

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 26, 1988  
TO: Members - Planning and Economic Development  
FROM: Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning/Economic Development 90  
SUBJECT: Actions taken at September 22nd meeting

---

A meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee was held on Thursday, September 22, 1988 at 5:30 p.m. Those in attendance included Councilmember Dick Hrabko, Chairperson (Ward IV), Councilmember Jade Bute (Ward II), Councilmember Barry Flachsbart (Ward I), Councilmember Ward Overall (Ward III), and Jerry Duepner, Director of Planning/Economic Development.

The first item of business discussed was a memorandum from the Director of Planning concerning "Procedure for Review and Approval of Plats and Plans in the City of Chesterfield." It was the recommendation of Mr. Duepner that only subdivision plats be submitted for review and approval by the City Council, as required by State statutes. All other plans and plats such as site development plans, boundary adjustment plats, and display house plats, would be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Following discussion of the matter, the Committee recommended that, henceforth, all plans and plats, with the exception of subdivision plats, be reviewed and approved only by the Planning Commission, but that the Commission may refer such a matter to the City Council for approval if they so decide. The Committee instructed Mr. Duepner to prepare a policy memorandum reflecting this action.

The second issue discussed by the Committee was the Policy for Meetings of the Planning and Economic Development Committee. In a memorandum to the Committee, Mr. Duepner had recommended that the Committee serve as the public hearing body, rather than the entire City Council, for zoning and special procedure requests recommended by the City Planning Commission. It was noted that such Committee hearings would not be in lieu of the Planning Commission hearing, and could be attended by any member of the City Council. The hearing date would be set by the Committee and notice of the hearing would be sent to all persons who spoke on the matter at the Planning Commission public hearing. The members of the Committee were of the opinion that, in addition to those situations where a hearing may be required by the Zoning Ordinance (i.e., a valid protest of special procedure request), that any other matter would need to be referred by a majority of the Council, or both Councilmembers of the ward in which the request is located.

Actions taken at September 22nd meeting  
Page Two

Concerning the format of the hearings, the Committee was of the opinion that time should be allocated for both proponents and opponents. At the hearings, the Chairperson of the Committee would direct all questions, and that at a minimum the City Administrator and the Director of Planning should attend. At the end of a hearing, the Committee would make a recommendation which would be forwarded to the City Council.

Following discussion, the Committee recommended that it serve as the public hearing body for City Council on zoning and special procedure requests; that matters would be referred for hearing by majority of Council or by both Councilmembers of the Ward in which the particular matter is located, with the exception of those items referred via provisions of the Zoning Ordinance; and that the Director of Planning prepare a policy memorandum to that effect.

The third issue before the Committee was public notification concerning Planning Commission hearings. Mr. Duepner indicated that he was in the process of contacting other municipalities in St. Louis County concerning their policy on public notification. It was suggested by the Committee that a notice could be sent to the trustees of subdivisions in close proximity to a proposal. Mr. Duepner advised the Committee that he would take this into consideration in developing a policy, and would report back to the Committee on the matter at an upcoming meeting.

The next items of discussion were those matters considered by the Planning Commission at their September 12 meeting:

1. P.C. 6-88 (Toys R Us) - this request for rezoning to "C-8" Planned Commercial District and amended "C-8" District, was recommended for denial by the Planning Commission by a vote of 6 to 2. The members of the Committee voted unanimously to send the matter to the City Council with no recommendation, but, that consideration be given by the Council to any request presented by the petitioner to the Council.
2. P.C. 8-88 (C. and J. Properties) - this request for an amended "C-8" District was recommended for denial by the Commission vote of 8 - 0 - 1. The members of the Committee voted unanimously to accept the Commission recommendation, and to recommend denial of this petition by the City Council.

Attached to this memo please find copies of policy statements concerning plat and plan approval, and hearings before the Planning and Economic Development Committee; the minutes of the September 12 Planning Commission meeting; and the Commission reports on P.C. 6-88 and P.C. 8-88.

/sl

Attachments

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
AT CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL, SEPTEMBER 26, 1988  
PUBLIC HEARING

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

PRESENT

Mr. Edward Bidzinski  
Ms. Mary Brown  
Mr. Charles Bryant  
Ms. Mary Domahidy  
Mr. Lester Golub  
Mr. William Kirchoff  
Dr. Claude Pritchard  
Councilmember Dick Hrabko  
City Attorney Doug Beach  
Ms. June Schroeder  
Mr. Jerry Duepner  
Ms. Sandra Lohman

ABSENT

Ms. Kimberly Burnett

Rev. Joseph Pins from Ascension Catholic Church delivered the Invocation.

