

MEMORANDUM



TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, December 9, 2010

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, December 9, 2010 in Conference Room 101.

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

Also in attendance were: Acting-Mayor Barry Flachsbart; Councilmember Randy Logan (Ward III); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); G. Elliott Grissom, Planning Commission Chair; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Justin Wyse, Project Planner; and Kristine Kelley, Recording Secretary.

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

Chair Segal welcomed everyone in attendance and recognized the Committee and Non-committee members, Planning Commission Chair Grissom, former Councilmembers Jane Durrell and Dan Hurt.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the November 18, 2010 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of November 18, 2010. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 3 - 0**. Chair Segal pointed out that Councilmember Casey was not in attendance.

II. INTERVIEW FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPOINTEE

Speaking on behalf of Councilmember Casey, Councilmember Logan stated that Mr. Wuennenberg is a Trustee of Chesterfield Hill Subdivision and has expressed his interest in volunteering for the City. Both Councilmembers Casey and Logan would like to recommend his nomination for Planning Commission.

Nominee Response

Mr. Wuennenberg stated that he has been a Trustee for six years and explained how he was involved with the clean-up process of the ponds within the subdivision. The ponds had filled up with silt and were becoming very unsightly and the mosquito population was becoming a problem. After working with an engineer and Mr. Jeremy Craig with the City, a plan was developed in the most cost effective way to remedy the situation.

Councilmember Geiger asked if Mr. Wuennenberg had any interest in any property within the City of Chesterfield that could potentially come before the Planning Commission. Mr. Wuennenberg replied that besides his residence, he did not own any additional property. He then added that this would be a great opportunity to be involved within the community.

Councilmember Geiger noted that although the activity level is low, the Planning Commission continues to meet twice a month, so attendance and dedication is important. He then thanked Mr. Wuennenberg for his willingness to serve.

Councilmember Fults recommended that he be prepared for each meeting and that he be willing to speak up and ask questions. It was noted that Mr. Wuennenberg had no plans to relinquish his post as Trustee of Chesterfield Hill Subdivision.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward Mr. Steven Wuennenberg's nomination for the Planning Commission to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 3 – 0.**

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. **Amendment to City of Chesterfield City Code Sec. 18-111. Parking of Recreational Vehicles on Residential Lots.**

Due to other items on the agenda and to allow further research by Staff, Chair Segal asked for a concurrence of the Committee to hold discussion on this item until the next committee meeting.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to hold Amendment to City of Chesterfield City Code Sec. 18-111. Parking of Recreational Vehicles on Residential Lots to be discussed at the next scheduled meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 3 – 0.**

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 09-2010 Four Seasons West (Schuyer Corp.):** A request for a change of zoning from a “PC” Planned Commercial District to a new “PC” Planned Commercial District for a 2.35 acre tract of land located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Olive Street Road and River Valley Drive. (16Q230260)

STAFF REPORT

Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director stated that Schuyer Corporation, on behalf of Four Seasons West, petitioned the City for a change of zoning to add additional uses to the site. The primary use they are seeking is an adult day care facility.

The Public Hearing was held on November 22, 2010 and at that time there were a few issues brought up relative to the hours-of-operation, which have been incorporated into the Attachment A; existing uses with comparison to the permitted uses being requested - specifically a question arose regarding grocery stores, which is now included in the Attachment A but limited to the size and scope. There were concerns from some residents regarding a loud speaker that one of the tenants had. Since that time, the City has received notification that the loud speaker has been disconnected so that is no longer an issue.

Planning Commission recommended approval by a vote of 7 – 0. As part of the request for change in zoning, the petitioner requested a modification to the required open space. The “PC” Planned Commercial District regulations require 35% open space. The Petitioner requested that 23% open space be required to match the current conditions on the site.

A separate 2/3 affirmative vote was required for a positive recommendation regarding the modification to the open space requirement. The motion passed by a vote of 7 – 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Planning Commission Grissom stated that there was one issue pertaining to noise from a trash truck, but Ms. Nassif confirmed that the trash truck belonged to the adjoining development.

