

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
MEETING SUMMARY
MARCH 9, 2026**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Commissioner Gail Choate
Commissioner Khalid Chohan
Commissioner Allison Harris
Commissioner John Marino
Commissioner Robert Rodermund
Commissioner Jane Staniforth
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Guy Tilman

ABSENT

Commissioner Debbie Midgley

Mayor Dan Hurt
Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Council Liaison
Mr. Nathan Bruns, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning
Ms. Alyssa Ahner, Senior Planner
Mr. Isaak Simmers, Planner
Ms. Erica Blesener, Recording Secretary

Chair Tilman acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Dan Hurt; Councilmember Barbara McGuinness, Ward I; Councilmember Mary Monachella, Ward I; Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II; Councilmember Patricia Tocco, Ward II; and Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Council Liaison, Ward IV.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – Commissioner Wuennenberg read the “Opening Comments” for the Public Hearings.

- A. P.Z. 02-2026 14319 Olive Blvd (Old House at Hog Hollow):** An ordinance amendment for an existing landmark and preservation area (LPA) to modify hours of operation and criteria related to outdoor use.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Alyssa Ahner, Senior Planner provided the following information about the subject site:

Site History

Ms. Ahner explained the full site history is located in the report. Due to the length of the site history, she described the most recent requests.

In 2022 a request was made to rezone the site to “PC” Planned Commercial in order to obtain additional permitted uses. During this review process, a notice of violation was sent to the property owner for modifications that were made to the site and structure without going through the appropriate City review processes. A Site Development Plan was submitted and approval was obtained retroactively following review by Chesterfield Historic Landmark Preservation

Committee and Planning Commission. The rezoning, running concurrently with the Site Development Plan, was reviewed by Planning Commission on February 13th, 2023 and motion to recommend approval failed by a vote of 0-8. In accordance with Section 405.02.190 Appeals and Protest, the petitioner filed an appeal with the City Council. On May 15th, 2023, following review of the appeal by Planning & Public Works Committee and City Council, a motion to recommend approval failed by a vote of 0-8.

In 2025 an ordinance amendment was submitted. However, due to an open violation, the request could not continue past sufficiency review. It was communicated that a new application could be submitted upon the violation being addressed with Municipal Court. This was resolved in January of 2026 which led to the submittal of the current ordinance amendment.

Request Summary

The request seeks approval to extend the restaurant operating hours from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. and retail hours from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., and to permit outdoor patio seating and food service. No physical changes to the property are proposed. The request is limited to modifications to operational regulations within the existing zoning ordinance. City planning staff explained that following the public hearing, staff will compile the information discussed and prepare a consolidated ordinance amendment for further consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Choate inquired whether the petitioner has proposed additional parking or provided the number of outdoor seats to be added. She noted that, during operating hours, vehicles are currently parked along the internal drive rather than in designated parking spaces. Ms. Ahner responded that, as of 2023, the development met the parking requirements outlined in the ordinance, which are based on a total of 45 seats.

Commissioner Marino asked whether any information had been submitted or discussed regarding noise regulations or sound studies, and how those considerations would relate to the anticipated use. Ms. Ahner stated that the City does not review sound studies as part of the Site Development Plan process. Additionally, public nuisances related to sound are investigated by St. Louis County.

Commissioner Staniforth noted that, in the past, nearby residents expressed concerns about music being played on the outdoor patio. She asked whether music is being proposed for the patio. Ms. Ahner responded that, based on the submitted narrative, the request is limited to outdoor food service only. She added that if the petitioner were to request outdoor music, Attachment A would need to be amended for Commission consideration.

Commissioner Chohan asked whether there is information available regarding the number of violations associated with this location. Justin Wyse, Planning Director responded that there is no reliable data available, although complaints have been received.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Angie White, General Manager for the Old House in Hog Hollow 1394 Green Birch Drive, Fenton, MO.

