

## *Olivette Strategic Plan Phase II Public Engagement Final Report*

---

### **Overview**

In the summer of 2004, the City of Olivette launched a strategic planning initiative to help guide the redevelopment of the Olive Boulevard corridor and the city's three industrial parks. At that time, the city contracted with Vandewalle & Associates to conduct an assessment of its development opportunities and challenges given its place in the region. Vandewalle consultants met with key stakeholders and residents to aid in their assessment and to obtain the information they needed to create possible redevelopment visions for Olivette. Out of their efforts, emerged an opportunities analysis that outlined three distinct, though overlapping, visions for Olivette. In these visions, Olivette ranged from being a community of quality neighborhoods to and an attractive regional destination to a smart, well-connected city known for its life-science, business and technology acumen. Vandewalle consultants presented the three visions to the community in the winter of 2004 and the spring of 2005 as the culmination of phase one of the strategic planning process.

To continue the planning process, the city subsequently retained Vector Communications Corporation to design and implement a public engagement campaign that would involve residents and business owners/operators in the identification of the city's development strengths, issues/needs and goals. In June and July of 2005, Vector consultants, working in conjunction with city officials, held three neighborhood conversations, hosted one business roundtable and staffed a booth at the city's annual Summerfest event as part of this campaign. These activities took place in what is known as phase two of the planning process, which attracted close to 200 meeting participants. The information gathered from this phase is presented in this document and its corresponding appendix and will be used to guide vision selection and refinement in phase three of the city's strategic planning.

In general, phase two findings indicate that community members want to maintain Olivette's high living standards and intimate neighborhood charm while building its appeal as a regional destination – a position most closely aligned with the second redevelopment vision. Residents and business representatives assert that the city has much to offer in terms of its location, regional connectivity, pleasant neighborhoods, quality housing, first-rate schools, socio-economic and ethnic diversity, and parks and green space. They contend that such features are attractive to prospective homebuyers and development interests alike, but to be leveraged effectively should be augmented by expanded commercial amenities, unique retail opportunities that have cross-generational appeal, a town center where people can come together, and pedestrian-friendly streetscapes that encourage foot-traffic along Olive Boulevard. With all of this in place, Olivette could significantly improve its image and curbside appeal. It could also expand its tax base and create an enhanced sense of community by becoming a better place to live, work and shop.

## Neighborhood Conversations & Business Roundtable

### *Mobilization & Outreach*

During the third week of July, more than 175 Olivette citizens participated in three neighborhood conversations and one business roundtable to discuss the city's redevelopment plans for the Olive Boulevard corridor and the city's three industrial parks. To generate interest in these events and to ensure adequate community participation, Vector consultants and city planning officials undertook the following efforts:

- ✓ Designed and posted six large signs along major thoroughfares for vehicular and pedestrian traffic announcing meeting dates, times and locations
- ✓ Designed and mailed post cards to every property owner announcing meeting dates, times and locations ten days before the public meetings
- ✓ Printed articles in the July *Olivette Advisory* summarizing phase one planning findings, publicizing the launch of phase two and providing notification of the upcoming public meetings. The *Advisory* was sent to every property owner in Olivette the week before the public meetings
- ✓ Sent letters of invitation to subdivision trustees concerning the public meetings to reinforce their awareness of the events and to encourage their mobilization of other subdivision residents
- ✓ Developed and posted meeting flyers on the city's web site
- ✓ Sent letters of invitation to all area business owners explaining the purpose of the planning process and the business roundtable
- ✓ Designed and mailed reminder post cards about the roundtable to every local business one week before the event
- ✓ Telephoned key business stakeholders to solicit their participation in the roundtable and to request their assistance in recruiting other business owners
- ✓ Canvassed businesses along the Olive Boulevard corridor and posted flyers about the neighborhood conversations in various stores to raise consumer awareness
- ✓ Developed a press advisory about the public meetings and pitched it to the media. Stories were printed in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and the *Citizen's Journal*.

As a result of these many efforts, each neighborhood conversation had more than 50 residents in attendance. At these sessions, conversation participants spent two hours meeting in small groups where they discussed their redevelopment ideas, concerns and goals. In addition, 25 local business owners/operators shared their commercial development thoughts with consultants and city officials at the morning business roundtable.

## ***Methodology***

Both the neighborhood conversations and the business roundtable were similarly organized with participants meeting in groups of 10 or more to discuss specific topics, including community character, commercial development, residential development, transportation and infrastructure and the city's development role. Members of the planning team, which consisted of Vector consultants and city planners, facilitated a total of 14 small groups (neighborhood conversations and business roundtable combined) with an average of 13 participants in each group.

Each small group was given roughly 15 to 20 minutes to deliberate on the individual topics.<sup>1</sup> For each topic, with the exception of the city's development role, facilitators asked participants to answer the following questions:

- What strengths or assets does Olivette possess regarding this topic that should be leveraged in the city's redevelopment plan?
- What issues or concerns do you have about this topic that the planning team should address in the strategic plan? (Note: This question gets to needs and desires.) And, for what reasons are these issues important?
- What would the city gain from undertaking significant investments in this area i.e. what are the benefits of planned action regarding this topic? (Note: Benefits can be translated into goal statements by planning team members.)

The questions regarding the city's development role varied slightly given the nature of the topic. Only two questions were asked on this subject, which included:

- In what ways should the city support redevelopment along the Olive Boulevard corridor and in the three industrial parks?
- What issues or concerns do you have about the city's involvement in the redevelopment process?

Each small group's answers to these questions were posted on large butcher-block sheets for ease of reference and review. Not surprisingly, there was significant conceptual overlap across topics and small groups. Recurring themes emerged for each topic and are featured on subsequent pages. Divergent perspectives concerning the various topics were also communicated, indicating the ideological diversity of participants.

All participant comments were transcribed and compiled into a summary document attached as an appendix to this report.<sup>2</sup> The comments that received the largest number of small group mentions are captured for each topic and question in the following section.

---

<sup>1</sup> Business roundtable participants discussed only four topics as residential development was not among their facilitated conversations.

<sup>2</sup> The comments generated by the neighborhood conversations and business roundtable were so similar in content as to not warrant separate treatment in this report or the appendix.

## ***Meeting Findings***

The findings from the neighborhood conversations and business roundtable are organized by topic and can be cross-referenced with the information in the appendix for greater detail.

### **COMMUNITY CHARACTER**

With regard to community character, meeting participants said that they valued most Olivette's close proximity to everything, diverse populations and housing styles, quality schools, outdoor amenities, affordability and quiet, safe neighborhoods. They were concerned most, however, about the perception of Olivette as a contentious, anti-development community. They also maintained that the city needed to develop a distinct community identity that would be attractive to residents and businesses. In addition, participants expressed a desire for a recreation/town center where people could meet, connect as a community and engage in family-oriented activities. They believed that having the plan address these and other issues, particularly the dearth of retail amenities, would foster an improved sense of community, enhance family life, and generate additional revenue for the city.

