

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
AGENDA
TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2018
7:00 P.M.**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:**
- 2. ROLL CALL:**
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - 1. Planning & Zoning Meeting – January 9, 2018**
- 4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
 - 1. PZ2018-2: The applicant is seeking approval of a Lot Consolidation Subdivision Plat, proposing to combine five existing tracts of property into one lot of 15.162 acres. The five existing tracts are described as Part of Tracts 15-19 Allenton Acres, in Section 8, US Survey 148 Township 43 North, St. Louis County, MO and are generally located at 18777 US Highway 66, 5882 Hill View Drive, 5844 Hill View Drive, 5840 Hill View Drive and 5836 Hill View Drive, Pacific, MO. ADB Companies, applicant**
 - 2. PZ2018-3: The applicant is seeking a PUD-PDM zoning approval for development of an approximate 15-acre site (as described in the proposed Lot Consolidation Plat above) for light industrial and office uses. The property is located at 18777 U.S. Highway 66 and is generally bounded by Eureka Fire Protection District property to the east, Hill View Drive to the west, and residential property to the north. The project includes construction of an approximate 20,370 square foot office building, an approximate 26,400 square foot maintenance building, parking area improvements, storm water detention facilities, fenced outside storage, and other improvements. ADB Companies, applicant.**
 - 3. PZ2018-4: A Public Hearing to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit for retail firearms sales to be located at 115 W. St. Louis Street. AX2 Sporting Arms LLC, applicant**
- 5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION-SPEAKER CARDS**

6. NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. PZ2018-2: Consideration of a Consolidation Subdivision Plat of Five lots into one lot located at 18777 U.S. Highway 66. ADB Companies, applicant.**
- 2. PZ2018-3: Consideration of a Planned Unit Development- Planned District Manufacturing for construction of an office building and a maintenance building for light industrial to be located at 18777 U.S. Highway 66. ADB Companies, applicant**
- 3. PZ2018-4: Consideration of a Conditional Use application for retail firearms sales to be located at 115 W. Louis Street. AX2 Sporting Arms LLC, applicant.**

7. OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. PZ2017-17: Consideration of a Planned Unit Development- Planned District Residential (PUD-PDR) to be located at 2305 Old Gray Summit Road. Stonebridge Custom Homes, applicant.**

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. BOARD OF ALDERMEN

B. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

9. OTHER BUSINESS:

10. ADJOURNMENT

This Meeting is Open To The Public

Note: The Planning and Zoning Commission will consider and act upon these matters listed above and any such others as may be presented at the meeting and determined appropriate for discussion at that time.

**CITY OF PACIFIC
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
AT THE PACIFIC CITY HALL, 300 HOVEN DRIVE
JANUARY 9, 2018**

The Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting was called to order by Chairman Bruns at 7:02 P.M. on January 9, 2018, at Pacific City Hall, 300 Hoven Drive, Pacific, Missouri.

The roll call was taken with the following results:

PRESENT

Chairman Bruns
Alderman Chlebowski
Commissioner Miles
Commissioner Koelling
Commissioner Graham
Commissioner Bates
Commissioner Eversmeyer

ABSENT

Commissioner Smith

Administrator Steve Roth, Attorney Lumley, and Rae Cowsert were also in attendance

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Planning & Zoning Meeting – December 12, 2017

A motion was made by Alderman Chlebowski and seconded by Commissioner Miles to approve the minutes of the December 12, 2017 Regular Planning and Zoning Meeting. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. PZ2018-01: A Public Hearing to consider an application for approval of a Subdivision Plat for property generally located at 419 E. Orleans Street, Pacific, MO. The applicant is proposing to divide an approximate 54-acre tract into two parcels: Parcel A, 25.03 acres and Parcel B, 28.99 acres. Great Rivers Greenway, applicant, on behalf of Louis E. and Barbara J. Brundick, owner.**

Chairman Bruns introduced the public hearing and asked if it was posted. Rae Cowsert stated it had been posted. Chairman Bruns asked Administrator Roth for the staff report. Administrator Roth presented the staff report and stated the property in question is entirely located in St. Louis County. The property is for the most part vacant land with one residence located at 419 E. Orleans Street. Administrator Roth stated as he understands it, the south parcel after the split would be sold to Green Rivers Greenway to be added to property they already own to be used for future trail development and park use. He also stated there is no public access to Lot B (south parcel) in the proposal. It appears there could be access at Congress Street across Lot A to Lot B. There are also no current city utilities on Lot B. Attorney Lumley stated if waivers were granted they would only be for the current proposed use. Any other use in the future would require another hearing before Planning and Zoning. Doug Marshall, the consultant for Green Rivers Greenway, stated the current plan is to hold the lot as green space. Commissioner Eversmeyer stated his concern about the lot being land locked and there being no current proposal for access at this time. Mr. Marshall stated there could be access from the south since GRG already owns the adjacent property to this lot. The Board stated again that any waivers would be solely for the current proposed use and if sold the process would have to start all over. There being no further comments or questions, Chairman Bruns closed the public hearing.

