

**CITY OF OLIVETTE
PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DESIGN COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JULY 20, 2023**

The City of Olivette Planning and Community Design Commission (PCDC) met on July 20th, 2023, at 7:00 PM via in person and videoconferencing on Zoom. Carol Waggoner presiding as Chair called the meeting to order. Commission Member Bryan Lewis served as secretary. The meeting was live streamed via

1. ROLL CALL:

On roll call, the following members were present: Commission members Daniel Rosenberg, Tim Spiegelglass, Bryan Lewis & Carol Waggoner. Carol Waggoner was the active chair, and Bryan Lewis was the active secretary.

Also, in attendance were Councilmember Missy Waldman, Director of the Planning and Community Development Carlos Trejo, Senior Planner Dawn Doty, and Planning and Zoning Administrator Jack Carswell.

A quorum being present, Chair Waggoner declared the meeting in session for the transaction of business.

2. REVIEW OF COMMISSION PROCEDURES:

Chair Waggoner provided an overview outlining the Commission's operational protocols, procedures for participation, and elucidating the process for conducting presentations. Additionally, the Chair offered a comprehensive overview of the Commission's review procedures.

3. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Planning Director Trejo provided a comprehensive update on the progress of the ongoing comprehensive plan process. During his presentation, Mr. Trejo elaborated on the formation and objectives of the comprehensive plan Advisory Committee. Furthermore, he emphasized essential aspects derived from a previous presentation conducted on July 13th, which included key highlights from a Market Analysis, showcasing pertinent housing data, and presenting survey results. Notably, this presentation effectively conveyed the aspirations of Olivette's residents, encapsulating their desired future changes and developments.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Trejo noted that there were no comments.

5. NEW BUSINESS:

A. 9214 Castle Ragh Court, petition for residential additions, review of Site Plan, Community Design, and Concept Stormwater Management Plan.

Mr. Trejo initiated the discussion by elucidating the various types of residential reviews and their respective procedural frameworks. Additionally, he provided insights into the commissioner voting process. He emphasized that the outcome of the vote, whether in favor or against, was not contingent on the specific count of votes. Instead, the crucial requirement was the presence of at least four members on the dais. If the quorum was met, the Commission could proceed with discussions, consider public input, and carry out the voting process effectively.

Mr. Trejo proceeded to present the proposed additions for 9214 Castle Ragh Court, encompassing a rear addition of 249 square feet, an open covered porch spanning 175 square feet, and a second-level addition comprising 1,101 square feet. The property's unique features

included its relatively narrower width and depth, attributed to its location within a cul-de-sac and its pie-shaped layout, causing it to widen towards the rear beyond the district's minimum requirements.

Regarding the Community Design Review, the evaluation based on Olivette's eight design principles yielded no unusual findings, indicating that the proposed additions aligned well with the community's design guidelines. Additionally, all zoning requirements were met satisfactorily.

The Site Plan assessment revealed a minor deviation in lot width, though only by a few feet, primarily due to the peculiar shape of the lot. However, it was observed that the lot expanded beyond the district's minimum width as it extended backward. Furthermore, the lot's limited depth was addressed, as it adjoined a parcel owned by Ameren UE, housing a substation, and adjoining an MSD channel. Drainage patterns indicated a flow from the northside to the southside, without foreseeing any adverse impacts on neighboring properties, except for the Ameren parcel, which was not intended for single-family use. The rear of the property did not affect any adjacent neighbors.

In adherence to specific regulations pertaining to the addition's footprint, the petitioner and owner were required to implement stormwater management measures, such as rain barrels or suitable Best Management Practices (BMPs).

Mr. Trejo made it known that notifications regarding the petition were sent to surrounding properties, and as of 5 PM, July 20th, 2023, no comments had been received.

Chair Waggoner invited questions from the commission members. In response, Commissioner Lewis sought clarification regarding the site plan's lot locations in relation to the lot locations depicted in aerial photographs. To address this query, petitioner Lauren Strutman and Mr. Trejo provided the necessary explanations and clarifications. Subsequently, no further questions were raised.

