

Table of Contents

Agenda	2
Draft minutes for the meeting of November 18, 2013.	
Draft minutes for the meeting of November 18, 2013.	4
Presentation of draft Environment and Sustainability element for the Comprehensive Plan	
Draft Environment and Sustainability Element	13
Discussion of senior housing regulations.	
Staff Memo on senior housing	22
Table A Excerpt (highlighting senior housing).	27
Collected Comments from Variance Application at 450 N. Lindbergh Blvd.	28



AGENDA
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF CREVE COEUR, MISSOURI
MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2013
7:00 PM

1. ROLL CALL

Mr. Michael Barton
Mr. Tim Carney
Mr. James Faron
Mr. Ken Howard
Mr. Tim Madden
Mr. Charles Pullium
Mr. Gene Rovak
Mr. Carl Lumley, City Attorney
Mr. Paul Langdon, Director of Community Development
Ms. Whitney Kelly, City Planner
Ms. Julie Lowery, Recording Secretary

Pursuant to Section 610.022 RSMO, the Planning and Zoning Commission could, at any time during the meeting, vote to close the public meeting and move to closed session to discuss matters relating to litigation, legal actions and/or communications from the City Attorney as provided under Section 610.021(1) RSMo. and/or personnel matters under Section 610.021(13) RSMo. and/or employee matters under Section 610.021(3) RSMo. and/or real estate matters under Section 610.021(2) or other matters as permitted by Chapter 610.

Reports, documents, plans, and related materials are available for examination at the Creve Coeur Government Center, 300 North New Ballas Road, prior to the meeting.

Special disabled service may be arranged by contacting the Office of the City Administrator in advance.

2. ADDITIONS TO – ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Draft minutes for the meeting of November 18, 2013.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

An opportunity for members of the public to address the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding issues or concerns not already on the agenda for this meeting. Those wishing to speak will be asked to limit comments to three minutes and to complete a speaker card

5. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

None

7. **WORK AGENDA**

A. **Presentation of draft Environment and Sustainability element for the Comprehensive Plan.**

Sarah Lewis, Coro Fellow

B. **Discussion of senior housing regulations.**

Paul Langdon, Director of Community Development

8. **OTHER BUSINESS**

A. **Planning Division Report**

B. **City Attorney Report**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Posted: _____
Whitney Kelly
City Planner



**CITY OF CREVE COEUR - MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2013
7:00 P.M.**

A public hearing and regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Creve Coeur, Missouri was held on Monday, November 18, 2013, at the Creve Coeur Government Center, 300 North New Ballas Road. Chair Tim Madden called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: *Mr. Tim Madden, Chair*
 Mr. Tim Carney
 Mr. James Faron
 Mr. Ken Howard
 Mr. Gene Rovak

OTHERS PRESENT: *Mr. Lee Curtis, Assistant City Attorney*
 Mr. Paul Langdon, Director of Community Development
 Ms. Whitney Kelly, AICP, City Planner
 Ms. Julie Lowery, Recording Secretary

2. ADDITIONS TO – ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Faron moved approval of the agenda, which carried unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Rovak moved approval of the draft minutes. Mr. Faron seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

Application #13-019: Request for Site Concept and Site Development Plan Approval of a 25,490 sq. ft. Retail Grocery Store, The Fresh Market.

Applicant/Agent: David Wolf
 Arcturis
 720 Olive Street, Suite 200
 St. Louis, MO 63101

Property Owner: CP North I, LLC
6 CityPlace Drive
Creve Coeur, MO 63141

Mr. Garrick Hamilton, 2 Cityplace Drive, said that at the last meeting it was brought to their attention that the Commission felt the corner of the site was not being used to its full potential. Mr. Hamilton said the Commission stated that the south elevation lacks an impact and the pedestrian connection from Olive Boulevard was lacking. Mr. Hamilton also said the Commission had issues with the dock area being visible from Cityplace Drive, and that better screening was needed for the trash compactor and transformer, and he hopes to address all those concerns with this revised plan.

Mr. Hamilton showed illustrations and explained, most notably, at the southwest corner, a tower element with a [glass] curtain wall has been added, which is a significant change, and while the wall cannot be clear due to sunlight on the produce and the floral department, they will be translucent and will emit light at night. Mr. Hamilton said the trellis has been added to the south elevation, and the windows have been enlarged. Mr. Hamilton said on the north elevation they have added a screen, and relocated the recycling bins to an area with significant screening. Mr. Hamilton also pointed out an enlarged screening for all the rooftop equipment. Mr. Hamilton said those are all the large ticket items that have been added to the development.

Mr. Hamilton said staff recommended eliminating the monument wall on the southwest corner, in light of the significant upward departure for façade signage, to which the applicant is agreeable. Mr. Hamilton showed pictures from different perspective views and explained the landscape through the pedestrian elements. Mr. Hamilton explained the colors for the brick and stated the brick is being matched to CityPlace 6 and the second tier of coloring of the brick is more of a sand color.

Mr. Hamilton went over some of the ordinance modifications, explaining they are mostly focused around the site coverage bonus discussion. Mr. Hamilton said it is identifying what can be built with the median out front. He stated that he understood staff was not suggesting that they build the entire median, but rather than build only part of it, they would be willing to contribute up to \$50,000 to a fund to help pay for the eventual construction of the median. Mr. Hamilton also said this issue ends up needing a longer term plan, but they also wanted to make clear in the ordinance, for this project, that the width of the median shall not be as wide as to cause a material detriment to the landscape along the Olive Boulevard frontage or functional damage to the parking lot. Mr. Langdon said MoDOT supports getting a median installed at this location and adjustments can be made to get a reasonable median with the preservation of the landscape, and they understood and were agreeable.

Mr. Faron asked about the wood screening on the trash compactor and why they chose wood instead of masonry. Mr. David Wolf, 720 Olive Street Road, said they chose wood screening to tie the elements of the elevations together. Mr. Faron asked if the screening on all of the building was the same, and Mr. Wolf said it was.

Mr. Robert Kent, 13084 Ferntrails Lane, said the project has come a long way from the first proposal and he thinks it a really good design.

Mr. David Caldwell, 257 Brooktrail Court, said he would like to see more attention paid to integrating pedestrian facilities with public transportation.

Ms. Lynn Berry, 626 Graeser Road, asked if there can be stipulations on the pictures in the window, like Walgreens has, and Ms. Berry said she would like to see an art feature on the corner.

Mr. Langdon stated he is happy with the effort and changes made to this project. He clarified that the City does consider transit shelters whenever possible but that this frontage is not deep and there is a lot of traffic moving through the new through and right turn lane so this might not be a good location for a transit stop.

Mr. Howard motioned to approve the CityPlace CDD and concept plan and approve the site development plan for The Fresh Market proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the revised draft ordinance attached to the staff report on Application #13-018, dated November 18, 2013, and subject to the changes discussed this night. Mr. Rovak seconded the motion with the resultant vote as follows:

Mr. Carney – aye
Mr. Rovak – aye

Mr. Howard – aye
Chair - aye

Mr. Faron – aye

B. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

Application #13-018: Request for approval of an amendment to the City Place Master Sign Plan to include new tenant signs.

Applicant/Agent: David Wolf
Arcturis
720 Olive Street, Suite 200
St. Louis, MO 63101

Property Owner: CP North I, LLC
6 CityPlace Drive
Creve Coeur, MO 63141

Mr. Garrick Hamilton, 2 CityPlace Drive, showed illustrations of the entire campus and said there were minor changes made to the draft ordinance, mainly for clarification. Mr. Hamilton said they do want to preserve the right for a multi-tenant real estate information sign and a new provision for that had been added to the draft ordinance for the Commission's review.

Mr. Langdon explained a Master Sign Plan regulates all signage within the effective area. Mr. Langdon said the signs being requested are the Cityplace signs on the tower element, the Fresh Market signs on the faces of the building, and the multi-tenant real estate sign. Mr. Langdon said window signs and temporary signs are all covered under the Master Sign Plan, which for this site is not included. Mr. Hamilton asked for a provision to allow for temporary signage in the ordinance. Chair Madden clarified the temporary signage was while the building was under construction, Mr. Hamilton said yes, or for grand opening purposes.

Mr. Faron motioned to recommend approval of Application #13-018 to amend the CityPlace Master Sign Plan, subject to the conditions listed in the draft ordinance prepared for the

meeting of November 18, 2013, including the provision to allow temporary signage. Mr. Carney seconded the motion with the resultant vote as follows:

Mr. Rovak – aye
Mr. Carney – aye

Mr. Faron – aye
Chair - aye

Mr. Howard – aye

C. Application #13-042: Rezoning of 10545 Old Olive Street Road to “PRD” Planned Residential Development District and Site Development Plan for a 182-unit residential development.

Applicant/Agent: Brad Goss
SmithAmundsen, LLC
120 S. Central Avenue, Suite 700
St. Louis, MO 63105

Property Owners Under Contract:
Terra West, LLC
5091 Baumgartner Road
St. Louis, MO 63129

Mr. Brad Goss, 120 S. Central Avenue, presented the revised site plan. Mr. Goss said the changes made were from comments taken away from the last meeting. Mr. Goss said they obtained MoDOT approval of their traffic study.

Mr. Goss showed a drawing of the revised site plan. Mr. Goss explained the changes that included the addition of a nature trail/walking path, a pet park, relocation of two carriage houses from the perimeter of the site to the interior, and several canopy parking locations that were moved. Mr. Goss said the retaining wall was pulled back for less encroachment into the existing forest on the north side. There was a water quality feature added on the southwest corner, Mr. Goss pointed out. Mr. Goss explained the addition of a transit shelter along the frontage of the property, and showed that the revised plans included a median on Old Olive Street Road to address comments from the traffic study. He also said they were making the entrance on the south side a right-in/right-out driveway. Mr. Goss stated that, with the changes that have been made, they improved the pedestrian traffic for the area by providing a crosswalk and sidewalk to the bus shelter. Mr. Goss said the bus shelter would be architecturally enhanced to match the look and materials of their building. Mr. Goss also said the changes improve the buffering by adding greenspace to the site and adding desirable amenities to the site.

Mr. Lee Cannon, 1830 Craig Park Court, said the traffic study looked at the existing traffic conditions at the surrounding intersections, as well as the proposed site driveways. Mr. Cannon said the traffic impacts based on adding the median and doing minor restriping are moderate. Mr. Cannon said the study was submitted to MoDOT, who owns and maintains that roadway, and they find the traffic study satisfactory and will be working through the design details with each other as they go.

Mr. Rovak wanted to know what signage would be used to indicate there was a pedestrian crossing. Mr. Cannon said MoDOT dictates those signs and through MoDOT's permitting process, those signs will be erected and it will be a marked crosswalk.

Mr. Goss stated, with regards to permitted accessory uses in Section B of the ordinance, that he did not see allowed accessory uses and would like the ordinance to allow, specifically, any of the accessory uses in the “GC” district.

