

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI**

**MINUTES OF MAP PLAN PUBLIC HEARING
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, CITY OF OLIVETTE,
CITY OF OVERLAND & CITY OF ST. ANN
October 24, 2000**

COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners	Present (P)/Absent (A)
MATT ARMSTRONG	A
TED ARMSTRONG	P
JANE ARNOLD	A
BOB FORD	P
AGNES GARINO	P
TOM HAYEK	A
DEE JOYNER	P
GREG KLOEPEL	P
ILENE ORDOWER	P
JOHNNIE SPEARS	P
DON WOJTKOWSKI	P

OTHERS PRESENT:

Daniel Krasnoff - Executive Director
David Hamilton - Legal Counsel

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Wojtkowski called to order the meeting of the Boundary Commission at 7:00 p.m. on October 24, 2000. The meeting took place at the Jewish Community Center, 11001 Schuetz Road, St. Louis, Missouri. The purpose of the meeting was to conduct a public hearing on the map plan submissions of St. Louis County, the City of Olivette, the City of Overland and the City of St. Ann.

- 1. Opening Remarks by Chairman*

Mr. Wojtkowski stated the purpose of the meeting was to review the map plans submitted by St. Louis County, Olivette, Overland and St. Ann. He introduced the commissioners: Johnnie Spears, Agnes Garino, Ileen Ordower, Greg Kloeppe, Dee Joyner, Ted Armstrong and Bob Ford. Mr. Wojtkowski began by outlining the process through which the Commission worked and explaining the purpose of the public hearing. He said the Commission was created by House Bill 1967 on June 27, 2000. The law governed the behavior of the Boundary Commission. The law required that municipalities interested in annexation had to submit map plans by July 1, 2000. Map plans designated areas in which municipalities could pursue proposals for annexation beginning April 15, 2001. The purpose of the hearing was not to review actual annexation proposals but to review the map plans submitted by the presenting jurisdictions.

Mr. Wojtkowski said there would be public comment at the hearing. Members of the public who desired to address the Commission were instructed to fill out speaker cards and return them to Mr. Krasnoff. Mr. Wojtkowski introduced Mr. Dan Krasnoff, Executive Director for the Commission and Mr. David Hamilton, the Commission's Legal Counsel. Mr. Wojtkowski said the speaker cards would be accepted through the final presentation and asked those who spoke to tell the Commission who they were and where they lived. He said handouts were available that included: the agenda, an information sheet about the Commission and questions the Commission had requested the submitting jurisdictions respond to in their presentations. Individuals were given three minutes to comment while those representing organizations were given five minutes to comment.

2. Presentation of St. Louis County

The Planning Director, Mr. Glenn Powers, presented St. Louis County's map plan. Mr. Powers began his presentation stating that he would follow the outline of the questions the Boundary Commission had provided all submitting entities. The County included the area in blue on the large format map next to the Commission table, in its map plan. He said the County was the main provider of municipal-type services to the unincorporated areas and would like to remain that provider if it was the desire of the area's citizens. He said St. Louis County was a large local government possessing a population of more than 300,000 people and 9,000 businesses. Unincorporated St. Louis County was, in effect, the third largest city in Missouri.

The area the County included in the map plan had a population of more than 2,500 people, the minimum population required by statute for the County to include an area in its map plan. The County was unsure in which order it would proceed with phasing. Areas all over the County that could have been the subject of proposals from the County, so, it was not easy to define a plan. How they proceeded would be affected by the public's desire to remain unincorporated and what they heard at the public hearings. The County was unsure how soon after April 15, 2001 they might submit a proposal.

It was important for the County to implement its map plan. The County provided services to residents for some time and had the staff and resources to provide high quality services. Any lessening of the County's ability to provide services would hinder its efficiency. That could also

hurt the municipalities because St. Louis County provided services to many municipalities on a contract basis.