The Pledge of Allegiance was lead by Chad DeVoe.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS - CHAIRMAN BARBARA MCGUINNESS

P.C. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19-88, Miceli Development Company

P.C. 14-88 Request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to C-8 Planned Commercial District for a 23.2 acre tract of land on the east side of Clarkson Road and the north side of Kehrs Mill Road. The proposed use is a shopping center with office buildings, financial institutions, restaurant and stores, shops, markets and service facilities.

P.C. 15-88 Request for a change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District for an 18.3 acre tract of land on the east side of Clarkson Road and the north side of Kehrs Mill Road.

P.C. 16-88 Request for a change in zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District for a 39.1 acre tract of land on the east side of Clarkson Road and the north side of Kehrs Mill Road.

P.C. 17-88 Request for a Planned Environment Unit procedure for a "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District and a "R-2" 15,000 square foot Residence District for a 57.4 acre tract of land on the east side of Clarkson Road and the north side of Kehrs Mill Road for a single family residential development.

P.C. 18-88 Request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non-Urban District to "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District for a 7.0 acre tract of land on the east side of Clarkson Road and the north side of Kehrs Mill Road.

P.C. 19-88 Request for a Planned Environment procedure Unit for a "R-3" 10,000 square foot Residence District for a 7.0 acre tract of land on the east side of Clarkson Road and the north side of Kehrs Mill Road for a single family residential development.

Al Michenfelder, an Attorney for Miceli, described the petition with the aid of slides. The Commercial development is a joint venture of Miceli Holding Company and Paragon Group project. The actual development will be by Paragon.

The commercial development would total 207,000 square feet of floor area. Uses would include 75,000 square feet for a supermarket; 89,000 square feet of retail shops; a freestanding drive-in bank; a two story 24,000 square feet office building; and a third freestanding structure would be a top quality restaurant. The proposed residential development would consist of 164 single family residences. Minimal of size within the "R-2" District would be 10,000 square feet, and 7500 square feet within the "R-3" District.

Mr. Michenfelder said that Miceli agreed to meet with the State and St. Louis County Highway Departments to discuss requirements.

The Commission stated concern about the supermarkets which existed in the area. Also, the condition of Kehrs Mill Road is a concern, especially with the addition of 20,000 traffic movements.

Mr. Michenfelder said there was a complete market analysis to determine the need for a market. He indicated that the traffic would have been approximately the same as if the Jr. College had been built.

Mr. Bill Bunte, of Crawford, Bunte and Brenemeier, gave the traffic report. Clarkson Road will be widened to 5 lanes, two through lanes in each direction, plus a center lane for left turns. At Kehrs Mill intersection, Kehrs Mill will also be widened. Therefore, the capacity of this intersection will be more than doubled from what it is today.

The Commission asked if the safety factor has been considered in relation to emergencies, police and fire vehicles, and if there could be alternate plans for entry to the subdivision. Mr. Bunte said that Kehrs Mill Road improvements would provide adequate safety measures, and there he would look into this and advise the Board of his findings on Kehrs Mill improvements.

The Commission asked whether the project fits into area S. Mr. Michenfelder said the study was not articulate in alternatives to the College. The report speaks only in terms of an alternate development to the College with reference to a small part of the tract on the eastern portion, identified on map. He is requesting that the Commission decide what the use should be.

Mr. Golub quoted the guidelines for Area S and S1, which indicated that the land should be used for residential in the event the Jr. College did not develop the land. Mr. Michenfelder said that only a part of a site was recommended to be residential.

Ms. Domahidy questioned the site plan. She stated it was already packed both residentially and commercially. Regarding the commercial, she asked if he compared the intensity of this commercial with that at Clarkson and Baxter, or at Clayton and Clarkson. Mr. Michenfelder could not give the acreage. The proposed development he calculated as 9,000 square feet of commercial development per acre. He believes this size is not in the intense range for retail development.

