CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES
October 6, 2020

The City Council met this date in a regular session, via Zoom, which was available to the public via teleconference, at 7:32 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 HEARINGS
23 W. Lockwood Avenue: An Application by Rob Goltermann, DCM Management Company, on Behalf of Elias LLC for an Amendment to the Existing “PC” Planned Commercial District to Allow a “Coffee Shop, No Drive-thru” Use on the Approximately 0.32 Acre Tract of Land Located at 23 W Lockwood Ave.

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 stated that this is an amendment to a “PC” Planned Commercial district (See Exhibit A, page 1). It is a recent change made in the last two years. The rezoning was made in regard to a Planned Commercial development that would include a Regions Bank as well as an additional building. She reviewed the history of the site and existing conditions (See Exhibit A, page 2). She reviewed the Comprehensive Plan analysis (See Exhibit A, page 3-4). We determined in 2019, when the rezoning occurred that this was in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. We determined via staff that the request was a minor amendment that could come straight to City Council for review. The additional use they are asking for is a coffee shop, no drive thru. She reviewed the impact on parking and access and circulation (See Exhibit A, page 6). We would be keeping all setbacks and the building has already been to the ARB and through plan review (See Exhibit A, page 6-7).

Mayor Welch asked about the retail marked on the plans. Ms. Perry stated that refers to just a preliminary when going through the new zoning a few years ago. Office is another use that could be allowed.
Councilmember Bliss asked why there is a new category for coffee shop. Ms. Perry stated that there are other elements that could need additional parking. The way the zoning was put together was to assume a mix of uses. Coffee shop can be a higher intensity use than a regular shop and can have more of a traffic impact.

Mayor Welch asked why no drive through. It is one of the things in this town that is missing. Is it us that discouraged it or the developer that did not want it.

Ms. Perry stated that we discouraged it. The overall plan approved from Old Webster removed drive throughs because it is supposed to be a walkable, pedestrian friendly district.

Council and staff discussed drive throughs for the bank and PC zoning, as well as the timing of this project.

Ms. Perry reviewed the staff recommendation (See Exhibit A, page 7-9).

Rob Goltermann, applicant, stated that the intent of this building is a small coffee shop up front and the back half for professional service offices. It will be a locally owned coffee shop with a nice outside seating area.

Mayor Welch asked if there was an owner yet for the coffee shop. Mr. Goltermann stated that the owner is the person who will have the office in the back as well.

Jennifer Conrad, Deputy City Clerk, read a statement into the record from Dave Buck (Exhibit B, available in the City Clerk’s office).

Neil Bruntrager, City Attorney, entered the following into the public record:
1. City Council staff report by Danny Jendusa, Planner for meeting date October 6, 2020
2. Applicant’s written statement – submitted September 4, 2020
3. Existing Conditions & Facilities Removal Plan, dated June 19, 2020
4. Conceptual Site and Grading Plan, dated June 19, 2020
5. Conceptual architectural elevations, 23 W Lockwood Ave. (east building), dated June 22, 2020
7. Copy of Lot Split Plat, recorded January 2, 2020
8. Letter from Dave Buck read into the record dated October 6, 2020
9. Director of Planning and Development’s Powerpoint before the City Council October 6, 2020
10. Zoning Code of the City of Webster Groves

Mayor Welch closed the Public Hearing.

BILL #9133 – FIRST & SECOND READING
Councilmember Bliss introduced BILL #9133 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING A “PC” PLANNED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AT 23 AND 29 W. LOCKWOOD ON AN APPROXIMATELY 0.79 ACRE TRACT OF LAND AND MATTERS RELATED THERETO, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE #9042, and at the
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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.

CONTINUED - Zoning Code Text Amendment - Parking Development Standards:

Ms. Perry stated that she has no presentation, this was a continuation so comments could be shared. I believe I only know of two things staff needs to continue to research. One item Councilmember Arnold sent to me and the item Mayor Welch had at the previous meeting.

