

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

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

**OCTOBER 26, 2010**

**COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:**

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director  
Elizabeth Chostner, Legal Counsel

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Good evening, everyone. I'd like to convene this Public Hearing. This is to entertain a proposal from the town of Grantwood Village regarding a Boundary Commission Case File Number 1004, and this is identified as Area B.

Before we begin, there may be some people who were not here at the last meeting, so I'd like to give you a little information on the Boundary Commission.

The Boundary Commission is an independent government body that reviews all boundary changes, boundary change proposals in St. Louis County. The Commission's authority derives from State Statutes and St. Louis County Ordinance. The Commission is comprised of eleven members along with two staff members, our Executive Director, Miss Michelle Dougherty, down here at the end, and our Legal Counsel, Mr. David Hamilton. Tonight, David is being represented by Ms. Elizabeth Chostner. Eleven Commissioners are all appointed according to the following formula: four members are appointed by the St. Louis County Municipal League, two from large cities, one from a medium city, and one from a small city. Four members are appointed by the County Executive. Three members are joint appointments by the Municipal League and the County Executive. We meet monthly with additional public hearings scheduled as necessary to consider Map Plans and boundary changes. Tonight's informational hearing provides an opportunity for the town of Grantwood Village to explain and comment on a revised proposal on the annexation of an area identified as Area B. Public comment will be directed toward the Map Plan being discussed this evening. The Commission staff will also be available to answer questions about the Commission process after tonight's meeting.

The Commission welcomes your participation in the Public Comment segment of tonight's Public Hearing; however, you will need to fill out and present a Public Comment Form to our Executive Director, Ms. Dougherty, prior to the end of St. Louis County's presentation to the Commission. If you are speaking as an individual, you will be allotted three minutes. If you are speaking on behalf of a group, you'll be allotted five minutes. The Commission will also take public comments either by mail or email for 21 days following tonight's meeting, and these comments will also be included in the public record.

As a reminder, no decision will be made this evening. The Commission will review the proposal along with the comments from Grantwood Village, from St. Louis County, your comments here this evening and any comments that we receive through the mail or by email. The Commission has nine months from the time of the original proposal, which was July 1, 2010. So we have to make a decision by April 1, 2011.

We'll now ask the Commission members who are present here this evening to introduce themselves, the city or area that they reside in and their appointing authority. So we will begin with Commissioner Ollendorff down at the end.

OLLENDORFF: Frank Ollendorff. I reside in University City. I'm appointed by the Municipal League of St. Louis County.

SAUERWEIN: My name is Bill Sauerwein. I'm from the city of Oakland, Missouri, and I was appointed by the mayors of small cities in St. Louis County.

SCHWEITZER: My name is Kathleen Schweitzer, and I was appointed by the St. Louis County Executive. I live in Unincorporated St. Louis County.

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

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

FREESMEIER: My name is Tom Freesmeier. I live in Florissant, and I was appointed by the municipalities of 20,000 population or more.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you all. We'll begin now with the Grantwood Village presentation and making that presentation tonight is Village Trustee, Mr. Mike Jones. Mr. Jones.

JONES: Thank you. I'm not sure this is on. Thank you very much. I'm sorry that this presentation is directly behind you, but I can assure you I didn't set up the setting. If you all just could just get comfortable, I'd appreciate it. Are you all good? Thank you.

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, just a real quick description of Grantwood Village. We're a community, a municipality in South St. Louis County that's a bit less than a square mile in size. We have a population at last census of 883 which represents 347 households. We're home to two major area attractions, both the Ulysses S. Grant National Historic Site and Grant's Farm. And we've been in business now since 1937 so we offer a full range of services and that's kind of my overview of Grantwood Village.

What I'd like to do next is address kind of the technicalities of this presentation. We're asked in the submission of a Boundary Commission proposal to address certain substantive ... substantive issues ... there are eleven of them ... and what I'd like to do even though it's a little bit technical for a lot of the people here, I'd just like to do quick review of where we stand with regard to that substantive nature of the document.

So regarding the impact on the tax base or the ability to raise revenue, as this property is currently undeveloped, it shouldn't require significant expenditures prior to its development. 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 this area and create a surplus of just over \$5,300.00 dollars per year over the next three years within the annexed area. The economic impact to the surrounding communities should be negligible. The possible loss of revenue to St. Louis County given the undeveloped nature of this property is expected also to be minimal, estimated at \$4,300.00 dollars per year in sales tax and \$120.00 dollars in utility tax per year.

Regarding the legal description, approximately 106 acres are represented in this proposal. They're substantially undeveloped and uninhabited land including six distinct locator numbered parcels owned by three different owners and those would be the Grant's Trail along here which is owned by Missouri Trail Net and maintained by St. Louis County Parks and Rec. This commercial district here, which is owned and operated by the Affton Athletic Association, and the land that's primarily at issue here, which is currently in foreclosure.

Bounded on the west by Musick Road, on the north by Gravois Road, on the east by McNary Drive, and Grant's Trail, and on the south by Unincorporated St. Louis County and Sunset Memorial Park, it's ... the access road to the Affton Athletic Association ... McNary Road bisects the tract west of Grant's Trail. The annexation itself would extend to the centerline of Musick Road, east ... excuse me ... all of McNary Road, and both sides of Gravois Road from Musick Road to Grantview Lane in Grantwood Village. The boundary selection for annexation is logical because it shares access to Gravois Road and is directly contiguous to the current boundaries of Grantwood Village ... and, by the way, this is Grant's Farm right here in this area.

The annexation area is in close proximity to Grant's Farm as I just showed, which is located within Grantwood Village and the similarity of the current use as well as the future possible uses of the annexation area make it a logical selection for annexation as well.

Regarding the creation of logical and reasonable boundaries, nearly 20 percent of the frontage of this area proposed for annexation is shared with Grantwood Village. The proposed area is roughly trapezoidal in shape and presents no irregular or discontinuous dimensions. In addition to a significant contiguous shared boundary, the topography, forestation, flood plain and other characteristics are largely held in common.

Regarding the provision of major services. There would be no loss of existing services resulting from this annexation. Grantwood Village proposes to provide licensing, permits, and parks and rec services in-house. All other services would be on a contractual basis from county, municipal or commercial providers on a bid basis. There would be no noticeable change in fees or charges for services since the area to be annexed again is primarily undeveloped and uninhabited.

Regarding the time schedule for provision of services, Grantwood Village anticipates acceptance of all responsibilities related to annexation within six months of the date of election or at an earlier date if allowed by law.

And finally, regarding the proposed zoning of the area, this is a look at the current zoning map, which is consistent with the zoning of the proposed map. You can see that it's largely mixed-use, flood plain, non-urban and non-urban flood plain.

So that deals with the substantive review of this property, and now a little bit of historical review if you will. I couldn't let the Halloweenishness of this date pass without noting that it was exactly five years ago to this very day that the intent to develop this property was first reported in the ... in the newspaper. The Director of the St. Louis County Planning Commission, in a sworn deposition in early 2007 said, "An unbroken, undeveloped piece of land of this size, this deep inside the County is rare." And we agree with that. He also said it represents a great opportunity to try a "new urbanist" design which mixes high density residential with mixed commercial and service development. He alluded to the Brentwood Promenade development as an example. He went on to state that development of a "Wildwood" in the area would be

a serious mis-utilization of the site. Although we're not exactly anticipating either Wildwood or Brentwood, this highlights a major concern we have with our County Planning Commission. Its preference is to experiment with something untried and inappropriate for the area because the large unoccupied space represents such a rare opportunity. The overall impact on traffic, on flood plain, and on green space hasn't even factored in.

In December of 2005 the largest crowd ever to attend a County Planning Commission meeting argued the pros and cons of an extremely dense residential development proposed for this very same tract. The results are tabulated here in the final report to the County Council. You can see here ... or maybe you can't ... I'll read it to you that opposed to proceeding with the development were zero individuals and a crowd count of 114. In favor ... excuse me, opposed to proceeding from the St. Louis County Planning Commission ... opposed to proceeding with this development individuals who spoke out in opposition, 17; letters received, 652; petitions signed and notarized, 297; and an active crowd count there that night in opposition, 348. The Commission promptly voted six to one in favor of proceeding and sent it on to the County Council for consideration.

And here it is. The things left undecided by the Planning Commission included how nearly half of the proposed residents would enter and exit their own new subdivisions. It contained no hydrology study and no comprehensive traffic study. The Commission deemed the housing density reasonable and appropriate although aggressive. It included no specific housing or parking designs. Carrie Williams of the MSD judged that the downstream sanitary sewers needed evaluation to insure capacity to handle the demand, but this was not mandated by the County Council in its ordinance approving the development. The Planning Commission voted to approve without having any ability to mitigate traffic volume or flow on Gravois, which is a MODOT road, and without establishing who even controlled the easements or ownership of McNary Road. In fact, the Affton Athletic Association, which does have private control over McNary, was never contacted by either the proposed developer or the Planning Commission regarding this proposal although the use of that road was critical in developing that property and interconnecting it to begin with. The Commission proposed to signalize Gravois at Grantview Road, which state code wouldn't allow, and to cross a pedestrian trail that they did not have legal access to. The Affton and Melville fire marshals and the Affton Third District Police expressed their concerns to the Planning Commission over the lack of secondary roads leading to Gravois and Musick for any of the approved 444 homes. The Planning Commission passed the proposal without a resolution to this problem. Mr. Powers, in his summation, said, "The advantages of this proposal are obvious." When to a person, the residents in the area came away wondering what exactly those advantages were. What was obvious? Who was it advantageous to? It was never laid out or presented in terms of benefit to the existing community because there was no benefit, there was only potential hazard here.

The Chairman of the County Planning Commission, Douglas Morgan, in his closing comments at the end of a long evening, said he hoped the residents of the area could work to resolve their issues with this development. This was an appropriate comment because it was very clear by then that the community was on its own from that point forward.

