PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
May 27, 1998

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

PRESENT
Mr. Fred Broemmer
Mr. Dave Dalton
Mr. Charles Eifler
Mr. Robert Grant
Mr. Dan Layton, Jr.
Ms. Linda McCarthy
Mr. Jerry Right
Chairman Rick Bly
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
Mr. Todd Streiler, Planner II
Ms. Annissa McCaskill, Planner I
Mr. James Gittemeier, Intern
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

ABSENT
Mr. Allen Yaffe

INVOCATION: Commissioner Dave Dalton

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. **P.Z. 17-98 AT&T Wireless PCS, Inc. c/o Quinn, Ground and Banton, L.L. P.**; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "LLR" Large Lot Residential District for a 18.4 tract of land on Wildhorse Creek Road. (Locator Number 18V120144). AND

B. **P.Z. 18-98 AT&T Wireless PCS, Inc. c/o Quinn, Ground and Banton, L.L.P.**; a request for a Conditional Use Permit in the "LLR" Large Lot Residential District for a 18.4 tract of land located on Wildhorse Creek Road. (Locator Number 18V120144); Proposed Use: Operation of a church and placement of a wireless telephone transmitting and receiving facility.

Commissioner Fred Broemmer read the first portion of the "Opening Comments."

Planner I Annissa McCaskill gave a slide presentation of the subject site and surrounding area.

Mr. Paul Ground, 14611 Manchester Road, Manchester, MO 63011, spoke on behalf of the petition noting the following:

- introduced Mr. Greg Stockell who is also here on behalf of the petitioner to answer questions; and

- summarized the rezoning request, noting it meets the requirements of the Ordinance with regard to lot setbacks, etc. - (LLR District).

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

City Attorney Doug Beach noted the proposed site has already been approved, via a CUP for Sprint [fifty-two (52) foot maximum tower height]. The request tonight is for approval of co-location, with Sprint, which would raise the height of the pole to eighty (80) feet. The pole would be painted red and white, with a blinking, red light on top, and have two (2) sets of antenna located inside of the pole.

- The history of the Sprint request and approval process was discussed.

Mr. Ground gave a rendering of the proposed antenna to the Planning Commissioners and noted the technical growth of antennas has progressed so that antenna farms are no longer required/utilized.

Chairman Bly recognized the attendance of Mayor Nancy Greenwood at tonight's meeting.

Mr.Ground noted that flag pole antennas come as a kit, and are designed to have the antenna inside of the pole. He further noted there will absolutely, under no circumstances, be any exterior AT&T antennas on the subject site. Other items noted by Mr. Ground included:

- The height of the pole on the rendering is at eighty (80) feet; the heights of the existing trees surrounding the pole are approximately fifty-five (55) feet.

- If AT&T is not allowed to co-locate on the subject site, they will need to request a pole for another site in the near vicinity.

Mr. Ground described three (3) separate land use maps: 1) depicting the existing area of coverage; 2) depicting the coverage when adding the subject site; and 3) depicting coverage if the pole is moved over to the Chesterfield Elementary School location - noting there would be a big gap in coverage to the south and west of the intended site.

City Attorney Beach inquired regarding the approximate height of the tower, if it would not be on the subject site.

Mr. Ground noted he couldn't say with any real authority. The technology is based on the "line of sight." Every time they move the antenna thirty (30) or forty (40) feet, they change all the harmonics of the radio frequency energy (i.e., the height may have to go up or down). It would depend upon the topography of the site. Other items noted by Mr. Ground included:

- The FAA requires the pole to be painted red and white and have a blinking red light on top, regardless of whether or not the extension being requested tonight is approved.

- There hasn't been any general effort to speak with property owners adjacent to the subject site.

- It is the understanding of the petitioner that the FAA requires a blinking red light, not a strobe light.

- The pole at the Baxter Nursery site is painted white and has an American flag on it, with a light shining on the flag.

- It is up to the Commission to decide whether or not they would like an American flag on the pole.

City Attorney Beach advised that Nextel Communications has also sent the City a letter indicating a desire, on their part, to co-locate on the subject site at ninety (90) feet. He noted the intent of the City has been to cut down on the proliferation of poles in the City. The FAA has given approval on the subject site for a one hundred and four (104) foot pole, to be painted red and white, with a blinking red light on top.

- There was discussion about the potential impact of the proposed pole upon the homes in Tara at Wildhorse Subdivision.

