CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES  
September 15, 2020

The City Council met this date in a regular session, via Zoom, which was available to the public via teleconference, at 7:38 pm.

Present at Roll Call: Mayor Gerry Welch  
Councilmember Laura Arnold  
Councilmember Pam Bliss  
Councilmember David Franklin  
Councilmember Emerson Smith  
Councilmember Karen D. Alexander  
Councilmember Sarah Richardson

A quorum was present.

Also present: Ms. Joan Jadali, Interim City Manager  
Mr. Neil Bruntrager, City Attorney  
Ms. Katie Nakazono, City Clerk

PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Welch opened the public hearing. Mara Perry, Director of Planning and Development, gave a brief presentation (Exhibit A, available in the City Clerk’s office). She reviewed the process for the proposed changes at the Plan Commission (See Exhibit A, page 2). These were approved by the Plan Commission in March of 2020, and we were prepared to come to Council in April when COVID hit. She stated that they are asking the Council to hold the Public Hearing open at this time for review and public comment. We added in bicycle parking regulations, based on discussion with the Sustainability Commission. More intense developments can cause parking deficits, especially in commercial districts. We looked at minimums and maximums – we don’t want to overpark. There are options for a variance including staff, Plan Commission, and the Board of Adjustment (See Exhibit A, page 5). We looked clearly at loading spaces (See Exhibit A, page 6). She reviewed parking facility design (See Exhibit A, page 7-10). We also looked at location and front yard parking. We have had complaints about people parking in the grass on the side of their driveway, etc. We looked at options for driveway extension without allowing a paved front yard. The Plan Commission spent a lot of time on this. We added in information on circle drives to ensure vehicles can make it around the driveway. She reviewed Commercial and Industrial Vehicles (See Exhibit A, page 10-12). She discussed trailers, dumpsters, etc. (See Exhibit A, page 12). We did add bicycle parking, which is new to our Code (See Exhibit A, page 13-14). She reviewed accessory parking facilities and modification of parking standards (See Exhibit A, page 14-16).
Councilmember Arnold asked about vehicle signage. I think it is not a particularly welcoming way to think about our community. I would encourage my colleagues to look at 53.183, the section on Commercial Vehicles, especially subsection 3 and 4. I really do find it bothersome to say to people that they can work in our community but not park their vehicle in a visible way.

Ms. Perry stated that they did have that discussion at Plan Commission, and they did not ask to change it. But you can certainly have that discussion here.

Councilmember Arnold also commended Ms. Perry and the Commission on all the work that went into this.

Councilmember Franklin asked why student parking only requires one space and multi-family requires 1.5. Ms. Perry stated that it assumes a combination in dorms where a lot of students don't have vehicles and use bikes or other means. We can research it further if you would like. Councilmember Franklin stated that he understands the rationale, and was just questioning.

Ms. Perry stated that we really only have Webster University. They have a certain amount of spaces for classrooms, office uses, beds, etc., and by keeping that number down it is because of group usage for the campus.

Councilmember Arnold asked about a scenario in which we want people to overpark. Ms. Perry stated that we don't. You will find cases where someone comes in and tears down a building and thinks they need a certain number of spaces and overpark it. Councilmember Arnold asked about the exception. Ms. Perry stated that other communities have been convinced that someone needs additional parking. Some cities do “phantom parking” where they can take out green space and squeeze spaces in. But it is rare, and maybe we don't need it.

Ms. Perry stated that if Council has questions ahead of the next meeting, they can prepare backup for them.

A motion was made by Councilmember Arnold, seconded by Councilmember Bliss, to keep the Public Hearing open until the October 6, 2020 Council meeting.

Mayor Welch called for the vote to keep the public hearing open until the October 6, 2020 Council meeting.

MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: ARNOLD, BLISS, FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that the public hearing would be kept open until the October 6, 2020 Council meeting.

