

BOUNDARY COMMISSION
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI
MEETING MINUTES
March 22, 2005

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Ted Armstrong, Christine Bredenkoetter, Bob Ford, Greg Kloeppe, Mary Schuman, Johnnie Spears, Edward Thibeault, Don Wojtkowski..
Commissioners Absent: Betty Marver, Matt Armstrong, Marvin Gelber.

Commission Staff Present: Randy Weber and John Young, Boundary Commission Legal Counsel, Courtney Irwin, Executive Director. Others Present: Lori Fiegel, St. Louis County Planning.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Spears called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., March 22, 2005. The meeting was held at the Sheraton Clayton Plaza, 7730 Bonhomme Ave., Gallery II, Clayton, MO, 63105.

ROLL IS CALLED – QUORUM DECLARED

Roll was called and a quorum declared by Mr. Weber.

APPROVE AGENDA

Mr. T. Armstrong moved to amend the agenda, so that item C. read: Discussion/Vote to accept or reject Ellisville Proposal BC0405 and to add item D. Discussion/Vote to accept or reject Ballwin Proposal BC0410. Mr. Ford seconded the motion. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed.*

APPROVE MINUTES

Ms. Schuman asked that the February 8, 2005 Valley Park public hearing indicate that she arrived 20-minutes late. Mr. Ford made a motion to accept the amended minutes of February 8th. Mr. T. Armstrong seconded the motion. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed.*

Mr. T. Armstrong made a motion to accept the February 22, 2005 minutes. Mr. Kloeppe seconded the motion. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed.*

FINANCIAL REPORT

There was no financial report.

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Valley Park Mayor Dan Michel spoke in favor of the Valley Park annexation. He commented that Valley Park is considered a welcome mat to cities such as Manchester, Ballwin and Twin Oaks from Interstate 44. He asked the Commission to allow the decision be decided by a vote of the people.

2. Valley Park City Clerk Marguerite Wilburn asked the Commission to put the annexation proposal to a vote of the Valley Park and Peerless Park constituents, rather than letting it be decided by people who live in other areas. She has visited with residents and businesses in Peerless Park who said the sewer and street infrastructure has not been provided to them through their current form of government. Ms. Wilburn requested that the Commission give Valley Park the same opportunities that other neighboring communities have had, in experiencing growth and economic development due to annexations.
3. Valley Park Alderman Dan Adams spoke in favor of the Valley Park annexation. He mentioned that the money Valley Park would generate from the annexation would be put back into the residential areas and businesses for improvements.
4. Alderman Thomas Bolte, a lifelong resident of Valley Park, was in favor of the annexation. His family used to own Bolte's IGA and they were bought out in 1983 when the now existing 141 bridge was built. He asked the Commission to give the city a place to expand its businesses.
5. Valley Park Alderman Randy Helton said that annexing Peerless Park would help Valley Park's tax base and allow them to grow. He has always regarded the proposed area and Valley Park as one city.
6. Alderman Mike White supported the annexation proposal. He reiterated that Valley Park lost a lot of businesses due to the 141 extension. He noted that it is now a lop-sided community when comparing the residential population to the commercial and industrial development. He believed that the annexation of Peerless Park would allow the city to balance itself out.
7. Valley Park City Attorney Eric Martin said the city satisfied the statutory criteria in presenting their boundary submission. He stated that this was a chance for the Commission to do some social engineering in the area because Valley Park is a bedroom community and therefore unbalanced. He described the proposal as an opportunity for Valley Park to give its residents the same advantages as other neighboring communities.
8. Manchester Mayor Larry Miles asked that the Manchester annexation proposal be put to a vote of the people. Mayor Miles cited two successful annexations by Manchester in 1997 and 1999 that included a lot of residential areas. He said the city lost 24 businesses due to the redevelopment of the 141 bridge at Manchester Road and has never recovered. He stated that he has spoken to people who voted against the previous annexations, but are now happy that they are Manchester residents. Mayor Miles also said the city is willing to partnership with St. Louis County in improving Love Park and Queeny Park.
9. City Administrator Ed Blattner added that local services are best provided by the municipality to the residents. He said Manchester has proven itself since the past two annexations that it is capable of providing those services.