Ms. White spoke in support of the request and described the Old House in Hog Hollow as a historic venue and community gathering place. She stated that the current limited operating hours restrict financial sustainability and that extending the hours to 7:00 p.m. would improve the viability of the business. The outdoor patio area includes approximately 24 seats, which is comparable to the indoor seating capacity. She further stated that no outdoor live music is planned and that the establishment intends to comply with existing residential noise regulations.

She indicated that no changes to existing lighting are proposed and that no additional landscaping is planned at this time. She expressed a commitment to operating as a responsible neighbor within the community.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR:

1. **Bridget Cromer**, 14320 Millchester Circle, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Cromer stated that she lives across the street from the restaurant and considers it a valuable asset to the City of Chesterfield. She noted that the lighting from the building contributes to a sense of safety and that the landscaping is well maintained and aesthetically pleasing. She further commented that many retail strip centers have vacant spaces, and allowing the restaurant to extend its hours would help support its continued operation. She added that the current 4:00 p.m. closing time limits accessibility for many families, as work schedules and children's school commitments often prevent them from dining at the establishment earlier in the day.

2. **Corey Wallis**, 23 Glen Cove Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Wallis expressed support for the restaurant and encouraged the City to remain open-minded in supporting small business owners. He described the building as unique and historic. While supportive of the request, he also acknowledged the concerns of nearby residents and emphasized the importance of complying with City rules and ordinances.

3. **Phil Fishman**, 1510 Goldleaf Drive, St. Louis, MO

Mr. Fishman stated that he was married at the Old House on May 18 and described it as an excellent experience. He expressed support for extending the operating hours so that others may enjoy and experience the historic building.

4. **Phil Strasser**, 14701 Whitebrook Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Strasser stated that he has been employed by the business since 2023. He addressed citations issued to the business, explaining that the most recent citation occurred when an outdoor wedding ceremony was briefly allowed due to favorable weather conditions, despite the ordinance prohibiting business activities outdoors. He also addressed concerns related to noise, stating that, in his opinion, a greater level of noise originates from Olive Boulevard than from the patio area.

5. **Bill Hill**, 2538 Lindy Lane, Grover, MO

Mr. Hill stated that he meets with a group of ladies at the restaurant on a monthly basis. He described the food as excellent and the atmosphere as welcoming, noting that patrons often develop a strong sense of community.

6. **Warren Stemme**, 107 Springbriar Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Stemme stated that he is a lifelong resident of Chesterfield and grew up on a farm east of the intersection of Hog Hollow Road and Olive Boulevard, now known as the Eagle Ridge Subdivision. He expressed support for extending the operating hours and allowing use of the outdoor patio, noting that he does not find the use disruptive to the surrounding area. He further stated that it is commendable that the owners are preserving the historic structure for others to enjoy. He emphasized the importance of supporting small businesses.

7. **Peggy Kaplan**, 1014 Woodlake Village Drive, St. Louis, MO

8. **Dr. Bill Schicht**, 15201 Olive Boulevard, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Schicht is a patron of the Old House and noted that many seniors frequent the establishment. He described the clientele as respectful and stated that the venue offers an elevated dining experience. He emphasized that, as a restaurant, the business must be able to operate during evening hours in order to remain financially viable and encouraged the City to allow it to do so. Chair Tilman clarified that the previously approved zoning ordinance reflected the hours presented to the Commission at that time and that the Commission did not mandate those hours.

9. **Terry Schreiter**, 1470 Shagbark Court, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Schreiter expressed support for the request to extend operating hours and noted that the property includes a well-designed and attractive outdoor patio.

10. **Lynne Strasser**, 14701 Whitebrook Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Strasser stated that she values the City of Chesterfield and referred to the Old House at Hog Hollow as the “Cheers” of Chesterfield, describing it as a welcoming and familiar gathering place. She provided background on the history of the building and noted that the business existed prior to the development of the Spyglass Subdivision, indicating that prospective homeowners would have been aware of the adjacent business. She expressed support for small, family-owned businesses and noted that an arborist was hired to install landscaping, including a berm, between the business and the adjacent residential property to provide screening over time. She also referenced ongoing concerns between neighboring residents and the business, stating that there is a perception of being closely monitored.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION:

1. **Terri Wynn**, 14324 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Wynn, President of the Mansions of Spyglass Subdivision Homeowners Association, spoke on behalf of the subdivision. She stated that the proposal is not consistent with the City of Chesterfield’s Comprehensive Plan, noting that this portion of Olive Boulevard has historically been designated as a suburban residential area. She explained that the City Council previously approved the business under Ordinances 1960 and 819, which established permitted uses and hours of operation. She further stated that, following the denial of a prior rezoning request, both the business license and liquor license were issued in accordance with the hours permitted under Ordinance 819.