Mr. Ground noted that he believes all communication providers have an overall agreement about shared use. He further noted that, when a particular event arises, they sign a sub-lease or some type of specific agreement of that character, as AT&T has with Sprint.

- There was discussion regarding the ability of Nextel Communications to be included as a co-user at the subject site.

Chairman Bly recognized the attendance of Councilmember Allan Sheppard at tonight's meeting.

- Concern was expressed by the Commission regarding the Nextel Communications' request.

- There was discussion regarding the pros and cons of constructing one (1) one hundred and four (104) foot antenna versus three (3) separate antennas that could be at a height not to exceed the height of surrounding trees.

Mr. Greg Stockell, engineer for AT&T, noted that, from a technical standpoint, they could do a tower farm. There does have to be separation vertically and horizontally. In either event, whether at the St. Thomas Church site or a site along any part of Wild Horse Creek Road - the FAA is going to require anything ten (10) feet above the ground to be painted red and white and lighted. The City could, in essence, be looking at three (3), red and white, fifty-two (52) foot or fifty-four (54) foot lighted poles, as opposed to one (1) eighty (80) foot pole. AT&T requires a minimum of sixty (60) feet for their system coverage, and Sprint needs to be at a minimum height of fifty-two (52) feet.

Mr. Ground noted that what the Commission decides this evening doesn't commit the City to one-hundred and four (104) feet, just eighty (80) feet. AT&T would be willing to share use with Nextel Communications.

City Attorney Beach noted the Master Plan anticipated the height at one hundred and twenty (120) to one hundred and twenty-five (125) feet as being the maximum heights of antennas. He further noted:

- having a Master Plan doesn't always work;
- all five (5) of the known providers are entitled to poles by the Federal Law;
- The City's intent is to provide poles for the users in the least offensive way possible; and
- issues were raised in the drafting of our Ordinance (i.e., to either deal with multiple poles at sixty (60) feet, or fewer poles, at higher elevations, by allowing co-location).

- There was discussion regarding the requirement for poles out of the flight pattern (i.e., whether or not they would need to be lighted and painted red and white).

Mr. Ground noted that communications companies select a spot and height for a potential antenna, and then the FAA determines whether or not it has to be painted, lighted, etc.

- There was discussion regarding the aesthetics and technical feasibility, of replacing the proposed eighty (80) foot structure with ten (10) separate antennae located at various types of sites (i.e., on church steeples, utility poles, or other existing structures).

Mr. Ground described the process AT&T and other communication companies go through in deciding on particular site. He noted that, in the search ring for the site being discussed tonight, there were no sites that would more efficiently accommodate the antenna. He further noted that AT&T made a vigorous effort to comply with the Ordinance (i.e., use the sky support structures wherever possible). In summary, several lower antennae sites could be accomplished technically speaking; however, as a practical matter, it probably could not.

Mayor Nancy Greenwood inquired about a tower recently constructed just west of the Daniel Boone Bridge.

Mr. Stockell noted they have had a one hundred and twenty (120) foot tower there for approximately one and one-half years. The FAA doesn't require painting this tower red and white; however, if it had constructed at one hundred and twenty-two (122) feet, the FAA would have required it to be painted.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR -

1. Mr. Thomas Cummings, Nextel Communications, 1 City Place Drive, Suite 100, St. Louis, MO. 63141, noted the following:

   - Nextel has had a communications hold in this area for well over a year;
   - the subject site affords the opportunity of co-location;
   - if approval of the existing pole to eighty (80) feet is allowed, it will not only eliminate the need for an additional AT&T pole, but probably a Nextel pole;
   - Nextel would not require the extension of the tower above eighty (80) feet
   - they have proposed, informally to Sprint, to put a one and one-half (1 ½) inch wide whip antennae which consist, basically, of sticks on top of the existing (80) foot pole; and
   - he provided photos of the "whip" antenna to the Commission.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- Whip antennae are approximately one and one-half (1 ½) inches wide, by four (4) feet long, and extend above the existing tower. They are located on a "COW" (Cell On Wheels). The proposed tower would not extend above eighty (80) feet, with these hardly visible antennae on top.

- Panel antennas, to be utilized by Sprint and AT&T, give a much better performance, but require more height than Whip antennas.

- Whip antennas broadcast a signal in three hundred and sixty (360) degrees, the Panel antennas broadcast at one face. This is the reason for the triangular platform design.

