

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
MEETING SUMMARY
APRIL 13, 2026**

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

ABSENT

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

Mayor Dan Hurt
Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Council Liaison
Mr. Nathan Bruns, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning
Mr. Isaak Simmers, Planner
Ms. Shilpi Bharti, Planner

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

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to amend the agenda to move Section VII.A., Site Plans, to the beginning of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Choate and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

Commissioner Wuennenberg subsequently made a motion to further amend the agenda to move Section VI., Public Comment, to the beginning of the agenda preceding Section VII.A., Site Plans. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

The following speaker spoke in **opposition** of Westland Acres 2026 SDP:

Judy Hart, 17631 Bridgeway Drive, Chesterfield, MO

Ms. Hart expressed concerns regarding the development and its impact on adjacent properties. She stated that she has consistently urged the Commission to ensure that approved plans are properly implemented and reiterated that concern, noting that she and two others are directly affected. She indicated that existing natural landscaping, including trees, has been removed and referenced prior discussion regarding the distinction between common ground and a buffer, stating that the buffer has now become common ground. Ms. Hart recommended that a site visit be performed to ensure the developer is mindful of neighboring properties.

DISCUSSION:

Councilmember Hansen noted that the Commission received communication from residents representing four (4) neighborhoods and that Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, has the correspondence. She stated that it is important for residents to notify the Commission when concerns arise, as they observe conditions on a daily basis, and that the Commission will rely on resident input throughout the process as they are an important voice.

Mr. Wyse echoed Councilmember Hansen's comments and encouraged residents to continue providing input, noting that it is appreciated by staff. He clarified the distinction between common ground and easements, explaining that approximately 90 percent of neighborhoods in the City of Chesterfield include common ground. He further explained that developments that were approved within the last 15 years and require perimeter buffers are typically designated as common ground unless identified as an easement. He stated that extensive discussion occurred during the ordinance process regarding landscape buffers and that during the rezoning, an additional 20-foot landscape buffer easement was required for Lots 10, 11, 12, 20, and 21, as well as for Lots 27, 28, 29, and the western boundary of Outlot A, in addition to the required 30-foot landscape buffer.

Councilmember Hansen stated that resident concerns are being addressed and that items of concern will be incorporated into indentures and bylaws to help regulate uses such as playgrounds behind common ground areas. Mr. Wyse noted that the landscape plans include a note regarding the landscape buffer easement, which is intentional and will be carried forward through the Record Plat process. He explained that the Record Plat, which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council, is the legal document that establishes lots, common ground, and other components of the development. The note will carry through each plan set and become a binding regulation on the properties from the Record Plats. Councilmember Hansen concluded by stating that the Commission will continue dialogue with residents to ensure understanding throughout the process.

The following speaker, representing the Petitioner for Westland Acres 2026 SDP, was available for questions:

John Nations, 16150 Main Circle Drive, Chesterfield, MO

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

- A. **Westland Acres 2026 SDP**: A Site Development Plan and Landscape Plan for the 56.32-acre Planned Unit Development zoned “PUD” Planned Unit District, located north of Strecker Road and east of Church Road.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Plan and Landscape Plan for **Westland Acres 2026 SDP**. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Chohan** and **passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0**.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – Commissioner Choate read the “Opening Comments” for the Public Hearing.

- A. **P.Z. 03-2026 Residential Lots**: An Amendment to the City of Chesterfield Unified Development Code to establish a procedure for properties under four acres.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Shilpi Bharti, Planner, provided a presentation regarding the proposed amendment to establish a Special Procedure for residential properties under four acres.

Ms. Bharti explained that the Planning Commission previously reviewed remaining undeveloped land designated for single-family residential development and identified that large-lot opportunities are increasingly limited, placing development pressure on smaller infill parcels that often present unique challenges. She outlined key challenges associated with infill development, including maintaining consistency with surrounding developments, predictability in the development review process, and density concerns. She noted that many infill parcels are surrounded by Planned Zoning Districts such as PEU, RDD, and PUD, which often require rezoning to achieve compatible development patterns. To address these challenges, Staff is proposing a new Special Procedure to allow flexibility in design standards while maintaining the underlying zoning and permitted density. She explained that the proposed procedure would allow for a more streamlined and coordinated review process, similar to a Conditional Use Permit, rather than the traditional linear process of rezoning, site plan, and improvement plan approvals. The new procedure will maintain the existing density requirements of the underlying zoning district, and would allow flexibility in design elements such as setbacks, lot size, and frontage.