#### **Top Strengths:**

- Location, centrality, proximity to county seat
- Diversity – population, housing, religion, socio-economic status, ethnicity
- Excellent schools (public and alternative)
- Safe (low crime), clean community
- Excellent recreation/outdoor facilities. Beautiful, well-maintained parks, walking trails
- Good variety of housing in terms of both types and costs. Affordability
- City is not overdeveloped. Olivette is sleepy/quiet. City is attractive to those seeking refuge from the hustle and bustle

#### **Top Issues/Concerns:**

- Outside view that Olivette is a contentious, anti-development community
- Lack of a recreation/town center where citizens can meet
- City's lack of a unique, distinct identity
- Underdeveloped commercial properties. Absence of desired retail amenities

#### **Top Benefits:**

- Development of places where people could meet, talk and exchange ideas.  
Improved sense of community and enhanced family relations
- Community would become a destination place where people would want to stay and shop
- Additional tax revenue for the city
- Improved health and quality of life for families

## **COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

In their discussions of commercial development, meeting participants again found Olivette's location to be a major asset and commercial draw. They also held that the city's good road network, solid residential base, high household income and underutilized commercial space would be appealing to prospective developers. Yet, they wanted to ensure that any future commercial development considered strongly residents' interests so as not to diminish the community's quality of life. This noted, many welcomed additional commercial development that would result in more retail amenities like restaurants (family-style and ethnic), coffee shops, a grocery store, a hardware store etc. Some even supported the construction of mixed-use developments along the Olive corridor that would combine commercial and residential uses as long as the developments addressed traffic flow concerns, met tasteful architectural standards and were not "big box" in design. They held that such developments would encourage more people to live and shop in the city, thus expanding the city's tax base.

### **Top Strengths:**

- Appealing location – close to major regional destinations
- Good road network
- City is ripe for redevelopment
- Solid residential community that is attractive because of Ladue school district
- High income of residents. City has enough wealth to support development
- Vacant buildings and underutilized commercial space provides lots of opportunities for developers

### **Top Issues/Concerns:**

- Need more restaurants, public squares/fountains, coffee shops, grocery stores etc. The convenience of having essential stores in the area is lacking
- Need architectural standards, central design themes that are tasteful
- Need mixed-use development in area that combine commercial and residential uses
- No "big box" developments or strip malls
- City not sure if it wants to be a bedroom community or more commercially developed. Commercial development must be weighed against residential interests
- Traffic congestion and lack of adequate, well-designed parking
- Need to be realistic in terms of what the market can bear

### **Top Benefits:**

- Expanded tax base. Better city services. Decreased dependence on property taxes
- People want to live in communities where amenities are close by
- Rather than Olive being treated as a pass-thru, new commercial development could make it a viable destination for non-residents and improve the city's image
- Potential for more employment opportunities for residents
- City more architecturally pleasing and inviting

## **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Most planning participants said that they enjoyed living in Olivette because of its appreciating property values, schools, well-built housing, cultural diversity, pleasant neighborhoods and open green space. These features of residential life are also valued by future homebuyers and housing developers. However, many participants communicated concerns about the replacement of older, smaller homes with newer, larger ones that occupy more of their lot space and change street character. Others asserted that the plan should address the city's lack of life cycle housing – housing that keeps people in the community through all stages of their life experience. With property values rising, keeping and attracting residents, particularly younger families, was an issue. A parallel concern was attracting developers given the city's reputation for being difficult to work with. For many, resolving these issues would afford the city an opportunity to not only preserve its existing residential assets, but also to enhance its neighborhoods through the development of different types of housing and infrastructure improvements.

### **Top Strengths:**

- Appreciating property values resulting in a higher tax base for the city
- High quality school district
- Great, diverse (styles, ages etc.) housing
- Good cultural mix of people
- Good neighborhoods – safe, friendly, pleasant, quiet and clean
- Open space, mature greenery

### **Top Issues/Concerns:**

- Replacement of smaller houses with bigger ones (McMansions) adversely changes street and community character
- Appreciating property values makes housing less affordable, which could negatively affect the city's demographic composition. Fewer options available
- Not enough life cycle housing to keep people in the community
- Perception/reality that the city is difficult to work with. Harder to build and improve housing in Olivette because of unfriendly ordinances and codes
- Newer residential developments often look cookie cutter, lack character and style
- Need set standards for housing, a central vision

### **Top Benefits:**

- Existing assets are preserved, while areas in need of improvement are addressed
- Improved relationships between citizens, sub-division trustees and city government
- More young families moving into the community
- More sidewalks – better, larger, safer pathways for pedestrians and runners
- A diversified housing stock that appeals to residents as they age
- Expanded tax base
- Better quality of homes that make the community even more stable

## **TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE**

When discussing transportation and infrastructure, several of the previously mentioned strengths were identified like the city's location and ease of access to major arterials. Others, like Olivette's proximity to the airport, good trails and bikeways, fine parks, connection to regional public transit and quality municipal services were also cited. However, many participants stated concerns about the absence and/or poor condition of sidewalks, the heavy traffic along Olive Boulevard especially during rush hour, and the lack of a MetroLink station located within the community. Several small groups also mentioned the need to widen turn lanes, synchronize stoplights, erect medians and add parking. For these participants, development efforts that addressed their concerns would help create a safer, healthier community with less traffic and parking problems and more pedestrian appeal.

### **Top Strengths:**

- Access to I-170, 70, 64/40, Lindbergh, airport etc.
- Central location
- Connection to regional public transit/potential MetroLink site
- Good trails and bikeways, especially between Stacy Park and Dielman
- Ease of navigating residential streets. Street system is fairly logical
- City's police, fire and ambulance services are good
- Good parks

### **Top Issues/Concerns:**

- Not a sidewalk/bike community. Sidewalks too narrow and in poor condition. Many are broken and uneven on Olive and Old Bonhomme. Provisions for pedestrians scant
- No easy way to MetroLink. Would like a station on or near Olive
- Rush hour traffic volume heavy, especially near I-170 where congestion is common and turn lanes need to be widened. Olivette is a city of stoplights that are not well coordinated or synchronized
- Not enough amenities to attract people to the city
- Poor management of traffic on Olive. Making left turns onto and off of Olive is difficult. Could use medians to enhance traffic flow. Street should be widened

### **Top Benefits:**

- MetroLink in the city would mean less traffic and parking problems. It would also attract more visitors
- Ability to stroll along Olive and meet neighbors would encourage a healthier, more connected community
- Redevelopment of I-170 interchanges would improve traffic and create opportunities for transit-oriented development

## **CITY'S DEVELOPMENT ROLE**

For most meeting participants, improving life in Olivette is a function of city government. While the city has lots of responsibilities, many asserted that among them should be supporting redevelopment. There was considerable debate over the extent to which this should be the case. However, most participants were in favor of the government playing a coordinating role in the development process as long as it aggressively sought public input and considered the interests of residents when dealing with developers. Participants repeatedly stated that they wanted the city to devise a master development vision that maintained the community's character, enhanced its image, addressed traffic concerns and expanded its tax base. To accomplish this, many were in favor of the city using the development tools at its disposal, provided that it was judicious in its offerings of development subsidies and exercised restraint in its exercise of eminent domain authority.