The Planning Commission and the County Council failed to see the same housing collapse that was noted during a public meeting held at Lindbergh High in 2006 regarding this same proposal. In their 2007 revision of the Affton Commercial Corridor Plan, the Planning Commission touted the new housing stock at Bexly [sounds like] Station, which is a development of McBride Breezeway Condos a mile east of this same tract that we're talking about tonight. These condos, the same as proposed along Gravois Creek are now in their third full year of being listed for sale. So what would have happened here on this tract with the Commission missing the signals from an exhausted market once the trees were dozed and the ground cleared and then the economy tanked. It most likely would have sat like an open wound eroding silt into Gravois Creek exacerbating the flooding downstream. It most likely would be sitting there like that today.

The benefit of this now to us as we can look at the results of our County Planning vision in hindsight. In 2005 real estate prices were at their very peak. The land in question sold for nearly a quarter of a million

dollars an acre. Nineteen of the 94 acres sold were in active flood plain and therefore non-developable, and it still sold for that kind of price. What it did in effect was it forced an unusually dense design on the land in order for those developers to recoup their money. The Planning Commission approved a plan calling for 444 living units crammed tight as sardines in a can into a landlocked area with severely restricted traffic access and repetitive septic flooding events.

So now we forward to 2010, right here, right now. What would we have now there if our County Planning Commission had had its way and the developers followed its new-urbanist approach? It's fairly obvious in retrospect that this project would have been a commercial fiasco. If you're familiar with this part of South County, you might be aware of the empty vastness of Crestwood Mall, the many commercial vacancies along both Watson and Gravois commercial corridors, and the housing units of many types still looking for buyers after several years on the market. In this community, the Planning Commission has lost its credibility. It approved by a six-to-one vote in the face of overwhelming community opposition a project which clearly would have proven neither economically nor physically viable.

Grantwood Village plans to do better by the people of this area. That in essence is why Grantwood Village respectfully comes before the St. Louis County Boundary Commission with a proposal to annex this same property because we do care more about the quality of life and the guaranty of safety to current residents than we do in handing this off for further experiments in new urbanism. Now the Director of the Planning Commission will tell you right here tonight that Grantwood Village has no planning commission. That's a failure to get the point here. It doesn't matter how many people work in your planning department if they don't understand the area in question and aren't curious about what would actually work and what existing residents need. The Planning Commission could have a hundred full-time employees and still make a bad call and then defend it four years later. You can hire all the intelligence you want, but you can't buy wisdom.

Grantwood Village proposes to work constructively with the eventual buyer of this property to insure its successful development, a development which is in harmony with its neighbors which doesn't by virtue of dense mixed-use development threaten our safety and the tenuous economic state of our existing Affton commercial corridor. The planning Grantwood Village intends to influence will be based on a clear understanding of the physical day-to-day potentials and limitations within this area. We want to ensure that development of this land proves equally livable for both newcomers and existing area property owners. We'll strive to further develop an area with stable and rising property values. We want to promote jobs for St. Louisians and children for South County schools, and business volume for our good neighbors along both the Gravois and Watson commercial corridors. Unlike the Planning Commission, we won't set out with a fixed notion of development. We understand that this area needs to eventually accrue to the benefit of all South County. We've seen the historical evidence that our advocacy for responsible development will prove more workable than the Planning Commission experimenting with new dense mixed-use schemes. Grantwood Village has demonstrated in its submission to the Boundary Commission that we can afford to annex it, that we have the infrastructure to administer it, and that the acquired wisdom to plan for its future is here. Come visit our Village and see the quality of life we deliver. We'll be delighted to meet with a potential buyer tomorrow to discuss our vision and our concerns for the development. Of course, you'll also hear from the attorney representing the bank invested in foreclosing on the land at issue. He'll strenuously object to this annexation proposal on the grounds that it will restrict the market for the property making it harder to sell to a buyer. I would suggest this in turn, a civil lawsuit brought against St. Louis County and then sustained for 16 months paralyzed all development until the downturn in housing became undeniable even to a builder. The developers got out gracefully, and we would suspect gratefully. Grantwood Village proposes that it would be much easier to reach a successful accommodation with our municipality than it will be through the County when a similar civil suit starts up again. We know this too from experience.

We ask that you enable Grantwood Village to protect the safety of its 800 plus St. Louis County residents and that of our surrounding neighborhoods by approving our request to annex this presently unincorporated and primarily undeveloped area. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. The next presentation will be by St. Louis County Planning, and Mr. Powers, are you prepared? Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, we'll have some questions. Mr. Ford.

FORD: First of all, did [inaudible] any public hearings before the annexation was submitted ... proposal was submitted?

JONES: Yes, we did and held a vote at that time, which was overwhelmingly in favor of ...

FORD: How did you notify your area residents, businesses, and surrounding residents?

JONES: We sent out cards to current residents.

FORD: To current residents of Grantwood?

JONES: Yes, to notify them of the election.

FORD: Did you notify the residents around the surrounding area of St. Louis County?

JONES: Not to the best of my knowledge.

FORD: Did you notify Cor Jesu?

JONES: No.

FORD: Okay. How stable is the Grantwood Village government? Wasn't there a recent news report about an alderman resigning which prevented a quorum; therefore, the government was kind of frozen, couldn't conduct any business?

JONES: That was an extremely short-term situation that was quickly remedied. Right now there's a full board and a fully functional board.

FORD: How was it remedied?

JONES: I'm sorry.

FORD: How was it remedied?

JONES: It was remedied ... three of the board members left the board voluntarily.

FORD: Okay.

JONES: Were replaced in short order, and we're up and functional. I'm one of the trust ... one of the new trustees on board now.

FORD: Is there anything put in place to prevent this from happening in the future?

JONES: As far as I know ... I mean it's functional right now. There were several differences of opinion that happened on the last board which are completely unrelated to the issue that's being discussed tonight. And three decided to resolve that by voluntarily leaving the board. They were replaced, I believe, very successfully by three good qualified people that are now on the board and we're dealing very well in my own estimation with the task at hand.

FORD: Okay. In speaking for myself I have to analyze the annexing party ... Village to determine are they stable enough or can support the annexation area so, therefore, that's the reason why the question has come up.

JONES: The current chairman on our board has been with the board for 18 years, and represents an awful lot of stability to the government that we all share.

FORD: You indicated it was resolved in short matter. How long ... How long did it take to resolve the matter?

JONES: Well, there was ... there are monthly meetings held of the Board of Trustees of Grantwood Village, and there was one ... well, I know there were ... of the possible five Trustees there were four at the next meeting and five by two meetings later.

FORD: Thank you so much. What kind of support staff does the Village have? Full-time personnel or ...?

JONES: We have a single full-time St. Louis County police patrolman, and the rest of our services are all on a contractual basis.

FORD: You don't have anybody at City Hall or anything?

JONES: At City Hall?

FORD: Yeah, or your Village City Hall to ... so other than the policeman ...

JONES: One of our Trustees ... we don't have a full-time employee answering the phones at City Hall if that's your question.

FORD: Yes.

JONES: No, we don't. One of our Trustees lives next door to the Town Hall and there is a trustee presence in the Town Hall every day, but not on a set schedule.

FORD: What about street maintenance or snow removal or anything like that?

JONES: Provided by the County.

FORD: Provided ... is it a contracted service?

JONES: Yes.

FORD: What kind of permit structure does the Village have?

JONES: I'm sorry ... permit structure?

FORD: Yes.

JONES: I'm afraid I'm not ... I would need to bring up who's in the audience; I could bring up our Streets ....

FORD: Please.

JONES: Bob, would you mind? Just not my area of expertise.

FORD: No problem.

BESS: My name is Bob Bess. I've been a resident of Grantwood Village for 15 years, currently serving as a Trustee. Past experience would include being Mayor and Alderman for a period of 16 years during the heyday of the building and development of Crestwood where the big stores were.

FORD: What is the procedure for permit structure for ... or what is the permit structure, first of all, for ... If I wanted to build a house in Grantwood Village, what's the procedure for permits?

BESS: You would call me and I would come and counsel you on what you needed to do, the permits that would be necessary and advise you also to go to St. Louis County Building Commission and seek their help also, and together we would work out anything that would be necessary.

FORD: What kinds of building codes does Grantwood Village have?

BESS: We have no particular commercial building codes at this time although we have provisions for them that have not been enacted to my knowledge.

FORD: What about residential building codes?

BESS: Residential, we have four or five different residential areas with appropriate building regulations for those various areas.

FORD: Okay. During construction, how does the Village follow up to be assured that building codes are being followed?

BESS: Well, I would be on it all the time. I function as more or less a full-time Building Commissioner and Street Commissioner for the Village of Grantwood. I am retired.

FORD: And what in your background gives you first-hand knowledge that things are being ... that proper building codes are being followed.

BESS: One thing my age. Another being I studied to be an architect at Washington University. Just common knowledge and common sense on things for my past 80 years.

FORD: Are you familiar with the BOCA codes?

BESS: Yes, I am.

FORD: Thank you, that's all I have on the codes.

BESS: Thank you.

FORD: Thank you. The proposal only takes up half of Musick Road. Why only one-half of the road and such a short period of distance? I drove it tonight; it's less than a mile.

JONES: We would like to be able to influence the road cuts and the maintenance along the side that we annex. Again, due to the historical nature of this property, on three different revisions of the County Council proposal, it kept being rev'ed every month. It kept back and it would be in a different revision. They kept moving where the road cut would be. It was across from Brookmere, then it was across from Surette [sounds like], and then it was across from another street, and it was driving the people on the other side of Musick crazy. We'd like to try to avoid a situation like that again, and we feel the best way is by having influence over where those curb cuts occur.

FORD: Why didn't you take all of Musick?

