

**City of Springfield
Minutes
Planning and Zoning Commission**

Dan Scott, Vice Chair
Helen Gunther
Christopher Lebeck
Betty Ridge

Randall Doennig, Chair

Bruce Colony
Eric Pauly
Bill Knuckles
Layne Hunton

July 17, 2025

6:30pm

**Regional Police-Fire Training Center
2620 West Battlefield Road
Room 101, 102, and 103**

ROLL CALL.

Present: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Hunton, and Commissioner Lebeck. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles (Commissioner Ridge left early)

Staff in attendance: Justin Crighton, Planning and Development Assistant Director, Bob Hosmer, Planning Manager, Michael Sparlin and Daniel Neal, Senior Planners, and Laura Vales, Assistant City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

The minutes of June 12, 2025 were approved.

COMMUNICATIONS.

City Council summary for June 2025 is included in your packet and we will be scheduling a special Planning and Zoning meeting on July 31, 2025 regarding the Missing Middle Meeting, and August 12, 2025 regarding the Code Update and combining items 6.1 and 6.7 presentations but with separate votes.

CONSENT ITEMS.

Relinquishment of Easement 961

2705 East Diamond Street

Applicant: New Prime, Inc.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Consent Item (Relinquishment of Easement 961); Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS. None

PUBLIC HEARINGS.

COMMISSION ACTION: (all speakers to 3 minutes)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to allow speakers only 3 minutes; Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

COMMISSION ACTION: (combine and move items)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Lebeck moved to combine presentations for Z-10-2025 COD 273 and Vacation 842 and move 6.6, 6.7, and 6.8 before item 6.5; Commissioner Scott seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Z-10-2025 COD 273

2961 East Republic Road and 4152 South Middleton Avenue

Applicant: Windmill Holdings, LLC

Combined presentation for Z-10-2025 COD 273 and Vacation 842.

Mr. Sparlin states that this is a request to rezone approximately 0.45 acres from R-SF, Single-family Residential District to LB, Limited Business District with Conditional Overlay District No. 273.

Mr. Scott ask for clarification for maintaining the existing structure and if any reason to specify where that 1000 square foot additional can go.

Mr. Sparlin stated that they had placed a Conditional Overlay District (COD) to preserve the building, and the applicant may need to explain where the addition is planned.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Wynn, 5051 S. National Avenue representing the owner and developer. He noted that the owners imagine bring the church back to life and to be used for small events and the extra requested space will be to make it ADA compliant (bathrooms and adding small kitchen space).

Mr. Pauly asked about the hours of operation.

Mr. Wynn noted that it should be 10:00am to 10:00pm, same as his other venue.

Ms. Melanie Bach, 3734 S. Elmview, president of the Galloway Village Neighborhood Association and is thankful that we have a developer willing to try to bring back the building to life, however, did note a concern on the hours of operation and no have concern on the request for the vacation. She also noted that they would like specific hours listed in the Conditional Overlay District.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Z-10-2025 COD 273; Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Vacation 842

2961 East Republic Road

Applicant: Windmill Holdings, LLC

Combined presentation for Z-10-2025 COD 273 and Vacation 842.

Mr. Sparlin states that this is a request to vacate a portion of an alley between 2900 block E. Huron Street and E. Republic Road.

Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Sparlin states that this is a request to rezone approximately 0.45 acres from R-SF, Single-family Residential District to LB, Limited Business District with Conditional Overlay District No. 273.

Mr. Scott ask for clarification for maintaining the existing structure and if any reason to specify where that 1000 square foot additional can go.

Mr. Sparlin stated that they had placed a Conditional Overlay District (COD) to preserve the building, and the applicant may need to explain where the addition is planned.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Wynn, 5051 S. National Avenue representing the owner and developer. He noted that the owners imagine bring the church back to life and to be used for small events and the extra requested space will be to make it ADA compliant (bathrooms and adding small kitchen space).

Mr. Pauly asked about the hours of operation.

Mr. Wynn noted that it should be 10:00am to 10:00pm, same as his other venue.