The County was the best jurisdiction to serve the area because it had tremendous capacity to deliver a wide variety of services. Mr. Powers said the County was fiscally healthy, one of only eighteen counties in the country with a AAA bond rating. Also, the County had not raised taxes since 1989, when taxes were lowered. Mr. Powers said the County Police Department was one agency he felt strongly about. The police had more than 700 commissioned officers and contracts for services with many municipalities. Mr. Powers said the Public Works Department was professionally staffed with code enforcement in electrical, mechanical, plumbing, etc. The County Highway and Traffic Department had a staff with a large number of professional engineers and more than 200 people in the maintenance division, with a local substation in the map plan area. Mr. Powers said the County had two parks in the area, not including Creve Coeur Park, located just outside the map plan area. The Planning Department had more than twenty professionals, not including those in the Community Development Division. He said they were mindful of citizen participation. They regularly held town hall meetings and had a countywide newsletter to keep citizens informed.

Residents had expressed some interest in remaining unincorporated. In South County there was an organized group of residents who were strongly in favor of remaining unincorporated. In the area under discussion that night there was not that kind of organized support. He felt those in attendance were probably interested in being educated and hearing what each jurisdiction had in mind. He said there were representatives from different departments to assist him in answering any questions.

Questions from the Commission

Mr. Ford asked what services the County contracted to municipalities. Mr. Powers said County wide services included: the helicopter, the special case squad, fingerprinting, etc. Many mid-county police departments contracted for police services, although none at the meeting did so. Typically, these services included a variety of activities: standard patrols, neighborhood policing, criminal investigation, etc. Mr. Ford asked how that would be affected by annexation. Mr. Powers said no municipalities at that night's hearing contracted for patrol services. Mr. Powers said annexation would mean a municipality would handle regular police services. Mr. Ford asked how the police departments from the jurisdictions presenting that evening compared with St. Louis County's. Mr. Powers said he could not provide statistics but said the County Police Department would rate well and was as good as any local police department. The County police received a prestigious rating recently that Mr. Powers did not think many municipalities had received. Captain George Corleil, the West County Precinct Captain said the County Police Department received an international certification. Of all the municipalities in St. Louis County, only University City and Clayton had received that recognition. He said crime was at a twenty-year low. The County Police had created substations to interact with citizens and neighborhood watch programs. This was a policy from the Chief. In West County, the County Police contracted for services with Hanley Hills, Country Life Acres, Norwood Park, Valley Park, Twin Oaks and the Winchester, as of January 1, 2001. During the previous ten years the size of

the force increased from 400 to 700 officers. He said they were committed to the highest level of police protection. Other services the County police offered were crime lab, tactical squad and the police academy for the County and municipalities, including in-service training. The County police had more than 100 detectives. Mr. Ford asked what support there was for municipalities who did not have a contract agreement with the County. He was told that the SWAT team, homicide unit and training services could be used.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked Mr. Powers the status of a small unincorporated area along Bauer Road. Mr. Powers said the area was north of Olivette and contained Martin Luther King Park and an apartment complex owned by the County Housing Authority. Mr. Ted Armstrong asked the population of the area. Mr. Powers said there were less than 2,500 people in the area, so it was not included in the County's map plan. Mr. Powers also said the County was happy to continue to provide services to the area if no annexation took place.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked Mr. Powers if the County would be pro-active or reactive regarding proposals in the map plan area. Mr. Powers said they would be more reactive than in South County because there had not been the kind of passionate support for remaining unincorporated. Mr. Ted Armstrong asked what the difference was between the area under discussion that evening and South County. Mr. Powers said he was not sure.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked about the history of annexations in the part of St. Louis County under discussion. Mr. Powers said an effort to incorporate a city called Thornhill failed. Earlier, St. Ann had attempted to annex a portion of the unincorporated area, that failed. There had been several small annexations, an example was the area between Lackland and Page that was annexed by Maryland Heights.

Mr. Ted Armstrong said there was a significant industrial area around: Page, Lindbergh, Warson and Bauer and asked what the tax impact on the County would be if the area was annexed. Mr. Powers said the effect would be significant. Mr. Powers said the Olivette proposal would only annex that industrial area. He said the County was concerned annexation by Olivette amounted to a tax grab. That was the kind of annexation that brought the original Boundary Commission into being.

Mr. Ted Armstrong said he did not understand the narrow unincorporated strip along Warson Road. Mr. Powers said he could not explain that area. Mr. Ted Armstrong asked if the unincorporated area extended only to the edge of the road. Mr. Powers said there was some front property along the west side of Warson Road that had not been annexed previously.

