

Webster Groves Plan Commission
Meeting Minutes
October 1, 2018

Members Present	Jeff Smith	PLANNER
	Brandon Harp	Danny Jendusca
	Steve Hunkins	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
	Scott Mueller	Mara Perry
	Annie Tierney	CITY ATTORNEY (Acting)
	Anne Tolan	Erin Seele
	Christopher Michael	COUNCIL LIAISON
	Matt Armstrong	
Members not Present	Charles Sindel	
	Adam Field	

REGULAR SESSION

1. Tolan opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**
Tolan asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the September 10, 2018 meeting. Michael made a motion to approve. Harp seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**
There was none.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING:**
 - a) **18-PC-17 Rolling Ridge:** An application by McMillian Development LLC for a Change of Zoning from "D" Commercial to "PC" Planned Commercial and to consider a Preliminary Development Plan utilizing existing structures and a proposed new multiple family residential building on an approximately 1.59 acre tract of land located at 60 N. Gore Avenue; 60 A N. Gore Avenue and 75 Marshall Place.

Smith stated that he currently resides on Marshall Place therefor he is recusing himself from any discussion on 18-PC-17.

Perry said when we have a meeting for a Planned Commercial use they can be very complex with a number of uses and requests. This hearing is for information purposes only and will not end with a set of recommendations or vote. The hearing is for staff and Plan Commission members to gather and request from the applicant information in order for us to continue to review the development and make some decisions. We are requesting this meeting be held open to a date certain with no vote tonight. We will post on the web site as well as signs for the next hearing but there will be no ad for the newspaper. Perry said staff has received numerous written comments, which are and will continue to be available on the web site as received.

Tolan suggested for all to gather their questions as we listen to the presentation tonight.

Jendusa said the preliminary development plan is for a change of zoning from “D” Commercial to “PC” Plan Commercial. It includes redevelopment and re-use of the existing structure, demolition and replacement of the existing green house with a new (1) one story commercial structure, and construction of new a (5) five story (36) thirty-six unit multi-family residential building. He presented photos of the existing structures and gave some history of the site. The existing building was built in 1893 as used as a feed and grain store. The conjoined building in 1914 and in 1959 James McMillan open the Rolling Ridge Nursery.

The properties are located in several historic districts. In 1985, 60 N. Gore Ave. was included as part of the Old Webster Local Historic District. It was not included as part of the Old Webster National Historic District adopted in 2004. Also 60 and 60A N. Gore Ave. and the southern half of 75 Marshall Place were included as part of the adoption of the Marshall Place National Historic District in 1982. None of the subject properties was listed as part of the Marshall Place Local Historic District in 1992. In 1986, the existing main structure at 60 N. Gore Ave. was designated as a local Historic Landmark on its own merits. A Certificate of Appropriateness from the city’s Historic Preservation Commission is required when a landmark structure is proposed for demolition. Staff is determining whether the demolition of the existing greenhouse would require review from the HPC. New construction and exterior alterations are required to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness at a public hearing at the City’s Architectural Review Board.

Several areas of the 1978 Comprehensive Plan discuss development in the city’s commercial area as well as multi-family residential development. It states that the City’s “overriding objective” is the “development and maintenance of a residential community”. To maintain residential value and provide quality public services and amenities. It also identified that the rehabilitation of the city’s commercial areas was necessary for maintaining the attractiveness and quality of life in Webster Groves. The plan’s first Community Policy discussed the tools and strategies available to the City to shape residential development, including the development of apartments and townhomes. This section stated “Apartments or townhouses should be permitted (or encouraged) adjacent to the three commercial areas (Lockwood-Gore, Elm Avenue, and Old Orchard)”. The second community policy discussed the rehabilitation of commercial areas and focused on retail and office use. In 2006 the Development Foundation Plan included the subject properties as part of the Old Webster district and identified Old Webster as “the most pedestrian friendly commercial area of the city.” Based on a market assessment, it recommended three principal use types in Old Webster: alternative housing types, retail services niches and office/employment uses. Also identified that the subject properties as part of the “Existing Old Webster Mixed Use Core”, recommending the preservation and enhancement of existing development along with new infill development. The 2006 DFP was never adopted by the City Council but in 2017, the city adopted the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment, which recommended mixed-use development of the subject property. Staff has determined that a “PC” Planned Commercial District incorporating

mixed office, restaurant, retail, limited production and multi-family uses at this site would appropriately meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

When requesting a change of zoning to a "PC" in a Commercial District, the applicant may request uses from the lists of permitted, conditional, and accessory uses in the "C" and "D" Commercial Districts. The proposal identifies thirty-six (36) new apartments, parking for the development, and approximately 25,500 sq. ft. of commercial uses, including outdoor commercial areas.

