



PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
OCTOBER 14, 2013

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Ms. Wendy Geckeler
Ms. Merrell Hansen
Ms. Laura Lueking
Ms. Debbie Midgley
Mr. Robert Puyear
Mr. Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Michael Watson

ABSENT

Ms. Amy Nolan
Mr. Stanley Proctor

Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison
City Attorney Rob Heggie
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director
Mr. John Boyer, Senior Planner
Ms. Jessica Henry, Project Planner
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Chair Watson acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Connie Fults, Council Liaison; and Councilmember Dan Hurt, Ward III.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Puyear made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the September 30, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg and passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Larry Enterprises – Lynch Hummer, Lot B (Scott Retail)

Speakers:

1. Mr. Rick Clawson, ACI Boland, representing the Petitioner, 11477 Olde Cabin Road, St. Louis, MO stated he was available for questions.

B. P.Z. 09-2013 & P.Z. 10-2013 Schoettler Grove (2349 Schoettler Rd.)

Speakers:

1. Mr. Mike Doster, Doster, Ullom, representing the Petitioner, 16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Chesterfield, MO
2. Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates, representing the Petitioner, 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO.

Mr. Doster asked that the Commission allow him and Mr. Stock to speak after the Staff presentation to address any concerns raised.

3. Ms. Barbara Burnside, speaking as a Neutral party, 8 Georgetown Road, Chesterfield, MO.
 - Ms. Burnside expressed concerns about traffic hazards that exist on Schoettler Road, particularly where Schoettler Road and Clayton Road intersect adjacent to the Schoettler Grove development. She noted that the speed limit is 10 mph higher on the Clayton Road end of Schoettler (40 mph) than the north end of Schoettler (30 mph).
 - Because there are no left-turn lanes on Schoettler Road for Georgetown subdivision, Westerly Place subdivision, or the proposed Schoettler Grove development, motorists sitting on Schoettler Road trying to turn into these subdivisions have vehicles coming up on them at 40 mph.
 - She has concerns that the proposed development will greatly compound the serious traffic problems along Schoettler Road and feels that the City is obligated to provide for the safety of its residents, “particularly when development is occurring at the point of extreme hazard.”

Commissioner Geckeler asked who is responsible for regulating speed limits. Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director replied that St. Louis County is the responsible agency. She indicated that the City could contact the County about possibly reducing the speed limits in this area.

4. Ms. Karen Moculeski, 14405 Rue de Gascony Court, Chesterfield, MO.
 - Ms. Moculeski requested that the Commission re-open the Public Hearing on this project because revised plans have been submitted and residents have not had an opportunity to have their questions answered.
 - She stated that the City’s *Active Projects* list, as posted on its website, is not all-inclusive as to when documents are received and sent out so the public is not aware when new plans are filed. She noted that she has to continually call the

City to determine what new documents have been submitted and then has to make a formal *Request for Public Records* in order to receive copies of them.

- Since the residents have questions about the new plans and Tree Stand Delineation, she asked that the Public Hearing be re-opened.

Commissioner Wuennenberg then asked Ms. Nassif to provide clarification on the public hearing process.

Ms. Nassif explained that Public Hearing notices are provided to property owners/residents within 225 feet of the subject site and to subdivision trustees within one mile. She noted that the City's notification requirements far exceed the State requirements. The notice includes the Project Planner's contact information and the *Active Projects* list is updated on the City's website. Because new plans have been submitted for this project, an Issues Meeting is being conducted to give everyone the opportunity to identify any new issues. Ms. Nassif pointed out that if anyone has questions about the project, they are welcome to stay after the meeting to meet with Mr. Boyer, project planner for this petition. Residents are also encouraged to send letters to the City outlining any concerns – these letters would then be included in the Commission's meeting packet.

Ms. Nassif added that after tonight's meeting, Staff will continue to meet with the Petitioners until all issues have been addressed. Once it is determined that all the issues have been addressed, the Commission will vote on the petitions. After the Planning Commission votes upon the petitions, they are forwarded to the Planning & Public Works Committee with the Commission's recommendation. The petitions then move forward to City Council for two readings

Ms. Moleculeski stated that the residents feel that they have not had the opportunity to express their concerns about the revised plans. She explained that most residents do not understand the procedures of an *Issues Meeting* – they were not aware that there would be another presentation at tonight's meeting and that they would be given another opportunity to express their concerns. Ms. Nassif pointed out that any letters submitted to the City regarding these petitions would be included in the Planning Commission's meeting packet.

