

ZONING ORDINANCE CHANGE PETITION REVIEW REPORT

Petition Number: Z 16-04

Petitioner: Benjamin Hagedorn
NorthPoint Development LLC
5015 NW Canal St., Suite 200
Riverside, MO 64150
816-888-7380

Agent: None

Project Name: NorthPoint Self-storage

Location: 14918 Manchester Rd.

Petition Date: 7/29/16

Review Date: 8/03/16

Requested Action: Zoning Change (Add Manchester Rd.
Revitalization Overlay Zoning)

Code Section: Zoning Ordinance, Article XIIC, XXIII

Existing Land Use/Zoning: Vacant / C-1 Commercial

Surrounding Land Use/Zoning: West –Retail/ C-1
South – Institutional / C-1
East - Commercial / C-1
North –Commercial/ C-1

Plan Designation: Commercial, Manchester Rd.
Revitalization

Proposal Description:

NorthPoint Development, LLC is requesting the application of a Manchester Road Revitalization Overlay (MRD) district on top of the existing C-1 commercial zoning for a portion of the approximately 1.5 acre site commonly known as 14918 Manchester Rd. The site is currently occupied by two buildings. The front building, which is the former home of Ballwin Furniture, is presently unoccupied. The rear building was formerly occupied by the Bullpen Brothers indoor batting cages business, and is also presently vacant. Both buildings will be razed. New construction that will house a self-storage business dba Beyond Self-Storage is proposed to be erected on the rear portion of the site. The front portion of the site is not proposed for development as a part of this petition.

This 1.49 acre site is completely surrounded by C-1 Commercial zoning which is primarily developed in commercial uses. The Preiss Cleaners building and the rear

portion of the CAP Carpet commercial property adjoin the site to the west. Adjoining the site to the east is Olde Towne Plaza across Ballpark Drive. The property across Manchester Rd. to the north is occupied by Lion's Choice Restaurant. The site adjoins the Ballwin Athletic Association property along the south side.

This is a corner location at the southwest quadrant of the Manchester Rd. / Ballpark Dr. intersection. This site has approximately 358 feet of frontage on Ballpark Dr., 210 feet of frontage along the Ballwin Athletic Association property and 222 feet of frontage with the CAP Carpet Plaza property. The site is "L" shaped around the Preiss Cleaner property with 104' of adjacency along the rear of the cleaner's site and about 176 feet along the east side. The petitioned site also has approximately 93' of frontage on the south side of the Manchester Rd.

The site drains southwardly toward the BAA site. The highest point is along the Manchester Rd. right-of-way at the intersection with an elevation of about 626 feet. The lowest point of the site with an elevation of 600 feet is at the southwest corner of the property. This yields a total elevation change of 26 feet across the site.

The existing buildings have a footprint of approximately 25,000 square feet. They will be removed and will not be utilized for any part of the envisioned development, nor will any portion of the existing parking lot.

Stormwater discharge from the site flows toward the BAA site and enters the BAA private stormwater system and the Ballpark Dr. stormwater system. Both systems ultimately discharge into Fishpot Creek to the south, and Fishpot Creek ultimately flows into the Meramec River near Valley Park.

This report has been prepared pursuant to the submission of an accompanying zoning petition (Z 16-03) that will make self-storage a use that is permitted by special use exception. Although this entire site is a single parcel, the front portion is not proposed for development in this petition. This report has, therefore, been prepared without considering the front area's compliance with the applicable regulations on the assumption that this area will be separated and developed independently in a future petition. Presently self-storage is not a permitted use in any of Ballwin's zoning districts. This report has been prepared pursuant to the assumption that petition Z 16-03 will be approved. The failure of that petition will invalidate this report and any recommendations herein.

PLANNING AND PLAN REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS:

This review report covers the C-1 Commercial district, the SUE and the MRD overlay zoning district regulations. This petition had been submitted to utilize the existing C-1 Commercial zoning for this site as the underlying zoning for the MRD. Although the C-1 zoning is in place, the existing site will be significantly modified to accommodate the proposed new development, so establishment of the MRD and reviews of the new site development plan per the C-1 district, the SUE regulations and the MRD are necessary. The nature of the MRD is such that it must be considered jointly with the regulations of the

underlying zoning district. The MRD can amend the provisions of the underlying zoning district such that only the passage of the MRD Governing Ordinance will be necessary to approve the site development plan. A separate ordinance approving the C-1 or a special use exception site development plan is not needed.

C-1 DISTRICT REGULATIONS:

This proposal entails the redevelopment of a large commercially zoned site. The MRD (Manchester Road Revitalization District) overlay allows more flexibility in site development than does the C-1 district, but it simultaneously imposes some more stringent or extensive site development regulations. The MRD regulations may supersede or amend the requirements of the C-1 district. Any regulation not superseded or amended will still apply. The C-1 district site developments issues are as follows:

1. Article IX, Section 2 identifies a list of uses that are allowed by right in the C-1 district. Article XIV of the zoning ordinance establishes additional uses that are allowed by special use exception in the C-1 district.

The MRD Governing Ordinance will include a listing of the only uses allowed in the development. These are to be drawn from the uses allowed by right or by special use exception in the C-1 district. The issue of allowed uses is discussed more thoroughly in the MRD section of this report.