Ms. Brown asked Mr. Michenfelder to indicate how many homes will fit the R3, 10,000 feet, and how many homes will fit R2, 15,000 square feet. Mr. Michenfelder said to develop the entire 64 acres could be approximately 182 homes, combining R2 and R3 permissible maximum. The request is for 164, the rest to be common ground. The request is broken into two pieces in case Rockwood would like to switch properties for the planned school. Mr. Bogard said the number of homes planned in the R3 are 69, and 95 in the R2.

Ms. Domahidy said the additional parking is not an advantage, there is not enough green space. Mr. Michenfelder said the additional parking is required for the supermarket. If more green space is determined necessary, he will consider a trade-off.

Dr. Pritchard asked if Miceli would be willing to admit the petition to include the whole site as residential. Mr. Michenfelder said they gave thought to all types of development, but they felt from the beginning that this was an appropriate location for the type of development which is proposed. No real consideration was given to any other type of development, however, they will consider the request of the Commission.

Ms. McGuiness asked Mr. Michenfelder what would happen to the 3 remaining corners. Mr. Michenfelder said the south east corner (1.7 acres) would probably be commercial. He does not believe the other corners command enough land to develop commercially.

Ms. Domahidy indicated the project would affect each municipalities, not only in terms of future use of land on the corner, but also in terms of suppling services. Mr. Michenfelder said a cooperative approach is necessary.

Mr. Hrabko stated a goal of the City Council is to develop a Park System. Is there any possibility of dedicating this area around the lake area as a park area? Mr. Michenfelder said the lake itself is about 2.6 acres, the green around it must add up to another acre. If the city has an interest, the developer might be interested in discussing.

Mr. Kirchoff recommended the commercial footage be shaved to some extent, maybe the residential also, such as using R2 throughout, not a combination of R2 and R3. Mr. Michenfelder said the developer and he would consider all comments.

Speakers in Favor of Petition None.

Speakers in Opposition

1. Tom Maddox, 15814 Country Ridge, President of the Trustees Association, representing Clarkson Woods South indicated the need for a Chesterfield Land Use Plan to be developed first. He expressed concern over the traffic, stating that the roads should be developed before any consideration of additional development of surrounding land. He indicated that a petition signed by 142 residents will be submitted to the Board. He expressed concern regarding the water run-off problems which already exist in Clarkson Woods. Residents are concerned about increased noise pollution. He questioned the meaning of tree retention by the Miceli project, and expressed a need for a Park System.

Ms. McGuinness indicated the Board has received petitions from Clarkson Crossing opposing the proposed development.

2. N. Douglas Pritt, 15975 Bowmell Green Drive, Chesterfield, representing a group from Williamsburg Green, Ballwin gave handouts to Board members. He turned in a petition with 64 resident signatures. He expressed concern about home values in the development area, indicating homes which abut property commercial property sold for approximately \$15,000 less than homes which do not abut commercial property. His study revealed that within a 1.7 mile radius of proposed development, there are: 2 - 5 super markets; 18 restaurants within 1 mile; 38 restaurants within 2 miles of intersection; 32 small retail stores within 1 mile; 212 retail stores within 2 miles; 3 two-story office buildings within 1 mile; 8 office buildings within 2 miles; 5 banks within 1 mile; 10 banks within 2 miles; 6 large retail stores (i.e., Famous Barr, Dillard's) within 1 mile and 17 within 2 miles.

3. Tom Cavedine, 15754 Carriage Hill, representing a group from Carriage Hill, did a survey of number of stores within a 1.5 mile radius. He indicated a concern for noise pollution, crime, traffic, safety of school children.

4. Mr. Tom Wetzel, 15789 Scenic Green Ct., indicated his objection to the existing traffic problem on Kehrs Mill Road/Clarkson, (indicating safety problems on curves). He feels there is already too much commercial development in West County.

5. Mr. Steve Smith, 2318 Sportsmen Hill Drive, Round Hill Subdivision representative, addressed traffic problems. He referred to Lego-Land as a zoning fiasco, and is against the commercial proposal.

Mr. Hrabko stated that curb cuts will be approved by State Highway. An ordinance has been passed against skate boards in the shopping centers. Would you feel that any type of commercial development, scaled down, might be acceptable to your residents? Mr. Smith answered "No."

6. Mr. Paul DeMargel, 15835 Willow Point, representing "Citizens for Residential Harmony" say no to commercial development. The reasons listed were: Precedence, Intensity, Incompatibility and Traffic..

