



Douglas Hill Questions, Considerations, & Inclusions - October 5, 2021

Responses to the questions below are given by City of Webster Groves employees or members of the developer's team when specified.

Questions Related to Traffic

1) Question: I would like to see updated another traffic study performed and recommendation that will mitigate some of the concerns with the additional traffic: around schools and the egress and ingress to the community on Rock Hill Road. There is considerable stacking at the beginning and end of the school day. Is it possible to predict how the traffic will be impacted?

Response from City Staff: *Yes, another traffic study in collaboration with Public Works to get updated and accurate traffic counts would be most beneficial. Public Works can place traffic counters at locations of interest (including intersections, schools, egress routes for trains, etc.).*

The Synchro Traffic Model is useful when predicting Traffic Impacts and Traffic Flow. The initial traffic study by T2 had a basic Synchro model showing the impacts of installing a new signal(s) at the proposed intersections to help mitigate traffic flow. However, there is a function in Synchro called Sim Traffic, which simulates traffic flow during certain time frames. In short, you collect the traffic volume data, input it into the program, input your street layout with existing or new proposed traffic control (signs vs signals or added lanes) then it will run a simulated run of traffic during a set range of hours (8 a.m.-10 a.m. with the traffic counts collected during that time frame or 5 p.m.-7 p.m.). After this runs 3 times and calculates an average, it provides information detailing the potential problem areas allowing for solutions to be created that 'optimize' the area to alleviate the congestion. As a recommendation, this should be included in the next traffic study so specific areas and times can be pinpointed, for example, Bristol during drop-off and pick-up times, new intersections and routes of concern, as well as inputting pedestrian and bike traffic, could be targeted. T2 has not provided this information

It should also be noted that the developer, in their next study, needs to add data for the improvements gained in the level of service (LOS) by widening the street at locations where they are proposing signals (i.e., Kirkham and Rockhill Rd leading to Elm Ave). This could show that the widening of the road at those locations might help more than just placing a signal. The developer has suggested that a signal will solve the traffic problem, which is helpful in most regards. However, we want to make sure that the areas

that have been suggested by the developer to have the signals, will not condense into a 'bottleneck'.

Response from T2 Traffic: *Traffic Trip Generation methodologies can be used to estimate daily trips for a development as well as trips during the peak hours of the development itself (e.g., shift changes) and during the peak hours of the adjacent roadway network. However, there is no methodology to project volumes during other periods of the day (such as school dismissals). It would be relatively straightforward to investigate the impacts to traffic at Givens Elementary during the morning arrival period, which aligns with the peak hour of the adjacent roadway if existing traffic turning movements were known at the Givens access points. The traffic forecasts for AM Peak Hour to/from the north via Rock Hill would be added to the existing volumes. However, there is no accepted engineering methodology to predict volumes during the Givens school departure period.*

The traffic data was initially collected late October/early November 2020. At that time, the peak hours of traffic in the study area were 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and 4:45-5:45 p.m. These times generally match peak hours of previous data collections. However, this was during a period of virtual schooling for WGSD and was also before the District changes that occurred during Summer 2021, when the former Steger 6th grade relocated and Givens Elementary transitioned from a small magnet elementary school to a neighborhood elementary school. Currently, Givens school hours are 7:50 a.m. to 2:50 p.m. Therefore, school arrivals are during the morning traffic peak hour, but the school departure period falls outside of (before) it.

2) Question: How will pedestrian and bike traffic at Rock Hill be handled? The greenway does not appear to exit the site at the intersection.

Response from SG Collaborative: *If we make the assumption that the greenway is also the riverwalk, then yes, as currently shown it does not exit at an intersection. However, there will be sidewalk improvements to either reach north to Kirkham or south to Lockwood. There are some details that still need to be worked out and this is one. Our goal is to make sure we have a super safe and easy-to-use environment. We still have a lot of work to do to get the greenway extended, and then they will have a lot to say about exactly how that is designed. Of course, the City will have a seat at the table.*

3) Question: To my knowledge, the question of interplay between railroad traffic and traffic on Gore and Rock Hill has not been addressed nor has traffic changes that may impact Oak Street or Marshall Place. While the traffic study looks at the intersections of Gore/Marshall and RH/Oak, I do not find any information on the expectation of increased traffic when trains make the south route difficult. What is this expected to look like?

