

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

September 25, 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 Ridge, Commissioner Knuckles, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony (zoom) and Commissioner Hunton. Absent: Commissioner Lebeck.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

The minutes of September 11, 2025 were approved.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Sunshine Corridor Study Design Charrette on Tuesday, September 30, 2025 from 2:30 to 4:00pm and it is a drop-in workshop. Combining Planned Development 392 and Subdivision Variance 360, but with separate votes each.

CONSENT ITEMS.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

COMMISSION ACTION: (amend speaking time)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved reduce speaker time to 3 minutes for the entire agenda and allow for the applicant's representative rebuttal time of 3 minutes. Commissioner Knuckles seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Lebeck. Abstain: None.

COMMISSION ACTION: (combine presentations 5.1 and 7.1)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott motioned to combine presentations 5.1 and 7.1 (5.1.- Planned Development 392 and 7.1 – Subdivision Variance 360). Commissioner Knuckles seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Lebeck. Abstain: None.

Planned Development 392
3830 East Division Street
Applicant: East Division Development, LLC et al

Mr. Neal states that this is a request to rezone approximately 48 acres of property from County A-1, Agriculture District to Planned Development No. 392 and request to vary from Section 36-243(2) of the Subdivision Regulations. The requested variance is to allow the proposed development to not provide a street connection to Danvers Road in Bristol Park Subdivision to the south.

Commissioner Gunther asked if there are legal ramifications for not using the road. Ms. Vales responded that she is not aware of any legal ramifications at this time and that it is a county road.

Commissioner Scott asked how long Mr. Neal had worked with the developer and if the proposed development meets the eight criteria that is used to evaluate the project. Mr. Neal responded that it does meet the intent of the comprehensive plan criteria.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Will Hoey, 550 St. Louis Street noted the reason why the developer wanted to come back was the removal of the 4th story of the units, however one more apartment complex was added to offset the loss of 70/80 units. He also wanted to highlight the distance from the property line to the apartment complexes, i.e., to the south, it is approximately 310 feet from the property line and approximately 500 feet from the right of way of LeCompte Road. He noted that at the 2nd neighborhood meeting that it was suggested eliminating the connection directly to the neighborhood to the south and new traffic improvements and adding ownership to some of the units.

Commissioner Colony noted his comments from the last meeting where no one is happy about having development in their backyard and serious concerns regarding the traffic and asked if the developer would be agreeable to amend the application to include language that would require traffic mitigation and offering an amendment.

COMMISSION ACTION: (amend traffic impacts)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Colony motioned to mitigate the traffic impacts generated by this development, the applicant shall contribute a portion of the cost of constructing the planned signal improvements at the intersection of Division Street and LeCompte Road. Such funds shall be escrowed prior to the issuance of building permits and construction of all required improvements must be completed by the applicant prior to certificates of occupancy being issued for phase 1 buildings. Commissioner Scott seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Lebeck. Abstain: None.

Discussion about the property line and the apartment complexes and Cooper Estates.

Mr. Matt Capen, 5039 S. National Avenue, principal architect and went over the comprehensive plan on the design use, stating emphasis on design over use. "Chapter five, states at the center of a comprehensive city plan lies the fundamental need to go guide the development and redevelopment of land with an emphasis on balanced growth on the city's edges and revitalization of established neighborhoods and corridor" and noting Forward SGF provides guidance on future use and design of the land. "Chapter seven, neighborhood revitalization will play a critical role in improving Springfield's housing stock, homeownership and economic success of residents. This includes growing inclusive and welcoming neighborhoods with a

variety of housing densities that support residents of all backgrounds and the ability to comfortably age in place.”

Commissioner Scott asked for clarification on the entrance from LeCompte.

Mr. Jonathan Peitz, 550 E. St. Louis Street and here to talk about the roadway improvements. The developer has agreed and is included as part of the traffic study which has been accepted by MoDOT and the City of Springfield for a right turn lane from Division Street onto LeCompte and a right turn lane at P2, a right turn lane at P1. P2 will be right out only and P1 will have full access, but is currently in discussion between the developer, the City, and MoDOT on what the contribution will be.