Ms. Melanie Bach, 3734 S. Elmview, president of the Galloway Village Neighborhood Association and is thankful that we have a developer willing to try to bring back the building to life, however, did note a concern on the hours of operation and no have concern on the request for the vacation. She also noted that they would like specific hours listed in the Conditional Overlay District.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Vacation 842; Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Z-11-2025 COD 271

2701 & 2747 East Sunshine Street and 2662, 2702, 2710 & 2740 East Stanford Street

Applicant: Schweitzer Church

Mr. Neal states that this is a request to rezone approximately 10 acres from GR, General Retail District, HC, Highway Commercial District and R-SF, Single-Family Residential District to GR, General Retail District and establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 271.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Ball, 650 N. Boonville Avenue representing the church and noted that the church is going through a new addition and new entries would better utilize their parking and remodeling within the existing facilities. He stated that he is aware about the residential properties being rezoned to General Retail, but noted it is only intended for church use such as parking lot as parking can go in any zoning, but this provides more intense bufferyard and believes this will also improve the stormwater problems and will add sidewalks on Stanford.

Mr. Scott questioned the permitted uses in the Conditional Overlay District (COD) and if the church would have any concern if the second line item said general office uses is eliminated, just in case the property is sold it would allow denser development under the new zoning.

Mr. Ball noted that he would have no problem taking that out if the church can guarantee related uses includes church offices.

Mr. William Phillips, 2717 E. Stanford Street and oppose the proposed rezoning from single family to general retail as they are significant for the immediate neighborhood. He stated that the rezoning would permit a driveway entrance mid-block on Stanford and there is no buffer zone between pedestrians, vehicles, and no infrastructure to absorb the rise in traffic. He also noted concerns for stormwater and believes without engineering plans presented upfront that it could worsen and also stated that the lighting will allow ambient spillover and illuminate adjacent yards.

Ms. Meghan Page, 2717 E. Stanford Street and opposes the rezoning and states that this is a private parking expansion to serve a private institution and does not provide any benefit to the residents on Stanford. She noted that the staff report used step-down transition language from commercial to retail and this rezoning brings general retail directly into a residential street when the use is an institutional scale parking lot that borders directly single-family homes. She stated noise, lighting, and traffic as main concerns and if the organization has outgrown its footprint, then it is their responsibility to find a solution that does not burden an established residential street.

Mr. Lebeck asked for her home location on the map and noted that she is basically caddy-corner to the parking lot.

Ms. Collette Freeman, 2245 S. Lone Pine and is the COO of the church and stated that they want to be good neighbors and gave examples of activities that the church does and noted that they will meet whatever lighting requirements are needed.

Ms. Tracy Brown, 2654 E. Stanford Street noting that she agrees with what the previous neighbors have stated and that there is a drainage problem and since she is in the lowest area she floods significantly and is concerned about the amount of water coming from the parking lots and hopes it will be addressed. She also stated she has concerns for security that when police are called the church does not allow the police to do their job, i.e., parking, using drugs or throwing things into their backyards and wants to see who enforces the automated gates and said that the traffic from the preschool is a concern and that there is no regard for any speed limit and that she cannot walk her pet without having to get off to the side of the street.

Mr. Spencer Smith, 2805 S. Cobblestone Drive and is the pastor of the church and wants to be good neighbors stating that they want to add an egress to Stanford and will put a gate on that access point will be limited. We are doing a large addition to our church and seek to remain in our location and believes that the adding the egress and parking will not impact the current families who are using it for the preschool.

Mr. Lebeck as about clarification on the parking lots that go into Stanford and what are the planned uses.

Mr. Smith noted that of the three lots, one is empty, one was a community garden, but now located to Oak Grove and the other has been used for transitional and will be torn down and the three lots will become parking lots with access on Wednesday's and Sunday's.

Mr. Pauly asked about the gate and how it will be activated and who will have access.

Mr. Smith stated that he does not have the answers right now.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lebeck has questions regarding the Conditional Overlay District for the church and accessory uses are defined.

Mr. Hosmer stated that churches and accessory uses are defined.

Mr. Lebeck also asked about the three lots being turned into parking lots in the middle of a residential street and how this is a step-down development.

Mr. Crighton stated that in terms of the staff analysis comes from the buffering and there is enough of a screen around it to make it compatible with the surrounding uses.

Discussion on what if the zoning change is not approved and it was stated that the bufferyard amount would change for each zoning district.

COMMISSION ACTION: (amendment)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to modify Attachment 1 of Z-11-2025 COD 271, eliminating Section 1 Line ii. General Office uses, with the understanding that the first line that says church and accessory uses, including off street parking, also includes general office uses for the church specifically; Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Z-11-2025 COD 271; Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Z-12-2025

2800 North Kansas Expressway

Applicant: Khan Family Properties, LLC

Mr. Neal states that this is a request to rezone approximately 1.22 acres from a GR, General Retail District to a HC, Highway Commercial District.