2. Article IX, Section 3 limits the height of structures to a maximum of 45 feet. The submitted architectural elevation shows the height of the tallest elements of the storage building to be about 45'. The proposed building appears to be within the maximum height limit of the ordinance. **The height limits of the C-1 district can be amended by the MRD overlay. The governing ordinance should establish the maximum and minimum allowable building heights for this site development plan. These should be set to provide sufficient parapet or screening wall heights to hide rooftop equipment and address the building height issue that will be discussed more extensively in subsequent portions of this report.**
3. Article IX, Section 4. (1) (i) requires buildings fronting on Manchester Rd. to have a minimum setback of 60' and buildings along other roadways are to have a minimum setback of 40'. **There is no building proposed for the front portion of the lot in this petition. A future development proposal for that area will have to address the Manchester Rd. setback question. The proposed storage building meets the 40' side street setback requirement for Ballpark Dr.** The issue of building setbacks is discussed again in the MRD portion of this report.
4. Article IX, Section 4. (1) (ii) only applies to properties fronting on the south side of Orchard Lane and does not apply to this petition.
5. Article IX, Section 4. (1) (iii) is not a requirement. It is permissive and allows the developer of properties fronting on Manchester Rd. to have front yard setbacks as small as 20 feet for as much as 75% of the roadway frontage if the small front yard areas are

utilized for pedestrian circulation and landscaping. This petition does not appear to qualify to utilize this subsection.

6. Article IX, Section 4. (1) (iv) requires the provision of a 10' deep landscaped area along all roadway frontages of the site. The submitted plan appears to provide the required 10' greenspace long the self-storage portion of the site along the Ballpark Dr. frontage but does not appear to meet the requirement along the balance of the site's roadway frontages **The MRD governing ordinance can waive this requirement, but the MRD district imposes its own greenspace requirements. This is discussed more fully in the MRD section of this report.**
7. Article IX, Section 4. (2) requires landscaped "side" yards of 25' depth where commercial sites abut residential uses, residential zoning or recreational zoning classifications in a side yard configuration. This requirement does not apply to this petition. There are no residential or recreational uses adjoining any side yards of this site.
8. Article IX, Section 4. (3): The section requires the establishment of a 25' rear yard. **This requirement has not been met.** This requirement can be waived under the MRD regulations.
9. Article IX, Section 4. (3) (i, ii and iii) and (4) do not apply to this petition.
10. Article IX, Sections 4. (3) (iv) requires rear yards that abut commercial or industrial zoning districts to provide screening via a 6' tall fence or landscaping meeting the requirements of subsection ii. **The plans do not show a fence or landscaping anywhere in the rear yards in this development so this plan is not compliant with the minimum requirements of this subsection. These issues can be waived under the MRD. This issue is discussed more thoroughly in the MRD section of this report.**
11. Article IX, Section 5. (1) requires the provision of parking in accordance with the provisions of Article XV. This section does not address parking for the self-storage use. Previous petitioners have maintained that these developments have very minor parking needs. That strikes me as a reasonable argument based upon my personal anecdotal observations of other self-storage businesses. **Ballwin's parking regulations are based upon square footage of the building and would require substantial parking for a building of this size (several hundred spaces). The parking requirements may be amended by the MRD. This is discussed more thoroughly in the MRD section of the report**
12. Article IX, Section 5. (2) allows a parking reduction in exchange for more landscaping on sites in excess of 100,000 square feet of floor area. The development is large enough to qualify for this parking adjustment, but the petition does not appear to be attempting to make use of these ordinance provisions.
13. Article IX, Section 6. requires the submission of the site development plan to MoDOT for its review. No change to the Manchester Rd. curb cut configuration is proposed so no MoDOT comment is required.

14. Article IX, Section 7. (1) requires that the minimum spacing of curb cuts be 500' between centerlines. **This is to promote access management along Manchester Rd. and adjoining roadways. Limiting curb cuts is fundamental to access management. The submitted plan does not meet the spacing requirement, but no change to the existing curb cut configuration is proposed, so the petitioner may have a basis to claim that the site is legally nonconforming relative to this matter. Additionally, this requirement can be waived via the MRD process.**
15. Article IX, Section 7. (2) requires the construction of a 6' wide sidewalk along Manchester Rd. This sidewalk was built by Ballwin in 2005 with 70% funding from a federal transportation grant. Ordinance 05-39 requires that Ballwin be reimbursed for its 30% of the cost upon the development/redevelopment of the site or transfer of any special use exception associated with any property benefiting from such sidewalk construction. Since this petition has been reviewed with the exclusion of the front portion because of an anticipated future development petition for that area, there is no applicable reimbursement with this development.
16. Article IX, Section 7. (3) requires that a cross access, driveway/parking lot vehicular interconnection easement be established to provide for future parking lot connections to the adjoining properties. Just like the driveway spacing requirements discussed in Section 7. (1) above, such easements are fundamental to establishing access management along Manchester Rd. They are also part of the Great Streets Plan element of the Comprehensive Community plan which recommends that Manchester Rd. access be limited to a relatively small number of points and supplemented by the creation of rear service roadway connections, utilization of side roads and the interconnection of parking lots wherever possible.

