

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

**MEETING MINUTES
October 1, 1996**

ROLL CALL

COMMISSIONER	PRESENT (P)/ ABSENT(A)
ED BRUER	P
AL ECKERT	A
JULIUS FRAGER	P
AGNES GARINO	P
SCOTT MIDDELKAMP	P
JACK REHAGEN	P
KENNETH TRETTER	P
JACK WIESEHAN	P
ANNA MARIE WINGRON	P
DON WOJTKOWSKI	A
VACANCY	

OTHERS PRESENT:

Carl Ramey-Administrator
Steve Martin - Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Wingron at 6:00 PM on October 1, 1996. The meeting was held in the office of the Boundary Commission, 1516 S. Brentwood Blvd., Suite 101, Brentwood, Mo.

ROLL IS CALLED-QUORUM DECLARED

Carl Ramey called the roll as reflected above, and a quorum was declared.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner Bruer to accept the agenda as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Middelkamp. Voice Vote: Ayes - All Nays - None *The motion passed.*

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Ramey reported that he received a telephone call from Al Eckert indicating his intention to resign from the Commission. His call was prompted by an upcoming newspaper article which indicated his consideration to resign. He stated that after giving this matter great consideration and speaking with Commissioners Bruer and Frager, he concluded that this is what he intended to do.

Also included in the Commission's packet is a copy of a letter which was included in the County Council packet for the meeting to be held on October 3, recommending the appointment of Charles Saulsberry to replace Willie Weary. Mr. Ramey did not know whether the Council's action on the appointment was pro forma or whether it could be delayed. Hopefully, the Commission will have a new member for the October 15 meeting.

Mr. Ramey advised the Commission of continued contacts with the City of Ferguson on their proposal for annexation. He also reported a discussion with the attorney of the City of St. George about a possible annexation, and a discussion with the City of Black Jack regarding the annexation of Paddock Country Club.

OLD BUSINESS:

Prior to beginning their review of the proposals, the Commission confirmed that at this meeting their review was to follow Step 1 of the proposal review process. The Commission reviewed the purpose of Step 1, which includes determining whether there are any questions arising from the required factors or any additional information needed which may not be related to the eleven factors for review. Because the Commission previously undertook a more detailed review of the eleven factors on the first four proposals, the Commission agreed it is unnecessary to redue that same process

A. Discussion re: BC9607 - Annexation Proposal Area IV - City of Sunset Hills

The Commission's Step 1 review of the Area IV proposal resulted in the following questions:

1. Specifically, what are the regulations regarding recreational vehicles in the required front yard of a residential zoning district? How will the Sunset Hills Zoning Ordinance or any other ordinance treat campers, trailers,

- boats, etc. that currently are permitted to be parked in the required front yard?
2. Please clarify the location of the proposed boundary along Sappington Road in Area IV in relation to the City's current boundary to the north of proposed annexation area.
 3. Is the City of Sunset Hills making a commitment to the continuance of the Baptist Church-Green Park-Buckley Traffic Generation Assessment Road Trust administered by St. Louis County and the implementation of the Highway System Plan as a part of its requirements of future development in the annexation area?
 4. Please clarify the City's position regarding the city's zoning regulations for the condominiums in the annexation area. After annexation, will the City continue to follow the county's zoning ordinance? Does the city have a similar zoning district which will allow the condominiums as permitted uses? If not, is the city considering the creation of a zoning district which will allow the condominiums as permitted uses? What are the specific consequences and/or limitations to the condominiums if they are considered non-conforming uses?

The Commission agreed the Step 2 review of this proposal would be set for October 22.

B. *Discussion re: BC9602 - Annexation Proposal Wedgwood Area - City of Florissant*

The Commission's Step 1 review of the Wedgwood Area proposal resulted in the following questions:

1. Please provide the Commission with an update on the proposal to reduce the utility tax. Has there been any further discussion as to how much of a reduction will actually be considered?
2. If all five proposals submitted to the Commission received voter approval, what is the impact on the service requirements for the city? For example, will there be a need for increased staff? If so, how much, in what departments, and at what cost?
3. Is the City of Florissant making a commitment to the continuance of the Bluff-Old Halls Ferry Road Traffic Generation Assessment Road Trust administered by St. Louis County and the implementation of the Highway System Plan as part of its requirements for future development in the annexation area?

In a matter not specifically related to either proposal, but which came to the attention of

the Commission during their review, was the status of Cougar Road, north of Lindbergh Blvd. It appeared to the Commission that from the County maps, this area may be a small pocket of unincorporated territory surrounded by the City of Florissant. This pocket appears to be the roadway going to a school. It was the consensus of the Commission that staff should inquire of the City what their records show the status of that area to be.

The Commission agreed the Step 2 review of this proposal would be set for October 22.

C. *Discussion re: BC9613 - Annexation Proposal Kensington Area - City of Florissant*

The Commission's Step 1 review of the Kensington Area proposal resulted in the following questions:

The Commission felt the general questions contained in their review of the Wedgwood proposal also applied to this proposal. Staff was to review the minutes of the public hearing relating to Mr. Goldenberg's comments to determine if a response to Commissioner Garino's questions had been provided.

The Commission agreed the Step 2 review of this proposal would be set for October 22.

D. *Discussion re: BC9606 - Annexation Proposal South Industrial Area - City of Hazelwood*

The Commission's Step 1 review of the South Industrial Area proposal resulted in the following questions:

The Commission had no further questions regarding this proposal.

The Commission agreed to move this project to Step 3 Deliberation on October 22.

E. *Discussion re: BC9606¹² - Annexation Proposal McDonnell Douglas Area - City of Berkeley*

The Commission's Step 1 review of the McDonnell Douglas Area proposal resulted in the following questions:

1. Is it legally possible for the City of Berkeley to create a separate taxing structure for the area proposed for annexation without the creation of a Special Business District in that area?
2. If the City creates a Special Business District, how will the City treat the existing McDonnell Douglas campus which is presently within the City of Berkeley?

3. What specific steps will the City be taking to balance the City's budget within the next five year period, with and without the proposed annexation. Please make your discussion of this issue specific.

The Commission agreed the Step 2 review of this proposal would be set for October 22.

B. Discussion re: Process for Acting Upon Approval/Disapproval of Proposals

The Commission discussed at great length the portion of the Process for Decision Making relating to "Principles." They considered the principles drafted by staff as well as those submitted by Julius Frager and Don Wojtkowski. There was unanimous agreement that if the Commission were to adopt any principles, they should be agreed to by all. Discussion centered around whether the principles are in fact too philosophical and not substantive enough. Questions were raised whether the principles supplemented or replaced the eleven factors for review.

A motion was made by Commissioner Garino to table the discussion of the Process for Acting Upon Approval/Disapproval of Proposals to the October 15 meeting of the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bruer. Voice Vote: Ayes: All Nays: None *The motion passed.*

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Rehagen made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bruer. Voice Vote: Ayes - All Nays - None *The motion passed.*

This being a memorandum of the activities at this meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Carl E. Ramey
Administrator

Approved October 15, 1996