7. Mr. Gil Sherman, Chairman of Chesterfield Road & Trust Advisory Committee, referred to traffic problems. Suggested another left turn light will be required, but not approved by the State. He recommended the project be delayed until further traffic studies are performed.
8. Mr. Troy Burklow, 15760 Carriage Hill, Round Hill Subdivision Resident, stated there is already a glut of housing for sale and property values have decreased. Widen roads first.
9. Ms. Carol Kenney, 16 Ridge Crest, Chesterfield Resident's Association representative, stated the Chesterfield Area Study indicated the land should be single family residences. If it is approved, limit it to 2 entrances; also, consider setting some land aside for a park site.
10. Mr. Allen W. Brown, 15768 Carriage Hill Drive, Round Hill Subdivision, addressed traffic on Kehrs Mill Road and the safety of children attending proposed grade school.
11. Isabelle O'Connor, 15720 Gotting Court, Kehrs Mill Farm representative, submitted a petition against project. She addressed traffic, safety of children, zoning changes, drainage problems in Clarkson Woods, and requested consideration of development of parks.
12. Mr. Robert Lee, 2342 Sportsmen Hill, Round Hill Subdivision, an individual, stated opposition to the proposed development. He questioned the logic of the intersection and the need of another large 24-hour supermarket.
13. Mr. Sanford P. Becker, 2283 Hill House Road, Kehrs Mill Farm Subdivision, individual, stated concern about trees used as buffers to shopping center. The elevation of Kehrs Mill Road will present hazardous driving conditions in inclement weather.
14. Mr. Frank W. Hodgen III, 8 Greenbank Drive, Chairman of Planning and Zoning in Clarkson Valley, expressed concern regarding the residential plan proposed. He pointed out that the plan indicates a potential race track.
15. Mr. Lee Reid, 26 Forest Club Drive, Trustee for Forest Hills, passed due to the completeness of the other presentations.
16. Mr. Jim Cizek, 2301 Westpar Drive, Clarkson Crossing Subdivision, also passed.
17. Ms. Phyllis J. Roggio, 2375 Westpar Drive, Clarkson Crossing Subdivision, also passed.
18. Mr. John R. Maldoon, 15924 Eagles Landing Court, Individual from Clarkson Crossing, referred to the drainage problem, traffic problem, the saturation of commercial property, and school safety problem. He listed various types of commercial buildings in the area to illustrate the saturation of the area.

Opposition (continued)

19. Mr. Fred Scott, 15907 Woodlet Way Court, speaking on behalf of Clarkson Woods residents, indicated that the County allowed a shopping center in front of subdivision 10 years after Miceli built residences. Residents tried, unsuccessfully, to purchase land in order to build tennis courts, swimming pool, etc.

20. Mr. Douglas Crowell, 15550 Windmill, Trustee of Kehrs Mill Bend Subdivision, tried to negotiate with Mr. Miceli, Jr. without resolution on previous matter. He indicated his support of the opposition to the planned development.

REBUTTAL.

Mr. Michenfelder, representing the petitioner, stated the R3 has 69 lots, with a minimum width of 75 feet; in the R2 has 95 lots, with 90 foot lot widths. The need is there for this development. Most of the people have to go east on Clarkson to get to services. The Clarkson Road improvements will not turn it into another Manchester Road because of the present policies in control. Property value studies performed indicated that housing adjacent to commercial developments were not detrimentally affected. Clarkson Center was zoned about 15 years ago as part of a submission of what was once Clarkson Woods, owned by Mr. Erker. Miceli never owned it, the county had no choice but to allow the center to be constructed.

Mr. Bill Bunte, traffic consultant and engineer, Crawford, Bunte and Brammeier, representing the petitioner, stated that the Jr. College would have generated more traffic than the present development. He indicated that the location of the development is ideal due to the location next to a major intersection. The left turns will solve traffic problems. He said the traffic on Clarkson will be relieved somewhat because of the new development. The residents will have these services closer to them. He also indicated that the grade on Kehrs Mill Road will be corrected when the road is realigned.

The Board asked what impact the commercial development traffic will have on the children attending the proposed Rockwood Elementary School. Mr. Bunte stated that this was not looked at specifically. Will take a copy of the site plan and get back to the Board.

The Board asked if the market would be a 24-hour market, and the status of the trees to the North of the retention pond. Mr. Michenfelder answered the market is going to be a 24-hour. He said the Commission did not look at any other use of this tract for the Jr. College other than a small part believed to be S1. His position is not that the study is wrong in any way about the property, but that the study did not speak to the issue.

