CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Roger Ellis called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. Following the Pledge of Allegiance, Chairman Ellis explained that under the unique situation of the COVID-19 Pandemic, public participation in this evening’s meeting would only be permitted through virtual presence live via WebEx, via the SCCMOTV YouTube channel at www.sccmo.org, or via Charter Spectrum Channel 993. Chairman Ellis explained the functions of the Planning and Zoning Division, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the County Council. He explained that the Planning & Zoning Commission will make a recommendation on rezoning applications heard during the meeting, which will then be submitted to the St. Charles County Council for their final decision. The vote on preliminary plats heard during the meeting is final, only a recommendation for denial would be heard by the County Council.

Chairman Ellis introduced the following documents into the record: The Unified Development Ordinance of St. Charles County (UDO), including zoning maps; and the 2030 Master Plan for St.
Charles County, which includes the 2030 Future Land Use Plan Map. A roll call was taken to ensure presence of quorum.

Editor’s Note: Under the unique situation of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the public participated in the meeting through virtual presence and the agenda stated the following, “PUBLIC ATTENDANCE WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED THROUGH VIRTUAL PRESENCE LIVE VIA CHARTER SPECTRUM CHANNEL 993, THE COUNTY WEBSITE (https://tv.sccmo.org/CablecastPublicSite), OR OUR SCCMOTV YouTube CHANNEL”. The agenda was posted on Tuesday, March 31, 2020 on the County’s website, instructing anyone wishing to submit public comments to do so by 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 15, 2020. Those comments received were made part of the Planning & Zoning Commission’s agenda packets as part of the official record.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

NONE

PUBLIC HEARINGS

I. REZONING REQUEST - 6171 HIGHWAY V

Application No: RZ20-03
Property Owners: Tully Investments, Incorporated
Current Zoning: A, Agricultural District, with Floodway and Floodway Fringe Overlay Districts
Requested Zoning: Riverfront District, with Floodway and Floodway Fringe Overlay Districts
2030 Master Plan: Recommends Agricultural uses
Parcel Size: 55.55 acres
Location: On the west side of Highway V, approximately 1,300 feet north of North Shore Drive
Council District: 6
Account No.: 905790A000

Robert Myers, Planning and Zoning Division Director, described the subject property and the surrounding land uses. The rezoning request is for a parcel of 55.55 acres in size with the current, primary use of the property as a marina. Under the current Agricultural Zoning District, a marina is considered to be a permissive use, however, services that are in conjunction with a marina such as boat brokerage, sales and storage of boats, marine gas services, and campgrounds are considered to be conditional uses. Currently, should any marina wish to add a service in conjunction with the marina use or change any of its original conditional uses under its current Agricultural zoning designation, it must apply for a conditional use permit and submit a subsequent site plan. Under the Riverfront zoning designation, these types of uses are considered permissive uses and would only require an update to their current site plan for review by Community Development Department staff.

The marina located directly to the north of this marina and the marina located approximately 2,000 feet to the south along the Mississippi River are both currently zoned RF, Riverfront District with Floodway and Floodway Fringe Overlay Districts. The 2030 Land Use Plan for this area does
recommend agricultural land use with 5-acre minimum lot size, however, the existing marinas that are zoned Riverfront, have a land use recommendation of Parks and Open Space which is supportive of the recreational use of the Mississippi River and its necessary marina facilities.

County staff recommends that P&Z Commission recommend approval of this rezoning to RF, Riverfront District, and finds the proposed zoning to be consistent with the other marinas located in the immediate area.

For the record, Robert Myers stated there was one written communication received regarding this rezoning request from Arnie C. Dienoff. This communication stated that Mr. Dienoff recommends the Commission recommend approval of this rezoning request.

Chairman Ellis asked if the Commission had any questions for the Planning & Zoning staff.

Chairman Ellis stated while looking at the aerial map where the majority of property is covered by trees. He asked if the owner would be required to come back before the Planning & Zoning Commission for approval should he choose to develop a marina sales or campground area on the property in the future.