Ms. Wynn referenced a letter from the Director of Planning outlining permissible hours of operation and applicable ordinance requirements, including those violations could result in revocation of the business license, revocation of the liquor license, and/or referral to Municipal Court. She stated that the subdivision has notified the City on multiple occasions to investigate alleged violations. She cited ongoing concerns related to noise, lighting, parking, and outdoor activity in close proximity to residential homes. She emphasized that residents chose to live in the neighborhood for its quiet, secluded, and park-like character and expressed opposition to both the outdoor use and the requested extension of hours.

Ms. Wynn stated that, of the 50 homes in the subdivision, 37 are opposed to any modification to the current zoning, eight (8) did not respond, and five (5) declined to sign the petition. In response to a question regarding why such requests are considered,

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Wuennenberg stated that residents and business owners have the right to submit requests, and the Commission evaluates whether they are appropriate.

Commissioner Staniforth noted that extending hours to 7:00 p.m. would likely not result in headlight impacts due to daylight conditions. Commissioner Harris inquired about existing noise from Olive Boulevard; Ms. Wynn responded that noise is currently audible, particularly since vegetation was removed, and that newly planted trees are not yet sufficient to buffer sound. She also stated that vehicles associated with the business have driven through the subdivision and parked within it. In response to a question regarding the gated entrance, she explained that the gate remains open due to ongoing construction activity within the subdivision.

2. **Clair Allen**, 668 Spyglass Summit Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Allen stated that noise from the business patio is audible from his property. He explained that he purchased his home with the understanding that the area was quiet and that the existing zoning supported that expectation. He expressed concern that approval of the request would negatively impact the quiet character of the neighborhood.

3. **Andrew Smith**, 14380 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

4. **Mary Louise Smith**, 14380 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Smith stated that she is opposed to the proposal. She referenced past violations associated with the business and expressed the opinion that support for the request should come primarily from City of Chesterfield residents. She also referenced social media discussions regarding ongoing issues between the business and nearby residents.

5. **Gary Vickar**, 14342 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Vickar expressed concern that extending operating hours to 7:00 p.m. could result in activity continuing beyond that time, particularly for patrons using the outdoor patio. He stated that this could increase both noise and traffic in the area.

6. **William Baber**, 14364 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Baber requested that the Commission deny the proposal. He stated that he recently moved to the Spyglass Subdivision and expressed concern that the business may evolve into a more entertainment-focused venue. He also raised concerns regarding parking, noting that during events, vehicles have been observed parking on grass areas, along streets, and within the subdivision.

7. **Bernard Mayer**, 612 Paddington Hill Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Mayer expressed concerns regarding the limited number of parking spaces available. He also raised concerns about noise from the outdoor patio, as well as reports of individuals not using restroom facilities and instead relieving themselves outdoors. Additionally, he expressed concern that outdoor food service could attract rodents.

8. **Elena Kratz**, 651 Spyglass Summit Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Kratz stated that her property overlooks the rear of the Hog Hollow property. She explained that subdivision indentures prohibit residents from playing music at the pool or on their decks and questioned why residents should be subjected to music from a neighboring property. She stated that she values the quiet character of the neighborhood and does not believe residents

should have to close their gate to prevent non-residents from entering and parking within the subdivision. She also expressed concern that extended hours could negatively impact property values and deter prospective homebuyers. Additionally, she stated that parking capacity should be increased if the intensity of use is expanded.

