The Town Center Update Team meeting was called to order by Chair Loyal, at 6:30 p.m., on Tuesday, April 9, 2019, at Wildwood City Hall, 16860 Main Street, Wildwood, Missouri.

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks by Chair Loyal and Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Loyal welcomed the Team Members and thanked them for their attendance this evening.

Chair Loyal led the attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Roll Call was taken, with the following results:


Absent Team Members: Edwards, Broyles, and Hood.

Staff in attendance: Director of Planning Vujnich and Assistant Director Arnett.

II. Review and Action on Draft Minutes from March 12, 2019 Team Meeting

Chair Loyal noted that, during the second public comment section of the previous meeting, Team Member Hood responded to Mr. Bosworth’s statement and addressed his concerns. This explanation was not noted in the minutes.

A motion was made by Chair Loyal, seconded by Team Member Sedlak, to approve the minutes from the March 12, 2019 meeting, with the change suggested. Dr. Jones called for a voice vote, and hearing no opposition, declared the motion approved.

III. Public Comments and Input

Jim Van Nest, 17133 Windsor Crest Boulevard, noted he is the current President of the Windsor Crest Homeowners Association and noted it was the first subdivision within the Town Center Area to use alleys. He stated the alleys were built to a public standard relative to the depth of the pavement, and he believes they are not private, given services are conducted from them. He stated the homeowners within the development did not know alleys were private, when they purchased their homes, and he believes if the City can provide services, such as rural internet and concerts, it can take over the Town Center alleys.

Bert Kembitzky, 16677 Cherry Hollow, noted that, when he purchased his home in the Manors at the Meadows of Cherry Hills Subdivision, he did not know the alleys were private. He is concerned that, with only thirty-eight (38) homes in the subdivision, they will struggle to maintain the improvements they are responsible for, which includes the retention basins and alleys, and believes Wildwood is better equipped to maintain the alleys.
Bob Abrams, 158 Stella Cherry Way, resides on an alley in the Manors at the Meadows of Cherry Hills Subdivision and he believes the alley is a street, not an alley, because he has a street address to it and pays taxes on it, as well as the fact the post office says it is a street.

Vince Loyal, 154 Stella Cherry Way, noted to the Committee they were provided two (2) emails from residents in neighborhoods with alleys. He noted he lives in the neo-traditional part of the Manors at the Meadows of Cherry Hills Subdivision and has alley access to his garage. He did not know the alley was private, when he purchased his home, and he believes the subdivision is not equipped to maintain roads, as well as the City. There are services in the alley, which he believes makes it more of a street, and the City should’ve adjusted its process and had alleys be publicly maintained, after the first subdivisions were created with them. He noted on Page 60 of the Master Plan that local access streets in Town Center should be public and, since Andres Duany provided for latitude in the plan, he believes it should be the City taking over the maintenance of the alleys.

Don Coon, 150 Stella Cherry Way, submitted a comment card for his statement to be noted in the minutes, but he did not wish to speak at the meeting. Mr. Coon’s comments were: “Because my wife and I live on an alley, we are not currently on GPS. Deliveries to our home have been impeded by this. Streets in the Manors of Cherry Hills are on GPS. We must tell delivery people that we are the first house on the right on Cherry Hills Meadows Drive, not our actual address. Delivery people often call us and tell us they are lost. If we were accepted by Wildwood as a “street” we would not have to deal with this problem. Our house is also the one that had the street light go out. Safety was an issue.”

IV. Distribution & Explanation of Meeting Materials by Department of Planning and Parks

Director Vujnich provided a brief explanation of the items in the packet, noting they were all relative to tonight’s meeting. The street matrix, as directed by the Team, has been completed and is intended as a starting point for discussion. Street network discussion also includes the governing ordinances, the Site Development Plans, and the Record Plats for all five (5) subdivisions that use the alley concept. The updated meeting timeline was also included. He noted the Boundary Map would be introduced tonight, as well. There were no questions at this time from the Team Members.

V. Overview and Discussion of Private Alleys in the Town Center Area

Director of Planning Vujnich provided an overview of the history of alleys in the Town Center Area. Namely, the designer, Andres Duany, emphasized the direction was to use rear-entry garages and serve them by private alleys. As the plan has progressed, not all lots could be served this way, especially due to topography. Rear-entry garages provide the desired streetscape of the Town Center Area and a greater level of walkability. Subdivisions with alleys have always been set as private by their governing ordinances, approved Site Development Plans, and Record Plats. The ownership could be changed, but requires action by City Council and resubdivision of the properties to transfer them to public ownership.

