

I. A.

# MEMORANDUM



TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator  
FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works  
SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary  
Thursday, May 6, 2010

---

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, May 6, 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: Councilmember Randy Logan (Ward III); Councilmember Bob Nation (Ward IV); Michael Herring, City Administrator; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer; Mindy Mohrman, City Arborist/Urban Forester; Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Senior Planner; and Kristine Kelley, Administrative Assistant.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM

## I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the April 22, 2010 Committee Meeting Summary.

**Councilmember Geiger made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of April 22, 2010.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

## II. OLD BUSINESS - None

## III. NEW BUSINESS

A. **T.S.P. 15-2009 Clearwire US LLC (18620 Olive Street Road):** A request to obtain approval for a Telecommunications Siting Permit for the purpose of adding additional antennas and equipment to an existing lattice-work telecommunications tower on a 2500 square foot lease area zoned "PI" Planned Industrial at 18620 Olive Street Road. (17W510093).

## **STAFF REPORT**

Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing an aerial of the site. Ms. McCaskill-Clay stated the following:

The Petitioner has requested a telecommunications facilities siting permit to allow the following on an existing lattice-work tower located at the former location of Chesterfield Fence & Deck Company. She stated that Clearwire is a new user in the St. Louis Metropolitan area. The request consists of:

- Installation of a dish antenna, as well as, three (3) additional antennas to the existing tower.
- Installation of associated ground-located equipment within the existing fenced compound.

It was noted that the Petitioner will not be expanding or changing the compound size.

**Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward T.S.P. 15-2009 Clearwire US LLC (18620 Olive Street Road) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger. The motion **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 0.****

**Note: This is a Telecommunication Siting Permit, which requires a voice vote at the May 17, 2010 City Council Meeting.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on T.S.P. 15-2009 Clearwire US LLC (18620 Olive Street Road)].**

- B. T.S.P. 22-2010 Clearwire US LLC, (Kinkead Estates/Parkway Central High School):** A request to obtain approval for a Telecommunication Facility Siting Permit for collocation of additional antennas and equipment on an existing telecommunications tower on a 10,000 square foot lease area "NU" Non-Urban District-zoned tract of land located on N. Woods Mill Road (17Q230085).

## **STAFF REPORT**

Annissa McCaskill-Clay, Senior Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation showing an aerial of the site. Ms. McCaskill-Clay stated the following:

The Petitioner has requested a telecommunications facilities siting permit to allow the following on an existing mono-pole tower located at the northwest corner of the Parkway Central Campus. The proposed area is secluded with screening by trees on three sides. The request consists of:

- Installation of three (3) additional antennas to the existing mono-pole tower.
- Installation of associated ground-located equipment within the existing fenced compound with no expansion to the concrete or the fencing boundaries.

**Councilmember Geiger made a motion to forward T.S.P. 22-2010 Clearwire US LLC, (Kinkead Estates/Parkway Central High School) to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults. The motion **passed** by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

**Note: This is a Telecommunication Siting Permit, which requires a voice vote at the May 17, 2010 City Council Meeting.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on T.S.P. 22-2010 Clearwire US LLC, (Kinkead Estates/Parkway Central High School)].**

#### **C. Discussion on attention-getting signs**

**Councilmember Geiger motioned to table the discussion of attention-getting signs to the May 20, 2010 Planning & Public Works Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults. The motion **passed** by a voice vote of 3 to 0.**

Chair Segal then recognized former Mayor Nancy Greenwood.

#### **D. Update on Tree Trimming**

##### **STAFF REPORT**

Brian McGownd, Public Works Director/City Engineer provided the Committee with background history of the Department's tree removal efforts. He stated that over the last couple of years the City's tree removal efforts have intensified due to weather conditions in 2007, the over-abundance of the "green ash" trees that are declining, and trees that are merely aging.

Staff has received numerous calls from residents asking for tree removal and has also met with trustees to identify those trees that need to be removed.

A tree inventory was completed in 2009 for Wards I and II, and the majority of Ward III, Ward IV will be completed in the next phase this coming winter. The Davey Tree Resources Group, Certified Arborists, which has provided service for several municipalities throughout St. Louis County, conducted the inventory.

Some of those results are listed below:

- 16,000 trees have been inventoried;
  - 82 trees were identified as “Priority One” removals, which are categorized as **hazardous** – dead and ready to fall over and create a liability issue for the City. Those trees have been removed.
  - Approximately 500 trees were identified as “Priority Two” removals, which are categorized as **declining** – decay, split trunks, dead wood, etc. These are considered still viable trees, so Ms. Mohrman will re-inspect the trees to determine whether they need removal. The inspections are based off of the City’s Snow Map.

#### “Priority Two” Analysis

When it has been determined that a “Priority Two” tree is declining, but still in good health, it will be kept on a “Watch List” and inspected annually.

Once it has been determined that a “Priority Two” tree is declining with more decay, but not a hazard, Staff will mark the tree with a “white dot” on the base for accurate identification. The resident will be provided a written letter on their front door indicating the condition of the tree, contact information and information about the Street Tree Replacement Program.

If the resident does not respond within a couple of weeks, Ms. Mohrman will schedule the tree for removal, which will either be done by City crews or an outside contractor. Most of the time, the resident will contact Staff and authorize removal of the tree.

In some cases, residents will contact Ms. Mohrman requesting that the tree not be removed, so the tree remains on the “Watch List”. Once it reaches the hazardous range, the tree would require immediate removal.

Mr. McGownd feels that Staff is making a good effort regarding the notification that is given to the residents.

### **DISCUSSION**

Councilmember Logan asked what is causing the trees to decline and questioned whether they could potentially infect the neighboring trees. Ms. Mohrman responded that the cause is mainly structural.

Former Mayor Nancy Greenwood feels that Staff is being too aggressive with “Priority Two” trees and would like to see those trees decline further before being removed. She would prefer that removal be done on a request basis only by the residents or trustees.

Councilmember Geiger stated that he has heard from several Ward II residents and trustees who are happy with the City's tree removal efforts, some of whom have indicated that they would like for us to be more aggressive with tree removals.

Councilmember Logan asked what liability the City has if a tree has been identified as being on the decline and has not been removed and subsequently falls causing property damage. Mr. Herring stated that a resident could use this as a piece of evidence if so inclined.

Chair Segal questioned whether there is a cost savings to allow more leniencies of "Priority Two" removals. Mr. Geisel did not feel there would be a cost savings as the outcome would be more "reactive" than "proactive". He noted that only after a second inspection by Ms. Mohrman and approval by the residents that the "Priority Two" trees are being removed.

Resident Mitch Millstein referred to a situation where a tree near his home was removed. His neighbor was notified that the tree was going to be removed, but Mr. Millstein was not notified. He would have preferred that the tree be identified in a conspicuous manner so that he could have requested that it not be removed as he does not feel it was a hazard. He suggested that more than one resident be notified of possible tree removals. It was noted that only the resident responsible for maintaining the tree is notified as it is that person's decision as to whether a tree is removed or not.

Councilmember Fults questioned whether "Priority Two" trees are more susceptible to ice and wind storms. Ms. Mohrman explained that storms do cause damage to these trees, but damage is usually caused by the overall shape of the tree making them structurally unsound.

Mr. McGownd provided the Committee with photos of trees that are categorized as "Priority Two" which are yet to be removed.

After further discussion on the tree removal criteria and possible changes to the procedures, Chair Segal suggested that the discussion be placed back on the agenda and that Ms. Mohrman provide the Committee, former Mayor Greenwood and Mr. & Mrs. Millstein with information on the tree removal criteria.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m.