Ms. Joyner asked if the County encountered any difficulty in service delivery for the area under discussion and if there was any community of interest within the area. Mr. Powers said there were three communities of interest: west of I-270, east of I-270 and east of Lindbergh Boulevard (west Overland). He said the population of the area, 30,000 people, was large enough to allow for the efficient delivery of services.

Mr. Kloepfel asked why the small area between Olivette and Overland was unincorporated. He

wanted to know if the area had been changing. Mr. Powers said the area called Elmwood Park was a lower income African American area and no one desired to take it in until recently.

Mr. Wojtkowski clarified that the Elmwood Park area could not be part of the County map plan because it was not contiguous with the large map plan area and did not have 2,500 residents. Mr. Powers said Elmwood Park was an area the County had invested more than \$10 million. He said the area was much different today than a few years ago.

Ms. Garino asked Mr. Powers to point out McDonnell Park on the map. Ms. Garino said on her map the park looked as though it was in St. Ann. Mr. Powers said part of it was in St. Ann and a portion was in unincorporated St. Louis County.

Ms. Garino requested that in the future the County should be able to define countywide services versus municipal services provided to unincorporated areas.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked what citizens who desired to remain unincorporated should do to make the County aware of their feelings. Mr. Powers said residents should communicate with the County because it desired to get a sense of how widespread support was to remain unincorporated. He said the County would continue services if that was what the public desired. Mr. Wojtkowski asked if the County had already informally polled the area. Mr. Powers said no and that the County had no plans at that time to do so. Mr. Wojtkowski said therefore, it was up to the citizens to organize and inform the County of their feelings, similarly to what had happened in South County.

3. *Presentation of Olivette*

A consultant, Mr. Bob Ernst, from Farsons, Harland Bartholomew, presented Olivette's map plan. He said Mr. Barry Hogue was called away at the last minute and could not attend the hearing. Mr. Tim Pickering, Olivette's City Manager was out of town and the City Council was meeting that evening. He said the City was interested in two parcels. One parcel was a mixed-use site along Dielman and north of the railroad, known as Elmwood Park or Kim Garden. The second area was bounded by: Page, Ashby, Lindbergh and the railroad tracks. Both parcels were mixed use. The parcel along Dielman Road was a little more than 50% residential, with single family housing and some mixed light industrial, warehouse-office uses. The second area along Warson contained some single-family housing, some multi-family housing and some institutional uses with a couple of commercial uses. The irregularly shaped area north of Warson/Ashby contained almost exclusively, light industrial, warehouse and office uses. There appeared to be a residential unit although that was difficult to discern.

Olivette included the areas in its map plan because it could provide efficient urban services to residents and businesses. These services would be a logical extension of current services. Olivette had no phasing plan and would work on both proposals simultaneously. Olivette would be ready to bring a proposal to the Boundary Commission by the spring.

Mr. Ernst said it was important to implement the map plan in order to bring quality city services

to areas adjacent to the City boundaries. Both areas passed the 15% contiguity test.

He said Olivette was the best to serve the area due to minimum property maintenance code enforcement and the high quality of fire and police services. The quality of the services just mentioned would benefit residents and property owners. The City had heard positive comments regarding the map plan from both residents and business owners.

Questions from the Commission

Mr. Spears asked if Olivette was currently providing any services to either area. Mr. Ernst said he thought the City was, particularly in the Elmwood Park area. However, he was unsure as to the nature of those services. He apologized that he was not better prepared, but he had only been given the assignment that morning.

Ms. Garino asked what parts of the area along Warson Road were included in the map plan. Mr. Ernst said the existing Olivette boundary extended along the eastern boundary of the parcels that fronted on Warson Road. The Creve Coeur boundary extended to the west edge of the Warson Road right of way. Olivette's map plan boundary extended to the west side of the parcels on the east side of Warson Road, not to the existing Creve Coeur boundary. Mr. Ernst said he was unaware why the map plan boundary line was drawn at that location. Mr. Ted Armstrong said he thought a gap would be left if Olivette implemented its map plan. Mr. Ernst agreed that a gap would exist. He said it was a proposal not a final document and the City would consider legitimate criticism of the map plan.

Ms. Ordower asked what the population of the map plan areas were. Mr. Ernst said the largely commercial area had a population of zero or close to zero. In the Elmwood Park area, there were 120 zoned single-family lots and multi-family housing. He said he did not know the exact number of residents.

