

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
FEBRUARY 22, 1993



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

PRESENT

Ms. Mary Brown
Mr. Dave Dalton
Ms. Barbara McGuinness
Ms. Pat O'Brien
Mr. Walter Scruggs
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Chairman Mary Domahidy
Mr. Douglas R. Beach, City Attorney
Councilmember Betty Hathaway, Council Liaison
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Senior Planner
Mr. Joseph Hanke, Planning Specialist
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Jamie Cannon
Mr. Bill Kirchoff

INVOCATION: - Councilmember Betty Hathaway

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All

Chair Domahidy recognized the attendance of Councilmember Dick Hrabko.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - Commissioner Pat O'Brien

- A. P.Z. 3-93 DLC Development Company (Wild Horse Springs); a request for change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District for a 12.6 acre tract of land located on the north side of Wild Horse Creek Road, approximately 250 feet east of the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road and Wilson Road. (Locator Numbers 18T420073 and 18T420017)

AND

P.Z. 4-93 DLC Development Company (Wild Horse Springs); a request for a Planned Environment Unit Procedure in the "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District for the same 12.6 acre tract of land located on the north side of Wild Horse Creek Road, approximately 250 feet east of the intersection of Wild Horse Creek Road and Wilson Road. (Locator Numbers 18T420073 and 18T420017). Proposed Use: Single-Family Residences

Planning Specialist Joe Hanke gave the slide presentation for the proposed petitions.

Mr. Jim Zavradin spoke on behalf of the petitioner, noting the following:

- The topography of the proposed site and surrounding land uses were defined.
- The Woodcliffe Subdivision (zoned "R-3" with a PEU), and Chesterfield Farms Subdivision (zoned "R-6" and "R-2" with a PEU) were noted.
- The proposed development will have lots a minimum of 8700 square feet, averaging 12,750 square feet.
- There is a stub street at the rear of the property that will, at some time in the future, connect with the adjacent property, when it is developed.
- Four (4) common ground areas are proposed; two (2) in the front of the property with thirty (30) foot landscape buffers (heavily landscaped); and one (1) common ground area is proposed in the rear portion to house a detention basin. There will be a very large common ground area located adjacent to the Layton property, which will be heavily landscaped with trees (however, a few existing trees will have to be removed).
- The total common ground area will consist of 87,800 square feet.
- A plan depicting results of a development study was given to the Planning Commissioners (showing the area of the proposed development and surrounding areas up to Caulks Creek, including the flood plain area).
- The base price of homes would be \$200,000.00. They would be very similar to those in Woodcliffe and surrounding areas.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSIONERS

- The rationale for requesting "R-3" Zoning was discussed.

- The map handed out to Planning Commission by Mr. Zavradinos did not show the Cybertel Tower on the Reuther tract (west side of proposed development).
- The petitioner is proposing to use Reuther Drive as the buffer on the west of the proposed development. No additional landscaping is proposed in this area.

Mr. Zavradinos introduced Mr. David Cunningham, who is DLC Development.

Mr. David Cunningham noted the following:

- DLC was established six (6) months ago, primarily for the proposed development.
- He is in association with one (1) other individual who has been in the building business for thirty-five (35) years. That individual has development in St. Charles (The Lakes Subdivision) and North County (Pheasant Hollow Subdivision). The business office of DLC is 2203 Clayville Court, Chesterfield, MO.
- The existing trees on common ground areas will have to be removed due to grading requirements. They will be replanted.
- The existing trees along Wild Horse Creek Road (in the front of the existing house) will be retained.
- Mustang Court will be a public road that may be used by the residents to the rear of the proposed development (those who have access by Reuther Lane).
- The developer has communicated with adjacent property owners. The driveway easement has yet to be resolved for the proposed roadway.
- The possible effects of the widening of Wild Horse Creek Road would have on the proposed thirty (30) foot landscape buffer along Wild Horse Creek Road were discussed.

