

PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

Meeting - May 3, 1989

P.Z. 6-89 Chesterfield Development Corporation

A Hearing was held before the Planning and Economic Development Committee on May 3, 1989, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers of the City of Chesterfield. Committee Members in attendance were Richard Hrabko, Chairman (Ward IV); Councilmember Jade Bute (Ward II); Councilmember Betty Hathaway (Ward I); Councilmember Dan Hurt (Ward III). Also in attendance were Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning/Economic Development, and Anna Kleiner, Planning Specialist.

Speaking on behalf of the petitioner was Mr. Thomas Utterback, Attorney. Mr. Utterback addressed the Committee relative to legal issues.

Other Speakers

Mr. Paul Susman, 14307 Millchester Circle - speaking in opposition.

Mr. John Stobbe, 1227 Hidden Oak - speaking in opposition.

Mr. Randy Aselage, 7011 Emerson, Creve Coeur - speaking in opposition.

Rebuttal

Mr. Utterback spoke in rebuttal of those persons speaking in opposition.

The Committee took P.Z. 6-89 Chesterfield Development Corporation under advisement, for consideration at their meeting of May 17, 1989.

[PH5-3M]

199.10.1896-196  
OF THE  
PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
Minutes - May 3, 1989

A public hearing meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee of the City of Chesterfield City Council was held on May 3, 1989 at 7:00 P.M. In attendance were Councilmember Richard Hrabko, Chairman (Ward IV),

Richard Hrabko, Chairman, called the meeting to order. He explained the process of the public hearing, which is held before the Planning & Economic Development Committee, which is made up of four Councilmembers, one from each ward. All planning and zoning matters go through this Committee after they leave the Planning Commission and recommendations are made and then passed on to the Committee as a whole and voted on at a later date. He stated that the Committee had been requested by the petitioner for P.Z. 6-89, the Chesterfield Development Corporation, to have a public hearing and the Committee wanted to honor his request. Mr. Hrabko also stated that notices had been sent out to those folks that participated in the public hearing when it was conducted before the Planning Commission to advise them that there would be a public hearing. The rules are simple Mr. Hrabko said, the Committee is going to give the petitioner fifteen (15) minutes to make a presentation. The Committee is going to allow

anyone that wants to speak, with any information that they might have, five (5) minutes after the petitioner is done and then the Committee will give the petitioner five (5) minutes of rebuttal time at the end, if there is any opposition that the petitioner needs to talk to. Mr. Hrabko said at this time, the Committee would like to ask the petitioner, whoever is going to represent them, to come forward and speak into the microphone, because the Committee is recording the proceedings for the minutes and to identify themselves and make their presentation.

Mr. Tom Utterback came forward and stated - Now, we don't intend to make a presentation tonight, nor to try to sell you on the project. We are all knowledgeable people and you know the property involved in this project. You surely must know as absolutely by itself it has absolutely no other use and is a commercial development. You, that is the City, has received substantial information and communication and evidence from my clients from this project. We have presented to you a good project. We believe for this City, its citizens and my clients, all come out well. I will certainly be here and answer any questions that you have on the particular project. I want to make it clear at this time that we did not get our appropriate commercial zoning in this City and that you as individuals take a grave risk of having all of your actions reviewed by Federal Courts. 1978, this is relatively recent law, a case called Monel vs. Department of Social Services, the United States Supreme Court found that municipalities may be sued under 42 U.S. Code

1963. That is the Civil Rights Act. Likewise, under Federal Law, Federal or state-court type claims may also be joined in a federal lawsuit in the U.S. District Court. Now what this means is that should this matter evolve into a matter of litigation, that my client can sue the City of Chesterfield in Federal Court and can also, in Federal Court, seek review of your zoning decisions. Likewise, I can enjoin all appropriate parties, which would include members or at least selected members of the Council as well as appropriate officers, City officers and its appropriate members of the Planning and Zoning Commission. A brief description of Section 1983 is just this: It imposes liability for violations of rights protected by the United States Constitution and Federal Statute. Now this includes, amongst other things, violations for procedural due process that denied to a particular plaintiff the use of the plaintiff's property. Likewise, Section 1983, also includes claims based on violations of substantive rights. For example, City of Chesterfield, may have afforded all the appropriate hearings along the way on a zoning application but by reason of the substantive action taken by the government it will have violated the substantive constitutional right; such as the right to use one's property as is necessary and reasonable. Suing a municipality under 1983, a court must make a determination as to whether or not the offending act was one of official municipal policy. And we strongly suspect that officials advising the City Council and even perhaps the Council itself, or at least certain members have