BILL #9131 – FIRST & SECOND READING (NOT CONDUCTED)
AND UPDATE REGULATIONS FOR PARKING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICTS AND MATTERS RELATED THERETO

REMARKS OF VISITORS
Jennifer Conrad, Deputy City Clerk, read submitted Remarks of Visitors into the record. Submissions were received from:

- Janice Epperson – (Exhibit B) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- AJ AngaJala – (Exhibit C) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Meredith Gugger – (Exhibit D) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Peter Nuernberger – (Exhibit E) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Dave Buck - (Exhibit F) - Comments on youth involvement in government.
- Richard Mazzarella – (Exhibit G) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Jamie Hasemeier – (Exhibit H) - Comments on concerns about Sustainability in Webster Groves.
- Bo Roche – (Exhibit I) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.

Following Jamie Hasemeier’s statement, Mayor Welch stated that the Mayors for Clean Energy has been coming up a lot. I have been asked repeatedly to sign it. I never sign any agreement without the support of Council. This supports a 100% clean renewable energy. It is a goal, a policy that the City would have a goal of 100% clean energy. A lot of my fellow mayors have not signed it because it is so extreme. I will pass it on to you to take a look. If the Council wants to establish a goal of 100% clean energy we can go ahead with it.

NEW BUSINESS – MAYOR, COUNCILMEMBERS, CITY ATTORNEY, CITY MANAGER
Mayor Welch reminded everyone that developer SG Collaborative is holding a virtual Town Hall on Thursday, September 24.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
BILL #9127 & #9128 – THIRD READINGS (NOT CONDUCTED)
A motion was made by Councilmember Franklin, seconded by Councilmember Arnold, to postpone the third reading of, BILL #9127 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE LEVying AND ESTABLISHING THE RATE OF ANNUAL PROPERTY TAXES TO BE COLLECTED FOR THE YEAR 2020 BY THE CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES, MISSOURI, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 9086, AND BILL #9128 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE LEVying AND ESTABLISHING THE RATE OF ANNUAL PROPERTY TAXES TO BE COLLECTED FOR THE YEAR 2020 FOR THE
WEBSTER GROVES LIBRARY DISTRICT, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 9087, until the City receives final numbers from the Board of Equalization.
Mayor Welch called for the vote to postpone the third readings of Bill #9127 and #9128 until final numbers are received from the Board of Equalization.
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: BLISS, FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that the third reading of Bill #9127 and Bill #9128 would be postponed until final numbers are received from the Board of Equalization.

BILL #9130 – THIRD READING
On motion of Councilmember Bliss, seconded by Councilmember Franklin, BILL #9130 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE LEVYING THE COST OF ABATING CERTAIN NUISANCES (TITLE SEARCH, CUT/TRIM, DEBRIS, ETC.) AS SPECIAL TAX BILLS AGAINST THE PROPERTIES HEREINAFTER DESCRIBED AND CONSTITUTING LEVIES AS LIENS ON THE RESPECTIVE PROPERTIES, having been introduced and read twice on September 1, 2020, was taken up its title read a third time and placed upon its passage to become Ordinance #9130.
Mayor Welch called for the vote on Bill #9130.
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that Bill #9130 was approved

NEW BUSINESS
BILL #9132 – FIRST & SECOND READING
Councilmember Alexander introduced BILL #9132 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES, MISSOURI, AMENDING THE CITY CODE, CHAPTER 4, ARTICLE XX, SECTION 4.1200 “POLICE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT BOARD CREATED”, AND SECTION 4.1205 “MEMBERSHIP” TO ADD A REGULAR MEMBER POSITION AND AMEND THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE YOUTH LIAISON, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE #9129, and at the Councilmember’s request, the Bill was read twice, first and second times by title only, and placed on the agenda for future consideration of the Council.

A motion was made by Councilmember Arnold, seconded by Councilmember Alexander, to amend Bill #9132, Section 4.1205.a.5 to add the sentence, “Preference will be given for a member focused on youth engagement.”
Mayor Welch called for the vote to amend Bill #9132.
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS, FRANKLIN
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that Bill #9132 was amended.