JONES: Because we just want to be able to access and egress from the area that we propose to annex. We don't want to affect how our neighbors enter and exit their properties. We want to be able to affect how traffic comes in and out of any future development on our side.

FORD: Doesn't that create problems for street maintenance and snow removal, et cetera, et cetera?

JONES: I'm not sure it would because Musick is a County road and because we do contract through the County, it would be a fairly easy enough thing when one half is being done or likely to be done that we would contract for the other half at the same time.

FORD: Okay. One more question about the codes. How do you keep up with the changing codes? I'm sure the codes are an on-going, changing, evolving situation.

BESS: Very much so. Very much so. We get copies of changes, and I try to absorb them as best I could the things that might affect us. There are many things in BOCA code that would not affect Grantwood Village nor the area that we are proposing [for] annexation.

FORD: Thank you. Sorry about .... In your revised proposal, why didn't you include all of Cor Jesu Academy instead of eliminating the area that Cor Jesu just bought? Why didn't you go the other direction instead ... instead of eliminating, why didn't you add to your proposal?

JONES: In which direction?

FORD: Take in all of Cor Jesu as opposed to eliminating the part that they wanted you to eliminate?

JONES: It was Cor Jesu's request that they remain unincorporated, and we honored that request.

FORD: So, in essence, they weren't really in favor of the annexation.

JONES: Well, they're in favor of the annexation outside of the property they intend to develop themselves. You have to remember this original request for annexation was placed back in 2006, and that land has been developed ...

FORD: No. The Map Plan was submitted ...

JONES: Excuse me, the Map Plan that we submitted was based on information we had at that point. If you look now, that area that they've bought is already being developed into athletic fields. Their plan is to run their physical plant across the back as well, and they didn't want to be hung up between our land and the ...

FORD: In your Map Plan, did you include Cor Jesu?

JONES: No ... just the ....

FORD: Okay. Thank you. That answers that question. Thank you.

JONES: Okay.

FORD: In your revised proposal, why did you keep Gravois Road, that little sliver of Gravois Road instead of going down to where your actual property line ... or the annexation proposal picks up?

JONES: Once again, you're looking at 103 homes in Old Grantwood, which is half of Grantwood Village, that have one way of getting in and out; 103 households with one way of getting in and out and that is right on Gravois. It's basically ... it's built like a horseshoe, but it's ... their only way onto Gravois is through two unsignalized intersections directly on Gravois in a 40-mile-per-hour zone. In a half-mile area, you have traffic from McNary Road for the Affton Athletic Association, you have traffic from Grant's Far, you have traffic from Cor Jesu, you have traffic from both of these intersections coming in from Grantwood Village, plus you've got all of the cross stuff coming through at 40 miles an hour in that zone. Add to that, if you will, the potential for development in that area, and we thought it was imperative that we try to get some kind influence over ... again, the nature of the curb cuts and the nature of where the entrances and exits for the future might be located.

FORD: Okay.

JONES: I'm sorry, is that vague?

FORD: Yes. I'm just a truck driver so you need to explain ...

JONES: No, no, no. It's fine. I want to be clear if I can. We feel that it's in the best interests of our own residents to make sure we have influence over where further entrances and exits to that stretch of Gravois would be located.

FORD: But isn't that a State road?

JONES: Yes, it is.

FORD: Wouldn't you have ... go through the State?

JONES: Yes, but it would be up to us to do it.

FORD: What's the difference between that and a developer requesting the State for the cuts and stuff?

JONES: What would be the difference between that and development?

FORD: What's the difference between Grantwood Village and a developer asking the State of Missouri to do a cut here or a cut there?

JONES: We, primarily, would not be asking for cuts. What we're trying to do is make sure that they don't happen in a way that's unreasonable for trying to get in and out of the only access road that we have into Old Grantwood.

FORD: Okay.

JONES: This is not with regard to something specific that we intend to propose.

FORD: In your original proposal in the annexation, you had a 94 acres, you eliminated 16, and in this proposal you said 99 acres. Tonight you mentioned 106 acres. Is it throw a dart or do we have an actual remedy to figure out exactly how many acres we've got?

JONES: In his presentation last month, Glenn Powers, the Director of Planning, corrected us and said it was 123 acres so there are even more figures floating out there. To the best of my knowledge, Cor Jesu intends to buy a total of 16, and I had an engineer do a survey ... do an aerial survey of what we intend to purchase as submitted in this last proposal. His best estimate was 106.

FORD: Okay. How did you determine the boundary lines of the annexation ... the annexing area?

JONES: How did we determine the border lines of the ...?

FORD: Yeah. You came up your lines for the annexation proposal. How did you determine that? Was it by ...?

JONES: Well, it essentially follows the boundaries of Andy Busch's former property, which does the same abutment along Musick Road, along Gravois Road, along what's essentially Clydesdale Estates and Terra Hills to the south and then Grant's Trail on the east. They're very natural, very natural borders there plus it represents that that entire parcel that was for sales.

FORD: So the parcel boundaries is what ...

JONES: This almost totally overlaps the parcel boundaries with the exception of the acreage that Cor Jesu has taken.

FORD: It doesn't cut through any ... the middle of any parcels or anything?

JONES: No, it doesn't.

FORD: Okay.

JONES: I might add, Mr. Ford, just in clarification, that, you know, it is essentially a trapezoidal shape which is shown behind you, but take my word for it, but it essentially cuts off ... if there's anything that's bisected, it would go about ... it takes into consideration all of the Affton Athletic Association that is actively serviced by McNary Road. Less than half of the Affton Athletic Association is not accessible by McNary Road; it's accessible from the south off Tesshire and that area is not represented here. So if there's anything that is not being included in its totality it would be the area represented by the Triple A.

FORD: Okay. You mentioned you had a surplus of \$5,300 dollars or something. Could you go over that in your presentation, you mentioned.

JONES: It's actually in the submission, the formal submission to the Boundary Commission.

FORD: Okay. Could you explain it again, please?

JONES: It has to do ... yes. What I had said was that the municipally pooled and shared county sales and property tax revenues ...

FORD: Okay.

JONES: ... should offset the projected costs of extending, for example, the police coverage to the area and create a surplus of just of over \$5,300 dollars per year over the next three years within the annexed area.

FORD: All because of the expanded area, that increases your pool?

JONES: Correct.

FORD: Okay. Okay. You mentioned you have a Parks and Recreation Department?

JONES: We administer to the parks and recreation needs that we have within our own community and would anticipate extending that to the new land.

FORD: And the Affton Athletic Association wouldn't come underneath [inaudible].

JONES: Would not come underneath what?

FORD: Parks and Recreations or ...

[End Side A – Start Side B – Tape labeled “Grantwood”]

JONES: ... intend to have this be a completely neutral process to the Affton Athletic Association. There would be no status change for them whatsoever.

FORD: Okay. Going back to this \$5,300 dollar surplus, is that enough to develop the property?

JONES: We don't intend to develop the property as a municipality. We're looking to work in conjunction with a developer who does develop that property.

FORD: Okay. You hit hard on St. Louis County Planning, which ... that's fine, that's up to you.

JONES: I don't mean it as throwing rocks at the County; I mean it as a historical description of why we feel as passionately as we do about this particular issue.

FORD: How can Grantwood Village handle a proposal to develop the area?

JONES: How can we handle a proposal to develop what?

FORD: The annexed area ... proposed annexed area, I should say.

JONES: Sure. I mean what we would do is we would solicit any kind of approach that we could get from a developer and work in conjunction with them to try to make sure that the physical requirements of that area are met and observed in their design plan for that area. Mr. Powers last month got up and said, you know, these are the same people who shot down the developers who wanted to come in and put in this dense development and then they welcomed Erickson Development, which was planning to put in up to 1,500 units. Again, it misses the point. The point was this: it wasn't the exact density of the area that was in question; it was the impact of the density on the surrounding area and on the surrounding residents. Erickson came in ... the first thing they did was they took the leaders of the litigants that were filing suits against the County ... they had three separate private meetings with the litigants to determine what are the significant things that need to be resolved in order for us to be harmonic with you guys in the development of this area. They answered all eight; and I could submit the questions, and I could submit the answers. They then went to two open forums at Cor Jesu where they invited the whole community to come in and throw rocks at the proposal. It was great.

FORD: You're going over history. I'm asking for future. How is Grantwood Village going to handle a proposal?

JONES: We're going to handle it the same way.

FORD: Is it going to go to the aldermen or whatever the governing board ...

JONES: It's the Board of Trustees.

FORD: And they're just going to vote yes or no or ... and leave it up to developers ....

JONES: We would hope to be more actively involved than a simple thumbs up or thumbs down. We're not looking for somebody to give us a proposal on a yes/no basis. What we're looking to do is condition the proposal so that that proposal ends up being something that accrues to the benefit of the whole South County area.

FORD: Okay. No other question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you, Mr. Ford. Commissioner Schweitzer.

SCHWEITZER: I just maybe would like a little bit of a clarification and maybe I'm not understanding this correctly. My understanding is that the one developer who proposed a given density ... I'm assuming it's a planned unit development ...

JONES: Yes, it was.

SCHWEITZER: ... a certain density which, if I remember correctly, is less than 1,500 was unacceptable.

JONES: Yes, it ended up being 479.

SCHWEITZER: Okay.

JONES: But it was unacceptable because of what it did to the flood ... okay.

SCHWEITZER: Okay. That's what ...

JONES: Don't want to get too historical.

SCHWEITZER: That's kind of where I'm coming here. That's where I'm going to. So we have one planned unit development of about 500 units. We have another development of 1,500 units, yes, is that correct?

JONES: Essentially correct. That was the plan. I mean there's nothing there.

SCHWEITZER: And the 1,500 hundred unit development would have in your estimation created less of an impact on the area?

JONES: It actually would have in practice.