Mayor Welch stated that she is still concerned about the 10-foot driveway and has an objection. Ms. Perry stated that they can bring research on that to the next meeting. We request that you hold this public hearing open again. I know Councilmember Arnold had some questions on storage and parking of commercial vehicles and we are going to research that.

Councilmember Arnold stated that she would like to consider removing requirements for no commercial signage on a passenger vehicle parked at a residence.

Council and staff discussed commercial vehicle restrictions.

Mayor Welch asked if we distinguished the size of the vehicle. Councilmember Smith stated that they did.

Ms. Perry stated that this violation occurs after hours, so it is complaint driven. We do get complaints about larger vehicles parked overnight in driveways with advertising. I was going to come back with what other cities are doing, looking at the definition, and confirming whether making a change impacts any other codes.

Mayor Welch stated that a couple of us are really concerned about the 10-foot driveways. Ms. Perry stated that she will provide additional information at the next meeting.

Mayor Welch stated that is fine, but 7.5 and eight feet have worked for most people in this community and I would like to stick with that rather than more concrete.

Councilmember Arnold asked what is currently in place. Ms. Perry stated currently the Public Works code requires that the curb cut be at least 10 and no more than 24-feet wide. We have found that people come in with plans and do not see that Code section because it is not in the building code and they would get frustrated. So, when we updated the building code, we added that to it for consistency to match Public Works. We have, as staff said to match the 10-foot curb cut on driveways. You could get narrower if you had a Hollywood drive, but we have had issues with neighbors and fences. Other communities are having issues with people wanting massive driveways, so it is a balance.
Mayor Welch stated that she understands all of that, but we are a historic community and this seems out of character with sustainability and historic preservation. All it does is create more water runoff and less green space. I am really adamant about this.

Councilmember Franklin asked if the whole purpose was to meet the requirement for the curb cut. Ms. Perry stated that it was not. Our code says your car has to be on a paved surface. So we think of that as about the size of a parking space, which is nine feet wide. If you only have nine feet, and you have a fence on one side and a house on the other, you can’t really get your car door open. It was just a basic standard. I looked up other communities and most had ten feet as the minimum for a driveway.

Councilmember Franklin asked what a ten-foot driveway does to enhance our community. Ms. Perry stated that it is a means of where a vehicle can be on a paved surface.

Councilmember Smith clarified that this was also to get closer to County standards. Ms. Perry stated that all of the parking changes were to get closer to County. Some good requirements on turning radius, commercial parking, we didn’t have any standards on them. What is a basic standard for what a vehicle can sit on, as cars are getting larger and larger. We have a lot of people with shared driveways that have worked for decades, but someone moves, and then you don’t like each other. Someone puts a fence down the middle of it, or are tearing it up.

A motion was made by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Bliss, to keep the Public Hearing open until the October 20, 2020 Council meeting.

Mayor Welch called for the vote to keep the public hearing open until the October 20, 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 20, 2020 Council meeting.

BILL #9131 – FIRST & SECOND READING (NOT CONDUCTED)

REMARKS OF VISITORS
Ms. Conrad read submitted Remarks of Visitors into the record. Submissions were received from:

- Kent and Candy Stallings – (Exhibit C) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
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- Lauren and Tony Clawson - (Exhibit D) - In support of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Lynn and Paul Rutledge - (Exhibit E) - Opposition to size and scale of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Hannah Wilson - (Exhibit F) - Opposition to the size and scope of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Karen Moody - (Exhibit G) - Opposition to the density of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Anne Yard and Scott Phillips - (Exhibit H) - Opposition to the density of the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.
- Dave Buck - (Exhibit I) - Comments on Porchfest, October 18, 4-6 p.m.

Remarks were received via Zoom from Greg Cuddihee regarding work done at his home on Bacon. He indicated he was not getting much of a response from the Building Department.

