

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

**TRANSCRIPT OF MAP PLAN PUBLIC HEARING  
DES PERES, TOWN & COUNTRY, VALLEY PARK  
& ST. LOUIS COUNTY**

**November 8, 2006**

**COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:**

<b>Commissioners</b>	<b>Present (P)/Absent (A)</b>
Matt Armstrong	A
Ted Armstrong	P
Christine Bredenkoetter	P
Bob Ford	P
Frank Kenney	P
Greg Kloeppe	A
Mary Schuman	P
John Schuster	P
Johnnie Spears	P
Edward Thibeault	P
Don Wojtkowski	A

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director  
Beth Hofer, Legal Counsel  
CALL TO ORDER

---

*TRANSCRIPTIONIST'S NOTE: In text a word followed by [sic] indicates exactly what was said by the speaker.*

1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair Spears: Good evening. Welcome to the Public Hearing on the Map Plan of the five-year cycle presented by these various different municipalities. Tonight, Map Plans will be presented by Ballwin, Ellisville, Valley Park, Wildwood and St. Louis County, in that order. Each municipality will have 15 minutes to present their Map Plan followed by questions from the Commission. On the public comment section, we have some forms ... where are they? ... on the table back there ... we ask that if you want to speak during the public comment, that you fill out one of those forms and pass it up to the Executive Director. If you're speaking as an individual, we will give you three minutes. If you're speaking representing an organization, you'll have five minutes. We ask that your comments be directed to the specific Map Plans presented here tonight.

The Commission is not required to take any action on these Map Plans. It is a requirement of State Statute that each municipality submit a five-year Map Plan in order

to seek a proposal and a boundary change within that five years. Some of these Map Plans may be more in detail than what an original proposal would be. They cannot be more, but they could be less or they could be phased in depending on the in-depth of each municipality or group how they foresee.

The Boundary Commission is appointed throughout St. Louis County by the various municipalities based on size and population and by a joint committee of St. Louis County and the Municipal League. With that, I will introduce the Commissioners, starting to my far left.

THIBEAULT: My name is Ed Thibeault, and I represent the municipalities of over 30,000 residents.

BREDENKOETTER: My name is Christine Bredenkoetter, and I represent those cities over 50,000, large cities.

ARMSTRONG: I'm Ted Armstrong. I represent small cities.

FORD: I'm Bob Ford, and I represent St. Louis County.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: I'm Johnnie Spears, and I represent unincorporated St. Louis County by joint committee and the Municipal League.

SCHUMAN: My name is Mary Schuman. I was appointed by St. Louis County/Municipal League and St. Louis County, and I live in University City.

SCHUSTER: I'm John Schuster. I was appointed by County Executive Dooley.

KENNEY: My name is Frank Kenney. I was appointed by the mayors of large cities of 10,000 to 30,000 residents.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you. Our first Map Plan will be presented by the City of Ballwin.

YOUNG: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for giving us this evening the opportunity to present our Map Plan for the City of Ballwin. My name is Walt Young. I'm the Mayor of the City of Ballwin. Along with me, I have both my City Administrator, Bob Kuntz, and Tom Aiken, our City Planner and Assistant Administrator.

The plan that we are presenting this evening is generally the same as we presented to the Commission on November 14, 2000. In fact, it consists with ... it's consistent with Ballwin's long-term annexation plan which was initially adopted on January 11, 1992. At that time we established the goal of our ultimate boundaries to be Meramec River to the south, Clayton Road east of Baxter to the North, Sulphur Springs Road to the southeast and southwest along St. Paul Road. Much of that initial plan has successfully been implemented via annexations.

The major difference between our 2000 and our 2006 Plan is reflected in our commitment to leave no unincorporated service areas ... sorry ... not to leave any unincorporated service delivery areas between Ballwin and other municipal neighbors. In other words, no pockets. Prior to submission of our plan, we ... was [sic] shared with our potential affected cities and written offers were extended to meet and discuss so as to avoid overlapping proposals. At least we have agreed to ... for we at least to have to agree to future boundary lines. Clarkson Valley was not initially included since it did not submit a Map Plan, and we had no indication of competing interests. Based on formal discussions with the Mayor of Ellisville, Matt and myself and city administrators, it is likely that this small overlap can be resolved, and we are very proud of the fact that we've worked together as a team to do so. With Ballwin conceding any claim to the area, based on the submittal of the formal proposal by Ellisville that they include in this plan.

Unfortunately, we are not as optimistic regarding Wildwood since its plan includes significant overlap with Ballwin's proposal that was not anticipated. We've received no response to our communication nor engaged in any dialogue with them or with Valley Park although the door for compromise remains open.

The areas on this current Map Plan were significantly included because we feel strongly that they and Ballwin share the following mutual benefits: compatibility with existing communities, logical extension of current boundaries, ability to provide efficient service delivery, and future prospective revenue impact for Ballwin.

St. Louis County has traditionally argued that it can effectively continue to serve these isolated areas even though communities such as Ballwin have demonstrated that they offer more efficient and extensive municipal services. The County also pleads the case that annexation creates economic hardships. It is [sic] conveniently fails to take into account that the potential of service ... reduced service delivery and costs that can be and should be in the results. We will not deny that economic factors are our primary consideration in the submission of our annexation proposal. The City of Ballwin has no significant timetable or phasing plan to offer tonight, but based on our long-term and successful experience with the process, I can tell you that we will not consider any submissions unless there is significant interest from the affected areas. At that stage, the Board will likely direct staff to conduct a comprehensive economic analysis and based on this report and other relevant factors, the Board would then determine its official position. Unfortunately [sic], all we want is for the affected residents and property owners to have the opportunity to make the choice and we will abide by their decision. I want to thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Questions from the Commissioners. Start on my left, Ed?

THIBEAULT: Could you expound a little bit on the issue with Wildwood? You say you initiated some discussion, but there was no response?

YOUNG: We have contacted them on numerous occasions by email asking them to sit down and discuss the issue prior to their submittal and afterwards, and we've received nothing in return.

THIBEAULT: Thank you.

YOUNG: Yes, sir.

BREDENKOETTER: I don't have anything.

ARMSTRONG: I'm a little confused about what you said about Ellisville. I got the impression ... what I heard you say was that you arrived at some agreement with Ellisville ...

YOUNG: Yes, we have.

ARMSTRONG: ... But what I look ... when I look at this map here, I see there is overlap in the far ... what is that ... northwest corner of the proposed annexation area.

YOUNG: No, when you see and they present their plan, you will understand that we've agreed to the terms that they're looking at of what they want to annex. What we looked at was when we started this was [sic] we wanted to leave no pockets, no areas where somebody could say that we were trying to leave a pocket ...

ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

YOUNG: ... and both Ellisville and I, the mayor and I, had not had a chance to discuss what was the best interest so we submitted our plan based on that. Since then, both he and our city administrators have both sit [sic] down, worked out our differences to make sure that everybody is on the same page, and once they present their package, then we will be able to modify ours and take care of it.

ARMSTRONG: So I take it then that your agreement with Ellisville would be that the two northernmost, northwestern ... look at these with me ...

[background conversations – no direct microphones]

ARMSTRONG: Yeah, yeah, that's a good idea. [inaudible] these two pieces right here, which are overlapped by Ballwin and Ellisville [inaudible] have some agreement that they would go to Ellisville.

YOUNG: Yes.

ARMSTRONG: Do you have a similar agreement as to this piece down here where there is an overlap?

YOUNG: Yes. And there's this piece here that's actually in Ellisville, surrounded by Ellisville, we're only in Ballwin on one side so we [inaudible]

ARMSTRONG: But this part right here is [inaudible].

[background conversations]

YOUNG: There's a pocket up here in this off of Reinke Road. That's a little bitty subdivision that they have asked and requested, which makes sense because Ellisville is all the way around it on three sides. We explained to them that that would be amenable. They've also asked for these places that are already based in ... really in the Ellisville area but have never been picked up through other annexations. And through my discussions, I find that this area here with the city administrators have worked out that issue to go to Ellisville as well.

ARMSTRONG: I have no other questions.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Mr. Ford?

FORD: So do you and Ellisville ... I'll wait 'till Ellisville ... for them to answer, but do your two communities are [sic] going to request an amendment to your Map Plan to split everything up or am I misunderstanding or what?

YOUNG: Just a second, please.

[background conversations]

YOUNG: It will be reflected in our submission of our proposals.

FORD: So if one city or the other decides to change their mind, you're still covered under the Map Plan?

YOUNG: That's correct.

FORD: Okay, I want ...