The Petitioner/Architect, Lauren Strutman and property owner David Teuzer were present.

Commissioner Rosenberg motioned to approve the site plan, community design review, and authorize staff ensure concept stormwater management plan is submitted in compliant with Section 422.080 (A.3.) for a residential addition at 9214 Castle Ragh Court as presented in the memorandum from the Department of Planning & Community Development dated July 20th, 2023, subject to any staff conditions noted therein. Commissioner Lewis seconded the motion.

On a roll call vote, the following actions were taken:

Commissioner Spiegelglass Yes

Commissioner Rosenberg Yes

Commissioner Lewis Yes

Active Chair Waggoner Yes

The motion passes unanimously, 4 to 0.

Mr. Trejo reviewed the next steps in the process.

B. 537 Long Acres Lane, petition for new single-family residence, review of Community design, and Concept stormwater management plan.

Mr. Trejo clarified that the lot configuration of 537 Long Acres Lane, being part of a new subdivision, completely adheres to the SR district's dimensional requirements. Consequently, it is exempt from undergoing a Site Plan Review process. The commission has already

assessed the preceding seven homes within the Birdie Lane Subdivision, and 537 Long Acres Lane marks the eighth and final home in the development.

Upon careful evaluation of the elevation, articulation, materials, and massing of all the homes, the commission found that they all align with the guideline recommendations, demonstrating compliance with the established design standards. During this discussion, petitioner Harry Freeman was present via Zoom.

After the commission's question-and-answer session yielded no inquiries, Chair Waggoner proceeded to open the floor for public comments. Marc Lapp from 515 Dielman Road took this opportunity to voice his concerns regarding a strip of land that runs parallel to Dielman Road, situated east of the Birdie Lane Subdivision retaining wall. He emphasized that this strip of land belongs to the subdivision and expressed apprehension over its cleanliness, citing it as a potential safety hazard.

Mr. Lapp shared that he had been in communication with petitioner Harry Freeman prior to the July 20th meeting, discussing the possibility of installing pine tree plantings on the strip of land. To support his claims, he provided the Commission with videos showcasing his property and the adjacent sliver of land that falls under the ownership of the subdivision.

During the meeting, Mr. Trejo provided additional information to the Commission concerning subdivision improvements and the necessary deposits to ensure compliance. Councilmember Waldman sought further clarification on the ownership of the area beyond the retaining wall, inquiring about the portion belonging to the petitioner compared to the homeowner.

In response, Mr. Trejo explained that the petitioner's land extends approximately five feet eastward from the retaining wall. Upon completion of construction by Freeman Homes, the responsibility for maintaining the sliver of land behind Mr. Lapp's property line will fall under the jurisdiction of the Birdie Lane subdivision.

He further informed the Commission that although the retaining wall in question does not fully comply with the city's code, it was granted a variance by the Zoning Board of Adjustment, with Freeman Homes' representative indicating a commitment to undertaking plantings as a resolution.

Mr. Trejo also highlighted that according to the subdivision code, a specific number of plantings is mandated, and these plantings are typically installed towards the end of the construction process, once all the necessary improvements have been completed. The legal record specifies that the responsibility for conducting maintenance lies with the subdivision.

The commission's discussion persisted, and Chair Waggoner inquired if there were any further comments from the public. Petitioner Mr. Freeman responded, assuring that Freeman Homes would plant pine trees at intervals of every 10 feet. He also addressed the issue of weed eating and mentioned that a contractor had been employed to remove previous haybales and tidy up the concerned piece of land.

During the meeting, Commissioner Spiegelglass and Petitioner Freeman engaged in a conversation regarding the status of the sewer inlet fencing and the progress of the detention pond construction.

To provide clarity, Mr. Trejo highlighted the exact locations of the detention basins and highlighted pertinent information regarding other lots within the Birdie Lane Subdivision that had previously received approval from the Commission.