Mr. Scott asked for clarification on the separation requirements or bufferyard between Highway Commercial and the traditional neighborhood to the east.

Mr. Neal noted that there is no bufferyard with General Retail, but for Single-Family that would have a 20-foot bufferyard F.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Teresa Davison, 535 W. Battlefield Road and here to answer any questions.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Pauly moved to approve Z-12-2025; Commissioner Colony seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Z-13-2025 COD 272

1100 East Kearney Street, 1101 East Turner Street, 2306 North Howard Avenue and 2303 & 2307 North Taylor Avenue

Applicant: Elevate Lives

Mr. Sparlin states that this is a request to rezone approximately 3.83 acres from R-TH, Residential Townhouse District and HC, Highway Commercial District to R-MD, Medium Density Multifamily Residential District and HC, Highway Commercial District with Conditional Overlay District 272.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Billy Kimmons, 1722 S. Luster Avenue and representing the applicant stating that this rezoning is for Medium Density Multifamily Residential to support the development of the apartments (multi-family housing) and the rest is clean up split zoning.

Mr. Russell Gosselin, 2201 N. Jefferson Avenue and is adjacent to the proposed property. He stated that will be a hub for multiple organizations and non-profits to help low-income family. Elevate Lives focuses on the ones who are serious about changing their lives and becoming thriving members of society.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Z-13-2025 COD 272; Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Conditional Use Permit 482

1212 North Broadway Avenue

Applicant: MC Thompson Holdings, LLC

Mr. Sparlin states that this is a request to allow a daycare care center as an adaptive use of a nonresidential structure in a R-SF district.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Cameron Hole, 3213 S. West Bypass representing the owner and is for a child-care facility that once was a community center, the building will not change, but the parking lot will change by removing a portion of the driveway that is not in compliance.

Mr. Scott asked if they would have an out-door play area and Mr. Hole stated that they will not.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Conditional Use Permit 482; Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Preliminary Plat of Terragreen Condominiums Phase VI
2305 South Blackman Road

Applicant: 2305 Blackman Road Bldg A, LLC, Blackman Road Properties, LLC, ERCO Real Estate Company, LLC, and H2D2-TGD, LLC

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to amend a condominium plat of approximately 5.92 acres of property.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Will Hoey, 550 St. Louis Street and here on behalf of the developer and to answer any questions.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Preliminary Plat of Terragreen Condominiums Phase VI; Commissioner Colony seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

Planned Development 392
3830 East Division Street

Applicant: East Division Development, LLC et al

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to rezone approximately 48 acres of property from County A-1, Agriculture District to Planned Development No. 392.

Mr. Scott stated that he has a brother and sister-in-law that live in Cooper Estates and will not affect his vote. Ms. Gunther stated that she used to live in Cooper Estates and will not affect her vote.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Will Hoey, 550 E. St. Louis Street gave some back-ground of the property, noting that it was county property when the developer started to look at it. During the neighborhood meeting it was asked about property ownership and currently it will be locally owned and operated with a HOA for maintenance and about 100 people showed up for the neighborhood meeting

Questions about setbacks, lot sizes and zoning code requirements.

Mr. Hoey stated that the primary intent behind the planned development is low density allowing to go up to 18 du/ac and we are trying to stay in the middle and thus create a step-down between single-family, then villa type style middle and then to four-story apartment complexes.

Mr. Jonathan Pietz, 550 E. St. Louis Street here to talk about traffic concerns and highlighting some of the improvements, he noted that there is an existing project to widen Division from Hwy 65 over to Eastgate as well as installing new traffic signals. New improvements at the intersection of Division and Le Comte and the improvements on Eastgate will help the truck traffic for the underground.

Ms. Gunther asked if Division Street will be 4 lanes. Mr. Pietz noted that it is not currently being constructed and that the improvements will end at Eastgate.

Mr. Ricky Haase, 550 E. St. Louis Street spoke about the buffering around the single-family and noted that the site falls in grade significantly from the South to the North and have placed the multifamily units at a lower elevation. Spoke about the amenities, pickleball courts, pools, play areas, basketball courts, walking trails and a lot of green space. He stated that the stormwater will discharge into the Cooper's basin and have 2.5 to 3 acres of wet detention with permanent fountains, docks, and trails around it as well as keeping as many of the existing trees and that this development will be in phases and can take as long as 6 years.

Ms. Ridge asked about the rolling nature of the property and what will become of the house that is currently existing as well as the trees that lead up the home as they are very beautiful and if they will be retained.