- The lighting configuration, with regard to the Whip antenna configuration, has yet to be determined; but would comply with FAA regulations.

City Attorney Beach noted that, if we don't go with the AT&T request tonight (80 feet), then Nextel would come back to request an additional antenna. The desire to co-locate would be satisfied by the Whip antennas.

Mr. Cummings noted that the Nextel system is constructed in such a way that it needs to be above the tree line; therefore, if AT&T is not approved tonight, they would be before the Commission, in the future, with another pole request.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION - None

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL – None

REBUTTAL - Waived

Commissioner Broemmer read the next portion of the "Opening Comments."

C. **P.Z. 20-98 Straw Horse, Ltd.;** a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "PC" Planned Commercial District for a 2.43 acre tract of land on Olive Street Road. (Locator Number 17W510060); Proposed Use: Retail Sales.

It was noted that the Planning Department mailed notices of this public hearing to all people having property contiguous to the proposed site, within the prescribed radius, as determined by policy.

Planner I Annissa McCaskill gave a slide presentation of the subject site and surrounding area.

Ms. Dorothy M. Moor, representing Hawthorne Enterprises (Straw Horse, Ltd), 71 Wolfrom Road, Weldon Springs, MO 63309, spoke on behalf of the petition as follows:

- Hawthorne Enterprises has a contract to buy the subject parcel, with the intent of leasing it to Straw Horse, Ltd;
- described the subject site and surrounding area;
- The Straw Horse, Ltd. is a saddlery and gift shop presently located at 17625 Old Manchester Road, in Glencoe;
- The Straw Horse, Ltd. sells horse equipment (saddles, boots, barn supplies, feed supplements, hunting equipment, riding apparel, etc.), and also carry a wide assortment of unique house and garden gifts for country living;
- gave a history of The Straw Horse, Ltd. company;
- described the subject site and surrounding area;
- The proposed site currently has three (3) existing buildings:
  1) the larger yellow house – would be used for the tack and clothes, etc;
  2) the large red barn – would be used for barn supplies; and
  3) the small, one room, yellow house – would be used for antiques, coffee, gifts, etc.
- described the proposed parking layout (i.e., access, handicap parking, and standard parking), as designed by Farnsworth and Polk;

- there would be a corral fence joining the red bard to the yellow house, continuing behind the red barn, up the west side of the property behind the one room, yellow house, and back to meet the porch of the farmhouse;

- hours of operation are normally 9:00 a.m., to 5:00 p.m. – during Christmas, however, they are apt to be open a little bit later;

- described a rendering of the proposed parking lot layout to the Commission; and

- thanked the Planning Department for being so helpful.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- The Staff was asked to address what the Comprehensive Plan calls for, with respect to zoning of the subject site.

- The petitioner did not discuss the proposed project with adjacent property owners.

Director Price replied to the question regarding the Comprehensive Plan.

SPEAKERS – IN FAVOR:

1. Mr. David Kratz, 15471 Elk Ridge Lane, Apt. 4, Chesterfield, MO 63017, waived his turn to speak.

2. Mrs. L. J. Ross, Fox Hill Farm, P.O. Box 213, Chesterfield, MO 63006, spoke as an individual in favor of the proposal.

SPEAKER'S IN OPPOSITION: - None

SPEAKER'S – NEUTRAL: - None

REBUTTAL: - Waived

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

A motion to approve the May 11, 1998 Planning Commission Minutes was made by Commissioner Grant, seconded by Commissioner Eifler **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Mr. Tom Seeger, 175 S. Woods Mill Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual in opposition to P.Z. 16-98 Bopp Properties noting the following:

- homes and lot sizes of the proposed development are not consistent with those in surrounding area.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Councilmember Brown asked what Mr. Seeger believes would be a reasonable lot size for the subject area.

Mr. Seeger said he would like lots to be a minimum of one (1) acre." He further stated that the average lot size from Brooking Park to Ladue Road is close to three (3) acres.

Commissioner Grant inquired as to the number of lots Mr. Seeger is referring to as being an average of three (3) acres.

Mr. Seeger noted the Seeger Subdivision consists of two (2) lots; one five (5) acres, and one sixteen (16) acres; the Cowee's lot is approximately 3 ½ acres; the West County Christian Church has several acres; and the Clark's property has approximately two (2) acres. In addition, he believes there are four or five lots additional lots in the general area that well are over one (1) acre in size.

