

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD
MEETING SUMMARY
MONDAY – AUGUST 12, 2024**

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

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT

ABSENT

Commissioner Walter Bilgram
Commissioner Gail Choate
Commissioner Khalid Chohan
Commissioner Allision Harris
Commissioner John Marino
Commissioner Debbie Midgley
Commissioner Jane Staniforth
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg
Chair Guy Tilman

Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Council Liaison
Mr. Nathan Bruns, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville
Ms. Alyssa Ahner, Senior Planner
Ms. Shilpi Bharti, Planner
Mr. Isaak Simmers, Planner
Mr. Shane Streiler, Planner
Ms. Erica Blesener, Recording Secretary

Chair Tilman acknowledged the attendance of Councilmember Merrell Hansen, Council Liaison; Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II; and Councilmember Dan Hurt, Ward III.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. SILENT PRAYER

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

A. P.Z. 05-2024 16624 Old Chesterfield Road: A request for an ordinance amendment to modify the permitted uses for a 0.226-acre tract of land zoned “UC” Urban Core District with a Landmark Preservation Area overlay located on the south side of Old Chesterfield Road and its intersection with Santa Maria Drive (Ward 4).

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Planner Isaak Simmers gave a PowerPoint presentation showing photographs of the site and surrounding area. Then provided the following information about the subject site:

Request Summary

A request for an ordinance amendment to modify the permitted uses for a 0.226-acre tract of land zoned “UC” Urban Core District with a Landmark Preservation Area overlay located on the south side of Old Chesterfield Road and its intersection with Santa Maria Drive, also known as Lot 1 of Burkhardt Place Subdivision, Ward 4.

Site History

The subject site is Lot 1 of Burkhardt Subdivision which was recorded prior to the incorporation of the City of Chesterfield, and is located in one of the City of Chesterfield’s historic areas. In 2011, the site rezoned from “M2” Industrial District to “UC” Urban Core with a Landmark Preservation Area (LPA) overlay. At that time, the LPA allowed for the petitioner to request modifications to the development standards for the “UC” Urban Core District as incentives to protect areas with historic elements. Currently onsite, there is an existing home built in 1950 that is being used for commercial use.

Comprehensive Plan

The City of Chesterfield Land Use Plan designates the subject site as being part of the City Center (Historic Chesterfield) land use designation. The character description of this designation states; “An area with historic buildings including several residential properties on the south side of Old Chesterfield Road. This area of the city would be well suited for the creation of an artisan district where local artists would be invited to locate and where the arts could be celebrated or a farmers market providing for local produce and goods.”

- City Center should serve as the physical and visual focus for the city and include both residential and commercial development with parks, municipal services, and preservation of historic structures and areas, with cultural, entertainment and pedestrian amenities for its residents;
- Revitalization should lend itself to pedestrian comfort and safety;
- Preservation of historic building in which parking lots are relegated to the back of buildings in order to ensure a walkable place;
- Public art should be incorporated into new construction and re-development projects throughout the City Center;
- Buildings to be constructed closer to the roadways to promote the pedestrian experience;
- New architecture will be reviewed for contextual sensitivity of the designated Character Area.”

Request

To request the permitted uses of “Bakery”, “Grocery-Neighborhood”, Restaurant-Neighborhood”, and “Retail Sales Establishment-Neighborhood”. All of which are permitted in an Urban Core District and can be considered by Planning Commission.

There are no other requested changes to the development criteria for the site. Mr. Struckman owns four additional properties on Old Chesterfield Road (16635 Old Chesterfield Road, 16626 Old Chesterfield Road, 16630 Old Chesterfield Road, and 16636 Old Chesterfield Road) and has stated in the provided narrative that it is his goal and intent to expand the permitted uses of the property with the hope to attract more business to compliment the historic character of the area.

The primary goal for this ordinance amendment is to add four permitted uses, and remove two existing permitted uses that would no longer be considered in an Urban Core District. The uses proposed to be removed are “Warehouse, general” and “Plumbing, Electrical, Air Conditioning & Heating Equipment Sales, Warehousing & Repair Facility. These two uses are not permitted in the “UC” District but were originally incorporated in 2011 as part of the allowable incentive requests for the establishment of a Landmark Preservation Area (LPA). Following City Code revisions, overlay districts are no longer allowed permitted uses outside of what is permitted in the underlying zoning district thus removing “Warehouse, general” and “Plumbing, Electrical, Air Conditioning & Heating Equipment Sales, Warehousing & Repair Facility” would bring the site further into compliance.