Response from City Staff: *Since the only alternative route for the train is Elm Ave, trip generation models for the connecting roads to Elm (Moody, Lockwood, Kirkham,*

Marshall Pl, and possibly Newport for the crossing there at Glen) are needed. A potential solution is to have a sign on Elm or Lockwood that lights up when a train is passing, directing traffic to the next over/underpass. An example of this is in Kirkwood on Lindbergh. These signs can be placed at signals and maybe stand-alone flashers (research into this would be needed).

There are a total of 32 freight/coal trains that travel along the Union Pacific tracks daily, they have a length of 600 feet and they travel at 30 m.p.h. Also, there are 2 Amtrak trains that pass through. The general wait time for motorists at the crossing is 4 minutes and 24 seconds for the freight/coal trains. The Amtrak trains travel at a rate of 35 mph and have a shorter wait time.

Response from T2 Traffic: *Because the trains are not scheduled and there is no known frequency or length of crossing, an evaluation of the impacts of train closures cannot (and would not) be performed via standard engineering practice. Using approved methodologies is critical to defend and support analyses and for future liability. Standard engineering practice analyzes the peak periods of a typical weekday, typically the morning and evening “rush hours”, which represent the common highest traffic on the network. Although it is acknowledged that higher traffic peaks sometimes occur (e.g., during a special event), facilities are not designed for these occasional peaks, or our roadways would require more space, hardscape, and maintenance than is necessary. Under its current operations, the Rock Hill train crossing does not represent a regular peak. Although train crossing closures do occasionally overlap a peak hour of traffic, this cannot be documented as a daily occurrence.*

Furthermore, there is not standard practice to estimate impacts to the network of drivers who choose to alter their route in response to a train crossing - there is no way to document driver preferences which can vary between drivers and even for drivers depending on the immediate situation.

It is noted that Oak St. does not represent an alternate route for traffic diversion during a train closure as the west end of the street also has an at-grade train crossing. Therefore, increased traffic is not anticipated during a train crossing event. Elm Avenue does have a grade-separated train crossing and traffic entering or departing the proposed development can connect to Elm via Kirkham Ave. or Marshall Place.

The parking access within the development is designed to direct the majority of traffic (roughly 80%) to enter and exit the site via Kirkham Road. So, the bulk of the traffic during a train event would be expected to access Elm via Kirkham. Of the remaining 20% of traffic, 25% is projected to be traveling to/from the South via Elm Avenue - which represents roughly 12 vehicles during the PM Peak hour headed towards the development and 13 vehicles exiting the development via Gore. During a train event, it is possible that some of this traffic may attempt to divert around the at-grade railroad crossing of Gore Ave. via Marshall Place, but the actual amount could not be predicted nor could the

frequency.

4) Question: What is the status of the pedestrian bridge over the train tracks? Have any discussions occurred with the railroad to gauge the likelihood of approval?

Response from City Staff: *The railroad that owns the tracks is Union Pacific. At the appropriate time, PW staff will begin working with the developer and the railroad to determine what needs to be done for placing a pedestrian bridge over the tracks. The railroad will require height restrictions.*

Questions Related to Flooding

5) Question: What actions will there be to mitigate flooding?

Response from Stock & Associates: *The Douglass Hill Redevelopment – Flood Study dated 8/19/2021 for Shady Creek was prepared to study the existing and proposed Floodplain and Floodway along Shady Creek between Rock Hill Road and Gore Ave. Shady Creek existing alignment through the site will be improved and portions will include Modular Walls, enclosed box culverts, and re-establish vegetation. In addition, the existing arch culvert bridge under Gore Ave. will be replaced with a 16-foot-wide x 11-foot-tall box culvert. These improvements will lower the existing conditions 100-year flood water surface elevations between Rock Hill Road and Gore Ave., from 1.88 feet at the upper end to .06 feet at the lower end of the site. There are no changes to the existing 100-year flood elevations upstream or downstream of Rock Hill Road and Gore Ave., these elevation changes are reflected on table 3 of the Flood Study.*

6) Question: Please clearly state, without jargon, the effect of floodplain mitigation and its benefit for buildable property expansion for owners north of Kirkham. What is the timeline for FEMA releasing the CLOMR, and MO DNR and the Army Corp?