Mr. Kloeppe asked if there was support from business for the commercial areas of the map plan. Mr. Ernst said he knew there was some support, particularly near the Elmwood area and along Warson Road. He was unsure about the level of support in the light industrial area north of the railroad tracks. Mr. Ernst said he was told support from the residents in Elmwood was high. He again apologized that due to scheduling he was not better prepared to answer the Commission's questions.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked whom in the industrial area would vote on a proposal. Mr. Ernst said he would defer to the Commission's legal counsel. Mr. Hamilton said if there were no voters in the annexation area then the Olivette voters would decide the matter.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked if he understood correctly that Olivette planned to submit a proposal in April 2001. Mr. Ernst said that was true.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked if there was enough voter support for the annexation in Olivette. Mr. Ernst said City officials believed there was enough support.

Mr. Ford asked what differences there were in code enforcement between Olivette and St. Louis County. Mr. Ernst said the Olivette had an inspection ordinance, an occupancy code. He did not know how it differed from the County's. Mr. Ford asked about industrial code enforcement, Mr. Ernst said he knew nothing about that.

Ms. Ordower asked if there were residential lots on Warson Road. Mr. Ernst said there were twelve residentially zoned lots on Warson Road.

4. Presentation of Overland

A consultant, Mr. Aaron Young, from Bucher, Willis and Ratliff presented Overland's map plan. He was accompanied by Mayor Bob Dody, members of the Board of Aldermen and the Director of Public Works. Mr. Young said the area included in the plan was known as West Overland. Boundaries of the map plan were the City of St. Ann, to the north; Lindbergh or the City of Maryland Heights, to the west; the railroad tracks on the south and the City of Overland boundary, on the east. Midland Avenue and Page Avenue provided good access to Overland and the map plan area was 24% adjacent to Overland. The area included both housing and commercial uses.

Mr. Young said the annexation would take the form of a single proposal with no phasing being necessary. Overland anticipated submitting a proposal to the Boundary Commission sometime in the spring, 2001.

He said it was important to implement the plan because the Boundary Commission's process put Overland in a position to pursue annexation immediately or risk losing the opportunity to because a rival jurisdiction would submit a proposal. More than ten years earlier the City failed when it attempted to annex only the commercial area. The new approach was better because both residential and commercial areas were included.

Mr. Young said Overland was the best jurisdiction to serve the area because it was accessible along arterial roads to West Overland and because it had a strong economic growth program to support the area. The residents would be advantaged with quality city services, including trash pick-up, easy access to city hall, a capital improvement program, and use of the new Overland Community Center. There also was a low property tax rate, \$0.21 per \$100.00 of assessed value. He said the City's snow removal service was good. There also would be a senior citizen park programs and a senior citizen utility tax rebate of 50%.

The items previously mentioned formed the basis upon which the City would persuade those in the map plan area to support annexation. Some residents had told the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen they supported annexation.

Questions from the Commission

Mr. Spears asked what the population was of the map plan area. Mr. Young said that, according

to the 1990 census, it was approximately 4,388. Mr. Young said Overland's population was approximately 18,000.

Ms. Garino asked for an explanation of the southern map plan boundary. Mr. Young walked to the map and showed that the south boundary followed the railroad tracks. Mr. Wojtkowski said the south side of the railroad tracks would remain part of unincorporated St. Louis County if the map plan were fully implemented. Mr. Young said that was correct. He said access to the south side of the tracks was difficult from Overland and that other municipalities were in a better position to service the area.

Ms. Garino asked what percentage of land uses in the map plan area were commercial versus residential. Mr. Young said the area's land use was approximately 35% commercial and 65% residential.

Ms. Ordower asked if Overland's tax rate was lower than the County's. Mr. Young said he thought so. Ms. Ordower asked if Overland felt comfortable servicing the area. Mr. Young said the City did feel comfortable servicing the area and was adding new equipment and a potential police substation to the comprehensive plan to service the map plan area.

Mr. Kloeppe asked why the area was chosen to be in the map plan. Mr. Young said West Overland was the only area that the City could annex that included both residential and commercial areas. If the City did not attempt to annex the area, it would be landlocked. He said a few residents had approached the City regarding annexation but there had been no organized contact between the City and residents of the map plan area.