YOUNG: But I don't look for that to happen because we've agreed to this already.

FORD: You had indicated that Ballwin would not move forward unless there was some interest from the communities. Has there been any interest? Are residents come [sic] to you and request ... show any interest?

YOUNG: Yes, sir. I've had a number of subdivisions personally come to me individually, but back in the '90s when we were looking at this, they also submitted petitions at that time. Some of them have said that they are willing to do that, and I said not until this process is completed and we're ready to move on to the next phase.

FORD: Recently, they have?

YOUNG: Yes, they have.

FORD: Mr. Chairman, I have no other questions.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: I really don't have a question, but just a comment. I'm glad to hear that the cities are working together because the Commission strongly urges all the municipalities to work together before we get into the proposals and overlapping situations. I'm glad to hear it.

YOUNG: Well, both Matt and I believe that that's important that our cities work together not only on this but other issues that we've tried to work together. If you've kept abreast at all, we helped them out with their swimming pool issue this year where their pool was down, and we allowed them to come to our city's pool and partake and be part of it. And that's the only thing to do is be fair with other communities.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you. Mary?

SCHUMAN: I have no questions. Thank you, Mayor Young.

YOUNG: You're welcome.

SCHUSTER: No questions at this time.

KENNEY: Quickly, so I understand that with regard to the areas where both Ellisville and Ballwin have indicated an interest, you have indicated that Ellisville would be the one that if anybody was going to annex them, they would be the one ...

[background speaker inaudible]

... prior to any attempt by Ballwin?

[background speaker inaudible]

With regard to any of the other areas, you indicated that there was interest, but you have not requested that the neighbors ramp it up and file petitions or do anything ... in which areas ... in all three areas? It looks like there's three other areas, the overlap of Ballwin and Wildwood, the Ballwin area only, and the Ballwin and Valley Park area.

YOUNG: Okay, the areas that [inaudible] primarily discussing are the areas here off of Kiefer Creek and off of Big Bend.

KENNEY: Okay. And what's ... what is in that big area between Meramec River and ... yeah.

YOUNG: Castlewood Park.

KENNEY: Castlewood Park. Okay.

YOUNG: And Castlewood itself down in this area as well.

KENNEY: Okay. Thank you.

YOUNG: Yes, sir.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Any other questions? Thank you, sir.

YOUNG: Thank you very much for the opportunity, and if you have any other questions, I'll stick around, you can ask them.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Okay. Next on the Agenda would be the City of Ellisville.

PIRRELLO: Ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, I want to thank you personally for giving us this opportunity to present to you this evening. In light of some of the questions that you had earlier ... we're going to need just a few minutes just to get this set up and make sure it's operating ... I believe we'll be able to address the concerns that you had between Ballwin and Ellisville. Much like our Map Plan submittal, my presentation will be brief and efficient.

ARMSTRONG: We like that.

PIRRELLO: We have provided you this document that has color maps in it, and I'm going to be referring to those colored maps while we're going through this. We'll also be projecting up here for the sake of the public and then, of course, if you have some questions as we go through the map, we'll be able to identify those for both you and the public.

My name is Matt Pirrello. I am the Mayor for the City of Ellisville, and we are here to propose a [sic] annexation map proposal. This map proposal on the first map is the proposed annexation area ... shows three areas in total. The first map is the Old State Road area. The ... allow me to get Vanna to change the ... thank you, sir ... now this is working. Okay. Okay. The Old State Road area ... for some reason ... I am inept in this ... is located on the south end of Old State Road just next to Wildwood. This subdivision down in this area and ... is the only real residential. There's two residential parcels here, but on the west side is all light industrial and industrial zoned areas. As you can clearly see, the area is completely surrounded by the City of Ellisville and to merely fulfill the objectives of the Commission we're simply asking to close this pocket up for sake of efficiencies and services provided.

Next is the Reinke Road area. This is actually one of the two areas and questions that you all had some questions about. That is south on Reinke Road south of Manchester Road. The areas up here in pink are all areas surrounded by Ellisville and then, this is just a section of road up here. I've talked with Walt and our city managers had got [sic] together and discussed this and it seemed to be the most logical conclusion as to once again, close this pocket.

The third area map is the Kiefer Creek area, and this is where you all have expressed the most confusion, I'll say, with regard to what it is that we are proposing. Now, I will

say on the front side that we have submitted our map proposal as well as Ballwin and Wildwood, and this given area is now being encompassed by all three. The City of Ellisville has also made several attempts to contact Wildwood. We understand that they had actually formed a commission, a boundary commission of their own to review these things, and we were unable to get any cooperation and any information from them with regard to what it was they were doing in overlapping areas.

So what we are proposing is ... pardon me ... what we are proposing is south on Kiefer Creek Road, we have one parcel here, which is a single residential, which we'd like to close up, and then further down through this area from here on down Kiefer Creek Road through this area is all area that Wildwood has requested for annexation and up through this area was also Ballwin's. Now ... on behalf of Ballwin, I'd just like to say, their map submittal was first before ours, and in an effort to make sure that we covered all areas they had submitted, we had since talked to them and we'll have revised a submission for you. There's no reason for either one ... for me to believe that we're going to change our mind on anything with regard to this map.

Now this ... interestingly enough, the other two seem to be very logical and make sense, and without really knowing the area down here, you'll see that ... that I am inept in dealing with the technological aspects of what I'm trying to do here this evening ... anyway, let's move on ... that area down there is best accessed through Ellisville down Kiefer Creek Road. The Wildwood area, they have a long way to get around through that area and as Ballwin would as well. And it's the most logical place for us to be able to serve that. We've met with Ballwin, we've had discussions ... tried to have discussions with Wildwood, and we've also gone as far to approve an ordinance to approve this Map Plan submittal to you. In addition to that ... try this one more time ... as we understand it, the goals and objectives of the Boundary Commission were to eliminate the unincorporated pockets in the creation of logical and reasonable boundaries, which we believe we're doing here. Also the delivery of services, which we believe we've studied extensively to make sure that we're providing the best services for our public. I will say that on behalf of one of the questions that was raised by the Commission members was whether or not the public has expressed interest in becoming a part of the City, we actually have some petitions that are tied up right now in Clayton that were requesting to be a part of the City of Ellisville, and I don't know exactly how far along those are, do you?

[background speaker]

It's in the County's hands at this point, so there has been ... we have not had any opposition, I will say that. Nothing has been expressed at this point. All right, I'm done with that.

And then in conclusion ... you can go ahead and turn that off ... in conclusion, we believe that the Ellisville Map Plan fulfills the Boundary Commission's goals. The Map Plan area residents will benefit from the expanded residential services and quicker response times. Ellisville currently has staffing and resources in place to provide quality service for all areas included in the Ellisville Map Plan.



And I would like to echo a lot of the same things that Walt said. I don't want to repeat those for you; you've already heard them once, but we're really trying to do the best that we can with regard to providing services to the public and incorporating and bringing people into a good community. We believe a good community, a solid community. We just were very fortunate yesterday to pass a quarter-cent parks tax for our parks, which incidentally we have the largest amount of park area per capita in the City of Ellisville, so we're very proud of that as well. So I'd be happy to entertain any questions from the Commission.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you. I'll start on my far right.

KENNEY: And I apologize for this ... Ellisville is a full city, offers all city service, police, fire ...

PIRRELLO: Well, we have West ...

KENNEY: ... or is it fire district?

PIRRELLO: We have a fire district which also services also Wildwood and portions of Ballwin, but we do provide trash service. We also provide leaf pickup.

KENNEY: Do you have a parks and recreation department?

PIRRELLO: We have a parks and rec ... a full-service parks and recreation department. And hopefully this time next year we'll have a new pool.

KENNEY: Nothing further.

SCHUSTER: No questions.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Mary?

SCHUMAN: I hate to admit it, but I'm still a little bit confused about the location three.

PIRRELLO: That's quite all right, we'll go over it.

SCHUMAN: I really am sorry. I thought I understood with Ballwin, you know, did their thing and now I just lost it, I'm sorry.

PIRRELLO: That's fine. Actually, if you look on the colored map sections that we included for you, there is a map that looks like this, and this map is a representation of ours, correct, our submission, which is in yellow. The red submission is Wildwood's submission to you, and the blue submission is Ballwin's submission. So you can clearly see how both Wildwood and Ballwin overlap that small portion that we're interested in annexing. Does that help or do you have any further questions about that?

SCHUMAN: Well, what I didn't understand was when you ... when Ellisville and Ballwin had talked about this, what the ... what understandings resulted from those meetings about the top portion where [inaudible].

