

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL  
January 25, 1999**



---

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

**I. PRESENT**

**ABSENT**

Mr. Fred Broemmer  
Mr. Charles Eifler  
Mr. Dan Layton, Jr.  
Ms. Stephanie Macaluso  
Ms. Rachel Nolen  
Mr. Jerry Right  
Ms. Victoria Sherman  
Mr. Allen Yaffe  
Chairman Robert Grant  
Ms. Teresa Price, Director of Planning  
Ms. Laura Griggs-McElhanon, Assistant Director of Planning  
Ms. Angela McCormick, Planner I  
Ms. Annissa McCaskill, Planner I  
Ms. Molly Butler-Dunham, Planner I  
Ms. Kathy Lone, Executive Secretary, Planning Assistant

**II. INVOCATION: Commissioner Right**

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All**

Chairman Grant recognized the attendance of Mayor Nancy Greenwood; Councilmember Allan Sheppard (Ward I), Councilmember Larry Grosser (Ward II), Councilmember Barry Streeter (Ward II) and Council Liaison tonight: Councilmember Mary Brown (Ward IV).

Chairman Grant stated that there would not be a vote on P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc. tonight. These petitions are on the agenda for the Planning Commission to receive information from the Planning Department.

Mayor Greenwood also stated that this is a standard procedure for rezonings.

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

Commissioner Eifler read the first portion of the "Opening Comments".

- A. **P.Z. 03-1999 Labels Direct**; a request for a change in zoning from “NU” Non-Urban District to “PI” Planned Industrial District for a 3.485 acre tract of land located on Eatherton Road. (Locator Number: 18W14-0011); Proposed Uses: Business service establishment; mail order sale warehouses; manufacturing, fabrication, assembly, processing or packaging of any commodity **except**: facilities producing or processing explosives or flammable gases or liquids, facilities for animal slaughtering, meat packing, or rendering, sulfur plants, rubber reclamation plants, or cement plants, and steel mills, foundries or smelters; office or office buildings; printing and duplicating services; indoor sale of motor vehicles to be offered for sale or hire to the general public on the premises; warehousing, storage or wholesaling of manufactured commodities.

Planner I Angela McCormick gave a slide presentation of the subject site.

Mr. John King, 168 N. Meramec, Clayton, MO 63105, attorney for petitioner, noted the following:

- All business comes from the Internet. There is not any walk-in traffic;
- There would be one building, 10,000 square feet;
- Labels Direct would occupy 5,000 square feet, 500-1,000 square feet would be for offices and storage, the remaining would be for the factory, and the remaining 5,000 square feet to be leased out for office warehouse;
- Operations would be between the hours of 6:00 a.m. –10:00 p.m., Monday through Friday;
- At the present, there would be one truck per week for deliveries and labels sent by UPS or air express;
- The 23 parking spaces presently at the location is adequate;
- There will not be any toxic emissions.

Commissioner Eifler asked that the proposed uses be re-worded.

Commissioner Macaluso asked the petitioner to move the parking to the rear.

#### **SPEAKERS IN FAVOR –**

1. Mr. Bill Kirchoff, 17627 Wild Horse Creek Road, Chesterfield, MO 63005, Chairman, Valley Master Plan Committee, spoke in favor of petition;
  - Felt that the use was appropriate for this location;
  - Supported the project;
  - Time for Chesterfield to initiate some master plan activity for the western part of the Valley Master Plan.

#### **SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION – None**

**SPEAKERS NEUTRAL - None**

**SPEAKERS – REBUTTAL – Waived**

Commissioner Eifler read the closing comments.

**V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

A motion to approve the January 11, 1999 Meeting Minutes with the change of adding Roman numerals to the sections was made by Commissioner Broemmer and seconded by Commissioner Grant. The motion passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