Ms. Joyner said an obvious question when one looked at the map was why Overland had not included Elmwood Park in the plan. Mr. Young said that area had been overlooked when the map plan was created but if no other municipality was interested, Overland would be interested in pursuing its annexation.

Ms. Joyner asked if the map plan stopped at the railroad tracks and did not extend to Lindbergh Boulevard. She said the Commission map boundary extended past the railroad tracks to Lindbergh Boulevard. Mr. Young said north of the Page Avenue intersection the map plan boundary extended to the Maryland Heights' border while the railroad track was south of the intersection. The map plan boundary was north of the railroad tracks and east of Lindbergh Boulevard. Ms. Joyner asked where the south and west border was on Overland's map plan received by the Boundary Commission. Mr. Krasnoff said the official submission showed the west boundary to be Lindbergh Boulevard and the south boundary was the northeast portion of the Creve Coeur city limit and a small portion of the railroad tracks. Mr. Young reiterated that it made more sense for the railroad tracks to form the south boundary because the south side of the track was inaccessible from Overland.

Mr. Ted Armstrong said he detected a competition to annex West Overland between Overland St. Ann. He asked if Olivette and St. Ann made no annexation attempt in the area, would Overland also make no annexation attempt. Mr. Young said if there was no compromise there would be no

alternative but to proceed. Mr. Young said the Mayor and Board of Aldermen had informed him that they would be willing to discuss revised map plan boundaries with competing jurisdictions.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked if in the final analysis the matter would be a negotiation among the three cities. Mr. Young said he thought so. The map plan included all of the adjacent unincorporated area. When Overland created its map plan it did not know what St. Ann or Olivette was proposing.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked what effort's Overland made to gain resident support for a potential annexation. Mr. Young said discussions were a long process because Overland did not have the best representation in the past and the City had new representatives. He said that for the past ten to fifteen years the City had worked as hard as it could to make it a better place to live. Mr. Young said he had lived in St. Louis for about three years and felt Overland had done a good job improving itself. He said the City had taken no pro-active efforts to discuss the matter with those in the annexation area. Mayor Bob Dody stepped forward and said Overland had to act quickly in devising its map plan. The boundaries were chosen because they were easily accessed from Overland. The railroad track was a natural boundary. Mayor Dody said the omission of Elmwood Park from the map plan was an oversight. The City did not object to including it in their map plan. He also said implementation of the map plan would help the City prosper. Overland had been responsible by including both residential and commercial areas within the map plan. If the area was exclusively residential, however, it would have been difficult to fund capital improvements in the residential areas. The City's goal was to take the whole area as a package. If any pockets were left, the City was prepared to address that situation.

Mr. Ford asked Mayor Dody if Overland would not pursue annexation unless it was able to annex the whole map plan area. (The answer was inaudible)

Mr. Wojtkowski said the Commission could not require the map plan to be amended. If the map plan were amended, however, it might make the Commission very happy. Mr. Wojtkowski said the Commission could not dictate where in the map plan proposal boundaries were drawn, however, the Commission could reject such an application if it was unhappy with the proposal.

Mr. Wojtkowski said the Commission encouraged negotiation between the Olivette, Overland and St. Ann. If jurisdictions engaged in such activity, the Commission would be pleased. Mr. Wojtkowski said the negotiations should not be mediated or arbitrated by the Boundary Commission. The Commission could not require the jurisdictions to amend their map plans. If they did not, he said it was likely there would be competing proposals for the same area. The Commission would then be in the difficult position of determining who should and who should not be approved for an annexation. The Commission's desire would be for the municipalities to cooperate with one another.

5. *Presentation of St. Ann*

Mr. Bill Lander presented St. Ann's map plan. He said the map plan proposal was aggressive, bounded by Lindbergh Boulevard on the west, Page Avenue on the south, Ashby Road on the

east and the southern boundary of St. Ann on the north. In retrospect he said it was the City's goal to replace the population loss from airport expansion and airport related uses. The City was working with a real estate developer who had secured 400 development parcels. They believed that in the next couple of years developers would be interested in building in that area and the city would lose 1,200-1,300 people. St. Ann had been comfortable with its borders for the previous thirty years. The City had revenue to sustain quality services. With those issues in mind St. Ann desired to expand to the area bounded by Lindbergh on the west, Midland on the south and Ashby on the east. It contained enough land to allow the City to offset the per capita loss of population. Also, areas zoned for light commercial uses along Lindbergh and Midland could be further developed to create additional revenues for the City.