SCHWEITZER: Can you explain that because I'm a little confused?

JONES: Certainly. Certainly. They addressed ... they addressed traffic issues. Well, number one, it was a retirement community. I'm not sure if that's been accurately pointed out.

SCHWEITZER: Oh, okay.

JONES: But the average age of a resident in this property was 83 years old. These people are not by nature largely mobile. You actually would have less active traffic impact in the course of a day from that village than you would from people who are wage earners and making multiple trips in and out.

SCHWEITZER: So they were two completely different kinds of developments?

JONES: Totally.

SCHWEITZER: Okay.

JONES: The other thing is there were a number of things that they addressed extremely well. In terms of flood plain management, they proposed replacing the sewer line themselves in conjunction with MSD. The nature of the sewer there is very interesting. It's a 42-inch main and when it overflows, it goes both sanitary and septic systems into Gravois Creek and so we're very, very concerned about the situation where you get septic flooding onto the same ball fields that our kids are playing on at Affton Athletic Association, a legitimate concern. It was never address before. Erickson addressed it very actively. Another thing was light pollution, which is not a major thing, but if you're talking about a high rise, they proposed to put berms ... if you're all familiar with the concept of berming ... across the entire Musick and Gravois periphery of their properties. The multi-story units that they used for their retirement facilities would actually sit down and not be exposed to the site lines either from the street or toward the street. They were going to berm it and then forest it again. And we were very impressed with the fact that you weren't going to get a lot of refugee light out of that development. You weren't going to get a lot of unsightly site lines with tall buildings either.

SCHWEITZER: Okay.

JONES: I could go on ... there were eight different ones. I was very involved in this.

SCHWEITZER: Okay. Well, I was just ... I had forgotten what you had said at the last meeting.

JONES: Okay. Yeah, I don't mean to go on all night.

SCHWEITZER: One was a retirement community and one was ... no, that's fine.

JONES: Thanks.

SCHWEITZER: One more quick question.

JONES: Sure.

SCHWEITZER: Since the proposed boundary does include half of what is a County Road, I'm assuming ...

JONES: Being Musick?

SCHWEITZER: Yes.

JONES: Okay.

SCHWEITZER: Correct. I'm assuming that this \$5,300 dollar surplus would not have to be given to the County to maintain half of Musick Road.

JONES: Well, if it was, we would be fine with that. In fact, we proposed and we sent in a letter to Michelle that we actually proposed to take any incremental funds that we can identify as specifically being the result of this annexation and put it into a fund exactly for that kind of thing, kind of protect against the downside for things like road repair along Musick.

SCHWEITZER: All right. Thank you. No more questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Commissioner Sauerwein.

SAUERWEIN: Mr. Jones, you mentioned that the city of Grantwood Village has been around since 1937 ...

JONES: I wasn't there for all those years.

SAUERWEIN: ... and currently has 883 residents. Well, that's an important point that you bring that up because that was one of the questions I was going to ask you. I mean, it hasn't always been 883 residents, has it?

JONES: Correct.

SAUERWEIN: And as population has grown historically, do you feel as though the Board of Trustees historically and over the years has been able to meet the demands of the residents on offering services and things of that nature?

JONES: I suppose you'd have to poll our residents to figure that out. My wife and I have been in this year for over ten years now ... in Grantwood Village for over ten years. It is the only place in South County that I would choose to raise a family. I believe in it strongly enough that I joined the Board. I think I'm probably a very biased person to be asking that question of, but I can tell you this, our residential vacancy rate in Grantwood Village is almost nil.

SAUERWEIN: People enjoy living in Grantwood Village is what you're implying, I guess, correct?

JONES: And always have. These homes, interestingly, typically go ... they sell by word of mouth. They sell ... they don't get listed for long, and we have multigenerational families in Grantwood Village where you can ... actually we have a neighbor up the street who ... he's having his house worked on and the house was originally built by his father and built by the contractor ... the current contractor's father. So we have generations of contractors coming in and working with generations of families. It's an extremely stable area. And this represents a super opportunity, we think, to expand that vision.

SAUERWEIN: Okay. And it is ... do you believe it's your current intention and the intention of the residents to sort of continue with that tradition with respect to this new or additional property that could possibly be added to your city?

JONES: Yeah. Thanks for asking that because I'd like to point this out ... and I did point it out a month ago at this same meeting. Grantwood Village and the Board of Trustees of Grantwood Village are not automatically opposed to any residential, recreational, or limited commercial development of this property. Our main goal is to preserve the health and safety of the residents, not only of Grantwood Village but the people that largely don't have a voice outside of Unincorporated St. Louis County, and we want to try to make sure that whatever gets developed there fits in appropriately with their neighbors.

SAUERWEIN: As to the contractual ... or as to the services that you provide your residents now, you do that through contracts with other entities who are these service providers, correct?

JONES: Yes, we do.

SAUERWEIN: And these service providers hold themselves out to provide these services to cities just like yours and other cities the same size in St. Louis County?

JONES: Correct. One of the great things about being a small municipality is we're in good company in St. Louis County so there's a wealth of expertise that we have by going to communities like Glendale and saying, "What's best practice?" Oakville, saying, "What's working in your community? Who would you recommend?" And we do that quite frequently.

SAUERWEIN: And through that process you're able to provide police protection, fire protection, things of that nature to the residents adequately?

JONES: Yes, sir. Again, it's a somewhat biased opinion on my part. We do not have a lot of crime in Grantwood Village, but we think that our vigilance is good too.

SAUERWEIN: I know you were asked a lot about building codes and the BOCA code and your permitting structure in Grantwood Village, but is ... does Grantwood Village have ordinances adopted that affect the manner in which contractors can build structures and things of that nature? The quality of the structures erected?

JONES: Yes. And, you know, to this point as Bob had alluded to, we have limited experience with commercial development. Actually, Sam's Steakhouse is almost the extent of our commercial development within Grantwood Village. With regard to residential development, yes, there's a set of ordinances on file regarding what can be built and what size and of what materials.

BESS: Can I insert a comment here?

JONES: Certainly.

BESS: Grantwood Village in growing has acquired a Planning and Zoning Commission. We have a Board of Adjustment. We are a full-service small community and not unlike many, many other communities within St. Louis County, I'm sure we are equipped and we have the expertise to handle just about any type of development that would be presented to us.

JONES: Thank you.

SAUERWEIN: Likewise, isn't it the case that to the extent you don't have a particular code or a building code or a permitting structure in place now to accommodate a commercial development, you certainly could adopt something in the future, couldn't you, if anything arose?

BESS: Very much so.

SAUERWEIN: That'd be easy to do, right, through the Board of Trustees?

JONES: Any municipality's book of codes and ordinances is a living document and we look at it the same way. We have extremely competent municipal legal delegation, writes good ordinances and gives us really good input. And again, we also lean on our neighbors for that kind of input to try to figure out what's reasonable, what works, and what are the best practices.

SAUERWEIN: Your Board of Adjustment, your Zoning Commission now, those commissions are made up of residents of Grantwood Village, people that have volunteered for that service?

JONES: Yes, they are. In both cases.

SAUERWEIN: And they live in the area, things of that nature?

JONES: They're all residents.

SAUERWEIN: Do you feel like if this property was passed through this Commission and allowed to be voted on by the residents that the city, the structure of the city of Grantwood Village could adequately provide these same or similar services to any new residents that may be part of a development?

JONES: I would not be up in front of you doing this tonight if I didn't feel with my whole heart that that's the case.

SAUERWEIN: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you, Bill. Commissioner Ollendorff.

OLLENDORFF: I have no further questions. Very complete presentation. Thank you.

JONES: Great. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: I have just one question and a comment. This McNary Road that's currently a private road, if this annexation would proceed, would you, would the Village take that over or would that remain a private road?

JONES: That would remain a private road. Again, as I had stated earlier, our intention is to be totally neutral with regard to the administration or oversight of the Affton Athletic Association, and that's who controls McNary Road.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Okay. Okay. Now, you may not be able to answer this, but earlier in your presentation you were critical of St. Louis County Planning for not foreseeing the housing bubble, whatever, however we want to describe it.

JONES: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: What makes you believe that you have in-house ability to foresee those kinds of bubbles.

JONES: Mr. Schuster, we read the newspapers. If you don't mind, let me grab one. Oh, I love that you asked the question. We try to stay very tuned in to this area, arguably more so than the County does. There was an article in the paper just ten days ago on the 16<sup>th</sup> of October. I don't know how many of you saw it, but it's a significant article. MSD is going to cut its storm water control service in 2012. What it means is areas in the County inside of 270 cannot expect to have sewer improvements done because they don't have the funds to proceed with the work. From the standpoint of a Board of Trustees that's going to be looking at the annexed property and looking at what can work and what can't work, this is exactly the kind of thing that we try to stay tuned into to make sure that "Oh, yeah. This could have a definite affect." We're going to have to make sure that the developers have the means and the wherewithal to get this major done upgrade on their own because they're not going to get that help out of the MSD. That's the best answer I can give you is we try to keep our ear to the ground.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

JONES: Thank you very much.

FREESMEIER: On that same article you have there, you have several acres that are in a flood plain. Do you have plans at this time for any development there? And a follow-up question is is your Village capable of developing that area with, you know, with the safety in mind, with not having, you know, I guess the ordinances maybe in place or what you'd need to do that properly?

JONES: The original development proposal called for 1,600 feet of VERSA-LOK® wall, it was going to look like the Great Wall of China to basically raise area out of the flood plain. The worst thing that you can do in flood plain, especially in flood run, is change the topography that oversees it because what you're going to do is you're going to create a run-off effect that accelerates the flow of the water down the stream. That's exactly what happens to the Affton Athletic Association when all of those sewers overcharge with the really heavy spring rains.