2. Ms. Patti Cowee, 155 S. Woods Mill Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as an individual in opposition to P.Z. 16-98 Bopp Properties noting the following:

- there are eight (8) properties from Ladue Road up to Brooking Park that have 3.5, or more, acres each;
- there would be an additional threat to preservation of wildlife in the area;
- the proposed development could produce additional traffic problems on Woods Mill Road; and
- additional grading for the proposed development could create future water problems for the surrounding area.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Councilmember Brown inquired whether or not this property was offered for sale as a single-family home, rather than being sub-divided.

Ms. Cowee replied she believed it was offered, but was declined due to the monetary difference. She further noted that Bopp Properties also asked to buy her property; however, she declined, as she believes this is a unique area that needs to be protected.

3. Mr. James Noe, Musler Engineering, St. Peters, MO, spoke in favor of P.Z. 16-98 noting the following:

- apologized for not being at the public hearing on this item;
- the subject site is 6.3 acres, with approximately 3.3 acres in the flood plain;
- due to the large slope on the site, the usable portion of the ground is approximately 3 acres;
- the 15,000 square foot minimum is required in order to get adequate density from the site;
- the smallest lot would be 26,000 square feet – the largest lot would be 36,000 square feet;
- the homes would sell for upwards of $600,000.00;

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Commissioner McCarthy inquired about the pricing of the proposed homes.

Mr. Noe noted the builders are looking at the $600,000 price ranges due to the price of developing the ground. They believe development costs will run well over $100,000 per lot, just in the ground costs.

Commissioner Grant temporarily left the meeting.

Mr. Eifler inquired how Mr. Noe justifies the density being requested.

Mr. Noe noted there are smaller lots across Creve Coeur Creek and on the other side of Woods Mill Road. In looking at the overall area, the developer decided that, eventually, all of the existing four (4) or five (5) acre tracts would be developed into smaller lots. He noted the density decision was made after discussing it with the City Staff and getting recommendations about what they believed could go with the overall planning of the district.

4. Mr. Richard Clark, 83 Woods Mill Road South, Chesterfield, MO 63017, spoke as in individual in opposition noting the following:

- he thanked everyone for listening to all information being presented;
- more housing will add to the existing traffic problem;

- wildlife will be endangered with additional development in the area; and

- he believes the site should remain three (3) acres.

Commissioner Grant returned to the meeting.

5. Mr. Jean Magre, Premier Communities Corporation, spoke in favor of P.Z. 20 & 21-95 Windridge Estates, noting the following:

- builders are not in the sidewalk business;

- the subject sidewalk is separate from the remainder of the development, and can be accessed only via one (1) end of one (1) lot;

- the developer assumed the plans sealed by a licensed engineer, stamped/approved by the City would meet all safety standards, engineering standards (i.e., requirements of the City);

- as a result of information received, it has become apparent the developer may be asked to dedicate a very large portion of one (1) of the proposed lots for future construction easements;

- he believes the sidewalk requirement is unreasonable, and makes the development a money loser for Premier; and

- the developer would like the condition requiring the sidewalk be eliminated, noting that, in a letter from Public Works Director Mike Geisel, this is one (1) of three (3) viable options listed.

NEW BUINESS:

A. **P.Z. 20 & 21-95 Premier Development Corp. (Windridge Estates);** a request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance Number 1092 for a Planned Environment Unit (PEU) Procedure in the "R-1" One Acre Residence District and the "FPR-1" Flood Plain "R-1" One Acre Residence District; south side of Wild Horse Creek Road, west of Long Road (relative to deleting the sidewalk adjacent to Wild Horse Creek Road).

Assistant Planning Director Laura Griggs-McElhanon gave a slide presentation of the subject site, pointing out the proposed location of the sidewalk. (Various questions were addressed while viewing the slides.)

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- Concern was expressed regarding existing vegetation being to close to power lines.

- Neither the Landscape Plan nor Site Development Plan indicated a fence; therefore the relationship of the sidewalk to the fence is unknown at this time.

- The grading of the house on Lot 2 was discussed.

- Some time ago there was an area east of the subject site, adjacent to Baxter Gardens, that eroded, and was filled-in by the State Highway Department.

- Various grading possibilities that might enable construction of the sidewalk were discussed.