Mr. Ricky Haase, 550 E. St. Louis Street, representing the developer and noted they had several meetings and looked at options on different types of housing and what the comprehensive plan was calling for. He stated that he has met with various HOA's and incorporated their comments as well as have a second neighborhood meeting, stating that the development is thoughtfully phased and carefully designed to meet the city's vision and future growth.

Questions about the median on Division Street and restriping which will be coordinated with MoDOT.

Commissioner Colony asked if the developer, the City and MoDOT have had conversations about the traffic signal and the traffic concerns, Mr. Haase noted that they are still having meetings.

Mr. Bernie Burrier, 1155 N. Chesire Court noted the change since 1980 and questions why the developer will be adding apartments, and that people are wanting to protect the value of their homes and would like the developer to move the project to another location.

Commissioner Scott asked if the speaker was aware that there is an approved multi-family housing across the street for 432 units. Mr. Burrier stated that he was not aware of that but emphasized the protection of home values.

Mr. Joe Farley, 3730 E. Cromwell noted at the last meeting an amendment was passed limiting the height of the apartments to three floors but stated that the reduction in the total number of units is insignificant and should be limited to 2.6 units per acre for a total of 124 units. He also noted that Springfield Underground has opened a third entrance and with more truck traffic as well as additional runoff that will disappear into the existing sinkhole and that the developer has acknowledged the sinkhole.

Commissioner Pauly asked for clarification on the sinkhole and where it feeds to.

Mr. Codichini, Stormwater, Public Works noted that there is a depression on the property and could have been an old farm pond and the developer must provide a geotechnical report by the time of the public improvements.

Commissioner Colony asked if the city has requirements and plans for the developer and Mr. Codichini noted that it will be based on the geotechnical study and if it is a sinkhole then a boundary will be established with a 25-foot buffer around it or if it is small or could be remediated then it will be discussed at that time.

Mr. Ken Carter, 1302 N. Fenchurch Lane commented on the apartment units and parking spaces and that there is not adequate parking based on the number of the units, he also expressed concerns regarding traffic egress/ingress.

Commissioner Colony asked if he has looked at the developer plans and the traffic improvements already designed, and Mr. Carter stated that he is only dealing with the traffic within the development and is not sure that the proposed modifications will be adequate to handle the traffic.

Mr. David Rosenbuth, 4459 E. Kentbrook Drive expressed his concerns for the proposed development and that it does not align with the spirit and letter of Forward SGF noting that the area east of Hwy 65 off Division Street is composed of traditional single-family neighborhoods and is one of the fastest middle-class families and preserving its quality of place is critical and supporting low intensity elements, this proposed development does not reflect that vision, stating that 10 midrise apartment buildings are not low intensity by any reasonable standard.

Ms. Denise Rosenbuth, 4459 E. Kentwood Drive expressed concern over the increase of traffic in a tight area and that it does not account for the rapid growth in the surrounding neighborhoods and gave examples which subdivisions are planning for more development.

Mr. Roy Erwin, 4372 E. Kentbrook Drive and voiced his concern over the density of the apartments and ask for a redesign at a lower density that would complement the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ms. Roberta Osborn, 3504 E. Cooper Blvd, asking for the Commission to reject rezoning the parcel and keep the area zoned for single-family residential.

Mr. Mark Nelson, 4404 E. Kentbrook Drive noted that the staff report states that it is partnering has been done, but tonight it is still in the process of being negotiated and it needs to be put in writing and monies need to be escrowed and voiced his concern regarding the traffic increases as well as ingress/egress issues.

Mr. Chuck Cox, 4273 E. Sherwood Ct, stating that they will introduce more than 500 residential units into a narrow corridor already under strain and it could easily add 1,500 more trips per day as well as the industrial traffic from the Springfield Underground. He also noted a fatality from a neighborhood person when riding her bicycle on Division Street and that there have been several other near misses and asks for the Commission to prioritize public safety.

Commissioner Ridge stated that she has noted while driving around the area that a lot of people come out east on Division and turn around in the neighborhood.

Mr. Cox stated that they are getting a lot of 18-wheelers coming and making U-turns at the first intersection to the neighborhood.

Discussion about tractor trailers and the proposed development.

