

**CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LADUE
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI
MONDAY JULY 20TH, 2026**

The meeting of the City Council of the City of Ladue, St. Louis County, Missouri, was held on Monday July 20th, 2026, at 4:02 p.m. at Ladue Horton Watkins High School Performing Arts Center located at 1201 S. Warson Road Ladue Missouri 63124. The following members were present:

The Hon. Nancy Spewak, Mayor, presiding.

Members of the Council present:

William Brennan
Harold Burroughs
Patrick Hensley
John Howell
Stacey Kamps
Tim Kaufmann

Six Council Members present at the start of the meeting.

Also, present Police Chief Ken Andreski, Fire Chief Steve Lynn, Ms. Anne Lamitola, Senior Director of Public Services; Mr. Nicholas Wigglesworth, Director of Finance; Ms. Andrea Sukanek, City Planner; Mr. Paul Garlock, Building Official; Mr. Stephen Stumpf, Stormwater Manager; Ms. Erin Seele, City Attorney; and Ms. Stacey Seymour, City Clerk.

Approval of the Agenda:

Council Member Brennan motioned to approve the agenda as presented with a second from Council Member Burroughs, the motion was unanimously approved as presented.

Approval of the Minutes:

Council Member Howell moved approval of the regular meeting minutes of June 15th, 2026, and the closed meeting minutes of June 15th, 2026, and the Special Meeting Minutes of June 24th, 2026, and the closed meeting minutes of June 24th, 2026, as presented; upon second by Council Member Burroughs, the motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

None.

Presentations & Public Hearings:

PH1: The City Council of the City of Ladue will hold a Public Hearing regarding a proposed amendment to Sections III, VII, and XVI of the Ladue Zoning Ordinance 1175 regarding recreational marijuana facilities.

Council Member Burroughs moved to continue the public hearing and associated Bill 2335-A to the August 2026 council meeting, upon second by Council Member Hensley, the motion passed unanimously.

PH2: A public hearing will be held on a recommendation submitted by the Zoning and Planning Commission that the City Council deny the rezoning and General Development Plan for a Planned Development District at the consolidated "Rock Hill Quarries" property (1200, 1233, 1324, 1341 N. Rock Hill Rd and 2577 McKnight Rd.). Planned Development District would include a mixed-use building with 235 residential apartments, and 9,000 square feet of commercial space with structured parking and 42 single-family residential lots. Property is about 50 acres in size and is currently zoned H-Industrial and D-Residential.

Council Member Burroughs moved to open the public hearing, with a second by Council Member Brennan the motion passed unanimously.

Mayor Spewak opened the public hearing by acknowledging the significant public interest surrounding the proposed development and encouraged all participants to remain respectful throughout the proceedings.

Mr. Matt Segal, on behalf of TVL Development, addressed the Council and thanked the Zoning and Planning Commission, City staff, consultants, neighboring municipalities, and residents for their time and participation throughout the review process. He acknowledged the extensive public involvement and stated that the development team had reviewed the supplemental studies, public comments, and consultant reports submitted during the application process.

Mr. Segal stated that while many residents expressed a desire for the property to become a public park or remain undeveloped, the property is privately owned and redevelopment proposals must recognize the owner's legal property rights. He noted that the current zoning permits a continued industrial use and explained that the proposed Planned Development District was intended to provide a higher-quality mixed-use redevelopment that, in the applicant's opinion, would be more compatible with surrounding neighborhoods while preserving substantial open space and environmental improvements.

Mr. George Stock, President of Stock & Associates, presented the General Development Plan for the proposed Planned Development District. He reviewed the history of the City's Planned Development District regulations, noting the adoption of the original PDD ordinance in 2018, amendments approved in 2026, and the City's Strategic Plan and Vision 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which contemplate innovative mixed-use development opportunities.

Mr. Stock described the proposed redevelopment of approximately 50 acres surrounding the existing quarry landfill into three primary development areas consisting of eleven custom single-family homes, thirty-one maintenance-free villa

residences, and a mixed-use building containing up to 235 apartment units with approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial space. He reviewed the proposed subdivision layout, access points from Old Warson Road, McKnight Road, and Litzsinger Road, internal roadway system, parking, pedestrian connections, open space, and trail network. He further discussed the proposed stream restoration, floodplain improvements, and environmental enhancements intended to improve the existing conditions of Deer Creek.

