PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
August 10, 1998

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT
Mr. Dan Layton, Jr.
Ms. Stephanie Macaluso
Mr. Jerry Right
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Mr. Allen Yaffe
Chairman Robert Grant
Mayor Nancy Greenwood
Councilmember Mary Brown, Council Liaison
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney
Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Assistant Director of Planning
Ms. Reveena Shook, Planner II
Ms. Annissa McCaskill, Planner I
Ms. Molly Butler-Dunham, Planner I
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

ABSENT
Mr. Fred Broemmer
Mr. Charles Eifler
Ms. Rachel Nolen

INVOCATION: Commissioner Allen Yaffe

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

Chairman Grant recognized the attendance of Mayor Nancy Greenwood, Councilmember Mary Brown- Council Liaison (Ward IV), Councilmember Larry Grosser (Ward II), Councilmember Michael Casey (Ward III), Councilmember Dan Hurt (Ward III), Councilmember Allan Sheppard (Ward I), and Michael G. Herring, City Administrator.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Commissioner Macaluso read the first portion of the "Opening Comments."

A. **P.Z. 25-98 Mobil Mart**; a request for a change in zoning from "C-8" Planned Commercial District to "PC" Planned Commercial District for a 1.7 acre tract of land located at the intersection of Clayton and Baxter Roads. (Locator Number: 21R41-0960) Proposed uses: Filling station, including emergency towing and repair services, provided that no automobile, truck, or other vehicle may be parked or stored in the open on the premises for longer than twenty-four (24) hours; restaurant, fast food; and vehicle washing facility for automobiles

Planner I Molly Butler-Dunham gave a slide presentation of the subject site and surrounding area.

Mayor Greenwood explained the process as follows:

> Tonight is a public hearing. After the public hearing this will come before the Planning Commission for review. After the Planning Commission it goes to a Council Committee. After the Council Committee it does go before the City Council. This is the first step in the process, and no one is voting on the matter tonight.

Chairman Grant noted the Commission would just hear the public hearing portion with respect to this project. At subsequent meetings the Staff will provide the Commission with comments and issues. In addition, the Commission will vote on the matter at subsequent meetings. They will not vote tonight; but are here for the purpose of listening to the petitioner's side of the issues, and any issues from other interested parties.

Mr. Donald Kenneth Anderson, Jr., Attorney for the petitioner, noted the following:

- Mr. Bill Wallace, Mick Door and Bruce Work from Arch Energy, Mr. Steve Quigley of Clayton Engineering, and Craig Holan of Crawford-Bunte-Brammeier are here tonight on behalf of the petition.
- He described Exhibit #1 (an aerial photo from February - 1997) to the Commission, noting the subject parcel is in a commercial node.
- He gave a history and description of the subject site and surrounding area with regard to uses and zoning districts.
- He described Exhibit #2; noting it reflects a commercial node adjacent to the subject site.
- They propose a 7230 square foot facility, with a 1012 square foot car wash, leaving 24% of the site as greenspace.
- He described Exhibit #3 (the Site Plan). The proposal takes the site from 2% to 11% under the roof.
- The site would provide buffering to address the needs of Baxton Way residents.
- Also proposed, within the concept, is a car wash, which represents an improvement over the existing noise and quality of the existing facility.
- Economic/market conditions do not allow the site to be only sixty percent (60%) utilized (i.e., continuation of the half-acre park).
- The proposed uses of Mobil Mart (Mobil Lube, fast-food restaurants and car wash) are all permitted under the new PC Ordinance, they are not conditional.

- As a result of the moratorium the City created the new zoning classification of "PC" District in February of 1998.

- Under normal circumstances this would have been an amendment request for expansion of an existing "C-8" Zoned District, not a rezoning request.

- It is not possible to devote this particular site to any other use, since it is not subject to any of the "R" or "C" District categories.

- The petitioner took the necessary steps to meet with the neighbors, as directed by City Staff.

- The petitioner attempted to incorporate neighbors' concerns, but as of their last meeting there was no consensus. The petitioner was told that the residents would vehemently oppose the proposed development.

- There are currently signs erected on property adjacent to the subject site noting opposition to the proposed development.

Mr. Steve Quigley, Clayton Engineering Company, noted the following:

- The proposal utilizes the two (2) existing entrances; 1) Baxter Road; and 2) Clayton Road.

- On the west side of the property they are proposing to move the entrance approximately fifty (50) feet towards the west to provide more distance between the two (2) approaches.

- The new convenience store facility would be built to the rear the existing convenience store.

- He pointed out on the rendering where the small two (2) bay, Mobil Lube building and fast food unit would be added to the site.

- The new car wash building would be set back twenty-five (25) feet from the side (western) property line.

- They would maintain the required fifteen (15) foot buffer along Baxter and Clayton Roads, and the twenty-five (25) foot buffer along the rear of the site (i.e., towards the R-3 Zoned areas).

- They would provide a ten (10) foot to thirteen (13) foot high concrete, Versa-lok retaining wall at the rear of the site, with a six (6) foot high privacy fence on top.

- Stormwater detention provided would meet the new MSD criteria and the City of Chesterfield criteria.

- The site does not currently provide any stormwater detention; therefore, the situation of the downstream residents would be greatly improved.

Mr. Anderson noted the following:

- The area between the proposed Mobil Mart and the proposed fast food would not have any internal demise (i.e., walls).

- The inside of the main building would be an open area with access to the fast-food gated during the times the fast food service would be unavailable.

- The concept is to attract traffic already on site to other facilities available on the site.

- The Traffic Report to be presented by Mr. Holan will indicate that this would, in fact, divert traffic already present on the site (i.e. it is not a destination in and of itself).

Mr. Craig Holan, AICP, Crawford Bunte & Brammeier, noted the following:

- They measured the actual traffic counts of two (2) similar facilities: 1) the existing Mobil Mart in the Earth City area (Riverport); 2) the O'Fallon, Missouri Mobil Mart.

- They then took the greater of those two (2) sites (the Riverport area) and used those statistics for their projected traffic calculations for the subject site.

- The subject development has a high amount of pass-by traffic (i.e., it is a neighborhood-type development that typically would not draw from a very large area); instead, it pulls from the adjacent roadways.

