

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL
MAY 29, 1991



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

PRESENT

Ms. Mary Brown
Ms. Mary Domahidy
Mr. Jamie Cannon
Mr. William Kirchoff
Ms. Pat O'Brien
Mr. Walter Scruggs
Ms. Victoria Sherman
Mr. Doug Beach, City Attorney
Councilmember Betty Hathaway, Ward I
Mayor Jack Leonard
Mr. Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning/Economic Development
Mr. Joseph Hanke, Planning Specialist
Ms. Sandra Lohman, Executive Secretary

ABSENT

Mr. Dave Dalton

Vice-Chairman Mary Domahidy chaired the meeting until Chairman McGuinness arrived.

INVOCATION: Mayor Jack Leonard

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Led by Councilmember Betty Hathaway

PUBLIC HEARINGS - Commissioner Scruggs read the opening comments.

- A. **P.Z. 13-91 Chesterfield Day School**; a request for a Conditional Use Permit in the "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District; east side of White Road, south of Green Trails Drive South.

Note: Commissioner Sherman and Commissioner Cannon left the meeting during discussion of this matter, due to a possible conflict of interest.

Planning Director Jerry Duepner presented slides depicting the subject site and surrounding properties.

Dr. Barbara Fulton spoke on behalf of the request, noting the following:

- The present facility is a small, independent, not-for-profit school.
- Education is provided to children between the ages of eighteen (18) months and through sixth (6th) grade.
- There are 245 students attending the school, with 100 of the 180 families with children attending the school living in Chesterfield.
- The school was founded in 1962, and moved to the present location in 1974.
- One addition to the building was added in 1983, and in 1987 a second addition was made to the building.
- The school is Montessori based, independent, accredited, and a training center for teachers who are preparing to be Montessori Pre-school teachers.
- The school is affiliated with Maryville College, so that the students who go through the school's training program can receive up to 1/2 of a Master's Degree through Maryville.
- The petitioner has had many requests to provide a full-day pre-school program for children of working families. To this point the school provides only 1/2 day programs.
- In order to expand the pre-school program, the petitioner requires additional space.

- The petitioner intends to make only minimal changes to the building and landscaping surrounding same.
- Additional children coming into the Van Drew property would amount to thirty (30) maximum, arriving between 7:30 a.m. and 8:20 a.m. The petitioner believes the staggered time would cause the traffic congestion to be minimal.
- Dismissal for the full-day children would be between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.
- The ten (10) foot strip of property between the Van Drew property and the school property does not belong to the school or the Van Drews. The school is hopeful that something may be resolved in this matter. The school wishes to connect the two (2) properties internally, as this would be very positive.
- In reference to improvements to the site, as suggested by the County Highway Department, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, and Chesterfield Public Works and Planning Departments, the petitioner would propose to share some of the cost with the adjacent property owners.
- The petitioner is willing to cooperate and do its share of improvements, but would like consideration on the White Road improvements, storm sewer system, water detention system, plus dedication of fifteen (15) feet in the front of the property and fifty (50) feet on the side of the property. [Fifty (50) feet of dedication amounts to 1/3 of total property].
- The school intends to connect the sewer system to the house, as requested by MSD.
- The school is willing to provide the sidewalk, as requested.
- If development occurs behind this property, the petitioner would hope to receive a fair price for the fifty (50) feet of dedicated land.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Additional signage is not in the plan.
- The school has studied the traffic situation at the existing Chesterfield Day School, and have invited the Chesterfield Police, the County Police, anyone who could provide input as to how to improve this traffic situation. All who have been contacted regarding this situation have commended the school for its actions.

