CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES
June 1, 2021

The City Council met this date in a regular session, which was available to the public via teleconference, at 7:31 pm.

Present at Roll Call:
Mayor Gerry Welch
Councilmember Laura Arnold
Councilmember Pam Bliss
Councilmember David Franklin (via Zoom)
Councilmember Emerson Smith
Councilmember Karen D. Alexander
Councilmember Sarah Richardson (via Zoom)

A quorum was present.

Also present:
Dr. Marie Peoples, City Manager
Mr. Neil Bruntrager, City Attorney
Ms. Katie Nakazono, City Clerk

PUBLIC HEARINGS
Proposed City Budget – Fiscal Year 2022
Mayor Welch opened the public hearing. Eric Peterson, Director of Finance and Administration and Assistant City Manager, presented the proposed budget [Exhibit A- Copy in City Clerk’s office]. He reviewed the budget process (See Exhibit A, page 2). He reviewed revenues and appropriations for all funds (See Exhibit A, page 3). He reviewed revenues and appropriations for the General Fund (See Exhibit A, page 4). He reviewed personnel costs from FY2019 – 2022 (See Exhibit A, page 5). Moving into the salary ordinances, he reviewed the changes for FY22 (See Exhibit A, page 7-11). He reviewed the anticipated revenue from the American Rescue Plan (See Exhibit A, page 12).

Jennifer Conrad, Deputy City Clerk, read submitted Public Comments into the record.
- Dave Buck (Exhibit B)

Councilmember Alexander asked about the 1.5% performance increases. Mr. Peterson stated that following the last Work Session, they understood to remove that from the budget.

Councilmember Alexander stated that she knew it was being discussed, but wasn’t clear that we agreed to exclude it. Mayor Welch stated that it could be put back if it is something the Council wants to change.

Councilmember Smith stated that he left with the understanding it was going to be removed.

Councilmember Bliss stated that we had town hall meetings for the staff over two sessions, and I think our thinking behind removing those increases was explained.
Mr. Peterson stated that the compensation study is not just a budget reduction effort, but looking at where we are regarding salaries. He also spoke about moving that increase from the calendar year to the fiscal year.

Dr. Peoples stated that it is a tough budgetary year. If Council puts it back in we would like some discussions on the time of year it is done rather than being the partial mid-year. Also looking at the total compensation package. If we are talking about impacting the classifications of employees equally, perhaps that is looking at something with the COLA. Employees that make under $40,000 for example. Do they receive an increase commensurate with the insurance increase? That is the direction we are moving in.

Mayor Welch asked about the $5.3 million we are taking from the reserves. Do we know which reserves that is coming from? $2 million is from the general reserve fund, we have $3.3 million coming out of other reserves.

Mr. Peterson stated that the largest two other portions are just over $1.1 million in capital, and $1.06 million in stormwater, mostly for the culvert project under Kirkham. Then across the Park Fund, Police and Fire Pension, Street Fund, taxing district, etc.

Mayor Welch asked if we know how unusual this is from previous years, and do we know how quickly we will put funds back in. Mr. Peterson stated that off of the top of his head, he didn’t.

Mayor Welch stated that she may ask if she can sit and ask him some of these questions with the numbers in front of us.

I think it would be interesting to know, you have the slides here with the total personnel expenditures for each year, and it would be interesting for me to know what accounted for these increases year to year. I am putting you on the spot and I am sorry.

Mr. Peterson stated that these are all general fund numbers he is going to give them. It is one new position, plus people aging into their range, steps, etc.

Dr. Peoples stated that some of this was presented in the previous budget meeting, and I am happy to share it again.

Neil Bruntrager, City Attorney, entered the following into the public record:
   1. Copy of the FY-2022 Budget.
   2. Budget Presentation from the Director of Finance.
   3. Email from Dave Buck

Mayor Welch closed the public hearing.

