MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, June 10, 2010

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, June 10, 2010 in Chambers.

In attendance were: **Chair Matt Segal** (Ward I); **Councilmember Bruce Geiger** (Ward II), **Councilmember Mike Casey** (Ward III), and **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Mayor John Nations; Councilmember Lee Erickson (Ward II); Councilmember Randy Logan (Ward III); Maurice L. Hirsch, Jr., Planning Commission Chair; G. Elliott Grissom, Planning Commission Vice-chair; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Steve Jarvis, Assistant Director of Parks & Recreation; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Rob Heggie, City Attorney; Ben Niesen, Civil Engineer; Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Senior Planner; Shawn Seymour, Senior Planner; Kristian Corbin, Project Planner; Mary Ann Madden, Office Manager; and Kristine Kelley, Administrative Assistant.

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m.

Chair Segal explained to the audience the meeting procedures that would be followed.

It was noted that this was the final meeting for Planning Commission Chair Hirsch and that Commissioner Grissom will be taking on his responsibilities.

Commissioner Hirsch thanked members of City Council and the Planning & Public Works Committee for their cooperation and partnership that was shown to the Planning Commission. He is very proud and amazed of what has been accomplished due to everyone's support and leadership.

- New Residential Districts; including the PUD and Tear Downs and Additions.
- New "PI" and "PC" Districts
- New "PC&R" District for Downtown Chesterfield
- Wildhorse Overlay, New Parking Requirements, Tree Preservation Requirements, and Architectural Review Standards.

Chair Segal recognized and welcomed former Mayor Nancy Greenwood, former Councilmember Jane Durrell and former Councilmember Dan Hurt.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the May 20, 2010 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Casey made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of May 20, 2010**.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. **P.Z. 04-2010 Chesterfield Blue Valley (Chesterfield Blue Valley LLC)**: A request for a change of zoning from an existing "PC" Planned Commercial District and "NU" Non-Urban District to a new "PC" Planned Commercial District for 8 tracts of land totaling 137.606 acres located on the north side of Olive Street Road, west of its intersection with Chesterfield Airport Road. (17W520058, 17W540078, 17W530025, 17W530123, 16W210033, 16W210022, 16W230042, 16W230053)

STAFF REPORT

Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and surrounding area. Ms. McCaskill Clay stated the following:

- The Petitioner is requesting a change of zoning for eight tracts of land located along Olive Street Road in the west end of the Chesterfield Valley. Seven of these parcels are currently zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District. The eighth parcel of six acres, known as the Brasher tract, is zoned "NU" Non-Urban District.
- A Public Hearing was held on May 10, 2010 at which time one issue was brought before the Commission with respect to open space. The current "PC" District regulations require an open space of 35%; the Petitioner is requesting a reduction in open space to 30%. The existing Blue Valley ordinance, Ordinance No. 2443, already has a 30% open space requirement. The Planning Commission approved an open space requirement of 30% at its May 10th meeting.
- The Petitioner proposes to create a half-acre park surrounding a 47" caliper tree located on the Brasher tract in consideration of the 30% open space request. The Planning Commission also approved the following addition to the Attachment A:

> *The developer shall construct a one-half (1/2) acre park which shall be maintained and operated by the land developer. Said park is to be*

located in the southern portion of the site along Olive Street Road and shall include the forty-seven (47) inch Pecan Tree as shown on the Tree Stand Delineation. Specifics regarding the park design shall be provided during site development plan review.

- The Petitioner is also requesting additional changes to the Attachment A regarding previous traffic studies and language referencing improvements made.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Chair Hirsch stated that the Planning Commission considered the fact that the majority of the property had already been zoned with 30% open space. The Commission felt it was important to have the entire development under one governing ordinance. All outstanding issues were addressed and they are pleased with the proposed park. The petition was approved by a vote of 8-0.

DISCUSSION

Half-Acre Park

The half-acre park includes a 47" caliper monarch Pecan Tree, which is very rare in this part of the country. The park is not intended as a public park but as part of the development. Details for the park will be provided at the Site Plan stage.