NEW BUSINESS - MAYOR, COUNCILMEMBERS, CITY ATTORNEY, CITY MANAGER
No New Business.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
BILL #9132 – THIRD READING
On motion of Councilmember Alexander, seconded by Councilmember Arnold, 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, having been introduced and read twice on September 15, 2020, was taken up its title read a third time and placed upon its passage to become Ordinance #9132.
Mayor Welch called for the vote on Bill #9132.
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: BLISS, FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that Bill #9132 was approved

NEW BUSINESS
BILL #9134 – FIRST & SECOND READING
Councilmember Franklin introduced BILL #9134 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES, MISSOURI, AMENDING CHAPTER 60, SECTION 60.680, PROTECTIVE HEADGEAR REQUIRED OF OPERATORS AND PASSENGERS OF MOTORCYCLES, 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.

Council and staff discussed the necessity of this ordinance. Councilmember Arnold stated that she would like to see us consider talking about helmets as a good idea in some of our public safety messaging.
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Prior to the approval of the Consent Agenda, Councilmember Arnold asked if we know what the costs for the transporting and placing of the sculptures is. Mayor Welch stated that we talked this morning about maybe $500. They were moved by Normandy’s public works folks, and putting Earth Rabbit at the Recreation Complex we can pour our own pad and it shouldn’t be very costly at all.

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: FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that the Consent Agenda was approved.

The following consent agenda was approved:

- **Approval of Minutes** – September 15, 2020
  September 23, 2020 (Special Meeting)
- **Resolution #2020-37** – Amending the Budget for FY-2021
- **Resolution #2020-38** – Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Sculpture Loan Agreement with Great Streets Natural Bridge Community Development Corporation for Artwork Entitled “Earth Rabbit” and “After Hours”

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: SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS, FRANKLIN
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 9:34 p.m. on motion of the Mayor, duly seconded.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 20\textsuperscript{th} day of OCTOBER, 2020.

MAYOR

CITY CLERK
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**Bill #9133**  
**First & Second Reading**

An Ordinance Amending a "PC Planned Commercial District at 23 and 29 W. Lockwood on An Approximately 0.79 Acre Tract of Land and Matters Related Thereto, and Repealing Ordinance #9042

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zoning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PC&quot; Planned Commercial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North: Restaurant and parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northeast: &quot;A4&quot; single family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• South: A mix of uses including retail, personal services, offices, and the First Congregational Church of Webster Groves UCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• East: Office use and parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• West: Webster Groves Presbyterian Church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bill #9133
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Amending a "PC Planned Commercial District at 23 and 29 W. Lockwood on An Approximately 0.79 Acre Tract of Land and Matters Related Thereto, and Repealing Ordinance #9042

History
- 1865: Existing structure built as residence
- 1928: Converted for use as a mortuary
- 1956: Zoned "D" Commercial
- 2004: Old Webster National Historic District nomination.
- December 2016: Gerber Chapel mortuary closed
- May 2017: Granted Certificate of Appropriateness from the Webster Groves Historic Preservation Commission for demolition
- October 2018 – Rezoning to "PC" Planned Commercial District approved
- January 2019 – Final Development Plan approved

20-PC-11 23 W. Lockwood Avenue
Zoning Amendment

Existing Conditions
Looking west down Lockwood
Looking east down Lockwood
Looking north from Lockwood
Looking northeast into the site
City Council

20-PC-11 23 W. Lockwood Avenue
Zoning Amendment

Comprehensive Plan Analysis

The 1998 Comprehensive Plan: The City’s “overriding objective” is the “development and maintenance of a residential community”.

Encouraged rehabilitation of commercial districts as necessary for maintaining attractiveness and quality of life in the City.

Recommended limiting types of allowable uses in the walkable Old Webster district and further planning efforts to revitalize the city’s commercial areas.

2006 Development Foundation Plan identifies Old Webster as “the most pedestrian friendly commercial area of the city.”

Three principal areas in which Old Webster can address market gaps:

• Provision of alternative housing types
• Retail services niches
• Office/employment uses.
20-PC-11 23 W. Lockwood Avenue Zoning Amendment

Comprehensive Plan Analysis

2017 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment recommended office use at the subject property.