1. Mr. Stephen L. Kling, Jr., 10 South Brentwood Blvd., Suite 200, Clayton, MO, attorney representing Shenandoah Subdivision, Amherst Subdivision, Conway Glen Subdivision, Conway Forest Subdivision, Conway Meadows Subdivision and various individual residences along Conway Road, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;
  - Submitted a letter to the Planning Commission stating his client's position in opposition to the above petitions;
  - Reviewed the 1990 Comprehensive Plan adopted by the City in 1990. The Comprehensive Plan recommended office use for the southern portion of the subject properties and a transition zone of attached single-family residential or alternatively institutional uses for the northern portion of the property. Certain changes to the 1990 Comprehensive Plan were made on May 29, 1991 and December 14, 1992, specifically dealing with the subject properties. Clients have asked for documents pertaining to these changes since November 1, 1998 and today have not received all of them despite numerous requests. In reviewing the documents he has received, he has the following comments:
    - A. Commercial development is only a proposed alternative under the Comprehensive Plan. Single-family attached residential was and is the primary guideline. The Conceptual Land Use Plan on the summary report still shows only single-family residential use on the northern portion of the property.
    - B. The City records he has seen to date do not evidence any mistake or error in the 1990 Plan recommendations for these sites, nor any detailed analysis or community input as to why the initial recommendation of single-family attached residential in the northern portion should not be followed. Significant changes, even as alternatives to a Comprehensive Plan, should involve the same careful and comprehensive study.

- C. The City records do not reflect the public need for this type of massive development. The resolutions adopting amendments to the 1990 Plan require this Commission to weigh the desirability of all rezonings in light of the public welfare needs.
- D. The 1991 and 1992 Comprehensive Plan amendments do not reflect the extent of public input and seek a favorable treatment only for those affected landowners. Constant amendments to a Comprehensive Plan become more like special zoning concessions rather than long-range planning.
2. Mr. Ted Allison, 2126 Chesterfield Place, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking neutral on P.Z. 1-99 and P.Z. 2-99 Sunrise Assisted Living;
- Stated that he heard there was to be an outlet on Leiman Drive but there was no mention of this at the Public Hearing;
  - There have been questions concerning the height of the building in relationship to the height of the property but there are no drawings that show the height of the building with respect to the hill.
  - At this time, speaker is not opposed to project but he doesn't have enough information;
  - Speaker does not feel there is enough time to look at the reports before the Planning Commission votes on it.

Chairman Grant stated that no one as an individual can make recommendations in regards to egress or ingress or any other facets of a proposed development. The Planning Commission only speaks as a body. Chairman Grant explained the petition process.

Councilmember Brown asked the petitioner's attorney to provide the Planning Commission with drawings showing the scale.

3. Mr. Martin Schamber, 807 Madeline Ct., Manchester, MO, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Lord of Life Lutheran Church;
- Speaker feels the developer has been very forthcoming with information;
  - The Board of Trustees is neutral but feels that if this tract of land is developed, the land is very attractive for the use;
  - The Church does not have the same traffic problems but does not feel the traffic will be greatly impacted with the development;
  - Sunrise Assisted Living is a national company with a good reputation and would be a good neighbor;
  - The Board of Trustees is not concerned about the height of the building and does not feel it would be any higher than the Church. Sight lines would not be affected even if Sunrise was taller;
  - Speaker stated that the developer has mentioned that some of the fill could be placed on the Church's land and landscaping done along Leiman Drive to block the view of the ditch and

drainage basin for an aesthetic point of view. This is only in the discussion stage. The Church would also like to see curbing along Leiman Drive.

4. Ms. Jean Reilley, 2119 Chesterfield Place, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 1-99 and P.Z. 2-99 Sunrise Assisted Living;
  - Speaker stated that the plans look more like three stories than two – looks like a monstrosity;
  - The biggest problem would be the left-hand turn from Clarkson Road into the facility and that there would be a lot of the residents of Sunrise driving;
  - If the entrance would be off Old Clarkson Road, this would be bad for property values.
5. Mr. Ed Griesedieck, 1 City Center, St. Louis, MO, attorney for the petitioner for P.Z. 1-99 and P.Z. 2-99 Sunrise Assisted Living;

Speaker received the staff report and had the following comments:

- Used the parking for a nursing home as criteria for what was needed; felt it was more appropriate (provided 43 spaces and 26 are required);
  - Statistics from other Sunrise locations show that less than one percent of the residents drive, Sunrise will be providing shuttle service on heavy traffic days (holidays, etc.)
  - Regarding the Fire Department comments – the developer would be agreeable to change the access on Clarkson Road from two to one. The developer will revise plans accordingly;
  - The developer will rework the turning radius in the circle drive, as requested;
  - The developer will raise the under-drive canopy up to the 13 feet;
  - The developer will relocate the trash dumpster and its protection, as requested;
  - The developer wants to make the building look residential and is trying to act as a transition from commercial zoning to residential zoning and feels the building is doing that;
  - The developer will show the temporary (short-term) parking on the plans;
  - The speaker stated that the height of the building with a scale is shown on page 2 of the plans that have been submitted to the City.
6. Mr. Paul H. Switzer, 36 Conway Cove Dr., Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;
    - Just wanted to state that he is against the Conway development.
  7. Mr. Fred Byrne, 14308 Conway Meadows Ct., Chesterfield, MO 63017, member, Board of Managers of Conway Meadows Condominiums, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;
    - Speaker is opposed to the height and density of the proposed buildings by Sachs and Vitt. The Sach's site is an 8-story building with 176,000 sq. ft. of leasable space. The calculations used should be 5 parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of leasable space and they are using 3.625 spaces. The 8-story building is outrageous. Adding Timberlake and Solomon Brothers, there will be

5,300 vehicles.