Robert Myers responded that approval from the Planning & Zoning Commission would not be required for marina sales or a campground to be developed on this property, if this request to rezone the property to Riverfront District is approved by the County Council. Those uses would then be allowed by right in that district. Any future development on this property would require site plan approval from County staff. County staff would ensure that all property development conforms to the County’s Ordinance requirements through the site plan process. The owner would also be required to obtain a land disturbance permit from the Community Development Department, and a permit from Corps of Engineers.

Chairman Ellis asked if anyone else had questions for the Planning & Zoning staff.

Kevin Cleary asked if any building improvements made to the property would be required to be built above the flood plain.

Robert Myers stated there is a limited ability to build commercial properties that are not elevated within the Floodway District, especially improvements that are water based and which are to be flood proofed.

There being no further questions for staff, Chairman Ellis opened the public hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public.

Peter Tully, the applicant and property owner, was sworn in. Mr. Tully stated that the presentation given by the Planning and Zoning staff regarding this application is consistent with his request.

Chairman Ellis asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Kevin Cleary asked Mr. Tully if he has any plans for development of this property.

Peter Tully responded that he is considering a possible campground or recreational vehicle site at the entrance of the marina, similar to the adjacent North Shore Marina and Port Charles Marina. He would like to have a boat station there and he has already had discussions with Ameren Electric Company about his future plans. He stated that any development within the 33 acres of wooded
wetlands on the property would have to be approved by the Corps of Engineers, but he does not have any future development plans for that area at this time.

Kevin Cleary asked Mr. Tully what his plans are for wastewater removal on the property.

Peter Tully stated that the current plan is only to provide electric service on the property. Wastewater would be kept in holding tanks and would be manually removed from the property. He may install a septic system in the future.

There being no further questions, Chairman Ellis closed the public hearing and called for discussion from the Commission.

There being no discussion, Chairman Ellis entertained a motion to recommend approval of Application No. RZ20-03.

Tracy Boehmer made a motion of approval; and Terry Hollander seconded the motion.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Cleary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Frahm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McDonald</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Boehmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Hollander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Leonhard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application No RZ20-03 was recommended for APPROVAL.

The Vote Count was 8 Yeas, 0 Nays and Abstentions.

PLATS

I. PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR THE RESUBDIVISION OF CALLAWAY VALLEY PLAT ONE TRACT A - 2977 HIGHWAY F

Application No: PRE20-01
Property Owners: Robbie L. Johnson Revocable Living Trust
Surveyor: Landmark Surveying Company
Property Zoning: A, Agricultural District (5-acre minimum lot size)
Proposed lots: 3
Parcel Size: 40.05 acres
Location: On the northeast terminus of Highway F and Callaway Ridge Drive
Council District: 2
Account No.: 616500A001

Robert Myers, Director of Planning & Zoning, stated the property owner has made a lot division on this property without the obtaining the appropriate County approvals. As such, there are currently
three parcels that make up this subdivision. These three parcels make up Tract A of Callaway Valley Plat 1. The applicant requests approval of the previous division of the property into three parcels. The large lot to the north will take access from Highway F using an existing driveway. There is currently a home under construction on this lot. The two remaining lots front on Callaway Ridge Drive, so no public road improvements will be required. As a side note, the developer is working with the Callaway Valley Homeowners Association to remove this 30-acre parcel so that it will no longer be a part of that subdivision in the future.

Robert Myers stated that County staff recommends approval of this preliminary plat, as it meets all County Ordinance requirements.

For the record, staff received two written communications with comments regarding this preliminary plat from Fred Weber, Incorporated, and Arnie C. Dienoff.

Chairman Ellis asked if the Commission had any questions for County staff.

Tracy Boehmer asked how many homes will be built on the 30-acre tract.

Robert Myers stated that one home is currently being built on the property.