Mr. Stock also summarized the applicant's floodplain analysis and stated that the proposed development was designed to avoid adverse upstream or downstream flooding impacts. He discussed the hydrologic modeling performed for the project, anticipated creek restoration improvements, proposed floodplain modifications, and the applicant's position that the project would improve existing stormwater conditions while complying with applicable FEMA requirements. He acknowledged comments received from neighboring municipalities and the City's consultants and stated that the application continued to support the conclusions of its engineering analyses.

Ms. Julie Nolfo, Professional Traffic Engineer with Lochmueller Group, presented the project's Traffic Impact Study. She reviewed the study methodology and coordination with MoDOT, St. Louis County, the City of Ladue and its traffic consultant, CBB, and the City of Rock Hill and its consultant. She stated that the reviewing parties agreed upon the intersections, time periods, analysis scenarios, trip-generation methodology, and traffic-modeling procedures used in the study.

Ms. Nolfo explained that the study used conservative development assumptions by analyzing 40 villa residences rather than the proposed 31, 12 custom homes rather than the proposed 11, 250 apartments rather than the proposed 235, and 10,000 square feet of commercial space rather than the proposed 9,000 square feet. Based upon the anticipated distribution of traffic, the development was projected to increase peak-hour traffic volumes by approximately four to six percent on McKnight Road north of the site, three to five percent on McKnight Road south toward Old Warson Road, four to five percent on Litzsinger Road, and approximately two to three percent along other routes.

Ms. Nolfo stated that existing traffic conditions on McKnight Road must be improved before traffic generated by the proposed development is introduced. She noted that CBB previously evaluated this area for the City in 2019 and that the current analysis continued to identify substantial queuing between Interstate 64 and Litzsinger Road. The applicant and reviewing agencies were evaluating several improvement concepts, including signalization near Ellsworth Lane and York Drive South, which preliminary analyses indicated could significantly reduce existing queues. Additional improvements previously recommended by CBB included restriping McKnight Road to provide two northbound lanes between York Drive North/Lindworth Drive and the Interstate 64 eastbound ramps and widening southbound McKnight Road at Litzsinger Road to add a second through lane.

Ms. Nolfo further reviewed improvements recommended in connection with the proposed development, including restriping northbound McKnight Road to provide a through lane and center turn lane; installing a traffic signal at McKnight Road and Old Warson Road with a dedicated northbound left-turn lane; constructing a southbound right-turn lane into the mixed-use portion of the development; installing all-way stop controls at Old Warson Road and Rock Hill Road/Site Drive and at the single-family residential entrance; adding sidewalks and pedestrian crossings along the site frontage; and installing a stop sign at the Tilles Park exit onto Litzsinger Road.

Ms. Nolfo concluded that, if the identified improvements were completed, forecasted traffic conditions would be improved compared with existing conditions, even after accounting for background traffic growth and traffic generated by the proposed development.

Mr. Gary Aronberg, Stormwater Engineer with HR Green, presented his independent peer review of the applicant's flood study. He explained that the City retained HR Green to evaluate the applicant's analysis and that his review also considered comments submitted by City staff, neighboring municipalities, consultants, and members of the public. His evaluation addressed approximately twelve principal technical and environmental issues.

Mr. Aronberg explained that the proposed development would widen portions of the main channel of Deer Creek while placing fill within portions of the floodplain. These modifications would increase the creek channel's conveyance capacity while reducing some overbank conveyance and storage. He stated that increased water velocities were expected in portions of the project area, particularly following removal of the existing bridge, and that increase in water velocities may increase the potential for erosion. He also stated that Deer Creek currently has very high water velocities. He noted, however, that the applicant's plans included measures intended to address channel stabilization and erosion.