Mr. Faron asked if the pet park was a public amenity, and Mr. Goss said no it was just for the residents living on their property.

Mr. Scott Harris, 7 Fawnridge Court, said his house faces the wooded area and he was concerned with what they will be looking at when the project gets underway. Mr. Harris also said he thinks this project will increase the cut-through traffic on Willowbrook Drive. Mr. Goss pointed out the tree line to show where there would be tree preservation. Mr. Cannon said the traffic impact to the neighborhood will be minimal because there are few reasons for the apartment residents to go north through the neighborhood.

Mr. Paul Langdon, Director of Community Development, showed a picture of the proposed traffic median and explained the applicant would be subject to all normal state requirements for mid-block crossings, which is signage at a minimum but may include a warning light; right now it is unknown. Mr. Langdon said staff is happy with this effort to provide the crossing.

Mr. Langdon said there is 120 feet of tree preservation, pointed out on a drawing, and said there is also a buffer area of 30 feet that is required by zoning code, so at a minimum it meets or exceeds what was done on the prior “Vanguard” project. Mr. Langdon said the area will not be fenced and public use of the space is a significant contribution. Mr. Langdon spoke in regards to color schemes of the building and general design. Mr. Langdon spoke to the location of the bus shelter and showed on a drawing where the existing ones are in relation to the proposed one. Mr. Langdon also pointed out that the MoDOT-proposed location of the bus shelter adjacent to the crosswalk is for public safety, not design. Lastly, regarding traffic, Mr. Langdon stated when the review was done for the Vanguard project, up the street from this project, there was concern about the additive impact of this project. Mr. Langdon said the study for this project did include the Vanguard project, so it does examine the total impact of traffic on this area. Mr. Langdon said they are sending the traffic study to the City’s traffic consultant for verification of assumptions and conclusions.

Mr. Langdon spoke to tangible benefit, stating the public can use the open greenspaces, there will be a bus shelter and sidewalk/crosswalk, and these things can be considered tangible. However, Mr. Langdon said if the Commission finds these things sufficient that is fine. If the Commission is not satisfied, it has been suggested that there is, what appears to be, an abandoned property on Old Olive Boulevard, further to the east, and that this area lacks a public park and maybe this project, along with some assistance from others, could invest in converting this property to a park. Mr. Langdon said he has done no research on this issue, but it would be a voluntary option if the applicant wishes to pursue it and the Commission would have to indicate it would be a persuasive thing for them to do.

There was some discussion around color schemes and the materials being used on the buildings.

Chair Madden asked if the applicant was interested in the park idea, and Mr. Goss said no. Mr. Goss pointed out some things he believes are benefits, which included: greenspace, mixed uses,

putting the property back on the tax rolls, stormwater improvements, and providing housing that the local plant science industry is asking for.

Mr. Langdon stated one of the suggestions is to enhance the landscaping at one of the corners, and that could be a way to make the project better, beyond the minimum. Mr. Goss said he is willing to work with staff to enhance landscaping and work on the nature of the water quality feature.

The Commission members agreed that other than making sure the city's traffic consultant's report matches up with the applicant's and adding more landscape, the project is good and they are ready to move forward. However, should the traffic report conflict they would require the applicant to return to Planning and Zoning.

Mr. Faron motioned to recommend approval of Application #13-042, the rezoning and site development plan for Terra West Planned Residential Development subject to the conditions in the draft ordinance prepared for the meeting of November 18, 2013, including the city traffic study which should be in compliance with the present traffic studies. Mr. Rovak seconded the motion with the resultant vote as follows:

Mr. Carney – aye
Mr. Rovak – aye

Mr. Howard – aye
Chair - aye

Mr. Faron – aye

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Application #13-041: Minor site development plan for a 20-foot netting fence surrounding a sports court at 320 Cabin Grove Lane.

Applicant: Mike and Kelly Beat
320 Cabin Grove Lane
Creve Coeur, MO 63141

Representative: Stephen L. Kling, Jr. and Jennifer E. Beasley
Jenkins & Kling, P.C.
150 N. Meramec Avenue, Suite 400
Clayton, MO 63105

Ms. Jennifer Beasley, 150 N. Meramec Avenue, said the backyard of the property has a steep slope that leads into a wooded area, and because of that slope a retaining wall was installed to prevent erosion on the property. Ms. Beasley explained that, in connection with the retaining wall, the home owners also had a sports court and a retractable netting installed by contractor. Ms. Beasley said once the improvements were constructed the homeowners met with the city inspector at the property and the inspector indicated the wall, netting, and sports court looked good and a final approval was granted. Ms. Beasley said a year later the homeowners received a violation letter and notice that the final inspection was rescinded. Ms. Beasley showed some pictures of the property slope, the retaining wall, netting, and sports court. Ms. Beasley explained the sports court is on top of the retaining wall and the netting is along the perimeter. Ms. Beasley also said the netting is retractable, made of mesh, suspended by eight poles, and can be raised 20 feet high. The netting poles tie into the retaining wall with anchors and if they are removed it will cause structural damage to the wall, Ms. Beasley

explained. The property owners want the netting for safety and to prevent the sports equipment and sporting balls from going into neighbors' yards.

Chair Madden clarified that the property owners do not want to comply with any of the recommended conditions in the staff report. Ms. Beasley said that they understand if the Commission cannot approve any of the variances that are needed, but they feel the 20-foot height of the fence is required for this project. Chair Madden asked when the driveway was supposed to be moved. Ms. Whitney Kelly, City Planner, said the permit was issued in March 2013 and they have until March 2014 to comply.

Mr. Faron asked if the 20-foot fence was a requirement. Ms. Beasley said the netting is retractable and it is a little under 20-feet. Mr. Faron said he does not think the netting is the issue it is more the poles. Mr. Faron asked if a reduction to 10-feet would be acceptable.

Ms. Whitney Kelly, City Planner, gave a little background on the project and stated that, in 2011, the applicant submitted for a building permit for the retaining wall and it showed no sports court or a fence. Ms. Kelly stated that, during an inspection in August 2011, there were revisions requested due to possible drilling into the "Geo-grid" of the retaining wall, which can weaken the structure. Ms. Kelly explained that, in November of that year, there had still been no information received leading to the revocation of the final permit. Then, in January of 2013, the applicant came to the city seeking approval for a room addition, where the violation notices were made known, Ms. Kelly stated. Ms. Kelly explained that the Zoning Code requires that any private recreation facility must be setback 15-feet from any property line and this was built around 5-8 feet from the property line. Also, Ms. Kelly stated the maximum height for a fence for a tennis court is 10-feet tall, therefore staff recommends the fence is lowered to 10-feet tall, the raw aluminum poles be painted black, the site be brought into conformance with the site coverage, and that the sports court be located 15-feet from any property line in conformance with the zoning code.

Mr. Howard commented that in the event the poles were damaged there would have to be provisions for replacement of the poles. Therefore, why can this not be done to become compliant with City code? Mr. Bruce Null, 9 Cumberland, the contractor, said the pole sleeves go 4-feet into the ground and they fit very tight and would not be easily replaced. Mr. Null explained the pulley system used for the netting.

Mr. Howard asked if the city approved plans with a setback of 5-8 feet. Ms. Kelly showed a drawing of the site plan that was approved for just the retaining wall. Ms. Kelly explained the retaining wall can be permitted within any setback; it is the specific sports court and 10-foot tall fence that requires the setback from the property line. Ms. Kelly said there was nothing in the permit that indicated this would be used as a sports court area and the fence was installed after the "Geo-grid" for the retaining wall was inspected and the holes were noticed.

Mr. Rovak asked about painting the poles verses replacing them. Mr. Rovak also said if the purpose of the netting is for safety, it would still do the job at 10-feet tall. Mr. Rovak also said it would make sense to him that there is some sort of a cap on the poles to be able to cut them down to size and re-cap.

Ms. Kelly Beat, 320 Cabin Grove Lane, said the poles are aluminum and the size are specifically fitted into a sleeve and they were not available in black. Ms. Beat said the net is

retractable, is on a pulley system, and because it is not tight it drops down and it is not 20-feet tall. Ms. Beat said if it is being asked to be dropped to 10-feet then, it will probably hang closer to 6-7 feet. Ms. Beat said they had talked to someone about painting the poles and it is very expensive to do.

Ms. Kelly explained the inspector went out to do the final inspection for the retaining wall and he issued the final pending further revisions regarding information on the “Geo-grid” structure. Staff made several attempts to retrieve this information and had no success, therefore they rescinded the final inspection approval that was previously issued.

Mr. Mike Beat, 320 Cabin Grove Lane, said the height of the poles was chosen as a courtesy to the neighbors. Mr. Beat explained the neighbors have a pool and netting prevents the balls from going into the pool or knocking a window out. Mr. Beat said they would be happy to color the poles and reduce visibility, however by fixing this problem it creates a new one with their children chasing balls into the neighbor’s yard.

Ms. Kelly clarified that, when the notice was mailed, she was contacted by a couple of the subdivision trustees and they indicated they never were never asked and therefore never gave the applicant approval. Mr. Paul Langdon, Director of Community Development said, on October 21st, Mr. Spellmeyer did approach the Commission and made a comment saying the applicant never applied for trustee approval and never received trustee approval. Mr. Spellmeyer also stated he was opposed to the project.

Mr. Howard motioned to approve the site plan for a ten-foot high black netting fence at 320 Cabin Grove Lane submitted with Application #13-041 subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report, as presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 18, 2013. Mr. Faron seconded the motion with the resultant vote as follows:

Mr. Langdon clarified black paint is acceptable and, as far as the 15-foot setback, it means limiting the use of the sports court to 15-feet from the property line, so that implies relocating the edge of the fence.

Mr. Carney – aye
Mr. Rovak – aye

Mr. Howard – aye
Chair - aye

Mr. Faron – aye

B. Application #13-046: Request for the approval to amend the conditional use permit for Anis Hyderabad House Indian Restaurant to allow for outdoor seating.

Applicant: Anitha Koppara
Anis, L.L.C.
1212 Cold Springs Drive
O’Fallon, MO 63368

Property Owner: West Park Retail, LLC
1610 Des Peres Road, Suite 320
St. Louis, MO 63141

Ms. Anitha Koppara, 1212 Cold Springs Drive, stated the amendment is for outdoor seating at her restaurant. Ms. Koppara explained the proposal includes four tables with four chairs at each table.

City staff had nothing to add.

There being no further comments, Assistant City Attorney, Mr. Lee Curtis, presented the exhibits for the record and the public hearing was closed.