Mr. Haase stated that there will be a lot of grade changes and will try to minimize the amount of the change. Regarding the trees he stated that they will need to look at the landscape plan but believes that they can save some of them.

Mr. Scott asked about trash service and was told that the developer is looking at a plan for trash pickup.

Mr. Joe Farley, 3730 E. Cromwell Lane and president of Cooper Estates Owner Association and noted a sinkhole in the northwest corner of the property and believes it has not been addressed properly. He stated that architectural plots identify it as an existing farm pond. He directed the commissioners to his article regarding sinkholes and would like a geological evaluation completed.

Mr. Keith Abercrombie, 1236 N. New Castle Avenue stating that he is not opposed to growth but has concerns for the high-density development with over 530 residential units stating that it would be unsightly addition to the surrounding single-family neighborhoods. He questioned the housing shortage that is frequently stated and cannot find any substantial evidence to back up that assertion and that this is a post-war residential neighborhood containing predominantly single-family detached dwellings.

Mr. Bernie Burrier, 1155 N. Chesire Court voiced his concerns allowing apartments in single-family areas and may open pandora's box by allowing this development.

Mr. Mark Nelson, 4404 East Kentbrook Drive spoke about the missing middle, the proposed development will be lease only and not have ownership from the local people. He also stated his concern for the traffic,

and it will cause safety issues. He also voiced his dissatisfaction for the neighborhood meeting room size and like issues resolved and have the developer resubmit.

Mr. Crighton talked about the Comprehensive Plan and that the staff did recommend approval based on the edges to the traditional neighborhoods that do allow for more intensity.

Discussion on meeting notices and it was confirmed that the notices sent out met the requirements.

Commission member asked about traffic safety and MoDOT. Mr. Zickefoose stated that he believes MoDOT is still in the process of reviewing the traffic impact study specific to this development and that they will construct whatever improvements they feel are necessary for the development regardless of city requirements. MoDOT will have to make improvements before the preliminary plat could be approved.

Ms. Kathy Christie, 4313 E. Kentbrook Drive and is the vice-president of the Hickory Hill Property Owners Association and states that this plan is a disrupter and has significant concerns about the high-density development forever altering the suburban country nature of the neighborhood and does not believe this meets the need for more affordable entry level housing. She also voiced her concerns for the increased traffic.

Mr. Phil Jones, 1405 N. Bristol Avenue stated that they were surprised about the annexation into the city and talked about the housing guidelines and that the proposal is a partial conformance with two of the six guidelines with the established neighborhood character, and the area would be negatively impacted and not revitalized. He commented that they are trying to protect the investments that they have in their homes and ask that the commission protect adjacent properties.

Mr. Chuck Cox, 4273 E. Sherwood Street stated that the neighborhood will be impacted significantly by the development and that the children walking to school will have safety concerns due to the increased traffic and speeding as well as additional students will cause overcrowding.

Mr. David Rosenbuth, 4459 E. Kentwood Brook Drive believes that the Planned Development 392 is not in the spirit of the plan for this area as a traditional single-family. The neighborhoods should strive to increase and integrate the quality of place and complete neighborhood characteristics, and this plan does not fit with high story apartment buildings, and it is certainly not low intensity multifamily. He also stated that he is not against townhomes, duplexes or villas, but four-story apartments are the concern.

Mr. Mark Sharp, 4051 E. Brookdale Terrace stated that they chose their home due to the unique privacy and believes it is not in conformity with the Forward SGF comprehensive plan by putting this right in the neighborhood. The other concern is the passageway into the neighborhood and would like this to be postpone until traffic and other studies are complete.

Mr. Ken Carter, 1302 N. Fenchurch Lane spoke about traffic and the significant increase at the intersections. He also spoke that when he was a county planning and zoning commissioner that major apartment operations did not go past Ingram Mill Road by not allowing apartments on the east side of 65 Hwy and believes it should continue with that ban.

Kiara Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale Terrace voiced her concerns for lighting and noise as her home is facing the field of the proposed project.

Allen Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale Terrace and his property borders about 1/3 of a section of the area and voiced his concern regarding the density, increased traffic issues at the intersection of Le Compte and may have to wait 20 minutes to turn and forcing people to come into my subdivision. He also noted the sinkholes in the area and hopes that the commission passes a conditional overlay district to single-family only as well as the high monthly cost of leasing and believes it does not meet the missing middle.

Ms. Michelle Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale Terrace stated that she will be very affected by the development such as noise, loss of property values, and traffic and is adamantly opposed to this particular development and would like more single-family homes.