Chairman Barbara McGuinness asked for a show of hands in favor of P.C. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19-88, which was 21; those opposed, 199.

A recess of 10 minutes was called by Chairman Barbara McGuinness.

P.C. 20-88, Thomas C. Walker c/o John P. King

Mr. Kevin King represented the Outdoor Equipment Company. A request for a change of zoning from "NU" Non Urban District and "FP NU" Flood Plan Non Urban District to "C-8" Flood Plain Planned Commercial District for a 72.4 acre tract of land located on the north side of U.S. Highway 40, approximately 2200 feet east of Long Road. The proposed use of the property is a lawn care equipment sales facility, including outdoor display, offices, warehouse, driving range and golf course, and related uses.

Building A would be a 30,000 square foot structure to house the offices and outdoor equipment the company sells. It will also house maintenance facilities. Parking will be provided around the building. A second building, approximately 36,000 square feet, would be phased depending on the need for expansion. The remaining 65 acres would be used for a driving range or 4 holes for golf. Test plots of sod would be used to test various types of grass used on golf courses. Directional lighting along the driving range is requested, similar to the ball fields already there.

The Board asked if minature golf is a consideration. Also, how will equipment be displayed. Mr. King answered that Minature golf could be considered. Display of equipment would be minimal. The petitioner will submit a building description at a later date for approval. It would be similar to a car dealership.

The Board asked if C-8 zoning is the best. Is it difficult to access. The petitioner will check the zoning. The roads will be improved. Most customer do not come to their site, a traveling sales force is used.

The Board asked if the property is currently owned by petitioner. The petitioner owns property with a contingency attached. The Outer Road improvements will be looked into.

#### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes of the September 12, 1988 Meeting were submitted for approval. The motion was made and approved by the Board. A voice vote was taken with an affirmative result and the Minutes were approved.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

##### Comprehensive Planning Committee

Ms. Domahidy stated that the Committee will meet with Jerry Duepner to discuss the review of 3 Consultants. The Committee would like to be informed of choice of consultants. Copies of proposals should be available for review.

OLD BUSINESS

P.C. 11 and 12-88 Sullivan Hayes Companies

Mr. Duepner recommended a delay of action on this petition until a traffic study is completed. The motion was made by Ms. Brown and seconded by Dr. Pritchard to approve this recommendation. The motion passed 8 to 0.

White Gate Farms Amended Ordinance

Mr Duepner recommended the petitioner submit a new petition, since the plans indicate a significant change from the original presentation. Mr. Bryant made the motion and Ms. Domahidy seconded to allow the petitioner to re-submit the petition subject to a new Public Hearing. The motion passed 8 to 0.

NEW BUSINESS

Logan College of Chiropractic; Information Sign

This is a request by Logan College of Chiropractic to erect a 50 foot information sign to be located adjacent to their Schoettler Road frontage. The College is permitted a 50 foot information sign, however, in compliance with ordinance #129 of the City of Chesterfield, it requires review and approval by the Planning Commission. Mr. Kirchoff made the motion for approval and Mr. Golub seconded for approval of the sign. The Commission approved the request 8 to 0.

P.C. 53 and 54-87; Fischer and Fritchel (Coventry Farm)

The petitioner is requesting approval of an amended Site Development Plan for a planned environment unit, single family project, which is being developed on Kehrs Mill Road, just south of Sycamore. Previously the petitioner has proposed the retention of an existing single family dwellings. No he proposes to remove that structure and build a new structure.

Ms. Brown requested that the Department investigate whether the subdivision information signs at Coventry Farm are in conformance with City regulations.

Mr. Kirchoff made the following recommendation:

Whereas the Planning Commission has reviewed the amended site development plan for P.C. 53 and 54-87 Fischer and Fritchel (known as Coventry Farm) and finds the amendment acceptable; the Commission approves the amended site development plan and directs the owner to record said amended Site Development Plan in the St. Louis county Recorder's Office.

Mr. Bryant seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion 8 to 0.

Texaco Station Building Elevations; southeast corner of Olive Boulevard

This is a request for approval of building elevations for a Texaco located on Schoettler Road and Olive Boulevard. The petitioner submitted a site plan with building elevations that show a building of grey siding, and proposes a number of brick planters that would be located at the entrance of the building, as well as along the frontage of Schoettler and Olive Boulevard.