(This ends the Public Hearing; see verbatim transcript for further information)

Mr. Rovak motioned to recommend approval of Application #13-046 to repeal and replace the conditional use permit for the restaurant located at 12637 Olive Boulevard to allow 16 outdoor seats, subject to the conditions contained in the draft ordinance prepared for the meeting of November 18, 2013. Mr. Carney seconded the motioned with the resultant vote as follows:

Mr. Rovak – aye
Mr. Carney – aye

Mr. Faron – aye
Chair - aye

Mr. Howard – aye

7. WORK AGENDA

None

8. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Planning Division Report

Mr. Langdon said they will try and have something prepared for discussion around the assisted living/senior care housing that was raised a couple meetings ago. Mr. Langdon also said the second meeting in December there will be a text amendment presented to allow drive-thru's on a limited number of sites that are less than 3 acres.

B. City Attorney Report

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission, upon motion being made and duly seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Timothy Madden, Chair

Julie Lowery, Recording Secretary

Executive Summary

TBD

Environment and Sustainability

Intro TBD

Traffic and Transportation

In 2010, the City adopted Phase 1 of the Climate Action Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) community-wide 20 percent by 2015 in comparison to 2005 baseline levels. Transportation represents 34% of Creve Coeur's GHG emissions according to a study done of city emissions by sector in 2005. According to the Comprehensive Energy Audit conducted by the city in 2013, gasoline used for transportation produced 28% of GHG emissions. Traffic and transportation in Creve Coeur are thus prime targets for environmental initiatives to reduce GHG emissions and improve air quality in the community.

Traffic

Creve Coeur's key commitments to improve traffic congestion and movement throughout the city and therefore curb greenhouse gas emissions include:

- Multi-modal streets and highways that provide safe and efficient mobility for automobiles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.
- Evaluation methods to measure the performance of all transportation modes and establishment of minimum performance standards.
- Explore opportunities to connect residential streets, where appropriate, to collectors in order to improve traffic flow on major arterials such as Olive and Lindbergh Boulevards.
- Develop an Access Management Program for major arterials in the community.
- Identification of east/west connections across I-270, as well as the preservation of the identified future corridors, as an alternative to Olive Boulevard.
- Implement lane, signal, and other physical improvements to improve traffic flow and mitigate local congestion issues.
- Improve north-south vehicular flow in the western half of the city.

- Promotion of Creve Coeur’s role in regional transportation planning efforts to advance the City’s policies and interests regarding transportation improvements including but not limited to Highway 141 improvements, interstate highway modifications and improvements, and congestion mitigation on or near state and county roads, such as Olive Road, Lindbergh Boulevard, and Mason Road.
- Reconsider community-wide transportation demand management, including reformation of the Creve Coeur Transportation Management Organization, to reduce vehicular demand, particularly during the critical peak hours. Program elements might include staggered work hours (“flex-time”) through collaboration with major employers and car-pooling, including the development of a car pool matching service and/or encouragement of Employer Transportation Programs.
- Periodically (every 2-3 years) update the City’s signal-timing plan to enhance signal performance. Timing plans shall be updated based on current turn movement counts and separate timing plans for morning, noon and evening peak hour and off-peak conditions.
- Develop procedures for addressing requests for local traffic calming. The procedure will include the development of a definition of traffic calming that is based on local needs, which can be applied to local streets as needed and is consistent with evolving definitions being developed by the Institute for Traffic Engineering (ITE).
- Establish minimum level of service standards for residents and visitors and require new development and redevelopment in the Creve Coeur area to mitigate traffic impacts to meet or exceed minimum standards.

When the Comprehensive Plan was originally written in 2002, traffic was a much larger issue in Creve Coeur than it is currently. Signal upgrades to Olive Boulevard, the reopening and expansion of Highway 40, and the construction of the 270 bridge on Olive Boulevard have all improved traffic congestion throughout the city significantly. Traffic congestion is no longer identified as such a problem on major streets in Creve Coeur. Efforts to pursue other modes of transportation will continue to improve traffic flow in Creve Coeur by providing an alternative to cars.

Transportation

Creve Coeur’s key commitments to pursuing transportation opportunities throughout the city include:

- Transportation Fee Program to fund major new transportation improvements.
- Continue to implement and maintain the City’s Pedestrian Plan to ensure safe pedestrian travel and provide safe street crossing areas.

- Develop a bikeway/trail plan in cooperation with Trailnet, as conceptualized in the *Primary Pedestrian Corridors Map* (Map 6, Appendix A).
- Educate citizens that bicycles are increasingly used for transportation (as well as recreation), that they are intended road users, and that Creve Coeur's road system is being modified to accommodate bicycles. Encourage the use of streets by bicycle riders who are knowledgeable of the rules of the road including the rights and responsibilities of riders.
- Encourage sidewalks and pedestrian facilities, bicycle accommodations, traffic improvement mitigation, and traffic calming techniques for all new development or redevelopment.
- Encourage pedestrian facilities and linkage for all new development or redevelopment.
- Promote regional fixed and non-fixed transit including park-and-ride and explore local mass transit options. Improve regional transit connections to major activity centers and the airport. Consider additional transit improvements such as regional light rail stops, local transit, and shuttle services.
- Garner regional support to encourage and pursue a MetroLink route to serve Creve Coeur and West St. Louis County.
- Add bus shelters where possible and appropriate.
- Explore the feasibility of establishing a multi-modal center as part of the proposed Central Business District. A transit center in the in this area would provide an active setting for attracting multiple transportation modes with bicycle and pedestrian connections and potential for transit passengers to transfer between buses servicing transit routes in and around the City and region. At a minimum, the center would include space for transit vehicles and waiting passengers and bike lockers.

These transportation objectives represent Creve Coeur's move towards being a more environmentally conscious city. Building infrastructure to allow citizens to walk, bike, and use public transit to travel around the city and then encouraging use of it would reduce reliance on vehicle transportation and therefore cut down on GHG emissions. The largest component of Creve Coeur's transportation goals and one that has been steadily worked on since this Comprehensive Plan was written in 2002 is the Pedestrian Plan.

Pedestrian Plan

The purpose of the Pedestrian Plan is to create a comprehensive, community-wide network of off-street and on-street connections for pedestrians between parks and open spaces, the town center, schools, and neighborhoods. In order to do that, the City will utilize drainage, floodplains, stream corridors, utility rights-of-way, and existing trails and sidewalks to complete the system. Creve Coeur will also work with the

Missouri Department of Transportation to incorporate designated bike lanes along state routes. (See also Bikeway Plan under Transportation Goals.) The Pedestrian Plan will also connect to and implement the regional bike system.

Since the Comprehensive Plan was originally written in 2002, the Public Works department has placed at least one sidewalk on at least one side of all major streets in Creve Coeur that the City has control over, and on some that MoDOT and St. Louis County have control over. The City has also upgraded to Audio Pedestrian Signals (APS) at major intersections to allow for increased accessibility to citizens and compliance with federal ADA standards. Moving forward, the City will continue to implement the Pedestrian Plan and improve walkability in the community through increased sidewalk access and upgraded signaling technology.

Mixed-use zoning in certain areas of redevelopment in Creve Coeur could be a way to work towards the traffic, transportation, and pedestrian plan objections outlined above. By placing residential, commercial, and office spaces near to each other and making it a pedestrian-, bicycle-, and public transit-friendly environment, the City can encourage use of transportation other than vehicles. This would help to make Creve Coeur a more walkable city, as well as continue to define its identity by giving it a “sense of place.” Landscaping in the form of trees, shrubs, and flowers could be featured within the development (See Landscaping and Preservation for further detail).

Storm Water Management

Storm water runoff and erosion have been identified as growing problems in Creve Coeur since the current Comprehensive Plan was written in 2002. Tear down and rebuild projects on residential lots and in other development have led to much bigger driveways with greater impervious surface areas. This has increased the volume and rate of storm water runoff into neighboring lots since less rainwater can naturally permeate into the soil. This can lead to more frequent and severe flooding, erosion, and potential damage to public and private property.

The City’s commitments to addressing these issues with storm water management include:

- Continue to develop projects that address the high-priority storm water and erosion problems identified by Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District in its Creve Coeur and Deer Creek Watershed reports; establish a storm water level-of-service and prioritize the problems identified in the City’s storm water study based on those criteria; accelerate the implementation of the City’s Storm Water Master Plan to deal with the prioritized storm water problems.
- Continue to work with the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District to ensure that the needs of the community are met and that the current high quality level is maintained.
- Encourage the use of pervious paving materials and vegetated swales to manage storm water in new development and redeveloping areas.
- Develop projects that address the two high-priority problems identified in this area by Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District in the Creve Coeur Watershed report; establish a storm water

level-of-service and prioritize the problems identified in the City's storm water study based on those criteria; implement a storm water capital improvement plan to deal with the prioritized storm water problems identified in the 1999 Storm water Evaluation Final Report.

- Explore the protection and enhancement of stream channels to accomplish the dual purpose of providing natural pedestrian connections and managing storm water runoff.
- Focus efforts on resolving storm water problems in the areas experiencing the worst problems.

The City's Storm Water Master Plan written in 1999 recommended enacting ordinances that required implementing components of low-impact development (LID). LID is a method of managing storm water runoff by working with the natural processes of the water cycle. These methods can include rain gardens, vegetated filter strips, bioswales, pervious pavement, and green roofs or a combination of strategies that do not exceed the carrying capacity of a site's landscape. The City can specifically work with the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District to encourage the implementation of rain gardens in public and private space in Creve Coeur.

Landscaping and Preservation

An important component of Creve Coeur's environmental and sustainable commitments includes its physical outdoor space. The City will have a network of parks, open spaces, green corridors, and pedestrian connections that link the neighborhoods, schools, shopping areas, jobs, and town center. Creve Coeur will increase the net amount of open space, which is a part of this network. The City will actively pursue the respectful integration of trails and bikeways, and the preservation, protection, and acquisition of open spaces, natural areas, and creeks in an effort to improve the quality of life, environment, and air.

The City's landscaping and preservation objectives include:

- Explore the development of recreation facilities such as a central urban park (perhaps as part of the Central Business District), community recreation center, youth center, library, or community center.
- Encourage the continued preservation of the suburban landscape character of the area, its open green spaces, and stream corridors. New development or redevelopment should protect and enhance stream channels, preserving remaining riparian corridors, preserve trees and encourage re-establishment of natural streams, where feasible.
- Examine the utilization of public park or open space to determine if its benefit to the City is being maximized. Consider the sale of park property determined to be of little park value in order to purchase land better suited to park uses.
- Make needed improvements and repairs to Fountain Park. Enhance accessibility of the park with improvements to

pedestrian crosswalks on Olive Boulevard and North New Ballas Road.