Chair Segal reiterated that the Petitioner is requesting the rezoning to add the new use of an adult day care service.

Petitioner Response

Mr. Art Sommers responded that they would welcome the opportunity to bring the adult day care service to the City of Chesterfield. The Petitioner contacted the local churches as to whether there was a need for this type of service and the response was very

positive. The facility will be open from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm with 20 – 25 persons per day.

DISCUSSION

Question was raised by Councilmember Logan as to the square footage of the building. The Petitioner responded that the size would be approximately 3,600 square feet - no parking issues were identified. It was noted by Chair Segal that all meals will be catered from an outside source. Ms. Nassif confirmed that the facility will not have any overnight stay.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward P.Z. 09-2010 Four Seasons West (Schuyer Corp.) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 3 – 0.**

It was noted that there are no other adult day care centers within the City of Chesterfield.

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the January 3, 2011 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. 09-2010 Four Seasons West (Schuyer Corp.)].

B. Snow Removal Reimbursement Program – Formula Adjustment

STAFF REPORT

Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer stated that City Council directed Staff to adjust the formula used to determine the eligible reimbursement amount to the private subdivisions that participate in the Snow Removal Reimbursement Program.

Correction on Report

Mr. McGownd pointed out that City Council only approved \$75,000 for 2011 not the \$100,000 as indicated in the report.

After reviewing the history of the program, the current formula, and the overall financial exposure to the program, Staff recommends a 25% reduction in the formula, with a total expenditure cap of the budgeted amount, which is \$75,000 for the program budget in 2011. The reimbursement amount of \$6,000 per mile of street will be reduced to \$4,500, and the \$50 per unit reimbursement will be reduced to \$37.50. Staff will make the necessary adjustments to the reimbursement amounts in order to stay within the \$75,000 budgeted for the program.

Mr. Geisel added that there are subdivisions that qualify for the program but do not participate which allows for the 25% reduction. It was noted that gated communities do not qualify for the program.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to approve the Snow Removal Reimbursement Program – Formula Adjustment of 25% reduction. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 3 - 0.**

Mr. McGownd stated that all the subdivisions that qualify will receive notification explaining the program to allow proper budget adjustments for 2011.

C. Eberwein Park Development - Discussion

STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works, stated that Staff was directed to present cost information relative to rehabilitating the barn and white farm house for adaptive re-use or in a non-functional state. At that time, disposition of both structures was postponed and Staff was directed to obtain additional cost estimates associated with “mothballing” and with the historic renovation of the exterior of the structures.

Staff has already provided a cost assessment for adaptive re-use (functional) and non-functional use, so we turned our focus towards historic restoration and mothball costs for each structure. Historic restoration is a process in which a structure is restored with an eye toward maintaining its historic character and integrity rather than dealing only with its functionality.

Mr. Geisel added that it is important to note that for the purposes of this cost assessment, historic restoration deals solely with the exterior of the structure. The values provided are not bids, or to be interpreted as firm costs.

Estimates

It should also be stated that the estimates provided herein could increase significantly due to currently unknown or obscured defects. While we have conducted extensive research into typical costs, we have not conducted any significant destructive testing and have no ability to identify construction or material defects which are obscured from view. Such defects would only become known once the work has been initiated or in the case of a functional use, development of detailed architectural plans. Detailed architectural plans have not been developed, so we have no ability to determine what code and permitting issues might arise as it relates to a specific type of rehabilitation. We can only offer general information and general estimates for similar work with the understanding that a contingency factor is applied for just this sort of uncertainty.

While Staff developed a fairly rigorous scope of performance, the contractor’s reports required interpretation and validation. In some instances, the contractors made assumptions that we needed to adjust and reflect accordingly. In all cases, the

contractors' estimates were qualified and multiple exceptions were noted related to the inherent uncertainties.