There being no further questions for staff, Chairman Ellis asked if the owner or the applicant wished to comment on this preliminary plat.

Eric Merchant, owner’s representative and Real Estate Agent, was sworn in. Mr. Merchant stated that the average lot size in the Callaway Valley Subdivision is 7 acres. This lot has been on the market for years and they have been unable to find a buyer that wanted to develop the entire 40-acre property and build a 2,400 square-foot home on the lot. Sub-dividing the property into multiple lots will not only benefit the property owner, but it will also be of benefit to the Callaway Valley’s Homeowner’s Association by allowing them to collect additional fees once the lots have been built upon. It will also be of benefit to the County’s tax base.

Chairman Ellis asked if the Commission had any questions for the owner’s representative.

Kevin Cleary asked Mr. Merchant if the two lots that front to Callaway Valley Drive would be adopting the covenants of the Callaway Valley Subdivision’s Homeowner’s Association.

Eric Merchant responded in the affirmative.

Chairman Ellis asked the Commission if they had any further questions for the owner’s representative.

There being no further questions, Chairman Ellis opened the public hearing, and asked Robert Myers if he would like to add into the record the comments from the two letters that were received from Fred Weber Incorporated and Arnie Dienoff regarding this preliminary plat.

Robert Myers responded that the letter from Fred Weber Incorporated states that Fred Weber, Inc. ("FWI") owns and/or controls property along Highway F located to the northwest, west and south of the proposed subdivision. They have been conducting surface and/or underground mining and surface crushing, screening and stockpiling operations on the property, and such operations include blasting 6 days a week. Prior to FWI operating the property, it had been operated as a quarry since 1954. FWI intends to continue such operations indefinitely and the underground mining operations are currently progressing northward. We ask that the Commission consider such operations in...
reviewing and responding to the above referenced application and in issuing any conditions in connection with its recommendation. Without limiting the discretion of the Commission in requiring any conditions, we ask that it consider whether imposing reasonable conditions on the developer and the development. The other communication received from Arnie C. Dienoff states that the plat should be required to meet all standards of the County Subdivision Ordinance, and he also requests a deeper setback of the home from roadway. Mr. Dienoff also commented that he is highly opposed to the conduct and illegal violations of the Saint Charles County Planning and Zoning Commission, in how it proposes to hold Public Meetings in Violation of Chapter 610 in its entirety of the Revised State Statutes of Missouri, and no Revised State Statue gives the Commission authority to deviate and create their own rules and regulations.

Chairman Ellis asked if there were any further questions for the owner’s representative.

Kevin Cleary asked Eric Merchant if he has any concerns regarding people building homes on the property with blasting taking place at the nearby quarry.

Eric Merchant stated that he does not have any concerns and he is not aware of any complaints from surrounding homeowners regarding the mining operations. He has been at this site many times over the years and has never felt or heard any blasting going on. Chairman Ellis asked if there were any other additional questions for the applicant.

There being no further questions, Chairman Ellis entertained a motion to approve Application No. PRE20-01.

Craig Frahm made a motion to approve, and Tom Kuhn seconded the motion.

The vote on this motion was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Cleary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Frahm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tracy Boehmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Hollander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Leonhard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application No PRE20-01 was recommended for APPROVAL.

The Vote Count was 8 Yeas, 0 Nays and 0 Abstentions.

II. PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR GRONEFELD ESTATES - 432 & 442 JUNGS STATION ROAD

Application No: PRE20-05
Property Owners: Donald A. Gronefeld, Darrell Lee Gronefeld Trust Clarence, William Roth Trust, and Amanda Verna Roth Trust
Developer: Rolwes Company
Engineer: St. Charles Engineering
Property Zoning: R1E/FF, Single-Family Residential District (7,000 square foot minimum lot size), with Floodway Fringe Overlay District
Proposed lots: 31
Parcel Size: 16.00 acres
Location: On the southeast corner of the intersection of Upper Bottom Road and Jungs Station Road
Council District: 7
Account Nos.: 513360A003, 513360A002, 513360A001, 513420A000