2. PZ2017-17: A Public Hearing to consider an application for a Planned Unit Development-Planned District Residential (PUD-PDR) to be located at 2305 Old Gray Summit Road for construction of a new subdivision. Stonebridge Custom Homes, applicant.

Chairman Bruns introduced the public hearing and asked if it was posted. Rae Cowsert stated it had been posted. Chairman Bruns asked Administrator Roth for the staff report. Administrator Roth stated the applicant came before the Board of Aldermen at the January 3 board meeting for a voluntary annexation of this property. Public Water District #3 would be the water provider with the City providing the sewer. The proposed subdivision is to have 131 lots with varying lot sizes throughout the development. Administrator Roth stated the Comprehensive Plan would support this development. The current proposal is showing 40 foot ride of way with 26 feet pavement. The city code requires 50 foot ride of ways with a minimum of 30 foot pavement. Administrator Roth also stated they are proposing a 6 foot side set back. The city code is 10 foot side setbacks. This property on the Future Land Use Map was zoned for residential.

Gene Fribis, 1929 Richardson Road, is the engineer for the proposed project. Mr. Fribis talked about the proposed subdivision and stated Mike and Rob Lawless were also in attendance. Mr. Fribis stated there are no neighbors to the west of the development. He stated the lot depths proposed in this subdivision are deeper than the lots in Ridge Meadows. There are plans to make some improvements to Old Gray Summit Road. They have also got in the plans for a pool and cabana in the front of the subdivision. They are planning to leave some common ground in the front and also on the north side of property to keep a distance between homes and railroad tracks. Mr. Fribis stated this subdivision was laid out similar to what is being built in the St. Louis area. Mr. Fribis said they have found the wider the street the faster cars will drive. In regard to the 6 foot side setbacks, he stated this is to save ground and get more lots in the development. Mr. Fribis stated the current trend is for smaller lot sizes. They plan to put sidewalks on both sides of the streets inside of the ride of way. There would be trees planted but

they will be put in the front of the lots. Mr. Fribis feels with the screenings this would be a good development. Commissioner Graham asked about a detention area for the water. Mr. Fribis stated there is a detention area in the back (north side) of the subdivision for the water. Alderman Chlebowski asked how many lots would be lost if there was an 8 foot side setback. He also asked if having wider streets would affect the number of lots. Mr. Fribis stated it would not affect the number of lots. Mike Lawless with Stonebridge Custom Homes stated if the wider streets are required it would push the homes farther back on the lots. Mr. Lawless stated the homes in Westlake Subdivision are selling from \$150,000 to \$250,000. There were approximately 20 plus homes sold in Westlake this past year. He feels there is a market here but is cautious. Chairman Bruns asked how big the homes would be. Mr. Lawless stated they would be 1,400 square feet to 1,600 square feet with the largest house being approximately 2,800 square feet. Commissioner Bates asked what the target price would be for these homes. Mr. Lawless stated probably between \$200,000 and \$250,000. There would be ranch styles as well as 2-story homes. Mr. Lawless stated they plan to have 8 to 12 different styles. Commissioner Eversmeyer stated the reason for the 10 foot setback requirement was so people would have access to get equipment to the back yard if they wanted to construct anything. Commissioner Eversmeyer also stated Old Gray Summit Road would have to be improved to meet the city road. Administrator Roth also stated Old Gray Summit Road would have to be improved. Commissioner Koelling asked what traffic would be like. Administrator Roth stated there has not been a traffic study done at this time. He feels Old Gray Summit Road would be sufficient. Commissioner Bates stated he has always been a supporter of 30 foot pavement and 10 foot side setbacks. Commissioner Bates also questioned whether the islands in the entrance would hinder emergency vehicles. Administrator Roth stated the city does not have any requirements for entrances but the fire department does. Commissioner Eversmeyer stated he knows they had success with Silver Lakes. He also asked about green space or common ground in development. Mr. Lawless the lots which back up to Ridge Meadows are very deep and have plenty of room in the back yard for kids to play. Mr. Lawless feels this will be a great subdivision for kids. He stated they would not be here if they didn't believe in the project. Chairman Bruns stated all of the current subdivisions have 10 foot side setbacks and 30 foot pavements. Commissioner Bates stated he likes the various sizes of the lots in the plan. Commissioner Koelling asked if there would be a buffer along Ridge Meadows. Mr. Lawless stated there are no plans for a buffer but the lots are deep and the homes would be built towards the front of the lots. Commissioner Eversmeyer asked about the maintenance of the lots until all homes are built. Mr. Lawless stated they would not be putting all of the lots down at same time. Chairman Bruns asked about the grading and Mr. Lawless stated they plan to follow the lay of the land.