Councilmember Logan asked if the park will be required to remain if the 47" caliper tree dies or needs to be removed. Ms. Nassif stated that the Site Plan will show the park and it will remain regardless of whether the tree is there or not.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Mike Doster, representing the Petitioner, stated that a letter was submitted today requesting additional changes to the Attachment A which "address planning practice, interpretation and historical updates that will give direction to various agencies in their reviews". The changes requested are as follows:

- I.B.1. should be deleted as current planning practice in the City does not include square footage limitations because other requirements such as open space, F.A.R. and parking will control density.
- I.J.14, 15, and 17 should have language that acknowledges the existence of the November 12, 2007 Traffic Study completed by Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier ("CBB Traffic Study") and further states that the requirements relating to rights-of-way, road improvements and access in Attachment A have been and will be guided by the CBB Traffic Study as it has been supplemented.
- I.K. should contain a similar acknowledgment and statement with respect to the CBB Traffic Study.
- I.M. should contain an acknowledgment that this requirement has been satisfied.

Mr. George Stock, Stock & Associates stated that there was a recorded Concept Plan for the original 131 acres. The Preliminary Plan now being presented is nearly identical

to the approved Concept Plan with the exception of six acres which is being incorporated into the development.

They have moved forward in the last 18 months with an extensive design of the road plans that follow the submitted Traffic Plan. The road plans have already been reviewed by all the agencies and their approval is pending a limited amount of items, more or less paperwork. The technical design has been completed. The road plans "contemplate the six acres, they show the widening across the six acres" so they do not anticipate having to start over the process.

Noting that the Committee has not had adequate time to review the requested changes, Councilmember Geiger suggested that the Committee vote on the rezoning and the request to reduce the open space only at this time. A motion can then be made at Council amending the Attachment A to incorporate the changes requested above by Mr. Doster.

Councilmember Casey made a motion to forward P.Z. 04-2010 Chesterfield Blue Valley (Chesterfield Blue Valley LLC) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults. The motion **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the June 21, 2010 City Council Meeting. See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on P.Z. 04-2010 Chesterfield Blue Valley (Chesterfield Blue Valley LLC)].

B. **T.S.P. 18-2010 Clearwire US, LLC (Wildhorse Springs):** A request to obtain approval for a Telecommunication Siting Permit for the purpose of collocating new antennas and the addition of equipment to the equipment compound at an existing telecommunications tower for a .41 acre tract of land zoned R3(PEU) at 132A Woodcliffe Place Drive in Wildhorse Springs Subdivision. (18T410128)

STAFF REPORT

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

The Petitioner is requesting a collocation for the purpose of adding the following:

- Install additional antennas and equipment to the existing tower for the purpose of providing Broadband internet service.

A public hearing was held on May 24, 2010 before the Planning Commission, at which time no issues were identified germane to the request at hand. However, there were a number of issues which relate to the operation of the tower, which are listed below:

Provide a timeline of when things were approved in this area:

- The tower operates under a "Conditional Use Permit", which was approved prior to the new telecommunications facility siting permit for cell towers in 1992. In 1993 the Wildhorse Springs Subdivision Plat 1 was approved as an R2 (PEU).
- In 1995 the tower was constructed, and later that year Plat 2 of the Wildhorse Springs Subdivision was also approved as a R2 (PEU). The tower is located in Plat 2.

Safety Concerns

- There were concerns as to whether Staff had reviewed any engineering study.
- Concerns over whether the tower was being inspected properly.
- Concerns as to whether the load of additional antennas would cause a detrimental effect to the existing tower.

As a requirement of the new Telecommunications Facilities Siting Permit, all Petitioners are required to provide Staff with an engineering study. The study provided by Clearwire indicates that the additional antennas will not cause a detriment to the other providers.

Hours of Operation

- The City received several complaints from residents regarding people working late at night performing maintenance. Staff contacted Crown Castle and it was verified that work is being performed during the hours of 9:00 pm – 4:00 am. It was explained that the work is performed during these hours in order to limit service interruption for both general calls and Emergency 911 calls.
- The use of heavy machinery is being done during normal business hours. City ordinance requirements limit construction activity and use of heavy equipment to the hours of 7:00 am – 6:00 pm Monday – Friday and 7:30 am – 5:00 pm on Saturdays.

Inappropriate behavior bv the maintenance personnel.

Staff was assured that both Crown Castle staff and the individual carrier personnel will be advised that this is not acceptable and will not continue.