Response from Stock & Associates: *The benefit of lower Base flood elevations as adopted by FEMA, reduces the height requirements for which new home construction is required to build. Sheet No. C2 “FEMA Proposed Condition Plan” dated 8/18/2021 contained within the Flood Study shows the existing and proposed Floodplain and Floodway lines on the Northside of W. Kirkham Road. The changes do not create significant additional buildable property north of W. Kirkham.*

The process for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision commenced with the formal submittal of the Flood Study to the City of Webster Groves and the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District. The MSD review was completed and a comment letter seeking concurrence from the City of Webster Groves of their review and approval. In other

words, MSD is ready to give their concurrence approval on the Study once the City approves.

The next step would be to file an application to FEMA requesting a Conditional Letter of Map Revision, that application we file requires the City's execution of the application to FEMA. The CLOMR process takes several months. Based on our experience, the issuance of a CLOMR can range from 6-months to 12-months. The LOMR process following completion of the project follows a similar time frame. Regarding the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 Permit Process, we offer the following: A Pre-Application on-site with representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers occurred during the fall of 2020. Formal application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and MDNR would occur at same time as the CLOMR Application is filed with FEMA. Similar to FEMA their process takes several months.

7) Question: The Stock report provides a lot of data and information. We need a plain language description of how the stormwater will be mitigated. What specifically is going to happen to improve it on the site?

Response from Stock & Associates: *MSD Has classified this site as "Redevelopment" as such the re-development is required to manage Stormwater in accordance with the Governing "Rules and Regulations" of MSD, of which include the following:*

- A. Treatment of the First 1.14" of rainfall for "Water Quality, Wq", "Volume Reduction, VolR". The purpose of these two items is to clean the stormwater runoff and reduce the volume of runoff. This will be accomplished with "Green Roofs and Pervious Pavement".*
- B. Reduce rate of runoff below the Pre-Developed or existing conditions runoff. Today, there are no stormwater management basins or "Best Management Practices – BMP's" to attenuate Stormwater Runoff.*

In addition to the items being implemented in Item A.) Underground storage system below the street will be installed to attenuate the rate of Stormwater runoff from the site. Provided will be the following:

- 1. Channel Protection Storage (CPV) – this is holding the 1-year storm event approximately 2.5 inches of runoff and releasing over a 48-hour period.*
- 2. Detention for the 2-year / 24-Hour and 100-year / 24-hour storm events and discharging to Shady Creek at Rates below the existing conditions.*

Today, the development area does not include "Any" of these stormwater management items to clean, volume reduce and control the rate of stormwater discharge.

8) Question: What is the likely impact downstream? Even with the city's replacement of the Elm culvert, we have another one at Newport and under Brentwood just past Newport. Can those culverts handle the expected water?

Response from Stock & Associates: *No Adverse impact downstream of Gore Ave., as described in the previous response.*

9) Question: Areas downstream are already designated as in the flood plain. Should we expect more flooding of Corona Court, Brentwood Blvd, and along the borders of Lorraine Davis Park? If not, why not given the water has to go somewhere?

Response from Stock & Associates: *No, for all the reasons stated in previous responses.*

10) Question: The Stock report does mention the potential for flooding downstream. It recommends removing vegetation. Who has jurisdiction for that removal-the City, MSD? Who could perform that removal and at what cost?

Response from City Staff: *The maintenance of drainage channels is the responsibility of MSD as the stormwater utility for the St. Louis metropolitan area. However, MSD requires the municipalities to handle clearing of brush citing they do not have the funds or manpower to handle the creeks. Webster Groves Public Works crews have cleaned up the vegetation in the past and can do it in the future, but it would be at the City's expense, which averages \$1,200 per day to cover staffing.*

Response from SG Collaborative: *We don't know the jurisdiction of the creek downstream, but MSD would have some jurisdiction, as would the US Army Corps of Engineers, and Webster Groves. There can be no permit to fill in any of that area. However, simple removal of the vegetation should not require a permit either. If it is privately owned, with permission from the owner, The SG Collaborative would consider removing the vegetation in the area between Elm & Corona Ct.*

Response from Stock & Associates: *We would need to investigate property ownership, existing easements, and several other factors in determining potential permitting requirements and who has the right to remove vegetation.*

11) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the cost to mitigate flooding?