Mr. Zavradinos noted that the State Highway Department indicated they do not wish any additional right-of-way along Wild Horse Creek Road.

Chair Domahidy recognized the attendance of Councilmember Linda Tilley.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR:

1. Mr. Rick Machamer, 233 Hi Point Drive, Chesterfield, MO 63005, spoke as an individual noting the following:
 - He is concerned about the top of his driveway (where he has been filling-in with fertilizer). He has asked the developer to put in some sort of retaining wall to prevent any future drainage/leakage problem.
 - He requested the developer to place some landscaping to separate the proposed subdivision from the residents of Hi Pointe Subdivision. He noted that Mr. Cunningham agreed that it would help both sides; but, as of this evening, the developer has not come to a conclusion.
 - In summary, he would be in favor of the proposed development with the two (2) reservation noted above: (landscaping along lots 33, 34, 35 and 36, and a fifty (50) foot retaining wall).

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

Commissioner Dalton inquired whether Mr. Machamer feels the density is too great for the proposed development.

Mr. Machamer stated that he believes the density is too great. He would like to see larger lots.

SPEAKERS - NEUTRAL

1. Mr. Chris Layton, 16809 Wild Horse Creek Road, Chesterfield, MO 63005, spoke as an individual noting the following:
 - The deed for this property was created in 1946. A very specifically described thirty (30) foot wide easement for driveway purposes was included connecting his property to Wild Horse Creek Road. This is recorded in Book 2216, Page 488, referred to in the memo of 2/8/93.
 - No agreement has been reached between himself and the developer. He requested the Department and Commission to consider these rights in reviewing plans that would affect the easement in any way.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

City Attorney Doug Beach stated that, as far as the Planning Commission is concerned, if the project is approved, it would be approved with a road. Rights that road would have to be worked out between Mr. Layton and the developer. The City would not be infringing upon his rights; rather, this is a legal matter to be decided by the courts. If this is approved in concept, the developer will still need access through Mr. Layton's property. It will be the responsibility of the developer to acquire these rights.

Commissioner Dalton inquired whether Mr. Layton feels the density is too great for the proposed development.

Mr. Layton stated that he prefers larger lots. He noted that everything to the west of the development along Wild Horse Creek Road is three (3) acres.

REBUTTAL

Mr. Zavradinov noted the following:

- The retaining wall is a very minor issue. The developer will provide what is required.
- The developer will provide additional landscaping along Hi Pointe Drive. There is a green strip between the edge of the pavement and the development's east property line.
- He understands that the easement rights will have to be worked out between the developer and Mr. Layton.
- He believes the precedence of what zoning is being sought has already been established with Woodcliffe Estates, directly across from the proposed site, and Chesterfield Farms, directly behind the proposed development. The proposed development exceeds the minimum requirements of each of those developments in every respect.

SHOW OF HANDS

IN FAVOR: 12

IN OPPOSITION: 3

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes from the meeting of February 8, 1993, were approved.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 1-93 Greater Missouri Builders Inc. (Chesterfield Gardens); "C-8" Planned Commercial District and "R-1" One-Acre Residence District to "R-6A" 4500 square foot Residence District; Olive Boulevard between East Drive and West Drive;

and

P.Z. 2-93 Greater Missouri Builders Inc. (Chesterfield Gardens); Planned Environment Unit Procedure in "R-6A" 4500 square foot Residence District; Olive Boulevard between East and West Drive.

City Attorney Doug Beach noted that the City has just received a copy of a letter from a law firm indicating they represent the Prange's, the property owners using the East Drive portion of the proposed development. The letter references a State Statute which indicates that, if there is not a public use of this road for five (5) years, then it is deemed to be abandoned. However, he noted there may be some exceptions. He further stated that the Department may have to amend some of the language of the report to allow for both an eastern access and a western access, as approved by the Department. Should this be approved tonight, the Department will offer amended language accordingly.

Commissioner Brown left the meeting at this time.