The Willow in Webster CUP (60 N Gore Ave): An Application by McMillan Development LLC for a Conditional Use Permit to Allow a “Banquet Facility” Use and “Dancing Academy” Use in an Existing Structure on an Approximately 0.45 Acre Tract of Land Located at 60 N Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District
Mayor Welch opened the public hearing. Mara Perry, Director of Planning and Development, gave a brief presentation (Exhibit C, available in the City Clerk’s office). She reviewed the surrounding zoning, existing conditions, and site history (See Exhibit C, pages 2-4). We always identify and look at the Comprehensive Plan (See Exhibit C, pages 4-5). Staff determined that the uses are appropriate and in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan. She reviewed the five factors (See Exhibit C, page 5). She reviewed uses and stated that things like yoga and other classes fall under dancing academy (See Exhibit C, page 6). She explained parking requirements for the space (See Exhibit C, pages 7-8). Two of these parking lots are located within the redevelopment area. We discussed identifying something in the future to have those spaces if they aren’t available. She reviewed Fire Code occupancy (See Exhibit C, page 9). Recommended hours of operation are 7 a.m. – 11 p.m. all days of the week. She reviewed setbacks including a minor encroachment on the current building (See Exhibit C, page 10). She reviewed performance standards and lighting, including noise, vibration, odor, and smoke (See Exhibit C, page 11). Everything they want to do at this time is internal, but if they want to do something external, they were reminded that they would need approval from the Architectural Review Board because they are in a historic district.

Councilmember Smith asked about the definition of small vendor pop-ups. Ms. Perry stated that they don’t have a definition, but essentially our districts say you cannot operate a food truck or mobile vending without a special vendor’s license. They have had a number of events where they would have wanted a couple of small trucks and bring in vendors with specialty products. We don’t have a definition, but would call that a somewhat banquet facility use to provide for smaller events where multiple vendors come into one space.

Councilmember Bliss asked about the past when Marshall Place was advised about these events. Was that a courtesy or would that be a requirement? Ms. Perry stated that right now everything is on the interior. Advising was required with a special activities permit but not if they are in their structure as part of the CUP.

Ms. Perry reviewed the staff recommendations (See Exhibit C, page 12). This was approved unanimously by the Plan Commission. There were citizens there who spoke regarding questions and concerns. Some of the concerns were regarding the existing business, not the proposal. We will continue to monitor those.

Dr. Peoples asked about the hours of operation. Ms. Perry stated that we have been pretty uniform that restaurants are 1 a.m. In this case, the applicant gave us hours and we worked with them. If they wanted to change them, there is a shortened process to do that.

Lynn Cressler, applicant was available to answer questions.

Council complimented the use of the space.

Ms. Cressler stated that they have toyed for years with how to use the extra space in the building and over the last years have listened to the customers and community. We have frequent requests to rent our space.
Councilmember Arnold asked about a timeline. Ms. Cressler stated that fall is the earliest.

Neil Bruntrager, City Attorney, entered the following into the public record:
1. Plan Commission staff report by Danny Jendusa, Planner, for meeting date May 3, 2021
2. Cover letter from The Willow in Webster
3. Estimated seating capacities, provided by the applicant
4. ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey of subject property and adjacent properties
5. Preliminary floor plans
6. Fire Egress plans submitted May 3, 2021
7. Director of Planning and Development’s Powerpoint before the City Council June 1, 2021
8. Zoning Code of the City of Webster Groves

Mayor Welch closed the public hearing.

BILL #9150 – FIRST & SECOND READING
Councilmember Smith introduced BILL #9150 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE GRANTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO THE WILLOW IN WEBSTER TO ALLOW BANQUET FACILITY AND DANCING ACADEMY USES ON AN APPROXIMATELY 0.45-ACRE TRACT OF LAND IN AN EXISTING STRUCTURE AT 60 N. GORE AVENUE IN THE “D” COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND MATTERS RELATED THERETO, and at the Councilmember’s request, the Bill was read twice, first and second times by title only, and placed on the agenda for future consideration of the Council.

REMARKS OF VISITORS
The Deputy City Clerk read submitted Remarks of Visitor comments received by 4 p.m. on June 1, 2021, into the record (Exhibit D).
- Dave Buck

NEW BUSINESS – MAYOR, COUNCILMEMBERS, CITY ATTORNEY, CITY MANAGER
No New Business.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
BILL #9149 THIRD READING
On motion of Councilmember Bliss, seconded by Councilmember Arnold, BILL #9149 – ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES, MISSOURI, AMENDING CHAPTER 33, “ANIMALS”, SECTION 33.232 “GOATS” AND AMENDING SECTION 33.310 “KEEPING OF WILD ANIMALS PROHIBITED” AND MATTERS RELATED THERETO, having been introduced and read twice on May 18, 2021, was taken up its title read a third time and placed upon its passage to become Ordinance #9149.