Use of the generator

The City approved additional antennas and an emergency generator in 2009. The residents had concerns about how often it was being used and at the hours of operation. Councilmember Fults would like clarification as to whether testing needs to be performed on a weekly basis.

Cameras on the site
Staff has done a site inspection and did not notice any cameras, but Staff will investigate further.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Fults spoke to several residents and they understand that the tower was built prior to development of the subdivision. However, there continues to be ongoing issues with the three (3) existing carriers. Their concerns relate to after-hour operation and the use of unmarked vehicles. She concurs with the residents that the cars and personnel need to be identified and feels that the hours need to be restricted.

Councilmember Geiger asked whether the original approval allowed for work to be performed beyond the normal business hours and whether an amendment is required to change the hours of operation. Mr. Geisel noted that the original "Conditional Use Permit" did not restrict the hours of operation. He further explained that Clearwire's attorney has informed Staff that the work is scheduled during the late hours because the emergency service providers rely on the towers for Emergency 911 service and the minimal risk of a call occurring is during those hours. Staff will gladly look into the situation and follow-up with various dispatching services.

City Attorney Heggie indicated that the residents have valid concerns and he feels the current ordinance covers the situation of work being performed on the site. However, it does not cover the situation of unidentifiable vehicles or identification badges on the personnel. The Police Department will follow-up on calls relating to these issues. The issue of not wanting to interrupt the Emergency 911 service needs to be validated. He felt that the City has the ability to regulate the hours of operation by adopting a more stringent ordinance as it relates to cell tower sites. Mr. Heggie suggests the following:

- Get a better understanding of why the work needs to be done during those late evening hours.
- If the hours of operation can be regulated without disrupting the Emergency 911 system, then amend the existing Telecommunications Siting Ordinance or amend Chapter 7 of the Maintenance Code.

Councilmember Fults noted that work is being done too often at the site – sometimes on a weekly basis. She further noted that additional carriers will result in more maintenance workers and that work is being done too often. She would like to have the intended maintenance schedule.

Councilmember Fults asked whether the Petitioner has adequate bonds and insurance to protect the neighbor's property in the event of a fire or fallen tower. It was noted that the Telecommunications Facilities Siting Permit approved in 1997 has such requirements.

Chair Segal suggested a special "after-hours" maintenance permit to allow for after-hours operation in order to control such activity. Mr. Geisel noted that the existing ordinance covers those activities. However, there is a specific exemption that can be granted for life safety issues.

Mr. Geisel recommended holding the request until the issues raised are addressed by Clearwire.

Councilmember Logan suggests that if the work is being done by outside contractors, they must be required to carry identification badges and that the vehicles be marked. City Attorney Heggie stated that this can be taken into consideration.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to hold T.S.P. 18-2010 Clearwire US, LLC (Wildhorse Springs). This item will be placed back on the agenda as soon as issues are researched by Staff at which time the Petitioner and the tower owner are to be in attendance. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger. The motion **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

It was noted that if Clearwire and the tower owner are unable to attend the meeting, the petition will be held until they are able to attend.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers in Opposition:

1. Mr. Allen Goldberg, 201 Wildhorse Springs Court, Chesterfield, MO stated that he lives three lots down from the tower and asked for clarification on the following:

- He was told by the developer that the tower was under a 25-year lease and would like to know whether that is a fact.
- He understands that the tower was built prior to the subdivision development, but would like to know whether the tower owners must comply with the same subdivision indentures. Mr. Heggie recommended that Mr. Goldberg look at those indentures and the Plats that have been filed. The City cannot enforce those indentures, but the subdivision can.
- Once the lease expires, who will maintain or remove the tower? He would also like a copy of the lease. Mr. Heggie stated that he will find out who the titled owner of the lot is. The City cannot control whether the owner decides to renew the lease. If the tower becomes incompliant with the City's code then the tower would have to be removed but this is very unlikely.
- Lights on the tower to warn low-flying aircraft of the tower's existence are no longer being lit.