- Traffic congestion on White Road occurs between 3:10 p.m. and 3:30 p.m., during regular school dismissal. This is due mainly to parents arriving early and lining up along White Road to pick-up their children. The school provides staff members and volunteer parents, equipped with walkie-talkies, to help load children into waiting cars at dismissal.
- The pre-school will require five (5) additional parking spaces.
- About thirty-five (35) to forty (40) children stay for after school activities who will be leaving any time between 3:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.
- Safety officers consist of the Business Manager, Secretary, Receptionist, moms, Teacher Assistants, probably from four (4) to eight (8) people helping children into the awaiting cars along driveway.
- Part of the parking area for the pre-school will be in the existing car port area. Five parking spaces is required for the type of facility proposed.
- The request for a new driveway is being considered, but the school believes it may present some additional problems.
- The current school program provides a 1/2 day Pre-school, morning and afternoon. The school plans to add a full-day Pre-school program, with children arriving between 7:00 and 8:20 a.m.. These children would be dismissed between 3:10 and 3:30 p.m. The all day children can be picked-up any time between 3:10 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. Most of the parents would pick up their children between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.
- Of the 245 students in the existing facility, there are 64 pre-schoolers and 15 toddlers.

Chairman McGuinness arrived at this time.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR - None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION - None

REBUTTAL - Waived

SHOW OF HANDS

27 IN FAVOR 0 IN OPPOSITION

Commissioners Cannon and Sherman returned to the meeting at this time.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes were approved from May 13, 1991.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Ordinance Review Committee

Chairman Mary Brown stated the Committee met this evening, and are still in the process of looking at criteria for possible changes in permanent business signs. The Committee will meet again to discuss the process of examining options.

B. Architectural Review Committee - No Report

C. Site Plan/Landscape Committee

Chairman William Kirchoff stated the Committee will meet June 25, 1991, at 7:00 p.m.

D. Comprehensive Plan Committee/Chesterfield Valley Study

Chairman Mary Domahidy reported that the Chesterfield Valley Study Committee is in receipt of four (4) proposals. The interviews of the four (4) firms that submitted the proposals will be reviewed beginning June 12, 1991.

E. Procedures Committee - No Report

Chairman McGuinness reported that the Committee would be given the By-Laws for review and consideration relative to possible changes.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 8-91 Harold Arbeitman - Royal Companies; a request for a change of zoning from "M-3" Planned Industrial District to "C-8" Planned Commercial District; north side of Chesterfield Airport Road, approximately 400 feet east of Long Road.

Director Duepner stated the Department is still awaiting a revised site plan addressing concerns, and recommends this item be held until such time as a revised plan has been submitted.

Commissioner Domahidy made a motion to hold this item. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kirchoff and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.

- B. P.Z. 9-91 JPR Corporation; a request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District and "M-3" Planned Industrial District to "M-3" Planned Industrial District and Amended "M-3" Planned Industrial District; north side of Chesterfield Airport Road, south side of U.S. Highway 40/61 and I-64, east of Old Olive Street Road.

Director Duepner presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval subject to conditions in the Department's report, noting that: it may be more appropriate to address screening of the property at the time of review of the site development plan/architectural elevations. This would give the Commission the opportunity to view screening in terms of the total site and total usage.

A motion to approve the Department's recommendation was made by Commissioner Domahidy and was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The twenty (20) foot setback would only apply to the narrow portion of the property, and would widen to thirty (30) feet toward the west line.
- To accommodate the configuration of the subject parcel of land, it was suggested that the buildings could be moved to the western portion of the site and parking to the eastern portion of the site.
- Concern was expressed effective screening of outdoor storage.

- Commission expressed desire to retain flexibility over the two (2) buildings located on the western portion of the lot [i.e., whether the Commission could, at a later date, deem those buildings to be primarily office buildings rather than warehouse buildings].
- The petitioner would have the flexibility of determining use of these two (2) buildings, but would have to adjust the parking requirements as required by the use requested.
- Bulk material would be stored in a covered facility.
- The Master Plan being prepared for Chesterfield Valley, recognizes this site as a high-profile area.
- Commission expressed desire to shift the structures further to the west in order to better accommodate required setbacks along the eastern property line.

Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to amend the original motion that any other buildings on this site be office buildings. The motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Cannon made a motion to amend the original motion to require the petitioner to maintain a thirty (30) foot setback up to the structure on the eastern portion of the site. The motion died for lack of a second.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Desire to shift buildings to maintain thirty (30) foot setback along Chesterfield Airport Road and fifteen (15) foot setback along Highway 40/I-64. The shift to the west would be between thirty (30) and forty (40) feet, and would also shift the proposed parking area.
- The area between the proposed building and the easternmost portion of the property would include a septic field.
- Some work vehicles would be parked outside of the facility, the largest being a water tank truck to be stored primarily in the fall and winter months.
- No signage is proposed for the site at this time, but the petitioner would be allowed a free-standing sign.

Commissioner Sherman made a motion to amend the original motion to require that the work vehicles be kept west of the maintenance building. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Domahidy.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSIONERS

- This amendment would require parking be restricted to passenger vehicles only.

Director Duepner stated a clarification of the wording of the amendment as follows: "The parking area to the east shall be for visitor and employee parking only. No maintenance vehicles, equipment or materials shall be stored in this area."

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The amendment passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Upon a roll call the vote on the original motion, as amended, was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, no; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The amendment passed by a vote of 7 to 1.

- C. P.Z. 10-91 Edward J. Shaheen, Jr.; a request for a Commercial Service Procedure in the "NU" Non-Urban District; east side of Olive Boulevard, north of White Plains Drive.

Planning Specialist Joseph Hanke presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval based on the conditions outlined in Attachment A.

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

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSIONERS

- The existing trees would be retained with the exception of possible removal one (1) tree to allow for ingress and egress to the property.
- Sidewalks were discussed along several adjacent properties which abut Olive.

- Pedestrian safety was addressed both in terms of use and size of sidewalks, bicycle paths, etc. As the City continues to develop, the safety factor needs to be addressed when making future development decisions within the City.
- Stormwater will be addressed by the City of Chesterfield Public Works Department, as a standard procedure.
- A fence is not required; however, it could be utilized along with landscaping, as a buffer between adjacent properties. This would be determined at the time of site plan submittal.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Commissioner Brown left the meeting at this time.

D. Update of City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan and Final Report of the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Chesterfield.

Item #1 was presented by Director Duepner for consideration of the Commission.

Commissioner Brown returned to the meeting.

A motion to approve revision of the Comprehensive Plan relative to the area along Conway Road was made by Commissioner Sherman and seconded by Commissioner Domahidy.

Upon a roll call the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Item #2 was presented by Director Duepner for consideration of the Commission.

A motion to approve revision of the Comprehensive Plan relative to the Timberlake Manor Parkway area was made by Commissioner O'Brien and seconded by Commissioner Domahidy.

Commissioner Domahidy gave background information on this item, in view of comments made at the last hearing and the letter received from Mr. Barry Hayden. She stated the following:

- This task presents a challenge to provide a balance of all interests involved in this process of land development [i.e., dealing with residents, interests of the community as a whole, and the interests of the owner of the property].
- The Comprehensive Plan has not, at any time, endorsed any particular site plan within the City.
- The change proposed in Mr. Hayden's letter affects another parcel on the south side of Highway 40.
- The Committee dealt with the change on the north side of Highway 40, which was precipitated by the Sverdrup development and by the action taken by the City Council. At the same time the Committee dealt with correspondence received from a resident relative to review of this particular designation on the south side of Highway 40. The Committee recognized that both areas were designated as "Major Office." Therefore, taking both matters into consideration, the Committee asked the question, "are we misleading people by the notion that this also is a Major Office designation." The Committee is limited by the fact that the Comprehensive Plan allows for two (2) designations only, either Major Office or Office Campus.
- The Comprehensive Plan is a guide, and any specific proposal before the Commission for development would receive a public hearing and complete process as part of the rezoning process. The Committee is not involved in zoning at this time, but is merely looking at a revision of the Comprehensive Plan in view of changes that have occurred in that area in the past year.
- Until any proposal comes before the Commission, any plan for the site remains speculative.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Possibility of changing definition of Office-Campus.

Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to amend the original motion to restrict the height of the buildings [designated as Office-Campus] to a maximum of four (4) stories in height. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scruggs.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- If there is no definition, and there is an objection to one (1) to two (2) story, there may be persons who might also object to four (4) stories. Therefore, it might be better to completely eliminate any reference to a height.