Robert Myers, Director of Planning & Zoning, stated that the applicant is proposing to combine these parcels and develop a 31-lot residential subdivision. This property drops off fairly rapidly from Jungs Station Road to the rear of the property where a creek is located. Therefore, the homes on the property will mostly be clustered towards Jungs Station Road and Upper Bottom Road, such that the creek area on the property would be left undeveloped and designated as common ground which will be owned and maintained by the subdivision’s Homeowner’s Association. This will preserve approximately 2.5 acres of existing trees on the property and will meet the County’s requirements for both tree preservation and stream bank protection. There are also a number of retaining walls throughout this development that will maintain the maximum street slopes. Since this property slopes down a couple of feet lower than the property to the south, which is the site of the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision, storm water drainage from this development will stay on the property and drain towards the rear of the property and into the creek. The County Highway Department reviewed this application to determine the best place to locate an entrance; either Jungs Station Road or Upper Bottom Road. There was serious consideration for Jungs Station Road but because of sight distances, the Highway Department went with taking access off Upper Bottom Road. Currently, there is a light at the intersection at Jungs Station Road and Upper Bottom Road that does back up during peak rush hour times. The Highway Department does not believe that a full-blown traffic study would be justified for the proposed development, but instead they will need to provide the Highway Department with a traffic analysis on how they will manage traffic in this area.

County staff recommends approval of this preliminary plat as submitted.

For the record, 12 communications with comments and concerns regarding this preliminary plat were received from the following persons: Bernard Martin, Anne Baker, Betty Hildebrandt, John and Karen Baker, Karen and Kevin Beer, Don and Maureen Curtis, Frank Dvorak, Lori Neuschwander, Russ and Dottie Freitag, Eunice Torretta, Lisa and Dave Woznicki, and Arnie Dienoff. Both the Developer and the Engineer for this project submitted individual responses to most of these communications as well.

Chairman Ellis asked if the Commission had any questions for staff.

Tom Kuhn asked Robert Myers for the distance between proposed entrance to this subdivision and the existing entrance onto Crown Passage Drive. He stated there doesn’t appear to be a lot of room between those two entrances.

Robert Myers stated that the County requires there to be at least 300 feet between the two entrances, and it appears to him there is well over 300 feet between them. He estimates it to be roughly 600 feet.

Chairman Ellis asked if the Commission had any other questions for staff.

Kevin Cleary asked if there would be a turn-in lane added to the entrance due to the amount of traffic on Jungs Station Road. He stated that he is concerned that the proposed entrance from Jungs Station Road, along with the existing traffic coming from Upper Bottom Road may cause traffic to bottleneck at the entrance to the subdivision if there is not a dedicated left-turn lane.
Chairman Ellis suggested that Mr. Cleary hold this question until the project’s engineer is sworn in to speak.

There being no further questions for County staff, Chairman Ellis asked if the applicant or the engineer would like to comment on this preliminary plat.

Jim Piper, the owner’s engineer, was sworn in. Regarding the subdivision entrance, he stated either choice was the lesser of two evils. In looking at locating the entrance across from Rockford Way, the sight distance would not have been sufficient in any location. Due to this street having three lanes, traffic calculations show that traffic runs at a pretty high speed, which would require a substantial amount of added sight distance. Locating the entrance off of Jungs Station Road will allow for more than sufficient sight distance for the calculated traffic speeds. Mr. Piper acknowledged that traffic does back up past this intersection regularly, but they believe that if they were to have located the entrance across from Rockford Way the traffic along the roadway would drive down Upper Bottom Road anyway. Locating the entrance onto Jungs Station Road will keep the traffic from Upper Bottom Road out of the queue before the light. He does not see this subdivision entrance as being the cause for the existing traffic issue. There are just too many vehicles at one time on Jungs Station Road during peak hours.