2. Mr. Larry Wilson, 129 Woodcliffe Place, Chesterfield, MO stated that he and his wife have several letters from residents for review by the Committee. He is requesting that the Committee deny the request and then further stated:

- He confirmed that the tower is under a 25-year lease and was originally done by Mrs. Ruether and Cybertel.
- He has concerns about the "Conditional Use Permit" and would like it revoked. He also noted that the C.U.P. requires that it be in non-urban setback lines and he would like this to be reviewed. It was noted that the document referencing the non-urban setback lines pre-dates the existence of the subdivision.
- It has been documented that these towers do pose a hazard; it is within striking distance of residential homes.
- The impact to his residence is more visual and he would like Staff to look at the architectural features such as; the chain-link fence and the neglected landscaping surrounding the site.
- He would also like Staff to review the equipment and the new lines that have recently been added.
- He requested information on the amount of the required bond.

Chair Segal recommended that Mr. Wilson discuss any further issues with Staff or Councilmember Fults.

C. T.S.P. 23-2010 Excell Communications (724 Straub Road) – EXEMPTION FROM PUBLIC HEARING REQUEST.

STAFF REPORT

Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the site and surrounding area. Ms. McCaskill-Clay stated the following:

The subject site is located near Parkway West High School and is surrounded by a chain-link fence. There are currently existing monopole towers on the property. The Petitioner is proposing the following:

- Remove three (3) existing antennas and replace them with three (3) new antennas of similar dimension.
- Add a Node B Flexi cabinet to the existing equipment yard for the site. The Petitioner feels that since there are no substantial changes to the site, it qualifies for exemption from public hearing.

Councilmember Casey asked whether there is a resident that shares the roadway with the site regarding maintenance issues. Ms. Nassif indicated that under another application there were issues relating to access and road maintenance, but Staff was advised that those issues have been addressed by the applicant on that previous petition and the property owner.

Councilmember Casey made a motion to forward T.S.P. 23-2010 Excell Communications (724 Straub Road) – EXEMPTION FROM PUBLIC HEARING REQUEST to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults. The motion **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Note: This is a Request for Exemption from Public Hearing for a Telecommunications Siting Permit, which requires approval by City Council. A voice vote will be needed at the June 21, 2010 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, for additional information on T.S.P. 23-2010 Excell Communications (724 Straub Road) – EXEMPTION FROM PUBLIC HEARING REQUEST].

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to move Agenda Item H. Eberwein Park Development Phase I & II up on the agenda to be heard next. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

H. Eberwein Park Development Phase I & II - Report

Chair Segal pointed out the months of effort put into the upcoming presentation and commended Staff for the "phenomenal report and great job in presenting some of the vision" as directed by Council.

Ms. Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director, stated that she is representing the whole Project Team to talk about the Eberwein Park Development. Ms. Nassif acknowledged and thanked the following Staff members for their assistance on the project; Ben Niesen, Kristian Corbin and Steve Jarvis.

Ms. Nassif gave a PowerPoint Presentation outlining the following.

Purpose of the Phase I & Phase II Report is to:

- Provide a status update on project goals & timeline
- Provide a detailed site analysis of existing conditions
- Get direction on uses for the park
- Get direction on the existing structures
- Report on the work of the Citizen Participation Committee
- Obtain comments on the general plan layout
- Provide "ballpark" cost ideas
- Share preliminary ideas and recommendations from Staff

Since the last meeting on this topic, the Project Team has been working hard on the following tasks:

- Site Assessment
- Structural Assessments
- Secured the Site
- Preliminary Meetings with MSD
- Funding Research
- Meetings with the Citizen Committee, representatives from the Landmarks Preservation Committee, and the Historical Commission to discuss possible uses for the park
- Conducted a use analysis by researching zoning codes and development codes to determine which uses could be feasible taking into consideration preliminary direction received by Council
- Preparation of a General Layout sketch

Existing Structures:
There are five existing structures on the site.

- Chicken coop – approximately 300 sq. ft.
- White shed – approximately 364 sq. ft.
- Ranch-style home – approximately 2400 sq. ft.
- Barn structure – approximately 2000 sq. ft.
- White house – approximately 2100 sq. ft.

St. Louis County has inspected both the barn and the white house and determined that they are not unsafe and do not pose an imminent hazard. However, since that first inspection, a load-bearing column has been taken from the porch of the house. St. Louis County's Chief Building Inspector re-assessed the structure and has stated, "*The missing column creates a danger of collapse of part of the porch roof which is a structural and a life safety hazard. The lack of stair railing and porch guard rail are also safety hazards*." Since then, the City has taken steps to secure the building with wood beams to avoid any safety issues.