- Improve the appearance of Olive Boulevard through streetscape improvements related to pedestrian facilities, tree and flower plantings, landscaped medians, and other public amenities such as seating areas. Encourage landowners and developers to plant trees along Olive Boulevard when sites are redeveloped.
- Continue public investment in Olive Boulevard streetscape improvements, including landscaped islands, landscaping, street lighting, sidewalks and bike trails, and landscaped medians. Focus pedestrian improvements along Olive Boulevard, Mason Road, and Rue de Fleur (to serve Bellerive Elementary School).
- If the Monsanto site redevelops, the City should ensure that ample open space and trails are provided on site, and that mature trees are preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Buffers should also be maintained or created to protect adjacent residential development.
- Explore the development of a central city park for Creve Coeur within the Central Business District. The City should consider all options, including acquisition of vacant parcels, for park development. Different options should be considered, including possible reconfiguration of the Creve Coeur Golf Course that would free up 5 to 10 acres for a public gathering and events space. Any reconfiguration should be done in such a way that the golf course would continue to operate.
- Protect existing healthy, larger trees during the development or redevelopment process in the East Olive Corridor.

The City has already achieved some of its landscaping and preservation objectives, notably Millennium Park, which was completed since the Comprehensive Plan was written. Located just south of Olive Boulevard, it is one of the City's largest parks with 25 acres, walking trails, soccer and baseball fields, a 100-person pavilion, seasonal splash pad, and the historic Tappmeyer House. Making progress on the City's idea of a "green line" park as outlined in the original Comprehensive Plan would be another way to create more green space in Creve Coeur and therefore work towards some of the City's environmental goals.

Green-Line Park

The vision of the "green line" park is to make it a linear park along Olive Boulevard connecting the West Olive Corridor, Central Business District, East Olive Corridor, and Commerce Center. It would be developed primarily through additional landscaping and streetscaping, preservation of existing trees, and construction of sidewalks, with only such limited land acquisition as is necessary to fill in missing links. It would function as a buffer between the street and the commercial businesses via trees, benches, and other landscaping to create a two-sided green space on either side of the street. In this fashion it would create a feeling of driving or

walking through a two-sided park when going down Olive Boulevard. The “green line” park would thus contribute to Creve Coeur’s environmental objectives by adding a significant amount of green and park space to the city. This would help increase the City’s current public park ratio of less than 6 acres per 1,000 persons, as well as add more trees to improve air quality, give residents an additional place to enjoy nature, and demonstrate Creve Coeur’s commitment to the environment. (Please see the “East Olive Corridor” section for more information on the “green line” park).

New Initiatives

There are a few areas the City can continue to strengthen its commitment to the environment and sustainability in terms of landscaping and preservation. They include:

- Explore outdoor educational opportunities in public space. For example, nature explore classrooms, community gardens, and school gardens could be used to make learning about nature and sustainability more accessible to the public.
- Establish baseline tree preservation standards for commercial development or redevelopment projects, or baseline tree planting standards when tree preservation does not apply.
- Encourage residents to remove invasive plant species from their private property, and prohibit the replanting of invasive species. The City will maintain a list of invasive species, as well as a list of species that are native to the region and that are therefore acceptable to plant.
- Promote the implementation of rain gardens in public space to mitigate storm water runoff and also to enhance landscaping in areas that have been affected by erosion.

Energy

As aforementioned, in 2010 Creve Coeur pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions 20% by 2015 compared to its 2005 levels. Much has already been done to work towards this goal, including conducting an energy audit of all public works buildings, retrofitting all lighting at municipal facilities with energy efficient fixtures, and installing radiant heating at the Public Works facility, which has reduced winter gas bills by nearly 75%. Furthermore, the City of Creve Coeur became an EPA Green Power Community in 2013 by offsetting 3.77% of its energy usage from renewable sources. While these efforts demonstrate the City’s commitment to sustainability, there are further opportunities for Creve Coeur to work towards its 20% by 2015 goal.

New Initiatives

The City can reduce its carbon footprint and greenhouse gas emissions through the following:

- Promote public or private programs that facilitate the exchange of incandescent light bulbs for compact fluorescent bulbs.
- Streamline regulatory steps and approval process for installing solar panels and compact wind turbines on commercial and residential developments.
- Capitalize on Creve Coeur’s Green Power Community Status and increase the City’s 3.77% energy offset from renewable sources to 5%.

- Encourage the implementation of cool roofs and green roofs in commercial buildings.
- Institute energy benchmarking ordinances for businesses in Creve Coeur to collect data on the buildings' energy and water use.

All of these energy objectives in conjunction will help Creve Coeur reduce its energy usage and rate of greenhouse gas emissions. As the Baseline Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Audit found, in 2005 commercial buildings produced the most GHG emissions, comprising 42% of the total emissions. Furthermore, electricity use made up 28% of total energy use in 2005, although it produced 55% of total GHG emissions. Targeting electricity and energy use in the City therefore represents an effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality.



city of CREVE COEUR

300 North New Ballas Road • Creve Coeur, Missouri 63141
(314) 432-6000 • Fax (314) 872-2539 • Relay MO 1-800-735-2966
www.creve-coeur.org

MEMORANDUM TO THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Meeting Date: December 2, 2013

Subject: Senior Housing Regulations

Memo Prepared by: Paul Langdon, AICP, Community Development Director

Attachments: Excerpt from Table A, Permitted and Conditional Uses
Public comment received on variance application for 450 N. Lindbergh Boulevard

BACKGROUND

On October 17, 2013, the Creve Coeur Board of Adjustment heard a variance application for an increase in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) at 450 N. Lindbergh Boulevard. The project motivating the request was an assisted living facility and it was largely opposed by the surrounding residents. Had the variance request been successful, the project would have come before the Planning and Zoning Commission in pursuit of a conditional use permit (CUP).

In the course of discussions related to the variance request, the residents asked why assisted living was not subject to the same limitations as other senior housing uses. Specifically, all senior housing facilities, except assisted living, must meet the following minimum standards to be eligible for CUP approval:

Section 405.470 Conditional Uses

23. Nursing care facilities, residential mental retardation, mental health and substance abuse facilities, and community care facilities for the elderly--NAICS 623110, 623210, 623311 and 623990 (except boot camps and halfway group homes) (conditional use in the "HE", "PH", "PC", "GC" and "CB" districts).
 - a. Shall be located on sites of at least three (3) acres.
 - b. The density of development (for apartment-type units) within a personal care facility shall not exceed twenty (20) dwelling units per acre. Living units with cooking facilities shall count as one (1) dwelling unit and living units without cooking facilities shall count as two-thirds (2/3) of a dwelling unit for purposes of calculating the density of development.
 - c. Personal care facilities shall be primarily residential in character; however, convalescent and nursing homes, centralized eating facilities for residents of the facility, medical facilities and similar uses associated with the long- or short-term care of patients may be included.
 - d. No building shall be located within fifty (50) feet of any property line.

This question had particular relevance to the variance application because the site is less than three acres, the density was over 20 units/acre and the proposed layout did not meet the 50-foot setback requirements. In other words, if it had been subject to these regulations, the application could not have come forward to the Planning Commission without approval of multiple variances, not just for the FAR that fell under the bulk standards for the General Commercial (GC) zoning district. Regardless of the Section 405.470 regulations, Assisted Living Facilities (NAICS 623112) are still required to obtain a CUP in the commercial zoning districts.

The sequence of events that led to this difference in regulation was described as follows (in an email to concerned residents surrounding the 450 N. Lindbergh location):

- The draft Table A presented at the public hearing on February 19 did not show Assisted Living (623312) as permitted or conditional but there was discussion of that entire section of the table relating to social services, senior housing and group homes (beginning line 11, page 11 of the attached verbatim transcript). None of the Commissioners commented on that particular part of the table beyond some clarification of the way group homes were categorized. I also pointed out in the discussion that the City Attorney had questions regarding that area of the table and that I could not say how we would address his questions at that time. The discussion was continued to March 18th. (February 19th P&Z packet: <http://www.creve-coeur.org/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/2162>)
- The meeting on March 18th was canceled due to lack of quorum and all items were continued to April 1, 2013.
- On April 1st, in the staff report and (especially) in my verbal presentation (audio recording: <http://www.creve-coeur.org/Archive.aspx?ADID=2194>, beginning minute 3:30), I called the Commission's attention to the sections of the table covering certain healthcare, shelter and elder care uses stating that this was an area of substantial change from prior drafts and that we had proposed some new standards that we believed were appropriate given current conditions. Although not specifically discussed, 623312 was now shown as a conditional use in the "GC" district and was not shown with any minimum conditions in Section 405.470. The Commission did not raise any questions or concerns on that subject and, ultimately, voted to recommend approval of the draft ordinance, including Table A.
- On April 8, 2013, the City Council read the bill for the first time. That bill included Table A as recommended by the Commission and that included 623312 as a conditional use in the "GC" district (April 8th City Council packet: <http://www.creve-coeur.org/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/2197>). Neither I nor any Council members broached the specific question of senior housing, but I did point out to the Council that we had provided them all of the preceding documents and transcripts from the P&Z meetings and that I welcomed any questions on any matters of concern. No concerns were expressed.
- On April 22nd, the City Council approved the amendment, including Table A, with one minor change to a wine and spirits wholesale use (audio recording: <http://www.creve-coeur.org/Archive.aspx?ADID=2207>).
- All of the various drafts of Table A and all of the staff reports presented to the Planning Commission and City Council have been available online as the process proceeded and all meetings were open to the public. The public hearing was advertised in the city newsletter and a notice was posted inside and outside at the Government Center.

The first question posed to the Planning and Zoning Commission is whether or not the members of the Commission recognized the differences among the senior housing categories when they voted on final disposition of uses in Table A and the corresponding requirements in Section 405.470 and, supplemental to that, is whether or not the Commission wishes to pursue changes in the current regulations, regardless of the process that led up to this point.

QUESTIONS FOR THE COMMISSION

The following are offered to the members of the Commission to help begin the discussion, but no particular opinion or direction is implied, at this point:

Question:

How were senior housing uses handled in the past?

Initial Response:

The 1987 Standard Industry Classification (SIC) Manual did not classify uses in a manner that was directly analogous to the terminology in the 2012 NAICS Manual currently in use by the City. Nursing care is the one use that has remained largely defined in a consist manner and it has always been a conditional use subject to the special requirements quoted earlier in the GC and CB (Core Business) zoning districts. "Personal care" facilities appear to be most similar to community care and continuum of care facilities, and they too have been treated similarly

through the changes in the Zoning Code, but are only available in the GC and CB zoning districts. A third use, “Homes for the aged, with healthcare incidental,” is the nearest equivalent to the current “Assisted Living” use. That use was only allowed as a conditional use in the CB district and was not subject to any special requirements under Section 405-470.