The applicant has requested the following as Permitted Use for the subject properties:

1. Drinking Establishment- Microbrewery and brewpub
2. Food and beverage services, including cafeterias, ice cream parlors, and restaurants.
3. Store or shop for the conduct of a retail business.
4. Office for the conduct of any lawful business or professional pursuit.
5. Multiple family residential.

To provide flexibility for future occupants of the commercial space, staff recommends expanding the Permitted Uses for this "PC" Planned Commercial District to include the following uses which are permitted within the "C" and "D" Commercial Districts and which may have relatively low impact upon parking demand.

6. Personal, family, and household services
7. Bakery, whose products are sold only at retail on the premises.

Staff is unclear about the exact location of the proposed multifamily building and intensity of use within the development. Concerns for parking may set limitations for the number of residential units. Staff is requesting the applicant provide more details on the floor plans of the commercial areas. The "PC" District does not require a minimum number of parking spaces so staff has typically used St. Louis County's requirements as a basis for evaluation. Currently there are (5) five off-street parking spaces as well as a surface lot for (13) thirteen across the street owned by the applicant. The proposed development plan has (29) twenty-nine structured spaces in the multi-family residential building, thirty-seven (37) off-street proposed on a new lot behind the existing structure and (3) three off-street fronting N. Gore. Also (39) thirty-nine spaces would be located on the existing lot across the street, (26) twenty-six of which will be leased via a private lease agreement with the owner of 65 N. Gore. Staff is requesting a parking demand study by a licensed professional engineer or certified planner for further review of parking.

The City's Tree and Landscape Ordinance includes requirements for a landscaped buffer around the perimeter of a parking lot and landscaped islands within the parking lot based on the size of the proposed parking area. This could affect the parking lot design and the number of spaces.

Current access to the site is a single curb cut approximately seventy (70) ft. wide on Marshall Place. A paved, one-way circular path allows vehicles to access the outdoor storage area of Rolling Ridge Nursery.

The plan proposes a two-way curb cut for ingress and egress on Marshall Place about twenty-five (25) feet wide to the surface parking lot. An additional curb cut for ingress is proposed on

N. Gore Ave. and staff cannot determine the proposed width of this drive aisle at this time. Additional information will be required to determine if these points of access are sufficient for the uses and intensity of the proposed development. Staff is requesting a more detailed site plan and traffic study conducted by a licensed engineer or certified planner to review the impact on the surrounding streets and neighborhood.

The Building Commissioner has stated that the subject properties are located within the 100-year floodway and 500-year floodplain fringe, and the applicant will need to submit a National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) No-rise Certification to demonstrate that all proposed development will not cause increased flood risk in the surrounding community prior to the issuance of any building permit related to the Preliminary Development Plan. In addition, a Storm water Control Plan to the city as well as MSD will be required for review. All major land disturbance projects of greater than one acre require review from the Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources. Staff is not certain at this time whether the DNR will require their own review of this development.

Per City Code, an undisturbed natural vegetative buffer is required to be maintained within fifty (50) feet of the top of bank of Shady Grove Creek at the north end of the subject properties. Permanent vegetation and existing ground elevations and grades within this buffer area shall be required to be left intact and undisturbed. Staff does not have enough information to determine whether the plan may conceptually meet the City's Stream Buffer Protection requirements. Prior to making a recommendation regarding stream buffer protection, staff requests the applicant provide additional information. A topographical site plan of existing and proposed conditions, which detail efforts that will be made to mitigate land development and disturbance activity, which may affect the natural watercourse protection area. A Tree Preservation Plan will be required to ensure adequate tree protection during demo and construction. In addition, a Landscape Plan will also be required for the development, which will include any landscape buffers and parking lot islands or trash enclosures.

The "PC" District does not have set dimensional regulations for development. When an applicant request to rezone the City is able to provide greater flexibility to establish dimensional regulations specific to that property. At this time staff does not have enough information to evaluate the proposed setbacks of the preliminary development plan. Staff is requesting the applicant provide a topographical site plan drawn to scale for review. Staff will evaluate this with the existing setbacks of the "D", "B1" and "B2" Districts. In addition, a lot consolidation plat will need to be submitted for review to extinguish the existing lot lines and consolidate the properties into (1) one legal lot.