CONSENT AGENDA
A motion was made by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Arnold, to approve the Consent Agenda.
Mayor Welch called for the vote on the Consent Agenda.
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS, FRANKLIN, SMITH
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that the Consent Agenda was approved.

The following consent agenda was approved:
- **Approval of Minutes** – September 1, 2020
- **Resolution #2020-32** – Authorizing the City Manager to Purchase Personal Protective Gear for the Fire Department
- **Resolution #2020-33** – Amending the Budget for FY 2020 and FY 2021
- **Resolution #2020-34** – Authorizing the City Manager to Extend the Current Agreement with US Bank for Banking Depository Services
- **Resolution #2020-35** – Accepting MoDOT Grants for Police Services and Equipment for 2020-2021

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**
No appointments to Boards and Commissions.

**EXECUTIVE (CLOSED) SESSION**
Councilmember Arnold made a motion, which was seconded by Councilmember Bliss, to go into Executive Closed Session per Attorney-Client Privileged Communications [MO Statute 610.021(1)], Real Estate [MO Statute 610.021 (2)], and Negotiated Contract [MO Statute 610.021 (12)].
Mayor Welch called for the vote to go into Executive [Closed] Session.
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS, FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that they would go into Executive [Closed] Session.

**ADJOURNMENT**
There being no further business to come before the City Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m. on motion of the Mayor, duly seconded.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 10th day of OCTOBER, 2020.

[Signature]
MAYOR

[Signature]
CITY CLERK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC HEARING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to the format of holding a public hearing virtually via Zoom the City is using the following procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff is requesting that the Public Hearing be held open and all public comments held to the next scheduled meeting date of October 6, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The powerpoint and recording of the staff presentation will be made available on the City website by end of day Thursday September 17, 2020 for viewing.  
- Members of the public will have multiple options to speak at the October 6, 2020 continuation of the Public Hearing.  
  - Mail written comments to City Hall – three minutes of which will be read into the record  
  - E-mail comments into citycouncil@webstergroves.org – three minutes of which will be read into the record  
  - Submit Comments or Sign Up to Speak on line prior to the meeting (this option will be available by October 2). You may also email a request to speak at citycouncil@webstergroves.org  
  - Use the “hand up” option in Zoom to request to speak at the meeting.  
- A reminder that each speaker will have three minutes.  
- The order of speakers will begin with those who register ahead of time, followed by written comments read into the record and then “hand up” attending the Zoom meeting.
**Bill #9131 First & Second Reading**


**Plan Commission Discussion**

- Minimum dimensional requirements
- Parking supply minimum/maximum
- ADA Accessibility
- Trailers & commercial vehicles in residential districts
- Procedure for modification of standards
- Plan Commission priorities

---

**Bill #9131 First & Second Reading**


**Plan Commission Discussion**

- Existing city code does not contain minimum dimensional requirements
- Codifying standards can improve:
  - Clarified development expectations
  - Aesthetics
  - Safety
  - Property rights & shared driveway agreements
  - City enforcement

Parking Development Standards

- Definitions
- Parking supply minimums and maximums by use category
- Loading space requirements
- Parking facility design and dimensional requirements
- Cross-references to code sections on stormwater management, landscaping, ADA-accessibility & building code
- Bicycle parking regulations
- Commercial vehicle parking and other larger vehicle storage in residential districts
- Accessory parking facilities
- Refining procedure for requesting modifications from parking standards and shared parking

CONSIDERATIONS:
- Existing code regulations
- 1 per 300 sq ft commercial
- 1 per 1,000 sq ft industrial
- Additional limited uses identified in code
- Parking not required in "D" District
- St. Louis County parking regulations with further research into additional local and national standards
- Seeking to encourage flexible, adaptive reuse of existing buildings and facilities while accounting for parking impacts of new construction and more intense development

Minimum number of off-street parking spaces required for each use type and maximum supply allowed for each use type

Minimum Parking Space Requirements:
- The minimum number of off-street parking spaces required for permitted and conditional uses are found in Sections 53.168 of the Article. Where no minimum requirement is specified, or where one or more of the parking requirements may be considered as adequate by the same use, 1 car parking space shall be granted for each 200 square feet of the floor area of the paved area of the building, but no more than 120% of the space requirements found in Section 53.188 of the Article.
Bill #9131
First & Second Reading


