

MEMORANDUM



TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, March 8, 2012

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, March 8, 2012 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Connie Fults** (Ward IV); **Councilmember Matt Segal** (Ward I); **Councilmember Derek Grier** (Ward II); and **Councilmember Randy Logan** (Ward III).

Also in attendance were: Mayor Bruce Geiger; Councilmember Barry Flachsbart (Ward I); Councilmember G. Elliott Grissom (Ward II); Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Planning Commission Chair Amy Nolan; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks; Tom McCarthy, Director of Parks and Recreation; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Justin Wyse, Senior Planner; and Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the February 9, 2012 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Logan made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of February 9, 2012. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grier and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0**.

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Chesterfield Outlets: A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for a 48.625 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the north side of N. Outer 40 Road, east of Boone's Crossing.

Before discussion began, Chair Fults explained to those in attendance the format in which the meeting would be conducted.

STAFF REPORT

Justin Wyse, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and the surrounding area. Mr. Wyse stated the following:

The Petitioner is requesting the development of a 472,282 square foot outlet retail development along N. Outer 40 Road, west of the existing ice rink on a 48.625 acre site of land. The request would permit the development of an outlet retail center with internally oriented buildings and open pedestrian streets / courtyards. The project was before the Architectural Review Board on February 9th, 2012 at which time numerous items were discussed. The Board passed a motion to move the project forward with several recommendations by a vote of 5-0.

The project was before the Planning Commission on February 27th, 2012. After discussion of numerous items, the Commission recommended approval by a vote of 6 – 2. Discussion included; the northern façade facing the levee trail, parking lot lighting, lighting of the architectural towers, traffic concerns, recycling opportunities, disturbance of the levee, water table elevation, open space and drainage, parking, and length of the site. The Ordinance governing the site includes a provision for automatic power of review by the City Council.

Land Use and Zoning of Surrounding Properties

Direction	Land Use	Zoning
North	Levee / Trail	“FPNU” Floodplain Non-Urban District
South	N. Outer 40 Road and I-64	n/a
East	Ice Rink	“PC” Planned Commercial District
West	Office / Bank	“PC” Planned Commercial District

Traffic Access and Circulation

Proposed access to the site is provided by four points along N. Outer 40 Road. MoDOT, St. Louis County Department of Highways and Traffic and the City of Chesterfield Department of Planning, Public Works and Parks have all reviewed the proposed access points and all issues have been resolved.

Additionally, a traffic study was submitted to all necessary agencies and has been approved. As part of this study, improvements were identified that will be required to maintain appropriate operations along the public roadways. The following is a summary of the improvements that will be constructed as part of this development.

North Outer 40 Road at Boone’s Crossing:

- Install traffic signal.
- Widen the east leg to provide two eastbound through lanes and two westbound lanes.
- Widen the west leg as required for through lane transitions.

WB I-64 Ramps and Boone's Crossing:

- Increase the storage length of the three exit ramp lanes.
- Reconstruct the medians on the north and south legs to provide a third southbound through lane.
- Upgrade traffic signal equipment and timing plans to coordinate the four signals on Boone's Crossing between North Outer 40 Road and Chesterfield Airport Road. It was noted that the signals on Boone's Crossing Road are owned and operated by MoDOT and the signals on Chesterfield Airport Road are owned and operated by St. Louis County. There will be coordinating signal timing improvements and equipment upgrades.

North Outer 40 Road:

- Extend the four-lane widening on North Outer 40 Road from Boone's Crossing east to the location of Access Driveway 2 which will permit all traffic movements. The eastbound lane will be a dedicated left-turn lane into the development.
- Construct a curbed median on a segment of North Outer 40 Road to restrict traffic movements at Access Driveway 1 to right turns in and out.

Landscape Buffer

The Tree Preservation and Landscape Requirements ordinance requires a 30 foot landscape buffer along N. Outer 40 Rd. The proposed development of Chesterfield Outlets exceeds this requirement along the entire frontage. The buffer includes various landscaping including trees and lower lying landscaping (e.g. bushes, grasses).

The western portion of the frontage along N. Outer 40 does not provide plantings within the buffer area. This is due to the Protective Excavation Zone and sight distance requirements associated with the geometrics of N. Outer 40 Road / the western most driveway. A 478 foot easement has been placed over the site to insure the integrity of the levee. The Levee District will not allow anything to penetrate below a certain depth with respect to what can be constructed or planted.

