PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
JUNE 11, 2018

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT	ABSENT
Commissioner Laura Lueking	Commissioner Allison Harris
Commissioner John Marino	
Commissioner Debbie Midgley	
Commissioner Mary Monachella	
Commissioner James Rosenauer	
Commissioner Gene Schenberg	
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg	
Chair Merrell Hansen	

Mayor Bob Nation
Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison
Mr. Jay Godsy, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services
Ms. Cassandra Harashe, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

Chair Hansen acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison; Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II; Councilmember Michael Moore, Ward III; Councilmember Tom DeCampi, Ward IV; and Councilmember Michelle Ohley, Ward IV.

Chair Hansen then introduced and welcomed newly-appointed Planning Commissioner Gene Schenberg noting that he has been involved with the City of Chesterfield in a number of capacities as a former Planning Commissioner and Ward I Councilmember, as well as serving on the Monarch Fire District Citizens Budget Advisory Committee and Chesterfield's Economic Development Council.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the May 30, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and **passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0.** *(Commissioners Schenberg and Wuennenberg abstained from voting.)*

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. **Mr. George Stock**, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Stock stated he was available for questions regarding the site plan review for **Spirit Valley Business Park, Lot 16A (Chesterfield Fence and Deck)**.

Mr. Stock stated he was also representing the Petitioner, Payne Family Homes, regarding **P.Z. 04-2018 West County Acres, Nardin Drive (R-2, PC to R-4)**.

The following individuals then spoke regarding **P.Z. 22-2017 Clarkson Center (2264 Clarkson Road):**

1. **Dr. Doug Pernikoff, Petitioner**, 32 Clarkson Wilson Center, Chesterfield, MO.

Dr. Pernikoff noted what he feels are the primary sensitivity points for the Clarkson Woods Subdivision residents, as shown below:

Building Design: In response to the residents' concerns, he has had the proposed building conceptually redesigned by Architect Lauren Strutman to portray a more residential appearance in order to better blend into the neighborhood.

Traffic Impact: Dr. Pernikoff has been in contact with Karen Yeomans, Area Engineer for MoDOT, who has provided a letter stating that MoDOT has been apprised that Dr. Pernikoff hopes to move his vet clinic to 2264 Clarkson Road and would use the existing access drive onto Clarkson Woods Drive. MoDOT does not have concerns about the traffic impact of the use of that access drive on the state roadway.

Visual Barriers: The facility would be accessed via the easement road where berms and plantings will be installed. Dr. Pernikoff provided a drawing showing where additional trees, perennials, and bushes would be located on the site to both enhance it aesthetically and to provide a visual barrier.

The following individuals spoke **In Favor** of the petition:

1. **Mr. Steven D. Goldstein**, 2479 Clayborn Drive, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Goldstein stated that he grew up in the neighborhood at 16076 Clarkson Woods and remembers being Dr. Pernikoff's first client. Mr. Goldstein spoke highly of Dr. Pernikoff's character and as someone "who cares about what the neighborhood thinks".

2. **Mr. Joel Sorofman**, 15972 Deer Trail Court, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Sorofman introduced his wife, Tina, noting that they have lived at their current address since 1990. Mr. Sorofman stated that Dr. Pernikoff is a "wonderful contributor to our community and great vet". He expects that Dr. Pernikoff will do something special with the subject site that will have a positive effect on the neighborhood. Mr. Sorofman also stated that he does not foresee a traffic issue if the entrance comes from behind Salinas restaurant, as is currently proposed.

3. **Mr. Barry Goldstein**, 16076 Clarkson Woods, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Goldstein stated that he and his family have lived at their current address for 26 years. During the 24 years that Dr. Pernikoff has operated his clinic, Mr. Goldstein stated that he has not heard of any complaints regarding the practice. The proposed plans appear to take into consideration the residents' concerns regarding noise and visuals. Mr. Goldstein also noted that he does not expect there is anyone interested in building a home on the vacant site and feels that a veterinary clinic will not adversely affect traffic in the area.

