


**PUBLIC MEETING – TENTATIVE AGENDA
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2014 – 6:30 P.M.
VILLAGE OF TWIN OAKS – PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
1393 BIG BEND ROAD, SUITE F, TWIN OAKS, MO 63021**

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ROLL CALL
4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
5. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
 - a. Meeting Minutes of January 28, 2014
6. OLD BUSINESS
 - a. Commercial Sign Code
 - b. Storage Sheds
7. NEW BUSINESS

None
8. MISCELLANEOUS
9. ADJOURNMENT



Kathy A. Runge
Village Clerk/Controller

POSTED: March 7, 2014; 9:00 am

**PLEASE NOTE:
ANY PERSON REQUIRING PHYSICAL OR VERBAL ACCOMMODATIONS
SHOULD CONTACT THE VILLAGE OFFICE 24 HOURS PRIOR TO MEETING.
(636-225-7873)**

**MEETING MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
TWIN OAKS, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2014**

The Meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Board Room of the Village Office. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Roll call showed as follows:

Members: Roger Loesche, Chairman-*arrived at 6:55* Tim Stoeckl, Secretary-yea
 Shane Caskey-absent Lisa Eisenhower-*arrived at 6:40*
 Dan Wheeler-yea Frank Venturella-yea
 Ray Slama, Board Liaison-yea

Also Present: Robert Hartzog, Village Attorney
 Kathy A. Runge, Village Clerk

As Chairman Loesche was to arrive late, Secretary Tim Stoeckl chaired the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Acting Chairman Stoeckl requested a motion to approve the agenda. Member Wheeler motioned to approve the agenda as submitted, seconded by Member Venturella. Motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission of those present.

Approval of Consent Agenda: Acting Chairman Stoeckl requested a motion to approve the consent agenda. Member Slama motioned to approve Meeting Minutes of January 28, 2014 as submitted, seconded by Member Wheeler. Motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission of those present.

OLD BUSINESS

Commercial Sign Code: Member Venturella stated that he had reviewed the sample municipal codes that were distributed. He stated that he felt the simpler the better and pointed out that a community as small as Twin Oaks should not be so complicated. He stated that he was leaning towards one sign per window with no more than 50% coverage.

Member Slama stated that Manchester's window calculations were based on the frontage of the building rather than per window with no more than a 50% coverage. He added that this was as simple as it gets and easily enforced. Discussion ensued.

The Board then discussed signs on the sides of buildings and banners. They agreed that it would still be a violation to have signs attached to the side of buildings. They also agreed that banners could not be placed on a wall.

Member Eisenhower suggested that any non-conforming sign request should come to the Commission and then to the Board of Trustees. Member Loesche stated that he felt there should not be any variances or conditional permits for signs. He also stated that crafting code for a business was inappropriate. Discussion ensued.

Member Wheeler asked if the Commission felt it was the Village's responsibility to help businesses to succeed.

Member Loesche agreed that the Village should help businesses but shouldn't give one business something that another business could not enjoy.

After further discussion, the Commission unanimously agreed that the entire frontage of a building should be considered when judging a window and that only 50% of that frontage could be covered. It was also decided that there should not be temporary sign requirements or permits, just violations, i.e. if a business was in violation, they should be notified.

Acting Chairman Stoeckl suggested adopting Manchester's language for window signs as Twin Oaks new sign code. Member Venturella stated that he would like to review the verbiage one more time and vote at the next meeting.

Acting Chairman Stoeckl made a motion to bring the approved ordinance to the Commission for review at the next meeting. Member Slama seconded the motion. Motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission of those present.

Storage Sheds: Member Slama stated that the current limit for a storage shed was 12x12 and asked the Commission if they felt larger lots deserved larger buildings.

Member Loesche stated that in his opinion, if the shed was larger than 12x12, then it was no longer a shed but a structure. Discussion ensued.

The Board unanimously agreed that any storage request larger than 12x12 would be considered a structure or garage and they would need to make an application. They also stated that any large structure or garage would require a driveway running to it.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business to discuss.


ADJOURNMENT

With no further discussion, Member Loesche motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 pm, seconded by Member Eisenhauer. Motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission of those present.


Drafted By: Kathy A. Runge
Kathy A. Runge
Village Clerk

Date of Approval: June 10, 2014

ATTEST:



Kathy A. Runge
Village Clerk



Roger Loesche, Chairman
Planning & Zoning Commission