Mr. Aronberg stated that the applicant used a "steady-state" hydraulic model. He explained that this modeling approach does not fully evaluate floodplain storage and recommended that a "non- steady-state" model also be completed. Such a model would better account for the storage provided by the existing floodplain and assist in determining whether the proposed modifications could affect water-surface elevations or velocities differently than shown in the applicant's analysis. He stated that the significance of the existing storage could not be determined without completing that additional analysis.

Mr. Aronberg noted that the applicant's model relied upon older terrain and hydraulic information but incorporated more recent topographic data. He discussed the preliminary FEMA and SEMA information and stated that additional modeling would be required to determine whether application of that information would produce higher or lower modeled elevations throughout the project area. He further explained that the applicant used conservative flow information available from the USGS stream gauge, while other FEMA information reflected higher water surface elevations.

Mr. Aronberg stated that the applicant's study showed that the anticipated velocity increases would remain within the project area and would not extend upstream or downstream. He cautioned that a non-steady-state analysis could provide additional information regarding that conclusion. He explained that hydraulic modeling has evolved substantially and that current modeling tools can more effectively evaluate floodplain storage and other conditions that earlier models could not fully address.

Addressing comments submitted by the City of Rock Hill, Mr. Aronberg stated that he did not expect the project to increase sediment transported downstream. He noted, however, the importance of establishing a long-term maintenance plan for the creek and its stabilization improvements. He also discussed potential environmental concerns associated with increased water temperature and additional impervious surface, noting that the development would be required to incorporate appropriate water-quality measures.

Mr. Aronberg explained that technical guidance documents assist engineers in developing and evaluating hydraulic models but are not intended to function as stand-alone regulatory documents. He agreed with comments from City of Ladue staff and the Cities of Brentwood and Rock Hill that a non-steady-state analysis should be completed.

Mr. Aronberg also noted that Brentwood had inquired about the suitability of the property as a potential location for regional flood-control improvements. He explained that implementation of a regional project would generally require a public entity to acquire or otherwise obtain control of the necessary private property.

In response to questions regarding responsibility for Deer Creek, Mr. Aronberg explained that the creek is located on private property and that maintenance responsibility generally remains with the private property owner. He noted that questions regarding creek maintenance can involve private owners, municipalities, and the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District (MSD), but that there was no indication MSD would assume responsibility for this portion of the creek.

Mayor Spewak noted the City's longstanding position that creeks located on private property remain the responsibility of the applicable private property owners.

Mr. Matt Segal stated that ownership was prepared to accept responsibility for maintaining the creek and the approximately twenty acres of associated common ground. He committed to incorporating those obligations into the homeowners' association declarations and indentures so that they would continue in perpetuity. He stated that maintenance would include removal of debris and fallen timber, care of riprap and channel-stabilization improvements, landscaping, and an annual inspection or audit of the creek area.

Ms. Seele noted that the PDD ordinance requires the preparation and approval of covenants and restrictions and that the applicant's maintenance commitments would need to be addressed through that process.

Council Member Kamps asked whether there was any reason not to complete a non-steady-state model. Mr. Aronberg responded that, in his professional peer-review opinion, there was not.

Council Member Kamps also asked whether comparable flood-control projects could be reviewed. Mr. Aronberg referenced projects in Springfield, Missouri, and Des Moines, Iowa, that incorporated widened areas along creeks to provide additional floodwater storage.

Council Member Hensley asked about the anticipated increase in creek velocity resulting from widening the channel and removing the existing bridge.

Mr. George Stock responded that the project was not expected to increase the total stormwater runoff generated by the property. He stated that the development would provide additional green space and incorporate bioretention and infiltration features during the detailed design process. He acknowledged that removing the existing bridge would increase velocity at that location because the bridge currently acts as a constriction but stated that the project was intended to reduce the rate at which stormwater runoff enters the creek.

Council Member Hensley discussed the rapid onset and recession of flash-flood events and asked how those events were reflected in the modeling. Mr. Aronberg explained that hydraulic models are calibrated using available stream-gauge information and observed conditions so that engineers may evaluate how comparable storm events would affect the proposed and existing conditions. He stated that applying the same storm to both conditions would allow the relative impacts of the project to be compared.