As Mr. Freeman had made comments in response to Mr. Lapp's concerns, the latter returned to the podium to further address the issue. Chair Waggoner suggested that Mr. Lapp should schedule a meeting with Mr. Trejo to discuss his concerns in more detail, as the topic seemed to involve matters related to code enforcement.

Despite this, the Commission continued to encourage communication between Mr. Lapp and Mr. Freeman to clarify the types of plantings they intended to use (fern vs. pine). Additionally, the Commission emphasized the importance of appropriately handling any rebar that might be required for erosion control or construction purposes by ensuring it is capped and marked for safety and compliance reasons. These considerations aimed to address any potential discrepancies or misunderstandings between the involved parties while ensuring adherence to regulations and best practices.

Commissioner Rosenberg motioned to approve the petition for community design and concept stormwater management plan review for a new single-family home at 537 Long Acres Lane as presented in the Memorandum from the Department of Planning and Community Development dated July 20th, 2023, subject to any staff conditions noted therein and ensuring that the as promised in September the area is cleaned, trees are planted, and will continue to work with Mr. Trejo on any clean up. Commissioner Spiegelglass seconded the motion. On roll call vote, the following actions were taken:

Commissioner Spiegelglass Yes
Commissioner Rosenberg Yes
Commissioner Lewis Yes
Active Chair Waggoner Yes
The motion passed unanimously, 4 to 0, with conditions.

Mr. Trejo reviewed the next steps in the process.

C. 3 Stacy Drive, petition for new single-family home, review of Site Plan, Community Design, and Concept Stormwater Management Review.

Mr. Trejo began by explaining that the Site Plan review for the property under consideration differed due to certain lot deficiencies. He emphasized that the lot exceeded the minimum size requirements significantly, measuring 21,000 square feet, well above the minimum of 15,000 square feet. Similarly, the lot depth was ample, measuring 244 feet, exceeding the minimum depth requirement of 150 feet. However, the width of the lot measured around 88 to 89 feet, falling short by approximately 11 to 12 feet.

Regarding setbacks, Mr. Trejo pointed out that they were calculated based on the width of the lot. Setbacks were approximately 11.8 feet, which was slightly below the typical lot requirement of 12 feet. It was observed that setbacks reduced as the lot width decreased. The front yard setback and side yard setback, as well as the east side building elevation and stormwater management, were among the Site Plan concerns highlighted by Mr. Trejo.

He further noted that the home's placement adhered to the subdivision's indentures, with the front and southwest corners of the home being set back 40 feet, which met code requirements. Moreover, there was no maximum limit for setbacks defined by code.

Regarding the elevation of the proposed home, Mr. Trejo affirmed that it complied with the guidelines, demonstrating excellent articulation, incorporating various voids and masses, and utilizing diverse materials in its design.

Mr. Trejo informed the Commission that all homes constructed in Olivette within the last five years are mandated to have an on-site detention system, and this site adheres to that requirement. The detention system in place not only accommodates the previous surface area of the older home, which lacked a detention system, but it also accounts for the entire roof area of the proposed home. This detention system is located on the streetside, at the south end of the property. Additionally, a separate detention system is provided in the rear to handle water from the sump pump.

The property will undergo re-grading, but the flow of stormwater will remain unchanged as it naturally flows downhill. However, Mr. Trejo mentioned that there might be opportunities to collaborate with the petitioner to ensure that water is effectively directed away from the footprint of the home, enhancing drainage efficiency, and mitigating potential water-related concerns.

Furthermore, Mr. Trejo conveyed that a similar footprint for this home has been previously approved in the past, indicating a precedent for such construction in the area.

After the information was presented, Chair Waggoner inquired if any of the Commission members had questions. One question was raised regarding the distance between 3 Stacy Drive and 1 Stacy Drive, which was clarified to be 23 feet.

The petitioner, Doug Cohen, was present and took the opportunity to speak about the design of the petition, providing insight into his client's vision for the project. Additionally, he shared his prior experience with construction involving a similar housing footprint.

Commissioner Lewis requested further clarification on the setback of the previous home in relation to the proposed project, likely seeking to understand any differences or similarities in this aspect of the development.