4. **Ms. Jennifer Holmes**, 16066 Hunters Way Drive, Chesterfield, MO.

Ms. Holmes stated that she has lived in the Clarkson Woods subdivision for 13 years. After reviewing the revised plans, she is "impressed with the conscious effort Dr. Pernikoff has made to address and resolve neighbors' concerns". She feels that the proposed building has a residential look to it and would be a nice barrier to the back side of Clarkson Wilson Center, along with improving the aesthetics to the subdivision entrance. She is comfortable that the land will be used to benefit a local business owner, who has a vested interest in the community. She noted that the restricted use of the property will insure that no future developments, such as a fast-food restaurant or gas station, will occupy the site.

The following individuals spoke **In Opposition** to the petition:

1. **Dr. Dennis Ganahl & Dr. Gina Ganahl**, 15979 Woodlet Way Court, Chesterfield, MO.

Dr. Ganahl stated that he and his wife have lived in their subdivision since 2004 and he has served as a Trustee for the subdivision for nearly eight years. Dr. Ganahl stated that the petition is about maintaining the integrity of a residential neighborhood and noted his concerns as follows:

- Increased traffic – Speaker noted that during his past tenure as a Trustee, the subdivision paid $500 annually to repair tire ruts from cars turning out of the drive onto Clarkson Woods.
- Decreased property values – Local real estate agents have indicated that the homes could suffer as much as a 25% depreciation in their value. The home closest to the proposed development has exchanged hands four times in the last six years "because of the collateral issues of noise and traffic".
- Existing empty retail space – Speaker questioned the need for additional retail space when there are empty spaces in the existing development, and in other areas around the city.

Dr. Ganahl pointed out that the City has received over 50 letters in opposition to the petition, and that the master plan for the City calls for the site to be residential. The subdivision would be "happy to form a partnership with the City to figure out how to purchase and maintain the property".

Discussion

Commissioner Schenberg questioned whether Dr. Ganahl was representing only himself or the residents of Clarkson Woods subdivision. Dr. Ganahl responded that he was there as a trustee on behalf of 283 residents, with the exception of those residents who spoke earlier in favor of the petition. He noted that the trustees have voted collectively against the petition.

Commissioner Schenberg asked how the trustees would like to see the site developed. Dr. Ganahl replied that they would like it to remain a green space that has been appropriately landscaped, which would "make life better for the families living there".

2. **Mr. Peter White**, 16062 Hunters Way Drive, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. White stated that he had hoped to see the revised plans prior to addressing the Commission, and said he would defer his comments at this time.

3. **Mr. Tom Baranowski**, 16002 Park Forest Court, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Baranowski stated that he is in agreement with having the site remain as green space and questioned "what compelling reason is there to change the zoning from residential to commercial?" Because of the size of the proposed building, Speaker believes that it will house both the veterinary clinic and an additional business, which will increase the traffic. He questioned how MoDOT developed its study regarding traffic.

4. **Ms. Joy Dakich**, 16093 Meadow Oak Drive, Chesterfield, MO.

Ms. Dakich stated that she has lived at her present address for 39 years and noted her concerns as follows:

- Proposed uses for the building – Concern that a specific use has not been identified for the building.
- Location of the parking lot in front of the building - Speaker noted that the proposed building and fencing are fine – but once cars are parked in front of the building, visitors to their subdivision will see a "used car lot".

Ms. Dakich noted her agreement with the previous speakers wanting the site to remain green space, and perhaps developed as more of a parklike area.

5. **Mr. Paul Bostick**, 2139 Heather Glen, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Bostick stated that he and his wife have resided at their current address for 21 years and noted his concerns as follows:

- Not knowing what type of business will occupy the building
- Increased traffic
- Parking lot could have the appearance of a "used car lot".