The establishment of vehicular interconnectivity easement across the CAP Carpet Plaza property to the adjoining property (the petitioned site) was a condition of the approval of the CAP Carpet Plaza. This easement was granted to Ballwin. The intent of the easement is to allow access from the CAP carpet site from Ballpark Dr. and the petitioned site. This plan does not propose any interconnection with the adjoining CAP Carpet site or any cross access interconnection of the parking lots to Ballpark Dr. The absence of a cross access is not in accordance with this section of the code, the recommendations of the 2007 Comprehensive Community Plan. The MRD has its own regulations on this which are discussed more thoroughly later in this report.

SUE Regulations (Article XIV):

1. Sec.1 (1) (14) front yard parking is only allowed by special use exception (SUE) in the C-1 zoning district. **This will be addressed by the uses permitted in the MRD Governing Ordinance and the approved final site development plan.**

2. Sec. 2 (1) *Minimum Yard Requirements*: The minimum yard setback requirements of the C-1 District were discussed in the C-1 section of this report. **The**

submitted plan does not meet all of these requirements, but they can be waived through the MRD process. This is discussed later in this report.

3. *Sec. 2 (2) Site Illumination:* **No site illumination information has been provided. Since there are no nearby residential properties to be concerned with, it is recommended that a site illumination plan be provided that offers sufficient illumination to minimize any public safety and property security issues.** Pole mounted luminaries should be no higher than 25'. These should be of a design that has a flat lens mounted parallel to the ground below the fixture. No sag lenses or other sideways shining luminary designs should be incorporated. Wall mounted luminaries should be of a downward or upward facing variety. Outward facing wall pack style lights should not be used. It is further recommended that site illumination be provided via low energy luminaries, such as, but not limited to, LED technology. It is recommended that light cut-off shields be required for all luminaries to prevent the visibility of any lamp or lens from any nearby properties. Cut off lines should not extend beyond the property line. Such shields should be affixed at the direction of the City of Ballwin as they are determined to be needed after the luminaries are installed and made operational.

3. *Sec. 2 (3) Greenery and Planting:* **This issue is extensively discussed with recommendations in the MRD section of this report.**

4. *Sec. 2 (4) Fencing:* No fencing is proposed in this plan.

5. *Sec 2 (5) Parking:* This proposed parking is not consistent with the C-1 district guidelines. Substantial parking is required under the present regulations for a 100,000 square foot building. No discussion of a waiver or information regarding the experienced or understood demand for parking spaces has been provided. **This issue is discussed in the C-1 section of this report and again in the MRD review section.**

6. *Sec. 2 (6) Pavement:* No information is provided in the submitted plans relative to pavement design. It is premature to be discussing pavement design at this juncture. Final approved construction plans will have to comply with Ballwin's standards for commercial parking lot pavement design.

7. *Sec 2 (7) Storm water runoff control:* **An approach to storm water control has been presented as a part of this submission. No preliminary plan review report or letter from MSD has been provided. I recommend that the Commission not approve the submitted plan, even conceptually, until preliminary MSD review has been documented. This assures that MSD is accepting of the basic approach being undertaken. Ultimately, MSD approval of the final storm water plan will be required prior to the issuance of any development related permits or the commencement of any construction or grading activities on this site.**

8. *Sec. 2 (8) Loading docks and facilities:* **No external loading docks are proposed. The architectural elevations show a vehicular door providing access to the building. The accompanying site plan shows an area interior to the building that is for loading and unloading.**

9. Sec. 2 (9) *Ingress and Egress*: The submitted plans show no development scenario for the front part of the site. The curb cut to Manchester Rd. is being retained as is the existing pavement on the site. The existing building is being removed. The existing curb cut off of Ballpark Dr. that presently provides ingress and egress to the rear portion of the site that is proposed for the self-storage use is proposed to be widened and retained at its present location.

No traffic study that analyzes the traffic generated by the proposed self-storage use has been provided. Anecdotally, it has been my observation that such uses do not generate significant traffic. I therefore find it unlikely that the traffic generated by the proposed self-storage use justifies a wider curb cut than is presently in place at this location. Lacking any basis for the wider curb cut, I do not recommend allowing it to be made wider. The future development of the front part of the site may justify a wider curb cut at that time.

10. Sec. 2 (10) *Adequate area for the use*: Based on the information provided about parking, stormwater, and other site related issues there does not appear to be a serious or substantive issue in this regard for the intended use. **If the cross access easement connecting the adjoining plaza to Ballpark Dr. across this site is ultimately required, there is not sufficient room on this site for the proposed use.**

11. Sec. 2 (11) *Dead storage, dismantling and repair of automobiles*: This is regulated by on-going enforcement activities on a case by case basis as needed and is not expected to be an issue with this use.

12. Sec. 2 (12) *Rubbish and trash disposal and screening*: No dumpster is shown on the site. It may not be necessary to have such a facility for this use. If a dumpster is required, however, a screened enclosure that is architecturally compatible with the building needs to be provided.

13. Sec 4 (6) (1) *Increase traffic hazards*: This use is not expected to have any substantive impact on traffic volumes or congestion near the site.

14. Sec 4 (6) (2) *Neighborhood character impact*: The only neighborhood in close proximity to this site is a commercial one. This development appears to generally be in keeping with the character of other commercial developments in the area. **The site also abuts the BAA site, but no substantive impact is foreseen on that area as long as storm water is properly addressed.**

15. Sec. 4 (6) (3) *Community general welfare impact*: No substantive impact on the general welfare of the community is expected from this use.