Jendusa said staff is requesting additional information including renderings of the proposed multi-family residential building in order to provide greater scale context against the surroundings. They will compare with the height restrictions from the "D", "B1", "B2", "C1" and "A4" zoning districts.

In order to establish intensity of use, lot coverage, floor-area ratio, and average lot width are a few calculations that the City uses to evaluate and control the size of new construction on a lot. Staff is requesting these calculations for review.

At this time, the only new construction identified in the plan that would be located in the boundaries of a locally designated or nationally designated historic district is the new one-story greenhouse structure. This new structure would be located within the Shultz-McMillan Historic Landmark designation, the local Old Webster Historic District, and the Marshall Place National Historic District. The new construction multi-family residential building is not located within a designated historic district and therefore not reviewed against any historic district guidelines. Staff reviewed the dimensional elements of the new greenhouse structure against the Guidelines for Preservation of the Old Webster Historic District and Guidelines for Preservation of the Marshall Place Historic District and determined they would appropriately conform to these as submitted. The preliminary architectural renderings and a site plan provided in the preliminary plan are for contextual review purposes only. The final architectural renderings will need to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board.

The building code requires that the “level of lighting from any source shall not exceed 0.5 foot-candles at any residential property line”. The building code also requires shielding to be installed on fixtures to direct lighting in excess of these levels towards the ground and away from adjacent property. The height of lights on poles may not exceed the height of the building whose area they illuminate.

The “PC” District does not include Performance Standards to regulate impacts of commercial activity near residential areas. Staff believes that due to the property’s proximity to residential districts, Performance Standards should be put in place as conditions to the requested change of zoning. Noise regulations should be established for the commercial uses. Noise regulations could model what is currently allowed in the “D” Commercial District Performance Standards. “Every use shall be so operated that the maximum volume of sound or noise generated does not exceed fifty-five (55) decibels at any point on the lot line of the lot on which the use is located. Outdoor loudspeakers and audible communication systems are not permitted within one thousand (1,000) feet of a residential district”. Limitations upon hours of operation will be placed upon any Drinking Establishment use. Upon receiving additional information about the proposed uses, staff may recommend placing additional limitations upon hours of operation for other use types as conditions to the requested change of zoning.

Comments from other departments include:

The Police Department had no comment.

The Fire Department provided the following comments:

- The Fire Department shall have full access to the building and site during all phases of construction.
- Additional fire hydrants, sprinklers, standpipes, knox boxes and knox locks, if required by the Fire Department, shall be installed throughout the site at the direction of the Fire Chief.

- Any driveways or entrances/exits and canopys shall be able to accommodate the Webster Groves Fire Department ambulance and other emergency vehicles.
- All grades shall be designed not impede the use of The Webster Groves Fire Department ambulance and other apparatus.
- Any restrictive gates or similar devices shall only be permitted after the review and approval of the Fire Chief.
- Any restrictive gates, either temporary or permanent, shall be accessible by the Fire Department at all times. Any padlocks used to secure must be able to be opened with a Knox key (Knox Lock).
- Floor designations shall begin with 1 at the entrance level of the building.

The Public Works Department provided the following comments:

- The new driveway on N. Gore Ave. shall be constructed to ADA and City standards.
- The new driveway on Marshall Place shall be constructed to ADA and City standards.
- All sidewalks shall be replaced to ADA and City standards.

The Parks Department provided the following comments:

- The proposal will be subject to full tree preservation, landscape, and parking requirements.

The Building Commissioner provided the following comments:

- Part of the property is located in the floodplain. The City will require a NFIP No Rise Certificate during the building permit review stage.
- The proposed new construction appears to be located within the fifty (50)-ft stream buffer from the top of bank of Shady Grove Creek. Plans will need to be amended to meet the requirements of Chapter 83.
- It appears a fire suppression system will be needed for new construction. A determination will need to be made that there is adequate water flow to this location to provide fire suppression and domestic service to the buildings.
- The plans will need to be reviewed during building permit review to meet all current code requirements for the uses proposed.

All departments reserve the right to add additional comments once all the information requested by Staff has been submitted for review. Additional department comments will also be addressed when the plans are reviewed during Final Development Plan and building permit review to meet all current code requirements for the uses proposed.