Internal Landscaping

The proposed Landscape Plan includes numerous planting within the pedestrian mall area of the development. Plantings are generally accommodated in the middle area of the pedestrian area helping to soften the interior of the development. The proposed landscaping is detailed on the landscape plans.

Open Space

City of Chesterfield Ordinance 2682 requires a minimum of 30% open space for the development if the required storm water improvements along the southern frontage of the site are enclosed (35% is required if the improvements are not enclosed). The proposed development encloses the required improvements, thus complying with the condition to allow for 30% open space. The proposed development exceeds the minimum open space requirement and proposes 33.5% open space.

Screening

The site plan proposes an internal pedestrian environment where some of the “business areas” are pushed to the outside. To address this issue the developer is proposing two (2) types of screening to avoid monotony along the southern and the western sides of the buildings. Vertical green elements are being added to the screens where deep-root plantings are not allowed.

Parking Lot Lighting

The parking lot includes 93 fixtures mounted on 24 foot LED light (including the fixture) standards. The Lighting Ordinance has a list of acceptable lighting sources that are allowed with a provision for exceptions. Staff has reviewed the submitted photometric plans in detail and has no issues. Mr. Wyse then provided photographs taken during the evening hours of several locations throughout the St. Louis area which utilize the LED technology. The LED technology provides a more natural light as compared to other types of lighting. The lighting plan that was submitted has light levels that comply with the code requirements.

Towers

There are several entrances within the development that are marked by towers on each side. There are LED lights installed on the towers which are designed to emit a glowing effect.

Building Materials

The general structure materials will consist of tilt-up concrete, EIFS, brick and stone with aluminum and glass store fronts.

Due to concerns by the Planning Commission of the view from the levee, Staff coordinated with the Petitioner to provide the Committee with a realistic rendering of the back side of the levee.

The Architectural Review Board recommended the following:

1. *Provide additional architectural detailing on the east side of the building similar to the west and south sides.* Changes have been made to the proposed eastern elevation of the eastern most building (Building P). Initially, this elevation consisted primarily of exposed painted concrete tiltwall with painted concrete accent bands. To address this comment, the proposed elevations now break the eastern façade up and include brick veneer segments in addition to concrete tiltwall.
2. *Trash enclosures will only be located on the north side of the development.* All trash locations are shown on the submitted plan on the north side of the development. Additionally, a general note has been included on the plans that trash areas will only be included north of the proposed buildings.

3. *Transformers on the south side of the building will be completely contained within the screened walls adjacent to the retail development.* A general note has been included on the plans to this effect. Additionally, future applications for zoning approval for building permits will be required to provide verification that transformers will be completely screened.
4. *Roof drains, gutters, and downspouts on the south side of the development will be internal.* The submitted elevations reflect that no exterior mounted drains are proposed on the southern elevations. A general note has been included on the plans to clarify these drains will be internal.
5. *The petitioner will provide bike racks along the north side facing the levee trail.* A bicycle rack has been added to the northwest portion of the site adjacent to the connection between the parking area and the levee trail.
6. *Planting materials on the green screens located on the south side of the building should be clarified and provide year round coverage.* Proposed planting is included on the landscape plans for the screens. The screens are proposed to be plantings with an English Ivy (evergreen) to help provide screening during all times of the year. The City Arborist has reviewed the proposed vegetation and had no concerns.
7. *All wall mounted utilities will be painted to match the building and they will be installed below the height of the screen wall.* Any piping, conduit, etc., that needs to be mounted above the screening or that needs to be continued up to the roof line, is to be integrated into the exterior facade. A general note has been added to plans. Additionally, staff will review all submittals for building permits and follow-up with site inspections to ensure compliance.
8. *Roof screening materials are required to screen equipment on all four sides.* Details for the proposed rooftop screens are included on the SDP and Elevations. A general note has been included on the SDP that rooftop mechanical equipment will be screened from all directions.
9. *Additional architectural detailing materials and/or the inclusion of storefront or spandrel glass at the entry portals on the south side as well as pedestrian access ways between the buildings should be included; and*
10. *Alternate materials or finishes should be included / increased to reduce the amount of painted tilt up concrete.* The submitted elevations include numerous changes along the southern building, as requested by the Architectural Review Board. The proposed elevations seek to combine these two comments from the Board, by (1) including storefront glass in areas previously proposed EIF's infill panels, and (2) replacing highly visible portions of concrete tiltwall with either brick or stone.