16. Sec. 4 (6) (4) *Overtax public utilities*: I see a very limited potential to argue that the development will overtax public utilities.

17. Sec. 4 (6) (5) *Adverse impacts on public health and safety*: I see a limited basis to support the position that the development will have a significant negative impact on public health and safety.

18. Sec. 4 (6) (6) *Consistent with good planning practice*: Ballwin has previously allowed the establishment of commercial development on similarly situated properties in proximity to commercial and recreational developments. **If the issues raised in this review report are satisfactorily resolved, I believe that one could conclude that, as exercised in Ballwin, this is good planning practice.**

19. Sec. 4 (6) (7) *Operated in a manner that is compatible with permitted uses in the district*: Assuming that the site design concerns and operational questions raised in this review can be adequately resolved through the planning and approval process, I do not see a significant basis to support the position that this operation would be incompatible with permitted uses in the district.

20. Sec. 4(6) (8) *Operated in a manner that is visually compatible with the permitted uses in the surrounding area*. **There appears to be a limited basis to support the position that this use, as proposed, would not be visually compatible with permitted uses in the surrounding area. Nearby commercial buildings, however, have a distinctive retail look that this building does not have. It lacks the large display windows that characterize such buildings. This building is more indicative of buildings build in suburban industrial parks that lack such features. One could conclude that the industrial nature of the design of this building is not visually compatible with the retail commercial buildings that predominate in the C-1 district along Manchester Rd.**

MRD DISTRICT REGULATIONS (Article XIIC):

The MRD (Manchester Road Revitalization Overlay District) cannot stand on its own. It works only as an overlay district amending and supplementing an underlying zoning district. The MRD may retain, amend or waive the regulations of the underlying district and the subdivision ordinance, if applicable. With the exception of allowing multiple family uses in a mixed use configuration, the MRD cannot permit new uses on the property. The uses allowed by right and by special use exception (SUE) in the underlying zoning district are therefore critical and limit the MRD district. The use proposed with this petition (Z16-03) is presently not permitted in the C-1 district by SUE, but the accompanying petition would make it an allowed use, so the petitioner has elected not to change the underlying C-1 zoning of the property assuming that the zoning text change is approved. As mentioned above, the MRD may allow the waiver or modification of the regulations of the underlying district, but the governing ordinance that adopts the MRD must specifically outline and describe what those changes and waivers are. Any underlying district regulations not superseded or waived will still apply.

Section 1, Purpose: This section describes the purpose of the MRD district, which is "... to promote the local economy and mixed use development within the Manchester Road corridor while simultaneously maintaining the functional capacity of the highway." This section goes on to say that "The preferred land development pattern in the area will offer a pedestrian oriented development with a mix of residential and/or commercial uses that provide high quality services and amenities and that prolong and enhance the shopping, working and living experience. Special effort should be given to tenant mixes and the configuration of tenant spaces to maximize convenience, visibility and aesthetics." **The references to shopping, working and living experiences combined with the desire to**

maximize visibility and aesthetics are addressed extensively in the various subsections of the MRD regulations.

While evaluating an MRD development proposal, it may be useful to keep in mind that the MRD is envisioned by the comprehensive plan and the zoning regulations as a district that will eventually encompass the entire Manchester Rd. corridor. The *Purpose* therefore may best be understood on a corridor-wide basis. It may not be consistent with the MRD approach to apply the regulations and guidelines to every individual parcel or development proposal to the same degree. Parcels will typically be submitted for development and rezoning on an individual basis, but will eventually comprise a portion of the whole as envisioned for the MRD by the comprehensive plan. In a perfect world, every parcel will meet every nuance spelled out in the purpose statement, but in reality some parcels may meet some requirements in a stronger manner than others. Different parcels may fulfill some elements of the *Purpose* but best meet the overarching intent of the *Purpose* statement as a part of the aggregate of all parcels comprising the entire corridor.

Section 2, Permitted Uses: This section addresses permitted uses.

The petitioner has stated that the only uses anticipated for this development is a self-storage facility. Presently the self-storage use is not permitted in the C-1 district or by special use exception. Petition Z 16-03 that accompanies this petition proposes a text amendment to the zoning district regulations to permit the self-storage use in the C-1 district via a special use exception. That concept is discussed more thoroughly in the review report for that petition. This petition cannot receive a positive recommendation from the Commission if petition Z 16-03 is not approved, but this petition can be provisionally recommended if petition Z 16-03 has been recommended for approval but is still pending before the Board of Aldermen.

On the basis of the information presented, the following uses allowed by right in the C-1 district are recommended for inclusion in the governing ordinance:

- None

The following uses allowed by special-use-exception or proposed to be allowed by special use exception per petition Z 16-03 in the C-1 district are recommended for inclusion in the governing ordinance:

- Parking on a paved surface within any front yard for all uses allowed in the MRD Governing ordinance.
- Self-service storage facilities. (This use is subject to the approval or recommendation for petition Z 16-03)

Section 3, Intensity of Use: This section discusses allowing relief from, or the amendment of, the regulations of the underlying zoning ordinance (C-1 district) and associated site development regulations. Such relief or amendment is allowed if the petitioner can demonstrate that it achieves the purposes of this ordinance and it is included in the governing ordinance or on the approved site development plan. Any regulation that is not waived or amended by the ordinance or the approved site development plan is still in

effect. Additionally, the approval of the overlay district brings some regulations that supersede or enhance the parameters of the underlying zoning.