Staff determined commercial development would conform with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning Analysis

- "PC" Planned Commercial District
- The intent of the "PC" Planned Commercial District zoning is "to provide for modern shopping and office centers of integrated design"
Rezoning to a “PC” Planned Commercial District allows the applicant to request from the Permitted and Conditional Uses of the “C” and “D” Commercial Districts.

The applicant was approved for the following Permitted Uses:
1. Financial institutions, including banks, savings and loans, stock brokers and title companies.
2. Drive-in establishments, such as drive-in confectioners, restaurants, theaters, and retail establishments.
3. Store or shop for the conduct of a retail business.
4. Office for the conduct of any lawful business or professional pursuit.
5. Personal, family, and household services.
6. Bakery, whose products are sold only at retail on the premises.

Applicant is requesting to add “Coffee Shop, no Drive-thru” as an additional use.

Parking:
- “Total square footage of all structures shall not exceed 6,250 square feet or that which would maintain a minimum on-site parking ratio of four (4) parking spaces per 1,000 sq ft. of commercial space, whichever is greater, provided that the retail building will not be less than 3,000 square feet.”
- Currently, twenty-six (26) parking spaces are provided on the north surface parking lot.
Bill #9133
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Amending a
"PC Planned Commercial
District at 23 and 29 W.
Lockwood on An
Approximately 0.79 Acre
Tract of Land and Matters
Related Thereto, and
Repealing Ordinance #9042

Access & Circulation
- Remains the same with the
  new use proposed.

20-PC-11 23 W. Lockwood Avenue
Zoning Amendment

Bill #9133
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Amending a
"PC Planned Commercial
District at 23 and 29 W.
Lockwood on An
Approximately 0.79 Acre
Tract of Land and Matters
Related Thereto, and
Repealing Ordinance #9042

Dimensional Regulations –
Setbacks
The building has already been reviewed by the Architectural Review Board and has been approved.

Staff Recommendations
Should the City Council recommend approval, Staff would recommend the following conditions:

1. All provisions of the City Code shall apply except as expressly modified in this Ordinance No.9133.

2. The permitted uses for this "PC" Planned Commercial District shall be limited as follows:
   a. Financial institutions, including banks, savings and loans, stock brokers and title companies.
   b. Drive-in establishments for up to two ATM or VTM stations
   c. Store or shop for the conduct of a retail business.
   d. Office for the conduct of any lawful business or professional pursuit
   e. Personal, family and household services
   f. Bakery, whose products are sold only at retail upon the premises
   g. Coffee Shop, no Drive-Thru

3. Total square footage of all structures shall not exceed 6,250 square feet or that which would maintain a minimum on-site parking ratio of four (4) parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, whichever is greater provided that the retail building will not be less than 3,000 square feet.
## Staff Recommendations

Should the City Council recommend approval, Staff would recommend the following conditions:

4. The height of all structures shall not exceed the height restrictions of the "D" Commercial District nor shall it be less than nineteen and a half (19 ½) feet in height.

5. A minimum of twenty-five (25) parking spaces will be provided on site.

6. A minimum of two (2) vehicle-queuing spaces will be provided in the drive through lanes behind any VTM or ATM.

7. A minimum nine (9) foot wide passing lane will be provided on one side of the VTM stations.

8. The structure setbacks shall be the following:
   a. Ten (10)-ft front yard setback from the south property line fronting W Lockwood Avenue
   b. Seventy five (75)-ft north front yard setback from the north property line fronting W Moody Avenue
   c. Ten (10)-ft side yard setback from the west property line
   d. Ten (10)-ft side yard setback from the east property line

9. Retaining walls less than five (5) feet in height shall be allowed up to the property line with fall protection as needed per the building code.

10. Any restrictive gates or similar devices, either temporary or permanent, shall be accessible by the Fire Department at all times. Any padlocks must be able to be opened with Knox key (Knox lock). Any restrictive gates or similar devices shall only be permitted after the review and approval of the Fire Chief.