PIRRELLO: Okay. What we had ... we had actually talked about this prior to the submittal. So it wasn't a matter of them showing us this map and then we say, "Hey, wait a minute. We want to look at this." This is actually something that has been discussed at length prior to this submission. Ballwin's City Administrator and our City Administrator got together and discussed the quality services and the best means to deliver that service to that area, and both have agreed, and Walt and I both endorse that the best means for the delivery of service right through that small area is through Ellisville.

SCHUMAN: Okay.

PIRRELLO: Does that help?

SCHUMAN: I think that ... yeah, I think so, and I do remember hearing that the first time. I just didn't ...

PIRRELLO: That's quite all right. Thank you.

SCHUMAN: Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: I have no questions. Mr. Ford?

FORD: Yes. At the bottom of location three, that diagonal boundary submittal, is that across a parcel or is that a road there or what? What did you determine that [inaudible]?

PIRRELLO: On the far south end of it? Could you pull up ... you can't pull it up? It won't start.

Okay. Yeah, I'm following you. That's actually all residential right there. Those are all single residential homes on very large lots.

FORD: So that's a property line that you've determined [inaudible]

PIRRELLO: The ... the ... if you look to the east of that, that is actually a roadway that accesses that ... those parcels through there, so, on our map if you look between the yellow and the white there at the bottom, that's actually a roadway up through there. There's no way to start that, huh? I apologize.

KENNEY: Those are all roads that are the dividing line?

PIRRELLO: No, those aren't all roads. There's just one road leading into there that allows us to service that area. And actually ... and I'll draw your attention

directly above that, Mr. Ford, if you go directly above that, you'll notice there's a small corner up there that seems to be kind of jumbled up with a bunch of properties up there.

FORD: Yeah.

PIRRELLO: If you go straight up that north line there between the yellow and the green, that actually is another roadway, and then as it curves off there to the left, that little loop-de-do it does and curves around, that's all roadway through there. I guess I should have provided a ... it's kind of odd.

FORD: [inaudible]

PIRRELLO: It's undeveloped area.

FORD: Is all this area developed or ...?

PIRRELLO: Yes, actually to the south is all developed. I can't speak to the property to the far north, but all the properties abutting Kiefer Creek are developed.

FORD: And how is that development lot size compared to Ellisville as a whole?

PIRRELLO: Well, comparable in some sections. District 1 and 3 have large lot sizes, acre-and-a-half, two-acre lots. Some of these are obviously much larger than that and have not been subdivided, but they are relatively large lots.

KENNEY: [inaudible] there's a large subdivision that appears to be in Wildwood that's down there in that area off of Kiefer Creek Road. Is the only access to that large subdivision off of Kiefer Creek Road or ...?

PIRRELLO: No, that is actually St. Paul Road runs up through there and they would have access ...

KENNEY: [talking over Pirrello] So you can get to it from Wildwood from the other side?

PIRRELLO: Via ... yes, via St. Paul down Ridge Road.

KENNEY: Okay, 'cause why wouldn't Kiefer Creek Road be the ... kind of the dividing line there as opposed to both sides of Kiefer Creek.

PIRRELLO: Well, it currently is the dividing line up to ... are you talking about that just ... that one property there on the south?

[background conversations]

KENNEY: Well, I'm looking at this and then why wouldn't you just have Kiefer Creek Road be your dividing line and have this and this be in Wildwood as

opposed to these two portions? You're asking to annex those two portions also are you not? I apologize, I just ...

PIRRELLO: No, that's an excellent question. I'm glad you brought that up. We actually had requests from that area to be annexed into Ellisville.

KENNEY: Okay.

PIRRELLO: That was a large part of the reason.

FORD: Mr. Chairman, I have no other questions.

PIRRELLO: Thank you.

ARMSTRONG: That was my question as well. You said you had requests for annexation from both of those pieces that are on the south side of Kiefer Road?

PIRRELLO: There are ... there were two individuals ... there's one, two, three, four, five to the south there, and two of which had requested to become a part of Ellisville.

FORD: Two out of five?

PIRRELLO: Yes, sir.

ARMSTRONG: My reaction as well as ...

PIRRELLO: And we didn't hear adversely the other way.

ARMSTRONG: My reaction as well is that Kiefer Creek Road would seem to be a more logical boundary between Wildwood and Ellisville and Ballwin.

PIRRELLO: The south side of Kiefer Creek Road, the access to that is through, down Kiefer Creek, not off of St. Paul Road; whereas the dividing line off of St. Paul Road, access into that subdivision is off of St. Paul Road or off of Kiefer Creek.

ARMSTRONG: I see what you mean. A more detailed map with the roads on it would certainly be helpful in the future if you ... I have one other question, what's the ... I'm struck by locations 1 and 2, which seem to be sitting out there in the middle of nowhere. What's the history behind those?

PIRRELLO: I wish I could speak to that. I really don't know.

ARMSTRONG: You don't know whether there have been attempts to annex?

PIRRELLO: Yes, yes, we have. As a matter of fact, the section on Map 1 of 3 ...

ARMSTRONG: I'm sorry, which, say again?

PIRRELLO: Map 1 of 3 ... at the top.

[background conversation]

Look's like this.

ARMSTRONG: Okay. I got it.

PIRRELLO: That is a subdivision down there that has petitioned us to become a part of Ellisville. That subdivision is relatively new I might add. That area down there is really as a result of the unincorporated areas as it had spilled down into Wildwood before Wildwood became incorporated.

ARMSTRONG: And you say there have been previous attempts to annex this area? Did you say that?

PIRRELLO: No, we just received a submittal from them, a petition from them. It's relatively new ...

[talking over each other]

ARMSTRONG: I'm talking about the history. Have there been previous attempts to annex location 1 or location 2?

PIRRELLO: I can't speak to that. I don't know.

ARMSTRONG: You don't know. All right. No questions. No further questions.

1<sup>ST</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Commissioner?

BREDENKOETTER: I have nothing.

THIBEAULT: What are your priorities relative to these three areas in terms of most important to the least important? What would you annex first if you were given your choice?

PIRRELLO: Well, given the opportunity, if I was backed into a corner and told to pick one out of any of these, I would think that we would rather have the Map 1 of 3, and then second would be 2 of 3, and then 3 of 3 would be third.

THIBEAULT: So this corridor along here would be your third priority?

PIRRELLO: Correct.

THIBEAULT: There's a question ... you have a property tax in Ellisville?

PIRRELLO: Yes, we do, 15 cents for every ...

THIBEAULT: So the residents in these areas would be faced with an increase in their taxes, correct?

PIRRELLO: Fifteen cents for every hundred dollars value.

THIBEAULT: Any indication as to the current sentiments of the residents in these areas? I know last year in another proposal where it seemed to me there was a lot of sentiment against incorporating with Ellisville. Is that still true?

PIRRELLO: Yes, sir there was. Yeah, the area that was ... well, it's not cooperating ... I'd draw your attention to a parcel of land that ... let's go to Map 3 of 3. The last time that we were before this board requesting an annexation, the section ... that subdivision down there to the west of St. Paul Road to the south of Kiefer Creek ... it's in white there ... was not a subdivision, and that was the undeveloped land that the developer was here asking ... or not asking ... but I believe they did ask to become a part of Wildwood.

THIBEAULT: I see.

PIRRELLO: And then our submission prior to that was further down St. Paul Road into another subdivision that is now Wildwood, and that was predominantly the concerns that were expressed at the last meeting. None of the concerns that I'm aware of are in the given area that we're submitting right now within Map 3 of 3.

THIBEAULT: And you're in sync with Ballwin, you share the same view that the Mayor of Ballwin ... share the ...

PIRRELLO: Absolutely.

THIBEAULT: You're both in agreement on these areas.

PIRRELLO: I can't even begin to express my gratitude to the City of Ballwin, especially when they came to our behalf ... came to us and offered assistance on their behalf for the sake of the pool situation that really ... it was quite remarkable to see a community be able to do that. Chesterfield did it as well, and we don't even abut them. But they had offered the ability for our residents to be able to take advantage of getting pool passes as though they were residents of Ballwin and Chesterfield so it was very nice to see.

THIBEAULT: Thank you. No further questions.

PIRRELLO: Yes, sir.

FORD: You didn't give the ... you'd take 1, 2, and 3. What's your reasoning behind that?

PIRRELLO: Once again I want to reiterate the Boundary Commission's goals and objectives. The maps as submitted with the exception of the south end of Map 3 of 3 are merely closing pockets of being surrounded.

FORD: Okay.

PIRRELLO: Map 1 of 3 was surrounded by all four sides of Ellisville.

FORD: Yeah.

PIRRELLO: So it's an island among itself and then 2 and then 3, right. So really, if you recall ... I can't remember ... some of your faces look familiar from the last Commission meeting, but if you recall, we have condensed our request for annexation and our map submittal significantly from our previous proposal which had been awarded ... the annexation had been awarded to Wildwood. So we're just simply trying ... we're ... at this point we're landlocked. We really won't have any sort of opportunity to expand any so we're just really trying to define the boundaries of the municipality.

1<sup>ST</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you, Mayor.

PIRRELLO: I would like to thank you very much for taking the time and hearing me this evening.

1<sup>ST</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you. Our next presentation will be presented by the City of Valley Park. While they're preparing, I'd just like to make another announcement. These are only Map Plans and before anything go [sic] forward, there will be a formal proposal issued with the exacting boundaries, population and all the figures that go along with it in the proposal, and there will be another public hearing just like this one on each individual proposal as it directly states.

MARTIN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. My name is Eric Martin. I represent the City of Valley Park. I'm here on behalf of the mayor, Mr. ... Mayor Jeffery Whitteaker. Tonight, I was going to confine my presentation to the two areas to the west of the existing city limits and they're marked up there as Phased Areas 2 and 3. They extend from the current western boundary of the City of Valley Park to Sulphur Springs Avenue on the west, to Big Bend on the north, and Hanna Road of the east, and the Meramec River on the south. These are not priority annexations for the City of Valley Park. They are identical with the proposed Map Plan presented in the year 2000 to this Commission. The City did not act on those particular annexations. The City has not contacted or surveyed or done any capital improvement studies for these two areas although they have received at least three contacts from one subdivision immediately to the west of the city. It is the City's current desire to continue with the current proposal to annex Peerless Park and follow that through to a conclusion whatever the outcome may be.

The City's criteria for these areas were that they were over 25 percent contiguous to the existing city boundaries. The City certainly could and is willing to serve this area. They

are all in the Parkway School District. Some of the areas are in the Valley Park Fire Protection District, some are in the former Manchester Fire Protection District. Again, phasing, we're not looking for anything soon on these, if at all, during this particularly phasing.

[End Tape 1, side A]

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: That's it?

MARTIN: Yes, sir.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Start on my far left. Any questions from the Commission?

THIBEAULT: I believe there's an overlap issue with Ballwin.

MARTIN: There may be an overlap issue by Ballwin with the City of Valley Park.

THIBEAULT: Is there any discussion with the City of Ballwin?

MARTIN: There has not been.

BREDENKOETTER: Well, I guess that begs the question, do you intend to have any discussions with Ballwin to try to resolve this?

MARTIN: Always willing to meet and try to negotiate and resolve issues.

BREDENKOETTER: Okay.

ARMSTRONG: You indicated that the ... that the areas were sufficiently contiguous. As a matter of fact, Area 3 is not contiguous, standing alone is it not?

MARTIN: I stand corrected. You are correct, sir.

ARMSTRONG: Which would mean that you could not file a proposal to annex Area 3 unless you had already completed the annexation of Area 2.

MARTIN: You are absolutely correct.

ARMSTRONG: Secondly, I believe you said that you had some contact from a subdivision in one of these two areas. I'm confused as to where.

MARTIN: It would have been the one marked as Phase 2, sir.

ARMSTRONG: In location 2.

MARTIN: Yes, sir.

ARMSTRONG: Area 2.



MARTIN: Yes, sir.

ARMSTRONG: And did you say it was on the far west side of it?

MARTIN: It is on the far west side of the existing city limits. It would be on the eastern end of the proposed ...

ARMSTRONG: Eastern end of Area 2.

MARTIN: Yes, sir.

ARMSTRONG: That's all I have.

MARTIN: Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Commissioner Ford?

FORD: Yeah. You had commented about part of it is in the Valley Park Fired District. Is that a municipal fire department or is it a district?

MARTIN: It's a Fire Protection District.

FORD: Okay. Thank you. No other questions.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: I have no questions. Mary?

SCHUMAN: The area where you apparently have had some contact ...

MARTIN: Yes, ma'am.

SCHUMAN: ... and they've initiated something. Is that just one of the subdivisions in there or is that ... was that pretty representative of that Area 2?

MARTIN: It's ... actually, it's a subdivision called [Momburks?]. Yes, ma'am.

SCHUMAN: And about what kind of population? How many households do they have in that subdivision?

MARTIN: There's probably about 35 ... 35 houses, single family ...

SCHUMAN: Fairly small subdivision.

MARTIN: It's a very small subdivision.

SCHUMAN: Okay. Thank you.

SCHUSTER: No questions.

KENNEY: Do you currently ... does Valley Park currently provide any services to any of that ... any of the areas or subdivisions in 2 and 3.

MARTIN: We do not. In fact, the subdivision that I'm referring to has no water service at all nor does it have any sewer.

KENNEY: And their police ... their current police is St. Louis County Police?

MARTIN: It is.

KENNEY: Does Valley Park respond at all?

MARTIN: We both have ... we contract with St. Louis County Police for service in the City of Valley Park and our officers, of course, would respond to any out city ...

KENNEY: Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you Mr. Martin. Presentation of Map Plan by the City of Wildwood.

MARSHALL: Thank you very much for creating this venue for us. As Mr. Vujnich, Director of Parks & Planning is setting up the PowerPoint; I guess I'd like to explain the accusations that we're not talking to anyone. Two month's ago ... the mayors do get together ... the Lafayette area mayors and asked, you know, "Should we get together and discuss this?" and said "Yes, let's try to get it scheduled." Unfortunately, the plans had already been submitted when that point had taken place. There were initial discussions and, I guess is, and probably what we've learned through the last process of incorporation, which was a couple of years ago, that's really the job of you all. I don't know that the cities should sit down and try to determine a give or take. We're certainly willing to present the plan and then as you see fit because it will come back to the voters to decide, and for those many of you that were here before, some of those pockets that existed in the old maps, they begged and wanted to come to Wildwood, and we asked them, "No, that's not part of the map overlay that we submitted in 1999 so therefore, don't do it now." The process is laid out as set up by the Boundary Commission. So to clarify it, we've submitted a plan that would encompass those areas. Certainly willing to work with the other cities. I, however, as the Mayor, and we have 16 elected Council people, had to get a commitment as to "Do you want to submit this plan as this size or do you not want to submit it?" And it was brought up in our ... we have ... it's not a boundary commission, but we have working committees in the council and that particular committee submitted to the full council that they believed we should submit for the five-year plan the boundary annexation map that we're submitting to you tonight. So, certainly, there's nothing here that's not negotiable, but there's certainly nothing that we have set down to predetermine this belongs in one area or the other in order to do that. We do ... we have had maps submitted prior to with the other cities that were not the same ones that were submitted at the end, so I just come forth tonight to explain to you

that we're not bad people. We're just trying to respect the fact that that's the purpose that you all are here and that hopefully we can answer the questions based on the questions that you've asked us to present.

And if we'll start, we were just going to answer your responses as you have copies of them as we move through the information, the area that we're proposing and I believe we're going to show you a map, which is very hard to see. The ... I guess we have it kind of referred to as Castlewood/Sherman area. The Sherman area, as many of you might have remembered, was part of our 1999 submission, and when in 2005, the procedure moved forward, we elected not to bring that portion in based on the residents not wanting to be part of the incorporation so that was the initial part and was still carried over as being a contiguous part of the city that would be in the long-term plan.

As you move further to the east ... and the roads, as you've heard earlier tonight, in the southern part, there are limited roads coming in. However, our police coverage, which is contracted through the County, does not necessarily run through Ellisville. Our communities do connect through the Cherry Hills area. It connects right on to the other roads that pull into the City of Wildwood so it's not as if we're driving out, but we are a large city and we do have connecting cities all around us so it's not unusual, but we do contract with the County Police and that coverage is coming out of the Wildwood area.

So that's the map and hopefully ... it looks as if maybe you don't have a hard copy in front of you, but if we need to go back to it, okay, we can do that.

Your first question is "What were the city's criteria?" I guess it's a community of interest created to similar development patterns. As many of you know, Wildwood is a relatively new city, very rural. This is very much of the area that we incorporated as city. The majority of that area in the Castlewood or in the Sherman area do not have sewers, do not have, in many cases, public water. Certainly prime some time from now, 10 years, 20 years from now, there will be development needs. Those development needs are coming up now, and we're seeing those as we get calls from people wanting to know are they allowed to build houses on that hillside. Well, it's not our area, we refer it back to the County. But I think the interest of what the people have, it's not much different than what we had in the last southern annexation of the residents living there wondering what was going to be there. The common boundary lines are part of the adjustment to try stay on roads that connected and that the homes came out onto those roads so we didn't have leaving little spots in that overlay map. These and extending the service delivery area, we are down into those areas and certainly can efficiently deliver not only from ourself [sic] but for our contractors that provide those services. And the definable boundaries, I think, is probably the bigger issue as far as making sure that those lots are ... fall within those primary roads. Joe, the next one.

Would you proceed with the proposal? The decision of the Council was to proceed with a single annexation plan to submit this to you all for your five-year review with the understanding that yes, we'd be prepared to take that part on in order to do that. I could just really quickly mention on the phasing ... certainly could do that. We did learn in the last one that there's a \$17,000 cost associated with putting it on the ballot when you do

a special election that way so from our standpoint, we probably would not just come up and do it on a ballot without timing it to where it would be on with a municipal election or something else in order to do that at that timing so you learn as you do those, and that's certainly one.

The timetable we just talked about. Joe, four or three, I guess four. I'll not read it to you. You have it in front of you. I'll just kind of hit on a couple of the items. The zoning and land use considerations in that southern and eastern part are very similar to what we are dealing with now throughout our city and our non-urban area so it would define that. One issue that usually pops up is how do you deal with those non-conforming areas and this holding categories ... we've experienced that over the last 11 years in many parts of our city because annexing out of the County, we're in the County, the same zoning programs and therefore, it becomes pretty natural our compliance and the non-conforming use is phased through that way. The part of preserving the natural basin, the Glencoe area, we as well as the County have worked on the trail programs along the Meramec River. The Sherman area does abruptly stop that from expanding out along that natural barrier towards Castlewood and the Glencoe area of Wildwood, which now in cooperation with the County we have been able to assimilate about 14 areas ... 14 acres of park land that was flooded at one point and now will become part of the greenspace.

To offset the economic inefficiencies, it is an isolated area. It's a lot easier for us to contract and provide those services at the ... as they would continue down from those streets that we're talking about, Ridge Road and St. Paul Road, with our trash haulers and with the other contract services than it would be to come in as we talked before for the County to come in a maintain a short piece of road, has to be expensive regardless of who's paying for it. As a County resident, I think we're all paying for that so I think the efficiencies would be to try to get those services handled by the most cost-effective area regardless of whether it's in the County or the city.

Best service to the area. We do have a proven model for the high level of services. Again, we do contract the trash hauling out. We know, also from experience learned, when the annexation was approved last time, those folks were immediately ... their trash haulers immediately dropped them. We had to ask our contractors to go in and pick up the area. So we have learned the timing of the annexation does create some challenges for some areas.

The understanding of the physical characteristics and the development that will happen. There is development in some areas in the Castlewood area that I don't think people realize a long-term damages to the watersheds. We've experienced it. We have those water erosion and watershed programs, but I think that control and the enforcement of the zoning. The zoning is there, and I believe that we could make sure that those residents that will be affected by ... by that are certainly heard if not enforced.

The advantages ... one of the areas I would like to address is the police on patrols. We looked at this from the city standpoint. We right now are operating as a ... we contract with St. Louis County and we operate four beats, seven days a week with the exception

of two to three days. This annexation would allow us to have that coverage then expanded. From the city standpoint, we would hope then to negotiate because it's being covered by the County in another precinct now, but it would allow us to better utilize our cost of delivery of that police protection and I know that it would ensure ... it would end up with a smaller protection area for the County Police so that I think the residents that are affected by both those areas would have much greater coverage in order to do that. It is a cost, but I also believe that we would be in a position to work with the County as a contractor with them to make sure that we improve the service and not duplicate anything. So that is an important part of the efficiencies that we believe that would pull out of it.

The people are ... minimum tax burden relative ... we don't have a property tax in the City of Wildwood. I don't know that we can say that we'll never have one in ten years, but right now we're pool-city tax and we operate it based on the revenues that are generated that way, and we have to operate efficiently so we do contract, and it's very different, but I believe that as we talk to our residents, they see the fact that they would like not to have a city tax and continue to appreciate the fact that efficiencies gained through negotiating our contracts, whether it be for snow removal on those city-maintained roads or police protection, trash or whatever the services would be.

The comprehensive and appropriate services needed by the residents and property owners ... their needs are very different. They are rural in nature. They're not used to the enforcement of the codes. We certainly have experience in that. We try to work with the residents and, I guess, the long-term goal is whether it's now, four years, five years from now, the area will change and hopefully it will change gradually as development would take place and not one of having the development change and have those negative affects on the owners that the owners would appreciate and I think we certainly have parts of our City that initially felt it was the wrong thing who now would tell you that their property values have increased, which from the County standpoint, that's a good thing. For the neighboring properties, it's a good thing. And as I shared with you the situation we had in part of our other [sic] city by working and enforcing the codes and cleaning it up, we no longer, as well as, the County could buy properties because the properties got too expensive. So as you have to ... as you work and try to improve the values in those areas, you want to make sure that it works well for all the residents that are involved.

The cost-effective system for maintenance for public infrastructure ... again contracted and bid on an annual basis. And a commitment ... we just renewed our Master Plan and I think that the residents turn out for that event after ten years said a lot for the fact. They said, "Maintain the Master Plan. Don't make the changes. Don't allow the overdevelopment of those fragile areas of land that we have." And I believe that has served us well, and we're kind of looking forward saying sometime, certainly not today, but in the future these areas are going to experience the same type things and the damage doesn't have to occur if you can do it ahead of time. Again earlier we talked about the ... because we don't have a property tax, that the individual residents from a transition standpoint, the only actual difference that a resident in that area ... if they

would go and buy a new car, we do have a half-a-cent capital improvement tax which does improve the roads and capital improvements but that would be the only difference that they have now from the County taxes. So there's no ... that's only if you make a large purchase like a car that you would have that half-a-cent tax. Everything else would be the same as they have now. I don't know for sure, and we would certainly present that in the final plan. I would assume that their trash hauling prices would go down knowing the terrain and knowing what our residents experienced before we took franchises in and contracted out, they were paying pretty large prices to have that rural pickup for trash services.

Interest ... yes, we did send out surveys. Only received 54 back, but in the area we're talking about, there's 425 residents that were mailing addresses to do that, so it is a small basis, 12–15 percent. Were they all in favor of it? No, about half, but we had a lot of people who had expressed interest before that weren't picked up on the survey. Again, we submitted the plan so that as the future and you all make your decisions, that we would be prepared to take in that portion and be able to provide the kind of services that the citizens of Wildwood have come to expect.

I believe we're ready to answer any questions that you might have.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Okay. Thank you, Mayor Marshall. Start on my far right. Commissioner Kenney.

KENNEY: With regard to your trash hauling is ... you contract with the trash hauler ... do you or the trash hauler directly bill or is it included in your taxes?

MARSHALL: We don't have taxes so it's a direct bill by the hauler.

KENNEY: So basically it's a wash. You'd be providing your contract services ...

MARSHALL: The advantage, Mr. Kenney, is the fact is we would have people before, for example, the street I lived on has 25 homes. We had 29 trash trucks on that street every week. Now we have one for recycling and one for trash once a week. The cost reduced dramatically. There's no ... the competition is based on city-bidding and we bid out every three years so I'm paying less now for trash in year six than I did before we were able to pull the contracts in.

KENNEY: The taxes that you'd be receiving from these areas that you'd be annexing would essentially be the gross receipts tax?

MARSHALL: That portion of the pool-tax for the population as well as those taxes that are capitated [sic] such as the population-driven tobacco or the car/vehicle ...

KENNEY: [inaudible – talking at same time] What's your gross receipts tax rate?

MARSHALL: Five percent. Oh, I'm sorry, yes, for utilities. We would get the utility tax, yes 5 percent.

KENNEY: Okay. And Wildwood is notorious for ... or has a reputation, and I don't want to ...

MARSHALL: And I hope that's in a good way.

KENNEY: ... I don't want to mischaracterize anything ... my perception, my perception ...

MARSHALL: I'm sure we've heard it before, so go ahead.

KENNEY: My perception of Wildwood is that their ... they want to preserve what they have and they don't ... they don't like smaller lot sizes. They want to keep things. Is that one of the motivating factors for attempting to annex these so that smaller subdivisions or areas that are subdivided into smaller lots don't encroach or come next to their borders?

MARSHALL: Well, I think two things. The city is very large so we do have the high density areas of the city, but those are defined in areas that have the utilities. I'm serious. We have zoning with six units to an acre so we do have those high dense [sic] areas. This kind of terrain ... what we're talking about for an annexation area cannot handle that. You don't have sewage. You don't have potable water. And quite honestly, you don't have natural gas for that use tax. Most of that is propane in that particular region. So, no, we do have ... no, in that particular area, non-urban would be ... new developments would be under three acre lot size, which means that the homes can be on less than an acre, it's just that if you're going to put a 60-acre plat, you're going to put 20–21 homes.

KENNEY: So just ... I'm just trying to understand ... so given the areas that you're talking about annexing, have you done a cost/benefit analysis to the city? Not to the residents, but to the city? I mean what's it going to cost the city to provide the services versus [inaudible] services they're [inaudible] what revenues you're going to be receiving in?

MARSHALL: By covering the police protection and providing the snow removal, it's a breakeven for the City, and that's the reason the size is what it is ... is we do manage our costs and so the police coverage of picking up those extra shifts, that's where the breakeven is so ... it's not income gather for us. Again, it's a pool-tax city ... 425 [inaudible]

KENNEY: Then why would you ... I still don't understand why you'd do it, then.

MARSHALL: I think to maintain the property values of the contiguous areas around the city.

KENNEY: Okay. That's ... thank you. Nothing further.

SCHUSTER: Yeah, I have a question. Could you ... could we go back and talk about the water and the sewer ... area?

MARSHALL: Sure.

SCHUSTER: ... in this area? Could you ...

MARSHALL: Over half of the City of Wildwood does not have Metropolitan Sewer District.

SCHUSTER: Okay.

MARSHALL: In this annexation area, a lot of that territory or that area are on septic systems.

SCHUSTER: Okay.

MARSHALL: So, the City of Wildwood, if you are going to come in and develop an area or a subdivision or increase that usage, we have very standard guidelines that if it's up to seven homes, they can be on an individual septic systems if they're developed on three-acre lots so that you don't contaminate somebody else's well water.

SCHUSTER: Right.

MARSHALL: If they want to put more in than that, they're going to have to have access to either a treatment plant in that subdivision or they're going to have to connect to MSD.

SCHUSTER: So your plan is to put the onus on the developers rather than the city or ...

MARSHALL: I don't think that's really any different than the County's plan.

SCHUSTER: No, no. I'm just asking for clarification.

MARSHALL: I mean, yes, that's exactly right. I don't believe, you know, the City of Wildwood does not ... we don't have say under over [sic] what MSD does. We have to ... right now we're working on a community improvement district to bring sewage to a big portion of our city with the community college, so yeah, we don't have that so in certain areas, same thing. There are wells in this area which makes the sewage treatment an even bigger issue.

SCHUSTER: Yeah. All right. Thank you.

SCHUMAN: No questions.



1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: The Chair has no questions. Mr. Ford?

FORD: Yes. The ... I see your annexation boundary proposal goes down the Meramec River. Does it go to the edge of the river, the middle of the river or take in the whole river?

MARSHALL: Mr. Vujnich?

VUJNICH: Centerline.

FORD: Centerline of the river. Okay.

MARSHALL: The trail runs ... right now the Al Foster Trail runs right along ...

FORD: This right here ... I don't know if you can tell ... this right here, is that a street that goes over the river or a train tracks or what?

VUJNICH: Railroad.

FORD: Railroad. In your presentation you commented that if this annexation went through, you'd have a smaller protection area ... you kind of lost me there.

MARSHALL: Okay. The City of Wildwood is 68 square miles. We contract with the St. Louis County Wildwood Precinct so we have four beats, if you will, patrols that are seven ... 24 hours a day coverage, 7 days a week. Right now, with our current size of the city, we're short two to three days of being ... that fourth beat being covered. The County is covering this area from a police protection, and it's being covered out of another precinct. So the efficiencies, I would hope, that as we negotiate our contracts with the County we can say, "Look, let's work together on this." We have this section that needs to be covered. Maybe that's worth two days out of the week of police coverage that we can negotiate so that we would actually be able to utilize four complete beats which would fill our needs and the same police coverage would improve because now our police will cover that area if they can't do it because it's still a County Police ... it's mutual aid, but it would give the other precinct then smaller areas to cover. There are only two roads going into that area so it is very difficult if you have a call in there, and the Fire District has a station there, so it's not really accessible. Now, I guess from a crime standpoint you could block the road off and wait for them to come back out so ... there's not a whole access of other ways for people to get in and out so they have great coverage. I think we could improve it by having the closer proximity on our coverage because we're down into that area anyway as well as being able to allow the County then to be able to offset their protection the other side. It's certainly something we'd have to work out.

FORD: What fire protection? Is it all under the same fire ...?

MARSHALL: This particular part of our city is handled by Metro West. We also have part of the city under Eureka and part under Monarch so we have three fire

districts covering the city. Metro West actually has a station right in Castlewood so the majority of that ... and that part of our city is covered out of Castlewood location.

ARMSTRONG: Mayor Marshall, you have talked about ... in a broad sense about logical boundaries presented by this annexation area. I want to take you up to the northwest corner and ask how that triangle could possibly be a logical boundary situation.

MARSHALL: Last time, it was omitted from the plan and was told that they couldn't be boxed in. All we're trying to do is to say that if that can be worked on ... it's just that last time it wasn't brought into anybody's plan because nobody had it covered in their plan.

ARMSTRONG: Well, as a matter of fact, it's in three different plans now.

MARSHALL: It is today, but the last plan, as I remember in those discussions, we had properties left with no access and the decision was ...

ARMSTRONG: Well, I think you've just demonstrated why it's a good idea to talk with the other cities.

MARSHALL: I don't disagree.

ARMSTRONG: Secondly, in terms of logical boundaries, and I'm still up in the northwest area. Why isn't Kiefer Road a logical boundary between Wildwood and Ballwin or Ellisville?

MARSHALL: Because now it's unincorporated County.

ARMSTRONG: Why wouldn't it be a logical boundary in terms of an annexation proposal? Why shouldn't your ... if you proposed to annex that area, why wouldn't you annex up to the south side of Kiefer Road?

MARSHALL: I believe that's ... is that not where it is?

ARMSTRONG: No. Here ...

[background conversations]

ARMSTRONG: No, farther up. Do you see it? I'm talking about the north side of Kiefer. I'm wondering why that isn't much more logical as a part of Ballwin than Wildwood.

MARSHALL: I don't know, certainly could be. I don't have an answer for you because honestly I can't see it on there either, and I apologize for not bringing a better map.

ARMSTRONG: Well, okay, I guess the point is that the Boundary Commission is interested in logical boundaries, and I think you are too because you have mentioned it in your presentation, but in those two instances, it's difficult for me anyway to see that as being logical.

You mentioned that there was at least some opposition coming out of the Sherman area to the south. Can you ... do you have any idea why?

MARSHALL: Well, I'm sure ... just a ...

ARMSTRONG: What is it?

MARSHALL: Just a fear of enforcement of the ordinances.

ARMSTRONG: In terms of construction or ...

MARSHALL: Abandoned cars, trash that's not picked up, fences that are pulled down along the roads, pretty much what you'd have in some non-rural areas, and there are some lovely homes there. Unfortunately, those are the ones who call and say, "Can you do something about that?" And we turn it back to the County.

ARMSTRONG: Last question, or it's really not a question, and this is ... you did mention that you were considering doing this in a single bold step, bold move as I would consider it. If you do, I would encourage you strongly to make sure that you have done your homework with the residents of this area, these areas, and be sure that you have your support before you come here because this Commission is very sensitive to opposition from residents.

MARSHALL: Well, and as I stated before when we did the last annexation, we didn't come to you with Sherman. They didn't want any part of it, and we would do the same thing.

ARMSTRONG: Understand, but you have told us a little while ago that you're thinking about doing this in a single move. Is that what I understood?

MARSHALL: That would be our proposal, I guess, if you were to ask me the same question, "If you had a choice, what would you take?" I would do it all at one time. I wouldn't try to piecemeal it. I didn't believe that was our decision. I thought that's what you all would decide, and we'd be more than happy to work on a program with them.

ARMSTRONG: We're not telling you how to handle this and what kind of proposal to make. I think what we are suggesting to you though is that you need the support of the residents and if you don't have that, it's all uphill.

MARSHALL: We agree.

ARMSTRONG: Okay. That's all I have.