Commissioner Lueking suggested that interested residents stay in touch with Mr. Boyer in order to keep themselves updated on the project.

Ms. Moleculeski suggested that the *Active Projects* list include all documents submitted to the City, along with dates of the City's responses. Ms. Nassif stated that the City does include pertinent information on the *Active Projects* list but the list may not have been updated at the time Ms. Moleculeski was reviewing it.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- Larry Enterprises – Lynch Hummer, Lot B (Scott Retail)**: Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Amended Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations and Architect's Statement of Design for a 7.09 acre lot of land zoned "PI" Planned Industrial District located on the west side of Boone's Crossing on the north side of North Outer 40 Road.

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion recommending approval of the Amended Site Development Section Plan, Amended Lighting Plan, Amended Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for Larry Enterprises – Lynch Hummer, Lot B (Scott Retail). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Geckeler.

Discussion

Chair Watson expressed concern that the outdoor storage area east of Building C would be visible from Highway 40. Mr. Clawson referred to the eight parking spaces located at the rear of the site and suggested moving these parking spaces up to where the outdoor storage area is proposed and move the storage parking to the rear of the property. He noted that this would keep the parking numbers the same, along with the amount of outdoor parking display for equipment.

Commissioner Lueking noted that there is landscaping in the form of planters which she feels provides screening of the display area. Chair Watson thinks the planters will only provide screening when standing in front of the site – he thinks the parking and storage area will be visible when traveling along Highway 40.

Chair Watson then made a motion to amend the motion to exchange the employee parking area at the rear of the site with the first outdoor display area east of the proposed building.

Councilmember Fults agreed with Chair Watson's observations and his suggestion to have the outdoor storage area screened so that it is not visible from the highway.

Chair Watson asked whether the site is limited to displaying only vehicles in the outdoor storage areas. Ms. Nassif replied that the Lynch Hummer site and the adjacent vacant lot are considered Lot B and their ordinance states:

Outdoor storage shall be permitted for Lot B only and the outdoor storage is restricted to sales, rental, and leasing of new and used vehicles, including automobiles, trucks, trailers, construction equipment, agricultural equipment, and boats, as well as associated repairs and necessary outdoor storage of said.

Ms. Nassif noted that the ordinance does not specify where the outdoor storage has to be on the site, or how large of an area it can be. Mr. Clawson pointed out that the amount of outdoor display area being requested is what is allowable. He felt that the Petitioner would be agreeable to moving the display area to the back of the site and moving the employee parking to the side of the building. He does not think the Petitioner would be amenable to losing part of the outdoor storage, to which he is entitled under the site's governing ordinance.

City Attorney Heggie pointed out that the ordinance does not specify how much outdoor storage is allowed on the site; that would be defined by the Commission and/or City Council. He stated that the Commission has the ability to impose some additional requirements on the Petitioner. Ms. Nassif agreed but stated that Staff would not

recommend anything that would be contradictory to what the Monarch Levee District requires.

Commissioner Puyear then seconded Chair Watson's motion to amend to the motion *to exchange the employee parking area at the rear of the site with the first outdoor display area east of the proposed building.*

Both Commissioners Wuennenberg and Geckeler accepted the amendment to the motion.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

**Aye: Commissioner Geckeler, Commissioner Hansen,
Commissioner Lueking, Commissioner Midgley,
Commissioner Puyear, Commissioner Wuennenberg,
Chair Watson**

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

For informational purposes, Ms. Nassif stated that the outdoor storage area for this development is restricted to Lot B so when the other lots come in for development, outdoor storage will not be permitted.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. P.Z. 09-2013 Schoettler Grove (2349 Schoettler Rd.): A request for a zoning map amendment from "NU" Non-Urban District (3 acre) to "R-3" Residence (10,000 sqft lot min.) for 17.0 acres located northwest of the intersection of Clayton Rd. and Schoettler Rd. (20R310137 & 20R220010).