Discussion was held among the Team Members regarding the following: how many alleys are in the Town Center: all seventy-seven (77) homes in Windsor Crest access alleys, thirty (30) homes in Main Street Crossing, fifteen (15) homes in the Manors at the Meadows of Cherry Hills, the attached townhomes in Cambury, and forty (40) homes in the Villages at Bright Leaf Subdivision, so about 150 homes in total.; the distance of all existing alleys combined totals approximately one (1) mile; what would be required of homeowners to make them public: consent of homeowners or homeowners association. Question if changes are made to Record Plats, do all homeowners have to sign: staff noted they would need to verify with the City Attorney, but the City Council has to approve the acceptance; the existing width of alleys, which would require most traffic on them to stay one-way; the fact the construction requirements of the alleys were built to a high standard to prevent homeowners from having maintenance issues with a substandard street; the fact that, when these projects were presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission, the alleys were identified as private; the
Master Plan's reference to public streets, doesn't refer to lanes, which are intended to be private. First portion is about rural areas, where streets are private; what maintenance items would City need to accept if alleys were conveyed for public purposes: pavement, salting, snow removal, stormwater, general maintenance, etc. What is cost to City: staff will determine and bring back; the process for homeowners to have streets taken over by the City, which would begin as part of the update of the Town Center Plan, the Team could make recommendations to the City Council; the requests tonight seem to be to accept the current private alleys as public and require future alleys to be public; the fact all other streets in Town Center are public; the potential this discussion may impact private streets outside of Town Center Area, and the Department's concern that if the Team recommends alleys be converted to public, what would the City do if all large-lot subdivisions in rural areas want their streets taken over; and the examples of hybrid streets where City maintains part, but not all, which only includes the Windsor Crest Subdivision, where the neighborhood maintains landscaping on City property, while the City maintains their alleys.

A motion was made by Chair Loyal, seconded by Council Member Stephens, for the Team to endorse that all existing private alleys become public and all future alleys be platted public.

Discussion was then held regarding the following: what are the steps to complete the transition to public and what is the cost to the City; the concerns with the Chair's vested interest in this decision and a potential conflict of interest in him making a motion that he will financially benefit from in the future; the potential extent of future alleys in Town Center Area, which would likely be one-half (½) mile to less than one (1) mile; the question if homes would have to be replatted/subdivided and reduce their overall size of lot; the potential for the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to review costs and determine if they want to pursue the change, since the TCUT only makes a recommendation in this regard and other groups will make the final decision; the existing process for turning private streets into public; and the existing practice, if an association fails to maintain their alleys, the City and Fire District enforce maintenance and response times are impacted.

Facilitator Jones called for a roll call vote, which was conducted, with the following results:
Ayes: Team Members Curtis, Remy, Brewer, Risdall, Marion, Loyal, Sedlak, Helfrey, Lee, and Council Member Stephens.
Nays: Team Members Rowton, Weiss, Kohn, Hoffmann, and Council Member McCutchen
Absent: Team Members Edwards, Broyles, and Hood.
Dr. Jones declared the motion approved by a vote of 10-5.

VI. Further Discussion of the Decision Matrix for the Street Network Plan of the Town Center Plan

Director Vujnich reviewed the Priority Matrix for the Street Network Plan, noting modifications completed since last meeting, including the prioritization of street projects.

Discussion was then held among the Team Members and staff regarding the following: the elimination of the Pond-Grover Loop Road to the Taylor Road (extension), because now they are two (2) separate roads; the lower the overall score equals a higher overall rank (priority) of the road projects; numbers were determined by what work needs to be completed; the fact staff is comfortable with the top five (5) priorities; any changes need to be made to street network for roads that are planned, but are not built, yet, such as an east-west connector between Manchester Road and Main Street; the need for a north-south connector to be provided from State Route 100 to Manchester Road, which likely should be Wildwood Avenue; and the question if the Team Members like the current look of streets, including the vertical curbs and gutters, street trees, etc.

A motion was made by Council Member Stephens, seconded by Chair Loyal, to increase the spacing of street trees in the Town Center Area.

Discussion was held regarding the current spacing which actually varies by land use.
The motion was amended by the maker, and second, for the Department to provide further information on the specific spacing of trees for future action.

Discussion was then held regarding if the Team should be discussing these types of details or if their discussion should stay at macro level.

An amendment to the motion was offered by Team Member Lee, for the underlying zoning ordinances to be provided, so street trees can be dealt with on a land use basis. The maker, and second, of the motion agreed to the amendment.