Mayor Welch called for the vote on Bill #9149.

MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: ARNOLD, BLISS, FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH
NOES: NONE.

Mayor Welch stated that Bill #9149 was approved.
NEW BUSINESS
BILL #9151 – FIRST AND SECOND READING
Councilmember Arnold introduced BILL #9151 ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE DEFINING THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE OF THE CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES, FIXING THE COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES IN SAID CLASSIFICATIONS, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE #9123, and at the Councilmember’s request, the Bill was read twice, first and second times by title only, and placed on the agenda for future consideration of the Council.

BILL #9152 – FIRST AND SECOND READING
Councilmember Alexander introduced BILL #9152 ENTITLED: AN ORDINANCE FIXING THE COMPENSATION OF PERSONS IN THE UNCLASSIFIED SERVICE OF THE CITY OF WEBSTER GROVES, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE #9124, and at the Councilmember’s request, the Bill was read twice, first and second times by title only, and placed on the agenda for future consideration of the Council.

DISCUSSION OF REFERENDUM PETITION CERTIFICATION – REGARDING ORDINANCE #9145
Mr. Bruntrager stated that there was a petition for referendum that has been filed. We need to have the City Clerk certify to the Council the results of the review of the referendum petitions that were filed. There was one petition that was submitted to the St. Louis County Election Board to determine whether they had an adequate number of signatures of registered voters, and then the City Clerk reviewed each of the petitions for the statement of circulators.

Ms. Nakazono stated that, as required by the Charter, I am hereby certifying to the Council the results of the determination by me, and upon the advice of the City Attorney, as to the sufficiency or insufficiency of the referendum petition filed on May 18, 2021, in my office, regarding Ordinance #9145. The determination contained in the Certification, which is hereby entered into the minutes of the June 1, 2021 Council meeting (the first regular meeting since completing the examination of the petitions) is that the referendum petition is sufficient under the City Charter.

Mr. Bruntrager stated that having been deemed sufficient -- there is a document included in your records signed by the City Clerk acknowledging the sufficiency and the certification. Under Article 14 of the Charter there are certain duties that are now triggered and required of you. You now have thirty days to reconsider the ordinance to determine whether you would like to repeal the ordinance. Due to time constraints related to placing the measure on the next scheduled St. Louis County Election date, August 3, 2021, you would have to rule on that tonight. Part of what the Charter requires is that the City Clerk has 15 days to certify, then she has to bring it to the next regular meeting, which she has done. We then have 30 days to act. If we don’t act tonight, we will miss the window for that August election. We have been in touch with the Board of Election Commissioners and can still get it on the ballot for August 3. We have until Tuesday to do so. The next thing you must do is that someone must make a motion to reconsider Bill #9145 upon this question “Shall Ordinance #9145 be repealed”? 
A motion was made by Councilmember Arnold, seconded by Councilmember Franklin, to reconsider Ordinance #9145 upon the question “Shall ordinance #9145 be repealed?”

Councilmember Bliss stated that she has taken into account the comments we received from the community, and it is with benevolence and lots of research and forethought that I’ve reconsidered and discussed the options of either repealing or standing by this ordinance. The overall approach is to create more housing options for more residents during all of the various stages of their lives. This residential zone was selected because it touches all areas – north, south, east, west, and even through the middle of our city. Not all of these lots meet the criteria to permit two family dwellings so it is not an entire zone of residential lots. Ordinance #9145 is just one step and the best way to measure the opportunities this type of ordinance will create. That said I’m not in favor of tabling the idea of breaking down zoning barriers that may be keeping families from joining our community and I’m in favor of putting the referendum on the ballot for our community to decide.