Council Member Hensley asked whether the project would improve conditions during a flash-flood event. Mr. Aronberg responded that the applicant's submitted model showed improvement. He reiterated, however, that completing a non-steady-state analysis would provide additional information and could confirm whether the modeled improvement remained consistent when floodplain storage was more fully considered.

Council Member Hensley asked Ms. Nolfo how the traffic analysis accounted for human factors and recurring conditions such as school-bus stops and delays. He noted that McKnight Road serves traffic beyond the City of Ladue and is surrounded by residential neighborhoods where congestion and access challenges are particularly significant. He further observed that McKnight Road is classified as a collector roadway rather than an arterial roadway, although changes associated with the Interstate 64 interchange have caused it to function increasingly as a major north-south route.

Mr. Lee Cannon, representing CBB, presented the City's independent peer review of the applicant's Traffic Impact Study. He stated that McKnight Road carries approximately 18,000 to 20,000 vehicles each day and explained that this figure includes all traffic using the corridor, not merely traffic generated within Ladue or Brentwood.

Mr. Cannon reviewed the trip-generation methodology used in the applicant's study. He explained that traffic engineers estimate trips based upon established industry standards for the proposed land uses. A single-family residence generally produces approximately ten daily trips, while multifamily residences generate fewer trips per dwelling unit. Based upon the proposed mixture of residential and commercial uses, the development was expected to generate approximately 1,800 to 2,200 new vehicle trips per day.

Mr. Cannon stated that CBB found the study to be consistent with accepted traffic-engineering standards and methodologies. He explained that the underlying data, trip-generation assumptions, and interpretations fell within a reasonable and reliable range and that the study could be used by the city in evaluating the application.

He further explained that a traffic-impact study assumes the proposed development will be approved, constructed, and occupied. The analysis then compares projected roadway conditions with and without the development. When the analysis identifies a detrimental impact, the traffic engineer recommends improvements necessary to mitigate that impact and accommodate additional traffic.

Mr. Cannon stated that this site presented an unusual challenge because the surrounding roadway network on McKnight between Litzsinger and I-64/40 has no remaining capacity. In many development reviews, some surplus roadway capacity is available to absorb additional traffic; that was not the case on McKnight Road. Existing congestion is well documented, and the corridor is already operating beyond maximum capacity. He stated that, even without the proposed development, the roadway could not reasonably accommodate any additional traffic under existing conditions.

Mr. Cannon concluded that physical roadway and intersection improvements would therefore be necessary before the proposed development traffic could be accommodated. He stated that the recommended improvements must be coordinated among Ladue, Brentwood, MoDOT, St. Louis County, and other affected entities. He noted that potential solutions had been identified, but the participating jurisdictions and affected residents had not reached consensus regarding a comprehensive improvement plan.

Council Member Kamps asked what prevented the participating entities from reaching agreement when CBB studied the corridor in 2019.

Mr. Cannon stated that the prior study identified several potential improvements, including widening McKnight Road near Tilles Park to create a second southbound through lane, installing additional traffic signals, and acquiring additional right-of-way where necessary. He explained that many of the disagreements involved how residents would enter and exit their neighborhoods and how individual improvements would redistribute traffic among local streets.

Mr. Cannon noted that the 2019 process included substantial public participation, including meetings at Tilles Park and the Brentwood Community Center. He stated that the principal obstacle was not an inability to identify potential engineering solutions, but rather an inability to reach agreement on a cohesive plan acceptable to the affected jurisdictions and neighborhoods.

Council Member Burroughs observed that improving traffic flow could also attract additional vehicles to the corridor. Mr. Cannon agreed that physical improvements could influence travel patterns but maintained that the identified improvements were necessary to address existing conditions.

Council Member Kaufmann asked whether sufficient right-of-way existed to restripe or widen McKnight Road to provide a center turn lane and additional through lanes.

Mr. Cannon explained that the most significant capacity needs occur between Interstate 64 and York Drive, where intersections and lane transitions create choke points. He discussed the need for an additional northbound lane south of the interstate and the desire to improve southbound movements near York Drive. He stated that changes at one intersection may reroute vehicles to different neighborhood streets and must therefore be evaluated as part of a coordinated corridor plan.