Preliminary Development Plan

An ordinance amendment to a planned district requires a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) which has been included in the Planning Commission packet. The development depicted on the PDP was constructed prior to the incorporation of the City of Chesterfield and there are no proposed changes to the site at this time.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Choate inquired whether, if the City Council approves the current action, a site plan would need to be submitted. She also asked if any new or different uses for the site would necessitate adjustments to the parking requirements. Mr. Simmers confirmed that if any permitted uses were added, adjustments would have to be made to the parking. He added that no proposed changes are being requested.

Commissioner Marino asked about the extent of flexibility the City has in adjusting parking standards, considering that the businesses are unique and may not have the physical footprint to comply with standard parking requirements. Mr. Simmers stated the flexibility comes from the landmark preservation overlay, which allows for modifications to the development standards due to the fact that the property is located within a “Historic Area”. The intent is to try and preserve the character of the area. Mr. Simmers added, there is an existing ordinance that has a specific amount of parking and if they wanted to increase the parking, they would have to amend the existing ordinance.

B. P.Z. 06-2024 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code – Article 2):

An ordinance amending Article 2 of the Unified Development Code to remove the regulatory role from CHLPC to City of Chesterfield.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Planner Shilpi Bharti gave a PowerPoint presentation providing the following information about the subject petition:

Request Summary

The request is to amend the City of Chesterfield Unified Development code Article 2.

In 2024, City of Chesterfield City Council voted to disband the Chesterfield Historic and Landmark Preservation Committee (CHLPC). Since the CHLPC is disbanded, it is required to update the City of Chesterfield Unified Development Code Article 2 to remove the regulatory role from CHLPC to other existing groups within the City of Chesterfield.

Request

Amend three sections in Article 2

- Section 405.02.040.B.1.e. (11) (minor amendment)

- Section 405.02.060 Landmark and Preservation Area (LPA) and Historic Designation Procedures.
Amendments
 - Remove CHLPC from the formality of the nominating process
 - Aligning the process with similar zoning procedures
 - Modifying the process for Certificates of Appropriateness.

- Section 405.02.110.D. (i) (minor amendment)

DISCUSSION

Chair Tilman asked for clarification on section 405.02.060 under (C), the section was struck out and was updated with, “A Public Hearing shall be held per the requirements of Section 405.02.020 of this article.” He suggested that when the final paperwork is completed that it is clear who will have the Public Hearings, Planning Commission or City Council. Ms. Bharti confirmed the Planning Commission will be handling the Public Hearings.

Commissioner Marino questioned if the regulations would remain in effect if the regulatory body were removed. He also requested clarification on whether there would be any changes to the responsibilities related to the Historic Preservation in the City of Chesterfield. Ms. Bharti clarified that there will not be any changes to the regulations but the regulatory body has changed from CHLPC to the existing committees and such as ARB and Planning Commission.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Commissioner Choate made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the June 24, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0. (*Commissioner Wuennenberg abstained*)

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Windsor Crossing Community Church, Sign Package:

Representing the Petitioner – available for questions:

1. Joe Phillips, Piros Signs Inc, 1818 Old State Road M, Barnhardt, MO

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

- A. **17955 – 18055 N Outer 40 Road (Gumbo Flats)**: A Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan and Architectural Elevations for Contemporary Lodge & Wilderness Area located on four lots comprising total of 290.9-acre tract of land located north side of North Outer 40 Road, zoned “PC”-Planned Commercial, “PI” -Planned Industrial, “M3” -Planned Industrial, and “NU” - Non-Urban District.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion recommending approval of the Site Development Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, and Architectural Elevations for **17955 – 18055 N Outer 40 Road (Gumbo Flats)** with the amendment for the planter boxes in the parking islands. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino and **passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.**

- A. **Windsor Crossing Community Church, Sign Package**: A request for a Sign Package for a 38-acre tract of land zoned “NU” Non-Urban located east of North Eatherton Road and north of the Missouri Pacific Railroad tracks.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked for clarification regarding what was approved in 2019, specifically inquiring about what has been installed, what is new, and what changes are being requested. Mr. Joe Phillips explained that he was not involved in the 2019 sign package. He clarified two (2) wall signs and two (2) monument signs have been installed.

Ms. Alyssa Ahner explained that the sign package has renderings and calculations of the proposed signs along with the older sign package criteria. In addition to what is shown in the packet, there are eight (8) or nine (9) existing directional signs. These signs did not require Planning Commission approval due to the sign code that existed at that time.

Commissioner Wuennenberg asked if the Eatherton golf course entrance has a monument sign. He then expressed his concerns regarding the sign package not showing all of the signs on the site. Mr. Shane Streiler stated that the exhibits depict that there is an existing monument sign at the mentioned entrance.

Chair Tilman asked for clarification regarding elements of signs on the site that wouldn't necessarily have been required by a sign package under the old regulations versus the new regulations that we are using today. Ms. Ahner explained that the eight (8) or nine (9) directional signs that were approved by staff are still allowed and do not need to be included in the sign package.

