

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
MEETING SUMMARY
JUNE 8, 2026**

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Commissioner Gail Choate
Commissioner Allison Harris
Commissioner John Marino
Commissioner Debbie Midgley
Commissioner Robert Rodermund
Chair Guy Tilman

Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Acting Council Liaison
Mr. Nathan Bruns, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning
Ms. Shilpi Bharti, Planner
Ms. Erica Blesener, Recording Secretary

ABSENT

Commissioner Khalid Chohan
Commissioner Jane Staniforth
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg

Chair Tilman acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II, and Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Ward IV, who was serving as Acting Council Liaison on behalf of Councilmember Lane Koch, Ward III.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Choate made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the April 27, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino and **passed** by a voice vote of 5 to 0. (*Commissioner Harris abstained.*)

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Chesterfield Commons Seven, Lot 3

PETITIONERS:

Matt Garavaglia, 10095 Winding Ridge Rd., Ladue, MO – available for questions

Nate Scheer, 34 Austin Drive, Washington, MO – available for questions

Samuel Moon, 14000 Myford Road, Irvine, CA – available for questions

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

- A. Chesterfield Commons Seven, Lot 3:** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for an automobile dealership building located on a 4.69-acre tract of land located north of Arnage Road and south of I-64, zoned "PC"- Planned Commercial.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Marino summarized the discussion from the Site Plan Committee meeting.

Questions were raised regarding Rivian's sales model and whether it would operate similarly to the Tesla or as a typical automobile dealership as regulated by the State of Missouri. The applicant explained that the site would operate under the Rivian model, with vehicles on-site consisting of previously ordered vehicles and display vehicles rather than traditional inventory.

Body repair work would not be performed at the site.

Proposed signage along the I-64 frontage would be presented for review at a later date, should the applicant choose to pursue such signage.

Chair Tilman explained that his primary concern discussed at the Site Plan Committee meeting related to the larger Rivian vans. It was clarified that these vehicles would neither be sold nor serviced at the site.

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 Commons Seven, Lot 3. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino and passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Shilpi Bharti, Planner provided a presentation regarding the proposed amendment to the City of Chesterfield Unified Development Code to establish a procedure for residential properties under four (4) acres.

Ms. Bharti explained that in 2025, the City of Chesterfield Planning Commission reviewed the remaining undeveloped land designated for single-family residential development. The discussion focused on larger-lot development opportunities, which are increasingly limited in the City. As new areas for single-family residential development are limited, increased pressure is placed on remaining, often smaller parcels. These parcels are generally undeveloped because (1) owners were not interested in selling, or (2) significant challenges exist for the development of the parcels. The challenges for developing these properties were discussed with the Planning and Public Works Committee and the committee directed staff to draft some regulations for these parcels.

During the Public Hearing held on April 13, 2026 staff suggested adapting a new special procedure for lots that are smaller than four (4) acres and that involved amending Article 2 and Article 3 of the Unified Development Code. The Planning Commission asked staff to consider the following points while drafting the new procedure:

- If new standards are established, they should be clearly defined. The amendment would not change the underlying zoning of a property but would introduce a new procedure that would allow for variation of specifically defined requirements (e.g., setbacks) but all other requirements must comply with the regulations within the UDC.
- Properties with older St. Louis County zoning may require modifications but would likely be rezoned to be compatible with adjacent properties.
- The Commission supported the implementation process, whereby the Planning Commission would review proposals and make recommendations. If the City Council does not exercise its Power of Review, the project would proceed to the Planning Department for implementation. However, staff is now proposing to follow an approval process consistent with that required for all Special Procedures. Under this process, a new ordinance would be adopted for each site developed under the Infill Residential Development Procedure.

Based on the Commission's feedback, staff prepared regulations for a new "Infill Residential Development" procedure to be included as a special procedure within Article 3 of the Unified Development Code, and approval process defined in Article 2.

Ms. Bharti summarized the proposed changes to be made in **Article 3**.

"Infill Residential Development Procedure" to be included under the special procedure.

The design requirements for the new special procedure are outlined below:

- **Density:** Existing zoning district maximum permitted density.
- **Minimum Lot Size, Setbacks, and Lot Frontage:** Flexible as approved by the City Council in Attachment A with the Preliminary Development Plan.
- **Uses:** Single-family Homes (attached and detached), no multi-family permitted.
- **Height:** Conform to the applicable height limitations within the zoning district of the site.
- **Buffer:** Landscape requirement described in the UDC. Any modification to the buffer requirement will require the review and approval by the Planning Commission in accordance with Article 04 of the UDC.

Additionally, the Light Industrial District was relocated to the Conventional Zoning District under section 405.03.030.

