there was still a fair amount to cover. He said the next meeting has 4 projects to review and we may have to extend it into December.

Ms. Kistner said she didn't want to give less attention to the plan because their energy was waning.

Mr. Jaggi said there are 4 projects for the next meeting and we can try to finish Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. He suggested carrying over into December if needed.

Mr. Breihan gave the breakdown for the remainder of the plan and how long he thought it would take.

Mr. Jaggi said with the projects for the next meeting, it would be best to plan on not getting through too much.

Mr. Magruder asked when they could discuss things they may have concerns with.

Planning and Zoning Commission

November 7, 2016

Ms. Kistner said she thought that was what they were doing as they went through, but can discuss later.

Mr. Schuh asked about public notice.

Mr. Jaggi said the public had been notified. He said they could tweak some things based on comments tonight and present those changes at the next meeting.

Mr. Rovak made a motion to continue the hearing and Mr. Magruder seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Department Reports

Mr. Jaggi said there were 4 items on the agenda for the next meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission, upon motion being made and duly seconded, the public hearing was recessed until November 21, 2016 and the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Beth Kistner, Chairman

Jessica Stutte, Recording Secretary