Robert Tucker, 909 Sierra Ridge, Pacific, MO. Mr. Tucker is concerned about the lot sizes and sizes of the homes and how it will affect his home. Chairman Bruns commented there would be a variety of lot sizes and homes. Mr. Tucker stated he emailed Mr. Lawless and did not receive a reply.

Ben King, 515 Sierra Ridge, Pacific, MO. Mr. King stated he is not opposed to any development. He stated he does not want to see mud pits behind his house. He commented to the developer to error on the side of caution in regard to the lots which back up to the railroad tracks.

Bill Devine, 1966 Old Gray Summit Road, Pacific, MO. Mr. Devine stated he has lived here 40 years and Old Gray Summit would have to be improved. He stated there is no compaction under it. He stated he is not against the development but feels the road should be improved before the development starts.

Dennis Oliver, 905 Sierra Ridge Avenue, Pacific, MO. Mr. Oliver stated he supports the development. His main concern is Old Gray Summit Road improvements.

Mike Durko, 2403 Smokey Mountain Road, Pacific, MO. Mr. Durko voiced his concern about Old Gray Summit Road and how the construction traffic will affect it.

Michael Woodbright, 701 Sierra Ridge Avenue, Pacific, MO. Mr. Woodbright asked about the utility easement between Ridge Meadows and the new development. He also voiced some concern about any water run off which might affect his property.

Mike Venable, 527 Sierra Ridge Avenue, Pacific, MO. Mr. Venable said he has lived there for several years and has looked at nothing but woods. He would like to see a buffer between the two subdivisions.

Stephen Flannery III, 305 W. Pacific Street, Pacific, MO. Mr. Flannery stated he is a realtor in town and is glad to see what is happening. He stated the movement down the 44 corridor is here. Pacific for a long time was leading the residential market, but the leader is Union. He stated there is currently a shortage of homes. If there are more rooftops, there will be more taxes, and the community will grow. Pacific will prosper. We just have to make sure to do it correctly in the process.

Mr. Lawless stated they did not intend to give the impression they would build small homes. We will build what is needed. He also stated the market is not demanding a 10 foot setback. If the 10 foot setback is required, it will restrict the size of the homes that can be built. Mr. Lawless stated there is a lot of competition in the industry and they look forward to being a part of the competition. Commissioner Graham stated the mix of the types of homes, sizes and lot sizes compliments the subdivision. He thanked them for considering that. Chairman Bruns asked Administrator Roth the verify the setbacks required in the surrounding areas. Chairman Bruns closed the public hearing.

SPEAKER CARDS

The speakers were included in the public hearing comments.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. PZ2018-01: Consideration of an application for approval of a Subdivision Plat for property generally located at 419 E. Orleans Street, Pacific, MO. Great Rivers Greenway, applicant, on behalf of Louis E. and Barbara J. Brundick, owner.**

Commissioner Bates stated he would be abstaining from the vote. A motion was made by Alderman Chlebowski and seconded by Commissioner Eversmeyer to approve the application as proposed with the condition Parcel B be used for public use only and GRG will replat this parcel to be included with the previous acquired parcels. A vote was taken with the following results: Yays, Commissioner Graham, Commissioner Eversmeyer, Chairman Bruns, Alderman Chlebowski, Commissioner Miles,

Commissioner Koelling; Nays, none; Abstain, Commissioner Bates. The motion was approved 6-0 and will be presented to the Board of Aldermen on January 16, 2018.

2. PZ2017-17: Consideration of a Planned Unit Development-Planned District Residential (PUD-PDR) to be located at 2305 Old Gray Summit Road. Stonebridge Custom Homes, applicant.

Alderman Chlebowski stated he would like to see 30 foot pavement but is not concerned with the 10 foot side setback between houses. He would also like to see Old Gray Summit Road improved after construction. Commissioner Koelling stated they could consider 28 foot pavement. Chairman Bruns stated it is rational for 10 foot setbacks for easy access to backyard without having to cross on neighbors' property. Mr. Lawless stated they have built a lot of homes with a 6 foot setback on side yards and have not had any issues.

A motion was made by Commissioner Eversmeyer and seconded by Alderman Chlebowski to table the vote until the next meeting on January 23, 2018. A voice vote was taken with the motion being approved unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

None

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Board of Aldermen

Alderman Chlebowski stated the only thing he had to report was the Board approved the Hedgeapple Development application.

B. Board of Adjustment

There are currently two Variance applications which will be scheduled for the end of January.