Response from City Staff: *The City is currently under design contract with GBA for the replacement of the culvert under Elm at Kirkham. GBA has concluded that the existing culvert is undersized causing a restriction to the flow in the channel. GBA engineers are designing a larger culvert that should allow more flow through the channel under Elm. This will eliminate some of the flooding on Kirkham. The estimated cost is \$1,250,000. Beyond this culvert, the creek has vegetation that chokes down the flow. This vegetation will need to be removed to allow for a continual flow. Other structures downstream will need to be evaluated for proper size based on the flow parameters of the channel. This would need to be done by an engineering study that would cost approximately \$100,000.*

Response from SG Collaborative: *The plans for flooding are integral to the Douglass Hill development. If not approved, a separate plan would have to be developed and paid*

for. Engineering work alone would probably be around \$50,000-\$100,000, reconstruction of the bridge for water flow under Gore would be in the neighborhood of \$750,000 to \$1,000,000, and the remaining work up & down Shady Creek may or may not be required.

Questions Related to Tree Preservation & Greenspace

12) Question: All trees are in jeopardy. What is the plan for an alternative to meet the intention of the tree ordinance? Off-site? Working with Greenspace? Pay for the planting of trees throughout the community?

Response from City Staff: *At a minimum, the City should require the developer to meet the landscaping code for each building. If they remove adjusted caliper inches of trees exceeding the landscaping requirement then those funds should be paid into the tree fund for future planting throughout the community, same as any other permit.*

Those funds could be dedicated to the cleanup of the Shady Creek Nature Sanctuary to the northwest of this proposed development, or to the Shady Creek in its entirety, with the removal of invasive species and the replanting of natives. That would be a very large project but we may have a possibility to combine the funds with a Missouri Department of Conservation grant to get it accomplished.

The Greenspace Commission's biggest concerns are loss of trees, loss of continuous wildlife corridor, and developing too close to the creek.

Response from SG Collaborative: *We believe that because of their poor health, the trees are in jeopardy now. SG Collaborative would be happy to work with Green Space on any number of plans. Within the development, SG would restore vegetation up and down the Shady Creek corridor and throughout the development using native Missouri plant species and subject to the City's approval. WG will consider planting trees throughout the community to help replace the trees that inevitably die with age or are damaged by storms, etc.*

13) Question: Once the GSAC and the Deer Creek Watershed Alliance, Technical Advisory Committee (which happens to be comprised of city staff, someone from the MO Dept of Conservation, and the Shaw Nature Reserve among others) meet, will SG Collaborative accept this feedback and work collaboratively as the design and construction documents are finalized, and continue implementation throughout the project? On SG Collaborative's dime?

Response from SG Collaborative: *SG would of course accept the input from all of these entities. SG Collaborative expects to implement a robust plan at its cost. We are not in a position to provide an open checkbook but understand our responsibility in respect to the development.*

Questions Related to Acquisition

14) Question: A meeting with some business owners indicated that the developer had not contacted them for 1-2 years (attended by Pam, David, Emerson). What is the communication plan to keep the business owners in the loop?

Response from SG Collaborative: *In some cases, this is correct. It is important to differentiate between business owners and property owners. No property owner would appreciate us reaching out to their tenants (aka “businesses”) about relocation or any of those matters. Only when the property owner gives us permission do we do so. Or, if the business reaches out to us, we tell them we will need the permission of the property owner. You wouldn’t want someone talking to your tenant either. When it comes to the property owners, the message has been consistent. You are welcome to ask them. They are prepared to sit down and talk to us once they are confident that the City is going to go forward with the project. Until then, they consider it a waste of time. Since, without the City’s approval, I cannot SG tell them when or timing to buy their property and close, nor can I negotiate price. In other words, I cannot do all of the basics involved in a negotiation of that sort. Even so, SG has begun reaching out to all the property owners again to give them updates. So far, the message has been the same. When there is a real project, we will sit down at the table.*

Questions Related to Construction

15) Question: Is there a plan to mitigate interruption to the current business owners during construction?