Mr. Lebeck asked what a reasonable use of this property is.

Ms. Jacobs noted that she thinks it should be single-family homes and that individual plots could be sold for a high value, but could get behind duplexes, villas, and townhomes.

Mr. Brandon Corn, 801 N. Thorn Apple Lane stating that this development does not align with Forward SGF which designates this area as traditional neighborhood and intended primarily for single-family homes. Four-story apartments are too dense and intense for the area noting traffic, stormwater, police, fire, and schools services will be stretched thin.

Ms. Jessica Ingram, 4038 E. High Ridge Drive, stated that Planned Development 392 will disrupt their quality of life and that her driveway is only 30 feet from the proposal. She voiced concerns for traffic, safety, lighting, noise, and stated that the development plans to create an exit through their neighborhood. She also stated that it would negatively impact surrounding property values.

Mr. Lebeck asked about the traffic around Hickory Hills and what would be a fair balance/reasonable.

Ms. Ingram stated that with all the neighborhood surrounding the area the traffic is horrific and that Le Compte and Division do not have a traffic light, and the congestion is bad. She also noted that they knew when it was sold that it would be developed, but as single-family homes.

Mr. Ben Shantz, 2144 E. Republic Road talked about the comprehensive plan and the eight point criteria and believes that there is some room for multi-family but with predominant single-family homes. Also spoke about the gradual transition between single-family detached and higher density multifamily and states that it is too intense, as well as no clarity on sinkholes and the MoDOT study and whether it accounts for the existing aggregated traffic or will it be for the traffic when developed.

Mr. Lebeck asked what his relationship is to the neighborhood and what does he think as reasonable use for the property.

Ms. Shantz stated that he was hired by Bristol Park Community Association, attorney for the neighborhood. He noted whether there is an existing viable commercial alternative with the property itself. It was zoned single family residential when it was annexed in and can pencil out at single family residential given that it's a 48-acre site.

Mr. David Childers, 3811 E. Brookdale Terrace, gave out examples of existing traffic incidents (killed or injured in accidents).

Ms. Connie Keiser, 3893 E. Windsmore Drive gave out information on the number of apartments and parking spaces stating that a ridiculous amount of traffic will be coming out of the area and this proposal lacks common sense. She would like the MoDOT study completed before they approve the development and states that the schools are already overcrowded.

Mr. Larry Jefferies, 4146 E. Brookdale stated that his concerns are for stormwater and that with the recent rains (13 inches in 10 days) the water flows down there due to the natural drainage and that it is already close enough to his home and worries that it may come closer with the development.

Mr. Lebeck asked about the sinkhole/pond.

Mr. Jefferies the water flows down a natural valley right behind his property and that it was flowing fast and the sinkhole/pond does not hold water.

Mr. Dennis Owens, 4056 E. High Ridge stating that their front will face the high-rise apartments and ask for the commission not to support this proposal as they always envisioned single-family homes at some point.

Mr. Ian Vosalir, 2247 N. Citation Avenue stated that traffic starts to back up at the railroad tracks next to Hwy 65 and is not happy about the four-story apartments.

Mr. David Thornton, 5191 E. Farm Road 122 voiced his concern regarding traffic stating that he lived there for approximately 47 years and showed pictures of vehicles approaching noting the wait for traffic and has worked accidents at such intersections and the additional 1000 cars it will be a mess.

Ms. Leslie Kilpatrick, 1164 N. Chesire Court stated that she has taught at Hickory Hills a long time ago and was shocked at the change but is concerned for the safety of the people and stated that the infrastructure is inadequate for the number of cars that will be added by this development. She also stated that they do not know the plans of MoDOT.

Ms. Janae Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale and is adjacent to the proposed development and is concerned about the scale and structure and believes it will negatively impact and create challenges for the ones living in the area. She stated that her concerns are traffic as the intersection at Farm Road 185 and Division is already difficult and would like this development to be reconsidered.

Ms. Erica Gaynor, 3965 East Winsmore Drive and here on behalf of her neighborhood as the president of homeowner's association. The residents of Winsmore would like to see the density of the development reduced noting concern for the overcrowding of the schools as well as the exit points and is not built for the magnitude of the development and would like more single-family homes.

Mr. Brock Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale Terrace and his home directly borders the proposed development and that his home has provided a sense of peace, space and quiet, something that is becoming very difficult to find. He also stated that the sheer number of units and corresponding residents would overwhelm the area with the concerns of traffic and noise, and the complete loss of the countryside. The proposed development in its current form is not right for the location.