- They used the very conservative number of thirty-six percent (36%) as the count for the pass-by traffic, the remainder was added as new trips.

- This figure was then added to the count of the traffic at the intersection of Clayton and Baxter, adjacent to the subject site.

- The level of service is a grade of how they judge how an intersection is operating. With the added traffic, under both the AM and PM peak conditions, the intersection maintained the current level of service.

- The existing level of service in the AM is somewhat poor, but has nothing to do with the subject site. They believe this is due to the southbound left-turn movement that could be corrected to a service level of "C" simply by taking one of the through lanes and making it a second left-turn lane.

- The Clayton/Baxter intersection is impacted by the intersection of Manchester and Highway 141 (i.e., there is a lot of diverted traffic that currently goes up and through this intersection to get to Highway 40). They believe that at the end of the current construction cycle, when that interchange is completed, the Clayton and Baxter intersection will have an improved service level regardless of any additional development.

Mr. Anderson noted:

- The petitioner is simply asking for the expansion of a pre-existing use.
- To deny this request would create a pre-existing, non-conformity that the City will have to amortize over the remaining life of the site.
- If this becomes the case, the diminution of value of the site is dramatic.
- The petitioner has taken into account the necessary components revealed in discussions with the Trustees and other residents of Baxton Way and tried to incorporate them into their proposal.
- They have met, listened to concerns of residents and tried to incorporate their ideas; but have reached the zone where there are fundamental tensions between the protective property rights of somebody in a zoning classification and somebody in the adjacent residential area.
- Somebody in a residence always abuts commercial development; this is an in-escapable part of being in a growth corridor.
- The demand is there; the diminution in value is drastic; and they ask the Commission to review their application, bearing in mind the comments of the public.

The petitioners responded to questions from Commissioners as follows:

Bruce Work, Arch Energy, noted the petitioners had one (1) meeting with the members of Woodfield Association to advise them of the proposed project and get their comments. The petitioners sent thank you letters to all parties who participated and requested, after making suggested changes, to meet again with residents to advise them of the changes the petitioners were prepared to make, but the residents declined.

Mr. Anderson presented two (2) letters to the Commission for the record: 1) dated February 24, 1998 - from Wallis Oil Co., Inc. to Ms. Andrea Lawrence of Woodfield; and 2) dated April 7, 1998 - from the Woodfield Homes Association to Arch Energy, L.C.

Mr. Anderson noted Ordinance 12,800, adopted by St. Louis County in 1986, allows the uses of a food shop, car wash and filling station.

City Attorney Beach noted the Ordinance does not state the use of fast-food.

Mr. Anderson noted he doesn't believe there was a category for fast-food in 1986.

Chairman Grant noted he believes there was a fast-food category in commercial districts back in 1986.

Mr. Anderson noted a drive through fast-food restaurant is planned for the proposed development, and responded, as follows, to questions regarding the parking configuration for the subject site:

- A ten (10) foot lane for stacking of automobiles for the fast-food restaurant would be provided.

- Cars exiting the development on the north and western portion of the site would need to drive between the lanes of cars picking-up from the fast-food restaurant and cars going to the car wash.

- The petitioner designed three (3) one-way traffic lanes on the north and west side of the proposed site: 1) the drive through; 2) a by-pass lane; and 3) the stack lane for the car wash.

- All cars moving from parking spaces on the north and west end would need to get into the middle lane in order to exit the site because of the one (1) way traffic design.

- Five (5) or seven (7) employee parking spaces would be provided on the west side of the site.

Chairman Grant asked for clarification/breakdown regarding the total number of parking spaces (54 or 59) proposed for the subject site.

Mr. Anderson noted he would provide that information.

Chairman Grant inquired about the proposed ATM Machine.

Mr. Anderson responded as follows:

- The ATM Machine would be a walk-up, and is proposed to be located at corner of the site adjacent to the intersection of Baxter and Clayton Roads.

- The ATM Machine has not been treated by the petitioner as a separate use because it is not considered as a structure according to the City's Zoning Code.

City Attorney Beach inquired how the ATM machine would be accessed.

Mr. Quigley noted there are three (3) parallel parking spaces provided on the north side of the proposed ATM.

Commissioner Layton asked Mr. Anderson to clarify his earlier statement regarding the rezoning requirements for the subject site.

Mr. Anderson noted that if the "C-8" Zoning District was still in place for the site the petitioner would need to request an amendment of the existing Ordinance. He further noted that, because of the reclassification in the City's Zoning Ordinance, the current request is to rezone from "C-8" to "PC" District. In either event, the petitioner would be required to go through the public hearing process.

Commissioner Yaffe inquired regarding the identity, hours of operation, and proposed number of fast-food restaurants.

Mr. Anderson responded as follows:

- They don't have leasing agreements as yet; but he has suggested that one (1) of the restaurants be a Starbuck's.
- The hours of operation would be determined when the lease is signed.
- It is contemplated, at this time, that there would be two (2) restaurants; one (1) fast-food with a drive-up and one (1) fast-food internally captive, with no dividing wall.

Commissioner Yaffe inquired regarding the distance between the Baxter Road entrance to the site and the entrance to Woodfield Subdivision.

Mr. Quigley responded the distance, centerline to centerline, would be five hundred (500) feet.

Commissioner Yaffe requested more clarification regarding the Traffic Impact Study.

Mr. Holan, Traffic Engineer, responded as follows:

- The calculations are based upon the peak hours (i.e., the greatest impact on the street system).
- The total new trips during the PM peak hour would be 109.
- A trip is identified as: in is one (1) trip; out is one (1) trip.
- The figure shown is in addition to the existing traffic, minus what they took out as pass-by trips.
- They don't have any current counts of the actual traffic at the intersection of Clayton and Baxter Roads.
- They calculated the existing level of service at the intersection as "LOS-E" during the AM peak hour, and "LOS-D" during the PM peak hour.
- The service level could be improved by changing the second southbound through-lane to a southbound left-turn lane.

City Attorney Beach requested clarification of reasoning behind the southbound traffic calculations in the report.

Mr. Holan responded as follows:

- Southbound traffic was determined to be from Baxter southbound to Clayton eastbound.