OTHER BUSINESS

Administrator Roth stated there is a Subdivision and Planned Unit Development application from ADB Company which will be on the agenda for the January 23 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Bruns stating there being no further discussion asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion was made by Alderman Chlebowski and seconded by Commissioner Graham. A voice vote was taken and the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Jerry Eversmeyer, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

Steve Roth
City Administrator

636-271-0500 ext. 213
sroth@pacificmissouri.com

January 19, 2018

Dear Planning and Zoning Commission members,

The following constitutes my staff report for the January 23 meeting.

1. ADB Companies, PUD Site development plan; Lot Consolidation Subdivision Plat

Applicant: Grimes Consulting, on behalf of Progress Partners LLC, c/o ADB Companies

Address: 18777 US Highway 66

Current zoning: M-1

Proposed zoning: M-1

Background

ADB Companies is proposing to develop an approximate 15-acre site for use as office, maintenance / repair and outside storage. The property was annexed into the City in 2017 and was zoned M-1 Light Industrial. The property borders Eureka Fire Protection District and Missouri Eastern Correctional Center property to the east, residential property to the north, Hill View Drive (St. Louis County road) and residential property to the west, and an existing commercial site (Airgas) to the southwest.

The company is seeking approval of a Subdivision Plat and Development Plan for the property. The property is now comprised of five separate parcels, which are proposed to be combined into one lot of 15.162 acres. The Development Plan proposes two buildings—a two-story office building fronting Route 66, and a one-story maintenance building to the rear of the office building. The balance of the site is proposed for employee parking and outside storage uses.

Subdivision Plat review

The plat consolidates five existing parcels into one new lot. The resulting lot is 15.162 acres and meets or exceeds the M-1 district dimensional requirements. The plat provides utility easements along the front, side and rear boundaries. The plat as presented dedicates a 30-ft storm water drainage easement along a small creek on the southwest corner of the property. This is intended to meet the City requirement as provided for in Section 410.075.D.2. We would want to review this requirement and the easement as proposed prior to recommending action on the final plat. In other respects the plat is in substantial conformance with the City's Land Subdivision Requirements and we would respectfully request approval.

Site Development Plan review

The major features of the plan are as follows: Construction of a two-story office building fronting Route 66; construction of a maintenance building to the rear of the office building; construction of visitor and employee parking in two locations; construction of a wet detention pond at the immediate front of the property; and construction of a fenced outside storage yard behind the two proposed buildings.

The office building is proposed to be accessed off Route 66; the employee parking area is proposed to be accessed off Hill View Drive. A landscaped berm and sight-proof fence is proposed around the perimeter of the site proposed for use as outside storage. The project includes a 5-ft wide sidewalk around the perimeter of the storage yard; this is for employee uses.

Site data and other information can be found on the attached checklist. The project meets or exceeds development plan requirements in most areas; exceptions are noted on the checklist and discussed in further detail below.

Utilities

The site is not currently served by a public water supply. City sewer is available along the Route 66 frontage. The City has been in discussions with ADB over the water issue; more information on this topic will be presented at the meeting.

Storm water

The storm water plan provides underground detention in the outside storage yard, and the wet detention pond at the front of the property. These areas both drain into an existing creek on the site. The project engineer will provide detailed plans and calculations for City review prior to final approval.

Access

The initial plan for site access was for three accesses off Route 66; two for the main office building and one for the employee parking area. However it is my understanding that MoDOT would not approve the employee parking access, given its close proximity to Hill View Drive and an existing guardrail east of the employee parking. Thus the plan proposes the employee entrance off Hill View Drive, a public right-of-way maintained by St. Louis County. It is my understanding that the County has given preliminary approval to the Hill View Drive entrance as shown.

The Hill View Drive access is not ideal but would appear to have limited impact on traffic congestion, given the use for employee parking only. Employees typically would access the area in the morning and then leave in the afternoon or evening, so use of Hill View Drive would be limited to those time periods. From a plan review standpoint, I would have no particular objection to use of Hill View Drive to access the site, especially given the County's preliminary approval. However it should be noted that comments made during the initial annexation and zoning process indicated that access would be reserved for Route 66 only.

Landscaping and screening

The development plan as noted previously generally meets or exceeds the City's requirements. The landscaping and screening plan in particular exceeds requirements, and provides a high level of buffering against the adjacent residential uses. The plan proposes an 8-ft sight proof fence against the adjacent residential properties (code requirement is 6-ft fence), with the additional buffer of a landscaped berm, which is not a specific code requirement. The finished grade of the site is significantly lower in elevation than the finished berm height, which provides for further buffering. I would defer to the applicant presentation for further discussion on this aspect of the plan. However it appears that the plan in total provides excellent screening and buffering of the site, which again meets or exceeds the City code requirements.

Building construction

The building construction is subject to the requirements in Section 400.222, Standards for Buildings on Major Roadways and Downtown. The exterior office building is constructed of concrete panels and glass and is in conformance with the requirements. The maintenance building is more than 500 feet from the Route 66 centerline and thus is not subject to this code provision.