Our goal is to try to make sure that we're working actively with engineers because you have to have engineers ... there wasn't a hydrology study done prior to the Planning Commission approval of the first thing, even though the community was asking for it. We would mandate and as we did with Erickson that they be responsible for showing us that the environmental effects of that development are consistent with the capacity of the flood plain to absorb it. We don't think that's being unreasonable. We're all connected. We're all of a piece, and if you try to block the Creek, you get flooding upstream. If you try to speed up the Creek, you get more flooding downstream. It's a tricky balance. We're not saying we're experts at that, but we're saying that if you're really serious about coming in and developing the land, show us a good reasonable suggestion for dealing with that extra runoff you're going to get when you pave roads, when you put in rooftops and run gutters and eat up that green space that's currently represented there. That's really wonderful environmental buffer right now that soaks up a lot of water. That will change with development. We're very conscious of it and we intend to be kind of vigilant about it.

FREESMEIER: The question I have then after the follow-up on that and I'm relative new to the Board on this and so ... you don't have much commercial development?

JONES: That's correct ... in Grantwood Village, we don't.

FREESMEIER: Okay. Is the Village capable of handling these expenses that would be coming to develop that flood plain for future development? I know you'd have a developer involved in it, but if you try to correct that area like you had said that MSD or the County can't afford to do it, how do you plan on ....

JONES: We can't municipally upgrade the sewers that run along Gravois Creek. That's not within our capability, but if someone wants to come in and develop it ... if someone wants to further tax those same systems, they need to be able to show economically that they can do it and that they intend to do it to accommodate whatever they generate in excess of what's already there. I don't think that sounds harsh.

FREESMEIER: Do you plan at this time on any development on Gravois Road?

JONES: No. No. And, in fact, if I could, I'd like to add one other little aspect to this which is if Grantwood Village was interested in doing this because it would accrue revenue toward Grantwood Village with development, I'd like to propose that we wouldn't be able to recognize any of that until the census anyway because it's based on population at the census point. We're willing to put our markers down on the table with a long-term bet on the future of this property because it does affect all of the existing residents here. We won't make a dime out of this until 2020 and we're fine with that, but we know that a developer will come in and they'll say, "Well, this is short-term thing. We want to develop it. We want to try to recoup our money, and then we want to move on." Our job as leaders of a municipality is to try to take a longer view and that's all we're trying to do here.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Any other questions from any of the Commissioners? Okay. Thank you.

JONES: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Mr. Powers. Just a reminder to the audience, if you wish to address the Commission, you need turn in your re....

[End Side B – “Grantwood”]

[Tape A – “St. Louis County”]

POWERS: ... on the 75-acre property formerly owned by Andrew Busch. There are a number of other properties in the proposal essentially to straighten lines and assure 15 percent contiguity. But as I think it is already obvious to all of us what we are talking about is the future development of the ... of the Busch site. And in terms of our capacity and resources, we think we're in a better position to do that, and we don't think we're stupid. I can ... I ... I don't ... I'm not going to talk about the zoning, the previous zonings, I think too much time was spent on the proposal that isn't in effect as opposed to the one that is in effect, but ... we do have substantial experience in development matters. We are the municipal government for the unincorporated areas and this is something we have a lot of experience and ability to do.

Now, the property owner, as I expect you'll hear again tonight, is also opposed to this and essentially because it is unincorporated area right now. They are our ... our citizens and so we are supporting them in that regard also. Not to take away from Grantwood Village, but they are a small village. I don't ... it's not clear to me they even have one full-time employee. They contract with police from the County and everything else is pretty much on a contractual basis. We have a ... you know, a complete array of codes which I can explain in detail if, you know, when we get to questions and answers, and I think we're ... we're able to do that.

In terms of the financial impact, we agree it will probably be minimal now because the site's not ... the site's not developed. And although the site's currently approved for a retirement village, its future at this point is a little bit uncertain, and I think that's the other thing we're all talking about. But what the site does eventually develop as ... really it won't be clear what the site will do in terms of revenue until it's ultimately developed. So it's not so much that it's going to have a financial impact in its undeveloped state, but it will in a developed state.

A couple of issues in terms of the boundaries of the site. First of all, we don't think it's a compact area. We don't think that's a fairly regular shape, and Grantwood Village to this point doesn't extend south of Gravois Road. Gravois Road's a state road. Grantwood Village doesn't have any jurisdiction or control over that road. So ... the other point is that when they ... the current proposal takes Cor Jesu out because they wanted to be out ... but it left the right-of- way of Gravois Road in front of Cor Jesu in, which is an odd appendage and not the kind of thing I would think the Boundary Commission wants to see on a basis, but if you take that out, they're not going to make the 15 percent so there is a contiguity issue here.

On the southern boundary, there's kind of the opposite effect. They drew a straight line across the south to make the boundary regular and there's three or four parcels there that are split as a result where a portion of the site remains in the unincorporated County, a portion, according to the proposal, would go into Grantwood Village. That's not the ideal kind of thing.

And then finally on Musick ... on Musick Road, the split road situation is not something the County normally likes where you have one jurisdiction maintaining and policing one side of the road and another jurisdiction doing the other side. We much prefer the all-in or all-out type of approach on that.

So, again, we ... we would oppose the annexation ... and I'll be happy to answer any questions you have about codes or zoning or anything like that, although I hate to see it devolve into a zoning meeting since you're not a zoning board.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. Commissioner Freesmeier. I'm sorry I omitted you at the last ....

FREESMEIER: I don't have any questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Commissioner Ford.

FORD: There's been talk about the development of it, and I've requested information from Grantwood Village regarding their permit procedure. I think it's only fair to ask St. Louis County what is your permit procedure for development?

POWERS: Well, on a site such as this, every property has zoning and depending on that zoning, that sort of determines what you can do on it, the same in any jurisdiction. So it was zoned, under state law, that's ... that's ... that's a matter of a public hearing, which we had and was described to you. That zoning really is not the ... the development codes, there's an array of them. They start with the general, that's the zoning, and go to the specific, which are the individual building plans and things like that. So at zoning stage, we are trying to fix a concept, we are trying to agree on a general development concept, not design the site, because without zoning there is no project. And typically, you won't see extensive engineering going into developing concept plans because a developer doesn't ... doesn't want to expend that kind of money without knowing that they're going to be successful in the zoning, but that is not to say that ... that all these other extensive codes don't apply once zoning is approved. Approval of zoning doesn't constitute a waiver of all the more detailed storm water and sewer plans that follow. Zoning is just the beginning.

Then you go into what I'll call a site improvement stage of review where you're reviewing grading and storm water, piping and roads, the kinds of things that support ultimately the structures that get put on the site.

And then finally you are reviewing the building plans for the individual buildings and St. Louis County and most municipalities generally adopt national codes and then amend them on a local level depending on their preferences in certain areas.

FORD: How many different types of inspectors ... I started building my house on this after the zoning and all garbage is out of the way, and how many different kinds of inspectors have to come out and review my building as I'm building it.

POWERS: Just the building?

FORD: Yeah, just my home or ...

POWERS: Probably a half dozen ... you know, you've got your mechanical, your electrical, your plumbing and HVAC inspectors. There's a whole array of inspectors just on the structure. In terms of site improvements, grading and roads where we establish escrows guaranteeing that a financial assurance that things are going to be built as they're approved on plans, you know, there are inspectors that ... that are present when roads are being poured, for instance, that will personally guarantee that the concrete is being poured to a certain, you know, the minimum thickness and all, and then they'll ... and then they'll sign off on these things as construction is done. And then we'll release money once the inspectors are satisfied. So, just in that site improvement area, again you have an array of different people reviewing what's actually being constructed out in the field to assure that it's all being done in compliance with approved plans.

FORD: Okay. That’s all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Commissioner Schweitzer.

SCHWEITZER: I just have one, and it is a zoning question. Well, and a planning question, I guess.

POWERS: Okay.

SCHWEITZER: What kinds of things are allowed in a mixed-use urban flood plain designation.

POWERS: Well, the mixed-use, MXD, that’s designated for the site now, which was the result of a zoning that did go well in unincorporated St. Louis County after the one that’s been more fully described here. That is a custom zoning. That is where you can come in and apply for an assortment of uses, commercial, office, industrial even, residential, but you have to make a specific proposal. So it’s not a ... it’s not a zoning for a speculator, and it allows a lot of flexibility, but at the zoning hearing, we review that plan and we base our action on the zoning based on that site plan. Then we write what we call a site-specific ordinance which identifies the parameters within this mixed-use development there will be not more than x-number of homes, so many of them will be town houses, so many of them will be full retirement units arranged in so many buildings with setbacks. So you’re ... this is all done in an ordinance that runs with the land so any developer has to abide by that ... that comes by ... that gets an interest afterwards.

SCHWEITZER: And I guess where I was going with that is because it is also a flood plain, are there therefore more restrictions because it’s a mixed-use flood plain as opposed to just mixed-use?

POWERS: Yes, any time you have flood plain, we, like most ... just about all municipalities in St. Louis County are affiliated with FEMA. We subscribe to their guidelines. As a matter of fact, our flood plain requirements are more stringent than the national FEMA guidelines in that we demand a what I’ll call a no-rise criteria, which is to say that the ... that the likelihood of flooding after development can’t ... can be no more than what the site was in the undeveloped state. And we do that with a number of things, but that’s not to say we don’t allow grading in the flood plain. Part of what we ... one of our requirements is that we do what I’ll call compensating cut and fill. If you are going to grade in a flood plain in such a way as to fill a portion of the flood plain, you have to compensate by taking out somewhere else so that the overall volume of the flood plain across the site stays the same and you get the same flood conveyance. So, we actually do have a lot of regulations in place to assure that storm water is properly handled. Now that’s not to say that storm water, if you look at it historically in St. Louis County, has been handled great because those flood plain regulations have evolved over time. What we have in place right now is much better than we had in the 1960’s; and as recently as two years ago, the EPA and required a whole additional layer of flood plain regulations that have more to do with water quality than water quantity. But I would certainly agree, it’s a complicated thing, and we ... you know, all sorts of civil engineers get involved, but this is something we pay very close attention to.

