

City of Wildwood, Missouri
Record of Proceedings



Town Center Update Team Meeting

Tuesday, January 8, 2019
Wildwood City Hall, 16860 Main Street, Wildwood, Missouri 63040
Meeting Minutes

The Town Center Update Team meeting was called to order by Director of Planning Vujnich, at 6:30 p.m., on Tuesday, January 8, 2019, at Wildwood City Hall, 16860 Main Street, Wildwood, Missouri.

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks by Department of Planning and Parks Staff

Director of Planning Joe Vujnich welcomed the Team Members and thanked them for their attendance again this evening. He requested the Roll Call be taken, which was completed by Assistant Director Arnett, with the following results:

Present Team Members: Curtis, Remy, Jackson, Brewer, Weiss, Risdall, Marion, Broyles, Loyal, Sedlak, Lee, and Council Members McCutchen and Stephens.

Absent Team Members: Rowton, Hood, Kohn, Helfrey, and Hoffmann.

Staff in attendance: Director of Planning Vujnich and Assistant Director Arnett.

Director Vujnich then noted the first item on tonight's agenda was for the Team to select a Chair or Co-Chairs and nominations for the position(s) would now be accepted.

II. Election of Chair (or Co-Chairs) by Team Members

A nomination was made by Council Member Stephens for Team Member Loyal to chair the group. Team Member Loyal accepted the nomination and supported a Co-Chair, if desired. No other nominations were offered from the floor. A voice vote was taken with a unanimous, affirmative result, and Team Member Loyal was made Chair.

Chair Loyal then requested the Team discuss the potential use of a facilitator.

III. Review and Action on Draft Minutes from December 11, 2018 Team Meeting

A motion was made by Council Member Stephens, seconded by Team Member Remy, to approve the minutes from the December 11, 2018 meeting. Chair Loyal called for a voice vote, and hearing no opposition, declared the motion approved.

IV. Distribution of Meeting Materials, including Explanations of Them by Department of Planning and Parks

Director Vujnich noted tonight's meeting was to allow for questions from the information provided at the December 11, 2018 Kick-off meeting, as well as, to review the five (5) main components of the Town Center Plan. This discussion would then conclude the overall background of the Town Center Area.

V. Questions/Comments from Team Members about Information Provided at December 11, 2018 Meeting

Director Vujnich gave a brief review of the ten (10) items that had been provided at the previous meeting in December, which included the following:

1. Original Town Center Plan, by Andres Duany – never adopted.
2. Second Town Center Plan, adopted in 1998, some of which is still applicable and those parts have been included in newer versions.
3. First Development Manual, adopted in 1999, and created by the Architectural Review Board, no portion of which supersedes the local building codes.

Team Members then posed the following questions:

Which specific items from these documents this group will review? Director Vujnich noted the direction from City Council, when recommending this review, was to consider land use. This review will include activities allowed on properties and uses allowed within each Land Use Category. The group can also review the boundary of the Town Center Area and the Street Network Map. Neighborhood Design Standards and Architectural Guidelines do not need to be reviewed. The architectural guidelines were just reviewed by the City's Architectural Review Board, which consists of five (5) practicing architects, who spent a year refining them and the Neighborhood Design Standards have been in place for twenty (20) years and modifications can impact greatly the block and design of existing areas.

Can the Team be provided with what is working and what isn't right now, to better understand what needs to change and decisions to be made by this group, as well as to provide future direction?

Have previous groups expanded the Town Center boundary? In 2008, a major alteration was made to the boundary in the Cultural/Institutional District for the St. Louis Community College Campus and the Wildwood Family YMCA.

Can additional information be provided regarding where the assumptions are coming from for the traffic projections in the Town Center Area? Traffic engineers base assumptions on text book that provides regional averages. Director Vujnich noted the engineer who completed the Town Center Traffic Study can be invited to a future Team meeting to present his findings and answer questions.

Director Vujnich noted the goal is to create a plan that does not need to be modified by City Boards and Commissions, but instead is a solid, predictable resource.

What variances or deviations were granted to the Town Center Plan in the past? Director Vujnich noted the Wildwood Hotel and the B&B Theater were not intended to be developed on those properties, and are the most notable modifications to the Plan. It was further noted such uses can be difficult for a community to obtain and should be included in a New Urbanist area, so the modifications were granted due to their greater good for the City. He then noted a list will be provided by Staff of the instances, outside the update process, where the land use was modified. He then explained the difference between the planning process and a variance, noting all properties in Town Center Area have a site-specific ordinance governing them, which allows individual requirements to be tailored to the area and property. This results in most properties going through the rezoning process, even if the proposal is in compliance with the Town Center Plan.

The remaining seven (7) items provided were noted, with additional questions requested from the Team.

VI. Overview/Explanation of Five (5) Main Components of the Town Center Plan (1998 to 2012 Documents)

a. **Boundary Map**

Director Vujnich noted five (5) main factors were used in the layout of the original Town Center boundary, and they were:

1. **Existing zonings:** Completed by St. Louis County, prior to the City's incorporation. Many of these zonings were speculative, but the City had to decide if they wanted to legally challenge their existence or accept them as-is.
2. **Access:** This area has good access from arterial and collector roads.
3. **Topography:** Few areas in Wildwood are relatively flat, but the core area of the Town Center has less slope.
4. **Utility access:** Much of Wildwood does not have public water, sewer, or natural gas. Town Center either has full access to utilities or potential for such.
5. **Communities of interest:** Grover and Pond Areas had been commerce centers since the 1800's and were logical locations for the Town Center.

The City's Town Center Area is in excess of eight hundred (800) acres, while most New Urbanist developments are closer to forty (40) to one hundred (100) acres. The buildout of this larger area has always been projected to be a twenty (20) to thirty (30) year process. Director Vujnich noted the Team can review the boundary. In the past, property owners on the perimeter have been notified of the review, so they could petition if they want to be considered.