8. Mr. Kevin Kinealy, 14842 Rutland Circle, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Speaker questioned where the 10,000 people are going to eat;
- Wishes the City would pick and choose their developments better.

9. Mr. Jay Kirschbaum, 1520 Woodroyal East Dr., Chesterfield, MO 63017, trustee, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Not having more access on the Outer Road along Conway Road has forced the traffic onto the surrounding areas. The traffic affects both sides of Highway 40. This needs to remain residential and retain the character on both sides of the Highway.
- Speaker didn't oppose Solomon building. Residents were told by developers that it wouldn't be visible from the subdivision but it is.

10. Ms. Pam Copeland, 15128 Amherst Green Ct., Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Speaker feels that home values will go down;
- Feels misrepresented by the Planning Department as the meeting was moved to tonight instead of February 8.

11. Mr. Bill Mannen, 14865 Grantley Dr., Chesterfield, MO 63017, trustee, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- A majority of the residents of his subdivision oppose this development;
- The view across Highway 40 from his subdivision, especially in the winter time, will be trees with no leaves and office buildings;
- The site density is a problem as it is the largest development out here.

12. Mr. Lee Wall, 14759 Plumas, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Speaker stated that more time is needed to review projects of this size;
- Feels the water run-off should be contained so it is less than that presently experienced because the creek floods Conway Road just east of White Road when there is a heavy rain;
- The speaker urges the Planning Commission to make use of the Public Works Citizen's

Committee and have them review this project. This Committee is comprised of professional engineers.

Chairman Grant stated that the Planning Commission will take the appropriate time to review this project before voting.

13. Mr. Craig Silver, 14764 Plumas, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Speaker is opposed to this project due to the amount of traffic coming to the residential areas on Conway Road;
- Speaker likes the area due to the rural feel.

14. Ms. Lynne Johnson, 15125 Conway Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Thanked the Planning Commission for volunteering their time to review these plans;
- Speaker hopes Timberlake is not used as a precedent. The Site Development Plan was often changed. Originally, the closest structure to Conway Road was going to be 180 feet and presently it is 125 feet;
- The present building is intrusive, too close to the Outer Road and has too much light pollution on Conway Road.

15. Mr. John McDonald, 1332 Amherst Terrace Way, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- At first was in favor of the Vitt development, but now opposes it;
- When he built his home, he was told by the City of Chesterfield that the area would remain residential;
- High density area;
- Home values will go down.

16. Ms. Laura Lueking, 15021 Conway Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, speaking in opposition to P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.;

- Speaker thought that meeting was going to be February 8<sup>th</sup> not tonight;
- Wants the public to be better informed;
- Residents have their own traffic consultant because of the inconsistencies in the studies done by the Sachs and Vitt projects. The traffic studies seem to forget about the traffic that will be severely impacting the south side Highway 40, Schoettler Road and South Outer 40 that will

be now feeding into one lane of traffic with all of the wild turns the traffic engineers are throwing around. They are still going to have only one entrance on east-bound Highway 40 going out of that development. You are taking three lanes of traffic and feeding them into one with no other recourse.

Commissioner Nolen recommended that, if there are written materials, to please get the information to the Planning Department so the information can be put in their packets for review.

City Attorney Beach stated that the City saw inconsistencies in the traffic studies and hired their own traffic consultant.

17. Mr. Michael Doster, 16476 Chesterfield Airport Road, Chesterfield, MO 63017, attorney for petitioner (Wild Oats Markets, Inc.), spoke in favor of P.Z. 26-89 Midland Capitol Properties II (Chesterfield Crossing);

- Speaker stated that Wild Oats would sublet the Kids R Us store. Wild Oats is classified as a supermarket and the parking ratio for a grocery store is slightly higher and necessitated petitioner to file a request for a reduction in the parking requirements for the center. Under the Ordinance, the Planning Commission and the City Council can approve up to a 20% reduction.