Site lighting

The site lighting plan was provided on January 19, and I have not had time to review. I would request the applicant provide an overview of the lighting plan at the meeting.

Parking

The required parking spaces were calculated based on the provisions of 400.235.A.2.A. The parking requirement for the office building is 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet, or 105 spaces. The maintenance building calculation was based on the "Service stations, repair shops" provision; this is open to interpretation and reasonably could be interpreted differently to allow for a less stringent requirement. However upon discussion with the project engineer it is my understanding the owner has requested the parking space allotment as shown and so we would accept this as well.

Please note that the plan as presented does not meet City requirements in two areas: No vertical curbing around the parking areas (400.235.A.5.A.1), and no landscaping of the parking lot interiors (400.230.B.3). These can be discussion items at the meeting. The engineer has suggested an asphalt curbing, if required, around the parking lot perimeter. With respect to interior landscaping of parking areas, I have not found many examples of this at other sites in the City, so it does not appear this is a requirement that has been commonly imposed. The proposed landscaping and water feature adjacent to the front parking area are nice amenities that I feel adequately "dress up" the site. I would not be inclined to impose the interior parking landscaping requirement.

Summary / recommendation

The Development Plan as presented is in substantial compliance with most all aspects of the City's Zoning Code, with two exceptions as noted, both related to parking. The provision of water service remains to be worked out but should not be an impediment to the development plan approval at this time. The project in total I feel is a high value project that would be a welcome addition to the City. The project site is located between Route 66 uses that are commercial, institutional and light industrial in nature, and complement those existing uses. The project provides excellent landscaping and screening amenities to buffer against the adjacent and nearby residential properties. The employee parking access off Hill View Drive is not ideal but would appear to be of limited impact to the surrounding area. In summary I feel this is a high value project that complements the existing development along Route 66, and provides strong buffers against the adjacent residential uses, and would respectfully request approval.

2. Conditional Use Permit application, AX2 Firearms

Applicant: Michael Callahan, dba AX2 Sporting Arms, LLC

Owner: Laura Noonan Trust, Terry Ruyle, trustee

Address: 115 W. St. Louis Street

Current Zoning: C-1 Downtown Commercial

Background

The applicant is proposing to open a store offering retail firearms sales in a building located at 115 W. St. Louis. The building is immediately adjacent to the Nettie Suze Home Décor shop to the east and Scenic Regional Library Branch to the west. Firearms sales are not specifically listed as a permitted use in C-1 zones, nor are firearms sales specifically listed in the list of uses requiring conditional use permits. Thus the zoning code is somewhat silent on such use. In our judgment the proposed use is similar in character to other uses requiring a CUP (Section 400.120. C) and thus we determined that this proposed use is also subject to a CUP.

CUP standards

The standards for conditional use permit approval are found in Section 405.040.B. The Commission shall not recommend approval of a CUP unless the request:

1. Complies with all applicable provisions of the Land Use code
2. At the specific location will contribute to and promote the community welfare or convenience;
3. Will not cause injury to the value of neighboring property and will not create a nuisance;
4. Is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning district provisions;
5. Will provide, if applicable, off-street parking and loading areas in accordance with the standards contained in this Title;
6. Will provide, if applicable, erosion control and on-site stormwater detention in accordance with the standards contained in this Title; and
7. Will not substantially increase traffic congestion and noise.

Discussion / recommendation

It is a matter of some subjectivity if the proposed use meets the CUP criteria as established above, and in particular the requirements that the use "will contribute to and promote the community welfare or convenience" and that the use "will not cause injury to the value of neighboring property..." In this regard I would defer to comments made during the Public Hearing before making any judgments on these points.

With respect to the Comprehensive Plan, the Plan makes downtown revitalization a clear goal. Section 3.5, Objective 1, states: "Reestablish Downtown Pacific as an economically thriving district, cultural / historical destination, entertainment attraction and retail center by recruiting new businesses that fill niche markets." As an implementation strategy, the plan further states (Objective, Paragraph 1): "Create a walkable, outdoor shopping district downtown with integrated shops offering unique, high quality merchandise, cultural attractions, art galleries, entertainment and restaurants..." The complete section discussing downtown is included as an attachment to this report.

The Commission then should consider if a retail firearms sales use "is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan..." as required in the CUP standards. One could certainly argue that it is not, given the Plan language cited above. However, to be fair, certain uses that are now permitted by right in the C-1 zoning district could also be "inconsistent" with the Plan language, including "Self-service laundry, Household appliance sales and repairs, Lawn equipment sales and service" and others. Further, many of the C-1 uses now subject to a CUP would also be considered "inconsistent."