Mr. Kirchoff made the the following recommendation:

Whereas the Planning Commission has reviewed the building elevations for the proposed Texaco Station Convenience Store, Carwash and Storage Building, and find the proposed materials, colors and construction to be acceptable, I move that the Planning Commission approve the materials and color selections proposed for the elevations of the Texaco Station at Olive and Schoettler Roads and forward said approval to the St. Louis County Department of Public Works for issuance of the Building Permits for this gas station.

Ms. Domahidy seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7 to 1 to approve the motion, with Chairperson Mc. Guinness voting no.

Rockwood District School

This is a request for a building elevations for an elementary school site that is located on the North side of Kehrs Mill Road, just east of Clarkson Road.

Mr. Kirchoff moved,

Whereas the Planning Commission has reviewed the elevations for the proposed Rockwood District Elementary School, and find the proposed materials, colors and construction to be acceptable. I move the Planning Commission approve the materials and color selections proposed for the elevations of the Rockwood Elementary School on Kehrs Mill Road, east of Clarkson Road, and forward said approval the County Department of Public Works for the issuance of building permits.

Dr. Pritchard seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion 8 to 0.

Herman Stemme Office Building No. 3; Amended Section Plan

This is a request for an amended site development plan for office buildings located just to the east of this building. It entails a reduction in the number of parking spaces for the building originally approved on a prior site plan.

Mr. Kirchoff made the following motion:

Whereas the Planning Commission has reviewed the Herman Stemme Office Building No. Three Amended Final Development Section Plan and finds that said plan is in keeping with the orderly development of the City of Chesterfield and complies with the conditions of St. Louis County Ordinance No. 12, 959; I move that the Commission approve said plan for Amended Parking and Driveways only, and that the City Clerk notify the City Council of this action.

Ms. Domahidy seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion 8 to 0.

Mathis Development (Valley Center); Amended Concept and Section Plan

The subject tract of land is located on Chesterfield Airport Road, east of Long Road. The proposal is to modify one of the buildings from a prior approved plan.

Mr. Kirchoff made the following motion:

Whereas the Planning Commission has reviewed the request for approval of the Amended Site Development Concept Plan and the Site Development Section Plan with the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances of the City of Chesterfield and with St. Louis County Council Ordinance No. 13, 908 and find the requests to be in compliance with said ordinances, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Valley Center Amended Site Development Concept Plan and direct the City Planner to retain a copy on file in the Department of Planning and forward to the City Council a recommendation of approval of the Site development Section Plan for the office/warehouse, Building F; and ask the Council to direct the developer to record said Site Development Section Plan in the office of the Recorder of Deeds, St. Louis County, Missouri.

Mr. Bryant seconded the motion. The Commission a approved this motion 8 to 0.

The Bank of Chesterfield; Amended Concept Plan and Section Plan;

This is a concept plan and a approval of a section plan for the Industrial Park located south of Chesterfield Airport Road. Included with the review was also the building elevations an an indication of the type of material that the building would be constructed of.

Mr. Kirchoff made the following motion:

Whereas the Planning Commission has reviewed the Bank of Chesterfield Partial Amended Final Development Concept Plan and finds that the plan reflects adequate provisions for vehicular and utility access on a conceptual basis, I move that the Commission approve said plan and that the City Clerk notify the City Council of this action.

AND:

Whereas the Planning Commission has reviewed the Bank of Chesterfield Final Development Section Plan and finds that said plan is in keeping with the orderly development of the City of Chesterfield and complies with the conditions established in St. Louis County Ordinance No. 13,781; I move that the Commission approve said plan and that Mr. Jerry Duepner provide further processing.

Mr. Golub seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion 7 to 1, with Mr. Bidzinski abstaining.

#### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Mr. Duepner said that the Planning and Economic Development Subcommittee, the City Council met last week and they, henceforth, will be the entity that Public Hearings will be heard before as required by the ordinance. Any issues or matters for which the Council directs, will be held before that Committee. Lastly, henceforth, all development plans, site plans, display house plats, and boundary adjustment plats will be reviewed and approved by the Commission. No longer will they be sent to the City Council. The only matters that do have to be referred to the Council for action are subject issue plats. We will continue to send to the Council after their review by the Planning Committee

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.