11. Additional fire hydrants, sprinkler, standpipes, knox boxes and knox locks shall be installed throughout the site at the direction of the Fire Chief.

12. The Fire Department shall have full access to the building during all phases of construction.

13. Any driveways or entrances/exports and canopies shall be able to accommodate the Webster Groves Fire Department ambulance and other emergency vehicles.
Staff Recommendations
Should the City Council recommend approval, Staff would recommend the following conditions:

14. Sidewalks along West Lockwood shall be replaced to ADA standards to eliminate any trip hazards. This will be done at the direction of the Director of Public Works. The construction shall be to City standards to include colored concrete per the Department of Public Works.

15. Sidewalks along the Moody frontage must be installed to City and ADA standards. The construction shall be to City standards to include colored concrete per the Department of Public Works.

16. All curb cuts and driveway approaches on W. Lockwood and Moody shall be built to City standards and meet ADA requirements.

17. On-street parking spaces on W Lockwood Avenue shall be striped at the direction of the Director of Public Works. No on-street parking will be allowed on W Moody Avenue.

18. Every use shall be so operated in compliance with the Performance Standards of the "D" Commercial District.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

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
Bill #9131
First & Second Reading

Parking Development Standards

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

Bill #9131
First & Second Reading

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

Parking Development Standards
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Parking Development Standards

Parking facility design

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>45</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: [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:
- 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:
- 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

Parking Development Standards

Parking facility design

CONSIDERATIONS:

- Driveway design standards
- Maximum driveway width in front yard:
- Maximum/minimum curb cut width
- Minimum driveway turning radius

Additional Driveway Design Requirements:

- Residential driveway width:
  - At single and two family dwellings, driveway width in the portion of the front wall located in front of the dwelling shall not exceed that which is necessary to access 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.
  - 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 and approval of the Director of Planning and Development. Requests may be administratively approved if the applicant meets its 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.
  - 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.
  - Minimum turning radius:
    - Driveways shall have a minimum outside turning radius of twenty-eight (28) feet.
## 19-PC-15 Zoning Code Text Amendment – Parking Development Standards

### Bill #9131
First & Second Reading


### Parking Development Standards

**Parking facility design**

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

### Parking facility design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS:</th>
<th>• Maximum driveway width in front yard:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximum/minimum curb cut width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum driveway turning radius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 lot line.
2. **Minimum turning radius:** Driveways shall have a minimum outside turning radius of twenty-eight (28) feet.
Bill #9131
First & Second Reading


Parking Development Standards

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 signs.

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

Parking commercial and industrial vehicles in residential districts

Parking Development Standards

Bill #9131
First & Second Reading


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

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

- Bicycle Parking

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

- Trailers, Dumpsters, Etc.

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

**Parking Development Standards**

**Bicycle Parking**

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

### 2. Design and Location

Bicycle parking facilities shall include a secure storage facility as a separate structure that enables bicycles to be secured. Where racks are used, they shall meet the following standards:

A. The bicycle frame shall be locked to the rack with a high-security lock and a hook over the wheel where high wheels remain attached to the bicycle.

B. A handlebar (1-1/2") high on the seating rail shall be long enough to block free pedestrian access or walking otherwise impeding bicycle storage.

C. The racks must be securely anchored.

D. Racks and storage facilities shall be accessible without moving any bicycle.

E. Racks and storage facilities shall be located in convenient, well-lighted areas with easy access within 550 feet of major entrances of all commercial, residential and institutional buildings. Such locations shall be easily mixed with pedestrian traffic.

F. Bicycle racks and storage facilities shall not be located within any required parking space.

G. If not incorporated with a site plan including a parking structure, half of required bicycle parking spaces shall be located within said structure on the parking level closest to the primary pedestrian entrance.