Commissioner Chohan asked if the entrance directional sign (B) is currently on site. Mr. Streiler confirmed sign (B) exhibit three (3) is not currently located on the site and sign (C) exhibit four (4) is a replacement.

Commissioner Staniforth expressed her concerns regarding the order of the approval of the signs for a gate that has not been approved, but clarified that she did not have objections to the gate. She asked if there would be a size requirement for the sign located on the gate. Ms. Ahner explained the size of the sign (A) is listed on Exhibit 2.

Commission Marino asked if the City of Chesterfield needs to approve the gate. He also asked if there would be one (1) or two (2) gates. Ms. Ahner confirmed that its only one gate based on what was provided by the applicant on the site map and that it would require a separate review/approval process. She then further explained that process.

Commissioner Choate questioned why there is a need for the 25 foot height of Exhibit 5, sign (D). Mr. Phillips explained the intent of the sign is help guide traffic to the entrance of the building. The height allows for better visibility since it will be approximately 300 feet from the intersection of Eatherton Road. In addition to the height, the letters on the sign will be illuminated in the evening. Commissioner Staniforth inquired about the interior directional signs. Mr. Phillips stated the current directional signs are small and not easy to see. They are also made of wood and fade overtime which makes them difficult to read. The proposed directional signs are meant to be on the site for 20 years without decaying and falling apart. Commissioner Bilgram suggested wayfinding may be safer than a sign 300 feet away. He added that by replacing the current directional signs with more substantial signs may also avoid the necessity of the 25 foot height of sign (D). Commissioner Staniforth also suggested that interior directional signs may be more helpful in directing people than a large sign. Mr. Phillips stated it is difficult to navigate the site and agreed wayfinding is the best option for direction and traffic flow.

Chair Tilman raised a concern regarding Mr. Phillips' submissions of sign packages. He stated that the requests submitted by Mr. Phillips consistently exceed the size requirements set forth by the City of Chesterfield code requirements. Mr. Phillips explained that during the design process of sign packages, he reviews the code requirements with his clients. He stated that he aims to avoid exceeding boundaries, with the understanding that 99.9% of the time they will not be approved. Mr. Phillips acknowledged that larger sites often present challenges in complying with code requirements, which contributes to the difficulties faced during the submission process. He expressed awareness of the concerns raised by the planning commission regarding compliance.

Mr. Phillips explained he was unaware that gate needed to be presented to the Planning Commission. The gate signage was designed to block off the family entrance, which is not to be used every day. The gate was intended to be an architectural element to work with the site. The standard directional signage located on the gate was intended to assist in guiding people.

Commissioner Wuennenberg expressed his regret over the discussion regarding the sign package during the site plan committee meeting due to the extensive dialogue that took place. He noted that he feels there is a lack of an all-inclusive sign package and many signs are not on the sign package. He emphasized that he does not feel they are voting on the correct aspects and suggested that the commission should vote on the entire sign package. Commissioner Staniforth agreed with Mr. Wuennenberg that the sign package is confusing and it would be helpful to have all of the signs shown in the package. Commissioner Harris suggested it would be beneficial for a church representative to be at the meeting to hear the concerns that are being discussed.

Commissioner Wuennenberg, representing the Site Plan Committee, made a motion to table the **Sign Package for Windsor Crossing Community Church**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bilgram.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Midgley provided additional commentary on the necessity of wayfinding signage based on the type of function being held by the church. Mr. Phillips elaborated further on the different types of functions.

Chair Tilman provided expectations on what Commission would hope to see next time at a subsequent meeting. These items included a more comprehensive submittal including what is existing and what is proposed, the reduction of the 25 foot tall sign to 20 feet, the reduction of the eight (8) foot sign to six (6) feet.

Commissioner Marino requested further information on the prime times for church activity. The concern was also expressed about band-aid fixes to more comprehensive problems.

Commissioner Bilgram requested information on the traffic and circulation of the site. The incorporation of directional arrows on the site map may be helpful.

Various Commissioners continued to express their concern of the quantity of signs on the site and the general conditions of traffic in the area. The need for a traffic study was communicated.

The motion **passed** by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 06-2024 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code – Article 2):**
An ordinance amending Article 2 of the Unified Development Code to remove the regulatory role from CHLPC to City of Chesterfield.

Commissioner Wuennenberg made a motion to approve **P.Z. 06-2024 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code – Article 2)**.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marino.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

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

Nay: None

The motion **passed** by a vote of 9 to 0.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2025 Proposed Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Commissioner Choate made a motion to approve the 2025 Proposed Planning Commission Meeting Schedule with the amendment to remove the meeting on December 22, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Staniforth and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.



Gail Choate, Secretary