Kevin Cleary stated that if traffic is already backing up in this area, does Mr. Piper not foresee an issue with people turning in and out of this subdivision during rush hour traffic?

Jim Piper responded that there may possibly be issues if they are making a left-hand turn.

Kevin Cleary asked if there would be a separate designated turn-in lane for persons coming in and out of the subdivision.

Jim Piper responded that an additional turn-in lane is not being proposed for this subdivision.

Chairman Ellis asked Kevin Cleary if he was talking about a turn-in lane on Upper Bottom Road.

Kevin Cleary responded in the affirmative,

Mr. Cleary asked Robert Myers if the County Highway Department would be responsible for determining whether or not an additional turn-in lane is necessary for this subdivision entrance.

Robert Myers responded in the affirmative. He stated that the County Highway Department indicated to the Planning & Zoning staff that the additional traffic that will be generated from this subdivision will not be sufficient to warrant a traffic study being required prior to preliminary plat approval.

Chairman Ellis asked the Commission if there were any other questions for the owner’s engineer.

Tracy Boehmer stated that adding roughly 70 additional drivers per day to this area will affect the wait times, the possibility for accidents, and add additional frustration for drivers.

Jim Piper acknowledged that this development will increase the traffic flow in the area, but the location of the entrance to this subdivision is irrelevant to that fact. Wherever they put the entrance, there will be the same issue.

Tom Kuhn asked Mr. Piper what the final slope of this property will be, out of concern for potential runoff issues. He also asked where the runoff from the property will be directed, and if it will create a problem in the common ground area.
Jim Piper responded that the maximum street slope allowed by County regulations is 8 percent, so no lot would be steeper than that and the lots will all be about 70-feet wide. All of the stormwater will go into underground storm pipes to prevent erosion, and then will be drained down into the common ground area into a detention basin.

Tom Kuhn asked how tall would retaining walls in the development will be.

Jim Piper stated he believes there will be 10-feet tall walls located behind lots 25 through 31.

Chairman Ellis asked if there were any other additional questions for the owner’s engineer. There were no further questions.

Robert Myers stated he would like to put into record the names of people who submitted letters of concern and/or opposition regarding this plat, and he noted that a number of them have responses from the engineer and/or the developer attached. The names of persons who submitted letters are Bernard Martin, Anne Baker, Betty Hildebrandt, John and Karen Baker, Karen and Kevin Beer, Don and Maureen Curtis, Frank Dvorak, Lori Neuschwander, Russ and Dottie Freitag, Eunice Torretta, Lisa and Dave Woznicki, and Arnie Dienoff. Mr. Myers asked Chairman Ellis if he would like to for him to read some or all of those letters aloud.

Kevin Cleary interjected, and he asked Robert Myers if he could summarize the majority of the concerns that were expressed in the letters received.

Robert Myers responded that the homeowners to the south of the property in the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision expressed concerns including the following:

1. Concerns about whether the subdivision property be higher or lower than their properties in the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision, and where will the stormwater will drain to.

2. Concerns about how far the closest home in this subdivision will be from their home.

3. Multiple questions and concerns regarding traffic on Upper Bottom Road.

4. Concerns regarding the selling prices of the homes in this subdivision, and those will compare to the homes in the adjoining subdivisions.

5. Concerns regarding stormwater drainage and erosion around the creek.

Chairman Ellis asked if anyone had questions about any of the public comments received.

Tom Kuhn asked what the price range of the homes for this subdivision will be.

Chairman Ellis suggested that Tom Kuhn ask the owner’s representative or the developer’s representative that question when they are asked if they wish to respond to any of the written comments that were received.

Chairman Ellis asked if anyone had any additional questions for the owner’s engineer. There were no further questions.

Jim Piper stated that he wanted to note that a gentleman that lives off of Jungs Station Road stated that he is opposed to the entrance being located off of Jungs Station Road, so there was opposition received for both proposed entrance locations.
Chairman Ellis asked if the developer’s representative, Ed Zigarowicz, would like to speak regarding this application.