received and the zoning law of this State. Now by the way, it's just zoning code, but the restrictions that the law places upon the zoning authority in the State of Missouri. Now presuming that appointed officers as well as elected officials have proceeded with the responsibilities with a careless disregard of that which the law requires and understands, zoning as a legal matter, risk being liable under Section 1933 results. Now it may be that some of you are thinking that how could we think of such a thing. But when I see articles in the paper and presuming that this article correctly states that a Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission, in this City, stated that she wanted to have, for example, to have the Commission have final approval or tenants in a development. Folks, statements like that, make a 1983 case. Now, in the course of these proceedings, we have made the City aware of appropriate case law, which deals directly on the issues involving my clients application. There are in many instances, recent Supreme Court cases, which have clarified matters in zoning that existed unclear for many years. Should the court and a jury, for example, agree that we had presented a clear case for commercial zoning, then not only will we have created the situation, wherein the Court could grant us our zoning. We will also then have created the situation where a jury can award us damages from the City. And damages including punitive damages from individual City officers. Please understand, that the Supreme Court, in recent years, for the first time has said, City, you know you can not

face the attitude and, longer, well, you take us to court and if we're wrong you get your zoning. In the appropriate circumstances, you're going to pay for the damages. Please note, that there is substantial case law under 1983 litigation. Now this is only existing since '78, mind you, but even with that, substantial case law where municipalities have been responsible to pay damages in situations where they have been found to be grossly negligent or deliberately indifferent, in regard to trying (unintelligible). Obviously, my clients tried very hard not to be involved in litigation. The corporation is not in the business of doing business of suing cities or individuals who are officers of cities. However, in the course of doing business, principals of my client, sued municipalities and local governments and have prevailed. This is not something new to them. So if your wondering whether I have a client who will stay the course, I do. In summary, let me set out the City's choices as we see it. The City can refuse appropriate zoning on the tract of ground in question and then will very likely face Federal litigation. In that Federal litigation and presuming a prevailing plaintiff, the City could then be forced to grant the zoning required, pay damages resulting from a period of time from when the zoning should have been granted and was not to the resolution of the dispute. Attorney's fees of the prevailing plaintiff, that's part of 1983. And subject its officers to the possibility of paying punitive damages, which obviously would be a multiple of the other damages established or the City can grant

appropriate zoning and receive a substantial amount of property, worth into the many hundreds or thousands of dollars for the straightening of Olive Boulevard. Receive value and improvements to major thoroughfares, for example, Olive and White and would likewise see the resolution of a drainage problem that affects traffic on Olive, whenever it rains heavily or sometimes even when it doesn't rain heavily. All of this, in addition, to getting a fine project for the City. Please understand, however, though, if we prevail in the litigation, three acres of very expensive ground would not be given to either the City or the State Highway Commission and if we have to go through that process of litigation, come the time that Olive is to be straightened, that land is going to be paid for by whatever appropriate governmental entity is doing the project at commercial rates and that's what the law requires. Likewise, if zoning need be obtained through the courts, instead of from this City, my client will challenge any attempt to require to pay any impact fees or provide any improvements that may not be required by law. Understand also that in the State of Missouri, there is no authorizing constitutional provision or statutory provision for any municipality or county government to charge impact fees of any type in the State of Missouri. That is for example why everytime in St. Louis County, that somebody seriously challenges it is always worked out. Please understand, that if we go to litigation in this matter and proceed with necessary discovery, we expect to find a group of officers implementing policy that