Staff is requesting the public hearing for the Request for Change of Zoning and Preliminary Development Plan remain open for the applicant to submit additional information for staff and Plan Commission review.

The following is a summary list of additional information requested by Staff in order to fully review the proposed Change of Zoning and Preliminary Development Plan:

- More detailed floor plans and/or information about the proposed floor space of the proposed commercial uses;
- Topographical site plan of proposed conditions, drawn to scale. Show proposed contours and setbacks from property lines, required stream buffer protection area and flood plain location;
- Cross-sectional view of site demonstrating proposed conditions and scale of development from grade at right of way;
- Conceptual architectural renderings with estimated height measurements for contextual review only;
- Parking demand study conducted by licensed engineer or certified planner
- Traffic impact study conducted by licensed engineer or certified planner
- Conceptual landscape plan;
- Figures on proposed lot coverage and FAR;
- Preliminary lot consolidation plat;

Michael asked for clarification on the parking agreement. Jendusa said the applicant currently owns a lot across the street and to meet their parking needs they would like have an agreement with the owner of the parking lot next door, but that is not part of the change of zoning plan.

Hunkins asked about the residential on-site parking and Jendusa said yes there will be (29) twenty-nine spaces available for the residential area. At this time, we do not know the ratio of one or two bedroom units.

Tierney asked if the development would affect the Shady Creek Nature Reserve area; Jendusa and Perry said it would not be a part of the development.

Tolan said we need more information about the proposed apartments before a parking study can be done. Perry said a parking study would give information their engineer would be able to use to do calculations for the number of units for the available parking.

Harp said the building on the plan is two-dimensional and does not take into effect any buffer requirements for building. An engineered site plan would be important to see. Perry agreed and said there are many missing pieces that will each affect other areas of this development.

Stephen Symsack, Consultant to McMillan Development LLC, 115 Gray Ave., said he is here on behalf of the McMillan Family. He said this is a work in process and realizes this is a complicated project. A mixed-use project subject to details. However, this will benefit the community in such a tremendous manner you do not expect it to come easy. It is consistent with the long-range plan and will meet the needs of the downtown Webster Core. This will meet housing needs that some would say are currently not being met.

Thirty (30) percent of the population in Webster are age 60-70 in single-family homes and want to stay in Webster. He has provided for the members a packet of information that will support

many of the concerns brought forward. Mixed use will increase values. To reuse existing structures and build infill development is sustainable development. The economic effects of condominiums include supports for other businesses, taxes for schools and libraries. We want to work with the city and residence. Symsack had a letter from Mr. McMillan, which gave family history and how they continuously give back to the community and schools through tours, classes and markets. The family and development team wants to work with Webster in every way possible. On with Webster.

Tolan asked if the residential portion would be apartments or condominiums. Symsack said it has been plotted for condominiums.

Tierney asked the asking price for the condominiums. Symsack said it depends on the square footage. Shady Creek Reserve is an asset. They are expecting many of the units to be upwards of a million (1,000,000) dollars each.

Tolan said it sounds like even the number of units is in question; Symsack said at this point yes it is a process.

Tierney asked if it would remain a nursery. Symsack said yes the concept for this came from a microbrewery in Windsor Colorado. The businesses are to be integrated with the nursery.

Hunkins asked about the height. Symsack said they are working on the elevations now.

Mueller asked if they had financing in place; Symsack said they are interviewing potential developers.

Tierney asked about the time line; Symsack said first would be replacing the green house so they can be ready for their season.

Harp said he hopes they will have the engineer's site plan for the grading which shows how the finished floor sits on the site; Symsack said yes they will have that for review.

Corey Davis, 135 W. Kirkham Ave., has concerns about the height and the view in all seasons. In addition, the pervious pavement during flash flooding, which we see, happens all the time on Kirkham.

Chemical run-off from the parking lot into the creek. Also traffic and parking congestion.

Kevin Hasting, 73 Marshall Place, lives adjacent to Rolling Ridge on both sides. Appreciates the committee and all the reports but it is not enough. His concerns are the drinking establishment hours. The nursery has been a good neighbor but all that ends at 6:00 PM. The noise from the customers and cars in the late hours.