Ed Zigarowicz, representative for the developer (The Rolwes Company), was sworn in.

Tom Kuhn asked Ed Zigarowicz what the price point is will be for the smaller homes on back side of this development.

Ed Zigarowicz responded that without yet having a development plan that they can bid out, it is difficult to answer that question. The ground cost and development cost will dictate the final sales price of the new homes. He stated that the Bristol Ridge development off Old Friedens Road near the Tallbridge Subdivision has homes that are of similar value to the homes that will be developed on this property. The starting price for those homes was $279,900, but the price they are paying for the raw ground for the subject property is roughly twice as much as they paid for the ground for the Bristol Ridge development. The Bristol Ridge development also fronts to Old Friedens Road and did not require very much grading, and the cost of developing this property will exceed the transfer price of the homes in the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision. Mr. Zigarowicz stated that there is always a concern from existing homeowners that a new development would decrease property values, but he does not believe you could ever point out a place in this market area where new construction ever sells for less than existing homes.

Craig Frahm stated it’s obvious that you likely could not find a comparable new home selling for less than what the existing homes next to it are selling for. He stated that what he believes Tom Kuhn is alluding to is whether or not the size of the homes in this subdivision will be comparable to the size of the homes in the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision.

Tom Kuhn affirmed that he would like to know what the size of the homes in this subdivision will be as compared to the size of the homes in Huntleigh Manor.

Ed Zigarowicz stated that he recently had a Zoom meeting with members of the Huntleigh Manor Homeowner’s Association, and he provided them with brochures of the homes that would be available in Gronefeld Estates which are very comparable to the homes in the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision. He reiterated that the homes in the Bristol Ridge development, which had a starting price of $279,900 are comparable to the homes that will be built in Gronefeld Estates.

Craig Frahm asked if he knew what the lot size is for the homes in the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision.

Tom Kuhn stated that he believes that those lot sizes are around 12,000 to 15,000 square feet.

Robert Myers stated that the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision is in the same Zoning District as this property, R1E, Single-Family Residential District, which has a 7,000 square foot minimum lot size. He stated that the smallest lot size in the Huntleigh Manor Subdivision is about 8,600 square feet.

Craig Frahm stated that the proposed lot sizes shown on the plat are between 9,000 and 15,000 square feet.

Kevin Cleary asked what the minimum and maximum square footage of the homes in this development will be according to their Subdivision Restrictions.

Ed Zigarowicz stated the draft of their Subdivision Restrictions does not stipulate a minimum or maximum square footage for the homes. He asked if that was a requirement of St. Charles County.
Kevin Cleary stated he couldn’t speak to whether or not the County requires that, but he is asking because he would like to know exactly what the Commission is reviewing for approval.

Ed Zigarowicz stated if that is a requirement of St. Charles County, then The Rowles Company will meet that requirement.

Tracy Boehmer agrees with Kevin Cleary. She would like to know what the average size of the homes will be, and if they will it be comparable to the homes in Huntleigh Manor.

Ed Zigarowicz responded that he does not know the square footage of the homes in Huntleigh Manor, but these homes would be comparable to the homes in the Bristol Ridge development which are 1,562 to 3,000 square feet.

Chairman Ellis asked if there are any other questions for the developer’s representative.

There being no further questions, Chairman Ellis brought the application back before the Commission for discussion.

Kevin Cleary confirmed that Gronefeld Estates looks like it will be a good subdivision, but he has concerns about the entrance. He asked if anyone else on the Commission had the same concerns.

Tracy Boehmer and Robert McDonald stated that they both share those concerns.

Kevin Cleary asked if a condition could be added to approval of this preliminary plat requiring that a traffic study be performed prior to development. He stated that if the study comes back and it is determined that there are no additional lanes necessary and there aren’t any concerns about safety, then he would be fine with approving this preliminary plat.