- There would be an addition of 109 trips during the PM peak hour and 119 trips during the AM peak hour.

- Traffic service levels are rated as "LOS A" being the best and "LOS F" being the worst.

- Adding 119 trips during the AM peak hour would not change the current classification of the intersection from "LOS E" to "LOS F."

City Attorney Beach instructed Mr. Holan to calculate the exact number of trips that would mandate this service level to change and advise the Commission of his findings.

Mr. Holan stated that he would do so.

City Attorney Beach asked Mr. Holan if Crawford Bunte & Brammeier also did the Traffic Study for the Lenette Realty project located across the street from the subject site. He also asked Mr. Holan how the traffic count for the subject site was determined.

Mr. Holan noted Crawford Bunte & Brammeier did the Traffic Study for Lenette Realty. He further noted they used the same traffic count for that study for the site being presented tonight, but adjusted it for growth.

City Attorney Beach noted it is his recollection that the traffic study for Lenette Realty provided a traffic count (i.e., the number of cars going through the intersection per day).

Mr. Holan noted he would get that number.

City Attorney Beach asked Mr. Holan for clarification of his earlier statement regarding Highway 141 and Manchester (i.e., when is this going to occur).

Mr. Holan noted it would be within the next three (3) years.

City Attorney Beach inquired how Crawford Bunte & Brammeier determined that roadwork will off-load some of the traffic at this particular intersection.

Mr. Holan replied this was based on studies they had completed for the City of Ellisville.

City Attorney Beach asked how they ascertain that the people going through this intersection today would not be going through this intersection in three (3) years due to the completion/opening of the intersection of Highway 141 and Manchester.

Mr. Holan replied the traffic engineers performed an origin destination survey (i.e., stopped vehicles, sent postcards, traced license plates, etc.) for the City of Ellisville. This was not, however, done for the subject site in Chesterfield.

City Attorney Beach noted the intersection of the subject site is not in Ellisville, it is between Ballwin and Chesterfield.

Commissioner Yaffe asked which of the three (3) existing Mobil facilities the proposed building(s) would be comparable, appearance-wise, to the proposed development.

Mr. Anderson presented the rendering of the proposed site, noting the Architectural Review Board will be the ultimate arbitrator of how they will appear. He noted they have attempted to make the buildings blend with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Macaluso inquired regarding the buffer zone requirements.

Director Teresa Price noted a twenty (20) foot buffer is required.

Mr. Anderson referred to their Exhibit #4, noting the following:

- He described the elevations of the existing residence.
- He pointed out the proposed buildings and their respective property lines.
- He identified the location of the proposed sight proof fence.
- He pointed out the proposed buildings.
- All rooftop machinery would be screened and meet all performance standards.
- On order to eliminate any external performance standard problems, the proposed restaurants on the subject site would utilize a device that is the equivalent to a catalytic converter on an automobile.
- Due to the various grades of the site, the buffer distance may appear to be greater than twenty-five (25) feet in some areas.

Commissioner Macaluso inquired about the water runoff from the site onto the adjacent residential land.

Mr. Quigley, Engineer for the project, noted the following:

- All the water on the subject site, other than the twenty-five (25) foot green area, will be collected in an interior stormwater system and then be directed through a detention system per the requirements of MSD and the City of Chesterfield.
- The twenty-five (25) foot buffer area will have a slight swale in it
- Residential property currently receives stormwater from all of the green area on the site; they will no longer receive any of that water over land.

- The developer is proposing a curb line with inlets, to collect the water and then pipe it into the underground system after going through the detention device.

- In addition to collecting the amount of water in the green area, there will be a swale that will discharge water into the existing inlet.

Chairman Grant inquired about the interior detention system.

Mr. Quigley noted it would be an underground, concrete vault, as required by the City.

Chairman Grant noted, for clarification purposes, that the property to the north would still receive all of the stormwater it receives currently; it will just be metered in a different manner.

Mr. Quigley stated this is correct; currently there is no detention provided for the subject site.

Commissioner Layton asked Mr. Holan, Traffic Consultant, if the traffic report presented for the subject site utilized the numbers from the Study performed for Lenette approximately one (1) year ago.

Mr. Holan noted the study is based upon an actual count they took that was used as part of the previous study (i.e., for the Lenette site across the street).

Councilmember Brown asked from where the information originates regarding the traffic generated for a fast-food restaurant.

Mr. Holan replied as follows:

- This information is based upon national studies completed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

- At various sites throughout the country, this group has asked questions, by some of the means he described earlier tonight, as to the reason(s) for this trip: Were you already on the street? Where were you going? Was this a diverted link? Were you going on a different road and decided to go over to this site? etc.). Those studies listed a variety of percentages.

- Up to eighty percent (80%) are people who stop on their way home from work, or people who are on other pass-by related trips.

- Crawford Bunte & Brammeier have typically used thirty-six percent (36%) because they have found that it seems to be similar to other studies they have done within the St. Louis area.

- These studies are on a variety of convenience-type locations.

Councilmember Brown noted she believes a restaurant, even if it's just a fast-food restaurant, has a different appeal than stopping to pick-up something from a store on your way home.

Mr. Holan noted they also break it down by categories for gas stations, banks and convenience stores (i.e., Seven Eleven). The categories have varying percentages.

Councilmember Brown noted the gas station has been described as the major portion of this site; therefore, the issue, to a great extent, is the addition of one (1) or two (2) fast-food restaurants on the site. She further noted she believed the critical issue is the significant change of the usage on the site. She noted that every time we look into a fast-food restaurant usage, even if it is all by itself in a commercial area, it has a lot of implications for traffic, noise, etc.

Mr. Holan stated he wished to clarify some issues and noted the following:

- He feels very comfortable with the number used to identify pass-by trips (i.e., 36%).
- They used the highest traffic count for the Mobil Mart they have (i.e., the Riverport site), where the drive-by traffic is over 40,000 cars per day on the Earth City Expressway. This represents a significantly different characteristic than drive-by traffic. Therefore, they have probably been overly conservative regarding the total number in their traffic report.
- The pass-by trips are not counted as new trips.
- They have not distinguished what new trips are. In many cases those new trips might actually be diverted link trips (i.e., a trip perhaps to/from Manchester Road that may stop at this location).
- The impact at the subject location may be slightly greater, but it may have reduced the impact at another location, and they don't take that into account in their traffic impact studies.
- Overall, he believes they took a very conservative approach.
- The study shows that the impact relative to the existing level of service is probably minor.
- He believes the worst impact, which would be in the AM peak hour, was an average delay of 2 ½ seconds. This was not enough to push it from its existing level of service to a lower level service.