10. Michael Caramanna of 1704 Highview Circle Court represented the Ridgeview Place Condominium Association. He has been charged with expressing the Association's displeasure with the Manchester annexation proposal. He said the Association initially looked at the annexation as a positive, but after researching it concluded that it would not be beneficial to the unit owners. The services that St. Louis County provides the Ridgeview residents have been very adequate and sufficient.

11. Wayne Weaver of 315 Glyn Cagny Rd. spoke against the Manchester annexation proposal. He and his wife have lived in the area Manchester wants to annex for the past 32-years. He had previously submitted 396 petitions opposing this annexation. Mr. Weaver said he was happy with the services provided by St. Louis County and did not want to support another layer of government. He pointed out to the audience that the Commissioners serve without compensation and thanked them for their time.

12. John Lancaster of 1732 Highview Circle Ct. spoke about the internal workings of the Manchester government. According to Mr. Lancaster, there is currently a lawsuit between a Manchester alderman and the city. Mr. Lancaster claimed that the alderman is being denied access to secret meetings which are disguised as aldermanic/executive sessions. As such, the alderman's constituents are being deprived of legal representation in these meetings where votes are taken. Mr. Lancaster also alleged that at a January 17, 2005 meeting, there was a discussion by Mayor Miles, the aldermen and the city attorney, concerning the possibility of initiating a slap-suit to quiet Mr. Lancaster. Mr. Lancaster then turned to Mayor Myles and said, "Bring it on." He also said that a formal complaint had been filed with the Missouri Ethics Commission and is scheduled to be heard on March 24th. Mr. Lancaster also brought up the issue of the new Manchester Police facility. Residents of the proposed annexation area had no say as to whether or not this building should be constructed. He noted that now the city wants those residents to pay for the gullibility of the current residents who were fooled into voting for it in the first place. Mr. Lancaster urged the Commission not to let the proposal go to the ballot.

13. Jeff Khoury, Mayor of Ellisville, stated that Ellisville submitted a plan that meets the Boundary Commission's criteria. However, he wanted to provide some final thoughts to address what he perceived to be misperceptions on the part of some Commission members regarding both the Ellisville and Ballwin proposals. He said Ellisville is not a community that ended an annexation moratorium less than a year ago. The characterization by St. Louis County staff that Ellisville reacted to annexation plans of the City of Ballwin is inaccurate. That misinformation seemed to have been accepted as fact by some members of the Commission. Mayor Khoury said Ellisville had not wavered from its intent to annex the area during the past 5-years. At their initial presentation, Ellisville listened to residents from the affected area when they expressed uncertainty about an Ellisville annexation. In response, Ellisville provided residents with additional information about the city's structure, government services and philosophy. He said residents were invited to attend two separate open house meetings between staff and elected officials, and that Ellisville was the only community to take those additional steps. Furthermore, Ellisville has not been cutting services during the economic downturn of the past 5-years, and offers excellent essential services as well as a wide array of non-essential services. Ellisville was

not considering raising property taxes to meet the demand of rising expenses. Ellisville did not meet with another city to draft boundaries without one other community in attendance. Mayor Khoury said Ellisville has been labeled as uncooperative in the development of the boundaries that involved all three cities vying for annexation in that area. He said Ellisville would have met with Ballwin and Wildwood officials, if they had been invited to the meeting. As a result, the proposed boundaries of Ballwin and Wildwood meet each other south of Ellisville. He respected each city's right to draw the boundaries as they deemed appropriate, however he would not accept statements by County staff or Commission members insinuating that Ellisville had not been willing to discuss the matter. Ellisville staff and officials entered the process with the belief that they would be treated fairly and they did not believe that has been the case. He based this on comments by county staff and then by Commission members at a subsequent hearing. He recognized that individuals enter situations with some bias; however, he expected those to be managed with clarifying questions to the petitioner, rather than with unsubstantiated statements, statements that were not allowed to be responded to during the hearing. In closing, he said the Ellisville city council respectfully requested that the Commission consider the facts of their annexation proposal, and apply the rules of the Boundary Commission charter in making a final decision.

14. John Hanpeter of 1827 Dougherty Estate Drive was against the Manchester proposal. He and his wife have lived in unincorporated St. Louis County for 21-years and during that time St. Louis County has provided very good fire and police protection, as well as snow and ice removal. He also acknowledged seeing a news article that reported illegal meetings and delays on the new Manchester police headquarters. He asked the Commission to not let the annexation go to a vote.