There has been some discussion through the Missouri Main Street planning process for new zoning district provisions related to downtown. I have not been involved in those discussions directly but it would appear that the current downtown zoning does not reflect the direction of the Comprehensive Plan, nor likely the guidance of the Main Street program. This is an area the City likely will need to address going forward.

With respect to the proposed use in question, in my opinion retail firearms sales is a use better suited for the C-2 Arterial Commercial zoning district. The direction of the Comprehensive Plan indicates a preference for cultural attractions, entertainment, restaurants, niche retail and similar uses in the downtown area. It is a question for the Commission then if the proposed use meets that criteria. As always, I would advise hearing the public comment on this proposal before making any final determinations.

3. Old Business, Stonebridge Subdivision

This proposal is up for further discussion at the Jan. 23 meeting. Scott Waggoner, building inspector, researched area dimensional requirements; a copy is with this report. I have played "phone tag" with the developer and to date have not had further discussion since the Jan. 9 meeting.

The two primary points of discussion from the first meeting related to side yard setbacks and street widths. The developer has proposed 6-ft side yard setbacks and 26-ft street width. The nearby Ridge Meadows and Silver Lakes developments each have 30-ft street widths and 10-ft side yards.

As I noted at the Jan. 9 meeting, the Fire Code minimum street width is 26-ft, with one side no parking. As noted on the attached report, 26-ft is the St. Louis County minimum, and 26-ft is also used in Eureka. I do not have personal experience with 26-ft street widths, though I am familiar with 28-ft and I have seen that dimension work quite well. I am personally a little wary of 26-ft but accept that it is the minimum code requirement and apparently has been used in other communities with success.

With respect to side yard setbacks, 6-ft is not uncommon. While Eureka's standard zoning code has a 10-ft side yard, it's my understanding the more recent developments have been planned unit developments with side yards as narrow as 5-ft, which would be the minimum allowed under Fire Code.

There's no question that the trend in suburban development in recent years has been toward higher density and smaller street widths. This appears to be a function both of costs of development and market demand. The Comprehensive Plan does not have detailed guidance on this point, but in general does seem to support this type of development. Clearly there is not guidance in the Comprehensive Plan toward larger lot sizes and lesser densities.

My feeling is that the street width question relates not only to planning but also public safety. In this respect I would favor at least a 28-ft street width. The 26-ft width while a minimum by Fire Code is only that, a minimum. I feel the little extra width would help alleviate public safety concerns and essentially be a compromise between the existing 30-ft code requirement and the developer's 26-ft request.

With respect to side yards, this is primarily a planning question and in this regard I would tend to defer to the developer's request. The 10-ft requirement currently in place is OK with 80-ft minimum lot widths, but given the 70-ft (and less) lot widths proposed in Stonebridge, I would agree that the 10-ft side yards generally don't work. Given the varying lot widths proposed in Stonebridge, with the 6-ft side yard we would expect to see a mix of actual widths between houses, and not row upon row of houses stacked on top of each other. If the Commission is not comfortable with 6-ft, I would suggest considering at minimum an 8-ft side yard. This again may represent a compromise between the City's current requirement and the developer's request.

As always, if you have questions or need further information please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Roth
City Administrator