Section 4, Height Regulations: This section states that “all development pursuant to MRD zoning that fronts Manchester Rd. shall include buildings with a minimum height of two (2) stories. This requirement may be reduced on a case by case basis for no more than 50% of the linear building frontage for all roadway fronting buildings in the development if the petitioner can demonstrate that the proposed buildings and site development plan are in accordance with Section 1 of this Article (Purpose) and achieve the purpose of this ordinance or that the existing buildings being incorporated into the plan are structurally incapable of having additional levels added.”

The preliminary architectural elevations for the self-storage building show it to be a multi-story building consistent with the recommendations of this subsection of the MRD ordinance.

Section 5, Parking and Loading Regulations: This section establishes standards for the design, capacity and landscaping of parking facilities. No maximum or minimum parking standards are established. The ordinance clearly wants the petitioner to determine its parking needs and provide only the parking required. This ordinance may be anticipating a variation from the parking requirements of the underlying zoning district (C-1) via the MRD governing ordinance process.

The petitioner has proposed a site development plan with 8 parking spaces to accommodate the storage building.

Ballwin’s code has no parking standard for a self-service storage use. No information has been provided from the petitioner to support a minimum parking requirement for this facility. A previous petition for a similar use cited the ITE Parking Generation Manual for parking demand. **The results of that review indicated that 14 parking spaces for a 65,000 square foot storage building was midway between the average parking demand and the 95% percentile demand for parking that came from the ITE manual. This building is 104,000 square feet. Extending this same standard to this larger building suggests 23 spaces. This petition proposes 8 spaces. The petitioner stated that it has information supporting its proposed parking demand. I recommend that this petitioner be asked to provide additional information supporting the parking provided.**

The comprehensive plan, the MRD and the Great Streets study all support the concept of only building the parking that is necessary for a development and, hence, not creating excessive impervious surfaces with limited need or use.

Section 5 (1): On-street parking is recommended where site design and traffic patterns permit. Clearly, due to the nature of the roadway, on-street parking is not feasible on Manchester Rd. or Ballpark Dr.

Section 5 (2): No waiver of ADA standards can be granted in the MRD. The parking lot proposes 8 parking spaces for customers and employees. The one proposed accessible space meets the standard for accessible parking.

Section 5 (3): This subsection specifies that the provided parking facilities shall be concentrated in areas that are landscaped and buffered to minimize view from major rights-of-way, residential units and adjoining properties. The term parking as defined in the Ballwin Code of Ordinances means the standing of a vehicle whether occupied or unoccupied (except when engaged in loading or unloading), so any facility intended for the standing of a vehicle is a parking facility. This means that all of the pavements on this site are parking facilities and subject to this requirement.

Section 5 (4): This subsection requires that parking not provided within a dedicated right-of-way shall be located behind the primary use, in a parking structure or on a surface lot. The proposed parking plan appears to meet the surface lot recommendation.

Section 5 (5): This subsection requires perimeter landscaped buffers and curbed planting islands in all parking lots of 5 or more spaces. A landscaping plan has been provided that appears to meet this requirement.

Subsection 5 (6): This subsection establishes two parking lot screening designs that can be utilized to screen adjoining rights-of-way, public lands or adjacent properties from parking lots. Due to the design of the site the standards of this section will apply along the self-storage use's frontage on Ballpark Dr.

The first choice (a.) is a 12' deep (minimum) landscaped strip with 2" caliper deciduous trees and/or 6' evergreen trees on 50' centers with three 5 gallon shrubs per tree. The second choice (b.) is a 5' deep landscaped strip with a metal ornamental fence or masonry wall supplemented with clusters of 3 shrub (2 gallon size) plantings on 30' centers interspersed with 2" caliper trees on 50' centers or a continuous hedge with 2" caliper trees every 50'.

The screening designed for the portion of the parking lot south of the curb cut appears to have approximately the number and size of plantings required, but the landscape area is only 10' wide. This does not meet either minimum. If an ornamental fence were included in the submitted design, the requirements of choice (b) would be met. The current planting schedule would comply with choice (a) if the greenspace were widened to 12'.

The landscape area north of the curb cut completely fails to meet any of these landscaping requirements. It is too narrow and contains no landscape plantings except grass.

Section 5 (7): This subsection requires a minimum planting effort of one tree per 10 parking spaces. This requirement appears to have been met.

Section 5 (8): This subsection requires all planting areas within or adjacent to the parking lot or vehicular use areas to be irrigated. The landscaping plan appears to be compliant with this standard.

Section 5 (9): This subsection requires a vertical concrete curb for all parking lot islands and landscaped areas that are not adjacent to rain gardens. The standard nomenclature

for a curb has been utilized in these areas but it has not been labeled as such. The requirement appears to have been met.

Section 5 (10): This subsection requires tree plantings to be consistent with Ballwin standards for street tree plantings. There is no conflict with Ballwin's street tree planting guidelines.