15. Sal Tedesco of 125 Dietrich Rd. was against the Manchester annexation. He did not see any benefits or advantages to becoming a resident of Manchester.

16. Ron Hammelman of 534 Huntley Heights Dr. said he lives in a subdivision with over 200 homes and he has not come across one resident who was in favor of the Manchester annexation proposal. Mr. Hammelman prefers the St. Louis County police services, street department, snow removal and trash services. He would also rather be in the hands of St. Louis County as far as tax issues, rather than Manchester.

17. Dan O'Brien of #10 Lockhaven said the only reason a large city like Manchester wants to annex this small area is because of money.

18. Paul Gyurkikiss of 260 Glandore Drive has lived in the area Manchester is trying to annex for the past 15-years. He is opposed to Manchester because he does not want to give up the excellent St. Louis County police for an unaccredited, small town police force. Mr. Gyurkikiss remarked that smaller government is not necessarily better; however, competence is very important. He said Manchester wants this annexation because it will bring in more money, however if its residents are not willing to come up with it themselves, via tax increases, then he would want no part of it.

19. Kim Gardner of 4 Meppan Dr. spoke in favor of the Valley Park annexation proposal. He owns a home at #1 Thornhedge located in the former Peerless Park and although he does not live there now he was presenting the feelings of himself and the family that currently resides there. He had worked with Peerless Park in the past and has always been in favor of local control. Mr. Gardner said after the dissolution of Peerless Park, the area transformed itself from being a separate community to almost being contiguous with Valley Park. He asked the Commission to allow the people to vote on the annexation.

20. Cliff Kurrus of 2115 Mason Green Drive represented the Mason Green Condominium Association which is still strongly opposed to the Manchester annexation.

21. Roxanne Crosley of 3 Lockhaven Ln. has a sister who was annexed by Manchester in the 90s and she has expressed her displeasure with the decline of the Manchester services. It was Ms. Crosley's belief that the purpose of the Boundary Commission was to look out for the greater good of the whole area, not just a particular city or parcel of land. She was also concerned for businesses affected by the annexation where the sales tax would be increased. Ms. Crosley was also apprehensive about the loss of the Neighborhood Watch program which is offered by the St. Louis County Police.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Announcements or Communications.

STAFF REPORT

Mr. T. Armstrong said he was uncomfortable with the practice of sending out meeting minutes to those who request them before they have been reviewed and approved by the Board. Ms. Irwin stated that when minutes are requested, she includes a cover page stating that they have not been officially approved by the Boundary Commission. She also said that she was following the former Chairman's protocol. Ms. Bredenkoetter said she believed the Sunshine Law allows the public access to that kind of information. Mr. Weber said that she correct. Mr. Wojtkowski and Ms. Schuman agreed with Mr. T. Armstrong's concerns. Ms. Schuman suggested that from now on every page of the minutes be stamped as a "DRAFT" before being sent out.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Discussion/Vote to accept or reject Valley Park Proposal BC0411

Mr. Thibeault recognized that the Valley Park administration and staff were very committed to their city. His major concern with the proposal had to do with the public policy aspects, particularly the TIF as it related to the Drury area. What bothered him the most was that it said the property owners could request to be de-annexed at any time. He asked that someone explain why that provision was there. Mr. Wojtkowski did not see the term de-annexation within the content of the Valley Park plan of intent, but he did see the reference to de-annexation in what was being referred to as the Drury Agreement. He

recalled that the Drury proposal was completely non-binding, and if they chose not to proceed with the development, then they could de-annex themselves.

Valley Park City Attorney, Eric Martin, asked Mr. Spears if he could address that issue. Mr. Martin explained that de-annexation is a statutory term. If a city, in its plan of intent, fails to fulfill some of the functions there is a de-annexation process. He was not sure what it was, but he thought it was probably a judicial process. With this particular agreement, a TIF is going to be in place regardless whether it is Valley Park or unincorporated St. Louis County. He said there was some language in the Drury agreement that, should the City default on the terms, that they had the right to request de-annexation. The city indicated in the agreement that it would not protest that provision.