9. **Ruth Frederickson**, 629 Spyglass Summit Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Frederickson described the neighborhood as a quiet and well-maintained community where residents have made significant investments in their homes. She reported issues with individuals parking on subdivision streets and approaching residents for directions to Hog Hollow. She emphasized that residents are seeking to protect their property investments and expressed hope that the City would support the neighborhood in opposing the request.

10. **John Merjary**, 633 Spyglass Summit Drive, Chesterfield, MO

11. **Sue Hempstead**, 14384 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Hempstead questioned why the outdoor patio was constructed prior to receiving approval for its use. She stated that her property directly abuts the Hog Hollow site and that she purchased her home with the expectation of a private backyard, which has been impacted by the removal of trees and vegetation. She also noted that she reviewed surrounding zoning regulations prior to purchasing her home and expressed concern about being able to enjoy her outdoor space if the patio is actively used by patrons.

12. **Anne Agovino**, 14360 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

13. **Frank Agovino**, 14360 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Agovino spoke on behalf of a neighbor, Mark Gershensen of 14336 Spyglass Ridge, who was unable to attend and whose letter he read into the record. The letter stated that Mr. Gershensen has lived in Spyglass Summit, directly below the Old House at Hog Hollow, for five years and chose the location for its quiet and stable environment. The letter further explained that his 28-year-old son has an intellectual disability and benefits from the predictable and peaceful nature of the neighborhood. Concerns expressed included the potential for increased events, extended hours, outdoor music, and additional non-resident activity near the home. The letter also cited a lack of trust due to prior violations and concern that expanded permissions may not be adhered to.

14. **Judith Schlesinger**, 667 Spyglass Summit Drive, Chesterfield, MO

15. **Robert Rifkin**, 14348 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

16. **Rosemary Rifkin**, 14348 Spyglass Ridge, Chesterfield, MO

17. **Victoria Higginbotham**, 646 Spyglass Summit Drive, Chesterfield, MO

18. **Kent Higginbotham**, 646 Spyglass Summit Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Higginbotham stated that his property adjoins the Hog Hollow site to the north. He expressed concerns that the proposal is inconsistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and cited issues related to past violations, noise, vehicle headlights, increased traffic, loss of privacy, and disruption to the quiet residential character of the area.

SPEAKERS – NEUTRAL:

1. **A.J. Moll**, 14470 Tealcrest Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Moll stated that he is a candidate for City Council, Ward 1. He explained that, through canvassing and speaking with residents, he has heard a range of perspectives on the request. He noted that he had not previously visited the Old House at Hog Hollow but did so recently and observed that the clientele appeared to be older, estimating that the youngest patrons were approximately 60 years of age. He also stated that, based on his conversations with residents in the Spyglass Subdivision, tensions surrounding this issue are high. Mr. Moll indicated that he does not find it unreasonable to consider extending the operating hours; however, he expressed concerns regarding the proposed outdoor use given the quiet nature of the surrounding area. He further noted that some residents mentioned the possibility of closing the subdivision gate, which could help reduce through traffic and parking within the neighborhood.

Applicant Response

Ms. White acknowledged the concerns raised by nearby residents and expressed a willingness to work collaboratively to address issues related to parking, traffic direction, and neighborhood communication. She reiterated that the establishment operates primarily as a wine bar and café rather than an entertainment venue.

The applicant also noted that outdoor activities are limited in accordance with existing noise regulations and indicated openness to discussing reasonable limitations on outdoor service hours while maintaining the ability to operate a sustainable business.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Staniforth stated that with a closing time of 7:00 p.m., patrons might remain on-site beyond that time, and asked whether the petitioner would consider ceasing service earlier to allow for a timely departure. Additionally, she stated that parking remains a concern and that it should be addressed. Ms. White responded that she does not anticipate parking to be an issue, as the request is limited to extending operating hours rather than increasing capacity. She added that she is willing to work with the City to address any concerns that may arise.

Staff Follow-Up and Next Steps

Ms. Ahner indicated that a results letter will be prepared summarizing the discussion and identifying any outstanding questions. Staff will also request clarification regarding indoor and outdoor seating capacity, parking adequacy, and noise control measures.