### **Top Ways City Should Support Redevelopment:**

- Actively seek public opinion in redevelopment process. Be a conduit for dialogue, especially between developers and residents. Government must remain transparent
- Develop a master development plan/long-term vision. Set architectural standards. Recruit developers aligned with the vision
- Focus on aesthetic and infrastructure improvements that increase appeal
- Have the Economic Council or city staff focus on building tax revenue through development
- Work with developers. Put out requests for proposals that support specific goals. Use public financing tools (modestly) to attract desired development. City has to maintain a delicate balance and apply the "but for" test. Should get a return on its investments. Should also make the community competitive
- Widen Olive Boulevard to improve traffic flow
- Change codes so that area is more business friendly. Establish zoning that helps it meet its development goals
- Maintain the character of the community
- Collaborate with other municipalities in development efforts

### **Top Issues/Concerns:**

- Use of eminent domain is not favorable for existing residents and business owners. Should be used judiciously and prudently. City needs to be clear about how eminent domain could be applied
- Improvements may lead to displacements. How will city take care of residents being displaced? City must be mindful of tradeoffs. People want to be treated fairly and have investments protected
- Density demands of new developments
- Development climate of Olivette viewed as unfriendly, especially after Wal-Mart controversy. Difficult for community that's been fractured by previous TIF (tax increment financing) activities to objectively consider public financing tools

## **Summerfest Questionnaires**

During the annual Olivette Summerfest, Vector consultants and city officials manned a booth to raise awareness about the city's strategic planning process. Staff handed out flyers about the neighborhood conversations and business roundtable, answered questions about the planning process and asked interested attendants to complete a five-minute community questionnaire. The questionnaire sought to ascertain community members' views on residential development, commercial development and the city's development role. Questionnaire findings complement the information gained from the public meetings and are summarized below.

### ***About The Respondents***

Fifty-six people completed the "Shaping Olivette's Future" questionnaire. Seventy-nine percent of respondents checked that they owned a home in the city, while 13 percent identified themselves as renters. More people stated that they played in the city (23%) than worked in the city (16%). And only a limited number of respondents, five percent or less, indicated that they worshiped, owned a business or held office in the community.

With regard to respondents' demographic characteristics, 66% percent were European-American, 16% were African-American, and 11% stated that they were "other" (some respondents left the question blank). In addition, most respondents – 70% were married and had children. The average respondent household was comprised of two children and two adults.

### ***Questionnaire Findings***

Like public meeting attendees, questionnaire respondents were asked to identify what they valued most about Olivette. Their responses were the same as those given at the neighborhood conversations and business roundtable. In order of priority, they valued:

- Centrality of Olivette to Metro St. Louis
- Proximity to major thoroughfares and highways
- Quality of public education
- Safety of community
- Family friendly community
- Familiarity with area
- Proximity to employment
- Quality of city services (police, fire, trash pick-up, snow removal)

The aspects of Olivette respondents wanted to see most improved also mirrored the feedback received from meeting attendees. They wanted more retail amenities with a wider array of commercial goods and services as well as more entertainment venues for individual and family fun. They wanted Olive Boulevard to have more character and ambiance and maintained that it needed more focal points of interest for the casual shopper or pedestrian. In addition, they desired sidewalk improvements and repairs

along the corridor. Some respondents also wrote about the need for recreational enhancements at the local community center and in neighborhood parks.

In trying to gauge public opinion concerning residential development, commercial development and the city’s development role, the questionnaire presented a series of statements for respondents to rank on a scale of one to five, with one being strongly agree (SA), two being agree (A), three being neutral (N), four being disagree (D), and five being strongly disagree (SD). The statements as well as the average rankings they received from respondents are featured in the following tables.

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
	1	2	3	4	5
■ The community benefits when more multi-family residences (town homes, condominiums and apartments) are available.			X		
■ The community benefits when more senior designed housing is available.		X			
■ The community benefits more from residential rather than non-residential development.			X		
■ Olivette should consider the use of public financing tools to encourage residential development.			X		

**COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
	1	2	3	4	5
■ The community benefits from maintaining its largely residential character with small-scale businesses that meet local needs.		X			
■ The community benefits from having large-scale businesses that serve regional markets.			X		
■ The community would benefit from becoming more of an economic hub, with greater concentrations of employment, retail and personal services.		X			
■ The community would benefit from the creation of research and business development facilities within the existing industrial parks that enhance its regional position as a center for life sciences, business and technology.		X			
■ The community benefits more from non-residential rather than residential development.		X			
■ Olivette should consider the use of public financing tools to encourage <b>non-residential</b> development.		X			

**CITY’S DEVELOPMENT ROLE**

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
	1	2	3	4	5
■ The community benefits when private resources lead the redevelopment process with minimal use of public resources.		X			
■ The community benefits from having the city work with private developers to pursue mutual goals that benefit the community and private sector.		X			
■ The community benefits when the city is a full partner in bringing about redevelopment, using public and private resources to strengthen its position in the regional market.		X			
■ The community benefits when the city coordinates redevelopment activities with adjacent municipalities.		X			

As indicated by respondent rankings, most of those surveyed did not feel strongly about the residential development strategies mentioned, except when it came to the benefits of building more senior housing. Their positions were less neutral when responding to commercial development strategies with one exception – the development of large-scale businesses that serve regional markets. Perhaps their neutrality on this matter was influenced by “big box” development concerns, as was the case for public meeting participants. Overall, however, respondents recognized the benefits of commercial development as an economic generator so long as the city maintained its residential character. They were even amenable to considering the use of public financing tools to encourage commercial development. In addition, they agreed that the city should be involved in the redevelopment process at multiple levels.

**Conclusion**

This report’s findings will be shared with the community at-large at the upcoming September open house. At this event, consultants from Vandewalle & Associates will also present a redevelopment vision of choice based upon their interpretation of these findings and their work in phase one of the planning process. Citizens and other interested parties will have an opportunity to respond to the vision and to propose redevelopment ideas of their own for public consideration and comment.