Mr. Cannon noted that traffic volumes on McKnight Road exceeded 20,000 vehicles per day as early as the 1970s and stated that congestion in the corridor has been a longstanding issue rather than one created by the pending application.

Council Member Hensley asked how implementation of the improvements identified in 2019 would affect residents along the corridor.

Mr. Cannon responded that some residents would experience improved access or reduced traffic, while others could be affected differently as traffic shifted among neighborhood streets. He stated that several technically feasible solutions existed, but each produced different reactions from residents in Ladue and Brentwood.

Mr. Cannon also discussed latent demand, meaning motorists who currently avoid McKnight Road because of congestion but might use the corridor if conditions improved. He stated that some additional traffic could result from improved operations, but because the surrounding area is largely developed, he expected additional regional demand to be relatively limited.

Council Member Burroughs noted that the approximately 20,000 vehicles using McKnight Road each day do not originate solely within Ladue and Brentwood and asked how the roadway functions within the larger transportation network.

Mr. Cannon explained that McKnight Road is classified as a collector roadway. Its function is to carry traffic between local streets and arterial roadways. He stated that McKnight Road is performing that function as well as it can but lacks sufficient capacity to serve the volume of traffic currently using it.

Mayor Spewak asked whether the traffic analysis evaluated Old Warson Road and the effects of the proposed development upon that corridor. Ms. Nolfo responded that the study examined Old Warson Road between McKnight Road and Kortwright Avenue.

Ms. Andrea Sukanek, City Planner, presented the Planning Staff Report and summarized the staff's review of the proposed Planned Development District. She explained that the purpose of the PDD regulations is to encourage thoughtfully designed, mixed-use developments that provide flexibility while meeting the objectives established in the City's Zoning Ordinance. She stated that the proposed development satisfied the basic eligibility requirements for a Planned Development District, including the minimum site size and location requirements, and that portions of the proposal were generally consistent with certain goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan related to housing diversity, pedestrian connectivity, and open space.

Ms. Sukanek stated, however, that several concerns identified in the staff report remained unresolved. She noted that the proposed floodplain modifications would increase velocities in the Deer Creek channel, which is not permitted under the City's Floodplain Regulations without a variance from the Flood Management Board. She further explained that the application proposed significant grading and disturbance within the required stream buffer and setback areas and that staff had concerns regarding compliance with the City's stream buffer ordinance.

Ms. Sukanek also stated that additional stormwater information and supporting documentation remained outstanding, preventing staff from completing its review of certain stormwater management components. She noted that the Architectural Review Board had granted conditional approval of the mixed-use building and overall site concept subject to resolution of outstanding comments but had not approved the proposed villa development. She also identified remaining concerns regarding pedestrian connectivity, including sidewalk connections between portions of the development.

Ms. Sukanek concluded by noting that the Zoning and Planning Commission held three public meetings to consider the application, received presentations from the applicant, City staff, and consultants, heard public comment, and ultimately voted to recommend denial of the requested Planned Development District and General Development Plan.

Mr. Stephen Stumpf, Stormwater Engineering Manager, summarized his review of the proposed stream modifications. He explained that his review focused on the health and function of Deer Creek, including the effects of grading, stream widening, restoration measures, and compliance with the City's stream buffer requirements. Mr. Stumpf stated that the proposed widening of the creek would require substantial excavation within the stream corridor and questioned how the disturbed stream buffer would be restored following construction. He noted that the City's ordinance requires preservation of stream buffers and that restoration measures should demonstrate how the ecological functions of the stream corridor would be maintained or improved.

Ms. Erin Seele, City Attorney, stated that the notice of public hearing, the complete ZPC 26-10 application file, staff reports, consultant reports, peer review studies, recommendations, Ordinance 1175, the entire Ladue Code of Ordinances, and all documents submitted into the record would be considered as part of the public hearing.