DISCUSSION

Chair Fults stated that six points were discussed at the Planning Commission Meeting, upon which the Committee will focus their discussion.

Parking Reduction

Mr. Wyse explained that the Applicant submitted a request for a parking reduction asking that their minimum parking requirement be based upon the gross leasable area vs. the gross floor area. Based on studies of shopping centers from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, American Planning Association, and the International Council for Shopping Centers, and the Urban Land Institute, *gross leasable area* is identified as the variable that impacts parking. Using the *gross leasable area* for this site results in a 6.6% parking reduction (149 spaces), which is reflected in the plans.

Councilmember Logan expressed concern about the 273 compact parking spaces along the north side of the building as he felt the spaces would inevitably be used by larger vehicles. He pointed out that if the compact spaces were converted to full-size spaces, the parking in this area would be reduced to 180 spaces, bringing the total parking down to 2,090 spaces vs. the 2,183 spaces being requested. He would like to see more full-size parking spaces in this area than all the proposed compact parking spaces.

Mr. Wyse stated that the standard parking stall width is 9 feet and the proposed compact spaces are 8 feet wide. He noted that a full compact space is actually only 7 to 7.5 feet wide. The compact spaces have been located at the rear of the site because it is envisioned that the majority of this parking will be utilized as employee parking.

Back of the Site (North Elevation)

Chair Fults stated that the Planning Commission brought up the concern about what would be seen from the levee trail taking into consideration the amount of money the City has put into the trail system. She then directed the Committee to the picture of the site included in the Meeting Packet.

It was noted that the distance from the centerline of the levee trail to the edge of the parking area is approximately 30-40 feet.

Trash Areas

Councilmember Grier asked for information as to how closely-spaced the trash areas are along the rear of the site. Mr. Wyse stated that there is quite a bit of separation between the trash enclosures. It was also noted that the site will be utilizing four compactors (40' long and 6' feet high) instead of dumpsters with the compactors being about one-third of the way in from each end of the site. The trash enclosure wall is 9'6" tall.

Mayor Geiger asked whether trail users would be looking down inside the trash enclosures. It was indicated that this would not be the case.

Chesterfield Arts Master Plan

Councilmember Segal stated that THF has adopted the Chesterfield Arts Master Plan in contributing to art between the levee and their development and asked whether the Petitioner has any interest in contributing to this program considering their proximity to the levee.

The Petitioner indicated that there is such an interest. He went on to say that since there is 100 feet from the centerline of the levee trail to the building, there is ample room for art displays.

Greenery

Planning Chair Amy Nolan stated that at the Planning Commission Meeting she had suggested the idea of a “live wall” to provide greenery to the back side of the site.

The Petitioner agreed that adding greenery to the back of the building is a good suggestion but indicated that there are restrictions to the amount of planting that is allowed in this area near the levee. He pointed out that there are 20-foot wide “green” islands between the parking spaces on the back side of the site.

Long Expanse of Buildings

Chair Fults asked how the long expanse of buildings would be broken up in order to add interest to the site as seen from the levee trail.

Mr. Wyse stated that the elevations indicate that the back of the site will include a “painted concrete façade and brick textured painted concrete at base”. The Petitioner is not proposing brick on the northern façade, but the textured concrete is intended to give the effect of brick.

Chair Fults expressed concern that the view appears to be a “straight wall” without any indentations that could provide visual interest. It was then noted that there are 8-10 foot wide offsets in the building, along with height differences providing vertical relief.

Mr. Stock explained that the finished floor is at elevation 468.1, which is one-tenth of a foot higher than the 500-year flood on the river. The trail is approximately 474 so the building’s finished floor is six (6) feet below the trail. Consequently when a person is on the trail, he will not be looking down on the roof of the building.

Utility Connections/HVAC Units

Mayor Geiger asked whether the utility boxes and connections would be visible from the levee trail. It was noted that they are not visible – they are all interior to the project with connections penetrating the roof and circulating inside the building. The HVAC units are on top of the building and are fully-screened.

Mr. Wyse noted that these items were discussed in-depth with the Architectural Review Board and notes detailing such are required on the plans.

Traffic at the Rear of the Site

Mr. Stock noted that the traffic is two-way. There is a 26-foot wide fire and levee district access road, and a total of 44 feet of width from the sidewalk along the back of the building to the curb.

RV/Bus Parking

There are four parking spaces at the rear of the site (near Building F) for RVs and buses.