## VII. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Grant took two (2) items on the agenda out of order.

C. P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus); a request for a rezoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "PC" Planned Commercial District for twelve (12) parcels of land located at the intersection of Chesterfield Parkway North, Conway Road and North Outer Forty Road. (Locator Numbers: 18R110031, 18S320095, 18S320073, 18S320039, 18R110012, 18R110097, 18R110053, 18S320062, 18R110011, 18S320084, 18R110086, 18S320051). Proposed use: Offices or office buildings.

D. P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc.; a request for a change of zoning for a 4.7 acre tract of land from "NU" Non-Urban District to "PC" Planned Commercial District on North Outer Forty Road (Highway 40), 500 feet South of Conway Road (Locator Number 18r110020). Proposed Uses: Cafeterias for employees and guests only; offices or office buildings; Apartment dwelling units in buildings primarily designated for occupancy by one or more of the permitted commercial uses wherein occupancy of the dwelling unit shall be limited to the owner, manager, or employee of the permitted use or uses and their respective families. A minimum of eight hundred (800) square feet of contiguous open space for the dwelling unit, protectively screened from commercial activities and directly accessible to the

dwelling unit, shall be provided on the premises for the exclusive use of the occupants of such apartment. This is not to exclude one floor of multi-story (three or more) office buildings being developed for condominiums; and parking areas, including garages, for automobiles, but not including any sales of automobiles, or the storage of wrecked or otherwise damaged and immobilized automotive vehicles for a period in excess of seventy-two (72) hours.

Planning Director Teresa Price stated that there is information in their packet concerning these two petitions and this information is what has been received or has transpired on the project since they received the last set of information.

Commissioner Eifler asked Teresa Price about a letter dated December 11, 1998 from Richard Beckman of the St. Louis County Department of Highways and Traffic indicating the traffic problem at Chesterfield Parkway and the North Service Road would be mitigated by having a triple turn lane. This would be an interim solution until a triple U-turn lane is added to the Chesterfield Parkway bridge (Texas U-Turn). Commissioner Eifler questioned that if the triple turn lane mitigates this, why the need for the Texas U-Turn?

Ms. Price will ask Mr. Beckman this question.

Commissioner Eifler doesn't feel that this mitigates it efficiently. He also feels that there are not enough lanes on Chesterfield Parkway to accommodate the three left turn lanes. He would like this matter addressed.

Commissioner Eifler would also like the Planning Department to check into the creek causing flooding on Conway Road. Teresa Price will discuss this with the Department of Public Works.

Commissioner Eifler complimented the Department of Planning on doing a nice job on presenting all of the information on an interim basis to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Nolen requested that if a decision is to be made on February 8<sup>th</sup>, she has all of the information needed.

Commissioner Nolen questioned at what point would work begin on a possible Texas U-Turn ramp. At what point does construction begin - when buildings are 50 percent leased, 100 percent? Not much attention has been paid to the traffic going west-bound. Is the traffic consultant checking further down Highway 40 and exiting the Clarkson exit? What is the impact on the residents as more buildings are being developed.

Commissioner Layton also is concerned about the west-bound traffic. The penthouse in the Sachs project is built 679 feet above sea level. The development is built on a hill. North Outer 40 Drive is 540 feet above sea level. The total of the penthouse building is 139 feet above North Outer Forty which is approximately the height of a 12-story building.

Commissioner Layton would like to make sure that both projects are viewed by the same criteria or standard of density of footprint.

Chairman Grant moved to hold P.Z. 32-98 Conway Land Company (Chesterfield Corporate Campus) and P.Z. 30-98 Sachs Properties, Inc. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Layton and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

- A. **P.Z. 1-99 Sunrise Assisted Living**; A request for a change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-6" Residence District for a 3.21 acre tract of land located at the southeast corner of Leiman Drive and Clarkson Road. (Locator Number: 19S 11 0611) Proposed uses: Nursing homes and group homes for the elderly.

AND

- B. **P.Z. 2-99 Sunrise Assisted Living**; A request for a conditional use permit in the "R-6" Residence district for a 3.21 acre tract of land located at the southeast corner of Leiman Drive and Clarkson Road. (Locator Number: 19S 11 0611) Proposed uses: Nursing homes and group homes for the elderly.

Planner I Molly Butler Dunham gave a presentation. The following issues have been brought to the attention of the Planning Department: traffic, access, height of the building, compatibility with zoning and use with the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan, and the possibility of restricting the use of the site to the proposed assisted living center. The Department requests that the matter be held.