And

B. P.Z. 10-2013 Schoettler Grove (2349 Schoettler Rd.): A request for a zoning map amendment from "R-3" Residence District (10,000 sqft lot min.) to "PUD" Planned Unit Development for 17.0 acres located northwest of the intersection of Clayton Rd. and Schoettler Rd. (20R310137 & 20R220010).

Senior Planner John Boyer stated that the Public Hearing for these petitions was held on August 12, 2013 at which time multiple issues were brought up by the Commission, Staff, and the public. An issues letter was then generated by Staff to the Applicant for comments.

Mr. Boyer displayed the Preliminary Plan originally submitted to the City which shows 31 lots and an interior loop street, along with a preservation area and water detention on the western portion of the site. After taking note of the issues raised during the Public Hearing, the Petitioner submitted a new proposal. Mr. Boyer noted the following points about the revised plan:

- Thirty-one lots are still proposed for the development. The front half of the subdivision is staying pretty much the same as the original submission.

- The loop street has been replaced with a single-access cul-de-sac.
- An additional five feet has been added to the buffer on the north and south boundary lines to gain additional open space and buffering between the Westerly subdivision and the Gascony subdivision.
- There will be less grading of the site than originally planned.
- The rear of the properties will face the rear of the adjacent properties.
- As requested by the Chesterfield Historical and Landmark Preservation Committee (CHLPC), the Applicant has agreed to clean up and maintain the cemetery site, along with providing fencing around the grave markers. They will also provide access to the preservation area via a trail coming off the cul-de-sac.

Discussion

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked if all the recommendations from the CHLPC are being addressed. Mr. Boyer replied that both the plan and Attachment A have been updated to address the CHLPC's recommendations.

Commissioner Lueking asked for clarification on the ownership and acreage of the cemetery site. It was noted that the current owner of the cemetery site is the First Baptist Church of Ballwin; and the Church property is approximately 2.6 acres in size.

Mr. Stock added that the Church property is 230 feet in width and 488 feet in the north/south direction. Of the 2.6 acres, 51,000 sq. ft. is the preserved area which includes the cemetery. The 19 identified grave markers will be enclosed by a fence.

Commissioner Lueking has concerns that there may be other grave sites on the property that have not been identified. Mr. Stock stated that their surveyors have gone across the property and no other markers were found; however they will be very cautious when clearing the site. The location of the grave markers is consistent with what the Church had reported in that they are located on the southern portion of the Church property. Ms. Nassif added that the City will be requesting any additional comments from the CHLPC when the site plan for this development comes in.

Mr. Stock added that the cemetery is not accessible at this time but they are going to improve the cemetery and allow it to be accessible at the request of the Church Pastor.

Chair Watson asked what steps would be taken in the event additional grave sites are found. Mr. Stock stated that the trail plan would be modified so that no grave sites are paved over by the trail.

Commissioner Geckeler referred to the PUD design features which include *easily accessible walking trails, and biking trails connecting the whole subdivision* and noted that the proposed trail is at the very end of the site and felt it "was a contrivance to get the open space".

Mr. Doster replied that Commissioner Geckeler's statement is a misconception. He stated that the preservation area is not part of the common open space calculation. The preservation area was not needed to meet the open space requirement. The preservation area is there because they are utilizing part of the Church property for a storm water facility and the Church wanted to sell the entire property – not just part of it. The Church wanted to sell the whole property because they are unable to access it and

maintain it. As part of the contractual arrangement with the Church, the Petitioner agreed to establish a preservation area that would include the known grave sites as identified by the Church. They will make sure that all the graves are identified from the information provided by the Church and from other visual observations.

Commissioner Lueking stated that the total piece of Common Open Space and Preservation Area of 6.19 acres calculates into how dense the site can be at 4.1 units/acre. Mr. Doster then provided clarification noting that they do not need the preservation area to meet the requirements of the PUD.

