

Maurice Hirsch

354 Willow Weald Path
Chesterfield, MO 63005-1297
Phone: 636-532-8272
E-Mail: mlhjr@mac.com
Web: hirschwrites.com

RECEIVED
City of Chesterfield

Jun 13 2016

Department of Public Services

June 13, 2016

To: City of Chesterfield Planning Commission
From: Maurice Hirsch
Re: P.Z. 05-2016 Wildhorse Baxter Center, C148B (Shelbourne Senior Living)

I write this to you in support of the above project. Below are my thoughts and opinions about the proposed Shelbourne project. They are based not only on being a resident of The Reserve, but also from my years on the City of Chesterfield Planning Commission. I respect the thoughts and opinions of my neighbors who oppose the project as I hope they do of mine.

It's clear that there is a need for this type of facility in the area where it is proposed given the Certificate of Need from the State of Missouri. And other facilities (i.e., competition) in the area are moot since state law prohibits competition as a consideration. So the overall question is whether this project is appropriate for this site and, thus, whether rezoning to Urban Core District should be granted.

As a bit of history, the current C8 zoning seems related to the original zoning and land uses for the north end of The Reserve as well as the zoning of all four corner pieces at Baxter and Wild Horse Creek Road. Since this project will be immediately to the north of The Reserve, it's original zoning and plans are the most relevant. From what I remember when I was on the Planning Commission, the north end of The Reserve was to be condominiums in the main. While the south end of the subdivision was all single family dwellings (with only a few villa-type attached houses each for two families), this was not the case for the north end. So, there was the transition from the south end's single family units to the north end's condominiums, and then to the north of that, C8 zoning as commercial given the transition from the south to the north end of The Reserve.

When I was on the Planning Commission, the city approved modifications in the plans for the north end of the subdivision to what it is now – all single-family dwellings on individual lots. In my opinion, this changes what is appropriate to butt up against our subdivision. Uses and other conditions (and lack of them) in the current C8 zoning seem antithetical to be next to a subdivision that is entirely single-family and is surrounded by other residences, churches, and a community center.

The land in question seems to lie within what the city outlined as the Urban Core and the idea of a residential use seems correct. A rezoning also allows an Attachment A to set conditions for the petitioner so that the city can address proper zoning practices for such a facility given its location. And the proposed use seems consistent with the other currently developed sites along the Baxter/Wild Horse Creek Road intersection.

What I think those who oppose this project do not fully recognize is that if a proposed use comes in that falls under the current C8 zoning, it's then only a matter of processing a site plan. There would be no hearing, no rezoning. While the Planning Commission would review the site plan, if it conformed to the C8 zoning and applicable regulations it would be approved.

I know that building height will be an issue for this project. At this point, I have no opinion on this matter. I would like to see line-of-sight images in order to ascertain what could be seen from different angles within The Reserve. These images should include what is already built (e.g., churches, community center) in order to provide scale and a comparison to what my neighbors can see already.

Summary: My wife and I are in favor of the project both on its merits (good use of land, needed facility) and our belief that the change to residential zoning for the project is good for our area compared to the existing commercial zoning. And, given my age, 75, nice to think one of us could walk to this facility if the other ended up needing its services.

Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts.

Bud Hirsch

Jonathan Raiche

From: Dennis Buchmiller <denbuchm@swbell.net>
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2016 8:18 AM
To: Jonathan Raiche
Subject: Re-Zoning for Assisted Living project.

I am for the re-zoning of the land to allow the development of an Assisted Living facility.

1. The facility will not negatively impact traffic in an already busy area
2. Residents of facility are not likely to be noisy or commit crimes and is a "CLEAN" business
3. The managing company will take extra care to keep the exterior appearance of the facility appealing in order to get business
4. An Assisted Living complex will likely draw other similar clean businesses for the other two vacant parcels of land.
5. The facility will generate a lot of taxes without costly infrastructure upgrades
6. The height of the building will block the present view of the uninteresting backs of houses in the Reserve

Dennis Buchmiller

[Buochmüller - Buechmüller - Buchmüller - Buhmüller - Bumiller]

268 Cheval Square Drive
Chesterfield MO 63005

denbuchm@swbell.net

636 - 346 - 0311

Maurice Hirsch



Memo

To: Justin Wyse
From: Maurice Hirsch
CC:
Date: 1/21/17
Re: Shelbourne

Justin, I would have liked to be at the Planning Commission meeting on Monday, but a commitment to a non-profit board meeting precludes my ability to attend. I want to have the following put into the record and shared with Commission members.

- I support of PZ 05-2016 Wildhorse Baxter Center, C148B (Shelbourne Senior Living).
- I have looked at this from perspective of when I was on the PC and as an affected resident.
- My letter to the Planning Commission in June of last year outlines my overall thoughts, which I will not repeat.
- At that time, the only reservation I had was building height, but I believe that has been successfully addressed.
- I have read the staff report and am in agreement with the conclusions contained in it.
- I would also like to point out the offer to our subdivision, The Reserve, of substantial funds for landscaping and a landscape architect.
- Given that subdivision homes are at the top of a hill overlooking the development, it seems logical to me that any additional site buffering would be on those properties rather than below them on the development itself.

Thank you for considering my thoughts and opinion.

Bud Hirsch