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------------|-----------|
| City of Pacific | | | |
| PUD checklist | | | |
| | | | |
| Applicant | ADB Companies | | |
| Project Title | ADB - Pacific | | |
| Legal Description | Part of Tracts 15-19 Allenton Acres St Louis County | | |
| Parcel ID | 30Y3200055 | | |
| Zoning | M-1 | | |
| Permitted use? | Yes | | |
| Zoning District Dimensional Requirements | Requirement | Yes | No |
| Minimum Lot Area | 10000 sf | 15.162 acres | |
| Minimum Lot Width | 50 ft | Yes | |
| Minimum Lot depth | 100 ft | Yes | |
| Maximum site coverage | <85% | Yes; 80% | |
| Front setback | 25 ft | Yes | |
| Side setback | 0 ft | Yes | |
| Rear setback | 0 ft | Yes | |
| Maximum height | 3 stories / 50 ft | 2 stories, 36'10" high | |
| Minimum floor area | None | Yes | |
| Performance standards | Smoke / noise / odor | Yes | |
| Plan submittal requirements | | | |
| Applicant / owner signatures | Yes | | |
| 15 copies | Yes | | |
| All necessary data / drawings | Yes | | |
| Professional seal | Yes | | |
| Location map | Yes | | |
| Current / proposed zoning | Yes | | |
| Title block | Yes | | |
| Proposed use / setbacks | Yes | | |
| Location and size of building | Yes | | |
| Legal description/ area | Yes | | |
| Height / stories | Yes | | |
| Building elevations | Yes | | |
| Easements | Yes | | |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Utilities | Sanitary yes; water contingent | | |
| Sanitary / storm | Yes | | |
| Contour lines / floodplain | Yes | | |
| Site coverage data | Yes | | |
| Floor area to site area | Yes | | |
| Parking space data | Yes | | |
| Light poles / trash enclosures | Yes | | |
| Landscaping | Yes | | |
| Other agency approvals | MoDOT / Eureka Fire | | |
| Outboundary | Yes | | |
| Building data | Yes | | |
| Tree locations | Yes | | |
| Cross sections / FFE | Yes | | |
| Ingress / egress | Yes | | |
| Sanitary / storm plan | Yes; need storm calcs | | |
| Water source | Contingent | | |
| Other information as requested | Yes | | |
| All required fees | Yes | | |
| Supplemental regulations | | | |
| Accessory utility uses and facilities compliance | Not shown | | |
| Sanitary sewers | Yes | | |
| Storm drainage | Need calcs | | |
| Minimum design / development standards | | | |
| Standards for buildings on major roadways and downtown | Yes | | |
| Minimum exterior building material standards | Yes | | |
| Prohibited building materials | No | | |
| Landscaping and screening | Yes | | |
| Off-street parking and loading requirements | | | |
| Hard surface | Yes; need plan detail | | |
| Schedule compliance | Yes | | |
| Required spaces | 255 | | |
| Provided spaces | 262 | | |
| Dimensional requirements | OK | | |
| Stall depth | 19 | | |
| Aisle width | 24 | | |
| Parking construction standards compliance | | | |
| 8 inch rock / 2 inch asphalt | Need detail | | |
| Straight back / vertical curbing | Need detail | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Striping | Yes | | |
| 10-ft front setback | Yes | | |
| 10-ft side and rear (if applicable) | Yes | | |
| Loading compliance | Yes | | |
| Accessible spaces compliance | Yes | | |

Single Family, 8,000 to 10,000 sf

| | Minimum Lot Width | Front Yard Set Back | Side Yard Set Back | Rear Yard Set Back | Minimum Street Width | Lot Coverage Area | Other / notes |
|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Pacific | 10K/80ft 7.5K/80ft | 10K/25ft 7.5K/25ft | 10K/12ft 7.5K/10ft | 10K/20ft 7.5K/20ft | | 30% Maximum | 2 Story or 40ft maximum hgt. |
| Eureka | 10K/80ft 8.5K/70ft | 10K/30ft 8.5K/30ft | 10K/10ft 8.5K/10ft | 10K/25ft 8.5K/25ft | St. Louis Co. Hwy & Traffic | | 2.5 Story or 35ft maximum hgt. |
| Wildwood | 10K/60ft 7.5K/50ft | 10K/20ft 7.5K/20ft | 10K/10ft 7.5K/10ft | 10K/00ft 7.5K/30ft | | | 3 Story or 35ft maximum hgt. |
| Union | 10K/80 ft 7.5/65ft | 10K/50ft 7.5K/25ft | 10K/40ft 7.5K/10% of lot width not < 8ft | 10K/20ft 7.5K/20% of lot depth not < 25ft | | | |
| Washington | 10K/70ft 7.5K/60ft | 10K/25ft 7.5K/25ft | 10K/6ft 7.5K/6ft | 10K/25ft 7.5K/25ft | | 10K/ 25% max 7.5K/30% max | 2.5 Story or 35ft maximum hgt. |
| St. Louis County | 10K/70ft 7.5K/60ft | 10K/20ft 7.5K/20ft | 10K/8ft 7.5K/6ft | 10K/15ft 7.5K/15ft | minor 26ft collector 38ft | | 3 Story or 45ft maximum hgt. |
| Franklin County | | | | | | | |
| Jefferson County | 10K/50ft 7K/50ft | 10K/25ft 7K/25ft | 10K/6ft 7K/6ft | 10K/30ft 7K/30ft | | | |

Single Family, 10,000 to 12,000 sf

| | Minimum Lot Width | Front Yard Set Back | Side Yard Set Back | Rear Yard Set Back | Minimum Street Width | Lot Coverage Area | Other / notes |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Pacific | 14K/100ft 12K/90ft | 14K/25ft 12K/25ft | 14K/10ft 12K/12ft | 14K/20ft 12K/20ft | | 30% Maximum | 2 Story or 40ft maximum hgt. |
| Eureka | 15K/100ft | 15K/30ft | 15K/10ft | 15K/20ft | St. Louis Co. Hwy & Traffic | | 2.5 Story or 35ft maximum hgt. |
| Wildwood | 15K/70ft | 15K/25ft | 15K/10ft | 15K/30ft | | | 3 Story or 35ft maximum hgt. |
| Union | 12K/65ft | 12K/35ft | 12K/10% of lot width | 12K/20% of lot depth not < 25ft | | | 35ft max or 3 Story with 10ft increase in rear & side yards |
| Washington | 12K/50ft | 12K/25ft | 12K/6ft | 12K/25ft | | 35% Maximum | 3 Story or 35ft maximum hgt. |
| St. Louis County | 15K/70ft | 15K/20ft | 15K/10ft | 15K/15ft | minor 26ft collector 38ft | | 3 Story or 45ft maximum hgt. |
| Franklin County | | | | | | | |
| Jefferson County | | | | | | | |



future. The implementation strategies form a work program the City should follow to achieve the vision, goals and objectives adopted as part of this plan. Some strategies are clear actions the City should take; others are recommendations for additional planning work, more study or further public input.

