

Memo

To: Mike Herring, City Administrator
From: Mike Geisel, ^{MOBck} Director of Public Works/City Engineer
Date: May 28, 1998
Re: Minutes – Public Works/Parks Committee Meeting, May 21, 1998

A meeting of the Public Works/Parks Committee began at 8:15 pm on Thursday, May 21, 1998. All members of the committee were in attendance: Councilmember Barry Flachsbart (Ward I), Chairperson; Councilmember Barry Streeter (Ward II); Councilmember Dan Hurt (Ward III); and Councilmember Mary Brown (Ward IV). Also in attendance were Mayor Nancy Greenwood, Councilmember Linda Tilley, City Administrator Mike Herring, Director of Public Works/City Engineer Mike Geisel, Superintendent of Parks, Recreation and Arts Ron Coleman, Terry Weatherby of the Parks, Recreation and Arts Citizen Advisory Committee, Rex Cobb, Barb Nauert, and Mary Gherardini – trustees of Clarkson Woods South subdivision, Robert Coerver of Chesterfield Families for a Voice, Charles E. Schmidt, and Katie Humphreys.

The order in which agenda items were addressed was adjusted to accommodate the guests in attendance.

Item 12) City Administrator Herring explained the desire of the developer of Chesterfield Commons, who is constructing the new interchange in Chesterfield Valley east of Boone's Crossing, to name the street over the bridge Chesterfield Commons Crossing and to obtain conceptual approval of the appearance of the overpass. An artist's rendering of the overpass was distributed. After discussion about changing the name, the use of TIF, the implication of the name and developers choosing names of streets in subdivisions, Councilmember Hurt motioned and Councilmember Brown seconded to approve the name "Chesterfield Commons Crossing", as requested by the petitioner, and to approve the appearance of the bridge. The motion failed, 2-2, with Councilmembers Flachsbart and Streeter voting in opposition.

Councilmember Brown reported that the developer had indicated the proposal was modeled after a bridge near Boulder, Colorado. Ms. Brown has recently seen the bridge and it is very attractive. She requested information regarding whether the same terracing and brick would be used. **Councilmember Flachsbart moved and Councilmember Streeter seconded to give conceptual approval to the appearance of the bridge. The motion passed unanimously.**

Councilmember Streeter moved and Councilmember Flachsbart seconded that the interchange be named Boone's Crossing. After questions and discussion about the historical significance of the area and the name, the motion and second were withdrawn. **Councilmember Flachsbart moved and Councilmember Streeter seconded that the suggestion of an appropriate name for the interchange be referred to the Historical Commission. The motion passed unanimously.**

Item 1) Councilmember Brown moved and Councilmember Streeter seconded to accept the minutes of the March 17, 1998 meeting. The motion passed 3-0, with Councilmember Hurt abstaining.

Item 4) City Engineer Geisel summarized the history of the Clarkson Woods South sidewalk project. In the Fall of 1997, after receipt of a request for construction of a sidewalk on the east side of Clarkson Road between Country Ridge Drive and Clarkson-Wilson Center, the Public Works/Parks Committee recommended that funds be included in the 1998 budget for construction of a sidewalk. Staff was to notify adjacent property owners, solicit their input and report back to the Committee. Letters of opposition and support have been received. Funds for the project exist in the 1998 budget. Final direction from the Committee is needed before design and construction of the sidewalk is initiated. The Committee heard opposition to encouraging students to walk along Clarkson Road as opposed to the sidewalks that are in the adjacent subdivisions and support for providing safer passage for students who currently walk along the shoulder of the road. Further discussion included current sidewalk requirements, people's desire to take the shortest route to their destination, difficulties that must be addressed to construct the sidewalk, alternate routes, the need for a controlled crossing across Clarkson Road, the corporate limits of the City of Chesterfield, landscaping, berms, rails or other barriers between the sidewalk and the drainage channel to address safety concerns, ADA requirements, Ward 4 councilmembers being in favor of the project, residents of the subdivision voting 60% in favor of the project, and the clarity of the issue on which that vote was taken being questioned. **Councilmember Brown motioned and Councilmember Streeter seconded to proceed with construction of the project. The motion passed, 3-1, with Councilmember Flachsbart voting in opposition.**

★ **Item 11)** City Engineer Geisel reviewed his May 15, 1998 memo regarding a funding strategy for completion of construction of the Chesterfield Athletic Complex. He recommended that \$188,000 in capital funds be redirected to the project and that \$445,900 of the Special Allocation Fund of the TIF district be used to extend infrastructure to the site. City Administrator Herring explained that the TIF Commission has indicated it will defer to City Council. The TIF Commission originally did not fund the entire cost of construction due to the limited amount of unallocated funds available at the time and anticipated cost sharing by the proposed minor league baseball complex. The minor league complex is no longer proposed and adequate funds now exist in the Special Allocation Fund. Upon questioning, Mr. Geisel explained that other funding sources were identified to keep the request for TIF funding at the original level. **Councilmember Brown moved and Councilmember Flachsbart seconded to recommend to the full City Council that an additional \$633,900 of unallocated TIF funds be used to complete the Phase I improvements at the Chesterfield Athletic Complex. The motion passed unanimously.**

★ To be discussed at Monday's meeting

City Engineer Geisel noted that the Parks, Recreation and Arts Citizens Advisory Committee is reviewing and prioritizing items for the Phase II funding package and will forward to the Public Works/Parks Committee a list of priorities and estimated costs.