Ms. Seele explained that because the Zoning and Planning Commission recommended denial of the rezoning request, no ordinance approving the Planned Development District had been prepared for Council's consideration. She advised that, following the close of the public hearing, the Council had four procedural options: 1) Council can either close the public hearing and continue the matter with no action taken; 2) Council can vote to deny the rezoning and associated general development plan, 3) if Council wants to approve the rezoning and development plan then Council can simply direct staff to prepare an ordinance that can then be considered at another meeting in accordance with the sunshine law; or 4) Council can return it to Z&P if there is something additional Council wants to be studied before voting.

Mr. Larry Lipsitz, 42 Woodcliff Road, stated that many residents felt betrayed by the process and that the City needed to rebuild trust between elected officials and residents. He referenced a petition reportedly signed by more than 1,000 residents and stated that it demonstrated significant opposition to the proposal. He asked the Council to repeal Ordinance 2401 and reconsider portions of the Comprehensive Plan related to apartments and higher-density housing. He also expressed concern regarding developers serving on City boards and commissions.

Mr. Mitchell Botney, 4 Woodcliff Road, stated that much of the discussion had focused on traffic and flooding but that the potential effect on the Ladue School District also warranted consideration. He expressed concern that additional population could contribute to continued enrollment growth, place additional pressure on school facilities, and result in future bond issues for expansion. He asked whether the City had evaluated the anticipated number of school-age children associated with the development.

Ms. Lesley Schoedinger, 6 Babler Lane, stated that she had only recently learned of the proposal through the Mayor's letter and was impressed by the level of

discussion at the meeting. She supported completing a non-steady-state floodplain analysis and cautioned that even relatively small developments can create unintended consequences. She stated that a project of this size required more time for review and referenced Ladue's historic emphasis on residential character, property values, and open vistas. She requested that the matter be tabled or denied.

Ms. Melanie Hancock, 4 Lindworth Drive, described her experience with flash flooding and expressed concern regarding the long-term viability of the apartment development. She questioned what might occur if the proposed rents did not produce the anticipated occupancy levels and whether rents could later be reduced in order to maintain profitability.

Mr. Ed Bayham, 21 Godwin Lane, expressed concerns regarding traffic, school enrollment, and development within a floodplain. He stated that raising building elevations might address certain immediate concerns but believed restoration of the property would be a better long-term use. He also questioned whether the development would generate sufficient revenue to address future maintenance and infrastructure needs.

Ms. Traci Pupillo, an attorney speaking on behalf of several residents, addressed the legal standards applicable to the rezoning request. She stated that Missouri law requires the City to apply its zoning regulations and argued that several requirements of Ordinance 2401 had not been satisfied. She cited unresolved floodplain, stream-buffer, traffic, parking, and infrastructure issues and noted that some of the required traffic improvements were not within the applicant's control. She also referenced the proposed increase in floodway velocity and the applicant's withdrawal of its variance request. Ms. Pupillo stated that a court reviewing the Council's decision would consider whether it was supported by the record and urged the Council to follow the Zoning and Planning Commission's recommendation of denial.

Ms. Mary Clayton, 9379 Tilles Drive, stated that the development would directly affect her family. She clarified that she was not opposed to every aspect of the proposal but was concerned about the scale of the multifamily component, the increase in population, and the ability of residents to travel through the area. She also expressed concern that additional traffic would increase congestion associated with Tilles Park during both regular use and special events.

Ms. Marjorie Ivey, 28 Godwin Lane, described the difficulties experienced by residents living north of Interstate 64 who rely upon McKnight Road for access to and from their neighborhoods. She stated that the subdivisions in the area are effectively landlocked and that widening McKnight Road could create additional safety concerns. She questioned whether the traffic consultants had adequately considered the experience of residents who use the corridor daily and urged the Council to prioritize public safety.

Ms. Mary Barnes, 11 Ellsworth Lane, discussed flooding she had experienced while living in different areas of the City and stated that additional excavation would not prevent water from continuing to flow through the area. She also described worsening traffic conditions near Interstate 64 and expressed concern regarding the loss of green space and the possibility of gas emissions from the nearby landfill. She opposed the proposal and stated that additional study was needed.