Commissioner Brown returned to the meeting at this time.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon presented the report and the Department's recommendation of approval of P.Z. 1 & 2-93 to be rezoned to "R-4" 7,500 square foot Residence District, for a maximum of ninety (90) units, subject to the conditions in Attachment A.

Director Duepner noted that, in view of the letter distributed from the Attorney from the adjacent property owner relative to East Drive, and noting that the petitioner had originally proposed access via East Drive, the Department would recommend revision of the condition that references access to East Drive specifically, and revise it to indicate that access would be limited to one (1) entrance on West Drive and one (1) entrance on the eastern portion of the site, as approved by the State Highway Department and the City of Chesterfield. Also, where other references are made to access via East Drive, the wording be changed to state "the eastern drive." The Department would recommend that the condition dealing with the vacation of East

Drive be retained, and the remaining portion of East Drive, if it is not already abandoned or vacated, would be vacated in conjunction with development of this site. In summary, the Department is recommending there be two (2) access points, one at West Drive and one (1) at an eastern drive, or eastern roadway, as approved by the State and the City of Chesterfield.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Public Streets versus private streets were discussed relative to cost to property owner, maintenance responsibilities, etc.
- Private streets may provide more flexibility in design for developer, as public streets would require wider pavement and fewer curb cuts.
- The issue of combining driveways to decrease the number of curb cuts was discussed. This will be addressed at the time of site plan review.
- Provision of sidewalks along Olive were discussed. The Commission would prefer sidewalks be provided along Olive.
- An alternate sidewalk/street plan was discussed.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon stated that the Department's report reads: "If an alternative sidewalk plan is proposed, it would be as approved by the Planning Commission with the Site Development Plan."

Director Duepner stated that the State allows for sidewalks to be located within their right-of-way. At this time it cannot be determined whether there is sufficient area in their right-of-way to allow for a sidewalk. If there is, the State may allow the sidewalk there, and it may not be an issue. The Department recommendation was to provide for an alternative, in the event that the developer cannot get the sidewalk within the Olive right-of-way.

- The stabilized shoulder along the Olive portion of this site was discussed. It is not known whether this will be provided. The City has no power over the State Highway Department in this regard.
- Provision of a stop light along Olive for this development, and how this could be accomplished was discussed. This is the decision of the State Highway Department. The City could request a signal if warrants are met. There is no condition recommended, at this point, in the Department's report that would require a traffic signal. If the Commission, or City Council, deems it appropriate to request the State to consider and review it for warrants, this could be done.

Director Duepner noted that the Department, in terms of the public and private streets, is trying to illustrate that there is an alternative that could be considered at the time of Site Development Plan review by the Commission. This would give the developer some flexibility in design. A multi-family access drive is two (2) feet narrower than a public street (24 feet as opposed to 26 feet). It does allow for some off-street parking on a multi-family access drive (90 degree spaces right off the drive, as opposed to not being allowed on a public street). The Department merely made this a recommendation for consideration, as the Department does not think it appropriate to require them to be private streets. If the petitioner feels it appropriate to establish them as public streets, and the City deems it appropriate to accept those, then they would be public streets. He noted several developments of this type located within the City (multi-family units) that have private streets.

- The City's Subdivision Ordinance requires sidewalks along public streets.

Chair Domahidy stated that she feels that Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon has done a very good job in proposing and thinking of some creative alternatives. She noted her interpretation of the report as follows:

- the developer still has options to come back with something very similar to what he has presented, within the framework of the conditions set forth by the Department;
- the conditions do not require any private streets nor alternative sidewalks, they are presented to the developer as **options**;
- the Department recommends shortening the cul-de-sacs and require the three (3) acres of common ground in that area; and
- change the location of some of the two-story units.