Item 2) Councilmember Streefer moved and Councilmember Brown seconded to approve the following committee/commission liaisons:

Beautification Committee	Councilmember Brown
Citizens Committee for the Environment	Councilmember Brown
Chesterfield Arts Commission	Councilmember Hurt
Historical Commission	Councilmember Sheppard
Parks, Recreation, and Arts Citizens Advisory Committee	Councilmember Streefer
Public Works Board of Variance	Councilmember Flachsbart
Public Works Citizens Advisory Group	Councilmember Flachsbart
Transportation Committee	Councilmember Tilley
Valley Master Development Study Committee	Councilmember Hurt

The motion passed unanimously.

Councilmember Brown nominated Councilmember Streefer for Vice-Chair of the Public Works/Parks Committee. Councilmember Flachsbart seconded. Councilmember Streefer was elected unanimously.

Staff will notify liaisons by telephone prior to each committee meeting.

Item 3) City Engineer Geisel reported that Councilmembers Brown and Tilley have requested that concerns related to finish grades be referred to the Public Works Citizens Advisory Group (PWCAG) to discuss what additional controls or requirements could be placed. Councilmember Streefer moved and Councilmember Brown seconded to refer consideration of additional controls or requirements related to finish grades to the PWCAG. The motion passed unanimously.

★ **Item 5) City Engineer Geisel explained that St. Louis County still holds the escrow for some subdivisions that are located in Chesterfield. The City Attorney has been working with St. Louis County on the matter and has prepared an ordinance to accept transfer of these escrows to the City. Councilmember Hurt moved and Councilmember Brown seconded to recommend adoption of the ordinance for accepting assignment of subdivision development deposit agreements from St. Louis County. The motion passed unanimously.**

★ **Item 6) Superintendent of Parks, Recreation and Arts Coleman summarized the survey of area municipalities' policies relative to employee use of City facilities. City staff recommends that employees and their families be allowed use of the City pool at no charge. Councilmember Brown moved and Councilmember Flachsbart seconded to recommend to the Council that City employees and their families, excluding elected officials and their families, be allowed free use of the City pool. After discussion related to overcrowding, wanting employees to identify with the facility as "their" park and a nominal charge, the motion failed, 2-2, with Councilmembers Hurt and Streefer voting in opposition. Councilmember Streefer motioned and Councilmember Hurt seconded to recommend to the full City Council that the City provide free admission to the City pool to City employees, excluding elected officials, and charge employees \$25 for a family pass. After discussion, Councilmember Flachsbart**

moved and Councilmember Brown seconded to amend the motion by reducing the \$25 charge to \$15. The motion to amend failed, 2-2, with Councilmembers Hurt and Streeter voting in opposition. **The motion for free admission to City employees and \$25 family passes for employees passed by unanimous vote.**

Item 7) The Chesterfield Historical Society has requested concurrence from the City regarding installation of historic markers at five locations in the City. The markers would be located on State and County roads and the Historical Commission would be requesting permission from the appropriate agency on behalf of the City. **Councilmember Flachsbart moved and Councilmember Brown seconded to concur with the proposed installations. The motion passed unanimously.**

Item 8) City Administrator Herring reported that the Public Works/Parks Committee previously requested that staff prepare specifications for leaf vacuuming services and prequalify bidders. Limited response was received to the City's request for proposals. As detailed in City Engineer Geisel's May 4, 1998 memo, it is recommended that the City make sample specifications and a list of known contractors available to residents and subdivision organizations for their use without warranting or providing an opinion as to the contractor's suitability. **Councilmember Streeter moved and Councilmember Brown seconded that the availability of sample leaf vacuuming specifications and information be publicized in the Chesterfield Citizen newsletter. The motion passed, 3-1, with Councilmember Hurt voting in opposition.**

★ **Item 9)** City Engineer Geisel reported that the Beautification Committee proposed purchase of flag banners for display around the 4th of July. The banners would be hung on the brackets that were installed for the Celebrate Chesterfield banners. The purchase cost would be around \$8,500 for 100 banners and the cost to both put them up and take them down would be \$2,200 per occasion. **Councilmember Streeter moved and Councilmember Brown seconded to recommend transfer of \$10,000 from contingency to Parks for purchase and installation of 100 flag banners for the 4th of July and, due to time constraints, to approve a change order for purchase of banners from the vendor who provided the Celebrate Chesterfield banners. The motion passed unanimously.**