Response from SG Collaborative: *There will be very little impact, if any, on property owners outside the boundaries of the project. All the property inside the boundaries of the project will be acquired, tenants relocated, and the buildings demolished. Not sure we understand the question, please clarify your concerns and we will address it.*

Questions Related to Revenues

16) Question: I know you have the financial impact on your radar when the new numbers come out in October. I would like to see an impact report for the first ten years of the TIF, then on a five-year basis until the end of the TIF. Then what the impact will be for the first five years after the TIF. I am flexible on how the timeline should look.

Response from City Staff: *Development Strategies will build that model once the new tax rates are all compiled and assessed values published.*

As of today, the Cost-Benefit analysis indicates new revenue to the City of \$2,348,551 plus the city's share of pool sales tax (not calculated) over the life of the TIF.

Questions Related to Zoning

17) Question: “Gymnasium” is an accessory use in the PC District. Can we remove it and make it an accepted use? Can SG Collaborative house the gym in one of the new buildings? Are there other solutions?

Response from City Staff: *Per the September 13, 2021, Plan Commission report: “While fitness facilities for use by tenants of specific buildings within the development and not available to the general public had already been listed as an allowed accessory use (gymnasium) in the August 9th report, a “Recreation facility” use was added as a Permitted use in the draft ordinance to allow a commercial fitness center within the development.” They have in the ordinance both the opportunity to have a gym that is within their building for the tenants of the building only and a commercial type gym.*

Questions Related to Business Development

18) Question: How might a development positively/negatively impact existing Old Webster business owners that surround the site?

Response from City Staff: *Commercial redevelopment is generally understood to increase property values and traffic of customers that may choose to spend in current businesses. Any other impacts are speculation and without data.*

Response from SG Collaborative: *Local Webster Groves businesses can expect improved sales in business simply by increasing the density of people in Webster Groves in the immediate vicinity of their businesses. We are adding parking, so the parking problem gets mitigated. We are adding tax base, so the likelihood their taxes will be raised is*

lessened. I can't think of what the negative impacts would be, but I'm sure someone else can.

Questions Related to Workforce Housing

19) Question: What is the 10% commitment—of total units or rental units?

Response from SG Collaborative: *The commitment is 10% of the total units, not just rental units. Roughly 70 units +/- . The commitment may include ownership alternatives outside of the project area.*

20) Question: How will the units be allocated, including the size of the units, the distribution across buildings, timeframe in construction, number of units of varying sizes.

Response from SG Collaborative: *The goal here is to have units available of varying sizes with a basic 1-bedroom unit affordable by a new teacher in the Webster Groves school system, which today we estimate to be less than \$1,000/month. Studio units would be less expensive and 2&3 bedrooms would be more expensive but proportionately less than market rate. All the units will be mixed with the other units so no one would be able to tell the difference between a workforce unit and a typical market-rate unit. There will be no difference and they will not be segregated.*

21) Question: What is the proposed length of commitment to workforce housing?

Response from SG Collaborative: *The workforce housing commitment should last the same length as the public assistance commitment. Estimated 18-23 years. We are looking for some ownership alternates by including property outside the project area. To the extent that is achieved, the effect of that would be into perpetuity.*

22) Question: We need to consider an opportunity to extend the commitment with city resources at the end of the proposed commitment under the TIF.

Response from City Staff: *The City can, at any time, dedicate funding and mission prioritization to workforce housing. It may be advantageous for the City to contemplate a fund for workforce housing drawn from the revenues of the development. Council consensus and policy direction is needed as to "What is Workforce Housing"? Definitions will need to be agreed upon to develop enforceable language.*

Response from SG Collaborative: *The ability to offer workforce housing in a great part is because there are people and organizations that are willing to invest/loan money into projects at an interest way below-market interest rates. So long as that funding is available, the program can continue. However, we will need a different measure for what workforce means. Such as 80% of AMI or the initial index increasing by cost of living and/or other factors. Once we are beyond public assistance and fully subject to market conditions, we need some ability to be able to respond to what those conditions are.*

23) Question: In earlier discussions and materials, there was discussion of some off-site affordability efforts, like a partnership with Habitat for Humanity or Rebuilding together. Are any off-site efforts still being contemplated?

