

**Jefferson County, Missouri County Council
Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee**

March 26, 2025

I. CALL TO ORDER

Committee Chair Charles Groeteke called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

District 1 - Brian Haskins:	Present
District 2 – Billy Crow:	Present (arrived at 3:12 p.m.)
District 3 – Lori Arons:	Present (arrived at 3:07 p.m.)
District 4 - Charles Groeteke:	Present
District 5 - Scott Seek:	Absent
District 6 – Tim Brown:	Present
District 7 - Bob Tullock:	Present (remotely)

Note: Also in attendance were Mr. Alan Leaderbrand, Mr. John Giancola, Mr. Ben Menendez, and Mr. Jim Terry. County Counselor Jasha Kuenzel arrived at 3:20 p.m. and left at 4:30 p.m.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilman Tim Brown made a motion to approve the Agenda as presented, seconded by Councilman Brian Haskins.

Vote:

District 1 - Brian Haskins:	Yes
District 2 – Billy Crow:	Absent
District 3 – Lori Arons:	Yes
District 4 - Charles Groeteke:	Yes
District 5 - Scott Seek:	Absent
District 6 – Tim Brown	Yes
District 7 - Bob Tullock:	Yes

Motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

Approval of the March 19, 2025, Journal – Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee.

Councilman Tim Brown made a motion to approve the Journal of the March 19, 2025, meeting, seconded by Councilman Brian Haskins.

Vote:

District 1 - Brian Haskins:	Yes
District 2 – Billy Crow:	Absent
District 3 – Lori Arons:	Yes

District 4 - Charles Groeteke:	Yes
District 5 - Scott Seek:	Absent
District 6 – Tim Brown	Yes
District 7 - Bob Tullock:	Yes

Motion carried.

V. DISCUSSION OF MASTER PLAN DRAFT

After reviewing Chapter 4 of the Master Plan draft the following questions and concerns were brought up for discussion:

Floodplain Development – This must be spelled out very clearly. We just recently had a development proposed in a floodplain because of a federal process that potentially allows for an area to be reconsidered and built up above the flood stage. “Additionally, protecting wetlands and floodplains enhances water quality through natural filtration and ensures properties are appropriately sited, reducing the risk of flood damage while mitigating the impacts of development.”

This sentence seems to be worded poorly. The last part “...thereby compromising...” is probably intended to speak to “urban sprawl” and should be written to be clearer that urban sprawl would compromise the rural character. “This approach concentrates growth in designated areas, creating compact and accessible communities that minimize urban sprawl, thereby compromising the rural character of these areas.”

“Through zoning regulations and design standards, Jefferson County can ensure that new developments respect and embrace the existing environment.” Important statement to remember when rewriting the UDO to support the Master Plan.

Buffer zones – Mentioned several times but not clear how to identify and define them.

Page 30

Boundary Commission – Mentioned by several committee members as something for the Council to explore, including working at the State level if needed. Can the Council send a Resolution to our state reps to encourage support for legislation?

The recommendation below must be better defined as it refers to investment zones across municipalities. What does this mean? The County should also have a plan to protect the investments made so that municipalities don’t just wait for the County to build all the infrastructure and then annex the property.

--Identify key investment zones across multiple municipalities to ensure balanced development and resource allocations, preventing any single municipality from monopolizing growth opportunities.

Page 33

“Commercial, office, and industrial uses should be discouraged unless located near necessary infrastructure and established transportation nodes where such development could satisfy the needs of

the rural community.” Putting this kind of development in a Natural Rural Area could create situations where after a few small developments of this type are allowed, those then become the story to support more of the same which basically creates urban sprawl from within.

Page 36

Agriculture - What about Farms? Should there be a new land use definition specific to Farms/Farming? Does the official definition of Agriculture include Farms/Farming? To what extent?

Page 37

Parks/Open Spaces - Include Historic sites in this or create another section that speaks to protecting these sites throughout the county.

Nodes - Dependencies should be in place prior to developing as defined by the node type. Just because a node exists on the map doesn't mean it is ready to support development. Should each Node be prioritized for improvements to support development? Where is the data that was used to determine every Node location and its type? Some just appear in seemingly random areas or potentially controversial areas. We must understand how these were selected. It's suggested that the UDO be clear in defining when an area/node is available for developing for a certain type of use.

Is there a circumference that identifies the borders of a node?

What is the meaning of Incentives? What expectations are being set by the plan when it's recommended to provide incentives?

Using words like “Responsible” and “Sustainable” may need to be defined further. Many descriptive words have different meanings. A common topic is to have better descriptions to support these words and include them in a glossary of terms.

Bonus Standards - Glossary, and review for UDO. Current UDO has some of these bonus standards but should be reviewed to ensure intentions are met and not abused.

Density Metrics - Are these measures? Is total acreage of development considered even if a large purpose is unable to be developed? This could result in very small-lot sizes due to averages instead of the size specific to each unit.

High density apartments pushed in recommendations but how to ensure infrastructure is there first.

Concerns over the recommendation of using alleys to provide for rear driveways and parking. This seems to support very narrow lots and/or homes seated right next to each other. It also made many think of failed St. Louis city/council neighbors.

Mixed-Use - Concerns over residential and commercial combined in a single structure, i.e., separated by floors. Which zoning standards would apply when mixed in this way?

Tax Incentives - Is this the direction we want to go as a County

Conflicts of developing in areas that should be protected.

High density apartments are not wanted in mid density areas.

Encourage private parks, ball fields.

Councilwoman Lori Arons left the meeting at 4:50 p.m. for a phone call.

VI. SET NEXT MEETING DATE

Committee Chair Charles Groeteke announced the next meeting date will be April 2, 2025, at 3:00 p.m. in the Annex Training Room.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Councilman Tim Brown made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Councilman Billy Crow.

Vote:

District 1 - Brian Haskins:	Yes
District 2 – Billy Crow:	Yes
District 3 – Lori Arons:	Absent
District 4 - Charles Groeteke:	Yes
District 5 - Scott Seek:	Absent
District 6 – Tim Brown:	Yes
District 7 - Bob Tullock:	Yes

Motion carried, and the meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.