SCHWEITZER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Commissioner Sauerwein.

SAUERWEIN: Mr. Powers, am I to understand that St. Louis County would definitely approve development of the flood plain area of this ground being annexed? I mean that’s what St. Louis County contemplates right now in development in the flood plain?

POWERS: What ... no ... well, it is true that we allow flood plain to be filled and developed so long as that filling is compensated by an increase in volume of the flood plain somewhere else.

SAUERWEIN: The last development you approved for the area that Mr. Jones talked about, that allowed development in the flood plain, correct?

POWERS: There's no development in the flood plain. Before you can develop in an area formerly in a flood plain, and when I say “in the flood plain”, I mean horizontally speaking that property has to be raised out and flood proofed.

SAUERWEIN: [inaudible] semantics, isn't it. St. Louis County would allow the area designated as a flood plain to be developed, would it not?

POWERS: If they flood protected it, yes. And if they didn't increase the incidence of the risk of flooding upstream or downstream.

SAUERWEIN: Now, did I understand that one of your answers in response to Mr. Ford's question is that St. Louis County through their permitting process guarantees the quality of homes constructed in St. Louis County ... quality and condition? You said “through our permitting process and engineers, things like concrete that are installed are essentially guaranteed to be of a certain quality.” Is that what St. Louis County does?

POWERS: The specific example I was giving had to do with roads. If a road is proposed as being a public road, it has to be built to County standards, which means it has to be six inches of concrete over two inches of rock, and we don't take their word for it. We're out there when they do it.

SAUERWEIN: St. Louis County doesn't provide any independent guarantee; they don't ensure the quality of what a contractor builds, do they? No?

POWERS: No, we don't. They have to meet ... they have to meet code when they're inspected, but we don't have an insurance policy or a program. If a person buys a house and they're not satisfied with something ... and just about everybody is not totally satisfied with a new house ... it's between them and the contractor unless what they're not satisfied with is a code violation.

SAUERWEIN: Now you ... does the ... does St. Louis County have any evidence to indicate that the property being annexed by Grantwood Village is not 15 percent contiguous to its boundaries?

POWERS: It is if you allow that little gerrymander of Gravois Road to stand.

SAUERWEIN: Okay, so you agree ...

POWERS: That's what that's all about.

SAUERWEIN: You would agree that the legal description as proposed meets that condition of being 15 percent contiguous to the boundary of Grantwood Village.

POWERS: I ... I ... it appears to.

SAUERWEIN: Okay. Do you have any evidence as part of your presentation here today that the city of Grantwood Village can't meet the needs of any future residents that may move on to any approved development in that area?

POWERS: No, I really can't say what they can or can't do. I can only tell you what they're staffed for.

SAUERWEIN: Do you think they need dozens of employees to meet the needs of their residents?

POWERS: No, it's a very small place. It's ... it's ... Grantwood Village is smaller than a lot of subdivisions in the unincorporated area so it would never need a huge staff. Keep in mind that the unincorporated area is over 300,000 people. It's a little bit different thing. And St. Louis County government is staffed to provide code services for most of those municipalities.

SAUERWEIN: What's that mean? Does that mean ...?

POWERS: The overwhelming majority of municipalities contract with St. Louis County for their building code.

SAUERWEIN: They have to go to St. Louis County anyway for approval of building codes and things like that.

POWERS: Well, the expertise ... they don't have to. There are big cities such as Chesterfield, I think even University City, you know, the big, big cities have their own staffs, but three-quarters of them I would say contract with St. Louis County for those code services.

SAUERWEIN: You said in the beginning of your presentation that it's not in the best interest of this community to allow Grantwood Village to annex this ground. Yet, I didn't hear anything, any hard evidence in your presentation to suggest that that's the case. What is it that makes you believe that annexing this ground is not in the best interest of the residents, the community of Grantwood Village?

POWERS: Well, there's the community of Grantwood Village, there is the community ... the larger community of Affton, and even the larger community of unincorporated South County and unincorporated County, and we take perhaps take a little larger look and I was referring ... speaking to this a little bit at the earlier meeting, when we look at development proposals, our objective isn't necessarily to see that the future development of that property is in the image of Grantwood Village; however, it doesn't mean that we are totally insensitive to the needs of the local area. For instance, a couple of years back, we did something called the Affton Community Study, and there was a lot public input into that and one of the takeaways from that was that what Affton really needs is some move-up housing, that Affton has a lot of post-war housing, two bedrooms, one-car garage, maybe, that kind of a thing, and anytime a young family moves in, has one or two kids, they're out and gone because they can't find that ... that ... that move-up type house there. So with that in mind, you know, we entertained the first development proposal which was more of a ... it's not experimental, it's not new urbanist, it's kind of a typical West County development thing. You'll see it everywhere so it's not ... it wasn't that far ... it wasn't whatever's across the street from the Galleria, even the current nursing home isn't truly mixed-use. They wanted to have some concessions for residents in there so that's why we went mixed-use, but if you ask any planner is a retirement facility a true mixed-use development, they're thinking of something entirely different. But in any event, we did with that plan objective in mind entertain a move-up housing type of development there, the first time around. That's what it was. Now we can argue about the density and, you know, I came away very disappointed with, you know, the opposition we had, the disappoint we had, and that's one of the reasons why when Erickson came in, before they sat down with Grantwood Village, they sat down with me, and I pretty much recited the history of everything that had gone on. There was a law suit going on. I was very disappointed at the time about the amount of money that was being spent on the law suit. I didn't want to see that happen again. I don't want to see that happen in the future. So the first thing I told the Erickson folks was "Go talk to the people at Grantwood Village. If you can make peace with the people of Grantwood Village and bring forward a proposal that they can support, you'll have no problem from us." And ultimately that happened. And when we talk about the first proposal so much that's been superseded by the more recent one, I think it puts ... you know, the message there is we're insensitive, we don't know what the heck we're doing, and we didn't do what anybody wanted [sounds like]. But there was a second proposal that went much, much better, I think, and I think would be more of a ... more closely that's what we would do in the future really because I'll be darned if ... you know, I'm going to get ... I'm going to see people ...

SAUERWEIN: What did the second proposal involve? What kind of a development was it?

POWERS: The second proposal is the nursing home proposal, which again is ... that's the mixed-use development. It's a very specific set of development parameters for the site. Erickson ... they were great. They did exactly as described. They reached out, they ... they ... now they didn't do the ... design the storm water for the site ahead of time, but they responded to a lot of concerns and the whole thing went a lot better that way and ... but, you know, they're gone. They're a victim of the economy and so there's ... there's ... those development rights stay with the property for anyone who might acquire it, but it's uncertain at this point where we all go from here.

SAUERWEIN: Well, I asked you originally “How is it not in the best interests of this community to allow them to annex it?” And you talked about the Erickson development that failed that was approved by St. Louis County. But I still haven't heard anything to support the first statement that you made when you stepped to the microphone that said “It's not in the best interests of this community to approve this annexation.”

POWERS: Well, I think as a general matter, what we're doing is we're moving from a government that's well-resourced with a lot of expertise, opinions aside, to one that's not as well-resourced so why ...?

SAUERWEIN: But one that you admit doesn't need to be, right? I mean, they only have 833 residents.

POWERS: It remains to be seen. You know, it really remains to be seen. It's a bit of an unknown. There will be a development proposal in the future. There will be controversy. Drawing lines around the site and bringing it into your boundary doesn't ... is no ironclad guarantee against zoning controversies. We all have them.

SAUERWEIN: And you believe the city of Grantwood Village can't deal with those themselves?

POWERS: I think we're better equipped to do it.

SAUERWEIN: Because you have more employees?

POWERS: No, because we have more ... contrary to what's been said, we ... we have ... have more expertise as it stands right now and a more defined array of regulations.

SAUERWEIN: I don't have any other questions, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Commissioner Ollendorff.

OLLENDORFF: Would you compute for us ... if annexation did take place, I'm interested in getting the amount of revenue that the County would continue to receive. Post-annexation, how much revenue will the County continue to receive? If you could provide that figure for us.

POWERS: You know, I probably had that at the first ...

OLLENDORFF: I apologize.

POWERS: ... but, yes, but in general terms, you know, there'll be the sales tax ... there will be revenue attending to any city that would annex this.

OLLENDORFF: The amount is in there?

POWERS: Yes, an estimate.

OLLENDORFF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Are there any other questions?

SCHWEITZER: I did have just one.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Okay.

SCHWEITZER: You indicated that ... that the ability of someone to develop this property is currently, for all practical purposes, fixed with the property. Is that correct? You said it stayed with the property.

POWERS: There is a set ... there is a ... there is what ... a mixed-use development, although again what's approved for the site is not what I would call truly mixed-use, but that's the name of the zoning district it's zoned to. There is a mixed-use ordinance for the site which states exactly what can occur on the site to the exclusion of all other things.

SCHWEITZER: Okay.

POWERS: To do anything else would require a new public hearing and a new proposal.

SCHWEITZER: So even if this property were annexed by Grantwood Village ...

POWERS: Right.

SCHWEITZER: ... that the intended use or the proposed use is to a certain degree limited, I guess, or perhaps not limited as the case maybe depending upon the zoning.

POWERS: They have to accept the zoning that's in place.

SCHWEITZER: Okay. Accept it as it is.

POWERS: Yes.

SCHWEITZER: Okay. Thank you. That's all.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: If there are no further questions, thank you, Mr. Powers.