Director Duepner stated that the Commission could be too detailed in its definition as to what would be a reasonable height for a structure, or any particular use. He further stated that since the Plan is used as a guideline, he would caution the Commission about pre-judging a proposal that has yet to be submitted. Further, if an when something is submitted to the Commission it would be evaluated on its merit. He suggested leaving the low-rise designation in the text, and delete all reference to height of buildings. Director Duepner rendered his opinion that he does not believe the change is necessary to the Plan.

The amendment to the original motion was withdrawn.

An amendment to the original motion was made by Commissioner Cannon to delete the text [i.e., one (1) or two (2) stories]. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- The intent of the Committee relating to the height of buildings was an attempt to clarify its intentions to developers.
- The new wording of the proposed Plan clearly indicates many options for the property.
- Possibility of limiting height of institutional uses [e.g., a ten (10) story hospital].
- A low-rise building was described as in the neighborhood of three (3) to four (4) stories maximum. In all of our Residential Districts we allow a maximum of three (3) stories in height. Residences may not exceed three (3) stories or forty-five (45) feet in height.

Upon a roll call, the vote on the amendment to the original motion was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to amend the original motion, as amended, to state "When development occurs, it should be low-rise buildings." The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cannon.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- A question was raised whether a religious institution would be an acceptable use, according to this amendment. Commission Members stated that it would be considered according to policy in force at the time of the request.

Upon a roll call, the vote on the amendment to the original motion, as amended, was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Upon a roll call, the vote on the original motion [item 2], as amended was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Item #3 was presented by Director Duepner for consideration of the Commission.

A motion to approve revision of the Comprehensive Plan relative to neighborhood commercial areas at Hog Hollow and Ladue Road was made by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner O'Brien.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Concern about the western boundary being at the west side of the Phillips 66 Station. Also, the western boundary on the southern side of Olive may need to be further to the west [Petzold Road] including the old Lake School property.
- Concern that extending the commercial property designation would infringe upon the residential nature of the surrounding properties.

Upon a roll call, the vote on the original motion [item 3], was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, no; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 7 to 1.

A motion to Re-adopt the entire Comprehensive Plan, as amended, was made by Commissioner Cannon and seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

Upon a roll call, the vote to Re-adopt the entire Comprehensive Plan, as amended, was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

Chairman McGuinness noted that the last paragraph in the letter regarding the Final Report on Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance should state: "Upon approval by the Planning Commission, the final report on the Zoning and Subdivision, along with the Updated Comprehensive Plan would be forwarded to the City Council."

A motion to approve the Final Report on Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance dated May 29, 1991, from the Department of Planning/Economic Development, as modified by the Planning Commission to delete the recommendation and to say "along with the Updated Comprehensive Plan" was made by Commissioner Domahidy and seconded by Commissioner O'Brien.

Upon a roll call, the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, yes; Commissioner Cannon, yes; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

- E. P.Z. 11-91 Hufton Construction Company; a change of zoning from "C-8" Planned Commercial District to "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District; south side of Ladue Road, east of Green Trails Drive South.

Planning Specialist Joseph Hanke stated that the Department is currently reviewing this petition and will be evaluating the issues, as stated in the memo to the Commission. He further stated the Department's recommendation that this matter be held, according to Planning Commission policy.

CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY COMMISSIONERS

- A serious analysis of this site in the context of what a neighborhood retail node should encompass.
- Concern that the existing retail center has a history of businesses closing.
- Concern over maintaining existing commercial property.
- More neighborhood centers could minimize traffic in the City.

A motion to hold the matter was made by Commissioner Scruggs and seconded by Commissioner Sherman. The motion passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.

- F. Correspondence from Director of Planning/Economic Development concerning Street Design.

This item was received and filed by the Commission.

SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, AND SIGNS

- A. P.Z. 3-90 Dean R. Frankiewicz [Chesterfield Valley Golf Center]; CUP in "NU" Non-Urban and "FPNU" Flood Plain Non-Urban District Architectural Elevations; north side of North Outer Forty, east of Boones Crossing.

Director Duepner presented the report for review by the Commission.

On behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to approve the architectural elevations as follows:

- a) The club house structure is to be of concrete block.
- b) The concrete block is to be natural grey.
- c) The mortar would be colored to match the block.
- d) The green roof was satisfactory.
- e) The horizontal siding is to be painted grey to approximately match the concrete block.
- f) The triangle formed by the face rafters and the horizontal areas of the gutters would be painted white.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Domahidy, and passed by a voice vote of 6 to 2, with Commissioner's O'Brien and McGuinness voting no.

- B. P.C. 36-88 Barnes Continuing Care; MXD Architectural Elevations; south side of Olive Boulevard, west of Appalachian Trail Drive.

Director Duepner presented the revised elevations for review by the Commission.

A motion to hold the matter was made by Commissioner Kirchoff, on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Domahidy.

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION

- Concern was raised relative to need for the proposed seven (7) foot height of the screening.
- The Commission requested that screening material be less apparent. It was felt that the proposed materials and decorative trim would attract more attention to this portion of the building than desired by Commission.
- Some examples of acceptable screening were at the locations of: St. Luke's Surrey Place and Broadmoor Condominiums.

The motion to hold was approved by a voice vote of 8 to 0.

- C. P.C. 61A-74 Mason-Cassilly, Inc. [Broadmoor]; PEU in "R-5" Residence District Amended Site Development Plan; north side of Clayton Road, east of Baxter Road.

Director Duepner presented the request and the Department's recommendation of approval of the revised plan.

On behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to approve the Department's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Domahidy and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.

D. Valley Place; Large Lot Subdivision in "NU" Non-Urban District; east side of Eatherton Road, north of Wild Horse Creek Road.

Director Duepner presented the request for Commission consideration.

On behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee, Commissioner Kirchoff made a motion to approve the Department's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Domahidy and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0.

Chairman McGuinness confirmed that the annual dinner will be at Commissioner Cannon's house.

Chairman McGuinness referred the By-Laws to the Procedures Committee for review and recommendation.

Chairman McGuinness made a motion that the Nominating Committee consist of all Commissioners. She would like to have that portion of Article 3, Section 1, of the By-Laws suspended so that she may place all the Members of the Planning Commission on the Nominating Committee. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sherman.

Upon a roll call, the vote was as follows: Commissioner Brown, no; Commissioner Cannon, abstain; Commissioner Domahidy, yes; Commissioner Kirchoff, yes; Commissioner O'Brien, yes; Commissioner Scruggs, yes; Commissioner Sherman, yes; Chairman McGuinness, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 1, with 1 abstention.

Chairman McGuinness appointed Commissioners Dalton, Brown, Cannon, Domahidy, McGuinness, Sherman and O'Brien to the Nominating Committee, with McGuinness and Domahidy serving as Co-Chairs.

The Nominating Committee meeting will be before the June 10th meeting of the Planning Commission. The Nominating Committee will report to the Commission.

Chairman McGuinness brought up discussion about the possibility of changing meeting dates during the months of July, August and September.

Director Duepner stated that the City Council and the Planning and Economic Development Committee of the City Council are meeting only once in July, August and September. Any actions that are taken by the Planning Commission pass through the Planning and Economic Development Committee. He suggested to Chairman McGuinness that the Planning Commission revise its schedule in accordance, because if meetings are held on the fourth Monday of each month, those items will be delayed going to City Council, as the only meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee will be on the Wednesday following the third Monday of each month in July, August and September.

- Concern was expressed over the possible length of Planning Commission meetings.
- The Planning Commission met throughout the year last summer.

The Commission directed Director Duepner to determine whether a second meeting during the months of July, August and September would be necessary. If necessary, he will meet with the Chairman to decide whether or not to have a meeting. If a petition is filed and accepted, we are required by Ordinance to have a public hearing within a prescribed time period. Agendas for the Planning Commission close ten (10) days prior to the Commission meeting.

The Commission decided that, unless otherwise determined by the Chair and the Director, there would be a meeting in July and August on the second Monday only [July 8 and August 12, respectively].

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

William Kirchoff, Secretary

[MINS-29]