For many years, the only facility within any of these categories was the Delmar Gardens nursing home on Country Manor Lane. More recently, the Hallmark independent living facility was allowed to add assisted living functions to half of one floor of rooms, and the Spectrum Retirement project was approved on Decker Lane (currently under construction). Both of these newer developments are within the CB zoning district but all have residential development nearby. Delmar Gardens and Hallmark have single-family houses adjacent to them while Spectrum has the Summit Lofts condominiums adjacent. Delmar Gardens is on 5.05 acres, Hallmark is located on a 9.97 acre site, while Spectrum is on a 1.6 acre site. To date, staff are not aware of any functional conflicts between the Hallmark development and the adjacent residences but concerns with delivery vehicles and staff behavior have been voiced by neighbors of the Delmar Gardens facility.

Question:

How are these handled in other communities?

Initial Response:

An exhaustive review of other communities has not been completed, but initial conclusions are that many communities have been struggling with this issue as the population continues to age and the demand for such facilities increases. Locally, several communities (Clayton, Ellisville, Webster Groves) do not identify assisted living as a unique use, instead treating it the same as other institutionalized housing. Chesterfield and Maryland Heights regulate the use specifically, but handle it very differently (only in medical district in Chesterfield; only in residential district in Maryland Heights). It is probably a safe assumption that most communities allow for the use, but which particular concerns are addressed through the zoning code is a matter of community preference.

Question:

What are the issues with these developments?

Initial Response:

All institutionalized housing is similar to multi-family residential development in that it houses many people in a building that dwarfs a typical single-family house, there is activity 24-hours a day, and parking is typically provided in large lots. There are a few significant differences too. Institutions have commercial kitchens, commercial-grade laundry facilities, receive deliveries via large wheelbase trucks and place a significantly higher number of calls for emergency services.

Between the different forms of senior housing, nursing homes are certainly the most “commercial” in nature since they are most like an actual hospital. Community housing and continuum of care facilities tend to be the largest and will have some of every function resulting in the broadest range of potential issues. Independent living facilities are essentially age-restricted apartment complexes and create similar issues. Assisted living falls in between the extremes, both in function and impact. They do demand more emergency services, but they are more residential than a nursing home. They do not require the same number of staff, on a per resident basis, as a nursing home, but they have more staff than an independent living facility. They also might have some residents who drive, unlike a nursing home, but will have far fewer

than independent living. All senior housing has to provide for more visitor parking than an apartment complex, but less resident parking. So much less, in fact, that the total parking required for these facilities is far less than for apartment complexes. Where apartments require two parking spaces per dwelling unit for the first 50 dwelling units; 1¾ spaces per dwelling unit for the second 50 dwelling units; and 1½ spaces per dwelling unit for all units in excess of 100 units, assisted living requires only one space for every two beds. This was determined through a review of the requirements for nursing homes and the actual demand for parking at the Hallmark resulting from the addition of assisted living beds, as well as confirmation through the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation Manual that is based upon sampling of existing facilities around the country.

Question:

What do the special or “pre” conditions accomplish?

Initial Response:

Many cities place certain limitations on both permitted and conditional uses to preclude certain outcomes that the community finds to never be acceptable. These limitations typically impact intensity of the use and, on occasion, certain aesthetic considerations. Creve Coeur has an extensive set of these special conditions in Section 405.470 of the Zoning Code. While the conditional use permit process does provide a wide discretion for a city to approve or deny a given application, special conditions can create certain “no-go” zones. In Creve Coeur, the most well-known of these is the preclusion of isolated drive-through restaurants.

In the specific instance of the senior housing categories covered by Section 405.470, the conditions obligate the developer to a larger lot, suburban setting as opposed to a more urban style of arrangement. The questions raised by the 450 N. Lindbergh Boulevard project are whether or not the suburban model is achievable for an assisted living facility on a smaller lot and, if it were approved on a smaller lot, will it create issues that are supposed to be prevented on other senior housing projects by Section 405.470? If the answer to the latter is “yes,” then pre-conditions would appear to be appropriate and a text amendment should be pursued. If the answer is “no,” then the CUP will continue to be relied upon to address issues on a case-by-case basis.

Question:

Does this impact 450 N. Lindbergh Boulevard?

Initial Response:

A new CUP application has been submitted for a smaller assisted living facility at the Lindbergh Boulevard location. Although the proposal does not require any variances under the current Zoning Code regulations, the issues raised above and during the previous variance application are still valid questions within the Commission’s deliberations on the needed CUP. So, while it is unlikely that any specific ordinance changes could be accomplished prior to the CUP process concluding, the members of the Commission can certainly use this discussion to inform their actions on the CUP.

SUMMARY

Creve Coeur’s approach to senior housing has continued to evolve, as it has for many communities. The members of the Planning Commission should consider the questions raised above and consider any public comment received on this issue. For reference, the public comment received regarding the recent variance application on 450 N. Lindbergh Boulevard is attached to this memo since many of the comments express concerns over the intended assisted living use (versus the specific variance

findings). If, after discussing the matter on December 2, the Commission wishes to pursue any text amendments, staff will prepare an application and begin that process. In the meantime, the members of the Commission can also apply any concerns to the up-coming CUP application for the revised project at 450 N. Lindbergh Boulevard. If no concerns are identified, then the subject will next appear before the Commission during the public hearing on the 450 N. Lindbergh Boulevard proposal.

Chapter 405, Table A, Permitted and Conditional Uses

P=Permitted Use; C=Conditional Use Permit Required

Use Code	2012 NAICS Title	ZONING DISTRICTS													
		A	B	C	D	AR	HE	PH	PO	RO	MX	PC	GC	CB	LI
621310	Offices of Chiropractors							P	P		P	P	P	P	P
621320	Offices of Optometrists							P	P		P	P	P	P	P
621330	Offices of Mental Health Practitioners (except Physicians)							P	P		P	P	P	P	P
621340	Offices of Physical, Occupational and Speech Therapists, and Audiologists							P	P		P	P	P	P	P
621391	Offices of Podiatrists							P	P		P	P	P	P	P
621399	Offices of All Other Miscellaneous Health Practitioners							P	P		P	P	P	P	P
621410	Family Planning Centers							P	C			C	C	C	C
621420	Outpatient Mental Health and Substance Abuse Centers							P					C		
621491	HMO Medical Centers							P	P			P	P	P	P
621492	Kidney Dialysis Centers							P	P			P	P	P	P
621493	Freestanding Ambulatory Surgical and Emergency Centers							P	P			P	P	P	P
621498	All Other Outpatient Care Centers							P					C		P
621511	Medical Laboratories							P					C	P	P
621512	Diagnostic Imaging Centers							P					C	P	P
621610	Home Health Care Services							P				P	P	P	P
621910	Ambulance Services												C		P
621991	Blood and Organ Banks							P							P
621999	All Other Miscellaneous Ambulatory Health Care Services							P					C	C	
622110	General Medical and Surgical Hospitals							P							
622210	Psychiatric and Substance Abuse Hospitals							P							P
622310	Specialty (except Psychiatric and Substance Abuse) Hospitals							P							
623110	Nursing Care Facilities (Skilled Nursing Facilities)						C	C				C	C	C	
623210	Residential Intellectual and Developmental Disability Facilities (Subject to 405.450.B)	P	P	P	P	P	C	C				P			
623220	Residential Mental Health and Substance Abuse Facilities							P				C			
623311	Continuing Care Retirement Communities						C	C				C	C	C	
623312	Assisted Living Facilities for the Elderly						C	C				C	C	C	
623990	Other Residential Care Facilities (Subject to 405.450.B), excluding boot/disciplinary camps and halfway group homes.	P	P	P	P	P	C	C				C	C	C	
624110	Child and Youth Services							P						P	P
624120	Services for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities						C	P	C			P	P	P	
624190	Other Individual and Family Services							P	P			P	P	P	P
624210	Community Food Services											C	C		P
624221	Temporary Shelters							C				C	C		C
624229	Other Community Housing Services											C	C		P
624230	Emergency and Other Relief Services											C	C		C
624310	Vocational Rehabilitation Services												P		C
624410	Child Day Care Services	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
711110	Theater Companies and Dinner Theaters								C	C	C	C	C	C	C
711120	Dance Companies											C	C	C	C
711130	Musical Groups and Artists											C	C	C	C

From: [Donna Dierker](#)
To: [Kelly, Whitney](#)
Subject: Re: Is it possible for someone to read a statement for me?
Date: Thursday, October 17, 2013 3:21:49 PM

Thanks, Whitney. Here is my statement:

The requested variance from the floor area ratio limit (FAR) is too high. Granting this variance imposes too much hardship on residents. The inside space comes at the expense of outside space that is needed for parking and green areas to absorb water run-off. Beaver Drive simply is too narrow to accommodate overflow parking. Parking, green space, and driveways to accommodate emergency vehicles and delivery trucks will be inadequate, because the inside space consumes such a high proportion of the lot. Beaver Drive is the only access for residents of Beaver and Haven View to Lindbergh, and children walk to and from the bus stop there. Please deny this variance.

Thanks,

Donna Dierker
17 Haven View Drive

On Oct 17, 2013, at 3:13 PM, "Kelly, Whitney" <wkelly@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us> wrote:

> You can email it to me and I can place a copy on the dais for the Board, and then a hard copy is placed in the file.

>

> Whitney Kelly, AICP

> City Planner

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Donna Dierker [<mailto:donna@brainvis.wustl.edu>]

> Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 3:09 PM

> To: Kelly, Whitney

> Subject: Is it possible for someone to read a statement for me?

>

> Hi Whitney,

>

> My sitter fell through, and I wondered whether someone could read a statement at this evening's meeting on my behalf.

>

> Donna

>

> -----

> If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the City of Creve Coeur IT Coordinator (314-872-2509) and delete this message from your system. All email to and from the City are checked for viruses. Although this e-mail and any attachment(s) are believed to be free of any virus, worm, or other digital illness or defect that might affect any computer system that receives and opens this message, it is the responsibility of the recipient to make sure that it is free from any virus or other defect. The City does not accept, and specifically disclaims, any responsibility or liability for any loss or damage arising from the receipt or use of this message, and any attachment(s) in any way.

> -----

>

From: dkd1905@aol.com
To: [Langdon, Paul](#); [Kelly, Whitney](#); [Lowery, Julie](#)
Cc: [Perkins, Mark C.](#); [Glantz, Barry](#); [Kramer, Cynthia](#); [Kreuter, Dave](#)
Subject: 450 N Lindbergh Conditional Use Permit Requirements
Date: Monday, September 09, 2013 10:25:30 PM

I am opposed to Tealwood Acquisition's FAR variance request being brought before the Board of Adjustments until all other zoning variances including those under Section 405.470 Conditional Uses are also addressed.

Paul Langdon informed me that the Creve Coeur Zoning Ordinance Section 405.470 (paragraph 23) Conditional Uses *Nursing care facilities, residential mental retardation, mental health and substance abuse facilities, and community care facilities for the elderly (NAICS 623110, 623210, 623311 and 623990)* does not apply to the proposed development at 450 N. Lindbergh. He stated that assisted living facilities (NAICS 623312) were removed from this requirement during the zoning ordinance change from SIC to NAICS codes.