Mr. Wojtkowski made a motion to accept the Valley Park Proposal BC0411. Ms. Bredenkoetter seconded the motion. Mr. Spears opened up the floor for discussion. Mr. Wojtkowski said he was going to begin with the issue of logical boundaries. He attached the logical boundary issue to some of the comments he heard about letting the people vote. Within the content of the Valley Park proposal, the city admitted that they specifically designed their boundaries to eliminate people who would not be in favor of the proposal. The result is a boundary that is far from being a logical annexation boundary. Mr. Wojtkowski did not think that the Commission should allow a precedent to be set, wherein future boundaries can be drawn to eliminate the people who are not in favor of the proposal. Another major concern he had was relative to the appropriate and proper development of the area. He said St. Louis County, under their current development requirements, would require that Meramec Station Rd. be raised above the flood plane. He was positive that doing that would bring significant cost to the developer, but he felt it to be a very logical development requirement. Valley Park specifically indicated in its proposal that it would not require Meramec Station Rd. to be raised above the flood plane. He noted that at the public hearing, the Commission heard how that could be problematic for a number of the residents who live in the area. The other issue Mr. Wojtkowski had was that Valley Park made promises, and St. Louis County questioned even the legality of it, where they would use tax dollars to maintain private roadways, parking lots, lighting, and falling rocks from a cliff. He did not know if that use of money would be in the best interest of the Valley Park tax payer. Finally, was the issue of the Drury agreement which Mr. Wojtkowski said was being driven by TIFs. The developer can back out at anytime and he did not know if that would present a reason, or could be the catalyst, for de-annexation of the area. Mr. Wojtkowski did not see how this proposal could be approved.

Ms. Schuman said that all of the cities that were present at the meeting had been very upfront in their desire to grow through annexations, and in their wishes to control development and redevelopment along their borders. From the cities perspectives, and hers, annexation is a reasonable means to grow. Cities do not have to be treated like the enemy in these proposals. In fact, it was her opinion that it is in St. Louis County's interest that cities be strong and healthy. Sooner or later, many of the areas that the Commission was addressing that evening probably needed to be annexed. She thought it was the Commission's job and priority to get it right, at the right times. In terms of Valley Park, she was extremely impressed with the information the Commissioners received from the

Valley Park administration. She wanted to congratulate everyone on the “new Valley Park” because it was very impressive. She did not have any problems with the city’s upfront motivations to control development at their front door. Ms. Schuman observed that it is also St. Louis County’s front door, and they, too, should have a huge interest in the development that takes place there. She was apprehensive about the special agreements made with the condominium complex and Drury, as well as policy decisions to use public monies to maintain private property. She thought St. Louis County should insist under current TIF agreements that the road be raised. She was also concerned about the use of public tax dollars for the sewer improvements without some sort of special district that involved the property owners in that area. Ms. Schuman said the boundaries were not compact and logical. The argument that the boundaries are the way they are because that was the way the city of Peerless Park was shaped, does not hold anything with her, since Peerless Park had strange and illogical boundaries as well. Because of the irregular boundaries, she believed the service provisions would be impacted not only for St. Louis County but also for Valley Park. She thought it would be difficult to efficiently get the services in that area that are needed. Finally, the trash transfer station remained with her a very regional issue with very complex and regulatory concerns. Ms. Schuman said those issues were best handled by St. Louis County at this time.

Mr. Kloepfel said the issues he was concerned with had been addressed. Mr. T. Armstrong said he was opposed to the Valley Park proposal for the following reasons: First, nothing would change in the annexed area because they would continue being served by St. Louis County. Second, the biggest impact of the annexation would be on the commercial interests, which represented a large majority of the area. Most of those interests would be affected by an additional sales tax. Only 50 or so residents would be doing the voting for the business community and that bothered him a great deal. He thought Mr. Wojtkowski was correct in surmising that the boundaries had been drawn in order to capture those residents who would be in favor of it. Most importantly, this was not a compact or logical boundary situation. Mr. T. Armstrong agreed with Ms. Schuman in that it does not make any difference what Peerless Park looked like, and that it has every thing to do with what this proposed annexation area looked like. It crossed both Meramec River and Highway 44, either of which could be considered a logical boundary for Valley Park.