A motion was made by Council Member Stephens, seconded by Chair Loyal, to allow for a voice vote. Hearing no opposition, Dr. Jones called for a voice vote. Hearing no opposition to the motion, Dr. Jones declared the motion approved.

Discussion was held regarding if Taylor Road extension should be an arterial, instead of a collector street, and the Department’s request the TCUT Members approve the first six (6) priority streets in the matrix.

A motion was made by Team Member Rowton, seconded by Team Member Remy, to accept the recommendation for the top seven (7) priority street projects, which includes: Center Avenue, Eatherton Road, State Route 109, Taylor Road extension, West Avenue, Generations Avenue, and Wildwood Avenue.

Discussion was held with a request for the costs of the projects and to have the table ranked by priority. It was also noted the Main Street connection is included within the City Council’s 5-year Strategic Plan, but the Department considered the number of individual property owners, which are currently opposing the sale of the street to the City.

A motion was made by Team Member Lee, seconded by Team Member Hoffmann, to allow for a voice vote. Team Member Curtis voted nay. Dr. Jones then called for a roll call vote on the motion.

Nays: None.
Absent: Team Members Edwards, Broyles, and Hood.
Dr. Jones then declared the motion approved by a vote of 15-0.

VI. Introduction of Boundary Map

Director Vujnich provided the historical background, behind the creation of the Town Center Boundary. He noted the decisions to include or not include properties within the boundary revolved around existing zonings approved prior to the City’s incorporation, the availability of utilities, existing land uses, and the relatively flat topography compared to other areas within the City.

Discussion was held regarding the following: if there has been a change to the boundary, since its initial adoption: Cultural/Institutional Area was added; the lack of current requests for changes to the boundary; the rationales for keeping the Pond Historic District within the Town Center Area, including its lengthy history and a number of commercial properties located there, unless a separate category was created for Town Center; the question if there is a way to shrink the overall size of Town Center, without causing chaos: the west end may be most appropriate space for reduction, but needs more discussion. The zonings would have to stay in place, and could cause problems due to non-conformities; the inclusion of the piece of land just south of State Route 100; the fact the Town Center Area is the only location where commercial is allowed, but just because a property is in the Town Center Area, it doesn’t necessarily mean it is designated commercial; if the Pond Historic
District stays within the Town Center Area, is there greater level of oversight: yes, Department believes there is a greater level of control; the idea that, if the boundary is made smaller, the Pond Historic District could be eliminated from the Town Center Area it be its own district; and the overall density should be reviewed within the Town Center Plan.

A motion was made by Council Member Stephens, seconded by Chair Loyal, to remove from the boundary of Town Center the Pond Historic District.

Discussion continued regarding the following: the removal of the Pond Historic District from the Town Center Boundary and its impact on the Master Plan; the motion maker’s desire to remove it from Town Center, so as to reduce high density development in the area and force commercial development to the wedge area and not west of State Route 109, while also reducing public works expenditures if it was retained as part of Town Center; the fact the zoning advantage for removing the district is unclear; the question of why commercial in the historic district is bad, since the Pond Area has historically been a center of commerce; the opinion of some residents, who are not interested in high density developments expanding, so shrinking boundary achieves that; the ability of the Team to just change the permitted land uses within the historic district, retain a higher level of oversight, while reducing the intensity of uses in that area; the belief that infrastructure improvements would be a good thing in that area, especially the extension of sanitary sewer, which currently ends at Pond Elementary School; the support of changing the land uses, but keeping it in Town Center and not isolate, especially, since it is old Route 66; and the question if developers are required to participate in utility expansion.

Dr. Jones then called for a roll call vote on the motion.

Ayes: Team Member Lee and Council Member Stephens.

Nays: Team Members Curtis, Rowton, Remy, Brewer, Weiss, Risdall, Marion, Loyal, Sedlak, Kohn, Helfrey, Hoffmann, and Council Member McCutchen.

Absent: Team Members Edwards, Broyles, and Hood.

Dr. Jones then declared the motion failed by a vote of 2-13

VIII. Questions/Comments from Team Members about Information Provided to Date

None

IX. Public Comments and Input

None

X. Other

None

XI. Next Meeting Date May 14, 2019 (Tuesday)

No change was recommended to the next meeting date.

XII. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Chair thanked everyone for their efforts.

A motion was made by Council Member Stephens, seconded by Team Member Kohn, to adjourn the meeting. Having no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned by Dr. Jones at 8:28 p.m.