Per the definitions of the relevant NAICS codes, the St. Andrews Creve Coeur Certificate of Need (CON) application and statements made by a St. Andrews executive at the Sept. 9 neighborhood meeting, it is clear the proposed development at 450 N. Lindbergh falls under the NAICS code 623311 (Continuing Care Retirement Community) and not under code 623312 (Homes for the Elderly, which is currently being assumed to apply). Therefore, Creve Coeur Zoning requirements within Section 450.470 Conditional Uses fully apply to this proposed development.

The CON application and Missouri Statutes for assisted living facilities and residential care facilities define the services to be provided. These include:

Room and board

Protective oversight*

24-hour a day care*

Assistance with any activities of daily living (i.e. eating, dressing, bathing, toileting, transferring, walking)*

Storage, distribution and administration of medications*

Assistance in evacuation (e.g. fire) to mentally impaired residents (i.e. Memory Care Unit)

Supervision of health care under the direction of a licensed physician*

Licensed nurse on-site*

Care during short-term illness or recuperation*

Therapy room*

Social activities (exercise, art classes, computer room)

Please note that the State of Missouri defines nursing personnel as any employee including a nurse's aide or orderly who provides or assists in the provision of direct resident health care services (*see items with * above*).

The facility site and floor plans include space on each of three floors for medical charts and medication storage. A licensed Nursing Home Administrator is required.

The St. Andrews executive at the meeting explicitly stated that residents of St. Andrew's Creve Coeur Senior Living will require a doctor's order to be admitted, will have a registered nurse on-site full-time, and that all residents will have a medical need and require assistance with at least 3 Activities of Daily Living. She referred to the services provided as "nursing care."

The CON states "St. Andrew's Creve Coeur Senior Living is planned as a person-centered model of care". The CON further states research has demonstrated the person-centered model of care among other results has "improved clinical outcomes", thus explicitly linking the facility's approach to the delivery of clinical health care services.

The NAICS Association defines Homes for the Elderly (code 623312) and Continuing Care Retirement Communities (code 623311) very similarly:

NAICS 623312 Homes for the Elderly (excluded from Conditional Use section)	NAICS 623311 Continuing Care Retirement Communities (included in Conditional Use section)
This U.S. industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in providing residential and personal care services (i.e., <u>without on-site nursing care facilities</u>) for (1) the elderly or other persons who are unable to fully care for themselves and/or (2) the elderly or other persons who do not desire to live independently. <u>The care typically includes room, board, supervision, and assistance in daily living, such as housekeeping services.</u>	This U.S. industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in providing a range of residential and personal care services <u>with on-site nursing care facilities</u> for (1) the elderly and other persons who are unable to fully care for themselves and/or (2) the elderly and other persons who do not desire to live independently. Individuals live in a variety of residential settings with <u>meals, housekeeping, social, leisure, and other services available to assist residents in daily living.</u> Assisted-living facilities with on-site nursing care facilities are included in this industry.

As documented above, the proposed facility provides on-site nursing care which makes NAICS 623311 Continuing Care Retirement Communities the correct code, therefore, the requirements of Section 405.470 Conditional Uses apply. In addition to the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) exception already requested by Tealwood Acquisitions, there are three additional significant variances from code:

1. Site must be at least three (3) acres. 450 N. Lindbergh is 1.96 acres, or only 67% of the requirement.
2. The density of development within a personal care facility shall not exceed twenty (20) dwelling units per acre. Living units without cooking facilities shall count as two-

thirds (2/3) of a dwelling unit. Using the two-thirds count, rounding to two acres and ignoring the 3 acre minimum, the maximum number of units allowed at 450 N. Lindbergh is sixty (60). The plan proposes 75 units, or 25% more than zoning allows.

3. No building shall be located within fifty (50) feet of any property line. In the proposed plan, the set-back from the property line is ten (10) feet in the front and twenty (20) feet in the rear. Even there, the buffer would need to increase 150% to meet the zoning code.

Other variances from the Zoning Ordinances include a minimum 15 foot side yard setback for corner lots (the current setback is 12 feet), and 40 foot setback from the centerline of Lindbergh plus the required "GC" setback (the design provided for the public hearing does not meet this requirement).

Let me reiterate, I am opposed to Tealwood Acquisition's FAR variance request being brought before the Board of Adjustments until all other variances are included. A piecemeal approach to discussing and approving/disapproving the variances extends the proceedings and creates confusion.

Deni Dickler
7 Haven View Drive

From: [Kelly. Whitney](#)
To: [Kelly. Whitney](#)
Subject: FW: 450 N Lindbergh- Proposed Redevelopment ---objections/concerns
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2013 4:45:26 PM

----- Original Message -----

Subject: 450 N Lindbergh- Proposed Redevelopment ---objections/concerns

From: bin wang <bbwang23@yahoo.com>

To: "Langdon. Paul" <plangdon@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us>

CC:

Dear Paul

We are very upset with the proposed assisted living facility to be located on the present Tealwood Square Property. As our representatives, we are asking for your help in preventing this development. First, from a safety standpoint of the residents, a proposed service entrance on Beaver Drive is horrific. That area is where the school bus picks up and drops off students. Vehicles using that service entrance could block that entrance and hinder parents picking up their children from the bus stop as well as the possibility of those service vehicles hitting the children as they walk that obstacle course to their homes. Furthermore, emergency vehicles would not have quick access to the neighborhood homes needing immediate assistance. Entering and leaving Beaver Drive would also be dangerous for the residents of Beaver Drive and Haven View Drive as large vehicles would keep cars sitting on Lindbergh who are trying to enter Beaver Drive and also block views and access to Lindbergh of those exiting. To put the service entrance on Lindbergh is not an option due to the increased traffic and large size of the vehicles using such an entrance. At the present time, cars are stopped when large trucks back into the Dialysis Center which has its service entrance on Lindbergh creating a more dangerous situation in a dangerous area where cars run red lights and make illegal turns on a frequent basis. In addition, the number of parking spaces is not adequate for the total square footage of the building which is approximately 61,810 square feet. This is approximately 1 parking space for every 1818 square feet of building space which is definitely not adequate for the size. That would result in parking on Beaver Drive which is not wide enough for two cars to pass easily now. Moreover, a noise factor would be a problem due to the number of emergency vehicles coming in and out of such a facility. This will then result in a decline of our residential property values.

The medical concerns have been addressed by several physicians on Haven View and Dr. Purkerson has written about that in her communication. To add to those concerns, the property is not large enough to accomodate the biohazard waste problems such as odors, disposal, dumpsters being knocked over, waste blowing around the neighborhood -all problems associated with such a facility in a residential neighborhood.

As you can see, there are many concerns and objections about this proposed facility. The residents of Beaver Drive and Haven View Drive plan to attend the August 15th meeting to listen to the proposal and to voice their concerns and objections. Again, we are asking you as our elected representatives to assist us with keeping our neighborhood safe for all and our property values up.

Thank you for your assistance in this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Bin Wang/Wu Jin
9 Haven View Drive
bbwang23@yahoo.com

From: [O'Brien, Rhonda A.](#)
To: [Langdon, Paul](#); [Kelly, Whitney](#)
Cc: [Lowery, Julie](#); [Carl Lumley](#)
Subject: FW: TEALWOOD SQUARE DEVELOPMENT
Date: Friday, August 30, 2013 3:54:15 PM

I am forwarding this to you. I do not know whether other members of the board of adjustment received it or I am the only one. I assume that you will put it with the other comments and that I am not to respond. By the way, she mentions a bunch of variances but the emails seem to mention only 1 relating to area. Rhonda

RHONDA A. O'BRIEN
Attorney at Law
DIRECT: 314 436.8336
raobrien@lashlybaer.com
Licensed in Missouri and Illinois

LASHLY & BAER, P.C.
Attorneys at Law
714 Locust Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101-1699 TEL: 314 621.2939
20 East Main Street Belleville, Illinois 62220-1602 TEL: 618 233.5587
FAX: 314 621.6844 www.lashlybaer.com

THIS ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL FROM THE LAW FIRM OF LASHLY & BAER, P.C. The information contained in this communication and any attachments is intended solely for use by the addressee(s). If this was erroneously sent to you, please notify us immediately and permanently delete this communication including any electronic or printed versions and attachments. Electronic communications are not secure. Please advise if you do not wish to receive electronic communications in the future.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: In order to comply with IRS requirements, we inform you that if this electronic communication provides any U.S. tax advice, while we maintain our responsibility to you with respect to such advice, it is not written nor intended to be used and cannot be used for the purpose of avoiding Federal tax penalties nor for promoting, marketing or recommending to another party, any tax related matters addressed herein.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: sandeeggee19@aol.com [mailto:sandeeggee19@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 12:42 PM
To: O'Brien, Rhonda A.
Subject: TEALWOOD SQUARE DEVELOPMENT

Dear Rhonda:

As a resident and owner of property on Haven View Drive, I wish to express my concerns with the proposal for the property at 450 N. Lindbergh (Tealwood Square).

As a member of the Board of Adjustments of Creve Coeur, you are aware the proposed developers are requiring a multitude of variances from the existing "general commercial zoning". This negates the purpose of planned zoning districts. There are times when a simple variance is required and granted, but in this case there is a requirement for a minimum of at least four major variances, one of which changes the use of Beaver Drive from residential to commercial. In addition, this development, as formatted and presented along with the variances would effect the safety of the residents and their children and decrease the value of their properties.

Contrary to Paul Langdon's comments to the St. Louis Business Journal, senior living does generate additional traffic i.e visitors, employees, commerical deliveries of health care supplies, trash removal,

food services, linen services, maintenance crews, (of which the bulk of these enter through Beaver Drive-a residential street!) Your comment about seniors partying is not based on fact as there are holiday and weekend and week day events for the residents of the home which generate additional visitors and traffic.

As one can see from the plans, there is not sufficient parking allocated to accomodate the above.

I , together with the property owners of Beaver Drive and Haven View, oppose this development in its present design and proposal. I appreciate any assistance you can give us.

A response to the foregoing would be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Sandra Greenberg
19 Haven View
Creve Coeur, MO.
314 993 1625

sandeegee19@aol.com

sandeegee19@aol.com

From: [Langdon, Paul](#)
To: [Lowery, Julie](#)
Subject: FW: Tealwood Square development
Date: Friday, September 06, 2013 4:18:18 PM

Julie,

Please add the following comments to the Tealwood Square file. Thank you.