Mr. Dennis Brozowski, 3836 E. Brookdale Terrace, stating that they moved to Springfield not to be 500 yards from apartments. His concern is that apartment buildings will bring crime, theft, and division and believes it will kill the community.

Ms. Barbara Brozowski, 3836 E. Brookdale Terrace stating that there are four exists and noted that the traffic and intersections are a concern and that with the proposed development from her bedroom window will be about 40 feet from the traffic.

Mr. Andy Bennett, 771 N. Summer Creek Court talked about step down areas and traditional neighborhoods and believes that the apartment complexes are not a step down and that nine apartment buildings are too much. He also voiced his concern for the traffic issues and the current intersections.

Mr. Barrett Fisk, 3655 E. Moongate stated that Farm Road 185 that he travels daily is at capacity and the proposal will create absolute gridlock, noting the blind hill that intersects at Farm Road 185. He also noted that four-story apartment buildings are not the missing middle and that there are already plenty of apartments in Springfield. He also said that his property faces Chestnut and is limited to one-story buildings and need to maintain the same fairness for the zoning regulations equally. He noted that Hickory development and UC Springhill development are one story development with lower density.

Mr. Aiden Anthony, 4354 E. Kentbrook Drive, said that his concerns were the impact on the schools and that his class size is already over 30 people and that traffic is a problem but believes that Springfield needs affordable housing but not in in that area.

Mr. Frank Gardner, 3679 E. Cromwell and works for Cooper Estates and voiced his concern for the sinkholes and with the recent downpours the water runoff in Cooper Estates was more than he had ever seen. He also stated that the traffic and the intersections are a problem and gave examples of a couple accidents that had occurred and spoke about the development will be 100% rental and not ownership.

Ms. Gunther asked if Mr. Gardner remembered MoDOT turning Le Compte into four lanes. Mr. Gardner stated that he was at that meeting with MoDOT, and he said that those plans or drawings do not exist. He wants the traffic studies done before any approval of the development.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

Mr. Colony quoted, "I completely agree with and understand all the comments and concern on traffic and the seemingly lacking infrastructure that exists there. As far as the development goes, I think this kind of development is, is one of the things we're certainly looking for in Forward SGF. And that is a diverse development where we've got, you know, a little of everything sort of mixed in and I applaud the developer for putting together a plan that seems to work. You've got single family on the outside, your density changes as you crossover and, and you get to apartments in the middle and to the north end. I know it's tough for people to live in single-family neighborhoods to think about having apartment complexes move in and I don't, you know, but I but I think that's kind of where we're headed on some of these bigger open areas. There's a 48-acre plot and I think that's probably where we're headed, and I think these guys have done a good job at trying to accommodate that. I don't think whether they're four-story units or three-story units, the way the ground falls that they're going to be all that noticeable from anybody unless you're driving down Division Street, I don't think at the end of the day they'll have a negative impact, but the traffic is a

massive concern. And I don't know whether this should move forward yet without some additional information on how we're going to handle all of the rapidly advancing traffic issues that are that is coming into the area, so I'm sort of on the fence as to whether I'm behind this or not. I really think that we may be doing a disservice if we let this thing, and not only to the folks that live in the neighborhood, but to the folks that will be moving in the neighborhood be subjected to some dangerous traffic situations if we don't require and get some sort of additional information on traffic before we let this thing move forward."

Mr. Scott quoted, "I think there's a lot of good potential with this and I'm going to propose that we eat the elephant one bite at a time. My challenge is, and I apologize for somebody reprimanding one of our speakers for picking paragraphs out when there's pages that address this kind of develop specific development specifically. But I picked out my own paragraph that gives me a little pause and full acceptance of this proposal. And it's only two sentences related to the higher design of the apartments. The design of higher density residential uses integrated into the residential neighborhood. Place type should complement the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood. Attention should be given to the building height, orientation, architectural style and set back to ensure the existing neighborhood character is retained. I zoned in on the idea of scale and height and in in my thought of breaking this down to see what might be acceptable to the Commission. I would like to make an amendment. Propose a motion to limit the building height of the multifamily portion of the development to three stories. This would eliminate 74 units from that total of 4428 and would leave 354 apartments. Would also scale down the parking and the end of that motion would be that any added space to the development as a result of reduced parking. For the multifamily, the developer could add any of the lower density single family villas etcetera to the to the count that primarily reducing the apartments to no more than three stories. That to me addresses the complementing of the scale. Yes, it is one story higher than the surrounding neighborhoods that enjoy two stories, but it does not say match the height or scale. It says compliment, so I see that as a reasonable compromise between our neighborhood speakers tonight and the developer."