Staff also consulted two specialist contractors; one to assess the lead contamination and the other on the process and costs of abatement. Mr. Geisel noted that because of the lead abatement and the condition of the exterior of the structures, in order to bring the structures into property code compliance, there is a nominal difference between mothballing and the rehabilitation figures previously provided. He then added that the major difference between mothballing and rehabilitating the structures is the durability of the materials used to make the necessary repairs.

Mothballing the structure is basically patching the buildings and buying time whereas rehabilitation is intended to provide the lowest cost for ongoing annual maintenance that will provide the City with a secure structure.

The values provided are interpreted from cost estimates and supporting documentation provided by Robbins and Bisig and was supplemented by information obtained from other sources.

BARN			
	Mothball	Functional rehabilitation (interior storage only)	Historic Restoration (will not be for functional use)
Estimated cost	\$97,791	\$111,835	\$117,769
Estimated Annual Maintenance	\$16,800	\$9,800	\$21,800

FARM HOUSE				
	Mothball	Non- Functional	Functional (interior restroom)	Historic Restoration (will not be for functional use)
Estimated Cost	\$203,986	\$226,615	\$354,465*	\$368,627
Estimated Annual Maintenance	\$18,500	\$13,500	\$27,800	\$28,500

* The value for interior improvements was increased by \$17,850 due to expenses related to lead abatement. Analysis was provided by Midwest Abatement Company.

It was noted that the annual maintenance cost for mothballing the farm house is higher than maintenance for the structure in a non-functional use. Estimated annual maintenance costs are provided in the tables above.

Historic renovation is “exterior only” and part of the rehabilitation estimates included creating a secure, low maintenance building envelope. Rehab for the white house would involve stripping the siding, constructing a secure weatherproof envelope and replacing with new siding. This is considered cost-effective because of the lead contamination on the siding. If using the existing materials in place, the process changes for removing the lead. The historic renovation only deals with the exterior of the house but it does not provide for a secure building envelope. If it is then later decided to rehabilitate the “interior” of the structure, additional significant costs will incur to create the secure building envelope.

Mr. Geisel advised that the demolition cost for the barn and the white house is approximately \$30,000 each; plus an additional \$15,500 to abate the lead on the inside of the white house.

Chesterfield Heritage Foundation

Ms. Nassif stated that she has met with a couple members of the Heritage Foundation over the last couple weeks. This group has provided a formal letter to the Department where they have described what level of long term participation and partnership that they are willing to enter into in order to assist in preservation efforts for both the farm house and barn. Having such a partnership entitles the City to apply for state and federal funding opportunities which otherwise we would not qualify for which this group is offering to be responsible for researching and applying for.

The letter does not indicate any actual amounts but describes the action items that they are willing to undertake, as listed below;

- The HFC is willing to raise funds for the rehabilitation (interior and exterior) of the Farmhouse and Barn, after the initial mothballing is performed by the City. As a not-for-profit organization, the HFC is eligible for preservation funding grants, for which the City, as a municipality, would not qualify.
- The HFC is willing to apply, and pay, for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Designation of the buildings on the National Register will provide even more funding opportunities.
- The HFC is willing to lease the buildings from the City for a nominal fee. The HFC will be responsible for general Lessee expenditures, which it will pay for through the fundraising of its 501(c)(3).
- Once the buildings are restored and open to the public (for a use yet to be determined), the HFC will provide staff, thereby relieving the City of staffing responsibilities.

Ms. Nassif noted that representatives from the Heritage Foundation were in attendance and would explain these action items in more detail.

Chair Segal mentioned that a separate discussion and vote will be taken for the barn and the white house.

DISCUSSION ON THE BARN

Chair Segal compared the cost differences between mothballing the barn, historic restoration, and the functional rehabilitation. By making the barn functional and bringing it back to its original state, he feels that the barn will provide a value to the park as a functional use for temporary storage of materials for; hayrides, holiday events, etc. He supports keeping the barn in the “Functional rehabilitation” state for approximately \$112,000.