### 3. Reduction in Required Automobile Parking for Bicycle Parking

The total number of required off-street automobile parking spaces pursuant to Section 53.182(a) may be reduced at a ratio of one (1) automobile parking space for every two (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 projects.
Bill #9131  
First & Second Reading


Parking Development Standards

Accessory Parking Facilities

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

Modification of Parking Standards

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

Parking Development Standards
Modification of Parking Standards

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

1. Requests for a reduction in the minimum parking requirement:
   A. The Director of Planning and Development shall review and may approve requests for reduction for up to two city cent-perent-twenty percent (20%) of the minimum parking requirement.
   B. Requests for a reduction that exceed ten percent-twenty percent shall be subject to the review and approval of the City Plan Commission.

2. Requests to provide parking in excess of the maximum parking requirement:
   A. Requests to exceed the maximum parking requirement between ten percent-twenty percent shall be submitted to the review and approval of the Director of Planning and Development.
   B. Requests to provide off-street parking in excess of one hundred and twenty percent (120%) of the maximum parking requirement, exceeded maximum parking requirement by more than twenty percent shall be subject to the review and approval of the City Plan Commission. Where City Plan Commission approval is required for the proposed parking, the applicant shall submit a statement that identifies measures to mitigate for the increase in parking area.
**Bill #9131**  
First & Second Reading


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Development Standards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modification of Parking Standards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSIDERATIONS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allow for flexible, creative parking solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage adaptive re-use of existing structures and sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3. Requests for shared parking: Where two or more land uses listed in separate use categories share a parking lot, parking lots, or structure, the total off-street parking required for those uses may be reduced based on a parking study approved by the Director of Planning & Development and/or the City Plan Commission in accordance with Section 53.1800. A. Such study shall explain the parking demands of the land uses within the development and how business practices or hours of operation impact the demand for parking at different times of the day. Subsequent to approval of such a parking study, an appropriate legal instrument shall be recorded by the property owner with the County Recorder of Deeds. This legal instrument shall be...
Katie Nakazono - Dave Buck's "Public Comment" for October 6, 2020, Public Hearing on 23 W. Lockwood

From: Dave Buck <dave@buckstl.com>
To: "citycouncil@webstergroves.org" <citycouncil@webstergroves.org>
Date: 10/6/2020 1:46 PM
Subject: Dave Buck's "Public Comment" for October 6, 2020, Public Hearing on 23 W. Lockwood
Cc: Joan Jadali <jadalij@webstergroves.org>, Mara Perry <perrym@webstergrove...

To Mayor, City Council & City Staff,

What I like about this proposal is that at least SOMETHING is going to go into this unused vacant space.

What I do not like about it is the same thing I didn't like about it back when Gerber Funeral Home was still standing.

This lot is PRIME property right in the PRIME shopping & business district of Old Webster. And what did we settle for? Another bank. We and this space deserved better. This city needs another bank like a hole in the head.

And now, with all due respect to Mr. Golterman & DCM Management, what is he asking us again to settle for? Another coffee shop, when Clover & the Bee is right across the street, along with Old Webster's Bread Co, Parkmoor and Straub's, and not to mention nearby Starbucks, Einstein's, Boardwalk Cafe, McDonald's and gas stations. In short, Webster's coffee demand has plenty of supply!

Instead, may I please suggest you use a little imagination and creativity to come up with a new idea that's truly unique, different, and adds real value to our community. I suggest doing some research with a few residents. They have lots of good ideas!!!

PEACE.

Dave
Katie Nakazono - REMARKS BY VISITORS - CITY COUNCIL MEETING: Opposition to the Webster Redevelopment Project

From: <kentcan@swbell.net>  
To: <citycouncil@webstergroves.org>, <mayor@webstergroves.org>  
Date: 9/25/2020 6:50 PM  
Subject: REMARKS BY VISITORS - CITY COUNCIL MEETING: Opposition to the Webster Redevelopment Project

Councilmember Karen Alexander  
Councilmember Laura Arnold  
Councilmember Pam Bliss  
Councilmember David Franklin  
Councilmember Sarah Richardson  
Councilmember Emerson Smith

Honorable Council members and Madam Mayor,

We’re writing this note to state that we are WHOLEHEARTEDLY OPPOSED TO THE WEBSTER REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT currently being reviewed by the council.