Funding for the White House and Barn
Staff has been working diligently trying to find funding to save both structures. The report includes a breakdown of costs involved in restoring the structures and operational costs. Several municipalities have been interviewed about their experiences with restoring older buildings. Staff has researched numerous funding options including:

- Federal grants
- State grants
- Non-profit groups
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Department of the Interior
- Grants online
- Home Depot and Lowes

Unfortunately, municipalities do not qualify for most grants unless they are associated with a 501(c)(3) partner.

Staff also met with Jim Foley with Faust Parks to see if there would be an interest in moving the structures. After inspecting the structures, Jim Foley determined that they are not historically significant due to the updates made to them.

Recommended Uses for the Park

Noting that Council is interested in keeping the site as a "passive park", the following uses are recommended:

- Dog Park
- Trail System
- Open Play Area
- Children's Natural Playground – A natural playground utilizes large rocks, logs, and slides built into hillsides to keep a natural feel of the area.
- Picnic Area
- Community Garden
- Water Quality Area –Natural Vegetation/Conservation Area – This is the area in the center of the site around the stagnant pond, which is a national wetlands area. The area would be used as a conservation area to satisfy water quality requirements of MSD and the Army Corp of Engineers.

Two Stages of Development

Staff had been asked to separate the development into two stages so that the dog park would be the first stage. The development has been divided into two stages as follows:

- Stage 1: Construction of Dog Park, Parking Area, and necessary associated improvements such as restroom facilities and other uses/items as directed by City Council.
- Stage 2: Construction of remaining uses as approved by City Council such as trail system, children's natural play area, etc.

Dog Park Area

The Dog Park would be approximately two acres in size and would include separate areas for small dogs and another area for both small and large dogs..

Phase I & II of the process includes, but is not limited to:

- Getting approval to move forward on the Dog Park.
- Getting approval on the general location inside the park.
- Providing ballpark costs

Phase III of the process involves:

- Showing the dog park area on the Preliminary Plan.
- Providing projected costs for the Dog Park and detailed drawings, including materials and amenities.

Ballpark Cost Assessment for the Dog Park

The Appendix of the Report includes an Assessment of Costs—this is a "ballpark" figure and not preliminary or actual costs. This is to be used as a point of reference only. If directed to move forward on the Dog Park and required infrastructure, Staff will provide projected cost estimates along with specifics regarding amenities and features in the Phase III Report.

Estimated Costs for the Dog Park Area	
Fence	$80,000
Benches	2,100
Trash/pick up stations	3,700
Sod	15,360
Drinking fountains	3,700
Total possible cost	**$104,860**

Amenities for consideration	
Small shelter	$40,000
Water feature	25,000
Landscaping	9,200
Small agility toys	5,000
Total possible cost	**$79,200**

Other necessary improvements to facilitate construction of the dog park area	
Parking lot	$123,500
Trail/path to dog park area	2,000
Restrooms	200,000
Total possible cost	**$325,500**

TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	
Dog Park Area	$104,860
Possible Amenities	79,200
Possible Improvements	325,500
Grand Total of Possible Cost	**$509,560***
***Costs do not include disposition of the buildings**	

Master Plan Design Strategy

Staff worked with the Citizen Committee whereby the members were broken up into teams to where we had design charrettes and drew sketch ideas of where the different elements of the park could possibly be located. From these meetings and from various conversations with other persons involved in the project, Staff drew up a General Layout of the park. This is not a Plan. It provides Staff with a conceptual idea for uses and

structures as a point of reference in order to complete the Preliminary Plan. This does not provide specific information such as building size, exact number of parking spaces, public improvements, etc.

Phase III will include:

- A Preliminary Plan showing the number and size of buildings, parking, and public improvements
- Projected Costs for Stage 1 – the Dog Park
- Initiating the change of zoning to "Park & Scenic District" – currently the site is zoned "Non-Urban"
- Stage 1 site plan drawings, materials, and architectural renderings

Phase IV will include:

- Master Plan for Stage 2 details including signage, theme, and materials
- Stage 2 site plan drawings including landscaping, lighting, and architectural renderings
- Stage 2 Projected Costs
- Stage 1 improvement plans

Phase V will include:

- Final Master Plan drawings
- Improvement Plans for Stage 2
- Final costs complete.