Martha Hasting, 73 Marshall Place, is not completely opposed to the development. She supports commercial growth and development and believes it can be done in a way that is responsible and respectful. There are aspects of this plan that are surprisingly not respectful to

the surrounding neighborhood and the environment. She appreciates the City and Plan Commission members review. She has concerns about the ingress and egress on Marshall Place. She would request a two-way access on Gore as well and possibly closing the access on Marshall Place. Also, limit the hours of the establishment to hours that are compatible with the neighborhood to reduce noise.

Carl Campbell, 39 Marshall Place, Has concerns about traffic and parking. The Hasting's are the most vulnerable. He said their land was at one time McMillan property and was sub divided and the lot line was put one foot from the house. This seems a bit unusual and maybe should be looked into. In addition, there is some unusual topography for the parking lot. There are concerns about the retaining wall also.

Jill Anderson, 41 Marshall Place, most of what she has concerns about have been brought up. She has always been a customer of the nursery. She has been to the Side Project Brewery in Maplewood and they were kind enough to sit down and explain the project to her. She believes they will make a great neighbor. Her concerns are the parking lot, which is next to the Hasting house. The traffic and the environmental impact also is a concern. The condominiums do not have individual parking spaces for the units, which at the price quoted tonight should be a covered parking space. She would like the committee to get more information on the Brewery in Colorado and find out any impacts on the neighborhood from that business.

Ryan Teague, 69 Marshall Place, said he is not opposed to progress but has concerns. He wanted to address a comment posted on social media about the events Rolling Ridge had been having in the past several weeks. They stated they had canceled the latest event due to a noise complaint. However, they had actually failed to get the required permit for the events and when approached by the City to help them obtain the proper permit for the event they chose to cancel stating they canceled due to the noise complaint. This was false and misleading. They chose to publicly undermine and intimidate its neighbors. He believes this project will have a huge impact on Shady Creek and the surrounding natural areas. However, foremost is his concerns for the Hastings. They never complain about the current parking issues or trash and noise. He is asking Rolling Ridge to please consider the people whom have been your neighbors for over twenty (20) years and to preserve the existing green space and buffers. In addition, please do not ask for a five (5) story massive building in their back yard.

Natalie Teague, 69 Marshall Place, spoke about the historic buildings in the area. We already have flooding along Kirkham and Deer Creek during heavy rains. She has spoken to some of the homeowners about the rising cost of their flood insurance. Moreover, how this development could create more flooding. She urges Rolling Ridge rework the plan or quit all together.

Ruth Lee, 450 E. Lockwood Ave., is concerned about the lack of affordable housing in Webster Groves. After reviewing the city's list of items of concern, she noted the lack of information about the residential units. These seem to be high- end condominium units. She would like to see some options for affordable housing incorporated into the zoning review process.

Adam Eaton, 33 Marshall Place, said he respects commercial property owners and their rights to continue to do business on their property. He also wants to see the community thrive. His concerns are the (5) five story residential building which is out of scale for the area. Also the water run-off and environmental issue. Parking and access has always been a concern since many of our older homes do not have a garage and we park on the street. Many of the neighbors have donated time and money to preserve the Shady Creek area, Rolling Ridge uses the area to dump materials. Was this proposal done in haste and to intimidate their neighbors? Do not approve until these concerns have been addressed.

Dave Sanders, 418 W. Jackson, said this project or something similar needs to happen in the area. Due to the limited commercial space in Webster, he applauds anyone who can take the area and develop it further. The problem with the zoning process is it is not a discussion it a presentation and a response over and over. He hopes the owners and neighbors can sit down and have a dialogue. All issues are valid. The McMillians have history in this neighborhood.

Tara McCarthy, 72 Marshall Place, grew up in Webster Groves and played in Shady Creek. Many environmental groups are working to preserve the Shady Creek this project has nothing to do with preservation. She never imagined that Rolling Ridge would come up with plans to open a bar that is open to 1:00 AM along with a 36-unit apartment complex across the street from our home. She appreciates the McMillan family wanting to expand their business but at what cost. The families on Marshall Place have always been supportive, cooperative, and tolerant neighbors to Rolling Ridge and I kindly ask they offer us the same consideration.

Sara Smith 11 Marshall Place, moved here to enjoy the ability to walk to shops and restaurants in the small community. We knew we would hear traffic from Elm Ave., the train, and the likely hood that the businesses at the end of the street may change. We have been hoping for something new to compliment what is already there. Change can be challenging. She believes there is a plan that can benefit the community. She expects more from the developer, wants more information, and trusts the city and staff to see that is provided. The issue of growth. We can no longer approach a development in our community as having a negative impact. We need to change in order to provide funds for the community and attract people whom want to live here.