Team Members then posed the following questions:

Could a full utility map be provided to use in their analysis of the boundary?

Have any areas been requested for expansion previously? Director Vujnich noted the area south of Manchester Road, along Woods Road, and the area west of the proposed Ackerley Place Subdivision, both had previous requests for inclusion.

Why does the boundary meander and include so much space for residential? County zoning and most new urbanism developments are a project, not a design philosophy. Incorporation decision to preserve Non-Urban Areas, meant a location had to be provided, where higher density residential, and commercial, etc. would be allowed. New Urbanism also emphasizes the ability to live, work, shop, and play within walkable communities with ¼ mile radius. Residential is always a key element in a New Urbanist Area.

Could boundary be reduced? Yes, but the property owners would need to be involved in such a discussion.

What is benefit of owning property in Town Center, versus outside? Properties within the Town Center Area have a high density population, near businesses for customer base. Also, property within the Town Center Area can be developed at a higher density than outside the boundaries.

Is there a reason to keep developed properties within the Town Center boundary? Developed areas moved out of Town Center will create non-conformities. This action would cause extensive zoning issues with these properties. It was noted that, with the use of site-specific ordinances within the Town Center boundary, zoning precedences cannot be set.

b. **Street Network Map, with latest Town Center Traffic Study**

Director Vujnich provided an overview of the Street Network Map, noting it provided locations, engineering, and priorities for all main streets within the boundary. Andres Duany noted one of the fundamental powers of government is establishment of right-of-way and street layouts. Street frontage is key for properties, given it typically means value and exposure. The core streets were created in the Street Network Map and allow

individual projects to address local streets. The Traffic Study done in 2018 does have recommendations for certain Town Center streets. The backbone network of streets includes Manchester Road, Taylor Road, Main Street, Eatherton Road, and State Routes 109 and 100.

Team Members posed the following questions:

Can a discussion be held at a future meeting regarding alleys (service lanes)?

Can the author of the 2018 study to come to future meeting? There was consensus for this among Team Members and Department staff noted they would schedule it and allow the engineer to also provide information on assumptions used in the document.

Department staff also noted they can arrange for a number of experts on a range of topics to talk to the group, if they want that at any point.

c. Regulating Plan (Land Use Plan – Future), including the Table of Uses

Director Vujnich began by noting the Town Center Regulating Plan is a subset of the City’s Conceptual Land Use Plan of the Master Plan. Two (2) of the Regulating Plan categories allow commercial uses - Downtown and Workplace Districts. The Downtown District allows the most intensive uses and traffic generators, including drive-throughs, and buildings with the largest footprints. The Workplace District is a transition zone between the Downtown District and residential uses. The Workplace District has a reduction in density and intensity from Downtown. Districts with residential uses are Neighborhood General and Neighborhood Edge. The Neighborhood General District allows the widest range of uses, including attached residential, live/work, detached residential, etc. with the highest permissible densities. Neighborhood Edge District permits single family detached and allows the least intense uses and serves as a buffer to non-Town Center uses. The Cultural/Institutional District is an overlay district, which allows residences that are compatible with uses, like YMCA, churches, etc. The Pond/Historic District has the least amount of regulations, given designs need to work closely with historic development and characteristics.

It was noted the Grover Area is not a historic district, but contains historic properties.

Director Vujnich noted each land use district has a list of uses that can be considered within it and the Team will review where each District should be and what uses should be allowed within each. Department staff will bring questions that have been under discussion by the Architectural Review Board on certain uses to the Team for their input.

d. Neighborhood Design Standards

Director Vujnich provided a description of each District, and then the district specific standards, including building types, lot size, lot depth, façade standards, and site standards. He noted the Team will review some portion of the standards and may recommend changes to be included in its final recommendation.

e. Architectural Guidelines

Director Vujnich noted the Architectural Guidelines provide specifics on building design and materials. The current Development Manual reflects the most recent version of guidelines, which was updated by the Architectural Review Board last year.

VII. Public Comments and Input

None

Chair Loyal asked if the Team wanted to hear public comments at the beginning or end of meetings, or both. Consensus was reached among the Team to allow public comments at the beginning of the meetings, right after the approval of the minutes, and at the end of the meeting, prior to adjournment.

Discussion of Use of Facilitator

Chair Loyal requested if there was consensus among the Team Members to use a facilitator throughout the update process. Director Vujnich requested if Team Members had a suggested facilitator, if not, Department will contact someone.

A motion was made by Team Member Broyles, seconded by Team Member Marion, to have staff select a facilitator to begin at the February meeting. Chair Loyal called for a voice vote, and hearing no opposition, declared the motion approved.

Other:

Chair Loyal noted he would request a meeting with staff for review of process and the projected end result, to ensure the Team's focus is on-track. He also requested the Council Liaisons provide input throughout the process on the opinions of City Council, so the Team is set up for a successful result.

Director Vujnich noted action has been deferred on a rezoning request on Eatherton Road, and staff will talk to the Chair about the appropriate timing for this discussion, but the Team needs to make a decision sooner, rather than later on the land use classification of the property. He noted its decision has ramifications on all four (4) corners of the intersection and that more specific details on the property and immediate surrounding area will be provided.

The next meeting will address the Street Network Map, with a consultant presentation, and the Team can discuss a notification process for the Regulating Plan and Boundary Map updates at that time.

VIII. Next Meeting Date – February 12, 2019 (Tuesday)

No change was recommended to next meeting date.

IX. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

A motion was made by Council Liaison Stephens, seconded by Team Member Remy, to adjourn the meeting. Having no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Loyal at 8:07 p.m.