During the public comment period, Larry Nober from 2 Stacy Drive took the opportunity to express his concerns regarding the current Site Plan design. As a 22-year resident of Olivette and a trustee of the Heather Hill First Addition Homeowners Association for over four years, Mr. Nober voiced his apprehension regarding the setbacks of the proposed project.

He emphasized his worries about the house's alignment with the rest of the neighborhood, suggesting that the current design might not be in harmony with the surrounding properties. His comments brought attention to the need for careful consideration and integration of the new construction into the existing neighborhood's aesthetic and character.

Mr. Trejo engaged in a dialogue with Mr. Nober, seeking further information regarding the existence of a review board for Stacy Road and the activity level of the homeowner's association.

In response, Mr. Nober stated that he was not aware of any review board specifically for Stacy Lane. However, he confirmed that the homeowner's association to which he belongs, the Heather Hill First Addition Homeowners Association, is indeed active and involved in the neighborhood's affairs. His input shed light on the community's organizational structures and

emphasized the relevance of homeowner associations in addressing local concerns and interests.

In response to Mr. Nober's comments, petitioner Doug Cohen addressed the concern about the neighboring property to the west, indicating that it might undergo reconstruction in the future. This information aimed to provide context and highlight potential changes in the immediate vicinity.

Additionally, Mr. Cohen took the opportunity to elaborate further on his client's vision for the project, offering additional insights into the design and intentions behind the proposed construction. By sharing more about the client's vision, he aimed to provide a comprehensive perspective and context for the development, addressing any questions or uncertainties that might have arisen during the discussion.

Commissioner Rosenberg sought further clarification on Mr. Cohen's earlier comment regarding the viewing of more greenspace. Mr. Cohen clarified that the design of the proposed house would provide his client with an enhanced view of greenspace from the side of the house. This explanation aimed to emphasize the positive aspects of the design and how it aimed to enhance the living experience for the client. Following Mr. Cohen's clarification, Mr. Nober returned to the podium to respond to Mr. Cohen's comments.

Corey Feit, the homeowner of 1 Stacy Drive, who resides in the home situated east of the proposed development, took the opportunity to present a PDF presentation to the Commission. His presentation detailed how the proposed 40-foot setback of 3 Stacy Drive would obstruct his view to the street. Mr. Feit also expressed his concerns regarding the side setback, potential elevation issues blocking his solar panels, and stormwater management.

In his presentation, Mr. Feit included mirrored graphics, providing an example of how the site plan could potentially be altered to address his concerns more effectively. After concluding his presentation, he invited the Commission to ask any questions they might have. However, no questions were raised at that time, allowing Mr. Feit's presentation to stand as his statement and contribution to the discussion. His input brought attention to crucial considerations related to neighboring properties and the visual impact of the proposed development.

During the proceedings, Chair Waggoner inquired if any online participants wished to share their thoughts. The petitioner's architect, Katie Niesen Cook, took this opportunity to explain the rationale behind the site plan's placement of the proposed garage on the left or east side of the home/lot.

Ms. Cook clarified that the design was intentionally arranged in this manner to accommodate elevation changes, which allowed for the incorporation of basement windows while minimizing the number of steps required to access the home.

Mr. Trejo engaged in a discussion with the Commission members, during which they raised questions about the positioning of the proposed house and why it was set so far forward on the lot. In response, Chair Waggoner requested Mr. Trejo to indicate the point from which they were measuring the required 40-foot setback.

Mr. Trejo clarified that the setback measurement would be taken from the closest point of the new home to the road right of way, not from the curb. He used presentation graphics to illustrate the setback to provide a visual understanding of the concept to the Commission.

Commissioner Lewis posed a question regarding the measurement of the farthest corner on 1 Stacy Drive to the right of way. Mr. Trejo responded by stating that this corner was approximately 55.7 feet from the right of way, and the other corner for 1 Stacy Drive was a little over 85 feet away.