Mr. Stock explained that the site is 10,000 sq. ft. zoning so if the cemetery is removed from the site, it would leave 15.5 acres, which would still allow 60 units on the site. The 31 proposed units is 50% of the allowed density. Their product includes detached villas on the eastern side of the site and single-family homes, which average approximately 15,000-16,000 sq. ft. The revised plan picks up an additional 40 feet because there is now only a single road instead of two roads. This allowed them to increase the buffer from the south and to the north. The Church property is being used for storm water management but the 51,000 sq. ft. is not part of the common ground or open space calculation. The common ground and open space calculates to 219,602 sq. ft. which is 30% of the site. The preservation area is not needed to meet the PUD requirements of 30% common ground.

Ms. Nassif pointed out that the site meets the 'R3' density without the PUD and it meets the 'R3' density without the two-acre Church property. Mr. Stock added that they are not trying to put smaller homes on the site – they are proposing large homes with three-car garages.

Commissioner Geckeler asked for clarification about the proposed grading and how it will affect the existing trees. Mr. Stock explained that the area on the east side of Westerly Court will be graded and a berm constructed with new landscaping installed.

Commissioner Geckeler stated that the Tree Manual defines a Monarch tree as *a tree in fair or better condition with a life expectancy of more than 15 years, which is to be given special consideration during development*. She noted that the plan shows most of the Monarch trees being removed and she felt that at least a few of the Red Oaks on the western end of the site could be saved.

Mr. Stock pointed out that there is more right-of-way dedication required on Schoettler Road in order to accommodate the City's plan of improving Schoettler Road, which "squeezes" the site from Schoettler Road going west and challenges the grading. He is confident that they will be able to "re-landscape, re-forest and restore those perimeters". If Monarch trees are within the 35-foot buffers, they will try to save them. He confirmed that the trees on the northern boundary on the west side of the site will be preserved, which include a mix of mature deciduous and evergreens. Along the Gascony boundary, trees will be maintained behind six of the homes.

Commissioner Geckeler stated that some developers who utilize a PUD on difficult property cluster the homes closer together on smaller lots in order to save extensive areas of green space. She asked if such development would work on the proposed site. Mr. Stock replied that the subject site has very steep topography with constraints for points of access and the widening of Schoettler Road. The site includes a mixed use of

single-family detached villas adjacent to Schoettler and Clayton Roads and larger lots of 15,000-16,000 sq. ft. Along Westerly, they have provided a huge buffer and the storm water basin with a lot of green area.

Commissioner Midgley asked if there will be fencing and brick walls along Schoettler and Clayton Roads similar to the Amberleigh development across the street. Mr. Stock stated that the City's conceptual plan for Schoettler Road includes a sidewalk, bike trail, and five lanes of pavement. Amberleigh is at the level of Schoettler Road while the subject site sits below the road – it is anticipated that a decorative wall will be constructed, possibly a boulder wall or decorative landscaped wall. The slope will be landscaped. No fencing is proposed along Clayton Road – just landscaping.

Councilmember Fults noted that at the Public Hearing a lot of residents expressed an objection to connecting the stub road at Westerly Court into the new development. She feels that while the revised plan has improved the area to the west, she feels more work needs to be done to the east. She noted that the residents indicated that they want to keep Westerly Place separate from the proposed subdivision, but by taking out all the trees and adding the road, it gives the appearance of one subdivision rather than two distinct subdivisions. She would like to see trees on the east side saved to distinguish the two subdivisions. She then asked if the road is required to go through at Westerly.

Mr. Boyer stated that per Westerly Place's ordinance, the stub street was established as a future connection to the adjacent property at the time of its development; the Fire District also requires the street to connect to the proposed development. Ms. Nassif added that a stub street cannot remain a stub street once the adjacent property is developed. It may be possible to require additional plantings and landscaping using larger caliper trees to show a visual vegetative transition from one subdivision to the next.

Councilmember Fults still would like to see as much of the buffer kept as possible and then add additional landscaping as necessary, which would allow the two subdivisions to have separate identities.

Ms. Stock stated that they are preserving the "green wall" behind the Johnson property; they will also review whether some of the contours can be moved off the property from the area behind the Burch and Fabick properties in order to preserve more of the existing vegetation.

Commissioner Midgley asked if a Schoettler Grove subdivision identification sign will be installed in the area where motorists enter the subdivision from Westerly Court. Mr. Stock said they are open to installing such a sign.