Councilmember Arnold read remarks into the record. (See Exhibit E)

Councilmember Alexander stated, I don’t have a written out plan here but just in reflecting on many of the comments that we received around this, I would just really like people to consider that this is a positive attempt to offer more diversity in the housing stock in our communities. I think that people have looked at this as a negative. We’ve heard some really negative comments around this. I have even heard comments about you know people are going to come in and pick off these lots and then they’re going to just tear down houses and they’re going to start targeting these A4 areas. The reality is that’s already happening. I live in that area and I receive cards every day. I see people come by my house taking pictures of my land and what I think that this may allow us to do. We can't stop that, that's still going to happen but maybe the properties that are put there will be more affordable for people. This is not to create some low to moderate income influx of housing in our areas, but maybe a two to four hundred thousand dollar property is a lot more obtainable for people than a 500 plus thousand dollar property, and that's pretty much what we would be able to help facilitate with something like this. I am not in favor of repealing this and I would be very interested to see the public's comments or how the public would vote in August.

Mayor Welch stated that I can tell you I will vote to repeal it because I’ve been looking at what some of the other communities around us are doing and absolutely believe that we need duplexes and townhomes. All you have to do is go over to Kirkwood and you will find lots of building of townhomes and duplexes because they have a different zoning arrangement that allows for special considerations in transition lots and not in the middle of a residential neighborhood. I was hoping that we would have the ability to kind of back off and examine what some of the other local communities are doing very successfully but that is obviously not going to happen.

Mayor Welch called for the vote on repealing Ordinance #9145.
AYES: FRANKLIN, WELCH
NOES: BLISS, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, ARNOLD
Mayor Welch stated that the ordinance will not be repealed.
Mr. Bruntrager stated that upon your decision not to repeal, the Charter requires that within ninety days, we submit that ordinance to a vote of the people. We need to get this on August 3, otherwise we will be on the ballot by ourselves and that will be cost prohibitive. Resolution #2021-25 would allow for the submission of this matter to the Board of Election Commissioners. It would mandate that I as the City Attorney can file all claims necessary to get this on the ballot.

A motion was made by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Franklin to approve Resolution #2021-25 – A Resolution Providing for the Submission to the Qualified Voters of the City of Webster Groves of Ordinance Number 9145, Which Shall be Submitted to the Electors at the Special Election on August 3, 2021.

Councilmember Arnold asked to clarify for those at home what exactly is going to be on the ballot. Mr. Bruntrager stated that we will place the ballot language on the website.

Mayor Welch called for the vote on Resolution #2021-25
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: FRANKLIN, SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that Resolution #2021-25 was approved.

CONSENT AGENDA
A motion was made by Councilmember Bliss, seconded by Councilmember Arnold, to approve the Consent Agenda.
Mayor Welch called for the vote on the Consent Agenda.
MEMBERS VOTING:
AYES: SMITH, ALEXANDER, RICHARDSON, WELCH, ARNOLD, BLISS, FRANKLIN
NOES: NONE
Mayor Welch stated that the Consent Agenda was approved.

The following consent agenda was approved:
- **Approval of Minutes** – May 18, 2021
- **Resolution #2021-26** – Amending the City of Webster Groves Personnel Policy to Add Policy 6.14 – COVID-19 Face Covering & Evidence of Vaccination Policy
- **Resolution #2021-27** – Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement for a Compensation and Classification Study
- **Liquor License** – Application to Sell Liquor by the Drink for Consumption on the Premises Where Sold, and on Sundays, by J&K Design Consulting LLC, d/b/a The Annex Coffee and Foods, 8122 Big Bend Blvd. (LLC Name Change)

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
- Tess Thompson was reappointed to the Library Board.

EXECUTIVE (CLOSED) SESSION
No Executive (Closed) Session followed the meeting.
ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business to come before the City Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m. on motion of the Mayor, duly seconded.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 15th day of June 2021.

[Signature]
MAYOR

[Signature]
CITY CLERK
FY22 BUDGET HEARING

WEBSTER GROVES CITY COUNCIL

JUNE 1, 2021
BUDGET PROCESS & IMPORTANT INFORMATION

- **June 1**
  - Public Hearing
  - 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading of Salary Ordinances

- **June 15**
  - Budget Adoption
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading of Salary Ordinances

- **American Rescue Plan**
  - Budget does **NOT** include ARP funds (estimated at $4.2 million).
  - These funds were not included as they are not received and will have guidance attached on allowable expenditures.