Mr. T. Armstrong also said the argument that a smaller city yields better representation did not apply because, again, there are roughly 50 residents. The businesses that exist in the area and the proposed annexation area are really not desirable for a small municipality to govern. There is a composting and trash transfer station and those types of real estate are best managed by a larger governing body like St. Louis County. Mr. T. Armstrong said that the Drury interests have essentially forced Valley Park to revert the zoning to avoid raising the Meramec Station Rd. out of the flood plane. He did not think Valley Park was in a position to handle the kinds of interests that exist in the annexation area. He said this annexation would take the best part of the commercial unincorporated area, along with a general area, and it would leave other areas which will probably not attract future annexation interests by anyone. He had empathy for residents wanting to be part of a smaller municipality, but he also had concern for St. Louis County’s ability to afford the

services for the remaining unincorporated areas. For all of those reasons, he intended to vote against Mr. Wojtkowski's motion.

Ms. Bredenkoetter said Ms. Schuman eloquently expressed her concerns. Like Ms. Schuman, Ms. Bredenkoetter considered herself a very pro-cities person. She thought cities make St. Louis County strong, but shared many of the same concerns as Ms. Schuman. Mr. Ford called for a vote. Mr. Spears clarified that the motion on the floor was to approve the Valley Park proposal BC0411. A "yes" vote meant it would be approved, while a "no" vote meant it would be rejected.

Roll Call:

Matt Armstrong:

Ted Armstrong: No

Christine Bredenkoetter: No

Bob Ford: No

Marvin Gelber:

Greg Kloeppe: No

Betty Marver:

Mary Schuman: No

Johnnie Spears: No

Edward Thibeault: No

Don Wojtkowski: No

8 against. The motion was disapproved.

Mr. Wojtkowski made a motion to disapprove the Valley Park proposal BC0411. Mr. T. Armstrong seconded it.

Roll Call:

Matt Armstrong:

Ted Armstrong: Yes

Christine Bredenkoetter: Yes

Bob Ford: Yes

Marvin Gelber:

Greg Kloeppe: Yes

Betty Marver:

Mary Schuman: Yes

Johnnie Spears: Yes

Edward Thibeault: Yes

Don Wojtkowski: Yes

8 in favor, the motion passed.

B. Discussion/Vote to accept or reject Manchester Proposal BC0404

Mr. T. Armstrong made a motion to disapprove the Manchester proposal BC404. Mr. Wojtkowski seconded. Mr. Spears opened the motion up for discussion.

Ms. Bredenkoetter said that even though she is a very pro-cities person, she had problems with the Manchester proposal. One of the things that she looked for was, ‘what do the people want?’ Repeatedly, the Commission heard overwhelmingly that the people apart of the annexation were not interested in being part of the city of Manchester. That spoke very loudly to her. Also, she had a real problem using tax dollars to put the issue to a vote because the rooms at the meetings have been constantly filled with people who are opposed to it.

Mr. T. Armstrong was opposed to the Manchester proposal for a handful of reasons. First, there would be a significant tax impact on the annexed area. A lot of that impact would fall on businesses that were unable to vote on it. He said one of the duties of the Commission was to look out for those interests that are unable to express themselves. Secondly, the proposal would leave several areas vacant and would make it very difficult for unincorporated St. Louis County to continue to provide services. Third, St. Louis County strenuously opposes the proposal because there was a huge revenue impact of over a million dollars per year. Fourth, as Ms. Bredenkoetter mentioned, there was absolutely no indication of any citizen support for the Manchester proposal. He could not remember a single person at any of the meetings who spoke in favor of it. In this kind of situation, where there was no apparent backing, he felt that putting it to a vote was not only a waste of time, but a waste of money.

Mr. Spears said he shared Mr. T. Armstrong’s sentiment. Mr. Ford said he also agreed with Mr. T. Armstrong, in that the financial impact on St. Louis County would leave them unable to provide services. Mr. Ford wanted to commend the residents of the proposed area on their persistence in letting the Commission know how they felt. Ms. Schuman said she agreed with Manchester’s argument that annexation was a legitimate means to grow. When she first looked at the boundaries that were proposed, she thought they were extremely reasonable to Manchester and that they followed very good planning principles. Unfortunately, they created some very awkward boundaries for the remaining unincorporated pockets on either side of them. Whether St. Louis County should be serving a large unincorporated area that is surrounded by municipalities, is open for another discussion. However, this proposal made the service delivery situation much worse, and negatively affected the residents in those unincorporated pockets on either side of the area that Manchester wants to annex. It also made the remaining areas less attractive for future annexations because the proposal took most of the commercial properties out of that unincorporated area. She also came to the conclusion that there would be a fairly significant tax increase to the people being annexed, without a balancing increase in service level. In other words, the people were not going to get the most “bang for their buck”. The uncertainty about Manchester’s ability to meet some of the major capital needs, such as the Braeshire bridge repairs, was also a concern. Ms. Schuman pointed out that with zoning issues, some of the residential land uses have the potential to become non-conforming uses in the future. Manchester’s minimum lot size requirements are not compatible with some of the zoning that the newer subdivisions have been developed under. Also, in addition to increasing inefficiencies in service delivery, she felt that that would be compounded by reducing the revenues to St. Louis County.