Discussion

Commissioner Wuennenberg advised the residents that the Petitioner has removed a number of uses from his request and is now only requesting the following four uses:

- Office, dental
- Office, medical
- Office, general
- Veterinary clinic

The following individual spoke from a **Neutral** position regarding the petition:

1. **Ms. Margaret Gemski**, 16053 Meadow Oak Drive, Chesterfield, MO.

Ms. Gemski provided the following information:

- She sees a community businessman who would like to rezone a small tract of land close to his current business and for the purpose of revenue.
- She noted that while some of the subdivision residents are divided over the project, she feels that most of the residents "are neutral because the number of houses traffic impacts is a relatively small number".
- No one from her subdivision personally asked her whether she is in favor of or opposed to the project, so she questions statements that indicate that the majority of the residents are opposed to the petition. She added that the Trustees are not speaking on her behalf.
- Dr. Pernikoff has offered to address anyone's concerns and has revised his plans in response to some of the concerns raised.

Ms. Gemski then stated that she does have concerns that using the ingress/egress area will cause heavier traffic, and in fairness to the one house that borders the ingress/egress, she suggested that the entrance be located on the Clarkson Woods side of the site.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

A. Spirit Valley Business Park, Lot 16A (Chesterfield Fence and Deck): A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 6.183 acre parcel of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located on the south side of Olive Street Road, west of Spirit Valley East Drive.

Commissioner Rosenauer, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for Spirit Valley Business Park, Lot 16A (Chesterfield Fence and Deck). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg and **passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0**.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 22-2017 Clarkson Center (2264 Clarkson Road): A request for a zoning map amendment from a "R2" Residence District (15,000 square foot minimum) and "C-8" Planned Commercial to a "PC" Planned Commercial District for 0.9 acres located on the southern corner of the intersection of Clarkson Road and Clarkson Woods Drive. (20T610716).

Project Planner Cassie Harashe stated that a public hearing for this petition was held on February 12, 2018 at which time the following issues were identified:

1. **Uses.** The original request included 11 uses. The Petitioner has since removed the seven uses pertaining to retail. The four remaining uses are three office uses and a veterinary clinic.

2. **Tree Preservation.** At this time, the Petitioner is only required to submit a Tree Stand Delineation identifying trees on the property. A tree protection plan will be required at the Site Development stage, and at that time, Staff will work with the Applicant to ensure no off-site trees are removed without approval from the property owner.

3. **Parking.** Concerns were expressed regarding the size of the parking lot and the Petitioner's ability to sufficiently park the uses being requested. The Unified Development Code has maximum and minimum parking standards for all permitted uses, which are based on the square footage of the use.

   The Petitioner will be required to provide a Site Development Plan that complies with all requirements pertaining to minimum parking, stormwater quality, open space, and landscaping. The size of any proposed building will be dictated by these requirements.

   Additionally, if a multi-tenant building is proposed with a different user, a parking worksheet would be required to ensure adequate parking is provided.

4. **Noise.** The Petitioner's response letter states that they do not have any outdoor runs, and pets under their care are walked individually to minimize the amount of noise.

5. **Architecture of the proposed building.** The Petitioner has provided a new rendering for the proposed building, which includes many residential details. It was noted that this rendering is provided for informational purposes only. More detailed elevations and renderings will be required and will be reviewed by both the Architectural Review Board and Planning Commission as part of a Site Development Plan.

Preliminary Plan

There have been no significant changes to the Preliminary Plan since the Public Hearing. Access remains coming from the Clarkson Wilson Center which is located within an access easement. The building will be located on the south side of the

property closer to the existing buildings in the Clarkson Wilson Center. It was pointed out that the Petitioner is requesting a modification to the landscape buffer along Clarkson Road and Clarkson Woods Drive. These two roads require 30-foot landscape buffers; the Petitioner is requesting a 15-foot buffer along Clarkson Road, and a 10-foot buffer along Clarkson Woods Drive. These requests have been included in the draft Attachment A.