Councilmember Geiger asked for clarification of mothballing the barn in the “functional rehabilitation” state and the process involved to remove the exterior siding. Mr. Geisel replied that the deteriorated planking would be stripped and replaced with a more durable modern material similar in appearance. Councilmember Fults questioned how secure the building will be if replaced with historic materials. Mr. Geisel replied that the building would be secure but not have the weather seal between the interior and the exterior. If made available, the City would certainly utilize the interior.

Acting-Mayor Flachsbart asked whether the “functional rehabilitation” would preclude the Heritage Foundation from doing a lot of extra work in the future, in order to take the barn to a higher level. Mr. Geisel replied that under the current situation, he doesn’t think that the barn would qualify for historic status. Modifications must be done to make the barn “period” accurate. He does not think that the functional rehabilitation would limit the Heritage Foundation or would require them to “un-do” some of the work. However, if the end goal is to be on the Historic Register, the functional rehabilitation would require them to “un-do” all the new siding. Ms. Nassif stated that work involved would depend upon the requirements of the specific grant being sought.

Acting-Mayor Flachsbart recommends “historic restoration” based on the minimal cost differences between “function rehabilitation and historic restoration”. However the annual maintenance costs would be higher. Mr. Geisel indicated that if the City elected the “historic restoration” the interior would require much more work to facilitate public events.

Councilmember Logan asked what it would cost to build a new barn similar to the existing one. Mr. Geisel replied that he had not developed any such estimates, but a “best guess” at this time for a comparably sized barn would be approximately \$120,000 to \$145,000, along with demolition costs for the existing structure. Councilmember Logan then added that he would like to see the barn saved. He felt that the barn would provide the City with something that is functional and would tie the land back to its previous farm state. Councilmember Geiger agreed with Councilmember Logan to keep the barn in the “functional rehabilitation” option.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to save the barn with the “Functional rehabilitation” (interior storage only) option. The motion was seconded by Chair Segal.

Discussion on the Motion

Councilmember Fults asked for clarification as to whether removing the original siding and replacing it in the future would hinder the barn from historic value. Ms. Lauren Strutman replied that you cannot remove the materials and replace them with metal siding; and then come back and add wood siding at a later date and still qualify for the Historic Register. Mr. Geisel replied that the City has never suggested metal siding as an option. Councilmember Fults would prefer option three “Historic Restoration”, but felt the barn should be functional and used.

Chair Segal asked if the idea is to restore the barn for historic restoration because of its significance as a symbolic piece from that time period. Councilmember Fults indicated that the opinion from residents was to keep the barn with the new features, but she feels that since the cost difference is minimal; she would prefer option three “historic restoration”.

Councilmember Logan concurs with Councilmember Fults and asked (1) how they can keep the barn historically relevant and functional at the same time; and (2) whether the Heritage Foundation is interested in partnering with the City to share in the cost of the barn. He would like for the barn to remain because of its functionality and because it ties in with the history of the farm.

Chair Segal asked what the costs would be to historically restore the barn with a functional use. Mr. Geisel stated that for an historical renovation, the damaged vertical siding would have to be replaced with the same type of planking, and the doors would be replaced with historical-relevant doors. This work is sufficient for a barn use. However, if you want to make the structure a public space, there are substantial additional costs to make it code compliant.

Acting-Mayor Flachsbart stated that by doing the “functional rehabilitation” then the City precludes the Heritage Foundation from being able to do anything in the future for the barn. However, if the choice is “historic restoration” then it’s not a weather tight structure to allow for public access, but is still a viable structure for storage. The structure will be used and will allow the Heritage Foundation the possibility to do future restoration if they can raise the money. He indicated that he would prefer option three “historic restoration”.

If the City did the historic outside restoration and funding is later available for the inside, Councilmember Fults asked whether it would ever be allowed or public use based on code compliance requirements. Mr. Geisel replied that it would but the interior would not be historically significant.