Mr. Hunton asked about the proposed amendment regarding the dwelling unit count.

Mr. Scott stated that he was strictly talking about the apartments going from 428 to 354 units.

Mr. Pauly quoted, "The amendment that we just voted on, I'm sorry, but I see that is basically a band-aid solution to what's been discussed here tonight. There's a lot in this plan is good things within this plan as it's brought forward to us, but the things that aren't good have been brought up. Neighbors obviously are very much against the apartment buildings within this plan itself. And I think that again, by reducing the height, all we've done is just put a band-aid on the on the situation itself. So, looking at the plan the way that it is right now, this is something that I always go back to when we look at anything. Is it, is this the type of thing that makes sense today? Does it work today? Will it work tomorrow? Is it a smart development? I think it's close, but I don't think we're quite there."

Mr. Lebeck quoted, "Simply put, I think this is too big and too much for this area. Section 36-367, if you take a chance, look at our city code, when we do a rezoning, we have to make certain findings as a Commission and those findings ask us to look at 8 factors. And where this development fails, it fails on three primary factors. 1st, is this consistent with the comprehensive plan? And I've read the comprehensive plan, and we were a part of the comprehensive plan. And on page three, it talks about the top 10 initiatives by the Forward SGF Comprehensive Plan. The first one is Restore SGF Neighborhood Revitalization. It talks about encouraging reinvestment and home ownership in Springfield's neighborhoods. This cuts against that directly. It also talks as item 2 about a place-based approach. This plan champions a shift in the city's

planning focus from used to design with an emphasis on creating quality places. This again cuts against the comprehensive plan because it is deteriorating a good place in the city of Springfield and its current form. Another element, is it compatible with the uses of land in the immediate vicinity? The neighborhoods have all banded together tonight and they've spoken and said loud and clear. It does not, and I agree with that. In its current form with multifamily apartments buried inside some single family and some townhomes, it does not. It is not compatible with the properties in the immediate vicinity. And then finally and quite frankly, the most concerning part of this is the impact on not only vehicular but also pedestrian traffic and traffic safety. It's a traffic mess out there right now and I have not heard a consistent answer of how this is going to be fixed before we put additional property owners or renters in this area. This is an unanswered question and until this question is effectively answered, I think it would be simply irresponsible to approve this in its current form. So, I'm not supporting it currently because it does not comply with city code."

Ms. Ridge quoted, "From the beginning, I've had two objections to this project. The first was the population density that's proposed, which is just totally out of proportion with the rest of the area. The second was the traffic problems that could create. And then I have a third, I agree with much of what Mr. Lebeck said, but I also had a third objection because I'm very concerned about the aesthetics of our community. That's a beautiful area of town and that's a beautiful piece of property and I just didn't really want to see a jam packed with all those different types of structures. I didn't think it would do anything for the area. So those are my main objections to it."

Mr. Hunton quoted, "I think of myself as very pro-housing as a rule, and I think that it's something that we need to work on and something that we need to emphasize. There is good work, good intent behind this project, but I will also say that it does seem as though it hits a density that's a little bit higher than this board has in the past been okay with. If we look back at the 104-acres from just a couple months ago, similar numbers looking at that, it was approved by City Council, I think it was a split vote here, but they were at about 8.4 dwelling units per acre for those 104-acres. Based on Mr. Scott's amendment, we're down to 9.5 dwelling units per acre. Doesn't sound like a lot but that's still higher than I think we have been okay with, and I also think that there is a significant traffic issue. I came into this reading all the comments, reading every line of everything, even some of the cursive that I couldn't quite read. I tried my best; I came in today thinking that this was at least a fair approach. After hearing hours of commentary, I still think it's good in general, I think the intent is right, but I don't think this project necessarily is right. I think it does have legs, that there is a path forward but there's still questions such as the traffic, such as the density. I like it in general. I don't think I can support it at this time."

Ms. Gunther quoted, "I lived out there a long time and I know the traffic out there, it's not good. This is going to make it worse and they're going to have to figure out if they're going to build out there, they're going to have to figure out a way to do to move that traffic better. I agree with Mr. Lebeck that I would like to see ownership. I'm not feeling that this is necessarily a good thing to have renters only, but I am not going to support it."