Mr. Wojtkowski said that as the Commission applied the best interest test to this plan of intent, it failed in all respects. Mr. Thibeault had two points. First, the public sentiment for this proposal was obviously against it and the Commission was honor-bound to respect that point of view. Secondly, there was only one winner in the proposal, and that was the City of Manchester. The rest of the constituencies involved, whether it was the County or the area intended for annexation, will face higher taxes. It was apparent to him that the proposal was economically driven by the city, and was not in the spirit of what the annexation process was supposed to promote. It was supposed to be about promoting the greater good throughout the County and he did not think that the Manchester proposal in any way adhered to that.

Mr. T. Armstrong called for the question and Mr. Ford asked that the motion be stated. Mr. Spears announced that the motion on the floor was to reject Manchester proposal BC0404. A “yes” vote was to reject it and a “no” vote was to approve it.

Roll Call:

Matt Armstrong:

Ted Armstrong: Yes

Christine Bredenkoetter: Yes

Bob Ford: Yes

Marvin Gelber:

Greg Kloepfel: Abstained because he lives in the area.

Betty Marver:

Mary Schuman: Yes

Johnnie Spears: Yes

Edward Thibeault: Yes

Don Wojtkowski: Yes

7 in favor, 1 abstaining. The motion passed.

Vice-Chairman Spears called for a brief recess and the meeting reconvened.

C. Discussion/Vote to accept or reject Ellisville Proposal BC0405

Mr. Spears had Mr. Weber explain the options with the Ellisville proposal. Mr. Weber reminded the Commission that they had previously approved an application for the City of Wildwood. The proposal by Ellisville overlapped with both the Wildwood and Ballwin proposals. If it was the Commission’s desire to ultimately accept the Ellisville proposal, then their action that evening would be to defer, under section 72.405, subsection 10, after the Wildwood election on June 7, 2005. The Commission would be allowed to take final action on the deferred proposal within 45-days of the election.

Mr. Thibeault clarified that if the Wildwood voters were to reject their annexation, then there would not be an overlap with the Ellisville proposal; however, there would be an overlap with Ballwin. Mr. Weber replied yes. Mr. Wojtkowski asked if the Wildwood

proposal were accepted by the voters and the Commission deferred on the Ellisville proposal, then what would be the Commission's action at that time. Mr. Weber said the Commission would have to reject it. Mr. T. Armstrong asked if the Commission had the same option with respect to Ballwin. Mr. Weber said yes, but there is no overlap. He added that if the Commission deferred on Ellisville, then they needed to grant priority to Ballwin. Mr. Ford said the Commission could not, at that time, defer Ballwin's proposal because there is no overlap. Mr. Wojtkowski stated that the approval of both Ballwin and Wildwood would create a pocket.

Mr. Wojtkowski made a motion to reject the Ellisville proposal BC0405. Mr. T. Armstrong seconded the motion. Mr. Spears opened the floor up for discussion. Mr. Wojtkowski said it appeared to him that the ultimate destiny of the area was to be annexed by someone. It was a little perplexing, and he did not know if any of the Commission's past discussions pointed fingers at Ellisville, that after a two-year planning period, the three municipalities came forward with such overlapping proposals. The municipal planning was supposed to be the whole platform for the annexation process. He thought the Commission should disapprove both of the proposals, let the cities figure it out and then come back to the Commission in the next cycle with some proposals that make sense.