Response from SG Collaborative: *The development team has met with Habitat and Rebuilding STL Together (based in Webster). We would very much like to consider and work on those efforts. It just has been terribly difficult to make any significant plans in that regard. Not knowing what the likelihood of receiving approval will be. Off-site is the only realistic place to offer ownership at these cost levels. There are also other programs beyond Habitat that would allow similar things to occur. One possibility is a partnership with Rock Hill Ministries.*

Questions Related to Occupancy

24) Question: What is the total number of occupants expected once the entire development is finished? How is this estimate calculated? Development Strategies memo = 1370 (With 746 units, that is 1.8 occupants per unit.)

Response from SG Collaborative: *1,370 is a reasonable projection. We also believe 1,500 is a reasonable projection as well. One of the reasons the number 1,500 has been used by SG is because we have been looking for ways to include the impact of the office building, should it occur. If it does not occur for some reason, the number will be closer to 1,500.*

25) Question: What is the expected number of townhomes? Materials provided to city over time range from 8 (including all the visuals), 16 in pro forma and “up to 20” in zoning application.

Response from SG Collaborative: *In the final analysis, the maximum number of townhomes is probably closer to 8. Once we received the feedback from City staff on setbacks and applied those, then also decided to create the water feature in this area, it limits the number of townhomes that can be constructed. Depending on size, there may be as few as 6 townhomes. This will be determined by the final design.*

26) Question: We have a cost estimate for condos. What is the expected rent in easily understandable terms? (I understand that market forces will influence this as well. I am trying to understand who might have access to this development outside of the workforce component.)

Response from SG Collaborative: Rent is driven by the size of the unit. Lease rates are also impacted by amenities like balconies, # of parking spaces someone is entitled to use, etc. On the market-rate side, a reasonable range for a studio and 1 bedroom would be \$1,400 to just under \$1,800 per month, with a 3-bedroom as much at \$2,400-\$2,700 per month, plus everything in between.

A 1-bedroom workforce housing unit would be less than \$1,000/month with a studio being closer to \$900/month, and multiple bedrooms and multiples bathrooms increasing from there.

Questions Related to Divestment

27) Question: As the “land planning developer” rather than a “building developer”, SGC has indicated that they expect to sell the parcel for townhomes. A Development Strategies memo indicates that SGC expects to sell the buildings that they construct by 2029. Mr. Chapman has indicated that he intends to own some buildings for the long term. What are the intentions for maintaining ownership of buildings?

Response from SG Collaborative: SG believes the reference to selling by 2029 is only in the context of calculating an internal rate of return. D.S. has to assume a sale at some point in order to make that calculation. Townhomes, condominiums, and the office buildings, should we successfully attract an officer user, will be sold to others. Phil and I plan to build and hold the apartments for the long term. Whether the long term is 5, 10, 20 years or more, we cannot say. But we have no intention of a game plan where all the units are sold by 2029. SG thinks what is equally important is how these properties are operated has a lot to do with how successful they will be and whether the value we expect to be created will be there. As such, SG plans to manage the development and hold all the property owners to uniform standards, so the value remains.

Questions Related to City Impact

28) Question: Reports indicate that city will “re-evaluate” needs for additional code enforcement and a foot patrol officer as the project proceeds. How will these costs be covered if they are needed?

Response from City Staff: At this time, there is not an identified funding source for this potential expansion of the City workforce. The Cost/Benefit Analysis predicts the project

will generate about \$100,000/year in new tax revenues for the City. Those revenues could be dedicated to increased service costs. The City could also seek to incorporate into the Development Agreement an annual payment from the Developer for that purpose.

Response from SG Collaborative: *Based on the reporting so far, SG plans to purchase and give a new fire truck to Webster Groves.*

29) Question: I did not find any references to ambulance service. We are already stretched thin when it comes to ambulance service. What is the impact on that service?

Response from City Staff: *After reviewing the provided information, including some speculation on increased population and number of employees, one could mathematically calculate a daytime population increase of approximately seven percent. A seven percent increase in requests for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) would result in approximately 140 additional calls for EMS annually.*

However, the target demographic of “working professionals and families” is typically not a high-volume user of Emergency Medical Services. Therefore, a substantial impact to EMS call volume is not indicated. It is estimated that an additional 35 – 50 requests for EMS services annually would occur.

As EMS call volume continues to climb throughout the rest of the City and the addition of Total Access Urgent Care, a high-volume EMS call generator, the need for an additional ambulance and staff still cannot be ignored.