have had no training and no experience to assist the law regarding their actions. And again, I want to emphasize that the work of a Planning and Zoning Commissioner is to work with the City as regards zoning, is not the type of city planning or planning that you would get from some consultant; this is of legal matter. I suggest that the City Council, on this matter, go into Executive Session and discuss this matter with your attorney, Mr. Beach. My statement will obviously serve as a substantial threat of litigation, so as to enable the City Council to take this matter into Executive Session under the State Abidance Laws. I am confident that if this committee and the Council does that and if they study this closely and apply case law that's in the books to this particular situation, that we're going to get our zoning. Now, this is the tough part. When you're in public office, you don't just do and you cannot just do what you want to do. There's a system of laws and the laws require that you do certain things. There's a balancing test in this. So all we're suggesting is that you do consider this carefully. We certainly suggest that you do this in Executive Session, because folks we don't want to fight. But, as I think cases that we have cited to you indicate (unintelligible). For example, a thing like the Olive Street Road Study, in terms of what you have to do, as City officials, is worthless. No application that cannot have (unintelligible) any consideration and I have heard some, given by officials of this City that mean that this particular tract of ground, if its not developed in



this way or if this petition is denied, that it will somehow find its way into that greater tract of ground behind it. As the Sunset Hills case indicates to you which we have cited to you folks, we would have to take each piece of ground on its particular merits. You cannot do what you want to do. You don't have the authority to approve (unintelligible) in the subdivision. You don't have the authority to do a lot of things sometimes (unintelligible) developers are in the business to make money as most people are in the business to make money. They will bend every which way they can to accommodate a municipal or a county government if they can. If the numbers add up, their inclined to do a particular project. But, you can push a developer a long way, but when you push him off a cliff that's just the end of it. Now we've addressed this board in this way, simply because we had a 7 to 0 vote against us from the Planning & Zoning Commission. I have not discussed this matter with any of you folks here privately or and certainly don't intend to. So I don't know what the vote is on the City Council. I have not counted heads; don't intend to do that. What I did want to do though, is let you all know that we are very, very serious about this and we did not come here with anymore fine little charts and little drawings, and so forth. That's all been done. This, frankly, we believe, in terms of planning and zoning, following it by the law, this is just about one of the clearest cases you can possibly see for commercial zoning. Again, as the Sunset Hills case indicated, and as I have seen so often, Sunset Hills

attempted to stop commercial development along Lincoln  
Boulevard, very much as apparently certain members, at least at  
this point on the Planning and Zoning Commission are intent upon  
stopping development along Olive. You can't do it. It's not  
within your authority. So close, if you have any questions, we'd  
be glad to answer them. Obviously, I am sure you (unintelligible)  
any particular law at this point, this is certainly not the  
forum. If you have any particular questions on the project  
itself, we can answer those. Although we believe that you folks  
are very knowledgeable regarding the project.

Mr. Hrabko stated that he found it very interesting that Mr.  
Utterback asked for this Public Hearing so that he could lecture  
the Committee on the law.

Mr. Utterback stated that he did not ask for a Public Hearing.  
Mr. Hrabko said, yes you did, you requested a Public Hearing.

Mr. Utterback said it was understood that this matter was  
referred to Committee and all I simply asked is that we could  
make an appearance before the Committee. I did not ask for any  
public hearing.

Mr. Hrabko stated that appearances before this Council are in the  
form of a public hearing, which allows not only you to speak your  
piece but others to speak their piece and it's a public hearing.

Mr. Utterback said that's your choice, but that was not my  
understanding and as you are certainly aware, other cities in  
other governments do business differently. That every time you

...in their report a public hearing.  
Mr. Hrabko stated that the vote of the Planning Commission was 5  
to 0, not 7 to 0.

Mr. Utterback stated that he asked for confirmation of that in  
writing and had not received that from the staff.

Mr. Hrabko asked was it a similar vote in the County when this  
petition was brought up before the County.

Mr. Utterback said I think probably so.

Mr. Hrabko said, unanimously opposing it on the Planning  
Commission of the County?

Mr. Utterback stated that he couldn't recall but that may have  
been the case.

Mr. Hrabko stated that he was rather disappointed because he  
thought Mr. Utterback was going to bring some facts so that the  
Committee could really look at this project objectively, instead  
of a lecture on the law. Mr. Hrabko stated that the Committee had  
a lawyer, we pay him \$90,000.00 a year or whatever to advise us  
on the law. Mr. Hrabko asked if anybody on the Committee had any  
questions.

Mr. Utterback asked Mr. Hrabko if there were any other facts that  
he had not heard and that there's nothing else that you can hear.

Mr. Hrabko said the Committee had the staff report and Planning  
Commission report. Mr. Hrabko attended the public hearing  
personally and they have some questions.