Parking requirements are based on the building's square footage; therefore, unless structural modifications are proposed, additional parking would not be required under current regulations. Following staff review, the proposed amendment will return to the Planning Commission with a consolidated ordinance for formal recommendation before proceeding to the Public Works Committee and ultimately to the City Council for consideration.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Isaak Simmers, Planner provided the following information about the proposed amendment to Article 4, Attachment 4 of the Unified Development Code:

- A. **P.Z. 01-2026 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code, Attachment 4)**: An amendment to Article 4, Attachment 4 of the Unified Development Code to provide Site and Building Design criteria for Outdoor Storage and Display Areas.

Proposal Summary

Staff was directed by the Planning and Public Works Committee to review the Unified Development Code (UDC) provisions to address ongoing concerns related to the visual impact, organization, and operational safety of outdoor storage and display areas associated with commercial uses, particularly automobile dealerships and vehicle repair and service facilities.

Mr. Simmers provided an overview of Article 4, Attachment 4, which includes the table outlining site and building design criteria applicable to the request. He explained that the purpose of the public hearing is to gather input from both the public and the Planning Commission. This feedback will be used to inform any final revisions and the Commission's recommendation to City Council.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tilman noted that Mr. Simmers' explanation was presented in general terms. Mr. Simmers explained that the intent is to keep the language broad so it can be applied consistently across various types of developments, without needing to differentiate between specific uses such as automobiles, boats, UTVs, or motorcycles. He provided an example, stating that when reviewing an automobile service facility or dealership, broad language allows staff to apply site design criteria and Architectural Review Board (ARB) standards more effectively, particularly in cases where distinctions between service vehicles, employee parking, and inventory are not clearly defined.

Commissioner Marino suggested revising the language under "Automobile Dealership and Vehicle Repair Service Facilities – Landscaping and Screening" to emphasize minimizing the visual impact of inventory. He also questioned whether clearer distinctions should be made between "auto body" and general "auto repair" uses. Chair Tilman noted that screening requirements are typically more stringent for auto repair facilities than for new car sales lots and questioned whether both should be evaluated at the same level.

Commissioner Marino expressed concern regarding the visibility of damaged vehicles. Councilmember Merrell Hansen agreed and emphasized the importance of maintaining visually appealing developments, noting that decisions should consider long-term impacts. Commissioner Chohan echoed this point and raised concerns about future visual impacts, such as electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

Justin Wyse stated that the current code lacks clarity regarding storage, display, and inventory, particularly in relation to screening. He explained that staff is working to improve clarity while avoiding overly prescriptive regulations and noted increasing pressure from automobile-related uses.

Chair Tilman encouraged staff to review best practices from other municipalities. Additional discussion focused on whether more specific standards or minimum requirements may be necessary to ensure consistent outcomes. Chair Tilman added that well-crafted general language can help initiate early dialogue between applicants and staff, allowing expectations to be addressed during the initial design phase.

Key Issues Raised:

- How the City of Chesterfield can allow design flexibility while still achieving desired outcomes;
- How to ensure screening is intentional, effective, and of high quality rather than an afterthought;
- How to regulate visibility for sites viewed from multiple elevations and vantage points;
- Whether regulations should focus on specific land uses or instead address overall visual impacts and site conditions.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Choate made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the February 23, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino and **passed** by a voice vote of 7 to 0. (*Commissioner Harris abstained.*)

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, PLATS, AND SIGNS

- A. Chesterfield Village Mall, Lot 3B:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for a 16.82-acre tract of land zoned "PC&R" Planned Commercial and Residential located east of Chesterfield Parkway West and west of Chesterfield Center.

Commissioner Choate, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for Chesterfield Village Mall, Lot 3B with the following conditions:

- Retaining walls shall match those used in Wildhorse Village.
- All garage doors shall include a window component.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg and **passed** by a voice vote of 8 to 0.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

IX. NEW BUSINESS: None.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS: None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.



Gail Choate, Secretary