Mr. Mike Bettlach, 4366 E. Sherwood Street and here to discuss concerns that were discussed about the major intersection along Division Street and Highway YY, noting that the exit ramp traveling south on Hwy 65 is inadequate as a single and it will back up down the ramp. He voiced his concern regarding the safety for the drivers in the area and gave out examples of current and proposed driving conditions.

Ms. Carmen Jones, 1405 N. Bristol Avenue stated that there was a financial analysis done to determine if the development will have affordable one-bedroom apartments, etc., the analysis show that a one-person household cannot afford a one-bedroom apartment and that a two person could barely afford the rent. She commented on the missing middle, and it appears that the apartments will be unavailable for the very people that Springfield wants to help.

Commissioner Hunton asked about the affordability of the homes/apartments and if she is wanting more affordable units (low-income options) and Ms. Jones noted that she would like it to be people that can afford to live there.

Mr. Darlene Matrone, 1722 N. Waterstone Avenue stated that she is a resident who values the character and long-term health of the community noting that these apartments will not be affordable and gave examples of what some of the current apartments around Springfield cost and believes this will cause high vacancy.

Amie Rogers, 4450 E. Lancaster understands what makes neighborhood desirable and what create value as well as buyers and what repels them. She expressed serious concerns regarding the proposed development due to the dramatic change of neighborhood character and spoke about the density of Cooper Estates and what the proposed development would have and that it is not a gentle transition, but a hard break.

Mr. Michael Smith, 1465 N. Bristol Avenue addressed the commissioners about their major concerns by asking the following questions. "We want to know why this revised proposal is still ultra-high density why not any allowable space was to be used for the low-density options." "We also want to know how this proposal, this revised proposal is not detrimental to the currently thriving neighborhoods that exist in this area." "How does it conform to the Comprehensive Plan because we don't feel like that has been adequately addressed with us as well revitalization and whether or not it would be a good fit for our neighborhoods." "How does this accomplish all of that and what does it do to match the character of the existing neighborhoods that already exist there?"

Mr. Phil Jones, 1405 N. Bristol Avenue stated that he believes the will of the people is not being and that the developers' ideas and plans are taking precedence of the logic of the neighborhood and asking if the city has the legal right to adversely impact the neighborhoods, to take the land, to cause the neighborhoods to suffer. He also said that proposed development is missing 4 or 5 guidelines and violates the ones that were written, and the developer was supposed to reduce the 74 units, it was reduced to 20.

Commissioner Scott stated that he had requested the reduction to three stories but make it clear that the developer could make up the density in other areas.

Mr. Dennis Owens, 4056 E. High Ridge Drive, would like the development to be single family homes as the proposed development does not fit and voiced his concern regarding traffic and congestion.

Ms. Catherine Kershaw, 1304 N. Fenchurch Lane, went over the comprehensive plan noting that the surrounding areas have single dwelling homes and to include multiple dwelling homes or rental property seems to be inconsistent. She voiced traffic concerns.

Ms. Barbara Schneider, 3827 E. Brookdale Terrace moved to the neighborhood to get away from the noise and traffic and feel the plan to allow an out-of-state contract to develop in this area would end the secure and peaceful life. She also noted that the schools and roads will not be able to handle the increase traffic.

Mr. David Childers, 3811 E. Brookside Terrace, believes there will be too much density and traffic and the possibility of people getting hurt if they only put out manual controls as reported in the press release.

Mr. Zickefoose, Traffic Engineering, Public Works, stated that it may been regarding current road work and may be talking about stop signs, however he is not sure.

Mr. Alec Martinez, 2144 E. Republic Road and here on behalf of the Bristol Park Community Association. He went over the density concerns and noted of the 8 criteria, that numbers 2, 3, 6 & 7 are not met with the property and proposed development.

Discussion regarding the logical reading of the code and the 8 criteria.

Mr. Frank Gardner, 3679 E. Cromwell Lane, voiced his concern over the density of the proposed development, he also said he has lived in Cooper Estates for 25 years talked about the sinkhole and remembers when they closed it. He would like the Commission members deny the request.

Discussion regarding the possible development across on Division Street.

Mr. Paul Lewis, 1450 N. Fenchurch Lane, voiced his concern regarding safety and security and stated he knew the person who was killed while riding her bike.