Mr. Utterback asked if the staff report and Planning Commission  
report were available.

Mr. Utterback said he reviewed the record and was satisfied.  
Mr. Utterback said he reviewed the record and was not sure about  
yet.

Mr. Hrabeto asked if anyone on the Committee had any questions of  
Mr. Utterback.

Mr. Hrabeto thanked Mr. Utterback and asked if anyone else wished  
to speak on P. 2. 3-1977.

Mr. Hrabeto called Mr. Paul Sussman forward to speak and asked him  
to identify himself as to where he lives.

Mr. Sussman stated that he lives in Westmill Estates, which is  
about 3/4 mile east of the particular site that is under  
discussion. He addressed the City Council members that on  
February 27, 1989, he spoke in opposition to this rezoning before  
the Chesterfield Planning Commission. He said he is not going to  
repeat those remarks because they are part of the record as is  
the County Planning Commission report and the report of the  
Director of Parks and Recreation. Both from which Mr. Sussman  
quoted extensively. What Mr. Sussman wanted to comment on is that  
easily over a period of time, a City with the qualities possessed  
by the City of Chesterfield, can be trashed by people who are  
motivated more by greed than by any sense of responsibility. He  
stated that a strip shopping center located on this site will  
open all of Olive Street Road to commercial development. He said  
that right now on Olive Street Road, just east of this site, six  
homes have for sale signs on them, just waiting for the  
opportunity to go commercial. He stated that its no coincidence

That these steps appeared subsequent to the petitioners' first attempt to receive an order. He said once recording process starts regardless of how innocuous a project it might be, the project snowballs. He said no civic force can stop it, because even the courts will side with the developer, if and its a big if, if another developer has already been granted permission to rezone in this area. He stated an excellent example of this insidious process is downtown Creve Coeur. Thirty years ago Olive Street Road and the streets adjacent to it in Creve Coeur looked very much like Olive Street Road in Chesterfield looked now. The developers who built the first or second strip shopping centers probably had no idea that what they started along Olive would end up looking as it does now. Lights on every corner, a steady stream of slow-moving traffic and a hodge podge of stores and buildings with no sense of order or zoning, the epitome of rampant, tasteless commercialism. Mr. Susman said we already have the Chesterfield Mall area; we definitely do not need the rest of Olive Street Road and Clarkson Road looking just like Olive looks in Creve Coeur. But, Mr. Susman stated, in ten to twenty years, exactly that will happen, if we take that first step and allow this strip shopping center here in an area where none now exists. Mr. Susman said that he doesn't deny that this petitioner has every right to try to get his petition approved, even if he wants to go to court to do it, but let's dispense with the self-serving hogwash that this project will benefit the City, and its residents. Mr. Susman said this is simply another money-

making schemes for a few people, who have no concern for the well being of Chesterfield but demand that the City hold still while they just spoil it.

Mr. Hrabko asked if anyone had any questions for Mr. Susman.

Mr. Hrabko asked if Mr. Susman was a lawyer? Mr. Susman said no and Mr. Hrabko thanked him.

Mr. Hrabko called Mr. John Stobbe to speak.

Mr. Stobbe stated that he didn't wish to reiterate the comments that were made at the public hearing before the Planning Commission, those are all a matter of record. Mr. Stobbe simply wished to urge the committee to very strongly consider the comments and statements that were made by the citizens at the public hearing. There was a strong case made to deny this request and Mr. Stobbe encouraged the Committee to consider those and not to be intimidated by Mr. Utterback's threats tonight as Mr. Stobbe would see them. Mr. Stobbe said the petitioner, at the public hearing, made a case that commercial development of this tract of ground was the only plausible use of this ground and facts were brought out at the public hearing that disprove that; that there are other uses that could be put to this tract of ground and Mr. Stobbe urges you to consider those.

Mr. Hrabko asked if there were any questions of Mr. Stobbe.

Mr. Hrabko called Mr. Randy Aselage to speak.

Mr. Aselage said he lives in Creve Coeur and was acting as an agent for a property owner. Mr. Aselage said that it appears from the little knowledge that he personally has upon the facts

presented this evening that the information that we do have about the project in the past is that it shows little sensitivity to any of the abutting properties, which could be made available for a properly designed development. Mr. Aselage said there are numerous areas up and down Olive Street Road, in close proximity to this site, that do have residential uses to them and he would like the board to take that into consideration.