Parking Development Standards
Parking minimums/maximums

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Retain existing code regulations, where appropriate
• Incorporating St. Louis County Standards, where appropriate, with further research into additional local and national standards (Institute of Traffic Engineers, APA, etc.) where gaps exist
• Encourage adaptive re-use of existing buildings and facilities
• Account for parking impacts of new construction and more intense development
Bill #9131
First & Second Reading

Parking Development Standards
Parking Minimums/Maximums
- Fractions
- Multiple Uses
- Area measurements
- Off-street loading and service areas

Parking Development Standards
Loading Space Requirements

Exhibit A

Parking Development Standards

Parking facility design

- Minimum dimensional requirements
- Spatial requirements for parking spaces and access lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Angle (degrees)</th>
<th>Stall Width (feet)</th>
<th>Min. Length Stall to Curb (feet)</th>
<th>Aisle Width (feet)</th>
<th>Curb Length per Car (feet)</th>
<th>Curb to Curb (feet)</th>
<th>Center to Center Width Double Row (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1[1] With aisle between; additional width may be required where the aisle serves as the principal means of access to on-site buildings or structures.

CONSIDERATIONS: Codify St. Louis County Off-street Parking Facilities Design table or other similar reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Angle (degrees)</th>
<th>Stall Width (feet)</th>
<th>Min. Length Stall to Curb (feet)</th>
<th>Aisle Width (feet)</th>
<th>Curb Length per Car (feet)</th>
<th>Curb to Curb (feet)</th>
<th>Center to Center Width Double Row (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1[1] With aisle between; additional width may be required where the aisle serves as the principal means of access to on-site buildings or structures.

Exhibit A
Bill #9131  
First & Second Reading  

Parking Development Standards
Parking facility design

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Location
Regulating where parking may be located

• Retain existing requirements in residential districts
• Prohibit future front yard parking lots in "D" Commercial District (Old Webster)
• Limit tractor-trailer parking in front yards in commercial and industrial districts, except for deliveries

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Maximum driveway width in front yard:
• Maximum/ minimum curb cut width
• Minimum driveway turning radius

3. Driveway Design Requirements.
A. At single and two-family dwellings, driveway width in the portion of the front yard located in front of the dwelling shall not exceed that which is necessary to accommodate the required one (1) parking space located in the rear yard of that portion of the side yard which lies between the main building and the side lot lines or that which is necessary to access the parking space in a front entry attached garage.

B. Requests to exceed the maximum driveway width in front of a dwelling shall be accompanied by a site plan produced by a licensed professional engineer for the review of the Director of Planning and Development. Requests may be administratively approved if the applicant meets the burden of proof by showing clear and convincing evidence that the requested modifications are appropriate to the site and do not cause detriment to the adjacent properties.

C. Curb cut width.
Curb cut width shall not be narrower than ten (10) feet and shall not exceed twenty-four (24) feet at the front lot line.

D. Minimum turning radius.
Driveways shall have a minimum outside turning radius of twenty-eight (28) feet.

Exhibit A

Parking Development Standards

Parking facility design

CONSIDERATIONS:

• Driveway design standards

CONSIDERATIONS:

• Maximum driveway width in front yard:
• Maximum/ minimum curb cut width
• Minimum driveway turning radius


Exhibit A
Parking Development Standards

**Parking facility design**

- Driveway design standards

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Maximum driveway width in front yard:
- Maximum/minimum curb cut width
- Minimum driveway turning radius

### Additional Driveway Design Requirements:

1. **Curb cut width**
   - Curb cut width shall not be narrower than ten (10) feet and shall not exceed twenty-four (24) feet at the front of the property.

2. **Minimum turning radius**
   - Driveways shall have a minimum outside turning radius of twenty-eight (28) feet.