Staff has no outstanding issues so the Planning Commission may vote on this item this evening if they so choose. Ms. Harashe also pointed out that Staff had received numerous emails from residents, which were linked into the Planning Commission packet on the City's website.

Discussion

During discussion, the following information was reviewed and clarified as necessary:

Site History

There were a series of three zoning petitions under St. Louis County. During the first zoning, the subject site was included as part of the Clarkson Woods subdivision, but was omitted during platting, therefore it did not become a part of the subdivision. In 1972, the Clarkson Wilson Center lot was platted to create two separate lots, with the subject site being known as Lot 2 shown with the label *Future Development Proposed*. The subject site has split zoning between residential and commercial, which appears to be an approximate 50% split between the two zoning districts.

The access easement to the commercial property was part of the original Clarkson Wilson Center development, and is now a part of the subject site.

It was determined that a house could not be built on the subject site solely in the area zoned residential because of setback requirements. In order to accommodate a house, a zoning change would be necessary for that portion of the site currently zoned commercial.

Easement Maintenance

Maintenance of the easement is done through a private agreement between the two property owners. If the easement became a property maintenance code issue, it would be forwarded to the Police Department for code enforcement.

Parking

At the Site Development Plan stage, Staff will review the proposed square footage and how it is allocated between the permitted uses to determine the number of required parking spaces.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Dr. Pernikoff was asked to finish his earlier presentation whereby he presented a conceptual rendering of how the site would appear along Clarkson Woods Drive with the existing trees and proposed fence.

In summary, Dr. Pernikoff stated that:

- He has been transparent with Ward IV representatives and residents. Despite the fact that he has been unable to get a meeting with the ward representatives, he has made himself available.
- He has followed Chesterfield's guidelines and developed what he feels is an appropriate plan for the site.
- He has worked to address all reasonable resident concerns.
- Upon reviewing the 50 opposition letters sent to the Planning Commission, he has determined that they represent approximately 25 households out of nearly 300.

Dr. Pernikoff also stated that, as a long-term taxpayer and business owner, he feels that he has the same rights as residents to enjoy the opportunities of Chesterfield. He then addressed some of the comments made during the Public Comment portion of the meeting:

- The site will not appear as a parking lot – it will be "almost visually impossible to see".
- They intend to have all business activity concluded by 7:00 p.m. so traffic will not be impacted late in the evening.
- He does not feel traffic will be adversely affected by his proposal.
- Regarding property devaluation concerns, he noted that he used to be a broker in the real estate business and he doesn't see any proof of devaluation.
- Regarding the houses that have changed hands in recent years, he explained that it was due to out-of-town job opportunities, not traffic. Dr. Pernikoff stated that these individuals were his clients and he knows why they left. He also noted that the property values went up with each sale.
- He has not seen children playing on the lot.
- The size of the proposed building is 7,000-7,500 square feet vs. 12,000 square feet which would be permitted.
- He pointed out that maintenance of the easement road is under the responsibility of Hutkin Development. Dr. Pernikoff stated that he is also amenable to installing a stop sign at the end of the easement road.

Dr. Pernikoff compared his proposal to the City's Comprehensive Plan guidelines, as noted below:

- **Good Site Design:** He feels he has accomplished this.
- **Complementary Building Height:** The proposed building is one-story compared to most of the neighboring homes being two stories. The house design is very residential in appearance.
- **Parking:** Parking will be screened.
- **Visual Barriers:** His plan adds more plantings and trees to the site, along with vertical evergreens along the existing commercial center where Kennelwood was previously located.

Discussion

Building Floor Area

Commissioner Wuennenberg stated that the draft Attachment A shows that the *total building floor area shall not exceed 12,000 square feet*, and asked if the Petitioner would be agreeable to changing it from *12,000 square feet* to *7,500 square feet.* After further

discussion and clarification with Dr. Pernikoff, it was agreed to keep the language as drafted at *12,000 square feet* in order to take into account any possible basement square footage, which is considered in parking calculations. It was also noted that at 12,000 square feet, 38 parking spaces would be required but the site will not accommodate that many spaces. As currently proposed, 31 spaces are the most the site can accommodate.