Mr. Hrabko asked if anyone had any questions for Mr. Aselage.

Mr. Hrabko asked if there were any other speakers? He asked if Mr. Utterback wanted to say anything else?

Mr. Utterback said he wanted to propose to the committee that the only way that this body or that this City satisfy the desires of the people (unintelligible) is by keeping that land vacant. proposal condominium project same objections perhaps worse objections (unintelligible) that number of people small children right next to a four lane highway. Only alternative use expressed at the last public hearing was the evidence put forth by my client and the economic analysis that showed those simply not liable. The land is long (unintelligible) itself to residential development and it also indicates that the board at that past public hearing my clients (unintelligible) two projects under development in Chesterfield. If it could be developed residentially, it would be developed residential. You do not have the alternative unless you can buy it at fair market value to leave that property (unintelligible). That I think is a key analysis. This City needs to go back and do some seriously apply

some weight to that; leaving politics and everything else aside. Mr. Utterback said to Mr. Hratko that if he was offended him by both being a lawyer or by talking about the law, he does so because of the fact that this whole process, that this whole City is nothing but a creature of law.

Mr. Hurt had a question for Mr. Utterback. He said, keeping in mind that the Committee likes to consider themselves responsible people too, we are elected officials and we want to represent the people in the best manner possible. Mr. Hurt said that one of the statements that Mr. Utterback made early was that the Planning and Zoning Committee were not experts in planning and zoning. Mr. Utterback stated what he said was that they didn't receive any training in what the law requires of them. Mr. Hurt said that gives indication Mr. Utterback doesn't consider them experts and asked if that was an incorrect assumption. Mr. Utterback said no I do not consider them experts. Mr. Hurt said since we are inclined to listen to the people and the experts in our opinion and which we have hired a city administration which we consider certified people in our staff to address these type of situations, since we don't consider ourselves experts in everything also. Mr. Hurt said he assumes based on their recommendations and the County recommendations, Mr. Utterback had a disagreement with them also, so possibly you can direct us to some people you do consider experts because we thought we addressed them all. Mr. Utterback said that he suggested they confer with Mr. Beach, and certainly suggest that in that



conference you might want to ask Mr. Duerper if he considered in his approach to the situations, cases like the Sunset Hills case and he would submit to you that Mr. Duerper does not consider those things, that he is a planner. Mr. Utterback stated that that wasn't good enough if you are a City planner because you can't follow the law. Mr. Hurt asked again for guidance. Mr. Utterback stated he didn't intend to tell the City who they should talk to. He was trying simply to say and understands the position the City is in and represented City governments and does represent City governments and has for twenty years. Mr. Utterback said we intend to hold you all responsible for this. Mr. Hurt said Mr. Utterback stated that we don't have the authority to stop this development and the question is the people need to understand that if we don't have the authority to stop it or proceed with it, whatever the choice is, the question to Mr. Utterback is then, who does? Mr. Utterback, stated that the Committee has the authority to regulate it within reason, that's what the law allows you to do. You have the right of reasonable regulation, you cannot deny unto a property owner the reasonable use of his property. If a matter is debatable, if its a borderline situation, a court will always defer to the City Council. So when we go to court like in the Sunset Hills case, we have to show clear and convincing evidence, that there is only one use that property has and as in the Sunset Hills case we think that we will prevail. We could be wrong, I would certainly rely after consultation with your attorney.

Mr. Hrabko said there were no further speakers and that the Committee would take P.2.6 -89 under advisement and will discuss it at the next meeting in two weeks at the regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Hrabko adjourned the public hearing.

PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes - May 3, 1989

A meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee of the City of Chesterfield City Council was held on May 3, 1989, at 5:30 p.m. In attendance were Councilmember Richard Hrabko, Chairman (Ward IV); Councilmember Jude Bute (Ward II); Councilmember Betty Hathaway (Ward I); Councilmember Dan Hart (Ward III); Jerry Daepler, Director of Planning/Economic Development, and Anna Kleiner, Planning Specialist.