- **Budget Amendments**
  - The council may amend the budget throughout the year to account for changed revenues, operational needs, and the inclusion of the ARP funds.
TOTAL REVENUES & APPROPRIATIONS

ALL FUNDS

Total Revenues: $24,346,789.00

Total Appropriations: $29,619,910.00
GENERAL FUND REVENUES & APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL FUND

Total Revenues: $17,168,865.00
Total Appropriations: $19,262,487.00
Deficit: $2,093,622.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY19 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY20 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY21 ESTIMATE</th>
<th>FY22 BUDGET</th>
<th>FY19 to FY22 (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>$12,971,474.00</td>
<td>$13,335,142.78</td>
<td>$13,905,970.00</td>
<td>$14,841,310.00</td>
<td>1,869,836 (+14.415%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>16,762,270.80</td>
<td>16,048,261.64</td>
<td>17,753,049.00</td>
<td>17,168,865</td>
<td>406,594.18 (+2.425%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FTE</td>
<td>147.20</td>
<td>147.20</td>
<td>149.70</td>
<td>150.70</td>
<td>+3.5 FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 22 SALARY
ORDINANCES
DISCUSSION
WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE SALARY ORDINANCES AND FY22 BUDGET?

FY21 ADDED FTE

2.5 FTE Added in FY 21 (Mid-year)

1. Customer Support Supervisor (.5 to 1FTE)
2. Building Inspector
3. Public Affairs & Engagement Director

Two of these positions (Customer Support Supervisor and Public Affairs & Engagement Director) are added to the Salary range ordinance.

FY22 ADDED FTE

1 new FTE in FY22

Permit Technician – Planning and Development
## WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE SALARY ORDINANCES AND FY22 BUDGET?

### 2% COLA INCREASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Employees (Full &amp; Part-Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Salary ranges for each position in the City are adjusted up 2% and the current base salary of an employee is adjusted up 2%, effective July 1, 2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STEP PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Steps continued, in 3rd year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Steps continued, in 2nd year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the application of the 2% increase to each range, the fire and police personnel in the step program are advanced, on July 1, to their next step based on their anniversary date or last promotional date as it will occur within FY22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Police Steps FY 22 Shown with 2% Increase in Each Step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Police Officer ($)</th>
<th>Sergeant ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 0</td>
<td>59,331</td>
<td>80,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 1</td>
<td>61,554</td>
<td>82,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 2</td>
<td>63,777</td>
<td>84,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 3</td>
<td>66,001</td>
<td>86,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 4</td>
<td>68,224</td>
<td>88,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 5</td>
<td>70,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 6</td>
<td>72,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 7</td>
<td>74,894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 8</td>
<td>77,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22 Step 9</td>
<td>79,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE SALARY ORDINANCES AND FY22 BUDGET?

1.5% PERFORMANCE PAY

Historically granted on January 1 of each year, the performance pay was a base increase for employees determined by departmental performance review. For those at the maximum of their range, the increase was paid as a 27th pay period lump sum pay check.

The FY22 budget does not include funding for this base wage increase.
AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN INFORMATION

Anticipated Revenue: $4,202,978.18

- US Treasury -> State -> Webster Groves
  - State must issue funds within 30 days of receipt
- Further federal guidance on allowable expenditures required for City to act.
  - State cannot impose restrictions above the federal guidance
FY22 BUDGET QUESTIONS?
Mayor, City Council & City Staff,

As a resident, I applaud and appreciate City Hall's honesty, openness and courage to make the tough decisions in developing this year's city's budget during these challenging times.

This is the city's annual OPERATING budget for fiscal year 2021-2022, built department by department, and reflects everything it takes to run the city effectively and efficiently every day of the year.

But, in my mind, if this is a TRUE & TOTAL annual City budget, then it is incomplete.

Specifically, City Council regularly sets serious STRATEGIC goals for the city and itself. Some of these goals warrant being developed into specific action plans with associated budgets, such as these Council goals:

- Foster a strong business community.
- Engage in effective communications.
- Promote art and beautification efforts that advance Webster Groves as the "City of the Arts."

Judgmentally, a strong case can be made that these STRATEGIC goals warrant being built into the specific action plans and associated budgets to achieve them.

But without the backing of such plans or budgets, these goals risk becoming empty promises with no urgency or tangible commitment.

In closing, I think that the city's department OPERATING budget + City Council's STRATEGIC goal budget = the TRUE & TOTAL annual City budget.

PEACE.