Assistant Director Griggs-McElhanon noted that Staff still recommends denial of the request to amend the Ordinance.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- The Planning Department noted it would defer to Mr. Geisel's recommendation with regard to building part of the sidewalk and escrowing the other. It is also the decision of the Public Works Director/City Engineer as to the appropriate amount of Escrow money to be required.

Commissioner Broemmer made a motion to require the sidewalk to be built as far as practical and the escrow amount retained. When the sidewalk is built, the cost to build that sidewalk would be deducted from the escrow and the remaining amount would be there for continuation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Eifler.
COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

City Attorney Beach suggested the following wording for the motion:

> The sidewalk would be built as directed by the Department of Public Works, in accordance with the recommendation by Mr. Geisel. The amount of money escrowed for that portion of the sidewalk that could not be constructed would be retained by the City to be paid out, as directed by the Department of Public Works. **(In summary, once the money is paid in, the developer is relieved of any further obligation, but the City retains the money for future use.)**

- There was discussion regarding preservation of the large tree depicted on the slides.

- The petitioner's requested amendment would delete the requirement for the sidewalk escrow.

- The current condition, requiring the sidewalk, is addressed in Mr. Geisel's memo.

City Attorney Beach noted it might be more appropriate to deny the request for deletion of the sidewalk, and then direct that the sidewalk be built to the extent as directed by the Department of Public Works, with the balance being held in escrow. He further noted he would like the motion to include that the remaining escrow funds be retained by the City for either future sidewalk use or as directed by the Director of Public Works.

Commissioner Broemmer withdrew his motion. Commissioner Eifler withdrew his second.

A motion to deny P.Z. 20 & 21-95 was made by Commissioner Eifler and seconded by Commissioner Layton.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Layton, yes; Commissioner McCarthy, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Chairman Bly, yes.

The motion passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

Commissioner Broemmer made a motion amend the original Ordinance as follows:

- to require the sidewalk to be built, as directed by the Department of Public Works, per Mr. Geisel's memo dated May 7, 1998;
- that portion of the sidewalk not built is to be escrowed; and
- the funds are to be retained by the City for future use by the City, as directed by the Department of Public Works.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Eifler.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

City Attorney Beach noted it would be appropriate to note in the minutes the preservation of the existing large tree, as shown on the slides.

Upon a roll call the vote on motion, as amended, was as follows: Commissioner Broemmer, yes; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Layton, yes; Commissioner McCarthy, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Chairman Bly, yes.

The motion passes by a vote of 8 to 0.

B. **P.Z. 16-98 Bopp Properties;** a request for a change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban to an "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District and an "FPR-2" Flood Plain 15,000 square foot Residence District for a 6.8 acre tract of land; located on Woods Mill Road, 100 feet west of Highway 141, 1300 feet north of Conway Road.

A motion to hold was made by Commissioner Layton, seconded by Commissioner Grant **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

Commissioner Broemmer noted he would like the developer to build a maximum of three (3) houses on the subject site.

C. **P.Z. 26-93 Glenn Novack/Redia McGrath (The Wedge);** a request for an amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance Number 959, the governing "C-8" Planned Commercial District Ordinance for The Wedge; north side of Olive Street Road at Chesterfield Airport Road (relative to reducing the setback from Chesterfield Airport Road).

Assistant Director Griggs-McElhanon described the request and Department's recommendation for approval of an amendment to reduce the setbacks from forty (40) feet down to twenty-five (25) feet from the Chesterfield Airport Road right-of-way, as stated in the report.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- The recommendation is for a blanket twenty-five (25) foot setback for both existing and future structures on the site.

- The alternatives were discussed.

- The current Ordinance specifies the number of structures allowed on the site; therefore, requests for additional structures would need to come back to the Commission for approval.

Commissioner Eifler made a motion to approve a twenty-foot (25) foot setback to correct the current canopy setback problem only. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer.

Commissioner Grant made a motion to suspend the rules to allow the engineer, Mr. Mike Rufkahr, to address the setback issues. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Layton **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

Mr. Mike Rufkahr, Doering Engineering, spoke on behalf of the request noting the following:

- The Site Development Plan approved subsequent to adoption of Ordinance Number 854 had incorrectly depicted the property line adjacent to Chesterfield Airport Road.

- Correcting this situation moves the right-of-way line approximately fifteen (15) feet further toward the interior of the site. This movement, in turn, forces encroachment of a portion of the existing canopies and fuel pumps into the forty (40) foot setback.