Chair Waggoner expressed concerns about the potential impact on the solar panels at 1 Stacy Drive, which could be blocked by the elevation of the proposed house. In response, Mr. Trejo explained that the code recognizes that it is the responsibility of the property owner to be aware of potential impacts on adjacent properties. The code is not written in a way that the presence of solar panels dictates the development of another property.

Architect Katie Niesen Cook responded to the concerns raised about the potential impact on the solar panels by explaining the design of the proposed house. She clarified that only the right-side front of the house would be two stories tall, while the rest of the roof would lower to one story. Ms. Niesen Cook further emphasized that the solar array on the neighboring property would not be significantly blocked by the two-story portion of the proposed house, as currently laid out on the site.

To provide further clarification, Mr. Trejo used the site plan to illustrate visual examples for all participants and the Commission, helping them understand the layout and potential implications for the solar array.

Chair Waggoner then inquired if pushing the house back farther would impact the solar array's exposure to sunlight. Ms. Niesen Cook responded that it would indeed have a negative impact on the solar array's efficiency if the house were positioned further back. Her response highlighted the design considerations to minimize any potential interference with the neighboring property's solar panels while maintaining an optimal layout for the proposed house.

Mr. Feit returned to the podium to present counter information regarding the solar panels and expressed his willingness to take steps to address his concerns about the view of the new home. Specifically, he asked whether he could install taller vegetation to mitigate any potential impact on his view caused by the proposed house. In response, Mr. Trejo reassured Mr. Feit that there are vegetation options available to help address his concerns.

During the discussion, Mr. Trejo directed a question to Ms. Cook, seeking clarification on the factors that were influencing the forward placement of the home. Ms. Cook responded that the buyer's preference was to have a deeper backyard, which led to the decision to position the home farther forward on the lot.

Commissioner Lewis brought up the potential effects of neighboring properties constructing closer to the road and proposed that discussions be initiated to allow time for sorting out any potential issues. He expressed his hesitation to vote on the matter that night.

Chair Waggoner agreed with Commissioner Lewis, sharing the sentiment that while the proposed development met the requirements, the positioning of 3 Stacy Drive seemed out of place and too far forward. She urged the parties involved to begin negotiations with neighboring property owners to find a resolution that could address the concerns raised during the meeting.

During the discussion, Mr. Trejo observed that the Commission seemed to prefer a greater front yard setback for the proposed development. Commissioner Spiegelglass and Commissioner Lewis both expressed their agreement with this sentiment.

Commissioner Lewis acknowledged that while the Commission could not dictate specific setbacks due to the ordinance, the ordinance does contain guidelines regarding fitting into the neighborhood context. Considering the ample space available in the backyard, the Commission agreed to wait and allow the parties involved to explore more options.

Mr. Trejo suggested that the Commission consider the setback distances from the corners of the neighboring properties (number 1 and number 5 on the site plan) at two points - the two far ends - to calculate an average and be within a 5-foot tolerance of that average. The Commission discussed the logistics of this approach and eventually reached a consensus that an updated design should be presented to the Commission, reflecting the calculated average of the setbacks, and staying within a reasonable tolerance of that average.

As a result, the Commission decided not to vote on the proposal for 3 Stacy Drive on July 20th, 2023. Instead, they requested updated drawings that would address the setback concerns and provide a design that better fits the context of the neighborhood. This decision demonstrated the Commission's commitment to ensuring thoughtful and contextually appropriate developments within the community.

Mr. Trejo reviewed the next steps in the process.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. 10401 Baur Boulevard, Suite D, E, F for a Special Permit, including Site Plan Review

Chair Waggoner provided a concise overview of the petition under consideration. The proposal is to utilize 27,858 square feet of an existing multi-tenant office/warehouse building located at 10401 Baur Boulevard for operating a "consignment car sales" business. The intended business operation does not involve any outdoor activities or displays. This summary offered a clear and straightforward description of the petition's scope, focusing on the primary aspects of the proposed use of the property.

Mr. Trejo provided the Commission with background information about the site located in Warson/Baur Industrial Park, specifically focusing on the three tenant spaces at 10401 Baur Boulevard, which the petitioner intends to use for their "consignment car sales" business. He explained that Olivette's codes do not have specific references to car lots due to the significant amount of land they typically require, and the city currently does not have any new or used car lots.