Section 5 (11): This subsection prohibits surface parking lots from abutting rights-of-way for more than 50% of a site's roadway frontage. **The submitted plan is not in compliance with the requirements of this subsection. The entire roadway frontage of the self-storage portion of the site is adjacent to a parking lot. I see no way to reconfigure the lot to place the parking facilities in compliance with this subsection, so it may be necessary to appeal to the Board of Adjustment for a variance to this subsection requirement. Proving a hardship for a variance may be difficult as there is no obvious unique physical characteristic of this site which prohibits compliance with this requirement. It would just be necessary to reconfigure the site to place the building and the parking differently on the site.**

Section 5 (12): This subsection requires parking lots to have no more than 20 consecutive parking spaces without an intervening landscaped area. The submitted plans appear to meet this requirement.

Section 6, Setbacks: This section establishes **maximum** building setbacks from the right-of-way for new buildings. The purpose of this approach to site design is to move away from the vehicle orientation and front yard parking lots across the entire frontage of a site that have been common in the commercial corridor since the 1960's and encourage new buildings to be sited with less visibly dominating parking lots in a manner that also promotes pedestrian oriented development and a sense of neighborhood in these commercial developments.

Section 6 (1): This subsection recommends placing new structures at a maximum setback of 10' from the right-of-way line. The building does not meet this requirement. If it did and was configured differently it might be possible to build essentially the same size building, meet this requirement and resolve the parking lot frontage issue discussed in section 5(11) above.

Section 6 (2): This subsection addresses building setbacks for infill sites. This ordinance provision is intended to allow the setback of a new building in an infill situation to match the setback of the buildings on the adjoining properties and therefore better fit into the context of the neighborhood. Infill development is not specifically defined in the Ballwin code. The term was researched in the planning literature and is generally defined as the development of small, vacant or underutilized, economically unusable or out of date sites that are surrounded by established and developed properties. **Given this site's history of sitting vacant or underutilized for extended periods, and using these definitions, I believe that this site could be characterized as an infill site thus making the proposed building location compliant with this section. The adjoining BAA building to the south and the plaza across the street have setbacks similar to that of the proposed storage building, so the building may be considered compatible with the established setbacks along this section of roadway.**

Section 7, Pedestrian Access: This section requires that pedestrian access be an integral part of the overall design of the site. Safe and convenient pedestrian access is to be provided throughout, to and from parking areas and shall connect when possible with abutting properties, developments and rights-of-way.

Section 7 (1): This subsection requires an identifiable entrance and a path of entry from the street. The proposed self-storage building has no such path of entry. The sidewalk that is proposed only connects the doorway to the driveway. **A 6' wide sidewalk connecting the front entrance of the business offices to the roadway sidewalk is required by this subsection.**

Section 7 (2): This subsection requires sidewalks at least 6' wide along all sides of parking lots that abut rights-of-way or major internal driveways. Also, a 6' sidewalk is to be provided from the public sidewalks to the principal entrance. **The EZ Storage portion of the site does not meet the "all sides" requirement of this ordinance section, but its only exterior parking is adjacent to the street sidewalk near the entrance. There appears to be little reason to have perimeter sidewalks along portions of parking lots that are not at a location that would frequently utilized for pedestrians and do not provide direct access to the building entrance. The Ballpark Dr. sidewalk is in close proximity to the proposed parking and could be viewed as meeting the spirit of this requirement.**

Section 7 (3): This subsection requires that sidewalks be provided along any façade featuring customer entrances, or that abut a parking area or a roadway. Such sidewalks shall be at least 12' wide. This subsection goes on to say that these extra wide sidewalks are required to provide room for sidewalk sales, eating, etc. **This section theoretically requires such sidewalks to extend along the east edge of the storage building. No such sidewalk is shown on the submitted plans. Although a technical interpretation of this section requires a 12' side sidewalk along the building frontage, there seems to be little purpose served in any sidewalk being that wide since the proposed use of this property is not going to be hosting sidewalk sales, bistros or other such functions. A similar interpretation of this ordinance subsection was applied in the previously approved U-Gas and Nissan MRD reviews.**

Section 7 (4): This subsection requires benches, fountains, artwork, shade structures, pavement enhancements, tables and chairs, illumination and similar amenities and placemaking features to enhance the pedestrian ways. **No such features appear to have been included in the submitted plans. There may be little purpose served in a self-storage use having such a feature.**

Section 8, Use Limitations: This section outlines special use limitations related to certain specific possible land uses within an MRD.

Section 8 (1): This subsection prohibits the permanent outdoor storage, sale or display of merchandise, but allows temporary display and the permanent storage, display and sale if allowed by the permitted uses. No outdoor display, storage and sales are proposed to be allowed in section 2 in this report.

Section 8 (2): This subsection allows uses permitted by SUE in the underlying district pursuant to the POD/MRD process. The uses intended to be allowed in this development were discussed in Section 2 of this report.

Section 8 (3): This subsection contains regulations governing drive through facilities. This proposal features no drive through facility.

Section 8 (4): This subsection contains regulations governing vehicle wash facilities. No vehicle wash facilities are proposed.

Section 8(5): This subsection requires that the submitted site plan is to clearly show curb cuts and on site vehicle circulation patterns. This plan submittal requirement has been addressed.

Section 9, Architectural and Site Design Standards: All new buildings and any building altered more than 50% are required to comply with the requirements of this section, so the proposed self-storage building is subject to these regulations.