There was additional discussion as to whether the barn would be eligible for the Historic Register if the interior was not historically significant. Ms. Strutman noted the differences between the barn being a storage building and a public assembly building.

Councilmember Geiger removed his original motion from the table.

Councilmember Geiger felt that the Committee is in agreement to save the barn but questioned as to whether the City can get the “historic restoration” to a comparable point with the “functional rehabilitation” so that the barn can be used for the public. He suggested that the Committee should first vote on saving the barn. From there, Staff could be asked to provide comparable numbers for historically restoring the barn with a functional use.

If the desire is to remain “historically accurate” - Mr. Geisel asked if it is important that the barn is on the National Register; or that it looks like it does today, but in good condition. In order to make the barn accessible to the public, an extensive evaluation needs to be completed; an architect needs to be hired to draw plans, and a complete code review needs to be done to see exactly what the Fire Department requires. Mr. Geisel stated that Staff cannot ballpark these figures – none of the estimates included a renovation of the interior.

Councilmember Logan mentioned that he was less concerned with public access and would prefer the structure be kept for storage. Acting-Mayor Flachsbart suggested that the first step be the historic restoration and use it for storage, and not be concerned with public use at this time. Both Councilmember Fults and Chair Segal agreed with historic restoration. Mr. Geisel reiterated that the numbers are cost estimates only.

Disposition of the Barn

Councilmember Fults made a motion to keep the barn at the “Historic Restoration” option with functions for storage at the budgeted amount of \$117,769 with the first-year annual maintenance amount of \$21,800 to be taken out of the Parks Fund – Fund Reserves and to forward to City Council with a recommendation to approve.

Councilmember Nation mentioned that if he was a voting member of the Committee he would like to know the disposition of the farm house before voting on funding the historic restoration of the barn. Chair Segal replied that City Council has the option to amend any recommendation that the Planning & Public Works Committee puts forth. Chair Segal stated that he cannot support a second to the motion.

Councilmember Geiger had reservations regarding the additional maintenance cost of \$21,800 then added that he would prefer “functional rehabilitation” at estimated costs of \$111,835 and an annual maintenance cost of \$9,800. However, at this point, he felt that a recommendation needed to move forward to City Council.

Councilmember Geiger then seconded the motion.

Councilmember Fults had reservations about making it into a modern barn and strongly feels that it should remain historic.

Mr. Herring expressed the biggest downside is the unknown of the cost involved in maintaining a building built to historic standards. This could allow Council the opportunity to challenge the Heritage Foundation to get support and funding assistance to cover the costs of maintaining the barn.

Chair Segal would go along with the motion of “Historic Restoration” but would prefer saving the barn in the “Functional Rehabilitation” state.

It was noted that the City is taking on the expense and the annual maintenance cost and any outside partnership is welcomed but not expected.

The motion then **passed by a voice vote of 3 – 0.**

DISCUSSION ON THE FARM HOUSE

Presentation by The Heritage Foundation

Mr. Todd Williams, Director of The Heritage Foundation of Chesterfield and member of Chesterfield Landmarks Preservation Commission read an excerpt from the August 19, 2010 Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting regarding a statement from Mayor John Nations:

He stated that it appears there is clearly support for a dog park. The main issue is whether the City should spend approximately \$300,000 to preserve the white house and the barn. He noted that the Eberwein farm has been a priority for the community for the past two decades. Passage of Proposition B in 2004 made it possible to obtain the property. He feels that for \$300,000, the City has the opportunity to preserve the Eberwein’s legacy by keeping these two structures on the property for the people of Chesterfield.

Mr. Williams then stated that everyone has learned that historic preservation at any level is an expensive proposition; and that all aspects of the Eberwein Park are extremely expensive because of the prime location of the property. He noted that disposition of the ranch house and the mother-in-law quarters has already been decided. Final decision will be made this evening by the Committee on the disposition of the century farm house and barn. The Foundation feels that a vote to fund an additional 6% for the Eberwein Park project would save these two structures for at least five years. It is their opinion that in a partnership with the Heritage Foundation, along with the help of many residents in and around the Chesterfield region, the Eberwein Park could “be the envy of parks around the nation”. The Heritage Foundation feels that with a vote to save the house and farm, the residents of Chesterfield can have a great park experience and preserve the Eberwein’s legacy.