RESIDENTS' COMMENTS

Chair Watson recognized that there were a number of homeowners in the audience and invited them to the podium for their input.

1. Mr. Jeff Johnson, 2207 Westerly Court, Chesterfield, MO:
 - He feels the revised plan is a definite improvement.
 - Regarding the buffer, it is only five additional feet but the major improvement is the elevation and maintaining that elevation. He would like to have more information on what is planned for the area that will be left elevated.

- A major concern is that their 'R1' subdivision is connecting to an 'R3' subdivision.
- They also have concerns about the traffic that the thru-street will generate.
- He mentioned that information was brought forth at the Public Hearing that the Fire District may not require a second entrance if there are less than 30 homes in a subdivision. He stated that he has heard that the Monarch Fire District has not made a definite decision on requiring the second entrance. He pointed out that Town and Country is constructing a 60+ home subdivision across the street on Clayton Road with a single entrance.

Ms. Nassif explained that when Westerly Place was first zoned, the development was allowed 15,000 sq. ft. lots as a minimum. In order to get four more homes in the subdivision, the developer proposed a stub street rather than a cul-de-sac. At that time, the developer was advised that the stub street would be required to become a thru-street to the adjacent property once it was developed. Even if the Fire District would not require the connection, the City's codes and street standards would require it since the stub street was never meant to be a permanent stub street.

Mr. Johnson stated that he doesn't see the logic behind the City's requirements when the residents have clearly indicated they don't want the street connection. He also pointed out that a sign was never posted on the stub street advising future homebuyers that the street would eventually connect to the adjacent property; nor was he advised of it at his closing.

Commissioner Geckeler stated that the City has improved over the years and now requires stub streets to be posted about future street connections.

2. Mr. Steve Unwin, 14706 Westerly Place, Chesterfield, MO:

- His home is near the entrance of Schoettler Grove off of Schoettler Road.
- A utility line runs across the "green wall" which is filled with tall trees. He asked the Commission members to walk the site to view the existing "green wall" and to "consider preserving as much of the utility line green as possible".
- The road into Westerly Place is not a straight road – it curves. He invited the Commission members to drive the street and consider how the traffic from 31 more homes would affect the road.
- He noted that there is a stub street from Gascony Place into Schoettler Grove and asked how the City will choose which stub street will be opened and which one will remain closed.

Ms. Nassif stated that when Gascony's ordinance was prepared, the City had requested the stub street in the event of a future cross access to the adjacent property. She noted that this street is a cul-de-sac so emergency and maintenance vehicles can easily maneuver within it.

3. Ms. Cindy Burch, 2208 Westerly Court, Chesterfield, MO:

- Homeowners on the eastern side of Westerly Court see a forested area from their property. They are hoping to preserve the trees as they serve as a barrier between their property and the proposed development.
- She encouraged the Commission members to view the "green wall" from her property and noted that there are some trees in this area that are not in good

condition. They are concerned about what will happen when development begins – whether the trees will be damaged.

- She stated that she too was not informed by her realtor of any future plans for the stub street. She pointed out that the Brook Hill and Scarborough subdivisions only have one entrance into them and they are both much larger than the Westerly Place subdivision.

4. Ms. Caren Fabick, 14710 Westerly Place, Chesterfield, MO:

- The “green wall” extends from the beginning of the subdivision to the end of the subdivision. This area is a “wildlife corridor full of owls and deer and beautiful nature” and it separates their homes from “living on Clayton Road”. Once the trees are removed and until the new homes are built, they will be “sitting on Clayton”.
- She is asking that this tree line be saved.