Chairman Grant inquired about the eight (8) foot, masonry, Versa-lok wall proposed along two (2) or three (3) sides of the development.

Mr. Anderson noted it would vary in height from zero (0) to thirteen (13) feet.

Chairman Grant inquired about the fence.

Mr. Anderson noted the six (6) foot high, sight proof fence would go on top of the concrete, Versa-lok wall, and would be made of the new-type vinyl material - it would basically be a solid fence. He noted they would provide information at a future date for architectural review, and will meet the City's requirements.

Chairman Grant asked whether the fence would be a constant height.

Mr. Anderson noted it would be a constant height; the grade variations of the wall are due to the fact that the existing site falls off on the northwest corner. The highest portion of the wall would be in northwest corner of the site, and it gets a little bit shorter as it goes to the east and south.

Chairman Grant asked where the highest combination of the wall/fence would be on the site.

Mr. Anderson noted it would be nineteen (19) feet, located at the northwest corner. The landscaping and trees are proposed on the side of the site facing the residential area.

City Attorney Beach asked if the petitioner is maintaining the building setbacks that were in the original Ordinance (i.e., one hundred and twenty (120) feet from the northwest property limit; sixty-five (65) feet from the southwest; and fifty (50) feet from Clayton Road).

Mr. Quigley noted they are providing a fifty (50) foot setback on Baxter Road; maintaining the fifty (50) foot setback on Clayton Road; maintaining a twenty-five (25) foot setback on the southwest property line; and an eighty (80) foot setback on the northwest property line.

Chairman Grant noted there are proposed reductions in all of the original setbacks.

Mr. Quigley noted there are reductions in three (3) of the four (4) original setback requirements.

Commissioner Yaffe asked for clarification regarding the table/seating capacity of the fast-food restaurants.

Mr. Anderson noted the proposed second fast-food store would be a small mini-version, like the Riverport or Mid Rivers Drive stores (i.e., have a walk-up window inside the store). The seating capacity for (1) one fast-food store would not be doubled by the addition of the second fast-food store.

Commissioner Sherman requested more information about the internal traffic patterns.

Mr. Anderson noted the following:

- The north side, where the building is one hundred (100) feet long, would provide five (5) cars to be stacked; along the west side of the building there would be room for two (2) additional cars.

- The location/configuration of the building will depend upon the end user.

Commissioner Sherman asked the petitioner to provide information regarding how many cars would be waiting in line during peak times.

Mr. Quigley noted he doesn't have this information now, but would get it for the Commission.

Commissioner Sherman requested clarification regarding the proposed parking configuration.

Mr. Quigley noted there would be storage for at least two (2) cars, probably four (4) cars outside the Mobil Lube area and, in addition to that, there could be two (2) cars inside being serviced. He noted he would add those on the plan for clarification.

Commissioner Sherman inquired about the direction of the cars going to the Mobil Lube, and the stackback requirements.

Mr. Quigley noted it would be from the north to the south.

Chairman Grant instructed the petitioner to indicate on their rendering the automobiles and the direction they are supposed to be facing, as they did with the car wash. In addition, he requested they provide the numbers projected for stacking for all proposed uses on the site.

Commissioner Sherman asked if pedestrian traffic has been addressed on their plan (i.e., designated pathways).

Mr.Quigley noted they are providing sidewalks on both street frontages, and also across the front of the building. He further noted there are no designated pathways on their current plan, but he believes the development would be very accessible from either of the right-of-ways.

Commissioner Sherman inquired regarding the hours of operation for the businesses on the site.

Mr. Quigley replied as follows:

- The hours for the fast-food businesses is not known at this time. This will be determined when a lease is signed.
- The Mobil Convenience Store Service Station would operate twenty-four (24) hours per day.
- The Mobil Lube would operate twelve (12) hours per day.

Commissioner Layton requested clarification of the fast-food operation with regard to the location of menu boards, speaker phones, etc.

Mr. Quigley noted they would be as shown on the chart before the Commission tonight.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR: - None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION:

1. Mr. Hal Miller, 2355 Baxton Way, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke on behalf of the Woodfield Association noting the following:

- Woodfield Condominium consists of sixty-six (66) cluster homes, having two (2) sides abutting the subject site.

- Mr. Work of Arch Energy sent a letter dated February 24, 1998, to a resident of Woodfield whose property abuts the proposed development. The February 24, 1998 letter stated "We will employ the latest available technology in the Burger King grill which is designed to eliminate smoke and smell. The planned hours of operation typical in most franchise agreements are 6:00 a.m. in the morning to 10:00 p.m. at night, seven (7) days a week, three hundred and sixty-four (364) days a year. It is anticipated that the unit will serve an average of 600-700 customers per day. They said that they currently, in terms of gasoline customers, serve 1100 to 1300 customers per day."

- He presented a copy of this letter to the Commission to be made part of the record.

- He noted the petitioners stated earlier that they don't know what the fast-food restaurants will be on the subject site, but the letter specifically stated a Burger King grill.

- He presented and described an aerial photograph of the specific area to the Commission, noting he believes the proposed changes are major.

- He presented a "Fact Comparison Summary" sheet to the Commission. The figures utilized were taken from the drawing by Clayton Engineering. He quoted some of the statistics included on this summary sheet.

- He noted he has questions regarding the cut-through of their plan showing the height of everything, and would like the City to look at this very carefully.

- He believes the proposed development is an outrage.

- He noted residents have presented a list of their major issues and objections that will be addressed by subsequent speakers at tonight's meeting.

- He noted that stormwater is a major concern and serious issue for residents.