***Olivette Strategic Plan  
Public Engagement Final Report Appendix: Summary of Public Input***

Below are the combined findings from the facilitated neighborhood conversations and business roundtable. While there is conceptual overlap between columns, each column has its own focus i.e. strengths, concerns or benefits. The column titled “Group Mentions” refers to the number of small groups that when discussing the stated topic shared the same idea, issue or perspective. On average, small groups contained between 10 and 13 participants. There were a total of 14 small groups that participated in the neighborhood conversations and business roundtable. Comments that were repeated most often are presented first with less frequently mentioned ideas cited later.

<b>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Appreciating property values resulting in higher tax base for city	<b>8</b>	➤ Replacement of smaller houses w/ bigger ones (McMansions) adversely changing street and community character, esp. given size of lots. Odd mix homes on blocks (large, expensive homes with smaller ones) results in lack of continuity in housing styles	<b>6</b>	➤ Preserves existing assets / community qualities (character, history etc.) while addressing areas in need of redevelopment	<b>5</b>
➤ High quality school district	<b>8</b>	➤ Appreciating property values mean that housing is becoming less affordable, which could negatively affect city’s demographic composition. Fewer options are available due to price ranges. Displacement of existing residents as a result of new developments a concern	<b>4</b>	➤ Would improve relationships between citizens, sub-division trustees and city government	<b>2</b>
➤ Great / diverse / mixed age housing stock	<b>7</b>	➤ Not enough life cycle housing to keep people in community through all stages of their life experience. Insufficient housing mix, esp. concerning senior housing (e.g.: high end rental property, assisted living)	<b>4</b>	➤ Would attract younger families to community	<b>2</b>
➤ Good cultural mix of people	<b>7</b>	➤ Perception/reality that it is difficult to work with the city. Harder to build and improve because ordinances and codes not user friendly. Serves as a hindrance to developers	<b>4</b>	➤ Could result in more sidewalks – better, larger, safer pathways for runners and pedestrians	<b>2</b>
➤ Good neighborhoods – safe, friendly, pleasant, quiet and clean	<b>6</b>	➤ Don’t want housing stock to look cookie cutter. New residences are ordinary, uninspiring. Lack character and style	<b>4</b>	➤ A diversified housing stock will appeal to residents as they age, especially if have more senior housing	<b>2</b>
➤ Open space, mature greenery (not crowded)	<b>6</b>	➤ Need set standards for housing, a central vision. City has too much unplanned development. People build without thought to the future. Absence of a cohesive look	<b>4</b>	➤ New developments would increase the city’s tax base	<b>2</b>

<b>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT Contd.</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ City is centrally located	5	➤ Public Works dept.'s process for approving improvements and addressing violations cumbersome. Not resident friendly. Impedes homeowners from doing work on their homes. Inept building department.	3	➤ Better quality of homes from new developments would make the community even more stable	2
➤ City has wide variety of affordable housing given neighboring municipalities. Families able to "move up" within community	5	➤ Olivette becoming overdeveloped; running out of empty/green space. New development will mean cutting down trees	3	➤ New developments would continue the rise in property values	1
➤ Great parks and a community center (but limited amenities)	4	➤ Not enough attention paid to environmental impact of new large residential developments on smaller surrounding lots	2	➤ Better quality of services and amenities	1
➤ City does good job of providing basic services. This is attractive to existing home owners and potential home buyers	3	➤ Private subdivisions over which city has limited control result in significant variance in street conditions. Leads to appearance and infrastructure concerns that could deter prospective developers. (Note: not all subdivisions turned streets over to the city when had the chance)	1	➤ Increased tax revenues may be used to finance a state-of-the-art community center	1
➤ New residential development, esp. North of Olive	2	➤ Hilltop area disconnected from other communities in Olivette	1	➤ Would foster diversity in housing design and styles	1
➤ Older homes very well built, although need maintenance	2	➤ Trustees need to be informed of home designs	1	➤ Encourages/promotes socio-economic diversity	1
➤ Residents have many chances to participate in local government decision-making and are active at every level	2	➤ Not attractive to those looking for smaller homes (losing potential homebuyers to Central West End, Washington Loft district etc.)	1	➤ More community harmony and more cohesive neighborhoods	1
➤ Aging housing stock presents new opportunities to developers	1	➤ New synagogue will bring group that primarily walks and lives near each other	1	➤ Planned residential development promotes uniform growth	1
➤ Active real estate agents who recognize and promote quality of life in Olivette	1	➤ Need quality condominium area	1	➤ Provides opportunity to help subdivisions better address specific issues and use their indentures to protect and improve their areas	1
➤ Owner pride in housing	1	➤ Houses in disrepair not being kept up – just waiting to be sold	1	➤ Development would promote more home ownership and make city less attractive for rentals. Would raise standards for rental property owners	1

<b>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT Contd.</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Low taxes	1	➤ Community center lacks sufficient amenities	1	➤ Planned developments present opportunity to preserve nature, greenery	1
➤ New synagogue brings stability	1	➤ No attached homes (town homes)	1		
➤ Limited commercial encroachment into residential areas	1	➤ Need for elementary school north of Olive Blvd.	1		
➤ Large lot sizes for homes	1	➤ Subdivisions should take more control	1		
➤ Easy access to downtown St. Louis	1	➤ Indentured laws should be renewed/rewritten	1		
➤ Old Bonhomme school is filled to capacity	1	➤ Developers are not always using high quality construction that could conserve energy	1		
➤ Oak Estates is very community-oriented	1	➤ Tearing down the old to build new	1		
➤ Hillendale has a lot of character (e.g., annual picnic)	1	➤ Don't have infrastructure to support development	1		
➤ Children can walk to school during their elementary years	1	➤ North/South Olivette disjointed	1		
➤ New developments are bringing the community into the new century	1	➤ Eminent domain a major concern	1		
➤ Higher end residential developments are being built	1	➤ Need more daycare/childcare	1		
		➤ Too much rental property in city. Owners do not maintain units well. Lack of stability with turnover from short-term renters. Standards not enforced, especially for large, corporate-owned properties	1		
		➤ Apartment buildings on Olive present opportunity for commercial development	1		
		➤ Need a dog park	1		
		➤ Possible commercial development in some areas may increase the number of rental units (i.e. Hilltop)	1		
		➤ Need policy regarding buyouts that differentiates buyout amounts for live-in owners and rental owners	1		
		➤ Rental property owners want to run down the area to make it prime for commercial buyout	1		
		➤ More development will mean more traffic	1		

## COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Location is appealing to commercial developers; close proximity to airport, Clayton, Monsanto, downtown	<b>11</b>	➤ Need more family restaurants, mid-sized retail, ethnic restaurants, squares, fountains, skate park, Starbucks, farmer's market, Bread Co., Trader Joe's or grocery store, sporting goods, hardware store, new car dealerships etc. The convenience of having essential stores in the area is lacking. Stores are not adequate for people to spend their money in Olivette	<b>10</b>	➤ Expands tax base and increases revenue. Better able to maintain quality city services. Would also lessen the city's dependence on property taxes	<b>9</b>
➤ Good road network	<b>5</b>	➤ Need architectural standards. Central design themes that are tasteful	<b>7</b>	➤ People want to live in communities where amenities are close by. These amenities are met by commercial development	<b>4</b>
➤ Olivette ripe for development, an untapped market	<b>5</b>	➤ Need mixed-use development in area that brings together commercial and residential uses. Other communities benefiting from mixed-use developments (ex. Brentwood and Kirkwood). Tax dollars should go toward this, specifically in the area north of Olive Blvd. where the older homes are. The right complement of businesses is needed and mixed-use must have good design. Expect some resistance by residents around eliminating homes for commercial development	<b>6</b>	➤ Would attract retailers that meet community needs: ice cream; coffee shop; grocery store; restaurants (sit-down, bar, entertainment) – prefer locally owned vs. chains	<b>4</b>
➤ Anchored by solid residential community that is attractive b/c of Ladue school district	<b>4</b>	➤ Small scale commercial development / no big box / strip malls with which "Mom and Pop" stores can't compete	<b>5</b>	➤ Rather than Olive Blvd. being treated as a pass-thru, new commercial development could make it a viable destination for non-residents. It would improve the city's image	<b>3</b>
➤ Income of residents. Community has enough wealth to support commercial development	<b>4</b>	➤ City not sure if it wants to be a bedroom community or more commercially developed. Future commercial development needs to be weighed against residential interests	<b>4</b>	➤ Potential for more employment opportunities for residents (from entry-level jobs for students to executive level jobs)	<b>3</b>
➤ Vacant buildings and underutilized commercial space provide lots of opportunities for developers	<b>4</b>	➤ Doesn't have commercial anchor that attracts business (like schools serve as a residential anchor that attracts home buyers and renters). City has no true shopping district	<b>4</b>	➤ Planned commercial development would make the city more architecturally pleasing and inviting	<b>3</b>

<b>COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT Contd.</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Good police and fire departments/ services	3	➤ Lack of adequate well designed parking	4	➤ City would be more attractive to live, work and shop	2
➤ Good national access	3	➤ Need to be realistic. What can the market bear? We don't need everything. We're not a Brentwood or Creve Couer	4	➤ Health issues would be lessened and public attitude towards Olive Blvd. would improve	2
➤ Safe, diverse neighborhoods	3	➤ Careful attention should be paid to traffic and traffic patterns. Increased traffic likely to result from increased number of businesses. Traffic becomes worse if roads are not redesigned	4	➤ Money would come into and stay in Olivette.	2
➤ There are already three industrial parks in area	3	➤ Industrial parks have lot of vacancies. Need to be filled. Area looks shabby, is not inviting to business. Needs to be upgraded. Concern is that since areas designated for business are poorly used, will new commercial development lead to more of the same?	3	➤ Strengthens city's position politically	1
➤ Extension of Clayton corridor/ Clayton housing skyrocketing leads to opportunities in Olivette	2	➤ Upscale businesses. Not enough high-end retail	3	➤ Commercial development planning can assure residents that undesirable businesses are not located in the community. Planning also prevents piecemeal development	1
➤ Few "for sale" signs on commercial properties along Olive	2	➤ Need clustered commercial development	3	➤ Would increase user access to businesses for walkers and bike riders	1
➤ Residents need services. The demand for additional commercial amenities exists	1	➤ Economics of industrial parks have changed. Manufacturing and production based economy is gone. Need to modify land use so responds to today's economic realities. Need to diversify commercial tax base.	2	➤ Could attract niche stores, beauty salon (upscale whole body treatment spas), banquet facility, hotel, etc. to community	1
➤ Opportunity in life sciences	1	➤ City focused on needs of residents. Residents viewed as Olivette's biggest asset	2	➤ Would provide more places to take senior citizens and teens	1
➤ Community of choice for scientists	1	➤ Designed walkability	2		
➤ City's younger demographic is inviting to businesses	1	➤ Develop heart of Olivette; a place to assemble and meet	2		

**COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT Contd.**

<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Properties cheaper than Clayton and Creve Couer	1	➤ Adjacent neighborhoods are vulnerable/ services decline	2		
➤ Children's athletic program is a draw	1	➤ Concern about use of eminent domain	2		
➤ Olivette shopping center has good mix of businesses	1	➤ Politics of the city often blocks development. Restrictions on doing business prevent companies from coming into community	2		
➤ Olivette's a sleepy, family-oriented town	1	➤ City Hall taking up prime commercial space. (Consider trading with community center)	2		
➤ Parking is adequate for existing businesses	1	➤ The stop/go traffic created by many lights in a row are creating air quality issues/ traffic in general	2		
➤ Olivette has its own licensing department	1	➤ City lacks identity. Olive street is cold, unattractive, uninviting and provides no sense of community for the city	2		
➤ Not over-populated	1	➤ Cut-through residential traffic	2		
➤ City is bedroom community for other regional cities	1	➤ Need commercial development that helps pay for services and supports strong tax base	1		
➤ City has many basic services and is close to Post Office, drug store, bank	1	➤ Lack of commercial development that attracts airport traffic	1		
➤ City has a nursery	1	➤ Want to see something on Olive besides traffic	1		
➤ There are no big box stores in Olivette	1	➤ Unable to attract young adult interest in community	1		
➤ Low school tax	1	➤ Very few businesses operate in evening hours	1		
➤ Some businesses on Olive speak to Olivette's roots/history. Ex. Beckman Brothers, bowling alley, church near Old Bonhomme/Olive	1	➤ Only one bank in city	1		
➤ New residential development has benefited businesses	1	➤ Desire for greater demographic mix	1		
		➤ City halls/ town centers can be impetus for development	1		
		➤ Trying to make Olive Blvd do too many things	1		
		➤ Who owns Air Masters building, and what will become of it?	1		
		➤ Existing businesses should be given consideration during redevelopment	1		

**COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT Contd.**

<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
		➤ Concern about height of buildings (scale should be considered)	1		
		➤ Olive Blvd is controlled by the state, but it's Olivette's main source of commercial revenue. How will redevelopment work with MODOT controlling?	1		
		➤ Tax burden has been shifted to residents, but not commercial properties (no balance)	1		
		➤ Businesses have no character and are of poor quality	1		
		➤ The city is providing too many tax breaks that provide too little revenue for the city and hurt education	1		
		➤ The businesses that are coming in are not the things people want	1		
		➤ The types of buildings that are going up are not being thought of as part of a long term plan	1		
		➤ Olive Street is not pedestrian friendly. The walk signs near the intersections don't correspond with the lights	1		
		➤ Development's impact on noise, cleanliness, safety and crime	1		
		➤ Lighting and signage	1		
		➤ Impact on privacy	1		
		➤ Lack of a hotel on 170	1		
		➤ Shallow commercial lot depth constrains the type of development that is possible	1		
		➤ Enforcing ordinances that impact community's look i.e. Phillips Gas Station at Olive/Dielman	1		
		➤ Shrinking sales tax base because people don't do significant shopping/dining in city (at least not residents)	1		

## TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE

<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Access to I-170, Lindbergh, Clayton, Richmond Heights, U City, etc. Close to highways 70 and 40</li> </ul>	<b>7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Not a sidewalk/bike community. Sidewalks too narrow and not handicap-accessible. Many in poor condition – broken and uneven (on Olive, Old Bonhomme etc). Provisions for pedestrians scant</li> </ul>	<b>12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Metro Link in the city would mean less traffic and parking problems. People could commute to work. A station would attract more visitors. This would go towards a long range plan to conserve gas</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Central location</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ No easy way to Metro Link. Would like a station on or near Olive</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ability to stroll along Olive and meet neighbors – a healthier community. Wider sidewalks. Trees, median provide green buffer. But, median could limit traffic access to certain businesses</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Connected to regional public transit/ potential Metro Link site. (However, public transportation is currently underutilized)</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Traffic on Olive is a cause for concern and could become unmanageable. Rush hour traffic volume heavy, especially near I-170 where congestion is common and turn lanes need to be widened. Olive is a city of stoplights that are not well coordinated or synchronized. This presents a traffic flow and pollution issue</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Redevelopment of I-170 interchange will enhance opportunities for all types of development. Would also ease egress onto highway</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Good trails and bikeways, especially between Stacy Park and Dielman</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Nothing to attract someone to Olivette</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Safer residential area and safer traveling</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ease of navigating residential streets. Street system is fairly logical. Don't have lots of one way streets and street closures</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Bike traffic along Olive unsafe</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A downtown square would give city an identity, character, and better marketability</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Access to airport</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Lack of improvements/management on Olive Blvd. Could use medians to enhance traffic. Olive is narrow – needs widening</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Improved bike lanes and safety. More transportation options</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ City's police, fire and ambulance services are good</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Making left turns onto and off of Olive is difficult. Lack of left turn signal on Dielman Rd. This leads to accidents. Also, left turn signals are not always consistent</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Would keep traffic flowing on Olive</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

<b>TRANSPORTATION &amp; INFRASTRUCTURE Contd.</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Good parks (ex. Stacy Park)	4	➤ Inadequate infrastructure for increased volume into Olivette. Redevelopment could result in more traffic congestion and infrastructure demands. Would need to create parking lots and other enhancements	3	➤ Major streets would be redesigned to handle increased traffic	1
➤ New interchange for I-170	3	➤ Would like a walking bridge across Olive Blvd. since it's extremely dangerous to cross road as a pedestrian	3	➤ More growth would provide more tax revenues and better streets	1
➤ Olive Blvd. and I-170 interchange easy to get off/on during non-rush hour period	3	➤ Speed on Olive too fast. Difficult to walk across Olive	3	➤ Creation of a streetscape along Olive	1
➤ Intimacy of residential neighborhoods and access provided by Olive Blvd.	2	➤ Above ground utility lines are unappealing. The overhead utility lights are also an issue for safety reasons. Could plant large trees. Utilities should be buried or uniform	2	➤ Increased technological connectivity	1
➤ Nice, spread out residential community	2	➤ Not enough arterials going north/south in community. Turn lanes from north/south streets to Olive stack up	2	➤ Could lead to the implementation of measures that discouraging cut through traffic	1
➤ City maintains consistent utility services and other services like snow removal, trash collection and strong recycling program	2	➤ Dielman, Old Bonhomme and other residential streets lack sufficient pedestrian lighting. Should consider lighting needs, but avoid light pollution	2		
➤ The city's annual festival, Olivette in Bloom	2	➤ Isolation/ poor condition of community center. Facility could be improved and expanded to include more amenities for children etc.	2		
➤ Access to N. Price Rd. once interchange is complete	1	➤ No real "downtown"	2		
➤ Lack of streetlights (a nice mix of urban and rural feeling)	1	➤ Lack of a dog park	2		
➤ Close to churches	1	➤ Residents in area north of Olive and east of Dielman concerned that they're being targeted for development and feel threatened (no one talks about taking away the homes of the residents south of Olive)	2		
➤ Excellent school system	1	➤ Too many people use Old Bonhomme, Price and Dielman Roads to bypass Olive	2		

<b>TRANSPORTATION &amp; INFRASTRUCTURE Contd.</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Plenty of parking along Olive	1	➤ Against the widening of Olive and Old Bonhomme. Leave Old Bonhomme as is	1		
➤ Many ways to access Olivette	1	➤ Businesses that are between intersections experience access and congestion problems	1		
➤ Infrastructure in generally good condition	1	➤ Cell phone, DSL, technology providers don't have good reception/connection in city	1		
➤ City owns community center land, so can expand center	1	➤ Construction disruption	1		
➤ Residential streets make Olivette livable because of inability to drive through them	1	➤ Olive Blvd. acts as a barrier between north and south Olivette	1		
➤ Property at or near Saints Skating Rink is ripe for development as public use facility (community center)	1	➤ Not enough depth along Olive to create a vibrant and appealing commercial area	1		
➤ The 91 bus line is an asset to the community	1	➤ Need cooperation of state if any of the desired changes are to occur along Olive Blvd	1		
➤ Olive Blvd. is an effective east/west arterial (arguably)	1	➤ No arm at RR track on Dielman Rd.	1		
➤ Active involvement of residents	1	➤ The middle lane on Olive is dangerous and people don't use it correctly as a turn lane	1		
➤ Existence of Neighborhood Improvement District (NID)	1	➤ The city is landlocked and can't grow	1		
➤ Wide enough streets, although too small for current growth	1	➤ During the shift change at SBC, traffic on Alice street becomes overwhelming for residents	1		
➤ Traffic good, except rush hour	1	➤ The city didn't finish the bike path	1		
		➤ There is no right turn lane on Olive	1		
		➤ Should consider the development of shared parking garages to alleviate concerns about insufficient parking	1		
		➤ The use of eminent domain	1		
		➤ Non-NID streets have very little maintenance	1		
		➤ NID: Some areas improved, but others did not. The district is now closed for membership, but it would be nice if neighborhoods had the option to join	1		
		➤ New interchange needs nice enhancements	1		
		➤ Old Bonhomme will experience heavier traffic during I-170 interchange improvement	1		