Councilmember Segal asked if it is possible to move these spaces from the back of the site. Mr. Stock indicated that they could possibly be moved to the western or eastern portion of the site, but questioned whether moving them would be ideal. He felt they would look undesirable in other parts of the site.

During additional discussion, the Petitioner stated that since the site is not in a major tourism area, it is not felt that RV and bus parking will be a frequent occurrence.

Grass Area between Levee Trail and Parking Lot

It was noted that the proposed grass area between the levee trail and parking lot cannot be irrigated because the area is not allowed to be trenched.

Proximity to the Levee

Chair Fults noted that the Committee members were given copies of the Levee District's comments letter regarding the proposed project.

Mr. Geisel stated that while the Levee District plays a role in this project, the requirements for the restrictive area are established by the Army Corps of Engineers. These requirements are based on soil borings to determine the underlying strata. The subject site is nine (9) feet above the ice arena, which has a sand berm requirement from the rear of the building to the levee because the underlying material is more granular than the underlying material at the subject site, which is primarily clay. Due to the soil borings at the subject site, the Corps of Engineers has not required a sand berm, but the restrictive area is not allowed to be penetrated.

Chair Fults referred to the Levee District's comments and asked who is responsible for making sure all the comments are addressed. Mr. Geisel replied that a restrictive easement has been established and all the restrictions are legally attached to the property. Both the Levee District and the Army Corps of Engineers are responsible for insuring that these items are addressed. In addition, City Staff will be inspecting the site prior to issuing any permits for grading, etc.

Low Pressure Waterline Warning System

Chair Fults stated that the buildings are required to have a low pressure waterline warning system and asked for more information on the processes involved with respect to a low water pressure event. Mr. Geisel stated if a line develops a leak, there is a loss

of water resulting in a loss of pressure which triggers an alarm. In such an event, the Levee District would have to be notified and immediate repairs would have to be made.

Mr. Stock added that the fire loop that goes around the building, as well as the fire suppression system in the building, has a link tied to the owner of the mall, the Monarch Fire District, and the Monarch Chesterfield Levee District which alerts all of these entities when there is a water pressure drop.

Access to the Levee

During discussion, it was noted that there is an existing access to the levee from the west side of the project, which will be maintained.

The existing road on the east side will be improved up to the levee. In addition, when the site was rezoned, the Petitioner was required to provide a public access easement on both sides of the property.

Parking Lot Lighting

Mr. Geisel reported that the parking lot lighting is in full compliance with the City's Lighting Ordinance. The proposed lighting is fully-shielded, fully cut-off, and below the maximum height permitted by the City Code.

Councilmember Segal pointed out that LED lighting is desirable – “it is a clean, efficient, direct light for which the developer is spending extra money in order to have more efficient, concentrated light with less bleeding.”

Councilmember Flachsbart agreed that LED is desirable and encouraged the Committee to direct the Department to prepare updates to the City's Lighting Ordinance regarding LED lighting.

Lighting on the Building

Chair Fults stated that the lighting on the building was discussed at Planning Commission where there was the perception that neon lighting was being proposed for the towers. Mr. Geisel clarified that neon lighting is not being used on the building towers – in addition, the proposed bands of LED lighting are not exposed; they are behind an architectural element and provide a wash of light up against the façade.

Architectural Review Board (ARB) Recommendations

Mr. Wyse provided information on the recommendations from ARB:

- The original submittal proposed a painted concrete façade. ARB recommended that the Petitioner mimic the mixture of materials that are being proposed on the far western building (Building A), which the Petitioner has incorporated.
- ARB asked the Petitioner to review the materials and the amount of concrete vs. brick and stone. The Petitioner has upgraded the materials at each entry portal, with the exception of Building J which is proposed as a vending area and not visible to the public.

Councilmember Flachsbart pointed out that painted concrete walls will peel after a time and asked if the City can insure that maintenance is done on a timely basis. Mr. Geisel suggested proposing an amendment that would require the condition of the exterior colors and materials be maintained at an acceptable level. The Petitioner noted that the longevity of the paint is 15-20 years.

Mr. Geisel pointed out that the longevity of the paint is directly related to the quality of the application, the penetration of the material, and the paint color. For comparison purposes, he stated that the City's Public Works Facility has been painted three times since it was built.

Councilmember Logan commended the Architectural Review Board for their recommendations, which he feels have greatly improved the look of the project.