Hours of Operation
Commissioner Wuennenberg noted that the draft Attachment A shows *hours of operation for this "PC" District shall not be restricted.* He then asked Dr. Pernikoff if he would be amenable to restricting the hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday thru Saturday. It was pointed out that any other uses in the building would have to abide by these restricted hours. Dr. Pernikoff noted his agreement to restricting the hours of operation as suggested.

Commissioner Midgley inquired as to whether animals are kept overnight on a regular basis and whether staff is on-site for overnight care. Dr. Pernikoff replied that animals are only kept overnight when medically required to and that all personnel leave by 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to approve P.Z. 22-2017 Clarkson Center (2264 Clarkson Road). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino.

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to amend the motion to change Section I.A.2.a. of the draft Attachment A pertaining to Hours of Operation, as noted below: (changes shown in **bold)**

> Hours of operation for this "PC" District shall ~~**not**~~ be restricted **from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday thru Saturday.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schenberg.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Monachella, Commissioner Rosenauer, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Marino, Chair Hansen

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Reduced Buffers
The Commission noted its consensus with the Petitioner's request for a reduced 15-foot landscape buffer along Clarkson Road, and a reduced 10-foot landscape buffer along Clarkson Woods Drive, which match the neighboring development. These reduced buffers are included in the draft Attachment A.

In reviewing the zoning request, Commissioner Wuennenberg felt that the following two points should be taken into consideration:

1. Even though it was never built, the subject site was originally platted as Lot 2 of a commercial development; and
2. Residential zoning is not appropriate for the site since it is not anticipated anyone would consider building a house on it.

The vote to approve P.Z. 22-2017 Clarkson Center (2264 Clarkson Road), as amended, was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Monachella, Commissioner Rosenauer, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Lueking, Chair Hansen

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Chair Hansen informed the members of the audience that the petition will now be forwarded to the City Council's Planning & Public Work Committee with the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve. The meeting is open to the public for anyone interested in attending.

B. P.Z. 04-2018 West County Acres, Nardin Drive (R-2, PC to R-4): A request for a zoning map amendment from an "R-2" Residence District and "PC" Planned Commercial District to an "R-4" Residence District for a 20.7 acre tract of land located north and east of Swingley Ridge Road east of its intersection with Chesterfield Ridge Center Dr. (18S510164, 18S510142, 18S510131, 18S510119, 18S510098, 18S510229, 18S510021, 18S230158, 18S510010, 18S150043, 18S510087, 18S510108, 18S510120, 18S510153, 18S510175).

Project Planner Cassie Harashe, presenting on behalf of Senior Planner Jessica Henry, stated that the Public Hearing for this request was held on April 23, 2018 at which time three areas of concern were raised and discussed, as noted below:

1. **Desire to see a transition of zoning districts to ensure that the character of existing homes north of the subject site is preserved.**
   - The Petitioner has revised their request to match the R-2 zoning district of the adjacent property owners on each of the lots that abut these properties.
   - The Petitioner has also provided an informational exhibit showing that the required 20-foot landscape buffers will be provided between their development and the adjacent existing residences.
   - While not part of the formal zoning process or basis for the Commission's consideration of the request, the Petitioner has shared a private agreement reached between the development and the adjacent property

owners, which indicates that many of the concerns expressed by the property owners during the Public Hearing have been resolved.

2. **Feasibility of preserving the four Monarch trees identified on the Tree Stand Delineation.**
   - The Petitioner evaluated the location of the trees and has determined that constructing a new street that meets City standards will likely preclude the Petitioner from preserving these trees. However, substantial tree canopy in other areas of the property will remain.