Ms. Jane Durrell then pointed out that the Heritage Foundation consists of seven directors, five of whom were present at this meeting. She noted that they are a “strong group” that supports projects and coordinates fundraisers. The Foundation is in good

standing with the State of Missouri and is ready to partner with the City to help out however they can. All seven of the directors have voted in favor of saving the farm house and barn with full restoration and use of the structures. They feel these structures are good amenities for the City. She pointed out that they have the “expertise, willingness, dedication, and commitment” along with a website, a database of donors and potential donors, a pledge card, a contribution request letter, a checking account, and twenty ideas for fundraising. They voted last February unanimously to partner with the City. They are cooperating with the Historical Commission and the Landmarks Preservation Commission – both of which have voted unanimously to support this project. She also noted that the Citizens Committee voted in favor of this project. Ms. Nassif then clarified that there was never a formal vote taken by the Citizens Committee on this project.

Ms. Lauren Strutman, Strutman & Associates, stated that the National Register qualifies buildings for funding for restoration and provides a lot of possibilities. The building could be rehabilitated and even changed to an entirely different use without destroying its historic value. Over the years, she has found there is a lot of confusion and misinformation about the effects of listing of the National Register. It has been her experience that after a building has been restored and listed on the Register that it is an honor and recognition of the building’s historical significance based on national standards. It is her understanding that the Eberwein house would be recognized as significant to one remaining farmstead. The National Register provide opportunities for preservation incentives like federal and state grants for planning and rehabilitation – particularly if the City partners with a non-for-profit. A National Register listing places no obligations on property owners, there are no restrictions on the use, treatment, transfer, or disposition of the private property. Owners are free to maintain, manage, repair, or dispose of their property as they choose – they can do whatever they want with their property as long as there are no federal funds attached to it. Changes or additions can be made without asking for permission and without causing the building to be removed from the National Register. If drastic or inappropriate changes are made, there is a risk of “de-listing” but there is no penalty attached to it. There are guidelines to assist owners in making changes in a way that provides and preserves the historic integrity. These guidelines are reasonable and easy to work with and are written with an awareness that historic buildings must change over time in order to remain in service. It is her professional opinion that the Eberwein buildings have great potential as viable community assets and are in much better condition than other historic structures on which she has worked. She encouraged the Committee to vote in favor of saving the farm house and expressed her gratitude for their vote to save the barn. She asked that the City partner with the Heritage Foundation “to give these buildings long and productive futures”.

Ms. Barb Whitman, Chair of the Chesterfield Historical Commission feels that it would be undesirable to lose the 100-hundred year old farm house, which is the longest heritage in the Chesterfield community. She noted that functional rehabilitation will “close the door to future restoration”.

DISCUSSION

Funding

Chair Segal stated that about six months ago, Staff reported the City would be eligible for grants if there was the involvement of a 501(c)(3) organization. He noted that he was contacted by Mr. Williams only two weeks ago indicating the Heritage Foundation's desire to become involved. He also noted that their proposal involves a "six-figure undertaking" with only about \$5,000 raised and no pledges made, which is a concern to him. He questioned whether the Foundation is capable of doing what they are proposing. Ms. Durrell responded that they feel they can raise the money within the next five to ten years. But they think it would be difficult to ask for pledges until it is known what is planned for the project. However, they are willing to ask for pledges by January 3rd to show their commitment and ability to raise funds. Regarding the delay in approaching the City, she noted that the Foundation indicated in February that they were willing to partner with the City but was waiting for direction from the City.

Chair Segal feels that whatever decision is reached, the City has to approach making the decision based on its confidence in the Foundation's "ability to deliver".