<b>COMMUNITY CHARACTER</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Location/centrality. Next to Clayton, the county seat	12	➤ Outside view that Olivette is a contentious community i.e. bedroom vs. active community and anti-development rather than pro-development	7	➤ Redevelopment could create spaces where people could meet, talk, and exchange ideas. Improved sense of community and enhanced family relations	3
➤ Diversity – population, housing, religion, socio-economic status, ethnicity	12	➤ Lack of recreation/town center - place for people to meet, connect as a community and engage in family-oriented activities	6	➤ Olive would be nicer and safer. Would be a destination place where people would want to stay and shop	3
➤ Excellent schools (public and alternative)	9	➤ Olivette lacks a unique, distinct identity. Identity is necessary to attract businesses and residents	6	➤ Would generate additional tax revenue	2
➤ Safe (low crime), clean community	5	➤ Grossly under-developed with commercial properties (e.g., restaurants, grocery stores, etc.). Residents have to travel for basic amenities. Don't have enough places of quality in city to spend money. Means dollars leave the community	4	➤ Could improve health and family quality of life	2
➤ Excellent recreation/outdoor facilities. Beautiful, well-maintained parks, walking trails	5	➤ Residential dominance. Olivette is small and this is its strength. People know each other. Also, since it is land locked, it is limited in what it can do from a development stand point	3	➤ City could become better known for its ethnic mix – “come to Olivette to see the world”. Brings energy and vitality to area	1
➤ Good variety of housing stock in types and costs. Still affordable	5	➤ Use of TIF and eminent domain	3	➤ Increases property values	1
➤ City is not overdeveloped. Olivette a “sleepy/quiet”. It is not Creve Couer. Is attractive to those seeking refuge from the hustle and bustle.	5	➤ Concerned about commercial trends along Olive. The character of the businesses moving in are marginal with little staying power and quality	3	➤ Redevelopment could focused on areas that are currently under-developed (ex. industrial parks, bank card processing center)	1
➤ Residential dominance/ bedroom community	4	➤ City has no dog park. Community's dogs need safe place to play	3	➤ Safety may improve	1
➤ Great police and fire protection	4	➤ People afraid of change	3	➤ Would improve the look of the city and its image	1

**COMMUNITY CHARACTER Contd.**

<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Local friendliness/ environment/ quality of life	<b>4</b>	➤ Growing traffic on secondary streets (Price, Dielman, etc.)	<b>3</b>	➤ Would encourage/welcome development by providing a positive experience so city becomes more attractive to investment	<b>1</b>
➤ Huge kids athletic program	<b>3</b>	➤ No foot traffic/"strollability"; few sidewalks. Difficult for residents/pedestrians to walk around	<b>3</b>	➤ Redevelopment might improve the efficiency of city services like trash collection	<b>1</b>
➤ Increasing residential property values	<b>3</b>	➤ Nothing to draw you into the town. City not attractive, frumpy, stoic, aging	<b>3</b>		
➤ City has easy access to highways	<b>3</b>	➤ Interchange at Olive/170 is door step to community. Area needs visual markers to identify the city (something more prominent than a sign)	<b>3</b>		
➤ Greenery/trees/residential maintenance	<b>2</b>	➤ Development focus on specialized/small business	<b>2</b>		
➤ Residents enjoy good relationships with city officials. Involved citizenry	<b>2</b>	➤ Olive Blvd a big barrier that divides city north and south. Perception of north/south divide with regard to affluence. Shows up in schools	<b>2</b>		
➤ City provides good trash and recycling services	<b>2</b>	➤ Need to attract new businesses that meet basic needs	<b>2</b>		
➤ St. Louis' "best kept secret"	<b>1</b>	➤ Snooty like Ladue/Clayton	<b>2</b>		
➤ Enjoys close proximity to bio-sciences	<b>1</b>	➤ Uncertainty about land use future	<b>2</b>		
➤ Local traffic in residential areas	<b>1</b>	➤ Need for revenue	<b>2</b>		
➤ Good communication and ability to work together on events	<b>1</b>	➤ Unresponsive civil servants. City is bureaucratic and dogmatic when people try to get something done	<b>2</b>		
➤ More young people moving into community	<b>1</b>	➤ Indoor public facilities (e.g., community center) not up to par; poor distribution of indoor and outdoor facilities for all residents	<b>2</b>		
➤ Upgrading/new residential construction has led to growth	<b>1</b>	➤ Housing for older residents a concern. No provisions for the elderly to stay in community (e.g., assisted living)	<b>2</b>		
➤ Large lot sizes of homes	<b>1</b>	➤ City inconsistent in dealing with businesses – enforcement of ordinances	<b>1</b>		

<b>COMMUNITY CHARACTER Contd.</b>					
<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Successfully fought building of Wal-Mart	1	➤ Lack of overall strategic plan	1		
➤ Life-long residents	1	➤ Be a service friendly environment – enhance existing warehouse structure; provide identity-direction	1		
➤ Appealing community for executives	1	➤ No more Mexican or fast food restaurants	1		
➤ Olive is a thriving commercial corridor for the region	1	➤ Balance between vehicle/pedestrian traffic on Olive	1		
➤ City manager form of government provides more professional delivery of services	1	➤ Lack of streetscapes and pockets of nice places to be in	1		
➤ Well cared for properties	1	➤ Uniform sign control along street	1		
➤ Attractive to reinvestment in community – changing community from old to new; natural turnover	1	➤ Educate new residents on community’s values/history – better occupancy enforcement	1		
➤ Good place to live, but wouldn’t want to visit	1	➤ Bring in a mixture of commercial/diversity and architectural appearance	1		
		➤ Concerned about where cars will park in new streetscape	1		
		➤ Need recreational facilities for older demographic	1		
		➤ Governmental process for development	1		
		➤ Vacancy rate	1		
		➤ Growing authority of city government	1		
		➤ Loss of greenery/ open space	1		
		➤ Diverse populations do not integrate in community activities	1		
		➤ Not enough time spent on environmental issues	1		
		➤ Security issues (i.e. recent hold up at Petco)	1		
		➤ Don’t want to look like every other community	1		
		➤ Redevelopment may result in disenfranchising some residents (Hilltop area and north of Olive)	1		
		➤ Overbuilding residential properties at exceedingly higher prices (concern that an economic bust may occur)	1		
		➤ Supply/demand problem with new residential buildings (backlog exists for blueprints)	1		
		➤ Newer homeowners may be more mobile	1		