Given the pocket that was created, Mr. Thibeault supported Mr. Wojtkowski's suggestion. It was Mr. Thibeault's understanding that a survey was taken amongst the populous in the area to be annexed that reflected a rejection of wanting to be incorporated into Ellisville. For him, that was a key factor for rejecting the proposal, as well as the fact that the boundaries were not compact. Ms. Schuman also stated that the proposed annexation area was rather oddly-shaped anyway. She thought about the possibility of deferring to see what would happen with the Wildwood vote, but then she realized that the proposed annexation area, even with those adjusted boundaries, would become even stranger in its appearance. She was really impressed with the cooperative tone of the letter, in terms of the three unincorporated pockets that exist right now, and the offer of Mayor Khoury to look at the possibility of boundary adjustments for those three areas. She hoped that Ellisville would go back to the drawing board for the next phase, and in the meantime look at that boundary adjustment process for those three unincorporated pockets.

Mr. T. Armstrong agreed with both Mr. Wojtkowski and Ms. Schuman. He would have been willing to treat favorably the Ballwin proposal, but for the issue that there is a pocket because of an error in their map plan. The pocket between themselves and Wildwood can not be solved except through another map plan series. If the Commission allowed the Ballwin proposal to go forward and it is approved, then they would be leaving a series of pockets between there and the city of Ellisville. Mr. T. Armstrong felt the right thing to do in this case would be to disapprove both of the proposals and suggest to Ellisville and Ballwin that they address the issue in their next map plan series. He asked the cities to bring forth a proposal that they both can agree upon, that makes sense, and that does not leave any unincorporated pockets.

Mr. T. Armstrong called for the question and Mr. Spears stated that motion on the floor was to reject the Ellisville proposal BC0405.

Roll Call:

Matt Armstrong:

Ted Armstrong: Yes

Christine Bredenkoetter: Yes

Bob Ford: Yes

Marvin Gelber:

Greg Kloeppe: Yes

Betty Marver:

Mary Schuman: Yes

Johnnie Spears: Yes

Edward Thibeault: Yes

Don Wojtkowski: Yes

8 in favor. The motion passed.

D. Discussion/Vote to accept or reject Ballwin Proposal BC0410

Mr. Ford made a motion to reject Ballwin proposal BC0410. He based his reasoning on all of the comments that had been previously made. Primarily, the irregular boundaries that it would create and the pockets that it could potentially create. Mr. Thibeault seconded the motion and Mr. Spears opened the floor up for further discussion.

Ms. Schuman said the Ballwin proposal really gave her fits because she thought it was good. It was well-thought out in terms of orderly growth; the proposed boundaries seemed very logical; the area was compact; the natural boundaries and subdivision lines were all considered and applied; there were no commercial land grabs; lines were drawn very carefully so that the services to the annexed area would never have to physically leave the city of Ballwin. Also, the financial impact on the residents of the area appeared to be balanced from even St. Louis County's own analysis. However, at the January meeting Mr. Thibeault made the point that this is the time when the Commission has to get things right. If both Wildwood and Ballwin were to be approved, it would leave a very nasty pocket. Ms. Schuman said the Commission had talked a long time about whether the people in that area would be disenfranchised, but that was not her main concern. The main issue was that it would create severe service delivery problems for St. Louis County and she did not think the Commission wanted to create those kinds of problems. She mentioned that Ballwin eloquently argued in a letter that previous Commissioners have agreed with their logic and were willing to approve proposals that created pockets. However, Ms. Schuman did not think that the current Commission should do that at this time. Residents of the area being considered for annexation, although they were cautiously favorable, also expressed a wish to have plenty of time to do their homework on this issue. From her viewpoint, this was a very good proposal, but there was no pressing need to rush it. She suggested everyone else go back to the drawing board and do their homework, so that they could get it right.

Mr. Spears reiterated that the motion on the floor was to reject the Ballwin proposal BC0410.

Roll Call:

Matt Armstrong:

Ted Armstrong: Yes

Christine Bredenkoetter: Yes

Bob Ford: Yes

Marvin Gelber:

Greg Kloeppe: Yes

Betty Marver:

Mary Schuman: Yes

Johnnie Spears: Yes

Edward Thibeault: Yes

Don Wojtkowski: Yes

8 in favor. The motion passes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Ford made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wojtkowski seconded the motion. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.*

Respectfully submitted,
Courtney Irwin
Executive Director

Approved: April 26, 2005