### Commercial and Industrial Vehicles

Parking commercial and industrial vehicles in residential districts

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Alignment with Home Occupation regulations
- Allowance for hardships

---

**Commercial or Industrial Vehicle**: shall mean any vehicle or equipment used for commercial or industrial purposes with or without signage with the exception of a passenger vehicle or station wagon bearing no signpost.
Bill #9131
First & Second Reading


Parking Development Standards
Commercial and Industrial Vehicles

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Alignment with Home Occupation regulations
• Allowance for hardships

Parking commercial and industrial vehicles in residential districts

Bill #9131
First & Second Reading

Parking Development Standards
Commercial and Industrial Vehicles

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Alignment with Home Occupation regulations
• Allowance for hardships

Parking commercial and industrial vehicles in residential districts


Bill #9131
First & Second Reading

Parking Development Standards
Trailers, Dumpsters, Etc.

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Limit other vehicle storage to enclosed and rear yard spaces
• Allow for short term flexibility for construction periods, vacations, travel, etc.

Other vehicle and container storage in residential districts

Exhibit A

Parking Development Standards

Bicycle Parking

CONSIDERATIONS:
- Bicycle parking space requirements
- Design & location standards
- Required vehicle parking space reduction

Bicycle Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Bicycle Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family (4 or more units)</td>
<td>2 spaces or 1 space per 50 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, Government, Healthcare</td>
<td>2 spaces or 1 space per 10,000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, Stores &amp; Services</td>
<td>2 spaces or 1 space per 10,000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Use</td>
<td>2 spaces or 1 space per 10,000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1 space per classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other non-residential uses</td>
<td>2 spaces plus 1 space per 10 off-street bicycle parking spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit A
Bill #9131
First & Second Reading

Parking Development Standards

Bicycle Parking

CONSIDERATIONS:
- Bicycle parking space requirements
- Design & location standards
- Required vehicle parking space reduction

3. Reduction in Required Automobile Parking for Bicycle Parking
The total number of required off-street automobile parking spaces pursuant to Section S.155(a) may be reduced at a ratio of one (1) automobile parking space per every (2) bicycle parking spaces provided. The total number of required automobile parking spaces shall not be reduced by more than ten percent (10%) for any project.

Accessory Parking Facilities

CONSIDERATIONS:
- Conditional Use Permit required
- Design & location standards
- Vehicle limitations

Section S.156. Development Standards for Accessory Parking Facilities
Accessory parking facilities shall be permitted upon meeting the conditions below, and upon compliance with the provisions of Sec. 53.175 et. seq.:

a. Accessory parking facilities may be located within three hundred (300) feet of the primary use.

b. Accessory parking facilities shall not be located in required or established front yard.

c. Parking shall not be located within ten (10) feet of a property line abutting a residence district.

d. Accessory parking facilities shall adhere to the Site and Landscape Design Standards in Chapter 15 of the Multifamily Code.

In residential and commercial districts, accessory parking facilities shall not be used for the parking of trailer, RV's, commercial trailer-haulers, or similar such vehicles by determination by the Director of Planning & Development.

Bill #9131
First & Second Reading

Parking Development Standards
Modification of Parking Standards

CONSIDERATIONS:
- Allow for flexible, creative parking solutions
- Encourage adaptive re-use of existing structures and sites

Exhibit A
Bill #9131
First & Second Reading


Parking Development Standards
Modification of Parking Standards

CONSIDERATIONS:
• Allow for flexible, creative parking solutions
• Encourage adaptive re-use of existing structures and sites

Exhibit A
City Council,

I would like to express my concerns over the Webster Development Project. This project is way too big for the small area they are planning to develop. It will not only disrupt and destroy the Shady Creek area, but will also disrupt and destroy the sense of community that is Webster Groves.

With a development of this size it will not only destroy green space which wildlife depend on, but also take away the enjoyment people in this area experience everyday. It will also add to the already existing problem with flooding of roadways and yards in this area, only making it worse.

Many of the people who live in this area were attracted to it because of the green space, the feeling of living in a small, close community, and the charm of Old Webster. This development if allowed to progress will destroy all of that and more.