As the proposed business is a consignment operation, where RP Exotics will facilitate the sale of cars meeting their specifications for sellers, Mr. Trejo clarified that vehicles would be brought to the site and prepared for transactions. He mentioned that there might be a need for some vehicles to be stored on the lot overnight.

Parking was addressed as a concern, but Mr. Trejo assured the Commission that RP Exotics would not adversely impact parking for other tenants within the building, as they have sufficient parking to accommodate their needs. Moreover, he explained that most of the cars would be parked indoors, and the tenant spaces were equipped with sprinkler systems and the necessary provisions to support this arrangement.

Mr. Trejo also provided information about RP Exotics' business model, comparisons to similar businesses in the area, and how their proposed operation aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, indicating that the business is not contrary to the city's development goals.

The Commission was reminded that they do not have the final decision, and no significant improvements are proposed for the site as the building already contains a buffer, sprinkler systems, and loading docks for vehicles. Mr. Trejo outlined the conditions associated with the proposed business.

During the question period, Chair Waggoner sought clarification about the parking stalls, and Mr. Trejo responded that RP Exotics would be asked to mark six dedicated parking spaces for their business to inform other tenants of their allocated area. This information provided the Commission with a better understanding of the business proposal, its potential impact on the site, and the measures being taken to ensure compatibility with existing tenants.

Petitioner Corbin Holtzman from PPM/Baur, LLC, was present during the meeting and addressed the Commission. He shared information about their prior experiences working with tenants in the area and specifically mentioned the challenges they had faced with this location in the past, primarily related to parking issues.

Mr. Holtzman provided details about a previous noise violation that occurred at the property and explained the corrective actions taken in response to the violation. These actions included sending the tenant a default notice to address the noise-related concerns.

After sharing this information, Mr. Holtzman opened the floor for questions from the Commission, allowing them to inquire further about the property, the business proposal, and any other relevant matters.

Commissioner Spiegelglass sought further clarification on the noise violations that were previously mentioned by Mr. Holtzman. In response, Mr. Holtzman provided an explanation of the specific event that led to the noise violation, the measures taken in response to the issue, and how they ensured that the tenant has not received any further complaints related to noise.

Commissioner Spiegelglass sought clarification on the hours of operation for RP Exotics. In response, Mr. Holtzman stated that RP Exotics would operate during standard business hours. He also clarified that all mechanic work associated with the consignment car sales business would be conducted off-site at another location.

Commissioner Spiegelglass inquired about the need for any special exhaust systems for the proposed business. Mr. Trejo responded by stating that the warehouse is already configured with the necessary exhaust systems to meet the requirements.

Mr. Holtzman added to the response, mentioning that the warehouse already has the appropriate infrastructure, including proper sprinkler systems, fire alarms, exhaust facilities, and smoke detectors. These existing features were likely in place to accommodate the needs of the previous tenant's business type.

Commissioner Lewis raised a question concerning security measures and the potential need for police presence, considering the type of valuable inventory involved in the consignment car sales business. In response, Mr. Holtzman provided information about the steps taken to enhance security at the property.

Mr. Holtzman explained that they had increased the lighting around the premises to improve visibility during nighttime hours. Additionally, they worked closely with the local police to coordinate night-time drive-throughs for added security presence. Moreover, they implemented additional surveillance cameras on the property to monitor and enhance security measures.

Commissioner Rosenberg sought clarification on the access points for cars entering the warehouse. In response, Mr. Holtzman explained that the warehouse is equipped with four drive-ins that are surface level and at grade. These drive-ins provide direct and convenient access for cars to be pulled directly into the warehouse.

Councilmember Waldman sought clarification on the definition of "three recorded and verified noise complaints" in the context of the discussion. In response, Mr. Trejo explained that when noise complaints are received, they are documented and recorded by dispatch. Subsequently, an officer is dispatched to the location to either issue a citation for the noise violation or engage in a discussion with the owner to address the issue.