Staff has recently learned that the center area of the site where the stagnant pond is located is on the National Wetlands Map of the Army of Corp of Engineers. This national designation will involve additional meetings and permits affecting the timeline of the Master Design.

DISCUSSION

Mayor Nations commended Staff "for the tremendous job on the report – it's very thorough, it's very good and it's everything that we've asked for. Once again, you have time a tremendous job." He expressed his appreciation for all of the citizen participation involved on this project.

Park Monuments

When the City was working on acquiring this site, the Eberwein family was promised that the park would be named ***Eberwein Park*** as a memorial to the family. In addition, appropriate monuments are to be placed at Old Baxter & Highcroft and at Old Baxter & Baxter Road commemorating the site as Eberwein Park. The Mayor also asked that an historical marker be placed on the property explaining its history.

Suggested Uses & Amenities

- Baseball field for "pick-up games" – It was suggested that a backstop and minor grading may be all that is needed to accomplish this. It was felt that an open field area could easily be graded in the area adjacent to Highcroft and Old Baxter.
- A small pavilion about the size of 20' x 30'.

Water Quality Area

Councilmember Geiger questioned whether the water quality area could grow in size and whether there are any concerns associated with it. Mr. Geisel replied that there are multiple concerns with this part of the site. When the site is developed, the storm water has to be controlled. Because it is a wetland, it has to be kept but needs to be cleaned up. With the Phase II EPA clean water requirements, the City would be responsible for the amount of suspended solids in the water that is discharged and the chemical content of the storm water that is discharged. There are a variety of things that can be done with the site - such as: rain gardens; sand filters; or structural devices could be constructed. It was noted that wetlands are a natural cleaning filter for storm waters, which is a nice amenity that can be enhanced. The Army Corps of Engineers has already been advised that the City will most likely be pursuing an Enhancement Permit to improve this area.

ADA Requirements

Councilmember Fults asked if all amenities have to be handicapped accessible. It was noted any facility would have to be ADA-accessible. Ms. Nassif pointed out that the building code for a Dog Park does not require a restroom – but if one is built, it will need to meet all ADA requirements.

Mr. Geisel clarified that any public facility needs to be ADA-compliant. However, there can be multiple routes to a location - not all of which need to be ADA-compliant. As long as there is at least one viable ADA-compliant route to a facility, it satisfies ADA requirements.

Parking Requirements for a Dog Park

Ms. Nassif stated that parking for a dog park is the same requirement for any park. The City will follow the parking requirements for the Park & Scenic District for this site, which will be between 28-40 spaces.

Open Play Area

Ms. Nassif estimated that the open play area will be around six acres in size.

Citizens Committee

Councilmember Erickson requested a list of names of the residents who participated on the Citizens Committee.

Revenue Associated with Dog Parks

Ms. Nassif stated that some municipalities have dog parks that are free of charge; other municipalities charge fees in the range of $50-$75 per year. It is anticipated that the City will charge a nominal fee, which will assure that pets have been properly inoculated. It is not expected that such a fee will be "revenue-positive"; it will merely offset the maintenance cost of the dog park.

Funding for the White House

Question was raised as to whether the white house would qualify for a U.S. Historical site designation if it was designated as an historical site by the Chesterfield Landmarks Preservation Commission or the Historical Commission.

Ms. Nassif stated that she has reviewed the preliminary eligibility requirements for placement on the register and is not sure that either structure would quality. However, Staff is not recommending that this option not be pursued. If so directed, Staff could apply for such a designation. She confirmed that if the house was placed on the National Register, it would open up more avenues for funding. Most of the funding agencies require a partnership with a 501(c)(3) organization. There has been discussion with the Landmarks Preservation Commission about possibly partnering with the Heritage Foundation, but nothing has been verified yet.

Mr. Geisel pointed out that because there have been modifications and modern updates to the facilities, the National Register does not consider them to be in historic condition.

Councilmember Geiger asked if the Eberwein family had offered any information about the structure that may be of historical interest. Mayor Nations replied that the family does not view this house as an historic structure – to them, the home now owned by the Doty's is considered the Eberwein homestead.