Ms. Andrea Prosperi, 1801 Deer Creek Lane, questioned the decision to construct additional residences within a floodplain. She also expressed concern regarding the timing of the proposed development in relation to the continued operation and future closure of the landfill and stated that future residents should be fully informed regarding methane vents and other conditions associated with the adjoining property.

Ms. Margaret Hvatum, 11 Ladue Ridge, stated that portions of the presentation concerning Deer Creek water levels were misleading and referenced conditions during the July 2022 flooding event. She also described a prior incident in which she was struck while crossing near McKnight Road and stated that the existing volume of traffic was already excessive.

Ms. Kelly Ainsworth, 6 Lindworth Drive, stated that she had reviewed the prior traffic studies and the Comprehensive Plan and believed those documents established the foundation for the current proposal without sufficient public awareness or engagement. She urged the Council to deny the application, citing environmental, school, traffic, and flooding concerns. She also requested that Ordinances 2330 and 2401 be returned to the Zoning and Planning Commission for reconsideration, that the Comprehensive Plan be reviewed with additional public participation, and that working groups be established to address traffic and flood mitigation.

Ms. Stacey Arnold, 672 Bellsworth Drive, identified herself as a watershed planner working with communities in St. Louis and Jefferson Counties. She stated that she had worked with the City of Ladue on watershed-related matters and extended an invitation for the City to engage with the Technical Advisory Committee of the Deer Creek Watershed Alliance. She suggested that the Alliance could help facilitate a broader planning process to evaluate the proposal within the context of the entire watershed.

Mr. James Bond, 9560 Park Lane, stated that he has lived at his property since 1988 which adjoins the Rock Hill Quarries site and that he had documented numerous incidents involving water in the right-of-way, his yard, and his home. He stated that floodplain areas are generally best suited for parks, recreation, or other uses that allow room for flooding and cautioned that engineering improvements may ultimately be overcome by future storm events. He identified flooding and traffic as his principal concerns and opposed the inclusion of rental apartments.

Mr. Marc Merbaum, 18 Ellsworth Lane, stated that the developer and builders would eventually leave the project while residents and the surrounding community

would remain responsible for its long-term consequences. He expressed concern that traffic conditions would worsen and that future climate conditions could increase flooding. He urged the Council to consider whether the development's permanent impacts were consistent with the community's long-term interests.

Council Member Burroughs moved to close the public hearing, with a second by Council Member Brennan. The motion passed unanimously.

Council Member Brennan then moved to deny the requested rezoning to and General Development Plan for a Planned Development District at the consolidated Rock Hill Quarries property. The motion was seconded by Council Member Burroughs.

Prior to the vote, Mayor Spewak invited each Council Member to state their position.

Council Member Kaufmann thanked the residents, applicants, consultants, and staff who participated in the process. He stated that he had spoken with many residents and believed the review process had helped educate the Council and community regarding the proposal. He stated that he would vote in favor of the motion to deny.

Council Member Howell expressed appreciation for the review process and stated that he had heard significant concerns from residents, particularly those in Ward I. He noted that several issues remained unresolved and stated that he would vote in favor of denial.

Council Member Brennan cited concerns regarding traffic, flooding, environmental impacts, public safety, and the potential effect of congestion on emergency response times. He stated that he would vote in favor of the motion to deny.

Council Member Kamps stated that she would vote in favor of denial. She expressed sincere appreciation to residents who spoke both in support of and opposition to the proposal and thanked them for participating respectfully. She also thanked the applicants, development team, consultants, City staff, and Council for the substantial time and professional effort devoted to evaluating the project. She encouraged all participants to conclude the process with grace and gratitude.

Council Member Hensley stated that he had participated in many conversations with residents and understood the concerns raised throughout the review process. He stated that he would vote in favor of denying the application.

Council Member Burroughs stated that the process had worked as intended and had been legitimate, thorough, and thoughtful. He acknowledged that the applicant and its consultants had presented credible information and had developed a proposal for a difficult site that offered potential opportunities. He also thanked City staff for their

work and recognized the significant investment made by the applicant in bringing the proposal forward. He stated, however, that several matters remained unresolved and that the Council was not in a position to approve the application. He stated that he would vote in favor of denial.