Signage

Councilmember Segal asked for information about the signage for the development. Mr. Geisel stated that pylon signs are not normally permitted and that the maximum height allowed would be 20 feet if approved by Planning Commission. The permitted height under the sign ordinance is six (6) feet.

The Petitioner stated that they would be submitting a full sign package for the site.

Mr. Wyse stated that, at this time, the Committee would be approving only the locations of the freestanding signs, which are noted on the Site Development Plan. The sign package is reviewed and approved by Staff and the Planning Commission.

Ms. Nassif pointed out that sign packages encourage flexibility but also allows a developer to submit signs that may exceed the City's code. It was agreed that Staff would inform Council members when the sign package has been submitted.

Traffic

Chair Fults stated that the Planning Commission expressed serious concerns of potential backups along Highway 40. Mr. Geisel was asked to respond.

Mr. Geisel explained that there are all sorts of conditions contributing to highway backups. The following improvements will be made to help alleviate traffic backups:

- The addition of 270 feet in additional bay length to both of the left-bound turn lanes.
- Continuous right-turn storage of 750 feet.
- A signal at North Outer 40 Road.
- St. Louis County Department of Highway and Traffic (SLCDHT) and the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) are working together to coordinate traffic signals between Chesterfield Airport Road and Boones Crossing.
- There will be two (2) thru lanes up to the main entrance at the center of the development.

- Two additional lanes (1 eastbound and 1 westbound lane) along with a center turn lane.

Staff is confident that all scenarios have been addressed. Based on this development and the traffic that it could generate along with the improvements that the City, MoDOT and St. Louis County have required, Staff feels that the travel demand will be satisfied and does not expect traffic back-ups to be a routine occurrence.

Median

The small median past the entrance to westbound Highway I-64 will be reconstructed so that the thru-lane being proposed will be a continuous route through the intersection, which will then become the southbound left-hand turn to access eastbound I-64.

Boone's Crossing

Chair Fults asked for information on the changes from Boone's Crossing going left towards the CVAC Facility. Staff replied that there will be a new right-hand lane and then a traffic signal as opposed to a stop sign. Councilmember Logan noted that the traffic study shows that the traffic time will actually improve as you are exiting the highway.

Access Management

Councilmember Segal referred to the undesirable traffic situation at West County Mall and asked Mr. Geisel to address traffic management at the proposed site. Mr. Geisel responded that the viability of retail centers is directly related to how people can enter and exit the development and whether it is a good user experience. The City of Chesterfield has, and will continue to be, actively involved with access management, along with being very careful about the spacing and frequency of curb cuts. He is confident the proposed site will perform as demonstrated in the model.

Additional Development in the Area

Councilmember Logan has concerns about how traffic will be impacted if there is ever another development on the east side of the Hardee's Iceplex. Mr. Geisel replied that one of the improvements is a slip ramp off of Highway 40 and an interchange at Baxter Road. There is a limit of how much a bi-directional two-lane road can handle, but he did not feel that 200 more cars per hour would impact traffic. If the entire 50-acre parcel is developed, it will be necessary to include an additional access point.

Additional Access Point

Councilmember Segal asked as to whether a Swingley Ridge Road extension has been considered in order to give another access point into the development. Mr. Wyse responded that in the City's long-range plan there are proposed improvements connecting Swingley Ridge Road to N. Outer 40 Road.

Councilmember Segal made a motion to forward Chesterfield Outlets to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grier.

Councilmember Segal then amended the motion to require that 1) the developer maintain the condition of the exterior, and 2) that the City Council be notified of the submittal of the sign package at Planning Commission. Councilmember Grier accepted the amendment to the motion which then **passed** by a voice vote of 4 - 0.

Note: This is a Site Development Plan which requires a voice vote at the March 26, 2012 City Council Meeting.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director for additional information on Chesterfield Outlets].

Councilmember Flachsbart then asked about including Power of Review for sign packages to the City Code.

B. Eberwein Park improvements

STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks stated that there has been discussion about the need for additional parking due to the huge success of Eberwein Park. The City Street Division has already added 12 additional paved parking spots for a total of 34 spaces.

There is the possibility of adding approximately 12 additional parking spaces to the “interior” of the loop, which Staff proposes to be pervious spaces. Staff does not recommend paving the spaces with hard surface because it could overtax the storm sewer and rain garden. Because the dog park has proven to be so popular, an alternative is to consider constructing an additional, smaller dog park at a second location.

Mayor Geiger has reservations of adding a second dog park and recommends obtaining costs for 12 additional parking spaces.