Chair Domahidy further stated she believed the Department's recommendation presents an effort to preserve more of the sites natural assets. Also, she believes the alternatives are compensating factors that might allow the developer flexibility in adjusting to some of the constraints imposed.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to approve the report subject to conditions attached, and subject to the additional condition that all streets be public. The motion was seconded by Commissioner O'Brien.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The closest unit of the proposed development would be approximately sixty (60) feet from the edge of pavement of Olive.
- There is a significant change in the grade from Olive down to the development. The grade of the finished units in the middle would be 632, whereas, along Olive it would be 642 or 644.
- Landscaping is not required to be depicted until the time of Site Plan submittal.
- Should all streets be required to be public, the curb cuts have to be as approved by the Public Works Department, who would also be involved in review of the Site Development Plan.
- The proposal is for driveways of double car width.
- There was concern that if all streets are made public, some flexibility of design would be lost.
- Concern was expressed about unfair road maintenance costs to persons living along the private streets.

Director Duepner noted that the Department, in its recommendation, is attempting merely to show there is an alternative to be considered when the Site Development Plan is submitted for review. The Department is suggesting that they **may** wish to consider private streets. The Department is not requiring nor recommending they be required, but just leaving this as an **option**.

- It was suggested that developers should be more creative, within the confines of the Ordinances, to achieve fewer curb cuts.
- The developer has **always** proposed public streets within this development.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to **amend** the original motion to include, as part of the recommendation, a request that the City Council pursue provision of a traffic signal with the Missouri Department of Highways. The motion was seconded by Commissioner O'Brien.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Financial responsibility for the traffic signal was discussed.

City Attorney Doug Beach stated his concern whether this is the appropriate action for the Commission to take, because it requires someone other than the developer to do something.

Director Duepner suggested that, if this is the consensus of the Planning Commission, the appropriate vehicle for this request would be in the Commission's cover report to the City Council. The City could be requested by the Planning Commission to seek whether or not the warrants are met as a result of development, etc., at West Drive.

Director Duepner stated that the amendment could be revised so that in the report to the City Council (cover letter), the Planning Commission requests the City Council to pursue that matter, as opposed to making it a condition in the Attachment.

Commissioner Brown requested that the cover letter be worded to indicate that the Planning Commission recommends that City Council pursue the State Highway Department for consideration of a traffic signal at West Drive and Olive.

Director Duepner stated it may be more appropriate to state that the wording indicate that a traffic signal be pursued in an appropriate location, to be included in the Commission's report.

Commissioner Brown withdrew her amendment.

Commissioner Dalton suggested that the State Highway Department could adjust the timing of the stop signs, thereby giving flexibility regarding the required distance between traffic signals.

Upon a roll call the vote on the **main motion** was as follows: Commissioner Brown, no; Commissioner Dalton, no; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, no; Commissioner Sherman, no; Chair Domahidy, no.

The motion failed by a vote of 5 to 2.

A motion to approve the Department's report was made by Commissioner Scruggs and was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

Upon a roll call the vote on the motion was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Dalton, yes; Commissioner McGuinness, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chair Domahidy, yes.

The motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

Director Duepner suggested that the Planning Commission include, in its report, that the Commission is of the opinion that consideration needs to be given for traffic control in this area of Olive Boulevard, and that the Commission would urge the City Council to pursue, with the Missouri Highway and Transportation Department, appropriate traffic control measures in this area of Olive Boulevard.

Commissioner Brown included the comment of Director Duepner in her motion. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dalton, and **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.**

Chair Domahidy left the meeting and turned the gavel over to Commissioner Brown.

- B. P.C. 136-83 Four Seasons Center West; a request for amendment of "C-8" Planned Commercial District; south side of Olive Boulevard at River Valley Drive.

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon presented the request and noted that the Department is of the opinion that the proposed use would be similar in nature and traffic generation/parking needs to those of existing tenants of this center. The Department recommends approval, subject to the revisions stated in its report.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

- The lot line abuts Westbury Subdivision and Four Seasons Subdivision.
- The original ordinance did not allow a medical office use due to the belief that x-ray equipment, etc., might be allowed.
- It was suggested that neighbors of this development be polled before the Commission takes up consideration of this matter.
- Concern that this request is a substantial change from intent of the original ordinance.
- The services to be provided by the medical office use were discussed.