Section 9 (1): This subsection requires that the minimum of 50% of the exterior area of each wall shall consist of stone, brick, stucco or similar wall system or decorative metal panels. All of the grey, black and white exterior materials shown on the submitted drawings are metal panels. The brick-looking material is actually a concrete panel that is manufactured to look like brick without the expense and structural complications of masonry. The proposed materials appear to be acceptable per this subsection.

Section 9 (2) a: This subsection requires that rooftops and roof-mounted equipment must be architecturally concealed. The submitted architectural elevations do not show rooftop equipment. **The petitioner has stated that environmental control will be provided via 12 to 15 small HVAC units. These will be located on the ground along the western half of the north façade and along the west façade of the building. These are areas that are indicated for landscaping on the submitted plan. No information has been provided about how these units will be installed and how they can function in the drainage swale that is proposed for these areas. There will be a substantial flow of water in the west side swale. My preliminary calculations suggest that there will be a flow of approximately 1 cfs during the design storm. This is a substantial flow that will be impacted by the placement of HVAC units in this area. This location for equipment is further complicated by the presence of a sanitary sewer line along the west property line. It is not advisable to place these HVAC units in a utility easement and permission from the owner of the easement will be necessary.**

Section 9 (2) b: This subsection requires that overhanging eaves, recessed entrances or similar architectural treatments shall be included in the building design to protect entrances and walkways from the weather. **This requirement appears to have been met for the primary pedestrian entrance. No protection is offered for the secondary entrances. These may be emergency exits where such protection is not necessary, but the status of these doorways has not been provided by the petitioner.**

Section 9 (3): This subsection requires that "...walls in excess of 1500 square feet of exposed exterior area shall avoid treatment with a single color or texture, minimal detailing

and lacking architectural treatments. Architectural wall treatments shall be utilized on such walls to create visual interest through the use of texture variations, multiple complementary colors, shadow lines, contrasting shapes, applied features and related architectural devices.” The plans for the storage building have marginally addressed this requirement around the entire perimeter of the building. The west elevation is a little skimpy in this regard, but it faces a parking lot and is not generally visible from nearby highways or residential properties. **The building, however, has a pronounced industrial flavor. It looks like it was designed to be located in a suburban industrial park rather than in a commercial district. Additional windows on the upper floors on all elevations to highlight the multistory aspect of the building would help dramatically. This would have the added advantage of further breaking up the large wall areas.**

Section 9 (4): This subsection requires that the overall size, shape and proportion of the building elements and the building’s placement on the site are to be consistent with similar buildings in surrounding developments. I believe one can conclude that this building meets this general requirement.

Section 9 (5): This subsection addresses architectural screening devices and the uniform appearance of the building from all sides as it is viewed from off site.

There is no trash container shown on the site. Such facility may not be needed for a storage building. If such a facility is to be located on the premises, it should not be in the front yard and it should be screened in a manner that is 100% opaque from adjoining properties and architecturally compatible with the building.

The building is not uniform in its appearance from all sides. The eastern elevation, parallel to Ballpark Dr. is the most highly decorated (faux brick and an awning in addition to the black panels and white trim around the grey fields. There is some decoration on the eastern part of the north elevation, and a very small amount on the eastern end of the southern elevation. There is essentially no decoration on the western elevation. Although the argument will be made that the three sides with less decoration are less visible from the adjoining commercial properties, the fact is that the southern side is highly visible from BAA which is a highly trafficked area. A substantial portion of the northern side is very visible from Manchester Rd. and will probably continue to be very visible even when the intervening undeveloped adjoining parcel is developed because development is most likely to be an auto oriented development. Such developments tend to have small buildings and open lots for parking. Even the western elevation will be visible from the adjoining commercial properties and a portion of the BAA site. **I recommend that the architecture be upgraded to incorporate more decorative elements on these other building facades to minimize the large blank walls and the industrial feel of the building.**

Section 9(6): This subsection establishes additional regulations for large scale developments to further enhance the pedestrian experience and the visual appearance of the building from all sides. Subsection (a) addresses individual users with frontage in excess of 100’. **This building meets this requirement. I recommend that the exterior of the large walls be upgraded as discussed in Subsection 9(5) above.** Subsection (b) deals with building facades in excess of 30’. It requires the incorporation of design elements that especially enhance pedestrian oriented areas such as raised planters, variations in wall planes, pergolas, artwork, texture, shadow lines, porticos, etc. This

subsection also applies to this petition. **The area around the office entrance has some of the recommended architectural and site planning elements, but the balance of this elevation has none. I recommend that the awning, windows (even if they are faux) and other similar pedestrian scale decorative architectural elements be extended across more of the eastern elevation and the other doorways be enhanced to more closely resemble the entrance. This will give the elevation more connection to the roadway and sidewalk and better approximate the requirements of this subsection.**

Section 9 (7): This subsection requires the use of landscaping with irrigation and native or acclimatized species to complement and enhance the building's design. The submitted landscaping plan included notations that the spaces will be irrigated. **I recommend that the petitioner be required to submit a certification from a licensed landscape architect or certified nurseryman that the proposed plantings are native or acclimatized and well suited to their proposed locations.**