30) Question: At one point, there was some discussion of the potential need for “certain road improvements” to facilitate traffic once the buildings were completed (Sept townhall). Is this still the case? If yes, who is responsible for making these improvements? Who decides if and when such improvements are made?

Response from City Staff: *This is somewhat hard to predict. The traffic study indicates a modest increase in traffic volumes. The surrounding road systems volume would be unknown until the project is complete and near 100% occupancy. At that time, the traffic volumes would need to be computed and determine the need for additional lanes of pavement. This could be many years from now. An option could be to have the developer create an escrow account to fund these improvements for the future if needed. The costs would be for pavement widening, ROW acquisition, striping, sidewalks*

31) Question: Do we need to re-evaluate our impact on city services, police, and fire and planning (inspection)?

Response from City Staff: *The City Manager, along with Department Directors, is constantly evaluating the impact to City Services. The reports available to date, have not indicated City services will be hugely impacted. Due to the proposed build/phase*

schedule, any impacts that may result from the development would be meted out over time rather than a surge of demand. For further options, see the response to #29.

32) Question: Can we somehow disclose, based on the permit documentation that WG has, the actual \$\$ amount of improvements that have occurred in the past 2 years?

Response from City Staff: *The City's permitting system goes back to 1999 (22 years). Much of that permit data input did not include an estimated construction cost. In addition, some data in the mid-2000s became corrupt and wasn't able to be integrated into the current permitting system. [Staff is gathering available data and an early draft can be viewed by clicking here.](#)*

Questions Related to Alternatives

33) Question: Have we considered potential zoning changes that might make smaller scale, individual redevelopment options possible/feasible?

Response from City Staff: *A rezoning to "PC" Planned Commercial is based on a development plan provided to the City for what a developer wants to request. Any developer can come in with a plan to go through the rezoning process for the entire area or smaller sections of the area.*

34) Question: Is it possible the impending federal infrastructure initiative might provide assistance for infrastructure development that focus on environmentally sustainable/compatible redevelopment plans? I get this projection. But maybe other environmentally compatible funding might be available?

Response from City Staff: *The \$1.5 trillion dollar Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill does include funding for major infrastructure projects. However, there is no specific earmark or federal designation for projects such as Shady Creek. Funds would flow to state and/or regional agencies (MPOs) for allocation to projects.*

The City is investing \$1.25 million into Shady Creek improvements at Elm and Kirkham. Funding from ARP is eligible for stormwater improvements, but cost projections will be needed if the City decides to locally fund the improvements to Shady Creek.

35) Question: Since TIF funds go with the land, might we consider how they might be used in conjunction with zoning changes mentioned in #2 above? (Have we considered potential zoning changes that might make smaller scale, individual redevelopment options possible/feasible?)

Response from City Staff: *Due to the new deadline imposed by state law, if the City wishes to develop any part of the Shady Creek floodplain, the TIF Ordinance and RPA 1*

must be adopted by Dec 31. Should that not happen, TIF remains an alternative for any piece of the project area not in the floodplain.

36) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the cost to clean up/restore Green Space, make it usable for residents as done in Forest Park and by GRG?

Response from City Staff: *There is no City-owned green space within the boundaries of the project. The majority of the green space along Kirkham is all property owned by Old Community Baptist Church. The City could potentially partner with the church to clean up the area with City staffing and equipment.*

37) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the cost to simply add the bare minimum new infrastructure to the entire site?

Response from City Staff: *The City repaved W. Pacific Ave. in 2015. Lincoln St. was paved a few years earlier. Sherman Pl. is a gravel road and would need to be reconstructed, and would cost approximately \$253,600. As for utility upgrades, estimates from Ameren, Missouri American Water, and Spire are needed. Staff are currently trying to contact each entity to determine cost estimates. However, it would easily cost beyond \$10 million.*

38) Question: If this project is not approved, is it viable to develop with the 4 separate zones (A4, B1, PC, and E) right now?

Response from City Staff: *“A4” zoned area would be limited in development due to the floodplain. Without major improvements to the flood area, very little else could be developed. The “B1” zoned area has a site-specific ordinance that would only allow for a structure similar to what is built there today. It would be limited to the exact number of units. The “PC” zoned area does not have a site-specific ordinance that allows them to do anything other than what they already have in terms of existing structures. There was no development plan approved with that rezoning or a list of approved uses. The “E” industrial would be limited to what the code currently allows. Any new development or additions to structures would need to meet the parking code as well as other city regulations.*

39) Question: If this project is not approved, what can happen if the PC zoning does not occur and if the city leaves it open for the free market to fill in development based on each zone that it is now?