2) Mr. David N. Krem, 2435 Baxton Way, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- The Police Department currently records more than one (1) accident per week at the corner of Baxton and Clayton Roads. This has been the case for the past four (4) years, and the 1998 rate is running ahead of that schedule.

- The dollar value of those accidents averages approximately $800,000.00 per year; it would be approximately $1,000,000.00 in 1998.

- It does not take a traffic expert to realize that any additional development would increase traffic at that intersection and would automatically increase the number of accidents.

- The traffic situation that exists outside the present Mobil Station is ripe for a fatal accident, and every effort should be made to prevent this.

- It is currently very difficult to make a left turn out of Woodfield Subdivision onto Baxter Road.

- During the school year, there are approximately one hundred and twenty-five (125) school buses going through the intersection of Clayton and Baxter Roads every school day.

- He described the existing traffic problem of turning left off of Clayton to go north onto Baxter, and then immediately stopping to turn left into the Mobil Station.

- The comment made earlier tonight regarding traffic going south on Baxter becoming lessened by the opening of Highway 141 and Manchester is beyond his comprehension.

- Traffic going south on Baxter and turning left onto Clayton Road is desperately attempting to get to Highway 40.

- Residents of Woodfield no longer try to make that right turn because of the traffic; they actually turn left and go over to Clarkson Road, and then get onto Highway 40 from there.

- To permit Arch Energy to expand the operation of the existing Mobil with a Jiffy Lube, fast-food, drive-through restaurant, increased pumping, enlarged car washing, and ATM Bank would increase the traffic at the intersection of Baxter and Clayton Roads tremendously.

- In order for their operation to be successful, they need 1,000 additional cars to come through the Clayton and Baxter intersection. Those cars would cause more accidents; involve our Police Department and be costly to Chesterfield.

- The Planning Commission would be ignoring the City's Guidelines for maintaining the quality of lifestyle for Chesterfield, and be fiscally and governmentally irresponsible if they allow this to go through.

- It isn't necessary to turn green grass into black asphalt in order to make green bucks for Arch Energy Company.

3. Ms. Delores Silverberg, 2477 Baxton Way, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- The existing Mobil Car Wash runs parallel to her side entry driveway.

- They experience bright floodlights, loud noise from the car wash instruction radio, car radios, and litter thrown across the fence that separates their property from the car wash.

- They have had constant, standing water on the grass that necessitated the Subdivision to put in a French Drain to alleviate the problem.

- The request to blacktop the existing grassy area of the subject site would increase her water problems and those of adjacent homeowners.

- The proposed expansion of the car wash would move it approximately sixteen (16) feet closer to her house.

- The sit-down and drive-through restaurants would add to the existing noise, bright lights and litter problems.

- The dumpster for the proposed restaurant, as well as all other facilities on the site, would be in back of the car wash and also along her property line.

- The contents of the proposed dumpster would attract rodents and emit undesirable odors.

- The proposed restaurants would be a hang-out for teens, since it is so close to both Junior and Senior High Schools.

- She doesn't agree with the petitioner's statement that the development would not be a "destination."

- The air pollution from the proposed restaurants would permeate a large area of the neighborhood.

- Section 2.1.1. of Chesterfield's Comprehensive Plan encourages preservation of residential areas and requires appropriate buffers between new commercial development. The proposed development would not fit that criteria.

- Paragraph number 5, of Residential Development and Support Services states that no new neighborhood service areas are proposed for the south sub-area.

- One of the goals stated in the City's Mission Statement is to enhance property values. She asked someone to tell her how the proposed development would meet that goal, let alone maintain the present property values of the homes in the surrounding area.

4. Mr. Jerry Rieder, 15024 Baxter Village Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- He gave some handouts to Chairman Grant.

- His home is located across the street from the proposed site, behind the National Grocery Store.

- Even with the wooden fence and big buffer zone, they still hear a lot of noise (i.e., dumpster lids slamming, trucks coming in during the night).

- He believes the proposed development is a callous disregard for the people behind the Mobil Station.

- Section 1.2.3 of the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan – Diversity of Development states the following:

  "To provide a more complete range of lifestyle opportunities within the City of Chesterfield, new development should take into consideration the desire to provide opportunities which do not presently exist or exist in limited quantities, particularly in residential areas."

- He referred to the list he gave the Commission, and summarized the items on it.

- He addressed Section 2.1.1 of the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan that states: "Programs should be developed to preserve existing residential neighborhoods and to encourage a bond of common identity. New non-residential developments adjacent to existing residential subdivisions should provide an appropriate buffer and landscaped areas between the uses."

- He believes the proposed development would go against the guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan.

- He noted that present employees of the Mobil Mart have already been told that the restaurant will be a Burger King, and there will be one (1) or two (2) tow trucks.

5. Ms. Judy Stenzel, 15124 Baxton Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- The subject site adjoins her subdivision's common ground, and her backyard.

- She is opposed to the proposed retaining wall that would be eighteen (18) feet, plus a six (6) foot sight proof fence on top.

- Since her home, and that of her neighbor, is now five (5) feet lower than the bottom of the proposed wall, it would rise twenty-one (21) feet at its lowest point, and twenty-nine (29) feet at its highest point above their back yards.

- The proposed wall, if allowed, would be only twenty (20) feet from her subdivision's common ground and approximately fifty (50) feet from her home. This would result in hers and her neighbor's sunlight being obscured during the daytime, and lights from this twenty-four (24) hour facility would shine down on them at night.

- Removal of the 0.6 of an acre that has been an effective barrier between the Clayton Road commercial development and the existing residential community would set a precedent on Clayton Road and everywhere in Chesterfield.

- The proposed development would destroy the quiet enjoyment of their neighborhood.

- Mr. Don Stenzel met with Mr. Wallace, owner of the Mobil property and vacant lot, and offered to purchase this 0.6 acre parcel. Mr. Wallace declined this offer.

- Mr. Stenzel suggested that the Oil Company could donate this parcel and take a tax deduction. Mr. Wallace also declined this offer.

- She encouraged residents to sign petitions, write letters to Councilmembers who were elected to represent residents, and stop the greed of developers who want to take over and tarnish our residential areas.

- The Clayton/Baxter Road Intersection is not the proper place for the proposed development.

6. Mr. George Reeve, 15128 Baxton Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- His house is located in a circle directly behind the enlarged filling station.

- He currently has a six (6) foot fence around the perimeter of his property.

- Approval of the proposed development would constitute an invasion of the privacy of the citizens of Chesterfield.

- Mr. Donald Stenzel, 15124 Baxton Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- His home is to the immediate north of the subject site.

- He expressed concern regarding the noise from car radios, noting it is already at a level that rattles his windows, etc.

- The noise would probably affect at least fifty percent (50%) of the Woodfield residents. In addition it would affect residents of Baxter Village, Chesterton and others.

- Woodfield has many older residents, many of them living on a fixed income. This could drive them from their homes.

- The proposed development would cause their property values to drop dramatically.

- In his meeting with Mr. Wallace, he noted that the residential property values could drop approximately fifty percent (50%). Mr. Wallace didn't disagree with this statement, and mentioned that he and his neighbors are currently protesting a proposed landfill development near his home in Cuba, Missouri that they believe would have a devastating effect on their property values.

- He quoted from the City's Mission Statement: "Committed to Excellence by enhancing property values and by ensuring a secure environment."

- The proposed development would adversely affect thousands of Chesterfield citizens who live or work near this site.

- He asked the Commission to "please not let this happen."

8. Ms. Marcia McDonald, 14986 Chateau Village Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- She noted there are at least sixteen (16) sections of the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan that are in direct contradiction to the proposed development.

- These sixteen (16) sections cover everything from preservation of existing quality of life and conservation of natural features and open spaces to controlling strip commercial development and limiting left turns along arterial roadways. Examples given:

    1. Section 1.1.1 states that preservation and enhancement of the quality of life in Chesterfield should be a primary concern. – She stated the proposal would not increase the quality of her life or her family's.

    2. Section 1.2.3 addresses the subject of duplication of services. She noted that, as of today, we have two (2) other gasoline stations that, combined, offer us every service that Mobil is offering us in the subject proposal.

    3. We already have nine (9) restaurants.

- She noted the Section that deals with residential development and support services; paragraph 3 discusses community service areas. The commercial retail section of Clayton and Baxter Roads is, by definition, a community service area. These areas have a plan for a maximum of 150,000 square feet. With fifty-seven (57) retail businesses, and in excess of 164,800 commercial and retail square feet at this intersection, the maximum has already been exceeded. To add 8,600 square feet of building area and 18,000 square feet of asphalt is forbidden by the Comprehensive Plan. This fact alone is sufficient criteria for the Commission to deny this development request, and she respectfully asks the Commission to do so.

- The Traffic Study, by the consultant's own admission, is basically the same study that was done for Lenette Realty last year. It was pointed out to Lenette last year that the Study was absolutely ridiculous. It did not take into consideration any of the traffic generated by the

Parkway Schools, and she believes this developer should do a different traffic study that originates here and now, today. She requested the consultant follow the traffic patterns as they occur during school hours. Have a study done after Parkway School opens on September 1, 1998.

- She asked all of those who have internet access to look up the Burger King site. Facts are provided regarding how many people they serve, per day, in their restaurants. She noted that according to their web site they serve approximately 1300 to 1400 people per day.

9. Mr. Robert Ferré, 3124 Gurney Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63116, signed a speakers card but waived his turn to speak.

10. Mr. Bennett Whiteson, 15035 D. Baxter Village Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as President of Baxter Village Condominium Association noting the following:

- He gave a handout to the Commission.

- Traffic exiting the Mobil Station, as it is today, across Baxter Road is a circus. Traffic coming out of there turning left has to make the following maneuvers:

  1) cross three (3) lanes of southbound traffic;
  2) go through a 4th lane (a left turn lane to get onto Clayton Road going east); and
  3) merge with the northbound traffic on Baxter.

- He believes the use of engineering studies performed by similarities is not accurate in this particular case; you need to be a first-hand observer.

- Parkway School Transportation Department advised that approximately thirty (30) buses per day are used, and they make this transaction four (4) times per day. Their big times in the AM are from 6:30 to 9:00; and 1:30 to 6:00 in the PM, depending upon school activities.

- The impact of school buses is very significant; but this is not included in the studies he has heard about to date for the subject site.

- He described the various traffic problem situations that exist, as stated in the handout given to the Commission.

- The stormwater detention basin located south of Baxter Village Condominiums is already a receptacle for all kinds of litter.

- He described various existing traffic conditions that require cut-throughs and U-turns on private property.

- The residents of Baxter Village Condominiums see these problems every day and ask the Commission to deny the proposed expansions.

11. Mr. Jim Pierce, 2473 Baxton Way, Chesterfield, MO 63017, filled out a speaker's card but waived his turn to speak.

12. Mr. William B. Simon, 15004 Claymont Estates Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- He gave a letter to the Commission.
- He identified a current traffic hazard at the subject site and suggested a solution (a cement barrier along a 100 yard section of Baxter Road).
- The possible expansion of services at this site and the resulting increased traffic, noise, smell and litter can only degrade our community.
- He asked that the request be denied, and would like the Department of Chesterfield that is responsible for improving safety on our roads to try the afore-mentioned lane barrier test.

13. Mr. Joe Burns, 244 Cedar Trail, Ballwin, MO 63011, spoke as an individual noting the following:

- He and his neighbors appreciate the fact that the City previously rejected the request to put up a Walgreen's Drug Store just across the street from the subject site.
- They do not want additional, high intensity businesses at the Clayton/Baxter Intersection.

14. Mr. John Aumiller, President of the Chesterton Lane Trustees Association, 17 Chesterton Lane, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke on behalf of the Association noting the following:

- The same Traffic Study that was used for the Lenette Realty project has been used for the subject site.
- To compare the traffic at the Clayton/Baxter Intersection to the Riverport situation would be ludicrous.
- The Lenette development included approximately 172 parking spaces, two (2) drive-up windows to a pharmacy, multiple ATM's, and the result of the Traffic Study at that time was that there would be no significant increase in traffic at the intersection.
- He agrees that 108 additional cars during AM rush hour and 119 additional cars at the PM rush hour is not a significant increase in traffic at the intersection; however, he doesn't know where these numbers come from.
- He questioned whether or not these Traffic Studies include whether people are going straight through the Intersection, or making a right-turn or left-turn; because that would significantly increase the number of times that traffic would be slowed down.