Councilmember Geiger noted that the Heritage Foundation's letter of December 2, 2010 indicates their desire for a historical restoration with a functional use and asked how much funding they are willing to contribute for such an endeavor noting that the City has received an estimate of \$368,627 for historical restoration of the farm house with a **non-functional** use. It is the City's estimate that it would be approximately \$600,000-800,000 to make the structure functional. Ms. Durrell replied that it would not be the entire \$600,000-800,000. She felt that the decision should be made within 3-5 years but felt they could provide some information by January 3rd.

Councilmember Fults asked what the Foundation's goal would be for fundraising within the next two years and whether the fundraising would be for maintenance or for the historical renovation. Chair Segal added that it is important to have this information so that an informed decision can be made by the Committee. Ms. Durrell indicated that the fundraising would initially be for maintenance purposes, but that eventually they would have fundraisers for the historic preservation. Councilmember Fults noted that annual maintenance costs range from \$18,500-\$28,500.

Historic Renovation/Mothballing

Acting Mayor Flachsbart asked for further clarification on the historic restoration without a functional use. Mr. Geisel replied that that this type of restoration removes the exterior lead, repairs or replaces all of the damaged siding, windows, sections of the damaged porch, and necessary interior structural repairs. Basically, the building would be boarded shut with no interior access. The only access would be for maintenance or emergency response. If and when there is a decision to restore the interior of the building, it would involve interior lead abatement, complete rewiring and plumbing - it would involve a gut and a complete re-do of the interior. This type of restoration is very expensive.

Mr. Geisel went on to explain that historic restoration deals with the known defects while the mothball effect deals with all the imminent hazards and issues which will arise over the next five years. This is why the mothball maintenance costs are more than the maintenance costs for a non-functional use. It was then noted that both mothballing and the historic restoration would leave the house open for future possibilities; the functional interior restroom options would preclude any future work. It has not been determined whether a non-functional use would preclude any future work.

Ms. Nancy Greenwood questioned as to whether an application can be submitted for the National Register if the structure is mothballed. She noted that when a structure becomes a nationally-registered site, it becomes available for a lot of grants for funding restoration.

Chair Segal and Councilmember Fults both indicated a need to know the amount of funding that would be made available through such grants. Ms. Greenwood stated that through her experience from the Mayors Conference, she learned about the different funds that are available for this type of work in the range of \$100,000-\$300,000. Because of the current economy, she assumes this funding may have been cut back. She added that private groups also grant funds to historically-registered sites.

Mr. Geisel explained that the costs to mothball or historically renovate were independent. If the City elected to pursue mothballing the structure, it would cost more than the incremental difference to later pursue a historical renovation. A significant portion of the mothballing expenses would not offset the future restoration expenses.

Councilmember Logan asked for information about the three houses in Florissant that have been placed on the National Register with respect to their funding. Ms. Nassif replied that Staff researched about 20 historic houses and found there were partnerships with 501(c) (3) organizations in University City, Florissant and Town & Country. The most detailed information was received from University City where a 501(c) (3) corporation came forward to raise all the necessary money to restore an historic building. Creve Couer restored a house but there was not a 501(c)(3) organization involved. Staff has learned that most of the 501(c) (3) organizations in neighboring communities have been responsible for the annual maintenance cost and upkeep of the structures. Ms. Nassif added that when a structure is on the National Register, more opportunities are available for funding; but the majority of the grants are only available to municipalities if they are partnered with a 501 (c) (3).

Councilmember Geiger noted that if the City would decide to mothball with the intention of restoring it in the future, the total costs could be around \$500,000 (\$200,000 for mothballing and \$300,000 for restoration).

Grants

Councilmember Geiger asked for clarification on what grant funding could be used for. Ms. Nassif stated that grants could be used for construction, re-construction,

redevelopment, restoration or maintenance but most grants are for restoration purposes.

At this point, the Committee took a five-minute recess.