Councilmember Brown asked that the residents be included in the factoring for parking.

City Attorney Doug Beach requested that the Planning Department state what standard they use and to detail why. There is the need to rationalize how the parking number was arrived at.

Commissioner Layton wants #3 of the report to use stronger language in restricting the use.

Commissioner Sherman stated that the developer said that one area for short-term parking would be for parking but she would like to make sure it is shown on the plan.

Commissioner Eifler is concerned about what protections will be made at the top of the retaining wall to restrict access so that children or whomever will not be injured.

Commissioner Yaffe questioned whether or not there should be restrictions in regards to the construction vehicles and construction traffic in and out.

Molly Butler-Dunham stated that this is a standard that is looked into.

Councilmember Brown stated she would like to hear more comments from the Architectural Review Board based on the fact that this is being offered as a residential facility in a residential neighborhood and in an area designated residential by the Comprehensive Plan. Perhaps the ARB could look at this in a different way and also state their opinion on the type of architecture and the colors.

Commissioner Broemmer made a motion **to send this matter back to the Architectural Review Board** with the recommendation that the Planning Commission use this more as a residential building and would like for them to review it from the standpoint of being a residential-looking facility versus the commercial and send a recommendation back to the Planning Commission based on that information and to review the plans submitted to them which are residential in nature. This motion was seconded by Commission Sherman and **passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

Commissioner Sherman asked Molly Butler-Dunham if there would be more correspondence from the State on the traffic. Ms. Butler-Dunham responded that there would be more comments in the Site Development Plan stage.

Chairman Grant recognized Councilmember Linda Tilley (Ward IV) and former Councilmember Ed Levinson in the audience.

- E. P.Z. 26-89 Midland Capitol Properties II (Chesterfield Crossing); request for Parking Reduction in a "C-8" Planned Commercial District, west side of Clarkson Road, south of Chesterfield Parkway West.**

Assistant Planning Director Laura Griggs-McElhanon gave a presentation on the project. The request is to reduce the required parking by 10% to allow Wild Oats Market to move into the Kids R Us tenant space. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Griggs-McElhanon stated that Dierberg's Market, Clarkson Square, Hilltown Center and Chesterfield Mall also have parking reductions.

Commissioner Nolen asked if the State could be contacted regarding the exit at Lea Oak onto Clarkson Road.

Commissioner Broemmer made a motion **to reduce** the number of parking spaces 10% per the Planning Department's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Eifler and **passes by a vote of 9 to 0.**

## VIII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND SIGNS:

- A. **Hilltown Village (South parcel);** A request for Planning Commission approval of a 73.5 square foot business identification sign, 20 feet in height, with the bottom of the sign face 8 feet above the grade of the adjacent street located on the southern parcel of Hilltown Village, northwest of Olive Boulevard, approximately 150 feet northeast of Chesterfield Parkway.

Commissioner Layton, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, recommends a motion to **approve** Hilltown Village (South parcel) which is a request for approval of a business identification sign with the understanding that the motion is subject to the changes recommended by the Planning Department (**the sign height is to be 13 feet**). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

- B. **Hilltown Village (North parcel);** A request for Planning Commission approval of a 52.6 square foot business identification sign, 13 feet in height located on the northern parcel of Hilltown Village, northwest of Olive Boulevard, approximately 550 feet northeast of Chesterfield Parkway.

Commissioner Layton, on behalf of the Site Plan Committee, recommends a motion to approve Hilltown Village (North parcel) which is a request for Planning Commission approval of a business identification sign as amended by the Planning Department's recommendation (**the sign height is to be 12 feet**). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Broemmer and passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

IX. **COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

A. **Ordinance Review Committee** - No report

B. **Architectural Review Committee** -

Chairman Yaffe reported that prior to this evening's Planning Commission meeting, the Committee met and conducted a preliminary review of the Architectural Guidelines as have been submitted by the Architectural Review Board. On February 8, Staff will provide additional information so they may do a more extensive and detailed report. The Committee will be meeting before the February 8, 1999 meeting and making a recommendation.

C. **Site Plan/Landscape Committee** - No report

D. **Comprehensive Plan Committee** - No report

E. **Procedures and Planning Committee** - No report

A motion to **adjourn** was made by Commissioner Eifler and seconded by Chairman Grant. The motion passes by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

  
Fred Broemmer, Secretary