Ms. Bharti further described the Unified Development Code framework, including the role of Special Procedures and Overlay Districts, and stated that the proposed new procedure for infill development would be included into Article 3, Section 405.03.050. She outlined proposed design standards, including density, lot size, setbacks, frontage, permitted uses, height, and buffer requirements for the proposed new procedure. She also noted that Staff is proposing updates to Article 2 to establish the review process for the new procedure and to address inconsistencies, duplicative provisions, and organizational issues within the Code. Proposed revisions include reorganizing sections related to planned districts and special procedures, as well as clarifying and consolidating plan requirements.

Ms. Bharti concluded by requesting feedback from the Commission regarding the inclusion of the new Special Procedure, the proposed design framework, the review process, and related updates to site plan provisions of the code section.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Tilman questioned the role of the Planning Commission, noting that it is not chartered to make final decisions on behalf of the City of Chesterfield, but rather to make recommendations to City Council. He expressed uncertainty regarding the Commission's authority on Conditional Use Permits and asked for clarification on the status of Power of Review and the relationship between the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Wyse clarified that the Planning Commission does make determinations on Conditional Use Permits, subject to Power of Review. He explained that the Commission establishes the process, while City Council retains the authority to review decisions. From Staff's perspective, this process has remained unchanged.

Chair Tilman then questioned the specifics of the proposed amendment, asking whether minimum setbacks would be established or if proposals would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, including those with zero setbacks. Mr. Wyse responded that the current code is structured to allow that level of flexibility. He noted that Staff is seeking feedback from the Commission regarding appropriate setbacks and the desired degree of flexibility. He further explained that code amendments are first reviewed by the Planning and Public Works Committee, where initial issues are addressed, before being brought to the Planning Commission. He stated that the Public Hearing serves as an opportunity for Staff to receive direction and feedback from the Commission.

Chair Tilman stated that if the Commission is to establish new standards, those standards should be clearly defined. He added that the amendment does not change the underlying zoning of a property, but rather introduces a permitting overlay process. He noted that properties with older St. Louis County zoning may require modification, but would likely be brought forward with zoning compatible with adjacent properties. He explained that under this process, the Planning Commission would review proposals and make recommendations, and if City Council does not exercise Power of Review, the project would proceed to the Planning Department for implementation. He asked whether the City intends to provide specific guidelines for evaluating proposals or allow the Commission broader discretion in its decision-making.

Mr. Wyse reiterated that the amendment does not constitute a zoning change, but instead establishes a procedural framework. He explained that existing code already includes mechanisms that allow flexibility within base zoning districts, and that the amendment intends to remove barriers while maintaining compatibility with surrounding zoning and allowing flexibility in the review of developments.

Ms. Bharti added that, as an infill development, proposals would be required to remain consistent with neighboring structures.

Commissioner Marino stated that he supports the proposed amendment, provided that the Power of Review remains in place and that proposals continue to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Choate commented that the proposal is similar to a Planned Unit Development in that it allows flexibility in lot sizes and expressed support for providing the Commission with additional options.

Councilmember Hansen expressed concern, noting that the proposed approach may not be appropriate in all situations.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION:

Brett Hardesty, 232 Chesterfield Industrial Boulevard, Chesterfield, MO

Mr. Hardesty presented an example of a property located at 15000 Olive Boulevard. He stated that early discussions identified challenges with narrow "ribbon" parcels where the existing zoning does not permit development consistent with surrounding uses. He stated that the subject property is adjacent to attached residential units to the rear and east. He explained that higher-density development is typically located along arterial roads, with decreasing density toward collector and local streets, and noted that under the current zoning, a district such as R-5 would be required to allow similar development, which does not align with existing conditions. Mr. Hardesty stated that each property is unique and requires flexibility and presented conceptual examples illustrating how clustering development on buildable areas could allow flexibility while maintaining compatibility with surrounding density. He noted that there is currently no appropriate zoning district that allows for this type of development.

