

**AMENDED 9/11/06**  
**(Amended page 2)**

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**MEETING SUMMARY  
August 30, 2006**

**PRESENT**

Mr. David Asmus  
Mr. David Banks  
Mr. Fred Broemmer  
Ms. Wendy Geckeler  
Dr. Lynn O'Connor  
Ms. Lu Perantoni  
Mr. Thomas Sandifer (joined the meeting at 6:25 p.m.)  
Ms. Victoria Sherman  
Chair Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr.

Bruce Geiger, Councilmember  
Mr. Rob Heggie, City Attorney  
Ms. Libbey Simpson, Asst. City Administrator for Econ. & Com. Dev.  
Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning  
Ms. Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Assistant Director of Planning  
Ms. Aimee Nassif, Senior Planner  
Ms. Mara Perry, Senior Planner  
Mr. Charlie Campo, Project Planner  
Mr. Jarvis Myers, Project Planner  
Ms. Jennifer Yackley, Project Planner  
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant

**ABSENT**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Teresa Price, Director of Planning, gave a PowerPoint Presentation reviewing the planning process for the City of Chesterfield.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**Notification of Trustees of Public Hearings**

It was noted that the City sends out letters on an annual basis to the Subdivision Trustees on record with City Hall asking for any updates. These are the lists used

by the Planning Department to notify Trustees of any public hearings that may affect their neighborhoods.

### **Issues**

Discussion was held on how issues regarding projects should be handled. It was noted that during the Public Hearing, Commissioners may ask questions for clarification. If these types of questions are resolved during the Public Hearing process, they will be included in the Attachment A.

When Commissioners have questions for Staff about a particular project after the Public Hearing, they are asked to email the questions to the Director of Planning, who will assign it to the designated Planner for a response.

### **Preliminary Plan Requirements**

A review was given of what is required at the Preliminary Plan stage. It has been observed, however, that Petitioners are providing the Planning Commission with a lot more information at this stage than what is required. Because of the extra information being submitted, it was agreed that the criteria for the Preliminary Plan Requirements should be reviewed and updated.

### **Citizen Involvement**

Concern was expressed that citizens are not fully aware of the planning process and oftentimes are unsure as to whether their issues are being heard. Discussion was held on suggestions on how to keep the citizens more aware of the process. It was agreed to develop a hand-out to be placed at the back of Chambers explaining the public hearing process – including the phone number for the Planner of the Day.

### **Voting Criteria**

Chair Hirsch reminded the Committee that, when a petition is up for vote, a motion needs to be on the floor before discussion takes place.

City Attorney Heggie pointed out that the Commission's Bylaws state that an affirmative vote of at least five members of the Planning Commission is needed to approve "a major plan". However, there is no definition of "major plan" in the Bylaws. He will update the Bylaws to better define "major plan".

City Attorney Heggie also indicated that he would like the Agenda to note how many votes are needed for approval on each Agenda item.

### **Miscellaneous**

At the request of Councilmember Geiger, Commissioners Banks and Sherman brought up the issue of public notification of rezoned sites that have been out there for several years without a Site Development Plan ever being submitted. Discussion included addressing updated standards.

**Commissioner O'Connor recommended coordinating the site development plan process with the zoning process.**

Staff updated the Committee on research underway relative to the urban core with respect to zoning and governing ordinances.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.