Mr. Landers said St. Ann was an older community looking for areas to redevelop. The city estimated that within two years development would occur along the I-70 corridor and it was at that time they anticipated bringing a proposal to the Commission.

Mr. Landers described the area as having a depressed housing stock with poor code enforcement. The City would have an aggressive plan to upgrade the housing in the area with a large staff of building and housing inspectors to bring the area to code. St. Ann would develop a five-year plan to upgrade streets and sewers. These activities would be funded by a capital improvement tax and a parks-and-recreation tax.

He said the residents in the map plan area would like to be annexed and had expressed those opinions to the staff and members of the Board of Aldermen. He said there would be opposition from people who desired not to upgrade their housing. St. Ann, however, said it could convince those people that the benefits of being in St. Ann and the support they would receive would make annexation worth their while.

St. Ann had a community center, golf course, a first-rate Police Department, eight parks and services such as: free parks, free trash pick-up and other programs. Some residents of the map plan area desired to take advantage of City services. Those who supported the map plan did so in part to join a community improving its housing stock and infrastructure. Mr. Landers said St. Ann had a plan to replace streets and curbs and would do so in the map plan area if an annexation occurred.

Questions from the Commission

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked what the City had done to gain resident support. Mr. Landers said they had done nothing formally because they were unsure of the airport development timetable. They would go into the community, meet personally with the homeowners and document their comments and allow the Board of Aldermen to decide if there was enough support to authorize an annexation proposal.

Mr. Ted Armstrong said an allegation made by Mr. Landers was that there was lax code enforcement within St. Ann's map plan area. Mr. Landers said those comments came from residents who adjoined the West Overland area. He said there were streets where houses had a

great deal of outdoor, haphazard storage and derelict cars. These attributes gave areas a “run down” appearance. Those were not personal observations but were the thoughts of some who lived in the area.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked Mr. Powers to comment. He asked Karen Wittkoetter from the Public Works Department to speak to those issues. Mr. Powers said she was involved in the Comprehensive Code Enforcement program, in which all properties in an area were inspected for conditions such as: weeds, trash, derelict cars, etc. She said there were four inspectors for the unincorporated area alone, but three or four additional inspectors were brought in when a sweep was required. During a sweep the entire staff might be devoted to the area. Mr. Ted Armstrong asked if there were an inordinate number of complaints from the West Overland area regarding code enforcement. Ms. Karen Wittkoetter said there were not an inordinate number of complaints. For the small area under discussion she could not provide specific figures but that for the whole unincorporated area there were 332 complaints since January 1, 2000. That number ranked in the lower third for all unincorporated areas in St. Louis County.

Ms. Ordower asked the population of St. Ann. Mr. Landers said it was about 14,200, based on the 1990 census.

Ms. Garino asked why St. Ann chose Midland as the boundary to the map plan and asked the relationship between the boundary and the right-of-way. Mr. Landers said the boundary was on the north side of the right-of-way. The area was chosen because it was approximately the same size as the area they expected to lose in terms of residential population.

Ms. Garino asked if there were major commercial/industrial land uses in the area. Mr. Landers said he estimated the total amount of commercial land use to be approximately 15%-20% of the map plan area. The uses were primarily light commercial and were primarily along Lindbergh and Midland.

Ms. Garino said from driving the area that it was composed primarily of single-family houses. Mr. Landers said there were some multi-unit apartments along Midland.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked if St. Ann would be willing to amend their map plan. Mr. Landers said they were open to any discussion that would benefit them and the surrounding communities.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked if the City had estimated the effect on its tax base if it did not replace the lost population. Mr. Landers said the loss of property tax revenue would be minimal. St. Ann had a low rate of \$.16 per \$100.00 valuation. St. Ann was looking to future needs. Future programs would be based on per capita figures instead of flat rated property taxes. They desired to stabilize the community with additional land area and population.

6. *Public Comment*

Mr. Larry Waldon, 2305 Fairview

Mr. Waldon said he was from just south of Midland. He said most people in his area wanted to

stay unincorporated. He asked what citizens needed to do if they desired to stay unincorporated. Mr. Wojtkowski said that could be accomplished by a petition or from St. Louis County government.