- The proposed development would increase the amount of opportunities for people not to pay attention to the traffic light or right-of-way, thereby causing additional accidents.

- Due to the drainage requirement, people turning north onto Baxter Road off of Clayton Road, or anyone trying to make a left turn into the existing Mobil Station, almost have to come to a crawl to access the existing Mobil site.

- There are chunks in the concrete resulting from cars hitting the pavement at this location.

- He requested that the Commission turn down any requests for additional development at this intersection.

SPEAKERS - NEUTRAL - None

REBUTTAL

Mr. Anderson noted the following:

- The 0.6 acres is currently zoned "C-8" District and cannot remain as a park.

- The proposed overall increase is 6,430 square feet (under-roof surface).

- The water would be controlled by engineering to provide better service to residents than the existing conditions do.

- The test this Commission and Council will have to weigh is private detriment versus public benefit and retention of the existing zoning classification in its current form with the current level of density.

- The proposed setbacks would be a forty (40) foot change (i.e., each setback drops forty (40) feet from the southwest and the northwest).

- The petitioner has no intention to have a tow truck or storage of disabled vehicles on the subject site, and would like this verbiage removed from their proposal.

- Their Traffic Engineer noted that only the existing count (i.e., the number of traffic movements flowing through this intersection) is used for the predication; the balance of those results come from an actual traffic study.

- He noted the owner of the subject site has done a fine job on the project at Kehrs Mill Road and Wild Horse Creek Road, and will do a fine job at the subject site.

- The petitioner doesn't want to be compared to Lenette or Walgreen's. Walgreen's is a "destination site;" Mobil Mart would be bypass traffic only.

- The proposed development would enhance what the bypass traffic may do, once on the site.

- He asked the Commission to review all of the facts and determine where the balance lies (i.e., what is permitted, how much private detriment can be afforded for private benefit versus public benefit).

- The petitioner would like the Commission to view the proposal on its own merits.

- Review the enhancement of the stormwater issue.

- Note the improvements, architecturally, of the site.

- Allow this particular property owner to get an investment back (i.e., expectation realized) for a site of this magnitude.

- The petitioner is testing the rights of the property owners in two (2) classifications: 1) that of the property owners on a commercial intersection, in a commercial node where all four (4) corners are devoted to commercial activity; and 2) those in residential neighborhoods.

- The task is difficult and arduous, and he knows the Commission has the skills, wherewithal and foresight to review it in a logical and comprehensive fashion.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Councilmember Brown asked Mr. Anderson how he could say that when you increase the services at a site that you are not increasing the number of people that will go to use these services. She noted she has difficulty accepting this premise.

Mr. Anderson noted the following:

- That premise is what you will find with Traffic Engineers, uniformly, when you have a site like the one before the Commission tonight.

- Once someone stops for gasoline; they may then decide to pick-up something for dinner, etc.

- This has been his experience with other municipalities he has been associated with in the past.

- The natural trend is to have enhanced utilization of the site once you have already arrived.

- This is the deferral of the bypass traffic.

- The petitioner will provide more evidence from their engineers to indicate this pattern and that, perhaps, thirty-six percent (36%) is low.

Councilmember Brown noted she believes there is a difference between the human behavior that she has studied and that used in traffic engineering studies.

Commissioner Macaluso read the final portion of the "Opening Comments."

Chairman Grant recessed the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Chairman Grant reconvened the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Commissioner Layton made a motion to approve the July 27, 1998 Planning Commission Minutes, as amended on page 21, second bullet from the bottom of the page, as follows:

- *include a requirement that all AT&T and Sprint facilities be internal, with the understanding that if Nextel is on the tower, it may use whip antennas.*

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Right **and passes by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Mr. Mike Doster, 16476 Chesterfield Airport Road, Suite 200, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke in favor of P.Z. 22-98 G.H.H. Investments, L.L.C. noting the following:

- There has been some discussion regarding the permitted uses; their basic concern was that there appears to be no accessory/auxiliary uses under the PC and PI Districts.

- Based upon what was discussed in the Work Session held earlier tonight, the petitioner doesn't have any problems with the restrictions or limitations of uses discussed.

- They do not wish to have a drug treatment facility as a permitted use.

Chairman Grant asked Mr. Doster if the restrictions that were addressed in tonight's Work Session are acceptable to the petitioner.

Mr. Doster noted they are acceptable to the petitioner; they have no problem with them.

2. Mr. Dick Ansteth, Holleran Duitsman Architects, 1350 Elbridge Payne, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke in favor of P.Z. 24-98 Central Missouri Pizza, Inc., noting the following:

- The petitioner is in agreement with all the comments in the issues from the Planning Commission, except item number 8 – access to the site.

- Item number 8 recommends there not be any access off of Chesterfield Parkway, but access to the site be limited to a shared egress from the existing driveway that serves the Taco Bell property.

- The petitioner would like to discuss, with the Chesterfield Public Works Department, the logistics of this shared access. (They want to discuss how it would work; what the complications might be if the corporate offices of Central Missouri Pizza and a small bakery facility would need to share the entrance with the fast-food Taco Bell facility; etc.)

- The petitioner noted the St. Louis County Highway comments included in the packets noted they believe one (1) single commercial entrance off of the Chesterfield Parkway North is a good idea. The petitioner would like to pursue this further with the City.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Chairman Grant noted this issue will be thoroughly discussed.

Commissioner Layton asked if it would be technically possible for the petitioner to place the proposed office building up front on Parkway and the bakery at the rear of the site.

Mr. Ansteth replied that the petitioner could look at this possibility; however, the advantages are:

- the topography lends itself better for the office building to be at the back of the site, as the site slopes off and they can take advantage of an upper level entrance;

- they could have a walk-out lower level;

- the proposed office location provides a better place for parking for the office (i.e., at the back of the site); and

- the smaller bakery building would have its facilities nearer the street.