5. Ms. Karen Moculeski, 14405 Rue de Gascony Court, Chesterfield, MO:

- She has not seen the Staff Report or letter from the Chesterfield Historical and Landmark Preservation Committee as they were not listed on the *Active Projects* list as being available.
- She has reviewed the most recent Tree Stand Delineation report and noted that while the City Arborist has determined that it complies with the ordinance, she does not understand how it does.
- The current Tree Stand Delineation refers to the first Tree Stand Delineation dated March 2013, which everyone agreed included errors. She feels that the first plan was easier to understand because one could identify the trees and determine where trees were missing. She stated that she cannot reconcile the two plans together.
- The new plan lists 47 Monarch trees while the first plan identifies 98 Monarch trees.
- She noted that Section 13 of the City’s *Tree Preservation and Landscape Requirements Manual* states: *The number of replacement trees is determined by matching the total caliper inches of trees to be planted with the total DBH inches of the trees that were lost.* Consequently, she feels it is important that the City have an accurate and complete Tree Stand Delineation plan “that the average person can understand”.
- She still feels it’s possible to work with the topography and work with preserving the trees.
- She stated that the current Tree Stand Delineation only preserves 3 Monarch trees and 21 other trees.

Ms. Nassif explained that the Tree Stand Delineation (TSD) is an accounting of existing trees; it is not yet known what the tree preservation will be until the engineering drawings and Tree Preservation Plan are submitted during site plan review. Staff had asked for a preliminary, conceptual document that has not been completely reviewed or provided to the Commission because it is not required until the Site Plan stage. The only item required at this time is the TSD which does not provide any tree preservation information; it was noted that the City will only be referring to the most current TSD.

Ms. Nassif pointed out that section 13 cited by Ms. Moculeski is utilized at the stage of improvement plans and building permits. The City is just at the “accounting” stage and

there are different ways of accounting for large groves of trees and Monarch trees. A meeting can be scheduled with the City Arborist and Ms. Moculeski to review the TSD.

Ms. Moculeski then requested information about individual trees along the border between Gascony and the proposed development. Ms. Nassif stated that this information can be provided.

Ms. Moculeski then encouraged the Commission to continue to “press the developers for something that would be an improvement over this plan”.

PETITIONER’S RESPONSE

Mr. George Stock referred to the Burch and Fabick properties and indicated that they will try to retain some of the existing vegetation along their property lines.

ISSUES

Mr. Boyer then listed the issues raised during the meeting:

1. Additional buffering along the property lines on the northeast side of the site.
2. Limit the grading.
3. Preserve as much of the “green wall” as possible.
4. Concerns about Westerly Court and the connection street. *Mr. Boyer noted that this issue has been addressed unless the Commission wants to provide further direction.*
5. Concerns about the cemetery – making sure that the grave sites are preserved.
6. Traffic concerns associated with the Schoettler Grove improvements.

Ms. Nassif then asked if the Commission had any further direction for Staff as most of the concerns have been addressed in the Staff Report.

7. Chair Watson asked for information on how the discovery of any additional grave sites would be handled.
8. Commissioner Lueking expressed concern that children will be playing in the cemetery given that a trail is proposed within the preservation area. *Mr. Boyer stated that at this time the trail is conceptual – as conditions change through the development process, the site plan may need to be updated. Ms. Nassif noted that the trail could be removed from the Preliminary Plan and language included in the Attachment A stating a trail would be constructed, as directed by the City. The Commission indicated their agreement with Ms. Nassif’s suggestion.*

Chair Watson noted that *tree preservation on the northeast side of the site* is an open issue.

Chair Watson asked the Commission for their thoughts on whether they should move the petitions forward or have them returned to them.

Commissioner Geckeler felt they should come back to the Commission considering the number of issues still outstanding. She would like to have information from Mr. Stock about plans for preserving more of the “green wall”.

Ms. Nassif stated that the Petitioner will provide responses to the issues raised. Staff will review the responses and if Staff feels there are still issues outstanding, the petitions will be placed on the agenda as an *Issues Meeting* and the Commission would not vote at that time. Considering that there are only a few open issues, it is possible that the

petitions could be placed on the agenda for *vote*, which gives the Commission the opportunity to vote if they feel all the issues have been addressed.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed 2014 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

The 2014 Meeting Schedule was accepted by the Commission.

B. 2014 Planning Commission Liaison Schedule for Architectural Review Board Meetings

Chair Watson noted that there are still a number of 2014 ARB meetings which need a Planning Commission liaison.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chair Watson encouraged the Commission members to sign up for the *Fundamentals of Planning & Zoning* classes being offered by UMSL. Anyone interested should contact Ms. Nassif who will take care of the registration process.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Steve Wuennenberg, Secretary