Chris Earp, 72 Marshall Place, is not against development in Webster Groves. Reusing and existing building is always better. He is concerned about the scale of the (5) five-story building is not in character with the adjacent historic homes. Why are they proposing housing, we hear about the need for more housing however, St. Louis City and County have had negative populations growth since 2013. Webster has had negative population growth for the last four years.

Janet Noble, 333 N. Gore Ave., says traffic is already a concern there are morning she cannot get out of her driveway in the traffic. Marshall is crowded. There will be noise with the brewery. Let us keep the greenspace. We need lower and middle class income housing; \$600,000 is not needed in Webster Groves. We already have five coffee shops and to many microbreweries.

Patrick Finnegan, 55 Marshall Place, is concerned about the safety issues with traffic on Marshall Place.

Louis Bosso, 25 Marshall Place, is worried about the traffic on the street. Developers want to build as high as they can and if you look at the topo survey five (5) stories is too tall for that area. He believes this is a single-family community and he likes it the way it is.

Scott Heitland, 46 Marshall Place, spoke about the water problems created years ago and some more recently with new development when lots are cleared and divided. He has had communication from the city and MSD as long ago as 2005 about the water issues, to date no actions been taken. Per the maps, it appears there are no storm water pipes on our street and none with the proposed construction. Without adequate planning, we will be the ones to suffer.

Mary Schultz, Schultz & Associates, representing several residents of Marshall Place, Jill Gillibrand of 56 Marshall Place and Karen Ruecker of 33 Marshall Place. Has submitted additional information for the commission members to review. The major concerns are density, height and too many uses. This will adversely affect the neighborhood.

David Streeter, 34 Marshall Place, says Rolling Ridge has always been a good neighbor for many years. Marshall Place is a cut through for people wanting to avoid the railroad as well as parking for Schaefer Auto Body. Not a good proposal for the environment. Traffic is a major issue for safety vehicles. The city has done a great job on the research but there are no answers for us. We need more information.

Katie Bosso, 25 Marshall Place, shares the enthusiasm for the development and many of the concerns all have shared tonight. Traffic already is an issue on our street and she is concerned about the children walking to school.

Clark Hotaling, 118 W. Cedar Ave., thanked the McMillians for what they have done in the past and for investing in the future. Also for all the thorough research by the city. Said he is very excited about the project, but also understands the concerns for all the residents. They can work together.

Angela Burgess, 68 Marshall Place, is not opposed to the project but has concerns. It is already a busy street. Noise from a bar open to 1:30 AM causes concerns. Privacy from a (5) five story building as she lives across the street is an issue. Thanks to all for listening to our concerns.

Tolan said this would be a process for review. Perry said the next meeting would be on November 5, 2018.

Tolan asked for a motion to hold the meeting open until November 5, 2018. Tierney made a motion. Michael seconded the motion. Harp, Hunkins, Michael, Mueller, Tierney and Tolan all voted to hold the meeting open. Smith abstained from the vote.

5. PLATS AND SITE PLANS

There was none.

6. ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR SESSION

Tolan asked for a motion to close the regular session. Harp made a motion. Michael seconded the motion. All in favor the motion passed 7-0.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

- a) : **18-PC-17 Rolling Ridge:** An application by McMillian Development LLC for a Change of Zoning from "D" Commercial to "PC" Planned Commercial and to consider a Preliminary Development Plan utilizing existing structures and a proposed new multiple family residential building on an approximately 1.59 acre tract of land located at 60 N. Gore Avenue; 60 A N. Gore Avenue and 75 Marshall Place DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Mueller asked if we are expecting more information for the November 5, 2018 meeting. Perry said yes the applicant is already aware of the date, and has been continuing to address issues as they come up. It is important to get the date on record so that the public is aware they can come, get more information, and speak.

7. OTHER BUSINESS:

Perry said they do have other issues that will need to come before them on a future agenda such as group homes, home occupations and kennels. On City Council tomorrow will be the Gerber Chapel replacement and the CUP for the Church.

- 8. NEXT REGULAR MEETING:** November 5, 2018.

5. ADJOURNMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE

Tolan asked for a motion to adjourn. Tierney made a motion. Mueller seconded the motion. All in favor motion passed 7-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:45.