Grading on the Site

Councilmember Logan stated that he walked the site from the ranch house down to the current pond and noted that there is a noticeable rut running through the property, along with channeling ruts. He asked how the rutting can be limited. Mr. Geisel stated that there are a variety of strategies to address this issue – such as terracing, minor grading to disperse concentrated flow, vegetated mats, landscaping, rain gardens, infiltration trenches, etc.

Landscaping of the Site

Councilmember Logan stated along with berms and trees bordering the park site, he would like to see the introduction of native grasses and wild flowers to enhance the view. Ms. Nassif stated that these options are definitely being considered.

Disposition of the Five Structures on the Site

Because the report just became available this week, it was agreed that no decision would be made regarding destruction of any of the structures at this time. Mayor Nations would like to give the public the opportunity to review the report and to come forth with any ideas regarding uses for these structures.

Next Phase

Councilmember Casey asked what Staff needs from the Committee at this point to move forward. Mr. Geisel replied that if the Committee is in agreement with the presented concepts and uses, Staff needs the Committee's consensus to move forward to Phase III, which would involve the design of the Dog Park and the completion of the overall schematics for the rest of the park.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers

1. Nancy Greenwood, former Mayor of Chesterfield, 14441 Corallin Drive, Chesterfield, MO noted her concerns with the Report as follows:
   - There is no comparison to the farm house on Clayton Road, which was preserved by the City of Town & Country. This site includes; the farm house, a walking trail, and open space. She suggested that the City review what steps Town & Country took to preserve this farm house.
   - Regarding the reference in the Report to "Return on Investment", she noted that most reports concerning parks and recreation do not mention a "return on investment" because parks and recreation are considered an asset to the City. She questions the necessity of the farmhouse having to fund itself. She feels that the farm house and red barn offer opportunities to children right in the center of the City.
   - She asked that Staff check back with the Heritage Foundation to determine if there is the possibility of forming a partnership with them for the purpose restoring and maintaining the farm house.
   - The Report does not mention possible funding options through the St. Louis County Municipal Parks Grant program. She noted that the City of Wildwood received a grant of $290,000 through this agency to help with the "Old Pond School Project". She felt that the site has qualifying facilities for this grant money. She suggested that the farm house could be preserved in phases.
   - She urged the Committee to continue exploring funding options for the white house and red barn.

2. Alice Fugate, 14165 Cross Trails Drive, Chesterfield, MO stated the following:
   - She feels that just because a structure does not qualify for the National Register, it could still be considered "historic". The farm house is at least 100 years old and was lived in by early immigrants – it is part of the cultural identity of Chesterfield.
   - She feels that Chesterfield has the opportunity to show other municipalities what can be done with such a structure. The house could give the area "some character and distinctiveness".

- She encouraged the Committee to think of ways it could be incorporated into the park.
- She noted that the Landmarks Preservation Commission offered to put the house on the Chesterfield Register and is still interested in doing so.

3. Ms. Jane Durrell, 177 Gunston Hall Court, Chesterfield, MO stated the following:
   - She was one of 11 residents on the Citizens Participation Committee and she believed everyone on this Committee is in favor of saving the white house. She personally would like to see the white house, and possibly the barn, saved. She feels the other three structures on the site could be removed.
   - The house "has been deemed structurally good, it's a sturdy house, it's pleasant to look at, and would be an excellent model of an old farm house in the center of town. The plus side is that it's already owned by the City and it's already on the property."
   - She noted that the white house would not qualify for the National Register.
   - The Historical Commission feels that the house could be used for a number of things, such as meetings, fundraising events, and small weddings.
   - She does not think it would not take as much in restoration costs as what is being projected in the Report. She is of the opinion that restoration costs for the exterior, a new roof, making it ADA-compliant, and meeting codes could be done with $150,000.
   - She has concerns with the Report's reference to cost benefits as parks do not give a monetary return on investment "the return on parks is intangible".
   - Regarding the Heritage Foundation, she noted that the Foundation is willing to support the City in saving the white house but is not able to act in the capacity as a 501(c)(3) partner to the City in this endeavor due to the amount of work and effort that is required.