Commissioner Layton noted the reason for his question is his concern about the appearance of the Parkway and the attempt on the other side of the Parkway to phase-out from the heavy commercial at the corner into residential. He further noted that the thought of the office being along the Parkway would be, to him, more appealing. He noted he visited the Domino's facility located in Ladue Trails, and was rather put-off by the loud and garish advertising posters that filled the windows and were highly visible from the street.

Mr. Ansteth noted Domino's is interested in maintaining a presence that's modest and in-keeping with the surrounding neighborhood. He further noted that the facade of the proposed bakery is a very modest brick and colonial design, with simple arched windows and standing seam metal roof. He noted it is serious attempt by the petitioner to keep the facade of the proposed buildings in-keeping with the surrounding neighborhood, including the complex we are in tonight.

Commissioner Layton noted the rendering before the Commission is certainly more attractive than the strip mall at LadueTrails.

Commissioner Yaffe inquired regarding the distance from the street back to the proposed office building.

Mr. Ansteth replied it is between 120 to 130 feet back from the street, maybe a little more. He described the rendering of the proposed development.

Councilmember Brown noted concerns regarding the visibility of the delivery cars with the Domino's signs on top. She further noted that cars' being parked in front of the proposed bakery isn't the kind of use envisioned for Chesterfield Parkway.

Mr. Ansteth noted there would just be a couple of vehicles.

Councilmember Brown noted that it isn't so much the number of vehicles, it's the usage that makes it look like a fast-food restaurant type development. She inquired if there is any thought to facing the bakery to the Parkway, or putting the parking in a way to better conceal those cars in the back, closer to the office building.

Mr. Ansteth noted the delivery vehicles could be assigned parking spaces toward the center of the parking area, leaving the front parking spaces open for the office personnel. Part of the reason for developing the site as they have was that they expected to have access from the Parkway, in and out of the site; hence, the arrangement of the building and the parking along the side of the site. The petitioner would like to speak further with the City's Public Works Department, as they have asked that there be a shared access with the existing driveway (i.e., possibly moving this driveway over which would make it off-center from the Chapel Chiropractic Office across the Parkway). The petitioner believes moving this driveway would create a hazardous condition. He further noted that the petitioner would like clarification of the Public Works Department's concerns and they, in turn, need to better understand the petitioner's issues so they can come to an agreement.

Commissioner Sherman noted it is not just a concern about the cars being in front, it's the amount of asphalt visible from the Parkway.

Mr. Ansteth noted they are proposing a twenty-five percent (25%) greater landscape buffer than that of the Chapel Chiropractic located across the Parkway. He further noted he believes a two (2) story building next to the Parkway would be less desirable than the smaller one (1) story building proposed.

Commissioner Sherman noted we already have a two (2) story building just down the street (i.e., Fairfield Suites).

NEW BUSINESS:

A. **P.Z. 22-98 G.H.H. Investments, L.L.C.**; a request to rezone the 38.6 acre "M-3" Planned Industrial District located on Long Road, into two (2) distinct zoning designations: a "PC" Planned Commercial District is proposed for the 18.34 acre parcel A and a "PI" Planned Industrial District is proposed for the 20.23 acre parcel B.

Planner II Reveena Shook summarized the request and Department's recommendation of approval, as stated in the report and conditions contained in Attachment A.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner Layton asked Ms. Shook to state the hours of operation.

Ms Shook noted the following:

- The "PC" Planned Commercial District hours of operation are to be from 6:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m., Sunday through Saturday, excluding restaurants and pharmacies.

- The petitioner is proposing no restriction on the hours for the "PI" Planned Industrial District.

Chairman Grant asked if Commissioners were agreeable with those hours of operation.

The Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Layton made a motion to approve P.Z. 22-98, subject to the changes in the permitted uses, as discussed in Work Session meeting and as agreed to by the petitioner.

Chairman Grant noted the two (2) changes are restrictions in both the "PC" and "PI" Districts: 1) with respect to letting the clinics in with the normal medical practice in some suitable fashion; and 2) the sales of automobiles.

Commissioner Layton concurred.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Yaffe.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Councilmember Brown requested clarification regarding the reimbursement agreement for Edison Avenue (i.e., from whom to whom?).

Planner II Reveena Shook responded that the City would reimburse the developer or whoever makes those improvements.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Layton, yes; Commissioner Macaluso, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Commissioner Yaffe, yes; Chairman Grant, yes.

The motion passes by a vote of 6 to 0.

B. **P.Z. 23-98 Charitable Leasing Corporation, Inc.**; a request for a change in zoning from "M-3" Planned Industrial District to a "PC" Planned Commercial District for a 5.59 acre tract of land located on Chesterfield Airport Road, 200 feet west of Cepi Drive, 450 east of Goddard Avenue. (Locator Number: 17V24-0153). Proposed Use: Research and resource facility.

Planner I Annissa McCaskill summarized the issues being reviewed by the Department and requested this matter be held until the August 24, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting.

No issues were added.

A motion to hold was made by Commissioner Yaffe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Layton **and passes by a voice vote of 6 t 0.**

C. **P.Z. 24-98 Central Missouri Pizza, Inc.**; a request for a change of from "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District to "PC" Planned Commercial District for a 0.64 acre parcel of land located on Chesterfield Parkway North, 400 feet South of Olive Boulevard, 600 feet North of Swingley Ridge Road (Roosevelt Parkway). (Locator Number 18S52-0712). Proposed Uses: Corporate Office and Restaurant, Fast Food.

Planner I Annissa McCaskill summarized the issues being reviewed by the Department and requested this matter be held until the August 24, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting.

ISSUES ADDED:

1. Location of the buildings (i.e., whether or not there may be a more appropriate location of the buildings) and access to same.

2. What signs can be authorized in windows of the bakery?

3. Require both buildings to be built simultaneously, if that's the way they are approved.

4. Monument signage.

A motion to hold was made by Commissioner Yaffe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Layton **and passes by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS – None

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. **Ordinance Review Committee** - No report
B. **Architectural Review Committee** - No report
C. **Site Plan/Landscape Committee** – No report
D. **Comprehensive Plan Committee** – No report
E. **Procedures and Planning Committee** – No report

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Grant, seconded by Commissioner Layton **and passes by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Fred Broemmer, Secretary

[MIN8-10-98.doc]