Chair Segal re-convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. and noted that a couple of residents in the Highcroft area are in attendance who would like to address the Committee on behalf of themselves.

Comments from Highcroft Residents

Ms. Tania Pappas and Sue Smith from the Highcroft subdivision were present.

Ms. Pappas stated that she lives across the street from the Eberwein property and asked how much money would be spent on the dog park. Chair Segal replied that \$120,000 has been budgeted for the dog park, for the three acre-parcel closest to the shopping center side. The entire tract of land is 18-acres. She asked whether the dog park could be set aside until the historical buildings are taken care of. Chair Segal stated that based upon the gauge of City Council and the citizens of Chesterfield, a dog park is an amenity that is highly-sought after. Ms. Pappas indicated that the residents in her area did not know a dog park was being considered for the site and that many of them do not even have dogs.

It was pointed out that during political campaigning and surveying, the majority of residents expressed a desire for a dog park. Subsequently, residents approved Proposition P to fund park amenities.

Ms. Pappas noted her desire to have the farm house saved because she feels it “would bring a certain prestige to the park and an automatic respect”.

Final Discussion

Ms. Jane Durrell then asked the Committee to vote to keep the house standing at a minimum cost that does not preclude an interior historical restoration at the Foundation’s expense. She asked for an annual figure that the City would like as a contribution from the Foundation to which they could respond to by January 3rd.

Chair Segal stated that he had asked for this information to be made available for tonight’s meeting because the Committee would be making a recommendation to Council. He expressed concern that there is not a firm commitment for a specific amount of funding at this time. Councilmember Fults added that the City does not have the funding to spend on this structure.

Councilmember Logan asked how long it would take to determine whether the house would be eligible for the National Register. It was noted that this process would take approximately 9-12 months and that there would not be any fundraising efforts during that time.

The Heritage Foundation feels that if this is taken to the general citizenry of Chesterfield, funds will be raised. Chair Segal stated that excluding members of the Foundation and Historical Commission, he has heard from only one resident who is interested in keeping the house. He noted that during the past nine months, no 501 (c) (3) organization has come forward with a plan of action until the last two weeks.

Ms. Durrell again asked for a dollar amount that the City would like and added she was not aware that the Committee had been expecting a specific dollar amount.

Chair Segal stated that the total cost of \$400,000 for restoration would have to be raised by the Foundation. Ms. Durrell indicated that the Foundation would gather information regarding funding prior to January 3rd.

Disposition of the farm house

Chair Segal made a motion recommending that Council appropriate \$30,000, plus \$15,500 for lead paint abatement, for the demolition of the farm house. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger.

Discussion on the Motion

Acting Mayor Flachsbart stated that he thinks the motion to demolish is a mistake.

Councilmember Geiger and Councilmember Fults both indicated their feeling that this issue needs to be discussed at the Council level.

Chair Segal stated that he cannot make a motion for historic restoration because the City cannot afford that type of work; he is not going to make a motion for mothballing because he feels that 50% of that cost (\$204,000 plus annual maintenance) would be wasted when the structure could be restored for \$400,000. He encouraged the Heritage Foundation to bring a realistic plan of action and dollar amount to Council.

Councilmember Geiger and Councilmember Fults indicated that the only option that makes sense to them is the historical restoration of \$368,627. The other options just add more expense to the restoration option. Councilmember Geiger pointed out that from the \$700,000 reserve account, the Committee has recommended spending \$140,000 for the barn. If \$400,000 is used for restoring the house, it would leave only about \$100,000 for the remaining park amenities. Mr. Geisel added that there are also program issues that will require supplemental funding from Parks Funds, which lessens the reserve even more.

Councilmember Logan agreed that this issue needs to go forward to Council but more information is needed. He asked that the Foundation find out what monies were gotten for the houses in University City and Florissant. The Council needs to be convinced that the house can be saved without funding from the City.

The vote was then **approved by a vote of 3 to 0.**

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on Eberwein Park Development Funds.]

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.