3. **Feasibility of providing a pedestrian connection/trail to the office and commercial areas to the east.**
   - In their response, the Petitioner states that sidewalks will be provided along both sides of reconstructed Nardin Drive. However, the property is constrained on all sides by creeks, with no adjacent trails to connect to, which limits the feasibility of installing a new trail that would link to other residential or commercial developments in the area.

Staff has reviewed the request for a zoning map amendment and has found that it is compliant with the City's Unified Development Code. There being no outstanding issues, the Commission may take action on this item, if so desired.

Discussion

Noting that the proposed development is located within the City's urban core, Chair Hansen asked that the Applicant provide information about how the project meets the UDC's guidelines regarding the urban core.

Mr. George Stock stated that the land use designation for the site is Urban Core and the majority of surrounding properties have commercial zoning. The subject site is zoned "R2" and they are requesting that a portion of it be rezoned to "R4", which raises the density of the property.

As currently platted, the residential subdivision is non-compliant with the standards and specifications of both the City and Monarch Fire District, as noted below:

- Because of the dead-end street, the site has more lots than what is currently allowed.
- The street is non-compliant in width and has no pedestrian facilities or access.
- The longitudinal slope of the street far exceeds the City's requirements.
- There is no secondary means of ingress and egress.

Through the redevelopment and the request for an "R4" zoning, they will build a street that is compliant with the City's standards on pavement width and with the provision of sidewalks on both sides of the street. Additionally, a secondary connection will be provided to Private Drive. Private Drive will be dedicated as a public street with the City and will connect with Swingley Ridge Road.

With respect to urban core, they are preserving many of the site's natural resources. Because the site is flanked on both sides by creeks, there is only one creek crossing for the public street. The natural resources of the tree canopies will remain intact. They intend to develop a "sustainable residential subdivision that is nestled amongst

commercial development but buffered from the commercial developments by the on-site natural resources".

Regarding the creeks, they intend to request a nationwide permit from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, which limits the amount of disturbance of the creeks. The creeks will only be disturbed by the road and some storm water detention facilities. They are not asking for a second bridge or pedestrian crossing of the creek that would be required to get to adjoining properties. They will create common ground that provides access for the subdivision residents; the sidewalks will be tied into the sidewalk along Swingley Ridge.

Councilmember Hurt asked that consideration be given to providing an access to the creek. Mr. Stock stated that there is a common ground strip from their street to both the east and west property lines as passive recreation through the woods. There are no plans to clear anything within the common ground area over to the east property line.

Justin Wyse, Director of Planning & Development Services, asked for clarification on the existing public street and its deficiencies. Mr. Stock stated that the existing street is within a 50-foot right-of-way but the pavement is only 19-21 feet in width. The street will be replaced with a 26-foot wide concrete street. The existing street has a longitudinal slope of about 11-12% so the slope will be flattened out to be between 8-10%.

Commissioner Marino made a motion to approve P.Z. 04-2018 West County Acres, Nardin Drive (R-2, PC to R-4). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Rosenauer, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Monachella, Chair Hansen

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of Officers

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, **Commissioner Lueking made a motion to approve the following slate of officers for 2018-2019:**

- **Chair – Merrell Hansen**
- **Vice-Chair – Steve Wuennenberg**
- **Secretary – Debbie Midgley**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Monachella and **passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

B. Commissioner Wendy Geckeler

Chair Hansen recognized the service of Wendy Geckeler whose term as Planning Commissioner ended earlier this month. Ms. Geckeler served on the Planning Commission since 2006 and during those years, she reviewed 236 site plans, plats, and sign packages, and participated in 133 public hearings. The Commission has been impressed by her sincerity and extensive research on each project, and her efforts to ensure that the City's Comprehensive Plan was followed by both commercial and private builders. She also constantly reviewed the Architectural Review Board's recommendations and attended numerous ARB meetings. She had a keen interest in green space and trees, the Comprehensive Plan, the City, and its residents.

The Mayor has issued a Certificate of Appreciation for Ms. Geckeler and the Planning Commission thanks her for her service.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Debbie Midgley, Secretary