Upon voice vote, the motion to deny the rezoning and General Development Plan passed unanimously, with six Council Members voting in favor of denial and none opposed.

Mayor Spewak stated that the review process had identified significant concerns and that the Council had carefully considered the public comments, technical reports, staff recommendations, and input received from residents throughout the proceedings.

Upon discussion, Council Member Burroughs moved to refer Ordinance No. 2401 to the Zoning and Planning Commission for review and consideration of whether the ordinance should be repealed and whether the current restrictions and standards contained within the Planned Development District regulations remain appropriate. The motion was seconded by Council Member Hensley and passed unanimously.

Council Member Burroughs then moved to request that the Zoning and Planning Commission reopen and review the City's Comprehensive Plan with respect to its commentary and recommendations regarding mixed-use development in commercial and industrial districts. The motion was seconded by Council Member Howell and passed unanimously.

Council Member Hensley moved to direct the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance establishing a temporary stay on applications for Planned Unit Developments and Planned Development Districts involving property in commercial and industrial zoning districts until the Zoning and Planning Commission completed its review. The motion was seconded by Council Member Kaufmann and passed unanimously.

Mayor Spewak requested that staff prepare a report for presentation at the August City Council meeting regarding the history of the Rock Hill Quarries landfill, including the status of the landfill closure plan; the respective responsibilities of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources and the City with respect to landfill oversight and environmental regulation; applicable landfill buffer requirements; potential development and environmental considerations associated with the site; and the City's role in monitoring compliance with Missouri Department of Natural Resources requirements. There were no objections from Council.

Mayor Spewak thanked the members of the Zoning and Planning Commission, City staff, consultants, and residents for their time and participation throughout the review process. She stated that the public process had worked as intended and thanked the applicant for their vision and interest in investing in the city. She noted that the proposal reflected Ladue's desirability.

New Business:

Resolution 2026-25 A Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Execute on Behalf of the City of Ladue, Missouri a Service Agreement with Garage Technologies, Inc. for the Marketing and Sale of Surplus Fire Apparatus

Following discussion, Council Member Brennan moved to approve Resolution 2026-25, the motion passed unanimously upon a second by Council Member Hensley.

Old Business:

Bill 2335-A: An ordinance to amend Sections III, VII, and XVI of Ordinance 1175, the Zoning Ordinances of the City of Ladue, St. Louis County, Missouri, regarding recreational marijuana facilities.
This item was continued earlier in the meeting.

Report of Department Directors:

Senior Director of Public Services

Mayor and Council reviewed the Public Services Report drafted by the Senior Director of Public Services for June 2026. The Mayor ordered the report filed.

Financial Matters: The Mayor and Council reviewed the Significant Items in the Financial Report, Collector's Report, Treasurer's Report, Cash Flow Summary, and Investment Report for June 2026. The mayor ordered these reports filed for information.

The Mayor and Council reviewed Vouchers for Payment for the month of June 2026. Council Member Brennan moved their approval, upon second by Council Member Hensley the motion passed unanimously.

City Clerk: Mayor and Council reviewed the Report of the City Clerk for June 2026. The Mayor ordered the report filed.

Public Works & Building: Mayor and Council reviewed the report of the Director of the Public Works Department for June 2026. The Mayor ordered the report filed.

- **Municipal Courts:** Mayor and Council reviewed the Municipal Court report for June 2026. The Mayor ordered the report filed.

Police Department:

The Mayor and Council reviewed the Police Activity Report for June 2026. The Mayor ordered the report filed.

Fire Department:

The Mayor and Council reviewed the Fire Department Activity Report for June 2026. The Mayor ordered the report filed.

Report of the Mayor:

None.

Report from City Attorney:

None.

Reports of Various Board & Commission Meetings: The Mayor and Council reviewed the reports of various Board & Commission Meetings held in June 2026. The Mayor ordered the reports filed for information.

Adjournment: Council Member Kamps moved adjournment, with second by Council Member Brennan. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

APPROVED THIS 17th DAY OF AUGUST 2026.



Nancy Spewak, Mayor

ATTEST: 

Stacey Seymour, City Clerk