Mr. Joseph S. Dimarco, 2328 Rutter

Mr. Dimarco said he was a Warson Meadows resident, off Midland. He said he lived there for forty-one years and all the residents he knew were happy in unincorporated St. Louis County. He said he was employed by the St. Louis County Streets Department. They had paved the streets in his neighborhood within the previous three years. The County police were excellent and there had been only three or four burglaries in the area. In Overland, however, there were high crime rates. Commercial buildings on Old St. Charles Rock Road in St. Ann and Overland were underutilized and he wondered why those municipalities worried about successful areas outside of their jurisdictions when they could not sustain commercial activity in their own municipalities. He asked Overland and St. Ann what kind of service they would provide if annexation took place. Mr. Wojtkowski said the rules did not allow for the public to question those who presented to the Commission. Mr. Wojtkowski also said some of those issues were dealt during the presentations.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked Mr. Dimarco if he perceived a problem with housing code enforcement in his neighborhood. Mr. Dimarco said the enforcement was fine but that in small municipalities there was more complaining about small problems than in unincorporated St. Louis County.

Mr. William D'Auria, 2710 Bellecote

Mr. D'Auria said he lived in West Overland, just north of Midland and just east of Ashby. He said there was little opposition because it was not a well-known issue. Most people were not aware of the meeting. People he talked to were opposed to annexation, feeling it would only result in higher taxes. He said a couple of years before the County came through and did inspection. He said he had lived in the area about six or seven years, so he did not know if that was part of their regular pattern.

Mr. D'Auria said he knew people who lived in Overland and they complained that property values had decreased, and services were not always of a high quality. He felt the County was generally responsive to complaints or questions. The only municipal maintenance problem was storm sewers, which was MSDs responsibility, not St. Louis County's.

Mr. Ford asked if he was in favor of annexation, opposed to annexation or of an open mind. Mr. D'Auria said he was generally opposed because taxes would increase. He felt St. Ann had a better reputation than Overland. He said the thought his neighbors were against annexation.

Mr. Jefferey R. Carlile, 1419 Zimmerman Place

Mr. Carlile said he was not aware of the meeting but heard about it from neighbors. He said he lived in the area everyone forgot. He said he wanted to understand that Olivette had included the area in its map plan while Overland had not. Mr. Wojtkowski said that was correct.

Mr. Carlile said he wanted to gather information for residents in his community to help them determine what would be in their own best interest. He said he did not know how he felt. He said he was skeptical of the intentions of Olivette considering that Elmwood Park was a low-income neighborhood. He was worried people would be pushed out by higher taxes. He wanted to know what the municipalities would do to help citizens raise their house standards. Mr. Carlile said the housing complex two blocks down the road was being built with \$180,000-\$280,00 houses. He asked what he should do to better inform those in his community.

Mr. Wojtkowski said any municipality that made a proposal would provide detailed information in that proposal about the tax impact and other impacts on the area under consideration, the municipality itself and the surrounding area. All the information required to assess the information would be available to citizens of the area. Mr. Wojtkowski said the plans of intent could be submitted beginning April 15, 2001. He said the notice would be posted at the County Government Center. The Commission would create a web site in the future.

Mr. Ted Armstrong asked if poor housing conditions were the result of lax code enforcement by St. Louis County. Mr. Carlile said you could see it that way but there had been substantial improvement in the area. He said he could see why it would be beneficial to be annexed by Olivette or Overland in terms of the County's ability to provide police protection. He said there was a lack of code enforcement. Many of his neighbors supported more strict code enforcement. His assessment had increased by \$10,000 since he moved in. Mr. Ted Armstrong said he wanted to get a comparison of what the municipal jurisdictions would be able to offer versus St. Louis County. He asked Mr. Carlile if his community was getting necessary support from St. Louis County. Mr. Carlile said he was not sure. He wondered if people had been fined or not. He was afraid enforcement could drive people out of the neighborhood. He said he talked to a police officer who recommended he not move into the neighborhood. Mr. Carlile had friends who lived in the area who said the officer was wrong. He said most people were well established but there were bad eggs in every neighborhood. He said his neighbors were kind and had poured a patio and a new sidewalk at his house for free.

7. *Adjournment*

At the point the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted
Daniel Krasnoff
Executive Director

Approved: