

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

**TRANSCRIPT OF
BC1004 PLAN OF INTENT PUBLIC HEARING
GRANTWOOD VILLAGE “Area B” ANNEXATION AREA**

SEPTEMBER 14, 2010

COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners	Present (P)/Absent (A)
Bob Ford	P
Thomas Freesmeier	A
Betty Humphrey	A
Frank Ollendorff	P
Bill Sauerwein	A
John Schuster	P
Jack Schwartz	P
Kathleen Schweitzer	P
Don Wojtkowski	P

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director
Elizabeth Chostner, Legal Counsel

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: This is a public hearing to hear a proposal from Grantwood Village on the proposed annexation of Area B. I'd like to begin with just a few introductory comments relating to the Boundary Commission. The Boundary Commission is an independent government body that reviews boundary change proposals in St. Louis County. It derives its authority from the State Statutes and from St. Louis County Ordinance. The Commission is comprised of eleven members along with our two staff members, our Executive Director, Miss Michelle Dougherty, and our Legal Counsel, Mr. David Hamilton, who tonight is being represented by Ms. Elizabeth Chostner. The eleven Commissioners are all appointed according to the following. Four are appointed by the St. Louis County Municipal League. Four members are appointed by the County Executive, and three members are joint appointments of the Municipal League and the County Executive. We meet monthly with additional public hearings scheduled as necessary to consider Map Plans and Boundary Change Proposals.

Tonight's informational public hearing provides an opportunity for the Town of Grantwood Village to explain and comment on the proposed annexation of area ... the area identified as Area B and assigned a file case number BC1004. Public comment will be directed toward the Map Plan being discussed tonight, and the Commission staff will be available after the meeting to answer any questions regarding the process.

The Commission welcomes your participation in the public comment section of tonight's public hearing; however, you will need to fill out and present to Michelle a Public Comment Form. We ask that you do this prior to the end of St. Louis County's presentation. If you are speaking as an individual, you'll be allotted three minutes. If you're speaking for a group or an association, you'll be allotted five minutes. The Commission will also take public comment either by letter or email for up to 21 days after tonight's meeting. Those comments will also be part of the public record.

As a reminder, no decision will be made tonight. The Commission will review the information in the proposal by Grantwood Village, St. Louis County, and your comments and any comments that we receive

MINUTES – Boundary Commission Public Hearing BC1004

September 14, 2010

Page 2 of 18

within the next 21 days. We have nine months to make a decision, but that nine months begins with the acceptance of this proposal, which was July 1, 2010, so the decision date is April 1, 2011.

Both Grantwood Village and St. Louis County will have fifteen minutes. We ask that you respect that time guideline, and I will now ask the Commission members to introduce themselves and include their residence and their appointing authority. So we'll begin with Frank, down at the end.

OLLENDORFF: I'm Frank Ollendorff, University City, appointed by the Municipal League.

[background comments]

Frank Ollendorff. I reside in University City, and I was appointed by the County Municipal League.

WOJTKOWSKI: Good evening, everyone. My name is Don Wojtkowski. I am a resident in unincorporated North St. Louis County, and I was appointed by the County Executive.

SCHWEITZER: Hi! I'm Kathleen Schweitzer, and I live in unincorporated West St. Louis County, and I was appointed by the County Executive.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: I'm John Schuster. I reside in Glendale, and I was appointed by the County Executive.

FORD: My name is Bob Ford. I reside in South St. Louis County, and I was appointed by the County Executive.

SCHWARTZ: My name is Jack Schwartz. I reside in Creve Coeur. I was appointed by the Mayor of Chesterfield and the Mayor of Creve Coeur.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. We begin now with the presentation from Grantwood Village, please.

ROST: Good evening ... can everybody hear me? Good evening to the ladies and gentlemen of the Boundary Commission, Director, and Counsel and to all the concerned citizens here and property owners. My name is Paul Rost. I am the Village attorney for the Village and I'm here with and going to be presenting tonight with Mike Jones, who is a Trustee at the Village. And Grantwood Village is ... has Proposal B as the Commission knows, there was A and B submitted back in ... about five years ago. Now, tonight, we are discussing Proposal B.

The proposed annexation area, quite simply, is to the south of Gravois Road and it will encompass up to Musick Road on the west and on the south it will go along the subdivisions and across the property Affton Athletic Association up past Sunset, the memorial park, and then as proposed it jogs over and up along Cor Jesu Academy's property. Now I say "as proposed" because as of recent discussions with Cor Jesu, we have ... the Village has determined that there are several issues that have come up that might necessitate a modification by the Boundary Commission under Article 8 under your Rules ... and that would be because these parcels right here, when this Plan B was put into place five years ago, were part of the this overall parcel or at least owned in common ownership of this parcel. In 2008 this piece was purchased by Cor Jesu Academy and as it stands right now, that property under Cor Jesu's conceptual master plan right now is currently being graded and being prepared to be used for a soccer field. The parking area's already in place. This is the boundary line that we had ... the Village had drawn up five years ago. It went along the bottom of this and down to the south.

Also according to Cor Jesu's master plan, which we found out last week, they have a proposal to build some ... an auditorium, a theater, and a new gymnasium, which would go right across the property line or the boundary line that we proposed. For those reasons, the Village would support a modification of the

Plan that would basically remove these two lots since this one is already under Cor Jesu's ownership and Cor Jesu has or is close to purchasing this piece of property, and it's an integral part of their master plan. While the Village would love to see the whole parcel come into the Village, that wasn't part of our plan, the Cor Jesu property was not involved and those discussions will be for future times and not for tonight. So a slight modification we believe that wouldn't alter the proposal.

We now draw the land along Grant's Trail, which continues up into the Village and on south. So, with that slight modification, now I would tell you that the annexation area is instead of 95 acres, 79 acres of substantially undeveloped land. It does have now two owners, six distinct locator numbers, and it is bounded still by Musick, by Gravois and Cor Jesu's property. So we believe that the parcel, the area that we have drawn up on the Plan B for geographical and topographical reasons is a perfect fit and there ... to be incorporated into the jurisdiction of the Town of Grantwood Village because, again, Grant's Farm being directly across the road and having the same and similar features, this property having the Affton Athletic Association contained in the area, which is a recreational use which is very similar to the uses of ... currently there is no residence on the property, but there is a plan that is approved by St. Louis County for development of that area which would be in keeping with the density and the character of Grantwood Village even if developed. Right now the Village is 512 acres so this would put it somewhere in the neighborhood of just under 600 acres so it would be an increase of roughly somewhere between 12 to 15 percent in size, but in population it would have no effect at this time. Again, like I said, the recreational and ... and environmental and topographical uses are very similar to what the Village has already included in it. The familial connection of ownership with Grant's Farm in the past for the many years since back in 1937 when the Village was incorporated, the ... again ... the ... it's completely consistent with the type of uses and the type of topography of the Village. Again, it shares Grant's Trail and the Trail would continue to connect across Gravois to connect the Village to this proposed area.

The Village, again, shares the common boundary of approximately 20 percent of the proposed annexation area. There are no ... there is a substantial natural extension, obviously of the Village boundaries as we stated, and it is compact. It is not a strange or manufactured or forced area. When you look at the aerial and you look at the topography of the site, it's very clear that this is a logical extension of the Village and the types of lower intensity uses and environmental features.

So anyway ... the main thing that I want to get through before I turn it over to Mike, the zoning and land use of the area right now under the County is MXD, we've got flood plain, non-urban and more of the flood plain MXD. There is also site-specific zoning for this area that the Village would certainly uphold and carry forth with any development that would come forward. The Village would immediately pass a planned residential development ordinance so that it could be prepared for any modifications that might be needed by the developer. The developer would be certainly welcome to come to the Village and to discuss any kind of modifications to the plan or any kind of incentives that might be needed to help get the property developed in a ... a fashion that would be proper in density and in the protection of the natural resources flood plain. So Grantwood Village would uphold the zoning. The planned development would give flexibility to the developer and, I would just summarize quickly that the Village has conducted these public meetings within the Village. The comments from all the residents have been overwhelmingly in support. This boundary adjustment makes sense. It's ... not only from a geographical and land use perspective but also from the ... from all the residents surrounding Grantwood Village.

Now, I'd turn it over to Mike Jones to finish up.

JONES: Good evening, Boundary Commission members and fellow County residents. My name is Mike Jones, I live at 6 Grantwood Lane, and I serve our community as trustee on the Grantwood Village board. Thank you for the opportunity to address you this evening and to discuss the rationale behind Grantwood Village's proposal for annexation. First, a historical note on this area. In the late 1790's James MacKay bought land originally granted by the Spanish and which is now Grantwood Village. James MacKay had explored the Missouri River in 1793 and provided maps of the upriver area to Louis and Clark for their epic expedition. How interesting it is to have had a local map maker produce the charts

for perhaps the most significant map makers in the history of Western America. I don't believe the task of determining boundaries within this historically rich area has quite the pivotal nature as the maps drawn by James MacKay, but, nevertheless, we find throughout history that boundaries are part of living documents. These are maps which are flexible and redrawn according to changes in the land itself and the collective judgment of the residents living there. The Town of Grantwood Village has submitted a petition to you for the annexation of a primarily undeveloped, unoccupied, and unincorporated 79-acre tract adjacent to our town. This area was formerly the property of Andrew Busch and sold to Erickson Development which subsequently terminated an effort on their part to develop the property into a retirement community. At the point of the sale to Erickson, however, the surrounding community was largely supportive of their development plan. In contrast to this, in 2005 there was strong and organized community opposition to a dense residential development plan for the same area. The County passed over strenuous area objection an ordinance to zone this undeveloped pasture and flood plain area as R-4 and FPR-4 Residential. As nearly 20 percent of this parcel lay in active flood plain and so was undevelopable, the County passed an ordinance to allow a PEU or Planned Environmental Unit here. This permitted the developers to maximize the housing density to an effective zoning of R-6AA, which is around 6,800 square feet per plot. The final proposal passed by the Council allowed 439 units, mostly multi-story condos and attached villas to be built. This would have constituted a nearly ten-fold denser development than found in the adjacent community. With the added density allowed by PEU, these 6,800 square foot housing plots were approved into an area surrounded by Bridlewood and Sunset Hills Estates with 10,000 square foot plots, Clydesdale Estates and Grant's Forest with 11,000 square foot plots and Grantwood Village at 26,000 square feet. It was simply not even close to being proportional with the housing density of the surrounding residential area.

This unusual density was deemed necessary for the builders to recoup their over \$20 million dollar investment made in purchasing the tract, but the impact of this density on the surrounding community would have been greatly compounded by public safety considerations unique to this area.

The first one is traffic. The St. Louis County Library lists Gravois Road as already the busiest road in the entire County. MODOT cites 2001 data of over 18,700 vehicles a day characterizing major portions as "very congested and unstable" and "stop and go gridlock." The area Grantwood Village proposes to annex runs along Gravois Road from Musick Road to Grant Road, a total distance of less than a half mile. This area sees traffic with tremendous seasonable variability as it is the primary point of access for Grant's Farm, the Affton Athletic Association, White Cliff Park, the U.S. Grant historical site, Cor Jesu Academy, and Grant's Trail. From late spring through late fall, it sees both heavy vehicular and pedestrian traffic as one would expect given the area attractions. Four hundred thirty-nine new housing units would have added approximately 800 cars entering and exiting this busy half-mile stretch into a 40-mile-an-hour zone at least twice a day. In addition, the Mehlville and Affton Fire Marshals, the Third District Affton Police and the Lindbergh School District all expressed their concerns over the design and safety of the proposed development. The only real-time traffic study done prior to County Council approval was conducted at one intersection, that of Musick Road and Gravois for a four-hour stretch during a single day in late 2005.

The second issue is waste and storm water management. Although detentions were planned for this proposed development, all runoff would siphon toward a single 42-inch main running along Gravois Creek, which overcharges in heavy rain currently allowing untreated effluent into the Creek. This sewer system was placed in 1970 based on the expected demands at that time. The loss of green space incurred during development and the increased runoff caused by the heavy residential density would have exacerbated the current issues seen with storm and flood waters upstream, i.e., Grantwood Village. The Metropolitan Sewer District acknowledged this, but no provision was required or offered for improvement prior to the passage of the ordinance allowing the development to proceed. In fact, a formal hydrological study was not even submitted prior to approval of the development by the County Council. So, a community law suit was filed and then sustained over the next 18 months to prevent this development. It became apparent though during this time that the overall housing market was slowing dramatically. This proved fortuitous for both the community and the developers themselves. The

development plan was scrapped and the property sold to Erickson who encountered a situation whereby prospective residents were unable to market their homes for a transition into the planned retirement community. When I last looked, the property was transferred into the receivership of Bank of America and the tract has sat idle since. That will bring you up to date I hope.

Grantwood Village is enthusiastic both about the area that we propose to annex and its future. None of us is opposed to its residential, recreational, or limited commercial development. We feel this is both inevitable and desirable. We support jobs for St. Louisians, the business for merchants and the students for schools represented by the eventual development of this property. The larger community, however, in Grantwood Village, Grantwood Forest, Bridlewood Estates, Sunset Hills Estates, and Clydesdale Estates is nearly unanimously opposed to the development which compromises the safety of current residents. As such and as the only formal municipality of the communities I just mentioned, Grantwood Village considers it our responsibility to petition the Boundary Commission to allow this annexation. We respectfully request the opportunity to use our collective experience to encourage a safe, rational, and proportionate way to develop this area. We ask that you enable Grantwood Village to protect the safety of its 800+ St. Louis County residents and that of our surrounding neighborhoods by approving our request to annex this presently unincorporated and primarily undeveloped area.

Finally, a last thought on maps. Because James MacKay and Meriwether Lewis were careful in their mapping, the County was able to progress and settle easier and more rapidly than if it was all left to chance. It required both keen observation and careful execution. The Town of Grantwood Village pledges no less in the development of attractive land which looks substantially unchanged over the last couple centuries. We want it to be reasonably, responsibly developed and administered and we intend to provide and guarantee that if the Boundary Commission will allow. Thank you for your time. Good evening.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Frank. Frank, do you have any questions? Commissioner Ollendorff, do you have any questions for Grantwood Village?

OLLENDORFF: Not at this time.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Don?

WOJTKOWSKI: No, I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Commissioner Schweitzer?

SCHWEITZER: Yes, I just have one question. My recollection from the Executive Summary and supporting documentation is that Grant's Trail runs through this area, is that correct? The trail, the bicycle ...

ROST: [inaudible] Grant's Trail runs along the upper boundary and then along the east side of the proposed annexation area.

SCHWEITZER: And my understanding of the way these trails are typically constructed is that the maintenance for them then falls upon the municipality through which they pass. Do we know anything? Are you taking that from St. Louis County? Does St. Louis County currently do it? Is there funding available to maintain?

JONES: [inaudible] The trail itself, to the best of my knowledge, is maintained by St. Louis County Parks and Recreation, and Grantwood Village ... it's ... the rules are posted by the municipality through which it cuts so there's a bit of crossover there, but the active management is St. Louis Parks and Rec.

SCHWEITZER: And that would continue to be the same.

JONES: We would foresee no change in that status. By the way, the trail as it's listed in the annexation plan essentially parallels McNary Road, which is the access road for the Affton Athletic Association.

SCHWEITZER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Mr. Ford.

FORD: Yes. You talked about the future planning of the area if it's annexed into Grantwood Village. What kind of planning department does Grantwood Village have or do you contract that out or what?

ROST: The Village right now handles its own planning in-house, and it's done through contracting out with professionals that would provide the planning advice.

FORD: Okay. I'm a little confused on the Cor Jesu thing. Are you submitting a revision of your original Plan of Intent?

ROST: Well, based on the rules, it was too late to submit a revision under the rules of the 14-day requirement when we found out about the possible purchase of this other parcel so at that time we didn't believe we could submit a request ourselves so what we would do is submit a formal request to ask you to modify the plan if you thought it was in the best interests based on the testimony that you're hearing to remove ... like I said what was originally Originally when it was developed, I mean when Cor Jesu first bought the one parcel to the ... [background conversation] Okay, when they originally purchased the one parcel to the ... to the ... along Gravois, the use that we understood it was for was for a soccer field, outdoor recreation, and a parking lot. At that time, after 2008 when that purchase went through, at that time the Village didn't see that there would be too much of a conflict to have one jurisdiction that handled an already constructed soccer field and then one that would actually handle the buildings of the school. It wasn't until last week when ... when we learned of the possible purchase of this property and then the actual plan that they already have in place to use their whole parcel, which they should be allowed to do, to place actual buildings over the property line. At that time, we agreed with Cor Jesu that it would not be good for either the Village, them, or the County to actually have a parcel that is ... with buildings on it that has a property line ... I mean a jurisdictional line right down the middle of it. And so at that time when we found out about that, we agreed with them that we would ask you if you thought it was a good deletion and modification because we don't believe it alters the plan since this has not been taken out pretty much the future development of the rest of the parcel that we were looking at, it made sense to us to also let Cor Jesu govern their own property all in one jurisdiction.

FORD: So going back to the original question, are you going to submit a request for revision of the plan?

ROST: If you will ... I will submit it and request that you ...

FORD: By what you just said, I don't know what you want to do.

ROST: Here's the thing. Your rules don't allow me to do it, but if you want me to do it, I'll do it.

FORD: But you just said that you could request the Boundary Commission to ...

ROST: Yes, I will be submitting and I will be talking to the staff to see if they want a new survey that's modified to show it and to show the new out-boundaries and if that would be something that

the Boundary Commission wants, then we would tomorrow or as soon as we can, we would submit the request to ask you to make the modification. Yes, I'm sorry. I just misunderstood your questions.

JONES: If I could further address the first part of your question ...

FORD: Go ahead.

JONES: ... about the planning and what services are provided in-house, which are contracted, just a short statement. No loss of existing services would result from this annexation in terms of the area to be acquired. Grantwood Village proposes to provide in-house the licensing, the permits, the planning and the parks and recreation aspects through Grantwood Village directly. All other services would be on a contractual basis from either the County, from municipalities, or from commercial providers on a ... on a bid basis. There would be no noticeable change in fees or charges for these services, since again the area to be annexed is primarily undeveloped. Regarding the time schedule for implementation of those, we would propose to take full responsibility for those services within six months of the date of election or earlier if allowed by law.

FORD: And you say all the planning is in-house? Do you have full-time personnel, part-time personnel, or is it just guys getting together and deciding "Hey, let's do it this way."

JONES: No, we would have to get legal counsel along with some experienced people who could guide us through that process.

FORD: Okay. Thank you.

JONES: Based on our experience, we already have a fairly good sense of what we would prefer to have done, and we would work very closely in concert with the people who propose to buy and build upon that property.

FORD: What are you looking for as far as development in that property?

JONES: We don't have a specific plan in mind at this point. What we propose to do is ... and I wish to emphasize this point ... we propose to maintain the existing, current zoning with our annexation pending the future zoning modifications which are submitted and approved with the sale and development of this property. Again, we're not in a position to dictate, we don't want to. We want to see this area calmly and responsibly developed, but we want to be able to have enough input in it to ensure the safety of our residents and those of our surrounding municipalities.

FORD: Did I hear that you said there's a development plan in place now?

JONES: Not that I can specifically address, but I'm hearing words to that effect. I think you may hear more tonight.

FORD: Okay.

JONES: I'm not privy to that information.

FORD: No other questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you.

JONES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Mr. Schwartz.

MINUTES – Boundary Commission Public Hearing BC1004

September 14, 2010

Page 8 of 18

SCHWARTZ: Yes. I have a question. Can Grantwood Village afford to supply the services to this area financially?

JONES: Yes.

SCHWARTZ: Good answer. Can you be more specific?

JONES: Yes, I can. As this property is currently undeveloped, it should not require significant expenditures prior to development. Therefore, Grantwood Village should be able to accommodate the increased area with minimal impact to its current financial situation. Municipally-pooled and shared County sales and property tax revenues should offset the projected costs of extending St. Louis County police coverage to the area and create a surplus of just over \$5,300 dollars per year over the next three years within the annexed area. The economic impact to the surrounding communities will be negligible. The possible loss of revenue to St. Louis County, again given the undeveloped nature of the property, is expected to be minimal, estimated at \$4,300 in sales tax and about \$120 dollars in utility tax per year.

SCHWARTZ: Who estimated that?

JONES: That was submitted with the annexation ... with the annexation plan.

SCHWARTZ: As the property is developed, then your costs will go up ... for your services.

ROST: Yes, and I think the answer to that is yes, as it's developed, the cost of services go up. If it's developed as proposed, obviously the personal property taxes also rise with the people. More people brought into the city also raises the pool for which the Village participates for the sales tax so that economic benefit easily offsets the main service that the Village would have to provide which is police. The street service that would have to be provided over there, obviously there is some cost to that, but a new development ... it's going to ... there'll be plenty of time to build up reserves. There are no streets that need to be replaced now. There's no ... nothing over there needs to be done. McNary Road, the only road that's out there right now is a private road maintained by the Athletic Association. So ... as Mike said, there's right now, no cost to it other than police services and in the future as it gets developed the income will come with that ... that it will pay for itself for our services.

FORD: I have another question. That private road ... if it's annexed, are you going to take that over or is it going to remain with Affton Athletic Association.

ROST: That remains to be seen. I mean, that ... as we said in our Plan. We'll discuss that with the property owners. So far it hasn't been an issue. I don't know what their control ... they might want to maintain control over it. It's about .3 of an acre ...

FORD: This has not ... Affton hasn't been ... Affton Athletic Association hasn't been approached about these conditions or anything?

JONES: Yes, they have been approached but haven't rendered an opinion on it as of this point.

FORD: Nothing else.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Any other questions from anybody? Thank you, Mr. Rost. Thank you, Mr. Jones. St. Louis County.

Just a reminder to the audience. Anyone wishing to speak, please turn in your forms before Mr. Powers completes his presentation. Thank you.

POWERS: One minute, please, but just for starts, I'm Glenn Powers. I'm the Director Planning for St. Louis County and I'll be making the comments tonight. I'll try ... try to keep it short especially in describing county services because I think this is the third meeting in a short period of time and it's a little bit different tonight since no one lives in this area, at least not right now. So I'm not trying to convince anybody that the services they have now are better than what they would have in Grantwood Village, but they are. I'll save this speech for later. There we go. Okay.

So very quickly, St. Louis County government serves as the local government to unincorporated areas and a more over-reaching regional government to the entire county of one million people. About a third of the area is unincorporated and a third of its population is unincorporated so if you were to consider us a municipality, which we really are for unincorporated areas, we're about the third largest in the state of Missouri. And we have complete range of services that are offered by the County. And here is the list here. You've ... you've heard about them before. I will emphasize since we haven't been talking about planning and zoning, and I think development's really ... you know ... what's driving this. I kind of feel funny saying that because last week I was saying, you know, we ... development kind of drives these things nowadays, and it's probably a little bit the opposite this time around. But in terms of planning and zoning, I have a staff of over 20 people, that's not including my community development division which is another 20 people. We provide a complete range of services. We do land-use planning, the zoning and subdivision regulation. We do technical assistance to the neighborhoods. There aren't any neighborhoods here yet, but there will be someday probably. And we do community-level planning. Some examples in the Affton area are the Affton business corridor study, which we did a few years back, and there's an Affton community plan. As county government, we tend to have a different perspective than perhaps Grantwood Village when we look at what the development potential is for a property, we look at a larger area. We're not trying to mimic a smaller area, and so we'll talk a little more about that when we ... when we get into the zoning history.

Many of the services we provide are contracted services that Grantwood Village takes advantage of. Police patrols are provided by St. Louis County. They reduced their contract recently to one officer and some occasional drive-throughs.

Code enforcement and permitting is done entirely by St. Louis County to the extent that they have development in Grantwood Village. I'm not telling you that there's a lot of development in Grantwood Village, but it's done under contract to St. Louis County.

The mosquito control is kind of universal throughout the County. The County does that with its Health Department, which is county-wide.

Going to the specifics of the annexation Area B, well, right off the bat, we ... we had a difference of opinion as to what the acreage of the property was. Using our GIS equipment we estimated it to be 123.5 acres and that is before any kind of a takeout for the Cor Jesu property; but even with that, I think when the initial estimate of 95 acres was made, that was based on the development acreage of the retirement community proposal. Well, there's more in their proposal than just those ... those pieces, and so we're probably up closer to 100 acres, but that is what it is.

In terms of population, the 2000 census put it at nine. We know that nobody is living in that area now so when we give revenue estimates, some of them are based on that population; but obviously, that changes, and if we were doing that today, it would be different. And you can see the assessed valuation information there.

Now, here we have parcel ownership and it is basically Cor Jesu; the Affton Athletic Association, which has a couple of properties titled slightly different; Trail Net, which has fee simple ownership of the old rail right-away; and the St. Louis Campus, LLC, which is ... was really Eric ... limited liability corporation formed by Erickson to do the retirement village and that is ...

[END OF SIDE A]

... evidently been foreclosed upon and it's in the hands of a bank right now. And many of these properties are tax-exempt properties, Cor Jesu, obviously, the Trail. I believe Affton Athletic also so the taxable property is really the retirement property.

Moving on, existing land use ... white is vacant so other than ... so other than the recreational fields down in the flood plain here, and actually that blue there, it is the piece of property currently being graded. It's Cor Jesu's piece. It's not actually built upon yet so if we were being really accurate that might ... that might be white also. So it's a largely undeveloped area. There are three houses on the old Busch property. They're not occupied at this point. They're down in this southwest portion of the property.

Moving on, the zoning correctly stated, MXD, which is called a Mixed Use District, encompasses the retirement home property as it was previously approved. Some pieces are zoned non-urban that were not included in that proposal, and we have an overlay district called Flood Plain. So this area here is called Flood Plain Mixed Use District. The underlying zoning is Mixed Use District and then the overlay zone corresponds to the Hundred Year Flood Plain going across the site, and you heard a little bit about that.

And in the history as previously described is generally correct. This was a large tract with a single-family home on it. It's actually five or six parcels, but the focus of the attention was on the old Busch property that was ... the majority of it was pasture. It had, you know, horses roaming it at a previous time, but they decided to sell it for a price somewhere north of \$20 million dollars. Their plan was to move to California and they wanted to be sure they were able to buy something equivalent when they arrived so they drove a very hard bargain and that had its ripple effect all the way through the first proposal. A consortium of three local developers, large ones, petitioned in 2005, to develop this ... this area with a combination of multiple family and single-family homes. The original number was, I believe, 479, it was high 400's, and what they requested to accommodate that was a PEU in the R-4 zoning district. And the dominant residential zoning ... residential zoning district south of Gravois Road is R-4. The issue came out in how you interpret and how you count density, and we do give credit for ground in the flood plain as long as steps are taken to cluster development out of the flood plain. So when numbers were being given, it was called [inaudible] R ... R-6AA. Well, the minimum acreage per lot for R-6A is actually 3,000 square feet so we probably ... there are ... I believe that was overstated, but in any event, yes, we did allow clustering on smaller lots out of the flood plain. This is very, very common out there in the County and what we're trying to do is pull development back away from the flood plain. The County is a member of FEMA. We work very closely with MSD. We have a large engineering staff at our Highways and Public Works Department. We're aware of the rules, and we have a good sense of what we can accomplish within the rules and protect properties from an increased risk of flooding.

But as many zoning cases are, particularly infill, where's there a lot of existing development around and residence, that kind of forms a unique interest and, you know, there are differences of opinion as to what should happen on a piece of property. But in any event, that development went away. I think those developers are to this day thanking their lucky stars they were able to opt out at certain points with their options, and the law suit that was filed against the County was declared moot.

Then we went on to the next development, which was a retirement community where the minimum age would be 62, but in fact as Erickson stated the average age in their facilities is 78. It's quite a bit different from the previous proposal which would be kind of subdivision and attached single-family homes type of development. This was larger clusters of buildings three- and four-stories high. A total number of units over 1,500 so this is ... in terms of the sheer numbers of units, this is probably three times as much density as the previous proposal. However, because the residents tend to be older and when your average age is 78, the land use impact, the traffic volumes generated onto adjoining roads was ... would have been roughly equivalent. Certainly in terms of site coverage, it was probably higher. Nevertheless, it was ... it was ... it got quite a bit more acceptance by the surrounding community and ultimately that was approved. Erickson secured a certain amount of contracts, but not enough in the end. The housing

recession claimed them as a victim. The company nationwide ... and it was a large nationwide company and was very well regarded. Our dealings with them were excellent throughout. We were able to be helpful as far as negotiating the Cor Jesu tract. It looked like it was on its way and we had a quality developer, but it didn't happen. Since that time when they closed up their displays, we've had a number of issues with weeds and property maintenance. We've cited them a number of times. We've had to cut the property on at least one occasion, and when that happens, we add the cost of that to the tax bill. We have since met with them, agreed to what needs to be cut and maintained and what can kind of go uncut, pasture areas, if you will. And that's kind of something we ... that's a sign of the times, and we struggle with that at various different development sites throughout the County as their development timeframe has been extended. In terms of ... so ... yeah, that's the development history.

This is a crime slide. We always like to throw these in. Virtually ... inasmuch as it's vacant, there's virtually no crime in the area. We do show five Part One crimes, felonies, a number of calls for services. Almost universally they're related to Affton Athletic Association. Hockey moms or something ... probably not as serious as it ... as it looks.

Property maintenance. Again, we're ... you know, we do have a crew that proactively goes out and looks for these things in addition to responding to complaints. We have north and south preservations offices. Our problem properties unit has been on the site a number of times. I'll keep going. And those are the complaints that we have responded to and kind of a description of what's happened so far on the site. I think I already went through that.

Streets. You know, one thing I'll point out here is that the legal description that was submitted for this proposal goes down the centerline of Musick, and I don't know whether that's intended or not, but that's a ... that's a public street ... and ... do they really want to take over a public street? I don't know that any of their streets are public right now within Grantwood Village. And Gravois, of course, is maintained by the State so there's no big difference there.

Tax Rate Comparison. The city does have a property tax and a personal property tax. The utility tax is ... is less because that's pretty much dictated by State Statute. But there would be tax increase on any uses that would subsequently develop on this property.

The financial impact and the financial impact that you see here is ... is pretty small because it's based on the vacant status of the property right now, and it even assumes a number of residents, nine residents, that we know are not even there right now. So, in its undeveloped state, absolutely, there is very little tax impact, but we're ... but that's not what we're talking about here. We're not talking about what it is, the issue is what it will be.

I will just wrap up by saying that in this case as opposed to Valley Park last week, the County would not support this annexation. We don't think it's logical extending the boundaries of Grantwood Village south of Gravois Road. It's the difference between the existing jurisdiction which can offer a range of services and has pretty ... the capabilities of St. Louis County, I think, are much greater in ... in pursuing the development plans for a site that had been approved. You know, I would note that the MXD Ordinance that has been approved for the site runs with the land. It wasn't granted to the particular property owner that applied for it, so it is very much in effect for at least eight years out at which point if nothing ... if it's not acted upon, it goes away. And we think we're in a much better position, have much better capabilities to insure the proper development of that land including the proper grading with regard to storm water issues and road improvements, which are very important to any development of that size.

With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you, Mr. Powers. Commissioner Schwartz?

SCHWARTZ: No questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Commissioner Ford.

FORD: Is there currently any development plan in place for that ... or proposed for that area of annexation?

POWERS: There is an approved development plan. After they ... they ... after the zoning was approved for the retirement complex, which ... it's an interesting concept, and it's really in three villages, if you will, providing a range of ... of living opportunities from independent living to ... able-bodied people to assisted living, which would be more of ... you know, you have your dining in a central dining hall ... to full nursing care. But that ... that development plan ... a development plan was approved subsequent to the approval of the zoning. So the development rights are ... are pretty well secured.

FORD: So there is a group that's about to proceed with that development plan or ...

POWERS: No.

FORD: ... it's just been approved?

POWERS: That's right. The group that was going to proceed with that development plan is gone, and so what happens or whether somebody picks it up and runs with it as it is or proposes minor changes to ... to a retirement community complex or it could be sold to someone who proposes something completely different and we're back into the zoning thing all over again.

FORD: But that's all speculation?

POWERS: It's all speculation. I would say, though, that this concept is fixed in ordinance. If someone were to put a contract on the property to do something significantly different, like to go back to conventional single-family homes and multiple-family development as before, it would be the subject of a new public hearing.

FORD: Okay. You say that the current annexation proposal goes down the middle of Musick?

POWERS: It does.

FORD: Okay. No other questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. Commissioner Schweitzer?

SCHWEITZER: I would only ask you the same thing I asked Grantwood Village relative to maintenance issues on the trail that runs through the proposed annexed parcel.

POWERS: The trail is ... is currently maintained by St. Louis County. The trail was built by St. Louis County and subsequently enhanced by Great Rivers Greenway and extended by Great Rivers Greenway once that it formed up. The Greenway's model is to acquire property, build trails and turn them over to local jurisdictions for them to maintain. It is not the GRG's model to own and maintain trails. They are not a giant park system. They just get these things on the ground. So, as to whether the County would continue to maintain trails in incorporated areas or not is not so certain. That is ... it's a possibility. We're doing right now, but that's not necessarily the case going forward.

SCHWEITZER: Thank you. That's all.

WOJTKOWSKI: Glenn, relative to traffic issues. Is this area in a trust fund area?

POWERS: All unincorporated areas are in a trust fund area, so, yes.

WOJTKOWSKI: So typically, it's St. Louis County policy then that any developer, no matter what the development, would be assessed the appropriate funds to improve the arterials and the roadways to satisfy traffic demand and the safety of the area. Is that correct?

POWERS: Yes. What we do is we charge what we call a TGA, a traffic generation assessment, based on the scale of the development and the number of parking spaces required for the development. But roadway improvements that are required as part of that development except for things like sidewalks, the cost of constructing those in conjunction with the development is deducted from that TGA obligation.

WOJTKOWSKI: Right. I guess ...

POWERS: So in the case of this development, there's a widening to Musick Road involved, which allows safe left turn lanes. There was a widening and restriping to Gravois Road per MODOT. Musick and Gravois is a dangerous intersection. There's a lot of sight-distance problems as you go along Musick, but our accident statistics show that most of the accidents that occur there are rear-end type accidents because people who want to turn left ... they're going west and want to turn left onto Musick can't store safely out of the traffic flow and they get rammed.

WOJTKOWSKI: But for clarity, you still have the processes in effect where you legally extort funding out of the developers to improve roadways, is that correct?

POWERS: Yes, we do.

WOJTKOWSKI: That's okay.

POWERS: We legally extort and those provisions are written right into the MXD ordinance for this development.

WOJTKOWSKI: Did the previous two ... I'm sorry ... I just can't help it.

POWERS: I know, I can appreciate that.

WOJTKOWSKI: The previous two developments, did they go far enough into design to enter into permit processes or into engineering processes where MSD evaluated the impact of the development on the infrastructure?

POWERS: Definitely not on the ... in the case of the first development where there seems to have more hard feelings. On the second one, you know, I'm not sure whether anyone was actively working on improvement plans. They had set up a display, a trailer or two, and were ... were trying to generate contracts before ... and I think they were just about to the point ... they had, my understanding, secured a decent amount of contracts, close to 100, and were about to start their Phase 1, but their [inaudible] went way beyond this project. They were having problems on a nationwide basis.

WOJTKOWSKI: I was just kind of confused over, you know, the statement that 400 residences would surcharge the system, but 1,500 residences wouldn't. I ...

POWERS: Well, there would be a rate, but the parking ... it's based on parking and the parking requirement for elderly housing is half that potentially of a ...

WOJTKOWSKI: So less roadway, less driveways ...

POWERS: Yes.

WOJTKOWSKI: ... less impervious surface associated with senior living development.

POWERS: When we establish a rate, and I'll talk about residential, for instance, only establish a per unit rate or a per parking space rate, we look at trip generation numbers so we know that a single-family house will generate 10 to 12 trips per day ... you know, taking kids to basketball practice and things like that. And multiple family will be half that, less than half that. And if we're talking about elderly multiple family, that's even less because we know their driving habits are less frequent.

WOJTKOWSKI: Okay. So, my last question is a simple one. It seems that everyone is here tonight because they ... that St. Louis County has failed to inspire confidence in them that you can administer to the future development. [Applause] Can you put your finger on why ... on why that ... why that has occurred?

POWERS: Well, I think, you know, every jurisdiction, whether you're in Creve Coeur or Chesterfield or Wildwood or Florissant or unincorporated St. Louis County, has its zoning controversies. All you have to do is read the paper to know that. Zoning's a tough thing. It's a public process. It's mandated that way by law and so we're ... we're out there doing it. So, you know, I wish I had the luxury of saying I could do it better, but I guess, you know, we're all doing it.

WOJTKOWSKI: Okay.

POWERS: And it's not a happy thing all the time, but if you look at the history of County zoning decisions over time, I think we've created a quality-built environment that in many ways exceeds that of some of our neighbors in adjoining counties. So, have we made our mistakes over time? Sure, but I think we have a good system, but that doesn't ... it is a political process. It's always going to be controversial.

WOJTKOWSKI: Thank you, Glenn.

SCHWARTZ: I have no questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Powers.

POWERS: Yes sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: I'd like to take about a five-minute break before we go into the public comment. We have a number of them here so let's all get a drink of water, stretch, and we'll reconvene in five minutes.

... speaker is Clifford Underwood and the second is John Judd.

UNDERWOOD: I'd like to thank the Commission for the work that they do and the opportunity to make the comment tonight. In my note, I am firmly in favor of Grantwood Village's annexation proposal and the reason that I am so much in favor of that is the fact that I've been watching that area for the last ten years, and I've been very concerned about might happen to it, and I would say that that first proposal would have been an environmental disaster if it had been allowed to have happened. Anyway, I'm thinking in terms of the future and posterity, I think, as much as anything. I know that at the present time Whitehaven is under the umbrella of Grantwood Village and there is a proposal afoot to make Grant's Farm a part of the National Park Service as well. And it would be my hope for the future of posterity that should Grantwood Village annex this property that if the Park Service acquires the property that whatever they do will be in conjunction with what exists there now, and I would comment on Mr. Jones' proposal

that it was as clear and a precise presentation that I've heard in a long time, and I don't think he missed a trick. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. Mr. Judd. John Hessel.

HESEL: As many of you know, I'm an attorney and I've appeared before you on numerous occasions, actually seeking annexations on all of those occasions, and when I've sought those annexations, I suggested to you that the annexation was appropriate because it was a reasonable, logical extension of properties that were similar in residential nature or in commercial nature and there was a similarity as far as the ability to provide services.

In this instance this evening I represent Sovereign Bank and Sovereign Bank is in the process of foreclosing on the property. We anticipate that we will be the owner of that property within the next 45 to 60 days. We are not a developer; we are a bank. We do not have a buyer for the property so when we heard about the annexation, I contacted Cathy Forand, and again I thank her for being very gracious in speaking with me, and I spoke with Paul as well to find out more about the annexation itself. I then went back and spoke with my client about the annexation and the position that we would take. And we are here to oppose the annexation as the property owner, candidly because of the uncertainties associated with the annexation and again, candidly, because we don't believe that there are ... that this is a natural extension of the boundaries of Grantwood Village. What I mean by that is, the common boundary is truly Gravois Road and you are now leapfrog ... going across Gravois Road to annex this property. It's not a natural extension in which there is commonality in the existing residential properties or the existing commercial properties between Grantwood Village and the property. As we all know, it's undeveloped property. It's undeveloped property that my client holds. My client does not want to hold that property. We don't want to own that property. It's unfortunate that Erickson got into the position that they did, St. Louis Campus, LLC, and couldn't honor their obligations so we are in the process of owning that property, and again, in speaking with everyone within Grantwood Village and as they presented to you this evening, the purpose of this annexation is by their own admission to control future development. I don't blame them for that. On the other hand, I think, Mr. Ford, you asked the questions ... from my client's standpoint and as a person that's going to own the property, we have no guidance whatsoever as to what the future use of that property can be. There's no plan in place. There's no planning department in place. We have that with St. Louis County. Similarly, the questions were asked as to what ... how would Grantwood Village go about funding and taking care of the services in the future when a development occurs? Well, their answer was "There's no development now, so it's easy." Well, of course, it's easy now. It's vacant property. But what's going to happen when someone comes forward and there is no analysis being presented to you as to how Grantwood Village is going to be able to pay for the services that are associated with some development. And again, I don't know what that development's going to be. None of us in this room know what that development is going to be, but that puts us in a very difficult situation. All we know, and obviously that affects the marketability. In addition to that, the marketability of the property, you're talking about either jumping ... increasing the size of Grantwood Village by either 79 acres or 120 acres, I don't know which one it is; I've heard both of them this evening as you have heard, but in either event, it's a 15 percent or a 20 percent increase in the size of Grantwood Village. That is a very significant increase and when you're talking to my client, who is going to own this property, that has to market this property, you're talking about being involved in a community now where you're 20 percent of the land or 15 percent, however you want to characterize it. So, at the end of the day, we respect Grantwood Village, but it's our position that we want to stay with the known quantity, St. Louis County. You people have heard me when I've made presentations on behalf of jurisdictions that wanted to annex St. Louis County property. I have always qualified all of my comments, and I'll state them again this evening. I have the utmost respect and admiration for St. Louis County, even when I'm trying to annex property out of St. Louis County because that's just a choice of people. In this instance, to me it's important that we respect the St. Louis County process. I agree wholeheartedly with Glenn Powers. We have appeared before St. Louis County. There are good people that are involved in the process, and I'm sure that there are good people here don't always agree with the zoning decisions that are made within St. Louis County. I don't agree with all the zoning decisions made within all ... some of the communities I

represent, some of the communities that I have appeared before. Having said that, again, on behalf of the only entity that's going to own the property at issue, we are opposed to the annexation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you, Mr. Hessel. Paul Rost.

ROST: Yes, this is perfect timing. First of all, they're not the only entity. The Athletic Association is there. Second of all, I think it speaks volumes to the need for this annexation that the future owner of the property wants to go with the entity that they feel is most likely to afford them the full plethora of uses on the property. That's understandable. Of course, they're going to want to do that. But the fear that drives that is based on nothing. The Village has been around since 1937. It's not like it doesn't know how to pave streets. It's not like the Village has never dealt with development before. They have. They know what to do. They can handle it. They're big ... big boys and girls ... they can do it. So the point is simply not that you ... you talking about a bank that wants ... is going to own it but isn't going to develop it and isn't going to do anything other than try to sell it. That's fine. We understand that. But getting back to the main point, the Village can handle it. We wouldn't have done this if we couldn't handle it. As I stated, it's not like we don't know what we're going to do. The income will come as it develops from the people who live there because we have a tax basis that will go off of. We also will then get more from the pool and the sales taxes. We can handle that. Also, I want to clear up the part about Musick Road. We do know about the centerline thing; we did that on purpose. We want the jurisdiction over at least that half of the road for the right-of-way purposes for the ability to control that. That wasn't a mistake. We will be submitting tomorrow or by the end of the week at least a request to modify the plan as Commissioner Ford asked me about looking at the rules. And, I think finally just to sum this up, I think the County, again, this really wasn't ... isn't designed to be an "us" versus "them" kind of thing. This isn't about whether St. Louis County can provide services. We know they can. They do quite well. The County Police, the mosquitos, that's understandable, but this is more about the fact that through the process of the last five years with this parcel, it has been nothing but a series of missteps and misguided ... even if they have a large planning department ... misguided as to the entire community that surrounds it. This isn't just about Grantwood Village. As Trustee Mike Jones said, this is support from all the surrounding community, not just the people who live in Grantwood. They are looking to Grantwood. They are here to support this because they understand that Grantwood understands them and understands the people who live in this area. We might not have a 20-person staff, but we can get people to get it done. We've got the ability to handle the planning. There's a mixed use zoning already on the site so again, I'll just sum up with as the County said, clustering is common in the County. We don't want common. We want Grantwood Village. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you, Mr. Rost. The next speaker, Sister Barbara Thomas.

THOMAS: Thank you and good evening. I am Sister Barbara Thomas, and I have the privilege of being president of Cor Jesu Academy. Cor Jesu, established in 1956, has been in its current location on Gravois Road since 1964, and we are proud to have graduated almost 5,000 young women in the last 50 years who have taken the mission of Cor Jesu to heart. They leave us not only academically well prepared to go forward into college and career, but also they are women who will transform the world through their faith, their compassion, their integrity, and their impassioned service.

I am grateful and appreciate this opportunity to speak to you, and I will be very brief. As Paul has pointed out from Grantwood Village and explained in his presentation, there are approximately 16 acres in the annexation proposal that was submitted that are east of McNary Road. Of those 16 acres, Cor Jesu currently owns six and we are in negotiations to hopefully buy the other ten. And as you saw from Paul's slide, we have an athletic field under construction which will be completed in a few weeks and will be ready for play by next spring. The next construction scheduled in our master plan is a performance gymnasium and a theater, and the placement of these buildings would cross the annexation boundary line which would mean that not only would our campus lie in two different municipalities, but we would need to secure zoning and construction permits from those two different municipalities. We are very happy to be neighbors of the Village of Grantwood, and we share their mutual desire to continually

improve our local community. However, the potential complexity of having our one campus in two municipalities is why we ask to be excluded from that annexation proposal.

We'd like to thank the Village of Grantwood for meeting with us, listening to our concerns in this matter and for agreeing with our exclusion request, and we would ask the Boundary Commission to do the same. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you, Sister. The next speaker, Mary Ann Braun.

BRAUN: Thank you for being here, gentlemen and lady. Sir, I believe you hit on a very important factor that probably has caused this meeting to take place and for our activism to have come forward and that is because in all due respect St. Louis County did not do a good job of looking out for the residents of the area. When this ... the first proposal back in 2005 with the heavy density, St. Louis County commissioned the building commissioner, the planning commission should have never allowed that to get to the point of approval. They didn't do a good job of looking out for us, and if they had, we would not be here tonight asking for this annexation. What we are looking for ... I'm a 42-year resident of the Village. I live in the old part of Grantwood. Right now, the old part of Grantwood is suffering from a misstep that was part of that plan already in that we now only have one entrance in which to leave the Village if we want to go up toward Laclede Station, and it is becoming a nightmare. Sometimes when we're trying to get out of the Village at 7:30 to 7:45 in the morning, you have to beg your way across the street. Our granddaughter, who is going to Cor Jesu, lives in the Village, and we don't even allow her to walk across the street because of the way that the traffic patterns now flow. It's becoming a hazard. And I just ask you to please listen to these gentlemen from Grantwood Village and what they have proposed because they're ... their request is based on fact and all that we are trying to do is look out for the integrity of our neighborhood. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you.

[END SIDE B]

SCHMIDT... Sunset Hills subdivision, which is right next to the area, and from what I've seen over the last years, it scares me when I think of St. Louis County controlling that area and the development, and so that's why I'm in favor of Grantwood Village annexing that. At least we have some local controls, some people who have our interest at heart and not somebody from outside our area controlling what happens to us. If that other plan had went [stet] through, we would have had a traffic nightmare in that area. It would not have been good for any of us and so that's why I really worry about the County continuing. And this thing of Grantwood Village ... I've driven through Grantwood Village, I see how they run their area. I think they'll run the other area fine. And so I'm really in favor of them annexing it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. And our last speaker, Genevieve Webelhuth [sounds like].

WEBELHUTH: Hi! I'm Ginny Webelhuth. I am giving you my personal perspective. I lived in St. Louis County as a newlywed for 15 years on Affton Place. I had to deal with some things with local government, St. Louis County, such as reducing a speed limit on a small cul-de-sac, and also getting our street repaired, and I felt like I was swimming in an ocean of government. I felt like I was getting nowhere and luckily after being married 15 years, we bought a house in Grantwood Village. I've been so fortunate to be able to get my dream of owning property, owning a home in Grantwood Village for the last 16 years. I love it. The streets ... we are so spoiled. They are so beautifully maintained. I have a personal voice, a connection to our five trustees. They listen. We rose up and united several times even before I became a resident. The Ulysses S. Grant National Historic Site ... at one time they were proposing to build condominiums there. Grantwood Village rose up united and we defeated that. And now we have our beautiful, historic Presidential National Park because Grantwood Village saved Whitehaven. And I thank you. I wasn't even a resident then. They were proposing a Quick Shop on Gravois where our Town Hall is. Again, over the years the neighborhood rose up and defeated that. Now we have a quiet Missionary

Ridge Street, three residential lots and our Town Hall across the street from Cor Jesu where my three daughters went to school. It's beautiful. There were other times ... they were proposing a fast-food restaurant where Commerce Bank is on that corner. Again, the Grantwood Village residents rose up and defeated that zoning. That would have been horrible for our immediate area and all the residents around the area. It was totally inappropriate and because the neighborhood united, we were able to defeat that. I can tell you I love living in Grantwood Village. It has been the quality of life you dream of, and I would be so happy to see that property being annexed into Grantwood so that I would know that when the future years come that this neighborhood again will unite and make sure it's appropriate for all these people who live in this area because this is our home. It's not North County. It's not West County. It's not South County. This is where we live. This is where our children go to school. This is what we love, and we're taking a personal, personal interest to make sure this is something appropriate for our neighborhood, the people that live here and our community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you very much. If there are no further comments, we'll conclude the hearing. Thank you all for coming.