Mayor Nations addressed the concern expressed by both Mrs. Greenwood and Mrs. Durrell that the decision on saving the house is related to an R.O.I. He noted that the R.O.I. is not the determining factor – the question is whether the house can fit into the park plan and whether the City can justify spending public money on it. Council always asks Staff to research the costs related to any project being explored but the City's decision is not based solely on whether the structure would generate revenues.

Chair Segal asked Mrs. Durrell her feelings about restoring the house to a non-functional use and locking it up - but having it on site for aesthetic purposes. Mrs. Durrell indicated her agreement with such a purpose.

4. Joan Schacht, 15099 Manor Creek Drive, Chesterfield, MO asked that the City consider doing a true cost analysis of the house before any decision is made with its disposition. She also asked that money be invested in the house to keep it from further deterioration and vandalism.

The Chair called for a five-minute recess. Councilmember Casey excused himself from the meeting at this point.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to accept the Eberwein Park, Phase I and Phase II Site Analyis, Status and Recommendation Report as presented without making any immediate determinations to the disposition of any of the existing structures. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

D. Amendment to Section 1003.168.C.6 regarding signs for outdoor public art and art displays (Councilmember Casey)

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to hold the Amendment to Section 1003.168.C.6 regarding signs for outdoor public art and art displays until the next Planning & Public Works Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember _Fults. The motion **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

E. Chesterfield Valley Stormwater

STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works stated that the City has been actively working with the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District and the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District for stormwater management for Chesterfield Valley since the City's incorporation. In 2009, the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District conveyed responsibility of the stormwater system to the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District in the Chesterfield Valley. Since the Valley spans two municipalities (the City of Chesterfield and the City of Wildwood), the City now has centralized control.

A Memorandum of Understanding is being presented whereby the City of Chesterfield acts as the reviewing agency for the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District for the entire Chesterfield Valley. He is requesting that the Committee authorize the execution of the Memorandum of Understanding, with the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District which would then be forwarded to City Council for approval.

The second request pertains to the water quality improvements. Staff strongly believes that the stormwater system that is being built serves the purpose of water quality for the entire Chesterfield Valley. The Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District and the State of Missouri do not hold those same opinions.

There are extensive engineering and negotiations involved with such a project – approximately $75,000 has been spent. Several sources have contributed to this project; the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District, St. Louis County and the property owners. He recommends that since there are TIF Deferred Revenue Project funds available for stormwater management, that the City fund a share of this effort, in an amount not to exceed $50,000.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Geiger made a motion recommending that City Council authorize the City's participation in funding this engineering effort, in an amount not to exceed $50,000 paid for from the TIF Deferred Revenue Projects Fund. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults. The motion **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

Councilmember Geiger then made a motion recommending that City Council authorize the City Administrator to execute the Memorandum of Understanding with the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District.

Councilmember Logan asked whether the Memorandum of Understanding is for the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District to assume responsibility for the operation of the stormwater within the Chesterfield Valley. Mr. Geisel stated that the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District currently holds that responsibility for the stormwater system in the Valley. This commits the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District to acknowledge that the City of Chesterfield will be the review authority on stormwater and will be the floodplain manager for the Chesterfield Valley and will defer their execution of all those related things to the City.

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults. The motion **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on Chesterfield Valley Stormwater].

F. Chesterfield Historic Commission Mission Statement

Councilmember Fults made a motion to accept the changes to the Chesterfield Historic Commission Mission Statement as recommended by the City Attorney. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger.

It was noted by Ms. Nassif that the Chesterfield Historical Commission was aware that the proposal was on the agenda and there were no issues or concerns from the Chair Barb Whitman.

City Attorney Heggie stated that there needs to be a better clarification on the City's relationship with the Chesterfield Historical Commission and the Chesterfield Landmarks Preservation Commission. Mr. Heggie also mentioned that at one time there was discussion about merging these two Commissions.

Mr. Geisel stated that originally the Mission of the Chesterfield Historical Commission was to create and promote interest in the history of the Chesterfield region. This document will provide direction to those recommending bodies.

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults. **The motion passed by a voice vote of 3 – 0.**

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on Chesterfield Historic Commission Mission Statement].

F. Public Notification Policies and Procedures – Discussion

It was agreed by the Committee to defer this discussion until the next Committee meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.