Chairman Ellis stated Mr. Cleary would need to make a motion if he wished to add that as a condition of approval.

Kevin Cleary responded that he would like to make a motion to approve Application PRE20-05, with the condition that a traffic study be performed prior to final approval of the development.

Craig Frahm asked who would be responsible for performing this traffic study.

Kevin Cleary stated that he thought that the St. Charles County Highway Department would do it.

Chairman Ellis stated the County Highway Department has already determined that this development does not warrant the need for a traffic study, but if a traffic study were to be required it would have to be done at the expense of the applicant.

Robert Myers stated that this level of development might warrant just a traffic analysis, rather than a full traffic study. He explained that a traffic study is more involved than a traffic analysis, and he believes that the St. Charles County Highway Department should make the determination on which one should be done for this development. If Mr. Cleary wishes to add this requirement, his motion should probably state that approval of this plat will be contingent upon the satisfaction of either a traffic study or a traffic analysis being performed, at the discretion of the County Highway Department.
Kevin Cleary withdrew his prior motion and made a new motion that approval of this plat will be contingent upon the satisfaction of either a traffic study or a traffic analysis being performed at the discretion of the County Highway Department, at the expense of the applicant.

Chairman Ellis asked Kevin Cleary to clarify if his motion was to have the St. Charles County Highway Department determine whether a traffic study or a traffic analysis be should be done, at the expense of the applicant.

Kevin Cleary answered in the affirmative.

Chairman Ellis asked if anyone would like to second Mr. Cleary’s motion.

Robert McDonald seconded the motion.

The vote on the motion a require a traffic study or a traffic analysis was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kevin Cleary</th>
<th>Tom Kuhn</th>
<th>Roger Ellis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- No</td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craig Frahm</th>
<th>Tracy Boehmer</th>
<th>Terry Hollander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert McDonald</th>
<th>Jim Leonhard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vote Count was 4 Yeas, 4 Nays and 0 Abstentions. The motion failed.

Chairman Ellis then entertained a motion to recommend approval of Application No. PRE20-05 as presented the applicant.

Terry Hollander made a motion of approval, and Robert McDonald seconded the motion.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kevin Cleary</th>
<th>Tom Kuhn</th>
<th>Roger Ellis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- No</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craig Frahm</th>
<th>Tracy Boehmer</th>
<th>Terry Hollander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert McDonald</th>
<th>Jim Leonhard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No</td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application No. PRE20-05 was APPROVED as submitted.

The Vote Count was 5 Yeas, 3 Nays and 0 Abstentions.

**TABLED ITEMS**

**NONE**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 18, 2020 REGULAR MEETING**
Chairman Ellis asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the March 18, 2020 regular meeting.

Tom Kuhn made such motion, and the motion was seconded by Craig Frahm.

The minutes were approved by unanimous voice acclamation.

---

**OTHER BUSINESS**

I. **PLANNING AND ZONING DIVISION UPDATES**

1) Robert Myers announced that St. Charles County Council passed a new Ordinance for “Minor Subdivision Plats”. The new Ordinance is for subdivision plats having lots of 5-acres or larger that are located within Agricultural or Residential Zoning Districts. Under the new Ordinance, Minor Submissions are required to meet basic requirements such as having lots of 5-acres or larger, and fronting to public/private streets or an easement. Plats meeting those requirements would be approved internally by the County’s Planning & Zoning staff and would not be required to go before the Planning & Zoning Commission for approval. This new process will save time and expense for developers, since there are little or no improvements that need to be made on these rural sites.

2) Kevin Clearly asked Robert Myers to send him some information that states what the criteria are for when a development requires either a traffic study or a traffic analysis. Robert Myers responded that he will send that information to Mr. Cleary.

---

**ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

Tom Kuhn made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Craig Frahm and was approved by unanimous acclamation. The meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

__________________________  _________________________
Roger Ellis, Chairman        Tom Kuhn, Secretary