Director Duepner noted that correspondence from the owner indicates that x-ray service will not be provided. The basic service would be rendered by two or three people, on site, as exercise therapy.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion that a public hearing be held on this matter. The motion fails for lack of a second.

Director Duepner noted that the Department did consider a public hearing on this matter in view of the original request that included **all** the uses (medical office, restaurant, all specific uses in their original request). It is the Department's opinion that this amendment could be considered by the Planning Commission, without the need for a public hearing.

- Concern was expressed that the services are not clearly defined.

Director Duepner quoted the Zoning Ordinance definition of a medical office as: "A facility for the practice of medicine or dentistry for humans including accessory diagnostic laboratories, but not including inpatient or overnight care, or operating rooms for major surgery." He noted that the request is for a "medical office."

- Concern was expressed over x-rays floating in the air.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to table the item, and request Mr. Crabtree to attend the next meeting to answer questions/concerns expressed.

Director Duepner pointed out the following:

- If we were to do this, we would have to open the meeting up for a public hearing, or public session. He suggested that concerns of the Commission could be obtained from Mr. Crabtree in writing.
- The Department reviewed the request in terms of the report of the St. Louis County Planning Commission that addressed activity on the site and parking.
- It is the Department's recommendation, with the 2200 square foot limitation, that it be parked. If it can't be parked, then the use would not be permitted.
- If Commission wishes additional information from Mr. Crabtree, or the petitioner, in terms of what is **exactly** being proposed, the types of uses, and what is going to be, or not to be generated from the site, the Department will do so.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs.

Acting Chair Brown noted that, if we hold this, the Department can come back to the Commission in two weeks with additional information from Mr. Crabtree. At that point, if the Commission is still not satisfied, the Commission could go to a public hearing.

Director Duepner stated that the Commission always has the option of going to a public hearing. As set out in the Ordinance, if a request deals with a substantial change from that originally presented at the time of approval, then a public hearing is in order. This is a determination to be made by the Commission. If this is what is desired, then, in addition to the response from Mr. Crabtree, the Department will come back and indicate what was originally requested at that time, as well as what was presented. Our Zoning Ordinance does not encompass therapy facilities in its definition of medical offices or clinics.

Commissioner McGuinness withdrew her motion.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to **table** and instruct the Department to discuss the Commission's concern and request for additional information from Mr. Crabtree. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman and **passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0.**

- C. P.Z. 28-92 Buchholz Mortuaries Incorporated; Conditional Use Permit Procedure in the "R-1" One-Acre Residence District; southwest quadrant of the intersection of Clarkson Road and relocated Wilson Road.

Planning Specialist Joe Hanke pointed out that the Council exercised its Power of Review on February 16, 1993, for the Buchholz Mortuaries petition, in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance. The purpose of the report is to respond back to the City Council that the Planning Commission did, in deed, in its review of the petition, review the facts presented, and that the facts presented did support the criteria of a CUP. Therefore, the Planning Department requests the Planning Commission affirm that the petition did meet the requirements of the CUP, and should be forwarded back to the Council.

Commissioner McGuinness made a motion to approve the request. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The two (2) Councilmembers from Ward IV wanted to provide an additional opportunity for the public to speak. This is the reason Council exercised its Power of Review.

- This matter has to come back to the Planning Commission **before** it can go to a public hearing.

Councilmember Hathaway stated that, under the revised rules, the Council is going to ask for an "either/or" condition. It may come back to the Planning Commission, or may go straight to the Planning and Zoning Committee. In this matter, there is no change requested to the original recommendation of Commission.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 5 to 0, with Commissioner O'Brien abstaining.