Ms. Sandy Hopper, 747 N. Summercreek Court, said that one of the biggest matters of the neighbors is a sense of trust and their trust has not been completely fulfilled by the inconsistencies from Planning and Zoning and the developer. She spoke about the developer decreasing the elevation, but he has had to change the density and said they could build other possibilities that would not increase the traffic or put a burden on the school system and that the proposed development is too dense.

Mr. Chelsea Davison, 142 Walnut Avenue, Rogersville and here to speak in support of the development, noting that the housing supply has not kept up with the new residents that have moved to the area. She also said the concerns about traffic are real, but this project won't be a sudden impact and that it is a phased development and aligns with the city and state's infrastructure.

Mr. Jim Blaine, 3625 E. Kimberly stating that the area is almost exclusively homeowners and that homeowners have a vested interest in the long-term health and prosperity of the community and believes this development will have a negative impact and noting the traffic issues.

Discussion on the growing trend in the industry that people, especially in the younger generation and upwardly mobile professionals don't want to own, they want to rent and that this is a locally built, local operated proposal.

Ms. Michelle Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale and stated that this proposal is very personal, and they have a vested interest in the outcome, noting that this will permanently affect their homes, property values and their daily lives. She stated that the surrounding area is comprised of single-family owner-occupied homes and the east side of Springfield is not the missing middle and neither is Cooper Estates, Bristol Park, and Wild Horse and the density is too much for the existing community. She also said that if this project is needed for Springfield, then it needs to be placed in a location better suited for high density housing.

Mr. Allen Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale stating that a third of their property borders on the lower portion and this will be 19 houses in that location and stated that this proposal is not a good fit and in the wrong location. He also noted that the area is not made for the proposed density and will affect traffic adversely and our neighborhood was supposed to be a low impact area.

Ms. Bonnie Farley, 3730 E. Cromwell Lane voiced her concern over the apartment buildings and the density and volume of traffic that will occur. She noted that on the city website there is reference to a zoning of R MX1 which is specific for the missing middle. It defines that zoning as single family detached houses, duplexes, multi-unit houses of two to four units and townhouses on large lots of six units maximum and what they are proposing is not representative of the missing middle.

Ms. Connie Kiser, 3893 E. Windsor Drive asking what has this California investor done with this development that would change your mind from your original denial of the project? She voiced her concerns over traffic, school overcrowding, and density issues.

Mr. Keith Abercrombie, 1236 Newcastle Avenue noting that the apartment complex does not belong on the proposed parcel of land, and it does not make sense for a person to spend ½ million on a home within an apartment complex. He went over the heading of growth areas and annexation, “the buildings shall be post-war residential neighborhoods that contain predominantly single family detached dwellings with uniform setbacks, building designs and parcel sizes. This developer, the design group, and even the city staff can spin this any way they want to. But you cannot ignore the fact that this complex does not meet this vision in chapter six of the vision plan.” He also voiced concern over sinkholes, traffic, and density.

Discussion on the summary of the ownership and that all design firms and contractors are local, but the capital using to fund the project is from California.

Mr. Doennig asked for options from the city attorney:

1. Go ahead and vote tonight, send it on to council as scheduled.
2. Close the public hearing but postpone the vote to the October 9, 2025, meeting in two weeks. It is important to note that closing the public hearing triggers a clock. (Under code, Section 363.67 (6), gives you 30 days to take a vote from on any rezoning issue and send that to get that recommendation to pass on to council).
3. Keep the public hearing open and to postpone to the October 9, 2025, meeting and to take up the issue again. Any speakers who spoke this evening would not be eligible to speak as this is a continuation of the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION: (postpone / keep public hearing open – Planned Development 392)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott motioned to postpone Planned Development 392 to the October 9, 2025 meeting with the condition that the public hearing remain open to allow for additional speakers.

Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Lebeck. Abstain: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS.

OTHER BUSINESS.

Subdivision Variance 360

3830 East Division Street

Applicant: East Division Development, LLC et al

See above for combined presentation and comments/discussion.

COMMISSION ACTION: (postpone / keep public hearing open – Subdivision Variance 360)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott motioned to postpone Subdivision Variance 360 to the October 9, 2025 meeting with the condition that the public hearing remain open to allow for additional speakers.

Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Hunton, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Lebeck. Abstain: None.

ADJOURN.