The formulation of a vision, goals and objectives is a critical process in the preparation of a comprehensive plan. Implementation strategies are provided herein and repeated in the following thematic, issues-based Chapters: *Public Services, Parks, Floodplain Management, Economic Development and Future Land Use*. The stability and future growth of Pacific depends directly on its ability to provide the desired public services, facilities, administrative duties and expanded commercial/industrial growth options. These and other factors that influence the growth of Pacific have been considered in the development of the following goals and objectives.

Goals, Objectives and Implementation Strategies

The following sections include the citizen-defined goals, objectives and implementation strategies developed for each of the six (6) planning elements identified in the previous sections. See also Chapter 7 Economic Development.

Section 3.5 Business Stability & Economic Development

Pacific residents want more variety in shopping and entertainment. Participants support businesses and community investments that offer more things to do and see, support active living and reduce the need to leave town.

Business Stability & Economic Development Goal:

Diversify and strengthen the City's economic base and expand local employment opportunities.

Objective 1: *Reestablish Downtown Pacific as an economically thriving district, cultural/historical destination, entertainment attraction and retail center by recruiting new businesses that fill niche markets.*

Implementation Strategies:

The success of Downtown Pacific is tied directly to early railroad history and the result of numerous small steps over time by public and private partnerships. Continue incremental revitalization efforts and the following economic development implementation strategies:

- 1. Create a walkable, outdoor shopping district Downtown** with integrated shops offering unique, high quality merchandise, cultural attractions, art galleries, entertainment and restaurants offering al-fresco dining, and annual street festivals and entertainment.
- 2. Preserve on-street parking areas along both sides of all streets where the width permits.** On-street parking provides convenience to downtown shoppers and diners, serves as an effective traffic calming device, and a physical and psychological barrier protecting pedestrians from moving vehicles and bicycles.



CITY OF PACIFIC, MISSOURI COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Chapter 3: Vision, Goals & Objectives

3. **Consider the installation of a central parking lot** or expansion of the existing lot to accommodate visitors to the downtown and its employees. When the parking lot is not in use, it could serve as a gathering place, outdoor market, visual arts, and entertainment area, etc.
4. **Continue preserving and protecting the visual and physical characteristics** of Downtown Pacific and restricting certain uses such as drive-through services, ground floor housing (in multi-story buildings) and other uses that create conditions that are uninviting to pedestrians.
5. **Continue to invest time and resources in seasonal events**, decorations and festive/outdoor marketing activities that bring people downtown.
6. **Create clear, visible points of entry into the downtown district.**
7. **Create a Tourist Center:** Promote the creation of a Tourist Center with a museum, study area with WIFI, and outdoor gathering areas/classrooms to bring people together, reinforce connections to the City's heritage and generate a buzz about the outdoor recreation opportunities, parks and annual events that abound the Pacific area. Encourage the Tourism Committee to partner with the Shaw Nature Reserve, Washington University, the Pacific Partnership and other groups associated with the "3 Rs" (Route 66, Railroad and River)
8. **Encourage the adaptive reuse and preservation of Downtown Pacific:** Promote the success of the McHugh-Daily Mercantile Building/Pacific Opera House, the significance of Pacific within the Railroad Industry and the historic structures, streets, sites and events to help generate traffic and vitality downtown.
9. **Make Downtown Pacific "sticky"**. Promote Pacific as a weekend getaway with the intent of increasing the frequency and duration of visits to the city, specifically to the Downtown area.

Objective 2: *Promote and support commercial and industrial development, recruitment and expansion.*

Implementation Strategies:

1. **Attract retail and commercial uses to pacific.** Pacific residents leave the community to access a variety of different retail, food service and recreational opportunities currently not offered in Pacific. A key goal for the City is to retain retail dollars that leave the community. The City should continue to work proactively to attract new retailers in an effort to improve Pacific's image and provide a wider range of quality retail offerings.
2. **Meet with retail developers and franchise owners to identify opportunities.** Meet with retail developers and brokers to determine what Pacific can realistically do to recruit more retail and recreation businesses to reduce retail seepage, complement existing businesses and improve the quality of life in Pacific.