Commissioner Choate asked if Mr. Hardesty had experience building homes with zero lot lines in the St. Louis area. Mr. Hardesty stated that he has, citing a project in Wildwood, Missouri. He explained that zero lot line development allows a home to be placed on one side of a lot, with utilities also consolidated on one side. He noted that typical spacing between units (approximately 10–12 feet) functions similarly to a side yard. He further explained that this design can provide flexibility for features such as side courtyards and usable outdoor spaces, including areas for recreation and gathering, and noted that this approach has been implemented in other areas, such as Denver, Colorado, and Atlanta, Georgia.

Councilmember Hansen referenced Mr. Hardesty's comments and asked whether criteria could be established to allow homes to be sited in a manner that preserves existing trees and natural features. Mr. Wyse stated that Staff will evaluate this request.

Mr. Wyse summarized the discussion, stating that Staff has received significant feedback and that additional detail is needed. He noted that the amendment will need to establish clear standards and guardrails to balance flexibility in the review process, while ensuring the Commission retains the ability to deny proposals that are not appropriate. He added that Staff will evaluate inactive districts and consider design elements such as clustering, tree preservation, and applicable requirements, and will bring revisions back to the Commission for further feedback.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the March 23, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner

Choate and **passed** by a voice vote of 6 to 0. (Commissioners Marino, Rodermund, and Tilman abstained.)

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 01-2026 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code - Article 4, 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.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Isaak Simmers, Planner, provided a presentation regarding the proposed amendment to Article 4, Attachment 4 of the Unified Development Code to provide Site and Building Design criteria for Outdoor Storage and Display Areas.

Mr. Simmers provided background and stated that Staff was directed by the Planning and Public Works Committee to review Unified Development Code standards for outdoor storage and display areas. He explained that Staff added new sections to Article 4, Attachment 4 of the UDC. He noted that a public hearing was held on March 9, 2026, during which four (4) key issues were identified: balancing design flexibility with desired outcomes; ensuring screening is intentional and high quality rather than an afterthought; regulating visibility of sites viewed from multiple elevations or angles; and addressing regulations that focus on specific uses versus the visual impact of existing conditions.

Mr. Simmers identified three (3) primary buffer types to assist in developing regulations. A Landscape Buffer provides separation between land uses, is visually appealing, and helps reduce environmental impact; however, it requires time to establish and may vary seasonally. A Landscape Buffer and Screening combines fencing and planting to soften and enhance views without fully blocking them, offering design flexibility but not complete screening. A Fully Screened condition completely blocks views through physical barriers, effectively eliminating visibility but resulting in more rigid design outcomes. He stated that in response to feedback from the public hearing, Staff incorporated more descriptive and performance-based criteria into the table. Under Automobile Dealership and Vehicle Repair and Service Facilities, additional language was added requiring parking stalls used for dealership inventory to comply with Section 405.04.020. He noted that concerns regarding the storage of wrecked or immobilized vehicles were addressed by adding language under Exterior Elements requiring such vehicles to be stored in an enclosed building, with outdoor storage permitted only if fully screened from public view. He further stated that under Site Design, language was added prohibiting tandem parking of dealership inventory, and additional guidance was included encouraging site organization and display to minimize the visual impact of large vehicle inventories. Mr. Simmers concluded by presenting a PowerPoint showing examples of how the language proposed in the attachment can be applied to different site layouts and uses.

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve **P.Z. 01-2026 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code - Article 4, Attachment 4)**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Aye: Commissioner Choate, Commissioner Chohan,
Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Marino,
Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Rodermund
Commissioner Staniforth, Commissioner Wuennenberg,
Chair Tilman

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.



Gail Choate, Secretary