BREDENKOETTER: In your plan that you submitted the last time, the Sherman area where that very densely located subdivision is, was that there the last Map Plan?

MARSHALL: Yes.

BREDENKOETTER: So it was there.

MARSHALL: My guess is it's been there for an excess of 100 years.

BREDENKOETTER: Okay, that density. All right, and then the next question is ... and from the last Map Plan, I drove these roads religiously ... most of this area that you're looking to annex is (a) extremely rural, very hilly, et cetera. Would it still be that Non-Urban 3 that you're trying to enact in other areas of Wildwood?

MARSHALL: I guess I would let Mr. Vujnich answer that. We do have homes and beautiful homes on much smaller acres, but if somebody is going to come in for a new major development, we would expect them to develop that to the standards that we've set for the rest of the city. But that does not mean that people who have a smaller plat cannot put a home on that particular plat and of those pieces of property that are there, they have that right to do that and we would not be able to ...

BREDENKOETTER: Well, I'm assuming that the reason that you would want to enforce that is because of water runoff ...

MARSHALL: And sewage.

BREDENKOETTER: ... sewage, and preserving the atmosphere that presently exists upon St. Paul and what is it, Schaefer Woods or ... there's some subdivision back in there ... so in order to develop this, if someone ... let's say one of these owners wanted to sell it, it would be a major development a la what McBride wanted to do the last time which created those people coming to you, is that correct?

MARSHALL: Correct, and those developments are beginning in some of those areas now, three-acre lots.

BREDENKOETTER: Okay. So if you did annex this, then your goal is to preserve the nature ... when you talked about your Master Plan, one thing I would like to give you a compliment on. It does seem that Wildwood is following, unlike other cities, the state-dictate for a master plan, following the master plan, and not bending the master plan whenever a developer puts money in front of an area's location, unlike other areas. So this ... you would be pretty strong about keeping this as your ... what is that ... Urban 3 or whatever?

MARSHALL: Yeah. Joe, would you like to add any comments?

VUJNICH: The intent would be to retain the existing [inaudible – no microphone]

BREDENKOETTER: Okay, to kind of enforce it ...

VUJNICH: Yes, ma'am.

BREDENKOETTER: Environ ... you know, not to be violated.

MARSHALL: We try to refer to it as predictability as to what's the worst thing that will be in there. Now it is a holding zone, and a lot of residential, but I think that we would try to do our best ...

BREDENKOETTER: Because I am sure that this is part of watershed into the Meramec River.

MARSHALL: It is and so is the sewage.

BREDENKOETTER: Okay. All right. Thank you.

THIBEAULT: No questions, Mr. Chairman.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you, Mayor Marshall.

MARSHALL: Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Next, we have presentation by St. Louis County.

POWERS: Hello. I'm Glenn Powers. I'm Director of Planning for St. Louis County. I'll try to keep my comments ever short since we see so much of each other lately, as recently as last week.

First, generally speaking, as I always open up, St. Louis County Government is a large, local service provider. It provides local services to the unincorporated area which amount to 300,000 plus people, one-third of the total area of St. Louis County. We do think we are a very efficient provider of local services, and we do that in our unincorporated areas with high quality results. In addition, we do contract for some ... many of our services to the municipalities and so maintain the efficiency of our services. This is not only important to our unincorporated residents but also to the cities that we contract with. Some of the cities that are speaking tonight, for instance, contract with St. Louis County. Police, for instance. Ballwin and Ellisville contract for the computer-assisted report entry system that St. Louis County manages for a number of cities. Valley Park and Wildwood contract for the full range of county services so there are county vehicles patrolling those areas. In terms of code enforcement, we talked a little bit about code enforcement with Wildwood, more in terms of zoning enforcement and land use, and I'd be happy to answer questions about that later on because certainly in the area down along the Meramec River, the County's been absolutely crystal clear about what it's intentions are and what it's zoning plans are. But Ballwin, for instance, contracts for electrical inspections and code enforcement; Ellisville, for electrical and mechanical; Valley Park, electrical, mechanical, plumbing; Wildwood, all code enforcement in terms of the building codes and the associated codes, it's contracted out

to St. Louis County. And there are other things, but those are usually the major groupings.

In terms of the Map Plans we, as we usually do, come with maps in hand. We didn't bring enough easels, but as questions arise, we do have three land use maps over against the side wall, which show the land uses in the various areas, and this one here on the easel, you've referred to it already, shows the overlap areas. And I think many of you were ... have been on the Boundary Commission long enough to be familiar with the general area to the south along the Kiefer Creek Valley and are familiar with the hearings that took place.

Very quickly, the Ballwin Map Plan, the population in that area of the combined areas is ... and that's the largest in terms of population is 12,958 so that's a substantial number of residents.

One thing I would point out is ... and this is a very small thing ... we were contacted by the Mayor of Clarkson Valley in the past week, the past two weeks actually, about a pocket that runs along the right-of-way of Clarkson Road, and I think the Ballwin Mayor referred to discussions they've been having with Clarkson Valley. Clarkson Valley has sent a letter, and I can leave it with you if you don't already have it, indicating that they would like to annex the pocket, this particular pocket on Clarkson Road, and we've discussed that with them, and that is something because it is all right-of-way, that could occur outside of the Boundary Commission between St. Louis County and Clarkson Valley. And we've indicated a willingness to cooperate with Clarkson Valley on that.

Ellisville, the population of the various different areas ... it's really a series of pockets is 134, and, you know, we have no objection to the annexation of pockets so long as the residents and the property owners in those pockets desire to be incorporated into a city. In one case here, the pocket off of Old State Road, which I believe you talked about a little bit tonight, and that pocket is the result of piecemeal annexations that have occurred along that roadway in the past so it's what hasn't been taken yet essentially, but we did receive a request from the City of Ellisville to annex the Carrington Place subdivision. It's a villa subdivision in that pocket. It does not take up all of that pocket, and they have requested for a transfer of jurisdiction. And we have recommended to the County Council ... they haven't taken any action yet ... that that transfer of jurisdiction not be approved; however, I want to be clear to anybody that's listening tonight that our reluctance to approve that transfer of jurisdiction should not be taken as a sign that we are unwilling to allow that area to be annexed. There are two reasons really. One is, as I mentioned, it doesn't take up the pocket and we don't want just another piecemeal annexation that leaves us a couple of odd properties down on Old State Road. And then the second thing is ... and I've convinced the administration of this ... that the County in general wants to get of the transfer of jurisdiction business. Some of you can recall when we got involved in down in Eureka, and our experience there is we don't want to do that anymore and we want to send a clear message to other municipalities that we don't do that and we don't send that clear message by doing transfer of jurisdictions. And it sends the wrong message to a lot of residents that want to stay in unincorporated areas, and that's something that I frequently say here; and that is that St. Louis County

is more than happy to continue to be the local service provider for the unincorporated areas so long as those residents want us to do that. And, of course, when you're trading away ground, that is kind of a contradictory scheme so we generally don't want to do the transfers of jurisdiction; however, we have discussed the Carrington Place subdivision with the City of Ellisville, and we are fully supportive of the residents' rights to pursue the annexation under the normal petition annexation rules once that date comes up next year.

ARMSTRONG: Point out this area please. It's that one.

POWERS: It's right there, the red. A very small area.

ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

POWERS: And again, as I say, we will work with the residents of that subdivision and Ellisville to see that that is all done under normal procedures that would come before you.

With regard to Wildwood, I would simply say that, you know, it is a low density area. It has a population of a little over 1,700, and it is zoned Non-Urban. It has been the County's intent that that always remain Non-Urban. We've been tested on that a number of times, and that's about all I can say about that. I can answer specific questions about plans, et cetera, as they come up, but with many of these areas, it's really ... this is different than what we had hearing on last week where we were generally talking about commercial pockets. These are residential areas, a number of pockets, and so what resident preferences are is very important here, and that's why I mention my conversation with the Mayor of Clarkson Valley and also our ... the Carrington Place situation.

Finally, just a quick note about taxes, and I think much of this was already said. Ballwin and Wildwood don't have property taxes. Valley Park and Ellisville do so that there would be some increase in the case of those two plus some increased sales tax impacts.

I didn't mention Valley Park here because we solved that all last week, I think; we had the maps and all. But I'll be glad to answer any questions that you have.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Far left.

THIBEAULT: Yes. Could you amplify ... you mentioned words to the effect, "It's crystal clear as to what your zoning plans are going to be." I believe you were referring to that area down on the ...