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

- A. P.Z. 22, 24, 25 and 26-92 Chesterfield Village, Inc., Jones Custom Homes and Mayer Homes, Inc. (Chesterfield Farms/Chesterfield Farms Estates); PEU in the "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District "FPR-2" Flood Plain "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District and "R-6" 4,500 square foot Residence District Site Development Concept and Section Plans; north of Wild Horse Creek Road, west of Santa Maria Drive.

Commissioner Sherman, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, made a motion to approve the Site Development Section Plan and the Site Development Concept Plan, with the addition of the Missouri Highway and Traffic comment #6, stated in a letter dated February 15, 1993, be incorporated. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs.

Director Duepner sought clarification of the motion, noting his understanding that the motion is for approval of the Site Concept and the Site Development Section Plan.

Commissioner Sherman stated this as being correct.

Director Duepner noted there was some discussion of requiring the petitioner to indicate on the Plot Plans the extent of existing tree areas along the northern and western lines.

Commissioner Sherman added the requirement that the tree line, where grading will occur, is to be drawn in on the Plot Plan.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0.

Director Duepner requested the Commission revisit a previous item on the agenda. He noted that a representative from Four Seasons West is here, and discussed their proposal with him. He further stated that all they are proposing in that facility is a physical therapy or rehabilitation facility. It is not a medical office in terms of patients visiting doctors. It is a therapy facility. There will be no x-rays on the site. There will be no hazardous or medical waste.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The Commission requested the petitioner provide specific uses in writing.

Director Duepner stated that, if the Commission included a condition limiting it to physical therapy only, no physicians, no x-rays, we could include that as a condition as part of the ordinance, if it is approved by the City Council.

- If this amendment were to be approved, prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit, they would have to demonstrate that they meet the minimum parking requirements for office use. Handicapped parking spaces would be included in this requirement.

City Attorney Beach read the definition of physical therapy from Webster's Dictionary as follows: "The treatment of disease by physical and mechanical means as massage related exercise, water, light, heat and electricity.

- There was concern that, if this medical office is approved, and the Sisters of St. Mary's sell it, the new tenant could be some other form of medical office, we may be unable to prevent such a tenant.

Director Duepner noted that this may be a possibility, but the petitioner has indicated they are willing to accept the restriction of physical therapy. Absent a definition in the Zoning Ordinance, we fall back on the definition in the dictionary.

There was no motion to take the matter off the table.

Acting Chair Brown noted that the Department is requested to provide, from the petitioner, a description of the **exact** uses for this facility, as well as the hours of operation.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Committee Chair Brown reported that the Commission has an outstanding sign ordinance, prepared by Mr. Hanke, in their packet. The public hearing is scheduled for March 8, 1993.

B. Architectural Review Committee

Committee Chair O'Brien reported that the Committee is going to meet February 23, 1993, at 4:00 p.m., in Conference Room A. They will discuss letters received from various organizations, hoping to come to a new draft for review.

Commissioner Dalton noted he may not be able to attend this meeting. Commissioner Cannon will not be able to attend. Commissioner Scruggs will be able to attend around 4:20 p.m.

Director Duepner noted he will check tomorrow and advise whether or not the meeting will have to be rescheduled.

C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee

Senior Planner Laura Griggs-McElhanon reported that there was a meeting scheduled this week; however, it was canceled by Chair Kirchoff. Another meeting will have to be scheduled upon his return. The Committee members will be notified.

D. Comprehensive Plan Committee - No report.

E. Procedures Committee

Committee Chair Scruggs reported there will be a meeting as soon as one can be arranged. Director Duepner was directed to set the time/date of meeting.

F. Quarterly Meeting

Director Duepner noted the Quarterly Meeting is scheduled for March 29, 1993.

Director Duepner asked the Commission members who may be interested to mark their calendars for April 29th, for a Planning Commissioners Workshop being developed by the St. Louis Section of the American Planning Association. The title of the workshop is "Avoiding Arbitrary Decisions." The guest speaker is Doug Beach.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Mary Bonahady for

Walter Scruggs, Secretary

[MIN2-22.093]