Item 10) Councilmember Streeter explained that there was a significant problem with mosquitos at the CCA complex and expressed concerns that the matter be addressed for the Chesterfield Athletic Complex before it opened. **Councilmember Streeter motioned for staff to investigate how to best control mosquitos at the Chesterfield Athletic Complex. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Brown and passed unanimously.**

Item 12) City Engineer Geisel informed the Committee that this was Parks Superintendent Coleman's last meeting. The Committee thanked Mr. Coleman for his service to the City, congratulated him and wished him well in his new position.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m. The next meeting of the committee was not scheduled.

cc: Mayor Nancy Greenwood
Department Heads/Executive Staff

3

DATE: April 30, 1998
TO: Mike Herring, CA
FROM: Mike Geisel, DPWCE

JJG
5/1/98
cc: Mayor
City Council
City Attorney

SUBJECT: Grading issues

It has come to my attention that there is a growing misunderstanding with regard to the City's ability to inspect and control final grades on subdivision lots. As such, I have developed the following information for your use.

When a subdivision is initially approved, the Department of Public Works concurrently approves the Site Grading Plan. This plan depicts the rough grading for the site, absent any structures or final grading related issues. This plan generally locates stormwater swales and defines the boundaries of watersheds as well as the tributary areas to each stormwater inlet. A grading permit is issued based upon our engineer's evaluation of the proposed grading compliance with the minimum standards of our grading ordinance. Our grading ordinance is generic in that it deals with any grading activity, not just new developments or subdivisions. The existing grading ordinance requires that grades be within 1/2 foot of the grades proposed on the approved plans. The grading ordinance which existed prior to November 3rd of 1997, required grades after construction to be within .02 feet of the grades proposed on the approved plans.

Please note that the grading plan approved for residential subdivisions and developments depicts rough grading only. It relates to site grading, before any houses or structures are built. The grading ordinance lists a specific exemption for grading that is incidental to the construction of a foundation of a house or pool (see below). As such, the spoil materials that are taken out of the excavated foundation are not subject to the provisions of our grading ordinance and no separate grading permit is required. On any given lot, the final grades are dependent upon the size, type and location of the actual house construction. For example, if a multi-story house is constructed, the foundation is smaller and there is less spoil material that is left. The developer may construct the house two feet above the street on the driveway side to allow for disposal of the excavated material. If, however, the proposed house is a ranch with a large building footprint; the builder may set the house four feet above the street on the high (garage) side. The finish grade adjacent to the house will be approximate 8" below the foundation. If, however, the builder elects to construct a house with a walk-out basement; the finish grades can easily vary ten (10) feet from the same house without a walk-out. City Inspectors only inspect the rough grading to provide proper hydraulic function and ensure that vegetation is established. The final grades after construction of the homes will most likely vary considerably from the grading plans submitted and approved by the City.

In addition, The City of Chesterfield does not control or regulate the elevation that houses are to be built. The developer is free to set their house at any elevation they choose

Mike Herring
Grading Issues
Page two

relative to the street. The builder may elect to build their home above the street or below the street grade, depending on surrounding terrain. Obviously, this can seriously impact the flow of stormwater within the confines of a specific lot. It is the prospective home buyer who enters into a contract for the construction of a home with specific parameters. As such, the home buyer must determine whether or not their contractual conditions have been met prior to closing. The City currently has no ability to control or influence this relationship. Prior to adoption of the recent zoning revisions, the right of way was required to be graded to flow toward the street. A significant revision incorporated in the zoning regulations now requires the street shoulder to slope toward the street curb for a distance of four feet, but can then slope either up or down to facilitate placement of the house foundation at any elevation to impact the surrounding grade to a lesser extent. It is less prevalent, but still within standard construction practices, that some houses are set below the street grade to more closely fit in with the lay of the land.

St. Louis County currently inspects structures within the City under terms of a contractual agreement. This contract does not currently provide for St. Louis County inspectors to view grading or other site features outside of the structure. The contract could be modified to require this effort as part of the building permit inspection process. Please note that this would require St. Louis County to inspect lot grading, per the plot plan submitted with the application for a building permit. These grades would not necessarily reflect the rough grades depicted on the City approved engineering plans. However, the City's engineering division could easily incorporate a review of the rough grading when plot plans are approved for zoning approval. Please note that, at the present time, the City has no policy or legal requirement that plot plans depict grades; or other information that we would need to incorporate such a review. We would also require that plot plans depicting this information be signed and sealed by either a surveyor or engineer in conformance with state licensing requirements.

I hope this memorandum helps to eliminate confusion as to what ability the City currently has to manage and control grading. If you have questions or require additional information, please advise.

CC Teresa Price, Director of Planning
Bonnie Hubert, Superintendent of Engineering Operations