We moved from unincorporated West County to Webster Groves in 1998, after our children went to college and began their lives as adults. We love our Clark neighbors and everything about our town!

Webster is the epitome of the peaceful, neighbor-loving, welcoming small town and is the envy of thousands of communities in Missouri and around the country. It has grown over the years by respecting its citizens opinions while strategically adding businesses and carefully expanding housing and residential construction which improves the quality of life in the community.

We would support a rational, thoughtful, responsibly-designed mixed use development, but the current proposal is the antithesis of Webster’s values and well-earned national reputation as a welcoming community.

Please do the right thing by reducing the size and scope and reversing the negative impact of this project. It is, by all measures, a horrible proposition as it stands. Webster Groves deserves better!

Respectfully,
Kent and Candy Stallings  
408 Clark Ave
Good evening!

I'm writing in full support of the proposed redevelopment for a northern half of downtown Webster. Even without anchor tenants announced, this is a transformative project.

As a current city resident looking hard at relocating and purchasing in Webster, this is exactly the type of development that pulls me and my wife to move.

Creating a true "20 Minute City" with a robust city center will ensure long term stability and vibrancy. This goes a long way to achieving that, and I think the city will be even better as a result.

I hope this "outsider" perspective provides some insight into attracting new long term residents, and the direction of future city developments. I look forward to watching this project unfold.

Sincerely,
Lauren & Tony Clawson
we are strongly opposed to the proposed redevelopment project in old Webster. The multi storied buildings would alter the charm of the existing architecture in the area. It would also increase the volume of traffic in the area, and greatly decrease the green space and cause danger to the wild life. We have seen deer, fox and other small animals living in this area. LYNN AND PAUL RUTLEDGE.
My name is Hannah Wilson and I live across the street from Larsen Park on Oak St. in Webster Groves. My boyfriend and I have been in our home for 3 years and have grown to love our neighborhood and city. It is an affordable house for us at this time in our lives, and we very much wanted to be a part of the Webster community.

As you may know, there is a SIGNIFICANT development proposed for the area east of our home, and below are the main reasons we, as Webster Groves residents, are opposed to this project:

1. Multiple 7 story buildings that will completely alter the Old Webster character and historical value. I cannot imagine the small business and restaurant owners of Webster would approve of this project, as they have all worked very hard to maintain the main st. feel without creating an overly commercialized business district!
2. Destruction of the current wildlife and natural landscape in the area to attempt to "create a natural area" So we want to destroy existing natural areas to make new ones.....?
3. As a Webster resident yourself, I am certain you have experienced the traffic and often unsafe pedestrian area on Rock Hill Rd. approaching the train tracks. The area is already very congested at Rock Hill Rd. and Lockwood. Many kids ride bikes, walk to school, and walk to a bus stop right at Rock Hill and Kirkham.

Please consider voting down this project when given the opportunity and strongly opposing it along with our concerned group of Webster Groves residents.

Thank you for considering this message.

Have a great day!

--

Hannah M. Wilson
hmwilson2020@gmail.com
(618) 567-6294
I live in a neighborhood near the proposed development along Kirkham Avenue. I travel along Kirkham Road almost daily. Buildings towering seven stories above the street will totally change the feeling of the neighborhood. The addition of 8 townhouses where one home now sits at Rock Hill Road and Kirkham Avenue, would be hard to cram into that area. What would be the effect on Shady Creek and the brand new bridge over it? More underground parking? That would probably disturb the creek. Garage doors facing Kirkham?

I like being able to walk from my home to see my mother at Sunrise (before Covid-19) and to shops in Old Webster. The density of this proposal would make it a more difficult challenge with more traffic.

The density of this project would change the nearby neighborhoods of Webster Groves.