- Approval of the amendment will not change the appearance of the existing structures on the site.

- Ms. McGrath plans to continue building on the site utilizing the twenty-five (25) foot setback calculations, and would need to come back to the Commission for each new structure.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- The pros and cons of approving a conditional twenty-five (25) foot setback versus a blanket twenty-five (25) foot setback were discussed.

- The reason for the variance is the existing canopy is encroaching now, is that it was constructed in the wrong spot (i.e., there are a combination of problems and situations that need to be corrected).

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- Concern was expressed that approval of two (2) different setback requirements for the site may adversely affect its continuity.

- Mr. Rufkahr noted he has spoken with Dennis Bice, St. Louis County Department of Highways and Traffic, and Mr. Bice noted he doesn't have a problem with the proposed amendment.

- The setback requirement for the Cullen property is fifteen (15) feet from the right-of-way ("C-3" Zoning District).

- The setback requirement for Valley Village is forty (40) feet from the right-of-way of Chesterfield Airport Road. It is further to the east of the subject site.

Assistant Director Griggs-McElhanon provided clarification regarding the current site layout and the layout of the proposed structures.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- If the Commission doesn't allow the twenty-five (25) foot setback to be uniform across the site, then there would be offset canopies, moving of existing canopies, etc.

Commissioner Eifler withdrew his motion. Commissioner Broemmer withdrew his second to the motion.

Commissioner Layton made a motion to approve the amendment as originally proposed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dalton.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Broemmer, no; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner Eifler, yes; Commissioner Grant, yes; Commissioner Layton, yes; Commissioner McCarthy, yes; Commissioner Right, yes; Chairman Bly, yes.

The motion passes by a vote of 7 to 1.

The following Site Plan item was acted upon at this time:

A. **Ascension Church/School**; a Site Plan, Landscape Plan, and Architectural Elevations; in the "NU" Zoned District; east of Baxter Road and west of Santa Maria Drive and north of Wild Horse Creek Road.

Commissioner Grant, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Plan, Landscape Plan and Architectural Elevations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Layton **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

The following New Business item was acted upon at this time.

D. **P.Z. 12-93 Redia McGrath (McGrath Plaza);** request for an extension of time for a "C-8" Planned Commercial District Site Development Plan; south side of Chesterfield Airport Road, north of Old Olive Street Road.

Commissioner McCarthy made a motion to approve the request. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dalton **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

B. **Homewood Suites (C314) Subdivision Plat;** a Subdivision Record Plat in the "C-8" Planned Commercial District; east of Chesterfield Parkway North and north of Hilltown Village Center.

Commissioner Grant, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Subdivision Record Plat. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McCarthy **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

C. **P.C. 91-88 The Siteman Organization, Inc.**; "M-3" Planned Industrial District, Lighting Plan and Landscaping Plan to compliment a Freestanding Project Identification Sign, Chesterfield Airport Road and Spirit Drive.

Commissioner Grant, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the "M-3" Planned Industrial District Lighting Plan and Landscape Plan for the Freestanding Project Identification Sign. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

D. **P.Z. 24-97 THF Chesterfield Development L.L.C. (Chesterfield Commons);** C-8 Planned Commercial District, Redevelopment Agreement Site Development Concept Plan; north and south sides of Chesterfield Airport Road, east of the intersection of Boone's Crossing Street.

Commissioner Grant, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Redevelopment Agreement Site Development Concept Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McCarthy **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

E. **Howard Bend Water Treatment Plant;** Site Improvement Plan and Architectural Elevations. The improvements take place at the St. Louis City-Water Division's property located at the end of Howard Bend Station Road west of Hog Hollow. The site is zoned "FPNU" Floodplain Non Urban.

Commissioner Grant, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Improvement Plan and Architectural Elevations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

IX. 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
F. Nominating Committee:

Chairman Bly, on behalf of Committee Chairman Allen Yaffe, reported the following:

- This committee met following the previous Planning Commission Meeting (May 11, 1998).
- The consensus of the Committee was to nominate as follows:

1. Mr. Grant as Chairman for the coming year.

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

2. Mr. Layton as Vice Chairman for the coming year.

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

3. Mr. Broemmer as Secretary for the coming year.

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

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner McCarthy, seconded by Commissioner Eifler **and passes by a voice vote of 8 to 0.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

Fred Broemmer, Secretary

[MIN5-27-98.doc]