Paul

From: Ed Bloomquist [mailto:xjbloom@charter.net]
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 1:26 PM
To: Langdon, Paul
Cc: atessler@charter.net; xjbloom@charter.net; carolkengwong@yahoo.com; purkerm@wustl.edu; louanne@digitalcpt.com; jschilders@charter.net; donna.dierker@sbcglobal.net; rickisbell@charter.net; wujin1992@yahoo.com; gsgstriker@aol.com; blbackof@aol.com; cjBMZIM3@sbcglobal.net; yuxingfeng@hotmail.com; globen@sbcglobal.net; rainsmdemitula@aol.com; susan.d.turner@att.net; Carowe8@yaoo.com; colleenmcnealy@gmail.com; dkd1905@aol.com; liqiongzheng@hotmail.com; sandeeggee19@aol.com; asco19@aol.com; abelsonbrett@gmail.com; pinnick@att.net
Subject: Tealwood Square development

Dear Mr. Langdon:

As a resident and owner of property on Haven View Drive, We wish to express our concerns with the proposal for the property at 450 N. Lindbergh (Tealwood Square).

As you are aware, the proposed developers are requiring a multitude of variances from the existing "general commercial zoning". This negates the purpose of planned zoning districts. There are times when a simple variance is required and granted, but in this case there is a requirement for a minimum of at least four major variances, one of which changes the use of Beaver Drive from residential to commercial. In addition, this development, as formatted and presented along with the variances would effect the safety of the residents and their children and decrease the value of their properties.

Regarding your comments to the St. Louis Business Journal, senior living does generate additional traffic i.e visitors, employees, commerical deliveries of health care supplies, trash removal, food services, linen services, maintenance crews, (of which the bulk of these enter through Beaver Drive-a residential street!) Your comment about seniors partying is not based on fact as there are holiday and weekend and week day events for the residents of the home which generate additional visitors and traffic.

As one can see from the plans, there is not sufficient parking allocated to accommodate the above.

We , together with the property owners of Beaver Drive and Haven View, oppose this development in its present design and proposal.

Take a drive down Beaver Drive and observe the beautiful mature trees lining the street, these will be gone. Then as you exit the street onto Lindberg take note of the traffic and the difficulty in a safe exit. This will be even harder if a three story building is built close to the street.

Your attention to these problems would be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Ed & Elaine Bloomquist
12 Haven View
Creve Coeur, MO. 63141

Kelly, Whitney

From: Luella Isbell <lueisbell@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 10:22 PM
To: Kreuter, Dave; Kramer, Cynthia; blantz@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us; Kelly, Whitney; Lowery, Julie; Langdon, Paul
Subject: Proposed development of 450 N. Lindbergh as an Assisted Living Facility

Dear Councilmen and Planning and Zoning Committee Members:

My husband and I have watched with interest the revitalizing and building of various new retail and business establishments within our town of Creve Coeur. We are always excited when an empty or underused building is rented or bought to provide new services and tax revenue for our city. On this note, we would be very happy to see something productive happen with the property that currently comprises the largely unused Tealwood Square at 450 N. Lindbergh. We always root for our home team and want Creve Coeur to be the vital, vibrant community it strives to be.

Sadly, the Assisted Care/Dementia Facility currently proposed for this space is just not the right use for this property at the current time. My husband is Chief Estimator for one of the largest construction firms in Missouri. He spends his work days assessing building plans to come up with practical, cost-efficient and creative ways to build and renovate properties all over the United States and abroad. Upon viewing the plans for this project, his immediately cited major objections centered on the height and size of the facility in comparison with the size of the lot, the lack of appropriate parking and the safety issues resulting from service traffic entering and leaving the facility by way of Beaver Drive. Upon closer consideration, we both raise the following objections:

- Our small neighborhood consists of two "no-outlet" streets. The only way in or out of our neighborhood is Beaver Drive. To potentially block that entrance, even temporarily, with loading/unloading etc. would be a hardship and a danger to residents of our neighborhood. We need emergency vehicles to be free to come and go without impediment.
- We have all paid a premium for our homes. Our neighborhood is not large, but it is a quiet, well-kept oasis right off of busy Lindbergh. The building of this facility with its increased congestion, noise, trash, and traffic would not only jeopardize the safety of our residents, but the value of our homes
- The Ladue School bus picks up and drops off our children at the Lindbergh-end of Beaver Drive. This is already a less than ideal situation and the increased risk of further traffic and decreased visibility would make a bad situation even more dangerous, especially in rainy or icy weather.
- In a similar way, we already have a dangerous time entering and exiting our neighborhood. When I slow on Lindbergh to turn right onto Beaver, there is often a car or truck right on my back bumper. I have had to take the turn faster than was prudent on many occasions for fear of being rear-ended. To introduce a service driveway onto Beaver would make this turn even more dangerous. I would not want to sit on northbound Lindbergh waiting for my chance to turn as cars zoom around me.
- Exiting from Beaver onto Lindbergh is currently not too bad. The main exiting issue with this proposed facility would be the decreased visibility a three-story building would add. Once again, safety of our residents is very important.
- The parking scheduled for this building does not appear to be adequate to accommodate the number of patients, guests and workers. When all of the parking spaces are occupied, drivers will park along Beaver Drive and maybe even up along Haven View to visit their loved ones or work at the facility. I am especially concerned about special Holiday events. My mother lived at Delmar Gardens in Chesterfield.

On special days, the excess cars would line up and down the service road from the Delmar Gardens parking lot to Hwy 141. It was quite a mess and that space was extensive in comparison with our little neighborhood.

- The size of the facility would dwarf the homes directly to the east on Beaver Dr. and directly to the northeast behind the facility on Dielmann Farm Estate Drive. The former privacy and relative peacefulness of these homes would be greatly reduced. These particular home owners include our former Mayor, Harold Dielmann. Mayor Dielmann and his family live in the three homes closest to the proposed development and this seems to me to be a shoddy way to reward him for his many years of public service spent for the good of Creve Coeur.

Please, **please do not grant the variance** that will begin to put this ball into motion. We are not opposed to a progressive Creve Coeur: we are opposed to making our little neighborhood more congested and less safe.

Rick and Luelie Isbell
14 Haven View Drive
St. Louis, MO 63141
314-569-0017

From: dkd1905@aol.com
To: [Langdon, Paul](#); [Kelly, Whitney](#); [Lowery, Julie](#)
Cc: [Kramer, Cynthia](#); [Kreuter, Dave](#)
Subject: Opposition to Proposed 450 N. Lindbergh Redevelopment
Date: Thursday, August 15, 2013 8:19:22 PM

Paul Langdon, Whitney Kelly, and Julie Lowery,

I agree the commercial property at 450 N. Lindbergh needs to be improved. Without upgrades or redevelopment it will continue to be underutilized and not provide services or tax revenues beneficial to the residents of Creve Coeur.

I also believe an assisted living facility at this location could be an asset to the community and surrounding residential neighborhoods.

However, I strongly oppose the current plan for a 75 bed assisted living and memory care facility for reasons stated below.

1. The planned service drive and parking on Beaver Drive create multiple safety hazards.

The corner of Beaver and Lindbergh is a Ladue School bus stop. Children as young as age 5 walk along Beaver to this stop both in the morning and afternoon. There is no sidewalk. Delivery truck traffic at this intersection will worsen a situation that already represents dangers to our children.

The only way for trucks to make deliveries is to drive into Beaver, then back-up into the service drive. Food delivery and similar trucks are 28 to 48 feet long. While backing into the service drive, they will completely block Beaver traffic in both directions. While exiting forward and waiting to turn onto Lindbergh Blvd North, they will again block all traffic on Beaver. On one hand, this will be an unacceptable inconvenience to residents. On the other hand it could mean the difference between a house burning down or being saved, a heart attack victim surviving or dying and burglars being caught or getting away. Beaver Dr. is the only way to enter and exit the neighborhood. Our safety requires free access by emergency vehicles at all times.

In addition, while Beaver is blocked, vehicles wanting to turn onto this street will be left sitting on Lindbergh. Traffic through this section of Lindbergh often travels 40 – 50 mph. A sitting car not only creates a traffic jam, but can be easily rear-ended.

The submitted plan's "Existing Conditions" is incorrect. Beaver is not 40 feet wide, does not extend onto the property and does not have parking. Neither of the commercial properties bordering Beaver have access to the street. Beaver only has residential traffic. It is approximately 18 feet wide and narrowly allows two lanes of traffic.

The proposed plan adds parking spaces on the south side of Beaver, but does not address how these vehicles turn around to exit. The only way to legally turn around is to drive to the cul de sac at the end of either Beaver or Haven View Drives. Or, drivers can make illegal u-turns or use private driveways. I anticipate there will be overflow parking along Beaver and possibly Haven View on holidays and weekends.

These situations will increase non-resident traffic on both streets, which are strictly residential with no through traffic at this time. Currently the streets are safe for pedestrians and children even without sidewalks. The neighborhood will not be pedestrian friendly with the planned parking on Beaver.

2. The planned facility is incompatible with Creve Coeur zoning and the Comprehensive Plan.

The Zoning Code requires Nursing and Personal Care facilities to be located on a site at least 3 acres, density cannot exceed more than 20 dwelling units per acre and no building can be within 50 feet of any property line.

Public records indicate the current lot size of 450 N. Lindbergh is 1.96 acres, well short of the required acreage. The stated setback from property lines on the site plan is 12 feet on each side, 20 feet to the rear and 10 feet in the front. These stated setbacks are 50% or less of the requirement. In addition the design includes 5 feet within the side setbacks for parking spaces. My understanding is that the General Commercial Zoning Code requires that buffer areas have no impervious surface which should preclude the planned parking along Beaver and portions of the parking lot on the south side).

The proposed plan offers an oversized facility on a cramped lot. This is the first impression visitors to our neighborhood will have. Instead of the current tree lined entry on Beaver, friends and potential home buyers will see a large facility, delivery dock and parked cars.

The Creve Coeur Comprehensive Plan clearly states "Residential neighborhoods will be preserved and protected from commercial encroachment" ... "Protecting the residential neighborhoods from adverse land use and traffic impacts created by non-residential land uses. ... "Ensure that non-residential development is compatible with adjacent residential development" ... "Preserve existing predominately residential streets".

Approving commercial traffic on Beaver and Haven View, parking on our residential streets, removal of mature deciduous trees along Beaver and a service dock for deliveries and commercial trash hauling off a residential street is contrary to Creve Coeur's explicitly stated goals.

3. If the assisted living facility is built as proposed, the residential property values on Beaver and Haven View Drives will likely decrease.

Each of us purchased our homes, often at a premium price, to be in the Ladue School District and on a quiet, protected residential street. The entry onto Beaver from Lindbergh is tree-lined which adds to the neighborhood's character. We have minimal commercial noise and light pollution.

If this development proceeds, we will still be in the Ladue School District, but our streets will no longer be free of non-resident traffic. We will lose the tree-lined entry and gain 24-hour lighting, a loading dock likely to become the designated smoking area, semi-trucks and parked cars. Future home buyers will not be inclined to view these as assets.

I remain hopeful that Tealwood Acquisitions, LLC. will accommodate resident concerns and submit a revised, realistic design that benefits all constituents.