Karen Moody
To the Mayor and City Council:

We are homeowners at 465 Oak Street and would like to voice our opposition to the Old Webster Redevelopment project. Our primary concerns are the excessive density and negative environmental impact of the current plans, which would place an estimated 1,150 new residents and up to eight 7-story buildings adjacent to residential neighborhoods and Old Webster. In addition, the plan would decimate the existing wildlife corridor that follows Shady Creek.

The developer has made it clear that neither of these problems will be addressed: they insist the density is necessary to provide amenities and affordable housing, and they value renovation of the Shady Creek greenspace as an attractive amenity for people over its importance as wildlife habitat. That part of Shady Creek may not make it onto a postcard, but many animals call it home and would have no place to go; it’s past time to stop chipping away at animal habitat. In addition, many mature trees would be removed, only some replaced, with decades to wait until they reached equivalent maturity. We would ask you to walk down along Kirkham between Rock Hill and Gore, look up at those trees, and realize that in a year you could be looking up at 7-story buildings and the trees could be gone. Does this fit the character of Webster Groves?

As for the density, it is disappointing to hear that the only way we can offer affordable housing and add public amenities is to put up with a development so wildly out of scale with its surrounding community. We were shocked to hear that only 10% of the housing will be designated affordable housing. It’s frustrating because there are so many versions of a more modest development project that we and, I believe, our neighbors could get behind. What about a couple of modestly scaled apartment buildings with a larger percentage designated for “workforce housing”, a couple of modestly scaled retail facilities, and a multi-use outdoor facility for farmers’ markets or small concerts? Perhaps another developer could come up with more creative plans that respect our environment, our history and our quality of life.

We look forward to engaging with you further as the planning and approval process continues.

Sincerely,

Anne Yard and Scott Phillips
Katie Nakazono - Dave Buck's "Remarks of Visitors" at City Council Meeting, October 6, 2020

From: Dave Buck <dave@buckstl.com>
To: "citycouncil@webstergroves.org" <citycouncil@webstergroves.org>
Date: 10/5/2020 2:13 PM
Subject: Dave Buck's "Remarks of Visitors" at City Council Meeting, October 6, 2020
Cc: Joan Jadali <jadalij@webstergroves.org>, "njbatty@aol.com" <njbatty@aol.com>

Mayor, City Council & City Staff,

Assuming the weather cooperates and there are no more COVID spikes, Webster Groves' first ever, "Porchfest", will be held Sunday, October 18, from 4 pm - 6 pm, immediately following the Old Webster Business District, "Walktober" event from Noon - 4 pm that same day.

"Porchfest" is an outdoor, walkable, free & fun live music event featuring 21 different music performers, spread out and playing from the front porches of 21 gracious & enthusiastic homeowners in the neighborhood bordered by S. Gore and S. Gray and including three connecting cross streets, W. Cedar, W. Swon and W. Jackson.

Gerry, please know that I remain hopeful that your husband, Pat, and his "Rockin' Docs" combo can join us and play at your house. Please keep me posted.

One important observation: I am a complete stranger to many homeowners in this neighborhood. Yet when I was going door-to-door and inquiring if they had interest in sharing their front porch, I was blown away how friendly, kind, welcoming and inviting they all were.

Some came right out to meet me on their front walk. Some were sitting on their porch and invited me up to talk. When I got home, I told my wife, Barb, that it was truly a life affirming experience that made my day and made me feel so proud and lucky to live in Webster Groves.

I love "Porchfest" because it embodies the meaning of the word, community: "To share together as one". Our performers are playing for free and sharing their time and talent. Our homeowners are sharing their front porches. And our audience is sharing its time and appreciation for live music they are hungry for and to equally appreciative performers who have not played in front of a live audience for months.

And at the musicians' request, we will have one GIANT "tip jar" to collect cash and check donations to Webster-Rock Hill Ministries that serves the needy in our community.

Final note: if this first "Porchfest" is successful, our goal every year is to move and hold it in other Webster neighborhoods to share the love and spread the music!

PEACE.
Dave