The proposed change to be made in **Article 2** of the Unified Development Code:

- Include the "Infill Residential Development Procedure" to the Special Procedure table in Article 2.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Rodermund requested clarification regarding the approval process for the new procedure. Ms. Bharti confirmed that there would be no changes to the existing approval process. Planning Director Justin Wyse explained that during the previous meeting, the Commission discussed procedural changes, specifically in relation to zoning and special procedures where the site plan review currently occurs as a separate, subsequent process.

He noted that, due to the single-family residential nature—whether attached or detached—and properties of four (4) acres or less, staff identified these as appropriate candidates to combine processes. Under the proposed approach, the site plan would be reviewed and approved concurrently with the special procedure, rather than requiring a separate subsequent approval. He further explained that this adjustment is intended to address concerns from neighboring residents regarding uncertainty when plans are discussed but not yet approved, while also preventing applicants from being unable to respond to feedback due to the separation of approvals. The combined process is being considered as a way to streamline reviews and may be applied to other procedures in the future.

Commissioner Marino stated that he believes this is a great way to address unique parcels. He explained that when he served as Chair of the Ordinance Review Committee, a concern raised at that time was that a new ordinance was required for every development in the Valley. He asked whether this is a concern. He also asked how the City could ensure consistency from an economic development standpoint while avoiding potential liability. Mr. Wyse explained that this issue still exists, particularly with non-residential development. He noted that non-residential projects raise additional concerns, including the need for equal treatment of property owners.

Councilmember Hansen shared her concerns regarding the proposed process. She noted that properties with older St. Louis County zoning may require modifications and could potentially be rezoned to be compatible with adjacent properties. She referenced areas along Wilson Road where county zoning remains and noted that some larger parcels could potentially be divided in a manner that may not align with the intent of the proposed procedure. She also expressed concern regarding the review process, noting that projects could proceed directly to Planning Department implementation if Power of Review is not exercised by City Council. She stated that she would like to see the proposal refined further to better protect existing property owners who came to Chesterfield because they have land.

Chair Tilman asked what would happen if a development does not proceed after approval or if the property changes ownership before development occurs. He questioned whether the ordinance could be made specific to the applicant requesting the approval so that the zoning would not remain in effect indefinitely. He explained that his concern arises when the zoning required for a proposed development is not consistent with the zoning of adjacent properties. Mr. Wyse explained that, under this process, staff would not recommend approval of zoning that is incompatible with adjacent properties. Chair Tilman then asked how the process would apply when a property is adjacent to two (2) different zoning districts. Mr. Wyse responded that such situations become a legislative decision.

Chair Tilman stated that his concern is that the proposed process attempts to address both zoning and infill development for a property at the same time, and he questioned whether additional safeguards may be needed to address those circumstances.

Commissioner Choate stated that she understood and agreed with Mr. Wyse's explanation. She noted that the Commission would first evaluate the appropriate zoning classification for a property. She explained that the proposed small special procedure could then provide additional flexibility with respect to site design. She emphasized that, regardless of whether a specific development plan is submitted, the Commission must still evaluate the appropriateness and reasonableness of the underlying zoning district. She stated that the Commission is required to make that determination in any zoning case and that the presence of a specific design simply provides additional information for consideration.

Commissioner Choate explained that St. Louis County previously used a procedure in which a special approval would automatically expire if development did not occur within a specified time period (such as three (3) or five (5) years) and no extension was granted.

In those cases, the approval would not remain in effect indefinitely, and the Planning Commission retained oversight of the process. Chair Tilman stated that he felt more comfortable with that type of structure, noting that it provides a mechanism for review and accountability rather than leaving approvals in place after a project does not move forward. He added that this approach helps address concerns where decisions are made based on a project expected to proceed, but the project ultimately does not occur, and a review mechanism would provide additional safeguards.

Commissioner Marino stated that, based on what he was hearing, ordinances could include built-in "revert back" language within each individual ordinance. Chair Tilman agreed that such revert-back language should be included. Mr. Wyse stated that the matter could likely be addressed within the procedure itself. He referenced the narrative statement requirements submitted by developers, which the City uses to evaluate proposals. He asked the Commission whether there was anything missing from the existing submittal requirements that could help address their concerns.

The Commission generally expressed interest in ensuring that approvals include clear protections, including potential "revert back" provisions if projects are not completed.

Commissioner Marino made a motion to approve P.Z. 03-2026 Residential Lots an Amendment to the City of Chesterfield Unified Development Code to establish a procedure for residential properties under four acres, with the following condition:

- **Staff will coordinate with legal counsel to develop appropriate expiration language for the new special procedure, and an update from staff will be provided at the Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

**Aye: Commissioner Choate, Commissioner Harris
Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley,
Commissioner Rodermund, Chair Tilman**

Nay: None

The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS: None.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS: None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.



Gail Choate, Secretary