Commissioner Lewis motioned to forward a recommendation to the City Council to consider authorizing a special permit use for the operations of a "consignment care sales facilities" facility at the property addressed as 10401 Baur Boulevard, Suite D, E, and F and approve the Petition for Site Plan and Concept Stormwater Management Plan as illustrated in the Permit plans as presented on July 20, 2023. As presented before the Commission noted in the Memorandum from the Department of Planning and Community Development dated July 20, 2023, subject to any staff conditions noted therein. Commissioner Rosenberg seconded the motion. On roll call vote, the following actions were taken:

Commissioner Spiegelglass Yes
Commissioner Rosenberg Yes
Commissioner Lewis Yes
Active Chair Waggoner Yes
The motion passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

Mr. Trejo reviewed the next steps in the process.

B. 9514 Olive Boulevard (Suites 9510, 9412 & 9514) – Planthaven Commercial Center for a Special Permit, including Conceptual Site Plan Review

Chair Waggoner provided a concise overview of the petition, which is for the proposed development of an 8,010 square foot brewpub, comprising a production brewery and a restaurant with indoor seating. The breakdown of the space includes an 89-seat indoor restaurant covering approximately 2,851 square feet, as well as a 2,369 square foot production brewery.

Mr. Trejo then presented information to the Commission, explaining how the development aligns with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and how it is made possible due to Olivette's growth. He described the process that led to the petition being presented.

One of the concerns highlighted by Mr. Trejo was the issue of parking. To address this concern, an analysis was conducted, and Mr. Trejo provided information about the parking requirements and additional details about traffic flow, entry, and exit within the commercial center.

Regarding the proposed hours of operation, Mr. Trejo informed the Commission of the intended schedule for the brewpub.

To address the parking issue, Mr. Trejo mentioned that the business has established a good connection with neighboring properties to lease out some parking stalls, potentially providing a solution to the parking concern.

Chair Waggoner sought clarification on the proposed hours of operation for the brewpub, specifically considering the hours of neighboring tenants. Mr. Trejo explained that while some of the brewpub's operating hours may overlap with those of neighboring businesses, the busiest hours for the brewpub are anticipated to be on Friday and Saturday nights, precisely when the neighboring tenants are closed.

Councilmember Waldman inquired about the possibility of the petitioners requesting a modification or time change to the proposed hours of operation in the future. In response, Mr. Trejo clarified that the petitioner has the option to return to the Commission if they wish to seek any modifications or changes to the hours of operation.

Mr. Trejo also explained that the proposed hours of operation were designed to provide a level of security and allow for evaluation of the parking situation on the site. This indicates that the hours were carefully considered to ensure they align with the needs of the business and the surrounding area, while also offering the flexibility for adjustments if necessary.

Commissioner Rosenberg expressed concerns about the site's circulation, and in response, Mr. Trejo explained the limitations with previous easement ideas and how neighboring tenants have different circulation patterns. He further mentioned that a cross-axis easement across Olive Boulevard was secured in case the neighboring bowling alley ever underwent redevelopment.

To address potential future challenges, Mr. Trejo discussed possible implementations to enhance parking, traffic flow, and circulation around the site. He explained that the Commission could also consider discussing with the property owner the establishment of striping, potential stop signs, or other measures if needed. Widening the islands on the sides of the entrance was also proposed as a possibility to improve traffic management and accessibility.

Chair Waggoner called up the Petitioners to the podium to present their presentation. Petitioners John and Helena Valentine were present as well as their architect Thad Martin. The Valentine's presented the Commission with information regarding their proposed site plan, menu, hours, style, business opportunities, parking, and amount brewed. Mr. Valentine answered questions from the Commission regarding food, events, and alcohol.

Commissioner Spiegelglass raised concerns regarding the location of the kitchen's exhaust fan for the proposed brewpub. Architect Mr. Martin showed the Commission the location where the HVAC was currently exiting and explained that the kitchen exhaust would have to exit out of the southwest of the building. However, he also mentioned that they have not yet finalized the solution for the kitchen exhaust exit, but they are actively working on addressing this issue.