Dave
City Council
June 1, 2021

Bill #9150
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

Zoning “D” Commercial District

Exhibit C
Bill #9150
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)

Surrounding Uses/Zoning
- North: “D” Commercial District
- East: “A4” Seventy-Five Hundred Square Foot Residence District
- South: “D” Commercial District
- West: “PC” Planned Commercial District including office, surface parking, retail, and auto body repair uses

Existing Conditions
- Looking east from N. Gore Ave.
- Looking north from N. Gore Ave.
- Looking SW from Marshall Place
- Looking west from Marshall Place
Bill #9150
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster
CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)

History
• 1893- Existing structure built as Henry Shultz Feed & Grain Store
• 1923- 60 N Gore Ave. zoned “E” Industrial District
• 1959- Harriet and James McMillan opened Rolling Ridge Nursery
• 1987- 60 N Gore zoned “D” Commercial District along with many of the commercial & industrial properties in Old Webster commercial district

Additional office tenants have utilized space within the existing commercial building

21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster
CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)

Bill #9150
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

Historic Districts
Marshall Place National Historic District- June 17, 1982
Old Webster Local Historic District- July 2, 1985
Local Historic Landmark November 4, 1986
Comprehensive Plan Analysis

The 1978 Comprehensive Plan: Encouraged the success of commercial districts as necessary for maintaining attractiveness and quality of life in the City.

21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster
CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)

Comprehensive Plan Analysis

2006 Development Foundation Plan identifies Old Webster as “the most pedestrian friendly commercial area of the city.” Included subject properties as part of the “Existing Old Webster Mixed Use Core”

Recommended three principal areas to address market gaps in Old Webster:
- Provision of alternative housing types
- Retail services niches
- Office/employment uses

The maps of the 2006 Development Foundation Plan were adopted as an amendment to the 1978 Comprehensive Plan.
### Comprehensive Plan Analysis

In 2017, the City incorporated the 2006 DFP maps into a consolidated Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment. The 2017 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment recommended Mixed-Use Development at the subject properties along with much of the Old Webster commercial area.

Staff has determined that a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Banquet Facility use and Dancing Academy use at the subject property would be appropriate within the commercial and mixed use designation in the city’s Comprehensive Plan.

### Conditional Use Permit

Per Sec. 53.173(c), the Council shall determine whether the proposed banquet facility use and dancing academy use will not:

1. **Substantially increase traffic hazards or congestion.**
2. **Substantially increase fire hazards.**
3. Adversely affect the character of the neighborhood.
4. Adversely affect the general welfare of the community.
5. Overtax public utilities.
Uses
The applicant has requested to allow activities which would fall under a Banquet Facility use and a Dancing Academy use:

- Wedding/Bridal/Baby showers
- Bridal ready room
- Meetings
- Photoshoots
- Visual Art Gallery
- Intimate Live Music Venue
- Cocktail/Holiday/Birthday Gatherings
- Intimate Receptions
- Book Launch/Signing
- Yoga
- Small vendor pop-ups
City Council

21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster
CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)

Bill #9150
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

Parking
For a Banquet Facility use, the City’s Parking Code requires a minimum of one (1) parking space for every three (3) seats, plus two (2) parking spaces for every three (3) employees on the maximum shift.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Spaces</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 N Gore Ave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 N Gore Ave</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 W Pacific Ave</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Parking supply**

For Banquet Facility use, the City’s Parking Code requires a minimum of one (1) parking space for every three (3) seats, plus two (2) parking spaces for every three (3) employees on the maximum shift.

Evening events (after 5pm)
- When Rolling Ridge Nursery is closed for the day
- 65 parking spaces available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code Standard</th>
<th>Parking spaces required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2 spaces per 3 employees (8 employees assumed)</td>
<td>6 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>1 spaces per 3 seats (177 seats assumed)</td>
<td>59 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>65 parking spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Minimum Parking standards for Banquet Facility-Use (Evening events)**
**City Council**

**21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)**

**Bill #9150**

First & Second Reading

An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

**Parking**

Day events (7am-5pm)

- Rolling Ridge Nursery is open
- 30 parking spaces available

**Table 3: Minimum Parking standards for Banquet Facility Use (Day events)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code Standard</th>
<th>Parking spaces required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2 spaces per 3 employees (4 employees assumed)</td>
<td>4 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>1 space per 3 seats (78 seats assumed)</td>
<td>26 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 parking spaces</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking lots at 61 N Gore Ave and 147 W Pacific are located within the Old Webster Redevelopment Area

Staff would recommend requiring the applicant to obtain a private parking lease agreement to secure an equivalent number of parking spaces in the event 61 N Gore Ave and 147 W Pacific Ave are redeveloped.
Bill #9150
First & Second Reading
An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the “D” Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

Fire Code Occupancy

The fire code standards recommend a minimum floor area of fifteen (15) square feet per person in an assembly area with non-fixed tables and chairs.