POWERS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: I'd like to take about a three-minute break before enter into the Public Comment section and allow us all ... we've all been sitting here for an hour-and-a-half so maybe it's a good time to get up and stretch, and I'd like to reconvene at 8:35, please.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Ladies and gentlemen, we'd like to get started on the Public Comments section. And just as a reminder, if you're speaking as an individual, you'll be allotted three minutes. If you're speaking on behalf of an association, you'll be allotted five minutes. We ask you to respect these times so everybody gets a chance to express their views, and we're not here until midnight so, please, your cooperation is appreciated.

The first speaker will be Laura Max, and she is representing the Bridlewood Wood Estates Improvement Association. The next speaker will be Charles ... and forgive me if I mispronounce this name, Sarkisian. So Laura Max, please, to the microphone.

MAX: Hi. My name is Laura Max, and I am the Trustee for Bridlewood Estates Subdivision Phase I. The 54 homes that we are in charge of are the 54 homes that run right along Musick Road so we are the closest homes to the proposed annexed area. We went through this process several years ago, the first time with the County Zoning and Planning Commissions. As Mike ... you know, it's already been said tonight ... I'll try not to repeat. We were ... the County Planning and Zoning dismissed all of our concerns, all of our safety concerns. They totally disregarded every inherent danger that we presented to them regarding the possible irresponsible development of this land so we've been through this before. It became crystal clear to us at that time that we felt we could not rely on St. Louis County to address our concerns about the development of this land. So we're here tonight, thanks to the extreme efforts of Grantwood Village back in that time they, through their leadership and their efforts combined many areas of the community to help us keep ... get our people combined and organized to try to, I guess, inflict a little more ... have a little more input into the development of this property. We trust them inherently. They are leaders in our community and we view them as such. Unfortunately, our experiences with St. Louis County, even my more recent experiences with them have not been as positive. The retirement community that is on the land right now, they began the development ... I'm not sure how familiar everyone is with it, but there were sales trailers, a lot of expensive landscaping and things like that. Erickson did start and did begin their process on the land that they purchased from Andy Busch. They also purchased a home in our subdivision right on the opposite corner of the development and when they left, everything was left unattended. Not only does the home in my subdivision go unattended, the land that the retirement community was to go on along with the sales trailers and all of the landscaping and everything has been allowed to overgrow and go unattended. Many people of our subdivision and area residents have called the County and tried to get something done. They've made some minor efforts to mow the lawns once in a while and that's been about it. I also had the experience with them ... with even calling 911 about a year ago. Someone had come in over a weekend and vandalized, stolen long-needle pine trees, some very expensive landscaping, pulled them out, decided they didn't want some of them, put them back down. Someone vandalized and pillaged this entire retirement community area. I called and when they called me back a couple of hours later, they told me someone had given this person permission to do this to the area. So this is kind of what we've been dealing with. We would just like to be here tonight in support of Grantwood Village and to let the Boundary Commission know that we are 100 percent behind the annexation of the property.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you.

MAX: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Charles.

SARKESIAN: My name is Charles Sarkesian. I reside in the Bridlewood subdivision, which is immediate adjacent to this area that is proposed to be annexed. Now I can understand the principle of centralization; it's a wonderful thing. But when that centralization, that body of centralization betrays you and turns its back on you and doesn't listen to your concerns, I have no faith in that body. And that's exactly what's happened here with this project that was proposed back in 2005. These developers came in and virtually got everything they wanted. I got interested when I read an article in the *Post-Dispatch*; they commented on the fact that our Councilman in our District accepted \$3,000 dollars as a political contribution. He introduced this; he fought for it contrary to the wishes of the inhabitants of that area. Now, you know, it's a matter of trust, what affects their neighborhood affects my neighborhood. That's why I am in favor of this annexation. I have more confidence in Grantwood Village than I do in St. Louis County as far as this particular project is concerned. Now I've heard comments here about whether they are big enough, they have enough personnel, and so forth. In other words, the inference being they may not be able to handle it, but I want to ask you all where was St. Louis County, where was St. Louis County when all of these matters that were addressed were ignored. I went to several of those meetings. The County Council didn't even listen to us. Oh, they gave us a little form to voice our complaints, but they did nothing. There was only one member on that County Council that showed some concern about the problems that we wanted addressed and the rest were all in favor. Now, my point is this, these people, the city of Grantwood, after this project was passed by the City Council ... by the County Council, the city

of Grantwood, the people of Grantwood Village took the initiative along with support from others in Bridlewood Estates and surrounding areas. They took these developers to court. The very matters that were brought out were addressed in a court of law and the court held in favor. They said they were packing that area with too many homes. They had to reduce the number of units. That, of course, affected their profit and, as a result, they backed out, but those matters were all brought before the County Council. They were brought before the County Planning Commission. Why weren't those matters acknowledged by these so-called experts? They had the leadership, they had the personnel, and you've heard it said that they're better able to handle the matter. Folks, all I ask as a resident that I have the confidence and the trust in these people. They put their money on the line and took these developers to court, and they prevailed, and they were right.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you very much. The next speaker, Genevieve Webelhuth and John Hessel will be next.

WEBELHUTH: Hi, I'm Ginny Webelhuth and I wish other people would also speak besides me because they all have very good input including my husband who's a civil engineer. But I do want to comment on Mr. Powers. He said that he was not insensitive to the people with concerns. I don't agree with that because I spoke with him several times, and I felt that he was very insensitive to my input. I was saying that Grantwood Village has half-acre lots, beautiful homes, and directly across the street would have been a four-story high apartment building and I said it would stick out like a sore thumb. And he told me that since Grantwood Village is a municipality that they don't look at it ... it's like invisible, it doesn't count. And I'd like to hear him reply to that, but essentially, that's how it was. Grantwood Village had no effect because on the other side of Gravois was unincorporated, Grantwood Village was a municipality. Grantwood Village has half-acre lots; some of them have acre lots. To him, it meant nothing. And I was very discouraged with his reply to my response and my input. I also want to say in Grantwood Village, my own home, I'm a resident 17 years. My husband and I took out a permit twice to improve our property. We added a 400 square foot addition family room, and we finished a bathroom/bedroom in the basement for my daughter. No problem. It was great, and I bet 50 percent of the homes in Grantwood Village have improved or upgraded or took out permits to add value to their property. I walk ... and right now as of today, there are two homes in Old Grantwood. One home is adding a two-story addition plus a three-car garage, and it's beautiful, the architecture. These homes are magnificent. You should ride through there and look at them. It's just amazing this pocket of beauty and the trees and the green space and the acreage around there. But another point I do want to make is Grantwood Village is so connected to this community. We've got the bike trail, Grant's Farm, Ulysses S. Grant National Historic site, Grasso Plaza down the road, Seven Holy Founders, Cor Jesu, the lovely subdivision off Musick Road, and I met these lovely people through this zoning issue a few years ago. They are amazing people, but the point is Grantwood Village and the residents that live there, this is our home. We are so intimately connected to this community and to everything we have of value, the quality of life is so wonderful that this annexation is only logical.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. Thank you very much.

WEBELHUTH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Tina Nelson.

HELSEL: Good evening. As most of you know, I'm John Hessel. I'm an attorney. I represent the cities of Kirkwood and Florissant. I've had the pleasure of being before on various annexation proposals on behalf of those municipalities. As I mentioned during the public hearing on September 14 as well as my letter of October 4, this evening I'm here on behalf of Sovereign Bank. Sovereign Bank, as I mentioned before, is in the process of foreclosing on the property that is primarily the subject of this hearing, the 85 acres, and we anticipate that in the first week or second week of December, that we will in fact be the owner of that property. And I want to address the points that I raised in my letter in reverse order because I've heard this evening some confusion. There has been some comment about the Cor Jesu property being excluded from the annexation proposal between the prior

hearing and today. The ten acres that they're talking about is not owned by Cor Jesu. It's owned by my client or will be owned by my client. Eighty-five acres is my client's property. And what is now being proposed is carving out ten acres on the assumption that Cor Jesu is going to buy that ten acres that's adjacent to their property. Now I have met with Cor Jesu. I'm friends with people at Cor Jesu. I'm friends with the administration at Cor Jesu. I hope that Cor Jesu is able to acquire that property. But that's not my decision. That's a business decision that's going to occur somewhere down the road. Now what Grantwood Village has proposed through this amended annexation proposal is to accommodate Cor Jesus on the possibility that they may be acquire ten acres. That puts my client in an impossible, untenable situation. If we have a developer like Erickson that wants to come forward and propose a development, we can't do it. Our 10 acres will be in St. Louis County, 75 acres will be in Grantwood Village if this annexation proposal is approved. That's an impossible situation for a landowner. No person sitting in this room would consider that to be a reasonable situation if it was their property. Carve it up, put part in Grantwood Village and part in St. Louis County in case Cor Jesu acquires the property.

I will also add as I put in my letter that there is another piece of property that is owned by my client, will be owned by my client and that's 9703 Musick. It's at the southwest corner ... and I've identified it on this map as well for you. I incorrectly identified it in my letter as the southeast corner; it's the southwest corner. That property was included as part of the development because of access to accommodate the development. This annexation proposal doesn't include that property. As a result of that, you're again creating an intolerable situation where part of my client's property will be in St. Louis County and part of it will be within the confines of Grantwood Village.

I will also add that the gerrymandering that was referred to as far as Gravois Road, which allows them to now have adequate contiguousness between the properties is something that has been presented to this Boundary Commission. I've been before you for 20 years and gerrymandering like that has always been discouraged. To carve out an area of road for the sole purpose of meeting the statutory requirement has been discouraged.