In response to the Commissioner's concerns, Mr. Martin assured that they would provide more information in the future regarding the specific location and plan for the exhaust exit. This commitment aimed to address the Commissioner's request for transparency and detailed information about the exhaust system's implementation.

Commissioner Lewis inquired about potential noise and music issues from the proposed patio space. In response, Mr. Trejo stated that the development plans include a screen wall, which is intended to mitigate noise and music disturbances from the patio area.

Further, Commissioner Spiegelglass asked whether the patio would be covered. Mr. Martin clarified that the plan is not to cover the patio and explained how the screen wall would be

implemented to manage noise, the placement of speakers, and the addition of a fence to protect pedestrians.

Commissioner Lewis inquired about the assortment of televisions and their operating hours during sporting events. Mr. Valentine responded that the brewpub plans to have some televisions showing sporting events. However, when there are no ongoing events, the televisions will display more visual content, such as pictures.

Commissioner Spiegelglass raised a concern regarding fencing requirements, particularly in relation to alcohol consumption at the brewpub. In response, Mr. Trejo clarified that the city's regulations do not mandate a fence specifically because alcohol will be served on the premises. Nonetheless, the brewpub still intends to include a fence for security purposes, regardless of the alcohol-related requirements.

Mr. Trejo presented the Commission with the possible actions they could take, taking into account Commissioner Spiegelglass's comments and concerns. The Commission then engaged in a discussion to decide between two potential options: approval with specific conditions or deferring the decision to a later date.

During the discussion, Commissioner Spiegelglass and Mr. Martin had a conversation about exploring different exit points for the kitchen exhaust, possibly to address the concerns raised earlier regarding its location and potential noise impact.

Commissioner Spiegelglass motioned to forward a recommendation to the City Council to consider authorizing a special permit use for the operations of an 8,010 square foot "brewpub" facility at the property addressed as 9514 Olive Boulevard specifically the tenant spaces addressed as 9510, 9512, and 9514 and approve the Petition for Conceptual Site Plan as illustrated in Permit plans as presented on July 20, 2023 As presented before the Commission noted in the Memorandum from the Department of Planning and Community Development dated July 20, 2023, subject to any staff conditions noted therein that the petitioners will come back before the Commission with more details on exhaust fan and any other penetrations that are going through the roof. Commissioner Rosenberg seconded the motion. On roll call vote, the following actions were taken:

- Commissioner Spiegelglass Yes
- Commissioner Rosenberg Yes
- Commissioner Lewis Yes
- Active Chair Waggoner Yes

The motion passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

Mr. Trejo reviewed the next steps in the process and stated that the recommendation will go to the City Council at their August 8th meeting with a public hearing on August 22nd.

Mr. Trejo also informed the Commission on the status of 595 Dielman Road which was deferred until the August 3rd, 2023, PCDC meeting.

7. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Meeting Minutes

Mr. Trejo stated that there were none for the meeting. Several have been drafted up for the August meeting.

B. Reports:

Mr. Trejo welcomed Jack Carswell to the team.

The Centennial Greenway for the portion between Dielman and Warson Park will be going out for bid. Mr. Trejo noted the enhancements that have been made on the North side of Dielman Road.

Gateway TIF Amendment: The council did approve an amendment to the TIF agreement for Olive Crossing. Amendments were made to remove any restrictions around discount grocers.

Special Permits: The council approved a special permit for the Paddle & Pickle Ball Courts as well as the Wine Merchant.

Updates: Excited for the arrival of our new city manager on Monday, August 7th, 2023. Mr. Trejo also gave the Commission updates on the next step of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Trejo informed that he will be hosting a meeting his staff as well as neighboring municipalities to discuss the Olive Boulevard Corridor.

Councilmember Waldman gave closing remarks.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Waggoner asked for closing comments. There were none, and the meeting adjourned at 9:37 PM.

Commissioner Carol Waggoner

Chair Rob Jurgiel

Adopted 2023 08-03