Fire Department requested an emergency egress plan prior to future business license approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
<th>Max Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main building (1,118 sqft)</td>
<td>15sqft per person</td>
<td>75 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse (2,192 sqft)</td>
<td>15sqft per person</td>
<td>146 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>221 persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering parking and fire code standards

Staff recommends:
- Daytime: Max seventy five (75) persons for daytime events held prior to 5pm
- Evening: Max one hundred fifty (150) persons for events held between 5pm and 11pm
- Minimum parking supply of sixty-five (65) off-street parking spaces with the option to provide an equivalent number of off-street parking spaces through private parking lease agreements.
### Bill #9150 First & Second Reading

An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the "D" Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

### Hours of Operation

- **7am to 11pm, all days of the week**
- **Reduced maximum occupancy level for events held by The Willow in Webster prior to 5pm**

### Dimensional Regulations: Setbacks

The existing commercial building encroaches beyond the south front property line 1.11-feet into the Marshall Place right of way.  
- A legal non-conforming structure  
- Existing structure is allowed to remain in place with interior renovations and change of use as a legal, nonconforming structure.

Staff does not recommend placing additional dimensional regulations upon the proposed use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill #9150 First &amp; Second Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the &quot;D&quot; Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)

**Performance Standards & Lighting**
Regulating levels of noise, vibration, odor, smoke, and other externalities of operations that may impact neighboring properties

Max lighting is 0.5 foot-candles at any residential property line

Staff does not recommend setting Performance Standards for the requested uses beyond those already required in the "D" Commercial District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill #9150 First &amp; Second Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the &quot;D&quot; Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21-PC-03 The Willow in Webster CUP (60 N Gore Ave.)

**Historic Preservation & ARB**
The applicant has not proposed exterior alterations to the existing commercial buildings

Should the applicant propose future exterior alterations to the existing buildings in the future, the plans would require approval from the Architectural Review Board in a public hearing.
City Council

Bill #9150
First & Second Reading

An Ordinance Granting a Conditional Use Permit to The Willow in Webster to Allow Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy Uses on an Approximately 0.45-Acre Tract of Land in an Existing Structure at 60 N. Gore Avenue in the "D" Commercial District and Matters Related Thereto

Staff Recommendations

Should the City Council recommend approval, Staff would recommend the following conditions:

1. All provisions of the City Code shall apply except as expressly modified in this Ordinance #9150.
2. All events held under the Banquet Facility use and Dancing Academy use shall be located within the existing footprint of the greenhouse and second floor of the existing commercial structure.
3. The uses shall not encroach further beyond the south front property line than the existing legal, nonconforming commercial structure. The Dimensional Regulations of the "D" Commercial District shall apply.
4. The maximum occupancy level for events of the Banquet Facility and Dancing Academy uses shall not exceed seventy-five (75) persons for daytime events held prior to 5pm and one hundred and fifty (150) persons for evening events held between 5pm and 11pm.

5. A minimum of sixty-five (65) off-street parking spaces shall be provided. An equivalent number of off-street parking spaces shall be provided through private parking lease agreements should existing parking facilities at 61 N Gore Ave and 147 W Pacific Ave be removed or become unavailable.
6. Hours of operation shall be limited to 7AM to 11 PM daily.
7. The applicant shall provide the Fire Department with an emergency egress plan. Fire Department approval of the emergency egress plan shall be necessary prior to business license approval.
8. This conditional use permit is personal to the owner and shall not run with the land.
Mayor, City Council, City Staff & SG Collaborative,

This shares two personal hopes from the cheap seats to build upon your earlier work session discussion this evening on the Old Webster Redevelopment Project.