Response from City Staff: *The answer would be the same as for #40 and #47.*

40) Question: If this project is not approved; in relation to the School District - what other ways do they have to make \$\$ without adding special taxes?

Response from City Staff: *The City defers to the WG School District as we are unaware of the school district's financial options. However, City staff are not aware of any revenue options not currently used by the School District.*

41) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the likelihood that all the four independent zones currently are rezoned as one full zone of “E-All Industrial”? Are there pros or cons to this approach?

Response from City Staff: *The “A4” and “B1” areas should not be rezoned to “E” Industrial as residential uses are not allowed within that district. The structures and uses would be deemed non-conforming. It would limit them from being structurally altered or expanded. The uses currently located in the “PC” District were originally located in an “E” Industrial district. Most could continue to operate but might be limited in their expansion based on meeting regulations in the current codes.*

42) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the likelihood that all the four independent zones currently are rezoned as one full zone of “Commercial C or D”? Are there pro or cons to this approach?

Response from City Staff: *Rezoning to “C” or “D” Commercial districts would limit the industrial uses that are not currently allowed in the commercial districts. This would include warehousing which is limited in commercial areas. The structures and uses would be deemed non-conforming. It would limit them from being structurally altered or expanded.*

Any single-family homes would be non-conforming uses in the “D” Commercial District. The house currently on Kirkham would be considering non-conforming in that scenario.

Many of the structures which were built under former codes could be non-conforming to the required setbacks and development regulations of the commercial districts. Most could continue to operate but might be limited in their expansion based on meeting regulations in the current codes.

43) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the likelihood that all the four independent zones currently are rezoned as one full zone of “A4 – Residential”? Are there pros or cons to this approach?

Response from City Staff: *The entire area should not be rezoned to “A4” as almost all the existing uses, with the exception of the single-family house on Kirkham, are not allowed within that district. The structures and uses would be deemed non-conforming. It would limit them from being structurally altered or expanded.*

44) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the likelihood that all the four independent zones currently are rezoned as one full zone of “B1 – Multi-Family”? Are there pros or cons to this approach?

Response from City Staff: *In order to rezone to “B1” Multiple Family a development plan would need to be established which is similar to the “PC” Planned Commercial development plan. It would need to meet all the requirements and regulations for “B1” zoning. That would not include any uses other than multiple-family residential. All the existing uses on the site would not be allowed within that district. The structures and uses would be deemed non-conforming. It would limit them from being structurally altered or expanded.*

46) Question: If this project is not approved, what is the likelihood that all the four independent zones currently are rezoned as one full zone of “PC – Planned Commercial”? Are there pros or cons to this approach?

Response from City Staff:: *The area should only be rezoned to “PC” Planned Commercial with a development plan. That development plan as with the SG Collaborative plan would need to be a mixed-use plan. It would still need to go through the same rezoning process that has been underway with SG Collaborative.*

48: Question: Is it possible for the development to take the Kirkham right-of-way and then the boundary butts along the sculpture park? In other words, can we remove the sculpture park from the TIF and the rezoning? Would the Arts Commission rather be in or out of the development?

Response from City Staff: *The most advantageous route to "protect" the sculpture park would be to prohibit or restrict the Developer's rights within the current sculpture park area without the approval of the City Council and/or the Arts Commission.*

Response from SG Collaborative: *This area and all the rights of way surrounding the project area are included primarily because eligible TIF expenditures have to be made within the defined project area. We expect to do work with Ameren and other utilities out of the project area including this area. While cases suggest you can leave the boundaries of the TIF and still be okay, it is generally not a good idea. Particularly, if you are potentially subject to a challenge. It is our expectation we will sit down with the Arts Commission and City Council and make improvements to the sculpture park. But only to the extent they approve them. Including this area in the TIF project area doesn't give SG any rights over it that the City does not specifically agree to in the redevelopment agreement. Likewise, the redevelopment agreement can put specific provisions in there about the sculpture park about what can and cannot be done. Not sure what the concern is here, but it would be easy to address without having to change the boundaries of the TIF.*