Please take these concerns into consideration when deciding if this is the right development for our community.

Sincerely,

Janice Epperson

Sent from my iPad
Hi, I wanted to share how displeased my fiance (copied on this email) and I are about the new development of 8 7-story buildings. We are NOT in favor of these tall structures, population density, ruining the quintessential and picturesque neighborhood because some developer wants to make a buck on this. We are open to further dialogue and voting process.

AJ ANGAJALA | PRINCIPAL | BROKER
DIRECT 314.930.9991 | MAIN 314.930.9990 | EMAIL AJ@NextDoorSTL.com
NEXTDOORSTL.COM | VIEWSTLOUISREALESTATE.COM
Dear City Council,

I’m extremely concerned about the proposed Webster Redevelopment Project and the safety of my family and neighbors. I live at 505 W. Kirkham between Slocum and Parsons near Larson Park. The traffic speeds are already dangerously high on this stretch of Kirkham Ave, enough to where I worked with Captain Spear a few years ago to start a petition with my neighbors to get a traffic study done on Kirkham. Captain Spear had the study performed and found excessive speeding, however nothing came about from it, which was very disappointing. Now, with the talks of adding hundreds of more cars onto Kirkham daily, I’m very concerned about the dangerous conditions. Kirkham is a very windy and narrow road (narrow space between sidewalk and street) near Larson Park. I’m seriously consider moving if this development is approved.

Thank you,
Meredith

Meredith Gugger, CPA | Washington University in St. Louis
Arts & Sciences - Director of Budgeting and Accounting
South Brookings Suite 205, Campus Box 1094 | St. Louis, MO 63112
☎: 314.935.6399 | ✉️: meredith.gugger@wustl.edu
I am concerned with the scope and scale of the proposed redevelopment plan along Shady Creek. First off, the idea of multiple 7 story buildings does not fit into the community feel and pace that we moved to when we bought our home. Secondly, the traffic along Kirkham is already busy enough with people cutting through to the west - almost always at a high rate of speed. This street that has little separation with the sidewalk and nothing has been done to help this issue. The proposed riverwalk does nothing to help the added traffic that will be inevitable towards Rock Hill Rd. Finally, there are already enough empty storefronts along Lockwood where a great vibe is already beginning to take shape - shouldn't our efforts be focused on further developing what is already in place? What is going to be done to address the shortage of parking that is already at issue with the new restaurants opening this year? As currently detailed, I am opposed to this development

Peter Nuernberger (W. Kirkham Ave.)
To our "Young at Heart" Mayor & City Council,

As background, if you have never seen this video or if it has been a while, I encourage you to watch "16 in Webster Groves", a hour long documentary by CBS News and narrated by Charles Kuralt about students in Webster Groves High School in 1966. You may even recognize a few current adult residents. It paints a honest and sometimes unflattering picture of student life at school and in our community.

https://vimeo.com/12658300

16 in Webster Groves on Vimeo

16 In Webster Groves was a 1966 award-winning documentary one-hour TV special produced by CBS News focusing on the experiences of adolescents growing up and living in Webster Groves, Missouri, United States.

vimeo.com

My point in sharing this is that our kids, 18 and under, represent almost 30% of Webster's total population, yet we adults, including yours truly, do not reach out to them enough for their ideas, thinking and opinions. Kids are the hope of the world, they see the world through a different lens, and they are, by far, the most creative people on the planet.

Here's two opportunities:

• Your recent letter on racism and graffiti stated that Council has held meetings with the School District, Webster U and the North Webster Neighborhood Coalition, all with adults and no students. In particular, I would strongly encourage you to meet with the youth from the June 7 protest rally at Blackburn Park and let them fully participate in your community conversations.
• The idea to create a "Student Advisory Council" at the high school to provide perspectives and ideas to City Council on current issues has been put on the table and acknowledged, but
no action yet. Maybe it is a new City Board or Commission that meets regularly or when current issues demand it.