HOPE #1

Before it gets too late, I hope that City Council, City Staff and SG Collaborative come together as a united team and revisit and possibly rethink and update the original four objectives in the City’s RFP to better define success and evaluate performance on this project.

In abbreviated form, the original objectives were: 1) remediate conditions that can lead to blighting; 2) remove conditions representing economic and social liability; 3) promote new development; and 4) enhance the stability of the area.

Versus these broad and vague statements, a project this big and important needs well-defined and agreed-to SMART Goals that are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic & Timely.

Additionally, EVERYONE knows more about this project now than when it started over the year ago. For example, should an overall project goal exist around 1) affordable housing; or 2) advancing the historic small-town character and arts identity of Webster Groves; or 3) leveraging the deep history of the site as the 1866 home to freed former slaves who built the First Baptist Church on Porter’s Subdivision by Shady Creek and lived up the hill from the church on "Vinegar Hill?"

HOPE #2

Here is my single biggest concern about the redevelopment project. Bar none.

SG Collaborative is leading the biggest and most important creative development project of its kind in the history of Webster Groves. And in creative thinking, there is ALWAYS more than one right answer.

But SG Collaborative has presented to the community only ONE fundamental plan, dating back to last July. There have been meaningful enhancements along the way, but it is still the same ONE plan at its core.
So, let me be clear. My real issue is not in the ONE plan they have presented. It is that it is the
ONLY ONE.

Certainly, there is more than just ONE idea for this 15-acre site. Can the community at least have
a choice of at least two good and different options? The community deserves a second choice in
order to make a better final decision of the ONE they like best.

PEACE.

Dave
I will not vote to repeal this ordinance tonight and look forward to the community debate about it as we move to the August election. Contrary to what opponents say, I am not afraid of an election. It will provide an opportunity for our community to learn more about this ordinance and for us to have another conversation about housing options in our community.

Ordinance #9145 was designed to address what some planners refer to as “missing middle” housing. We have a growing problem with infill housing in which developers tear down affordable homes and replace them with new houses that are many times more expensive. I’ve provided several examples in the past. While some residents would like us to simply ban developers from building infill housing, we cannot legally do that. Instead, we can give them options that make homes relatively more affordable, like a duplex with each unit selling for significantly less than those single-family homes being built. These missing middle houses are not currently being built here and are very desirable for young families and seniors.

There are safeguards included in this ordinance and in Ordinance #9146, which was passed at the same time, to ensure that new homes (duplexes and single-family homes) better fit their neighborhood and lot size. For example, a great many of the A4 lots are by definition too small to allow duplexes. One estimate based on county assessment records suggests that 50% of A4 lots do not qualify based on the dimensional requirements in the ordinance. In addition, many of the remaining homes are valued at a price that makes them cost prohibitive for infill housing. In addition, there are limits on how much of a lot may be covered by a house and how tall a house can be based on the height of surrounding homes. Every duplex must meet all of the requirements of any single-family home, including off-street parking requirements and approval by the Architectural Review Board.

Finally, let me address the three criticisms of the proposal I hear most often:

(1) Property values will decline if “multifamily” housing is allowed on a street. There is no evidence that this will be the case. Studies consistently find no negative impact on property values and, in some cases, find an increase in value for property adjacent to or near multifamily homes. A local example is the concern about properties adjacent to or near the Elle on Lockwood. As recent assessments and nearby home sales demonstrate, homes near the Elle have continued to increase in value.

(2) Council members are discriminating against those in the A4 district. While I would have preferred a city-wide change and look forward to it in the future, in their deliberations, the Plan Commission decided that starting with the A4 district was preferable since current zoning already allows for duplexes there. Ordinance #9145 simply removes the requirement, added well after our zoning had been established, that 40% of a block must already have duplexes in order to build a new one.

(3) This proposal does not go far enough in addressing the issue of housing affordability in our community. There is no one proposal that will solve our affordability challenge. As noted, this is designed to focus on middle-range housing rather than low-income or affordable housing. We do need other avenues to address rising costs and the loss of affordable homes.

Zoning is a powerful tool that has too often been used to exclude people based on income or race. Allowing more duplexes is a small step in diversifying our housing stock.

Finally, I would note that the Plan Commission, including members who live in the A4 district unanimously approved this proposal after six months of thoughtful discussion. It is a small, good step in providing more options for our community.