**COMMUNITY CHARACTER Contd.**

<i>Strengths/Assets</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Perceived Benefits</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
		➤ Increased property taxes makes it difficult for retirees (living on a fixed income)	1		
		➤ There are no recreation drop-in activities, most activities are organized	1		
		➤ Stacy Park closes at dusk and there is no nighttime use	1		
		➤ The streets are not well maintained and they could use better signage	1		
		➤ The city does a poor job picking up trash and recycling	1		
		➤ City should finish off the second leg of bike trail it started	1		
		➤ City does not need an identity. It is a big secret and should stay that way	1		
		➤ Aging infrastructure	1		
		➤ As retail increases, crime increases	1		
		➤ Rising values lead to more teardowns	1		
		➤ Tax increase did not pass	1		
		➤ City sandwiched between two very different communities: University City and Ladue	1		

### CITY'S DEVELOPMENT ROLE

<i>Supporting Redevelopment</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ Should support redevelopment by actively seeking public opinion in redevelopment process. Should be a conduit for dialogue, esp. between developers and residents. Government must remain transparent	7	➤ Use of eminent domain not favorable for existing residents/business owners. Should be used judiciously and prudently. City needs to be clear about how eminent domain could be applied	5
➤ Good opportunity to develop master architectural plan/ long-term vision, esp. for main arteries and boulevards around 170 corridor and Olive. Set architectural standards – a unified look. Recruit/ attract developers aligned with the vision	5	➤ Improvements may lead to displacements. How will city take care of the residents being displaced? Developments may be detrimental to city's residential base, so city must remain mindful of tradeoffs. People want to be treated fairly and have investments protected	4
➤ City should be more aggressive than now, but needs resources to do so. City should focus on aesthetic and infrastructure improvements to make area more attractive to developers	4	➤ Density demands of new developments	3
➤ City should be looking to increase tax base with optimal redevelopment. Economic Council or at least one dedicated staff member should focus on building tax revenue through development	4	➤ 5 yrs ago Northwest quadrant redevelopment was very divisive (concerning big box development also look at Hanley and Manchester – people don't have realistic understanding of what kind of development is possible in city; development will require use of public development tools regarding land use, zoning, regulation, etc.) City will have to jump start this process. Development climate of Olivette is seen as unfriendly.	2
➤ Work with developers. Put out RFPs that support specific goals. Use public financing tools (modestly) to attract desired development. City has to maintain a delicate balance and apply the "but for" test. What does the city get in return for subsidizing development? City government should avoid extremes, but explore any and all tools to make the community competitive	4	➤ Difficult for community that's been fractured by previous TIF activities to objectively consider public financing tools	2
➤ City should widen Olive to improve traffic flow and undertake other street improvement projects. City should make sure that future development plans consider vehicular and pedestrian traffic impact	3	➤ Very little along Olive attracts younger demographic or money spenders	2
➤ Change codes so that areas are more attractive to businesses. City should establish zoning that helps it meet its development goals. Update/streamline ordinances (i.e. the number of parking spaces required for commercial retail etc.)	3	➤ How will city work with other communities to improve traffic access and how will traffic be affected by new development?	2
➤ City should focus on maintaining character of community	3	➤ Always groups of people waiting to offer resistance to development. Olivette fairly contentious place that doesn't lend itself readily/easily to consensus making	2

**CITY'S DEVELOPMENT ROLE Contd.**

<i>Supporting Redevelopment</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ City needs to collaborate more with other municipalities in development efforts (4 corners of 170 interchange)	2	➤ Concerned that the city is not sophisticated enough i.e. lacks the professional expertise and experience to take leadership of the development process	2
➤ City should NOT use eminent domain, TIFs and other public financing/development tools liberally. Let private markets organize development	2	➤ Issue of municipalities financing development, which can mean tax increases, costly infrastructure improvements, traffic concerns, and quality of life issues. Development for its own sake breeds its own set of problems that can make the community less attractive.	2
➤ City should adopt a leadership role in coordinating and monitoring development	2	➤ Because community is already developed, it is difficult to attract developers without incentives given demolition and other costs	1
➤ Needs to promote the development of a city center	1	➤ Transportation access a major issue for business development	1
➤ City needs to enthusiastically embrace transportation driven development and infrastructure improvements (esp. along 170 interchange).	1	➤ City should not be too hasty or too slow in development activity. Create good pace	1
➤ City should push for more retail development (restaurants and hotels)	1	➤ Development should be done fairly and with transparency	1
➤ City should enhance technology infrastructure	1	➤ How will redevelopment, which is necessary, affect existing businesses?	1
➤ If a developer comes with a “big box” idea, put it to a city vote	1	➤ Apartment modernization may jeopardize existing residents who live in them (from affordability standpoint)	1
➤ Put RFP's out to the community first before promoting nationally	1	➤ No TIF or eminent domain without voter approval	1
➤ Pick projects at early enough stages to address any problems (e.g., Price Road & Olive Blvd. area)	1	➤ Lack of sufficient community involvement	1
➤ Modernization of apartment areas (e.g., near OfficeMax and Hilltop area) would attract more residents	1	➤ Plan better for senior citizens to get to stores, entertainment, etc.	1
➤ Pursue a reciprocal arrangement with Creve Coeur to share public facilities	1	➤ City is more concerned about collecting taxes and focusing on commercial development, and not on the interests of Olivette residents (this has improved over the years though)	1
➤ City should take a proactive stance with the state legislature and let state policy makers know what type of tools it needs to spur the kind of development it wants. This can in part be done through the municipal league	1	➤ City should be open to new ideas (e.g., industrial park should be considered for multi-use purposes)	1
➤ City needs to continue to maintain the community's high quality of service	1	➤ Where will new development activities likely take place?	1
➤ City should better explain to citizens what public financing tools are available to assist in development	1	➤ Need consistent signage that allows for better traffic flow along Olive	1

**CITY’S DEVELOPMENT ROLE Contd.**

<i>Supporting Redevelopment</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>	<i>Issues of Concern</i>	<i>Group Mentions</i>
➤ City should consider a ½ cent economic development sales tax to spur development	1	➤ The laws should be changed to allow a system of negotiation between the developers and resident land owners	1
➤ Create entryways for East and West ends that “locate” community. Foster sense of place	1	➤ The current zoning ordinances are ineffective	1
➤ Should take advantage of plant/science opportunities to encourage this type of development	1	➤ City should remain open to increasing commercial density depth, even if it means some residential encroachment	1
		➤ Need to develop in a way that maintains size and standards of government	1
		➤ Need to qualitatively apply zoning ordinances to existing development	1
		➤ Government needs to behave regionally. Stop developers from shopping municipalities for best deals	1
		➤ City councilman that is anti-development	1
		➤ Silent majority of people want status quo, but city cannot afford this	1
		➤ City needs leaders that will commit to the plan. Who will take ownership of the plan? Turnover in politics is also a concern	1
		➤ City has not been proactive in the past and has missed opportunities as a result (ex. roller rink, 9666 Olive). Citizens have a lack of confidence in what will ultimately get done	1