POWERS: Well, specifically with regard to the comments made by Wildwood that ... with regard to three-acre. It is zoned three-acre. We have been through our plans that we've done and zoning cases that have been brought before us, we have shown a consistent desire to leave areas south of the Kiefer Creek Valley ...

there's a ridge line that runs along the south side of the Kiefer Creek Valley ... and there are subdivisions on the south side of Kiefer Creek Road, which access on to Kiefer Creek Road, and we have zoned those for higher density subdivisions. Relatively speaking, they are low-density subdivisions. But anything further south towards the river that has access off of rural roads, such as St. Paul Road, we have been crystal clear about leaving that Non-Urban, and we've been tested on that, as I've said, any number of times, and so I think ... and the Mayor said it at one point ... really we're kind of the same that way. And, of course, to develop it would require the same thing in St. Louis County as it would in Wildwood: a petition would have to come before the governing body. You can't develop at higher than a three-acre density effectively without sewer lines. The same rules apply.

THIBEAULT: Thank you.

BREDENKOETTER: Glenn, question. This McBride subdivision ...

POWERS: Yes.

BREDENKOETTER: ... that used to have this Non-Urban 3 zoning, correct, which has now been ...

POWERS: Right.

BREDENKOETTER: ... apparently re-zoned. Does that fall within this geographic area? You said the ridge line. I'm sorry I don't know that ... so is that inside the ridge line or outside the ridge line where you say that Non-Urban 3 is going to be.

POWERS: Yeah, that subdivision ... that subdivision is on the north side of the ridge line. Access to that subdivision is from Kiefer Creek Road. It is virtually the same as other subdivisions in terms of density that are along the south side of Kiefer Creek Road, so no, that fit into ... and it's very well articulated in all the planning and zoning reports we've done on that. And that subdivision, of course, was annexed into Wildwood, and they had to take the zoning that was in place. And it's developing at a fairly good clip. There's a number of lots left, but you can get a good feel for what happened there.

BREDENKOETTER: But it's only access is by Kiefer Creek.

POWERS: Right. Right. At the intersection with St. Paul Road. It is ... as you said, you drove that area extensively and at that intersection of Kiefer Creek Road and St. Paul Road, you head up a hill, and then you get to a high point and then you go back down.

BREDENKOETTER: Yeah. Very dangerous.

POWERS: That's that ridge line up there.

BREDENKOETTER: Okay.



POWERS: When you get that high point, that's that sort of ridge line. Everything forward of that or north of that ...

BREDENKOETTER: It's very dangerous. It's very narrow for anything that's ... to me three acres sounds fine. More acreage would be better because there isn't the ... there isn't the infrastructure to really support a whole lot of traffic on those roads.

POWERS: Absolutely. And that's ... that's why we ...

BREDENKOETTER: Those are County roads, are they not?

POWERS: They are, yeah.

BREDENKOETTER: Okay. All right. Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Commissioner

ARMSTRONG: Is ... you indicated that you provide code service for Wildwood?

POWERS: Yes.

ARMSTRONG: Is it their code or County's code?

POWERS: It would be their code or whatever they adopt, but to a great extent we adopt similar in the case of building codes, similar national codes.

ARMSTRONG: I'm just curious as to ... in response to one of my questions, Wildwood Mayor Marshall indicated that the opposition in the Sherman area was coming because of fear of the enforcement of the codes, and ostensibly, they could be the same. I don't get it.

POWERS: Well, I think what he was talking about was not in so much building codes as other property maintenance codes.

BREDENKOETTER: He's talking ordinances versus building codes.

POWERS: Sherman and the area down along the river, I'm sure many of you have probably been down there, is a remote area. Old camp lots along the Meramec River. Old housing stock. Really different than the newer suburban ...

ARMSTRONG: Wildwood.

POWERS: ... type development that you would see in other areas. So as you go south, it's different. Sherman's a different place. It's rural, but it's different rural than other areas.

ARMSTRONG: Got it. Thank you.

FORD: No questions.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: The Chair has no questions.

SCHUSTER: No.

KENNEY: No questions.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you.

BREDENKOETTER: We're talking building codes, you're talking [inaudible] building codes versus ordinances which deal with trash and road, et cetera, et cetera, correct? Is that the difference?

POWERS: Well, we all have property maintenance codes, and we enforce those. And we all have our difficulties with different property owners within our jurisdictions enforcing those codes. I don't ... you know, St. Louis County tends to be put at on trial a little bit more at these proceedings, but I think if we were all honest, we all have within our jurisdictions certain properties, property owners, where we struggle to get properties into compliance.

BREDENKOETTER: Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you. Now public comment. Has everyone filled out their speaker cards that wishing [sic] to speak tonight? We have two. We can do this brief. First will be Mr. Bill Roach.

ROACH: Ladies and gentlemen and committee ... Commission, thank you for allowing me this opportunity. I'm one of the trustees for a subdivision in unincorporated St. Louis County. It's Hollybrook, Plat 2. It intersects Big Bend Road just east of Ries Road and west of Sulphur Spring, and I believe it was maybe on the desire of the City of Ballwin to annex us. And the conversation I've had with some of the neighbors ... we recently had our block party ... and with public safety and residential services being the major issues, we already have the services of the third largest municipal police department in the State of Missouri, and we're very happy with that. We get ... the services we get from the St. Louis County Police Department, we believe, are, you know, second to none. We have other auxiliary services with St. Louis County; our roads are plowed in a very timely manner. Our roads ... our streets were just repaired so we have no problems with that. So we really see no benefit in our subdivision, Holly-brook, Plat 2, becoming just simply part of another government. We're happy with being part of St. Louis County. And I know tonight as I've listened, I've heard it said twice, that the resident preferences are something that you take into consideration, and if that's the truth ... if that's fact, then our preference is in Hollybrook, Plat 2, that we remain part of unincorporated St. Louis County. Thank you very much. Any questions for me? I guess there would be [inaudible]. Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you. Patricia Caldwell.

CALDWELL: Hello. I'm a trustee from the Springhill Farms subdivision, and on the maps that you are looking at, we are included in Ballwin and Valley Park. We are also unincorporated and cared for by the St. Louis County Police Department very well. They take care of our streets. We would wish to remain unincorporated. We are not interested in any way to be annexed by Valley Park. We have just had our subdivision meeting and it was unanimous Saturday as a no, and we would like to indicate that here tonight. Thank you.

KENNEY: How many lots [inaudible]?

CALDWELL: We have 129 homes, sir.

KENNEY: Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you.

CALDWELL: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: The next speaker, Michelle Hennessey.

HENNESSEY: I'm sorry. I really don't understand how all these proceedings work so you'll have to excuse me, but ... I live in Eaglebrook ... I mean Westbrook subdivision which is at the corner of Hanna and Big Bend. And Manchester has annexed all the way up to Hanna and Big Bend on the north side of Big Bend, and we're on the south side of Big Bend, and Valley Park is on the east side of Hanna Road. Am I to understand that because Manchester isn't here presenting tonight that we are not part of their annexation plan also?

DOUGHERTY: Manchester did not file a map plan.

HENNESSEY: So I can assume that we don't have to worry about Manchester? Well, I cannot speak for my whole subdivision, and I think there's probably over 300 houses in my subdivision, but I do not wish to be annexed by either Valley Park or Ballwin. We like being in unincorporated St. Louis County so I didn't know if there's somebody specific I should send my comments to so that ... okay, it will be on the record. Right. Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you.

ARMSTRONG: Would you be able to show us on this map approximately where your subdivision is? It's got to be in that yellow box somewhere.

HENNESSEY: Okay. Here's Hanna Road and this is Big Bend and this is our subdivision right here.

ARMSTRONG: Okay. All right.

HENNESSEY: It's a huge subdivision.

ARMSTRONG: Got it.

HENNESSEY: We're right next to Spring Hill Farms.

ARMSTRONG: That's fine. Thank you very much.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Thank you.

FORD: I'd like to point out that during these presentations tonight, it sounded like ... at times I could see where it sounded like that all of St. Louis County is going to be annexed by somebody. That's not necessarily the case. The proposals will be presented. They'll be analyzed by the Commission, and decisions will be made and public hearings will be at that point in time on annexation proposals. I just don't want people leaving here thinking, "Oh, my God, I've got to figure out what city I've got to go to." So ... and I'd like to have a show of hands ... who out here do not want to be annexed? If you would just raise your hands. Thank you.

1<sup>st</sup> VICE CHAIR SPEARS: Any other comments from the Commission? If not, this concludes our public hearing for tonight on the Map Plans. I want to thank everyone for taking their time out and coming out tonight.

ARMSTRONG: Well done, Johnnie.