Councilmember Segal pointed out that the dog park is still a novel idea for many residents and it is possible that the usage will lessen over time. He is concerned that if additional parking is added, residents are going to perceive the park as moving away from the original idea of being a “passive park”. There have already been reports from the neighboring residents that the parking situation is becoming overwhelming. Councilmember Grissom expressed concerns that the overflow parking is extending onto Old Baxter Road which is not allowed.

Mr. Geisel felt that the costs associated for additional parking spaces would be roughly \$5,000 or less. Staff does not recommend it at this time, but there are two (2) options to help alleviate the overcrowding problem, 1) increase the cost of the dog tags or, 2) limit the number of dog tags for sale.

After further discussion, it was agreed that there is an immediate need for the additional parking.

Instead of doing gravel parking, Councilmember Logan asked whether it would be beneficial to include “pavers with grass”. Mr. Geisel replied that pavers are an option but there are substantial costs associated with this type of feature. Mr. Geisel stated that due to time restraints, a gravel parking lot can be added with minimal expense and if the additional parking is successful, pavers or other pervious materials can be added after the prime use, peak season.

Councilmember Logan made a motion to authorize the construction of additional gravel parking spaces at the Eberwein Park. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Segal and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

C. Daniel Boone Bridge – Municipal Agreement

STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks stated that the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) has initiated the process to solicit design bid proposals for the construction of a new Missouri River Bridge at the west end of Chesterfield. Staff has worked with MoDOT project Staff to preserve our ability to incorporate enhancements into the project when designed. Accordingly, MODOT has prepared an agreement similar in scope and content to previous agreements for the Clayton Road project and Route 141 project, which defines the responsibilities and processes associated with the potential added amenities.

Mr. Geisel noted that it does not obligate the City to accept or fund the enhancements. It does, however, provide for the City to fund the enhancements if the City so elects. He added that the project is to be delivered via a design build mode. Possible amenities may include; areas for landscaping, identification signs or logos in the MSE walls, concrete form liners, tinted concrete, decorative lighting, and /or sign posts.

Councilmember Segal made a motion recommending that City Council authorize the City Administrator to enter into a Municipal Agreement with the Missouri Department of Transportation Commission for potential enhancements to the Daniel Boone Bridge. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grier and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks, for additional information on Daniel Boone Bridge – Municipal Agreement].

D. Sidewalk at Baxter and Wild Horse Creek Road

STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks stated that after discussions with residents and Councilmembers, it is suggested that a small area of sidewalk be constructed at the intersection of Baxter and Wild Horse Creek Road. The property is owned by Sachs Properties and it was confirmed that they will grant the necessary easements for the City to construct the sidewalk. It would cost roughly \$35,000 to build the sidewalk and would require appropriation of funds by City Council. Construction of the sidewalk will offer pedestrians safe access to the Central Park.

Councilmember Logan made a motion to approve construction of a sidewalk at Baxter and Wild Horse Creek Road with a fund transfer of \$35,000 from the General Fund – Fund Reserves to the Capital Projects Fund and to forward to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Segal and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

E. Amphitheater security cameras

STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks stated that the Public Works and Parks Staff have been working with both the Police Department (PD) and Information Technology (IT) Staff in an effort to increase security at the amphitheater for.

It has come to Staff's attention that security cameras are necessary due to recent graffiti related incidents. The security cameras are fixed and will be placed around the amphitheater.

In addition to security, these cameras offer the future ability to stream live video if the City would elect to offer that type of service. The cameras will be linked directly into the existing security cameras at City Hall.

In order to minimize duplication of systems, hardware, software, space and to simply use existing hardware and software in lieu of purchasing separate equipment; Staff determined it was in the City's best interest to simply add security cameras at the Amphitheater into the existing security system backbone. The security outputs are then fed wirelessly back to the City Hall system. *The proposal to design and install the equipment is \$18,465. The project will be fully funded by proceeds of the Phase Two Park Improvement Financing.*

As required by the City's purchasing procedures, any purchase in excess of \$5,000 for a sole or proprietary purchase must be approved by City Council.

Councilmember Logan made a motion to approve \$18,465 for the installation of **Amphitheater security cameras** to be funded by proceeds of the Phase Two Park Improvement Financing and to forward to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grier and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning, Public Works and Parks, for additional information on Amphitheater security cameras].

IV. OTHER

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:18 p.m.