Mr. Doennig quoted, "When I looked at this proposal just out of the gate, my initial reaction to it was the density is too high and I like the mix of properties. I like the fact that we have traditional single-family along with some villas, townhomes, duplexes, those sorts of things because it gives options to people. Not everybody wants to live in a single-family home on a lot, some people want to live in apartments, and they want to live in duplexes, townhomes, condominiums as I do so I like that. I like that mix of styles and options that they're trying to accomplish here. I supported Dan's amendment simply because it moves us in the right direction and that is less density, but I don't think it really goes far enough. My other comment is

and it's difficult for me as a commissioner to embrace something like this with MoDOT as the wild card. I am not disparaging MoDOT, they're good people and doing great work for our state, we have decent roads, and they are doing the best that they can do with what they have. That all said, I work with them frequently and I understand their process. And even if they were to come at us tomorrow and say, oh yeah, we finished that traffic study and we think that we need a traffic light at Le Compte and we need this, that and the other and maybe extend the three lanes on division or go 4 lanes on Division. All those things are, are wonderful, but the practical news is, that it is going to be years in the making. I do like the phased approach to the development because I think it sort of mitigates all of a 'sudden there' factor, but at the end of the day, based on all those things I am disinclined to support the proposal in front of us."

He also stated that it is an important part of the process, and he appreciates the process, but the Commission is an advisory board, so the recommendation will be passed to City Council, and it will be their decision as that will be the next step in the process.

COMMISSION ACTION: (amendment)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to **amend** Planned Development 392 to limit the building height of the multifamily portion of the development to three stories; Commissioner Colony seconded the motion. It was **Approved** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Gunther, and Commissioner Colony. Nays: Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Lebeck. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Planned Development 392; Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It was **Denied** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Scott and Commissioner Colony. Nays: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, and Commissioner Lebeck. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles. Abstain: None.

OTHER BUSINESS.

Subdivision Variance 358
2701 & 2747 East Sunshine Street
Applicant: Schweitzer Church

Mr. Neal states that the requested variance is to allow one (1) existing access point not in compliance with the subdivision regulations to remain near an intersection.

Mr. Pauly stated that he had spoken with the fire department and if they had any concerns, and they stated that they did not. He also noted that MoDOT has full jurisdiction over this route.

Mr. Scott and Mr. Colony talked about the circulation for the bank and possible shared access agreement.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Ball, 650 Boonville Avenue stated that there are two drives in front of the church, and they are requesting to close them and three more drives off Stanford and one of the two on Meadow View. He

noted that the bank has a agreement with the church about access, but there is no cross access easement and this access is the loading dock for the food and deliveries at the school.

Mr. Dave Bodeen, 304 W. Erie Street stating that they are getting rid of 6 accesses and keeping this drive is important and a safety issue.

Mr. Colony asked about using it as an entrance only and this solves the connection issue and asks that it remain.

Ms. Colette Freeman, 2245 S. Lone Pine gave out information regarding the preschool population and the loading dock area.

Mr. Matt Lucas, 37 Robinwood Drive, Arkansas and over the real estate for Simmons Bank and have reconfigured the entire bank to use this exit.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

Discussion on the variance by commission members.

Mr. Zickefoose, Public Works stated that he would like conditions placed on if approved.

Discussion on whether this would require an amendment since there is already a motion on the floor.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Lebeck moved to approve Subdivision Variance 358; Commissioner Gunther seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Gunther, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Colony. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles and Commissioner Ridge. Abstain: None.

Master Sign Plan Mercy Springfield South Campus

3020, 3023 & 3050 East Riverbluff Boulevard, 3026 East Evans Road and 6217 South Southwood Avenue

Applicant: Mercy Health and Tea Properties MO II, LLC

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to approve a Master Sign Plan to allow placement of on-premises and off-premises, detached signage within the Mercy Springfield South Campus.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ricky Haase, 550 E. St. Louis Street, stated that Mercy is finishing up construction on their emergency department and looking at a signage plan and cannot put signs on a parcel without a building.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Master Sign Plan Mercy Springfield South Campus; Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles and Commissioner Ridge. Abstain: None.

Amendments to the Publication / Posting Retail Liquor Sales
Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is a request to amend Section 36-459 publication of Retail Liquor Sales to remove the requirement to advertise in an official newspaper or a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Springfield, Missouri, for at least five straight consecutive issues.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to approve Amendments to the Publication / Posting Retail Liquor Sales; Commissioner Lebeck seconded the motion. It Passed with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Pauly, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Hunton, and Commissioner Lebeck. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Knuckles and Commissioner Ridge. Abstain: None.