In closing, the poet, William Wordsworth simply and profoundly wrote, "The child is father to the man." True, we adults teach our kids many things, but may we never forget that our kids teach us very valuable things in return. Please do not shut them out of commenting on the community they love.

Thank you.

PEACE.

Dave
Dear Mayor and City Council,

We continue to garner petition support against the enormous size of the Webster Redevelopment Project. It will destroy the environment of Shady Creek, will result in a reduction in the amount of green space and will also result in road widening and increased noise, traffic and parking problems for the surrounding community.

The buildings are clearly way too tall. To our knowledge there are no 6 or 7-story buildings in Webster Groves let alone 8 of them. A 5-story building was defeated across from City Hall because it was too tall. The Elle Apartments on Lockwood was proposed to be 6-stories high but was later modified to 3-stories because it was too tall. Why must the local residents from the poorer side of Webster endure at least 8 7-story buildings? Please dispense justice equally no matter which side of the railroad tracks the residents live.

Also the height of the buildings are cleverly hidden from the richer side of Webster while it will look like downtown Manhattan for the people on the other side. Where does Mr Chapman live we might ask? Undoubtedly on the richer side.

We hear the statement that the buildings need to be this tall because the land is so expensive. The primary concern should be that the development is good for Webster and it is also of benefit to the local residents. A project of this size does neither the detrimental effects to the environment and the living standards of the local residents far outweigh any potential benefits. Also, the potential for unforeseen negative secondary effects can not be underestimated from a gigantic project of this size.

Please reconsider making this project smaller by at least two-fold or go back to the drawing board and consider less invasive ideas.

Sincerely,
Rich Mazzarella
Greetings to all.
I realize we are looking at multiple crises at once. I know we are all working toward racial equality in meaningful and measurable ways, while dealing with a deadly pandemic that has hit the physical and economic health of our community in ways that could not have been predicted. I thank you for your time, energy, and perseverance.

However, I want to take this opportunity to remind everyone of the importance and urgency of managing the climate crisis our community faces as well.
While many might feel that the issue can be pushed to the back burner, it is simply fact that we have to start acting like our house is on fire, because for those in the west it literally is on fire, and for those south of us, they are preparing for yet another hurricane that threatens to inundate them with flood waters.

We are in an emergency.
It is time for us to take action.

Acting NOW will require us to think both locally and globally. What can WE do in Webster Groves to improve the health and sustainability of our community and of the global environment.

We must think of a multi-faceted approach; Big and small solutions.

Encouraging better behaviour of our citizens (walking and biking more, backyard composting, energy conservation incentives, encouraging our many restaurants to join the Green Dining Alliance) AND creating legislative support (reduce carbon emissions from our own fleet of vehicles, encourage energy efficiency of our buildings, high standards for new buildings, making streets safer for pedestrians and cyclists, curbside composting).
There are so many opportunities to rise up and lead in this effort to protect a livable future for future Webster Groves generations.

I realize that the City has taken steps in the past to address some issues that could make our community more sustainable, but I urge you to aspire to bold solutions.

Perhaps something as simple for a first step as signing the Mayors for Clean Energy program from Sierra Club that was introduced in 2019. While the pledge lacks specifics of "how to", it signals to our neighbors and to the utility companies that as a community we value each other and a livable future. That's the very least we can promise for our kids.

Perhaps it is time to consider a Director of Sustainability position for the City such as one Creve Coeur has (through a grant) to see Webster Groves take the lead in Sustainability.
Respectfully and Passionately,
Jamie Hasemeier
215 E. Swon Ave
Sustainability Commission Member

--
jamie hasemeier
Hello,
I am writing to voice my concerns over the size of the Webster Redevelopment Project and the variety of negative impacts it would have on the area where I live. My kids go to Bristol. I live off Kirkham and Rock Hill.

I can't see how that level of expansion can be supported by the community or infrastructure. I have seen what disruption comes with even residential construction and I fear the impact this would have on many people's daily lives for years to come.

I'm open to learning new information, but the scale is beyond double what I would have thought plausible development plan for the area. The ambition of it seems misplaced.

Thank you for your time,
Bo Roche