Sincerely,
Deneen Dickler
7 Haven View Drive

Cc: Cynthia Kramer, David Kreuter

From: [Jeff Dickler](#)
To: [Langdon, Paul](#); [Kelly, Whitney](#); jlower@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us
Cc: [Kramer, Cynthia](#); [Kreuter, Dave](#)
Subject: Proposed 450 N. Lindbergh Redevelopment
Date: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 7:00:57 PM
Attachments: [BeaverFromLindbergh.jpg](#)

Paul Langdon, Whitney Kelly, Julie Lowery

I am very alarmed at the prospect of any development at 450 N. Lindbergh that threatens to impact Beaver Drive which is the only access to both the Beaver and Haven View neighborhoods. Beaver Drive is only 18' 10" wide. Two Volkswagons going in opposite directions is already a traffic jam! Shortly after I moved here in 1993 I witnessed an accident at the entrance cause by someone trying to turn into the street while being tailgated by Lindbergh traffic. They were trying slow down to make the already sharp turn and wound up destroying the brick pillar on the north east corner. I myself have been put in precarious situations because of cars exiting Beaver without pulling all the way to the right at the intersection with Lindbergh. Any change to Beaver would only increase the hazard; for example having a truck backing into a service drive or cars parallel parking along that stretch even if it were slightly wider. Anything that would impede being able to smoothly turn into Beaver Drive would result in further potential accidents. Even widening it by a couple of feet would not help keep it clear if we are considering truck traffic into the proposed service drive.

And then there are the trees. (see attached) The mature trees that line both sides of Beaver Drive make a lovely introduction to the neighborhood. The plan for the proposed assisted living facility plan requires the removal of all them along the south side of the street.... you must be kidding!

By the way, how many zoning variances are these people looking for anyway? The occupancy density is only one of several that would stop this development. Let me list them.

- Care facilities require a 3 acre lot. This lot would have to be 50% larger to meet that requirement.
- There is a 50' required setback on all sides. That won't work!
- Buffer areas should not have impervious surfaces. That won't work either!

I saw a note on the submitted plans that they were drawn up without the benefit of a site visit. I hope the designer won't get paid for that kind of negligence.

In closing let me acknowledge their proposal from a different view. I am not opposed to the construction of personal care facilities so long as they don't compromise the livability and value of the neighborhoods that host them. With the coming wave of aging baby boomers we will certainly need a lot more of them. I would rather have such a facility at 450 N Lindbergh than some of the other lurid possibilities. However, the designers should come look at the site and use a bit more imagination. How about putting in underground parking, mechanicals , laundry and kitchen? That would allow them to reduce their foot print, include a wrap around driveway that would enable delivery trucks to enter and leave without ever having to block a street, Perhaps they could by the Davita building next door and get their entrance off the entry to Tealbrook. That should go over real well.

Respectfully

Jeffrey C Dickler
7 Haven View Drive

From: [Keng Wong](#)
To: [Langdon, Paul](#); [Kelly, Whitney](#); [Lowery, Julie](#); [Kramer, Cynthia](#); [Kreuter, Dave](#)
Subject: re: Proposed development of Tealwood Square
Date: Thursday, August 15, 2013 3:34:12 PM

Dear Sir and Madam,

I am very upset with the proposed assisted living facility to be located on the present Tealwood Square Property and hope that you can prevent this from happening.

After discussing with neighbors in Haven View Drive and Beaver Street, our main concerns are as follows:

- Safety for children at the end of Beaver school bus stop
- Service drive on Beaver creates a traffic hazard, especially when trucks will need to block Beaver as they back into the service drive. Moreover, parking added a long Beaver (approx. 5 spaces between the service drive and end of property) with no way for vehicles turn around and exit will add traffic on residential streets and use of private driveways
- Noise from increased traffic, trucks, ambulances
- Wandering residents, some with diminished mental capacity. This can be dangerous for those residents and for neighborhood residents when they drive.
- Unpleasant view: service drive/loading dock/trash removal area is first thing visitors see when coming to our neighborhood.

In sum, the proposed development will cause a lot of inconvenience for residents and adversely affect our safety on a daily basis. As a result, home values in the neighborhood will decrease. I am sincerely asking you to take all these issues into considerations and prevent the plan from becoming real. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Carol Keng Wong
11 Haven View Dr, MO 63141

From: [Donna Dierker](#)
To: karla.houchins@health.mo.gov; Jill.Schupp@house.mo.gov; [Kreuter, Dave](#); [Kramer, Cynthia](#); blantz@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us; [Kelly, Whitney](#); [Lowery, Julie](#); [Langdon, Paul](#)
Cc: dkd1905@aol.com; pinnick@att.net Pinnick; gsgstriker@aol.com; [Sandy Greenberg](#); [Janine Schilders](#); rckisbell@charter.net; xjbloom@charter.net; purkerm@wustl.edu
Subject: Tealwood Square development
Date: Thursday, August 29, 2013 7:37:19 PM

Hi all,

Like many of my neighbors, I'm very concerned about the plans to build an assisted living center on the Tealwood Square site. When I first heard about it, I thought, "On that lot? It's way too small." This reaction was affirmed by a neighbor with experience evaluating lots for commercial purposes.

I was going to wait to voice my concerns until the 9/9 meeting, where the developer will share its plans with the residents. But reading this column convinced me to make my concerns clear now:

<http://m.bizjournals.com/stlouis/blog/health-care/2013/08/creve-coeur-residents-oppose-18.html>

Here are my concerns:

* Decreased visibility for drivers turning from Beaver onto Lindbergh: If the building ends up closer to Lindbergh than the existing structure, I worry about all drivers having a harder time making that turn. The cars on Lindbergh often exceed the 40mph speed limit, and the margin of error is already pretty small. My son will be 16 in three years. Before any variance is granted, simulated testing with facades at the same positions as the final structure should be done, to evaluate the impact on drivers turning from Beaver onto Lindbergh and vice versa.

* Increased traffic congestion by vehicles entering/exiting Tealwood Square: With this type of facility, I fear an increase in larger delivery vehicles attempting to enter the lot. I personally was stuck on northbound Lindbergh at Tealbrook when a tractor-trailer attempted to enter the lot at Davita Dialysis a few years ago. Traffic was backed up as far as I could see in the northbound Lindbergh lane, because this trailer was stuck on the median. I think he attempted to use the Tealbrook turn-around to get to Davita from the southbound lane. I don't know. I only know he ended up driving over the median to get to Davita. I thought this was a one time event, but Jeff Dickler told me it happened to him several times. My concern is this facility will have even more deliveries, and because they are seriously overbuilding the lot, there won't be enough room for trucks to wait/park and turn around.

* Entrance/Exit from Beaver: If it is not obvious that this is a terrible idea, then a video camera should be placed at this intersection for a month and the contents analyzed by an independent safety reviewer. I can't imagine this being approved. This is our only entrance/exit to/from the subdivision.

* Slaughter of trees along south side of Beaver: It's tough to see how the trees on the south side of Beaver along Tealwood Square would survive any version of this plan. If they are sacrificed, then the character of this neighborhood will be significantly harmed, and it is not an exaggeration to say it will bring me to tears.

Like my other neighbors, I'm not against redevelopment, but I am against overbuilding by this substantial margin.

Donna Dierker
17 Haven View Drive
Creve Coeur, MO 63141-7902
314-660-3451

From: sandeegee19@aol.com
To: [Kelly. Whitney](mailto:Kelly.Whitney@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us); plangdon@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us; [Lowery. Julie](mailto:Lowery.Julie@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us)
Subject: Tealwood Square Proposal
Date: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 3:08:40 PM

copy of letter to Creve Coeur Officials.

-----Original Message-----

From: sandeegee19 <sandeegee19@aol.com>
To: ckramer <ckramer@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us>; dkreuter <dkreuter@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us>
Cc: bglantz@ci.creve-coeur.mo.us. Sent: Tue, Aug 6, 2013 2:30 pm
Subject: Public Hearing on Aug.15th for proposed development of Tealwood Square

Dear Councilman Cynthia Kramer and Councilman David Kreuter:

The residents of Haven View Drive and Beaver Drive are very upset with the proposed assisted living facility to be located on the present Tealwood Square Property. As our representatives, we are asking for your help in preventing this development.

First, from a safety standpoint of the residents, a proposed service entrance on Beaver Drive is horrific. That area is where the school bus picks up and drops off students. Vehicles using that service entrance could block that entrance and hinder parents picking up their children from the bus stop as well as the possibility of those service vehicles hitting the children as they walk that obstacle course to their homes. Furthermore, emergency vehicles would not have quick access to the neighborhood homes needing immediate assistance. Entering and leaving Beaver Drive would also be dangerous for the residents of Beaver Drive and Haven View Drive as large vehicles would keep cars sitting on Lindbergh who are trying to enter Beaver Drive and also block views and access to Lindbergh of those exiting. To put the service entrance on Lindbergh is not an option due to the increased traffic and large size of the vehicles using such an entrance. At the present time, cars are stopped when large trucks back into the Dialysis Center which has its service entrance on Lindbergh creating a more dangerous situation in a dangerous area where cars run red lights and make illegal turns on a frequent basis. In addition, the number of parking spaces is not adequate for the total square footage of the building which is approximately 61,810 square feet. This is approximately 1 parking space for every 1818 square feet of building space which is definitely not adequate for the size. That would result in parking on Beaver Drive which is not wide enough for two cars to pass easily now. Moreover, a noise factor would be a problem due to the number of emergency vehicles coming in and out of such a facility. This will then result in a decline of our residential property values.

The medical concerns have been addressed by several physicians on Haven View and Dr. Purkerson has written about that in her communication. To add to those concerns, the property is not large enough to accomodate the biohazard waste problems such as odors, disposal, dumpsters being knocked over, waste blowing around the neighborhood -all problems associated with such a facility in a residential neighborhood.

As you can see, there are many concerns and objections about this proposed facility. The residents of Beaver Drive and Haven View Drive plan to attend the August 15th meeting to listen to the proposal and to voice their concerns and objections. Again, we are asking you as our elected representatives to assist us with keeping our neighborhood safe for all and our property values up.

Thank you for your assistance in this critical matter.

Very truly yours,

Sandra Greenberg
19 Haven View Drive
314 93 1825
sandeegee19@aol.com

From: [Mike Knight](#)
To: [Kelly Whitney](#)
Subject: Variance Request - 450 N. Lindbergh
Date: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 10:18:26 PM

I spoke with a group of neighbors and discovered there has been an application for a variance to allow a floor area of approximately double the maximum ratio currently allowed in current zoning ordinances. It is my understanding the proposal is related to a planned assisted living facility at 450 N. Lindbergh.

Please be advised that we strongly oppose the approval of the referenced variance.

Respectfully,

Mike & Lilian Knight
20 Beaver Drive
Creve Coeur, MO 63141