Item #1 - Subdivision information and direction signs. This item had been held from the prior meeting, and it was anticipated that a representative from the Home Builder's Association would be in attendance. However, no one from the Home Builder's Association attended the meeting. The Committee directed the Department of Planning/Economic Development to pursue enforcement of sign regulations relative to subdivision information and direction signs, particularly in the area of Wild Horse Creek/Long Roads, Clarkson/Wilson Roads, Olive Boulevard/White Road.

Item #2 - Coventry Farm Addition; Subdivision Record Plat, Trust Indenture, Warranty Deed and Improvement Escrow; east side of Kehra Mill Road, north of Clayton Road. Coventry Farm Addition is a single-family subdivision of ten (10) lots for which the Planning Commission recommended approval of the record plat. Trust Indenture, Warranty Deed and Improvement Escrow were recommended for approval by the Department of Planning/Economic Development. A motion for approval was made by Councilmember Bute, seconded by Councilmember Hart, and approved by the Committee by a vote of 4-0.

Note: A bill relative to this matter will be needed for the next Council Meeting.

Item #3 and #4 - P.Z. 8-89 Sullivan Hayes Company; a request for a change of zoning from "R-6A" 4,000 square foot Residence District to "R-1" 1 acre Residence District; 5.5 acre tract of land located along East Drive, approximately 700 feet northwest of Olive Boulevard. (AND) P.Z. 9-89 Sullivan Hayes Company; a request for a change of zoning from "R-6A" 4,000 square foot Residence District and "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District to "C-8" Planned Commercial District; a 19.27 acre tract of land located on Olive Boulevard, between East and West Drive and approximately 200 feet southwest of West Drive. The Planning Commission had recommended approval of both petitions. The Commission recommendation was discussed by the Committee. It was noted that a Public Hearing has been scheduled for P.Z. 9-89 before the Planning and Economic Development Committee on May 17, 1989. Accordingly, the Committee voted 4 to 0 to hold these items on the agenda.

Item #5 - P.Z. 13 and 14-89 R. J. Barry Construction, Inc.; a request for a change of zoning from "AU" Non-Urban District to "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District and a Planned Environment Unit in the "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District; 11.7 acre tract of land located on the north side of Clayton Road, west of Schoettler Road. The Planning Commission by a vote of 6 to 1, with 1 abatement, recommended approval of P.Z. 13 and 14-89. Councilmember Hurt discussed concerns about stormwater in the area, particularly along Schoettler Road. A motion was made by Councilmember Hurt to support the Planning Commission recommendation with amending of Section five (5) of the conditions to indicate that handling of stormwater shall include a requirement that additional detention capacity may be required in order not to exacerbate stormwater problems within the area. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Bute, and passed by a vote of 4-0.

Note: Bills will be needed for the next Council Meeting regarding these items.

Item #6 - The Valley Center Plat 2; a request to amend Ordinance #265, relative to underground wiring; east side of Valley Center Drive, south of Chesterfield Airport Road. The Planning Commission by a vote of 7 to 0, with 1 abatement, recommended denial of the request to amend Ordinance #265. A motion was made by Councilmember Bute to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hathaway, and passed by a vote of 4-0.

Note: This report should be received and filed by the City Council at their next Meeting.

Item #7 - Oaktree Estates; Multi-family Subdivision Easement and Record Plat, Declaration of Condominium, and Improvement Escrow; west side of Schoettler Road, north of Highcroft. The Planning Commission had reviewed and approved the Subdivision Easement and Record Plat. The Department of Planning/Economic Development has reviewed and recommends approval of the Declaration of a Condominium in the Improvement Escrow. A motion was made by Councilmember Bute, and seconded by Councilmember Hathaway to approve the Plat, Declaration, and Escrow. The motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

Note: A bill relative to this matter will be necessary for the May 15th Council Meeting.

Item #8 - Proposal for amendment of sign regulations relative to schools and institutional uses. Mr Duepner presented the proposal for consideration of amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow schools which have roadway frontage greater than 250 feet, but less than 500 feet, two (2) information signs not to exceed fifty (50) square feet each. Upon discussion the Committee decided to hold this matter until their next meeting.

PED Minutes - May 3, 1989  
Page 3

Item #9 - City Council liaison to Citizen Boards and Commissions. The Committee selected the following members to serve as liaison to Citizen Boards and Commissions:

Dick Hrabko	Planning Commission
Betty Hathaway	Board of Adjustment
Dick Hrabko/Dan Hurt	Economic Development Council

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.