Now, let me also address very quickly the other things that I mentioned in the letter. First off, I suggested to you this is not a natural extension of the boundaries. You're leaping across Gravois Road. As some of you will recall, when I presented a proposal on behalf of the city of Florissant, the city of Florissant proposed to go across Lindbergh for a parcel that was said that was a leapfrog that's not the continuity and that annexation proposal was denied in significant part for that reason. We have exactly that situation here. You have Grantwood Village who's leaping across Gravois Road, so there's continuity, there's no commonality. Mr. Jones suggested the commonality is between Grant's Farm, an undeveloped property and this undeveloped property. This property's not going to undeveloped for the rest of time; in fact, that is the point, it's going to be developed and they've set forth their sole purpose is to control future development. I suggest to you that's a very dangerous precedent to allow an annexation based upon the desire to have control of future development. Mr. Jones and Grantwood Village, I know they're well meaning. They're very sincere. They say they'll meet with the developers. The problem that I have on behalf of my client was brought up. There was no land use plan, there's no planning department, there's no experience. The Plan of Intent does not address, as I mentioned the last time, how they're going to handle future development from a revenue and expenditure standpoint. They presented it as zero. Zero revenue, zero expenditure. Well, that assumes that it's going to be undeveloped. We already talked about the history. Mr. Jones went through the long history of the possibilities of development. That ignores all that history, it ignores the land use, the current zoning categories, and it ignores the reality that this property will be developed in the future. That's why they want it. To come forward and indicate in a Plan of Intent that they have zero expenditures, zero revenues is a fatal flaw within the Plan of Intent.

For all of those reasons, with all due respect to the people of Grantwood Village, we have no problem with the people of Grantwood Village. They're nice people, but St. Louis County has the experience. On behalf of my client, we're asking that this property remain with this current governmental jurisdiction that's providing all of the services, providing all of the land use experience. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you, Mr. Hessel. Tina Nelson. And the next speaker will be Edward Schaeffer.

NELSON: Good evening. My name is Tina Nelson, and I do not live in Grantwood Village. I live on Eddie and Park which is on the other side of Grant’s Farm. I am in favor of Grantwood Village taking responsibility in annexing this property. Based on history as we’ve all heard this evening from 2005, we were very involved in what was going on here, and St. Louis County has not shown that they listened to the residents here. I did not feel that my voice or my neighbor’s voices and opinions were respected and/or considered in the past regarding this specific parcel. Grantwood Village has shown that they are willing to listen to the community and make decisions based on responsible development. I believe they will evaluate all factors and take input from current neighbors and residents in areas affected by the development in the future, not just Grantwood Village, but all of us who live around there. So, as you can tell, I am in favor of it.

The one thing I would to say, I would to repeat what Mr. Powers just said a couple of minutes ago. He said that when Erickson came to St. Louis County to talk to them about developing the piece of property, he told them, “If you can make peace with the folks at Grantwood Village, you can have approval from us.” So that sounds to me like they believe that Grantwood Village should also annex this property. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: The next speaker after Mr. Schafer is Ed Brimer.

SCHAEFFER: Members of the Boundary Commission, my name is Ed Schafer. I’m a Trustee of Bridlewood Estates subdivision. And I would like to address the annexation of property located in the Unincorporated St. Louis County, Missouri, known as Area B. As one of the trustees of Bridlewood estates subdivision, I overwhelmingly support the proposed annexation of the property across Gravois Road from Grantwood Village as a natural extension of the boundary limits of Grantwood Village.

In 2006, a group of concerned neighbors joined Grantwood Village in a fight to fight a group of developers who entered into an agreement to purchase 94 acres of land. The proposal called for the creation of ... at that time, it was the Village at Gravois Creek, which included 479 residents. We worked hand-in-hand with Grantwood Village to fight for the stoppage of such a development. We have a great working relationship with Grantwood Village. The Planning Commission and the County Council would not listen to us. They turned their backs on us, and they did not have our best interests at heart. Grantwood Village and Bridlewood Estates subdivision have a common cause in annexing the proposed property. We support Grantwood Village. There is a common cause here, and we will fight that cause. Erickson would have been a great neighbor. Unfortunately, we lost them. The Planning Commission is not a good steward to have our best interest at heart. They have demonstrated that when the residents voiced their concerns on the re-zoning and that fell on deaf ears of the Planning Commission. I beg the Boundary Commission to listen to our concerns unlike the Planning Commission. I understand the Planning Commission has a lot of employees. I don’t know what that number is. If it’s eighty, a hundred, I would rather have the six, seven, eight members of Grantwood Village supporting me and we would be a great partner. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Next speaker, Marlene Sept [sounds like].

BRIMER: Hello, my name is Ed Brimmer. I live at 15 Grantwood Lane in the municipality of Grantwood Village. I had some prepared remarks, but a couple of things I wanted to clarify real quick, and you guys were talking about the zoning and the code enforcement. Grantwood Village ... and I have experience because I did a significant home addition a number of years ago ... Grantwood Village grants zoning approval and then all the inspections and permit issues go to the St. Louis County with their code enforcement officers. They grant the permit, they do the inspections, not unlike many large municipalities ... even Chesterfield doesn’t do their own building inspections. They defer to the County for that and for that we pay for their services and appreciate them. So there really shouldn’t be an expectation of Grantwood Village to provide building inspections or code enforcement. It’s purely zoning approval and

then it moves on to the County so having gone through that, there's a Board of Adjustment that Grantwood Village has that's made up of community volunteers, engineers, construction people that I've appeared before. They're knowledgeable, they understand construction, and there's a process that the city has in place for those types of matters when it comes to improvement of a home or possibly a larger development than just a single home. So I just wanted to kind of get that across. We refer to the County and the folks there for those issues. If there's ordinance to come about, we will defer to legal counsel to get ordinances written exactly as the County does when they prepare ordinances for their County Council.

Grantwood Village as a municipality did not have a say in any of those previous two developments whether it was Erickson or the housing development. It was the residents of Grantwood Village that voiced our opinions, but the government as a government entity could not have a say in those issues so when you're challenging Mr. Jones on some of those questions, he was speaking as a community resident not an official city official, but what we're looking for is to get that type of control and approval and process to go through our municipal government.

We do provide plenty of services. There's public space tree maintenance. There's common ground maintenance, trash removal, police services, street maintenance and repairs, snow removal, all those are provided by the city as services to their residents and that would continue into the new development if ever there would be one.

We're a community of volunteers with a sense of community and we respect on another and we arise to the occasion when issues like this are brought before us. If you notice the response to the speakers and the response to the attorney, there really wasn't much in favor of that.

I guess my question to you folks is whose job is it to oppose our position? We spoke in favor of our position, but if it's the County, are you going to listen to one person from the County and listen to an attorney from a bank and weigh your decision based on an out-of-town bank's attorney's position and is that why you make your decision or is it more about the community at large and the people that live here contiguous within the boundaries and outside of the boundaries and our feelings and opinions about where we live. Just something to think about.

There's also an issue about contiguous property. There's a Wal-Mart up in North County that bridges between St. Ann and Bridgeton, and they managed to make that work crossing municipal boundaries so developments can occur across municipal boundaries. It's not something that can't happen. It might put fear into the owners' hands over here at the bank, but it does happen. So I just wanted to kind of summarize to say that we're a community of people that care about one another, we care about our community and what we're talking about is controlling and watching the development to make it appropriate and consistent to where we live. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you for your remarks.

SEPT: My name is Marlene Sept. I am not a resident of Grantwood Village but of also Bridlewood Estates. My home is located on Glenshire Terrace, which is contiguous with the entrance road that was ultimately built into the Erickson property. At this point, looking at that property and the condition of it on a day-to-day basis, I have all confidence in Grantwood Village that they are going to be more in tune to the community, what's best for us. I have no fears that they're not going to maintain the east side of Musick as well as the County would maintain the west side, and I am in favor of the annexation.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. Thank you. And our final speaker, Emily Kelly.

KELLY: Good evening, my name is Emily Rushing Kelly. I am actually the attorney for Grantwood Village and I would be remiss if I didn't point out a couple of things that came up earlier. First

and foremost, the flood plain was an issue. Grantwood Village actually has existing flood plain within its current boundaries, and we do have a comprehensive flood plan maintenance ordinance on the books. It's about 11 pages long so the Village is well-versed on that and is capable of dealing with that with any future development that may happen on this property.

As Mr. Brimer just indicated, Grantwood Village unlike or, you know, like numerous other municipalities in St. Louis County, has adopted a St. Louis County building codes, has recently adopted them with the new changes, with the new amendments. We actually have a contract with St. Louis County to perform those inspections so it's actually kind of a non-issue because the County's going to be performing those inspections on this property whether or not it's annexed by Grantwood Village or not.

Also, I would like to point out that Grantwood Village is actually in great financial shape. Unlike a lot of municipalities, we are operating debt free, actually with a surplus so we're very fortunate in that respect. We don't anticipate this annexation creating any sort of financial burdens to the Village and so, in that respect, we're very fortunate and we would like to just point that out for your consideration.

Finally, it was pointed out that the Gravois Road was gerrymandering, I believe was the word that was used, and I would be remiss if I didn't point out that the Map Plan back in 2006 included that stretch of Gravois. It's always identified that part of Gravois as being part of the annexation. Grantwood Village, as you can hear from all the comments, is a good neighbor, has always been a good neighbor, and wants to continue to be a good neighbor. Cor Jesu identified these two parcels that we carved out after the last public hearing because at their request and they represented to the Grantwood Village that they were purchasing either in the process or had purchased those parcels for future development. And so being a good neighbor, Grantwood Village decided to carve out those two parcels, but to leave that stretch of Gravois and, as Mr. Jones, explained earlier, that was done so that there would some sort of control because that's the only access into Old Grantwood. And so I think it's a bit insincere to suggest that it's gerrymandering when that has always been identified, but Grantwood Village decided to keep including that section of Gravois Road in the annexation plan because it's always been identified there. But we took out those other two parcels at the request of Cor Jesu. And I believe those are the only points I wanted to address, so thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHUSTER: Thank you. If there are no further public comments, we will adjourn. Thank you all for coming. Thank you for your participation.