Section 9 (8): This subsection addresses issues of screening and landscaping on the site. Of particular note here is the requirement that screening of 80% to a height of 6' be provided along property lines shared with recreational uses. BAA is clearly a recreational use. **No screening or landscaping plantings of any kind are proposed along the south side of this parcel. There is a water quality feature in this area, that is a landscaped space, but it provides no screening. The landscape plan should be expanded along this side of the site to offer some vertical elements to the landscaping in this area. I recognize that no landscaping will screen a 42' tall building, but plantings that will obtain some significant height (say 20 -30 feet at maturity) in this area will grow to break up some of the angularity of the building and bring a more attractive human scale to this elevation.**

Section 9 (9): This subsection addresses the issue of the screening of all types of equipment. **As mentioned earlier in this report, the petitioner proposes to place multiple HVAC units along the western and northern sides of the building. These are not shown on the plan. The plan should be amended to show these units with appropriate screening to prevent them from being visible from adjoining "public rights-of-way, parcels and structures" as is required by this subsection.**

Section 9 (10): This subsection requires the placement of loading docks, trash enclosures etc. to be incorporated into the submitted site development plan. Such facilities are to be located near the service entrance of the building and be 100% screened from view from adjoining rights-of-way and residential uses with landscaping and/or architectural screening. No dedicated exterior loading docks or spaces are proposed as a part of this plan. Interior loading areas are part of the design of the self-storage building. The question of dumpster siting and screening was previously discussed in this report.

Section 9 (11): This subsection encourages, but does not require, community gateway features on all sites and requires them where they are identified on the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan does not identify this site for a gateway feature and it is probably not well suited for such a feature due to its location in the corridor.

Section 10, Urban Design Elements: These urban design guides are to be considered

when reviewing any requested relief from the requirements of the underlying zoning.

Section 10 (1): This subsection states that edges (natural such as waterways and ridgelines and man-made such as roadways, fences and property lines) signaling and defining the transitions between adjoining land uses, landmarks and public art shall be used to help define a sense of place for commercial projects, functions and uses within and between developments. **As applied to this site, I believe that this subsection goes primarily to the issue of the landscaping along Ballpark Dr. and the BAA facility, but it also applies to the need to make the development and adjoining properties that will be part of future MRD developments a unified whole and not individual lots that just happened to be developed next to each other. I believe that the landscaping plan with the recommended changes and additions will address this issue.**

Section 10 (2): This subsection addresses streetscape amenities such as lighting, landscaping and pedestrian amenities within 10' of the right-of-way. The landscaping plan has incorporated amenities into the roadway frontage areas of the site.

Section 10 (3): This subsection states "All proposed development shall provide methods of physically and visually connecting to adjoining properties, land uses and secondary roadways. Ingress and egress strategies that draw traffic away from the major arterials, such as developing alternative access roadway systems and providing access from side streets and adjoining properties providing that such access is available and does not negatively impact surrounding neighborhoods." This issue is also a requirement in the C-1 district regulations.

The CAP Carpet development adjoining this site to the west granted Ballwin a cross access and parking lot interconnection easement across its property from Manchester Rd. to the western edge of this site. The intent of this easement is to facilitate the establishment of a similar easement on the petitioned site (14918 Manchester Rd.) to establish vehicular and pedestrian access from the CAP Carpet and this site to Ballpark Dr. and thereby minimizes the need for uncontrolled turning movements onto and off of Manchester Rd. during high traffic count periods. This kind of parking lot interconnection is one element of 'access management' which reduces traffic congestion on the major thoroughfares by reducing turning movements. Similar easements have been established on several other sites in Ballwin and are held against the future opportunity to interconnect parking lots and provide alternative access to side streets. The previous self-storage petition of this site proposed the creation of a roadway interconnection easement along the south property line. There was objection to this from BAA for fear that significant traffic would utilize this connection to avoid the Ballpark Dr. - Manchester Rd. traffic light and that such traffic would drive in an unsafe manner endangering BAA participants. Such interconnections are a requirement of this subsection, but this concern probably falls under the "negatively impacting surrounding neighborhoods" exclusion.

Section 10 (4): This subsection discusses the utilization of access management to interconnect internally among the proposed lots and to the adjoining commercial properties and to allow future interconnections as adjoining properties are developed. This issue was addressed in the previous subsection.

Section 10 (5): This subsection discusses multi-way roadways as a means of achieving access management. The submitted plan does not address this issue. The Great Streets plan considered such a roadway configuration along Manchester Rd. and does not recommend it. There appears to be little opportunity to achieve this roadway design concept within the Manchester Road Revitalization Overlay District.

Section 10 (6): This section encourages but does not require multi story buildings. The petitioner has proposed a multi-story building.

Section 10 (7): This subsection also addresses the landmark feature issue such as public art or significant architectural or landscaping elements. This site is not recommended for a gateway feature as recommended in the comprehensive plan.

Section 10 (7): This subsection encourages the stacking of multiple uses in multi story buildings. The petitioner has not elected to pursue this approach to developing this site.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ISSUES:

The recommendations of the comprehensive plan relative to Manchester Rd. Revitalization Overlay District Development are on pages 8:22 – 8:24. Basically, these sections of the plan spell out the form that the overlay district was to take when it was created. They are therefore essentially redundant with the review that has been done in this report.

Thomas H. Aiken, AICP
City Planner/Assistant City Administrator