

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

October 9, 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 Lebeck.
Absent: Commissioner Hunton.

Staff in attendance: Justin Crighton, Planning and Development Assistant Director, Bob Hosmer, Planning Manager, Daniel Neal, Michael Sparlin, and Andrew Menke, Senior Planner, and Duke McDonald, Assistant City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

The minutes of September 25, 2025 were approved.

COMMUNICATIONS.

September Planning and Zoning and City Council actions. Planned Development 392 and Subdivision Variance 360 were combined and on the agenda for tonight as the public hearing was held open from the September 25, 2025 – speaker time is still at 3 minutes with the applicant’s representative rebuttal, this will require two separate votes.

CONSENT ITEMS.

Relinquishment of Easement 964
2709, 2713 & 2719 South Austin Avenue
Applicant: Dyke Industries, Inc.

Request to Acquire 549
1436 West Hovey Street
Applicant: City Utilities of Springfield

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles moved to approve Consent Items (Relinquishment of Easement 964 and Request to Acquire 549); Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

Z-16-2025

2655 North Kansas Expressway

Applicant: Neal Wood, Morris Loan and Investment Company

Mr. Sparlin stated that this is a request to rezone approximately 2.90 acres from a GR, General Retail District to a HC, Highway Commercial District.

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cathy West, Dallas, TX and is the applicant's representative and is currently under construction for the interior portion of the tractor supply and requesting to have fenced outdoor display with propane and seasonal displays as well as utility trailers.

Commissioner Pauly asked about the location for the propane storage and containers.

Ms. West stated that it shows on the site plan (handed out to commission members) and will be inside the fence and not accessible to the public.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles moved to approve Z-16-2025; Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

COMMISSION ACTION: (applicant's rebuttal time)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott moved to 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 Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

COMMISSION ACTION: (moved agenda items 5.2 and 5.3)

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Scott motioned to move items 5.2 and 5.3 after 7.1 (5.2.- Planned Development 392 and 5.3 – Subdivision Variance 360). Commissioner Knuckles seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

Planned Development 392

3830 East Division Street

Applicant: East Division Development, LLC et al

Mr. Neal stated at the last meeting, the Commission amended the plan development to add language about the traffic impacts to Division Street and LeCompte Road and will be adding that to exhibit one and will be part of the amendment.

Commissioners requested the developer's representative to come to the podium and give the latest update.

Mr. Ricky Haase, 550 E. St. Louis noting that they have been working with Public Works and have gotten g multiple bids back on the improvements at Division Street and LeCompte Road and the three parties being the developer, the city and MODOT are now in alignment on the goals of signalizing that intersection and in general agreement on the project costs for those improvements and they are in a good spot to move forward.

Commissioner Colony asked about the agreement and Mr. Haase noted that it is being reviewed and should be in place shortly.

Commissioner Scott asked about the neighbors to the south and Mr. Haase said that to appease the neighbors, that Subdivision Variance 360 need to be approved.

Commission Lebeck asked about the timeframe for a formal agreement and Mr. Haase noted that it should be next week.

Ms. Christina Lasmet, 1412 N. Cooper Blvd spoke about the core element of the plan for the housing and neighborhood section, i.e., walkability and the lack of neighborhood amenities.

Commissioner Lebeck spoke about the eight elements needed for rezoning and asking about the lack of walkability in the area.

Commission Scott asked if Ms. Lasmet about residential development if there is no walkability and she stated that it needs to support a livable, walkable and a complete neighborhood.

Mr. Dale Fagerland, 3638 E. Cromwell Court and said that the proposal is wrong for the area, i.e., density, missing middle and the funding for the development and asking if planning regulations limit out of state ownership or investment and if this is a legitimate consideration when approving, rejecting or limiting development.

Commissioner Doennig said it does not.

Ms. Jessica Ingram, 4038 E. High Ridge Drive and lives 30 feet from the proposed development and was told not to let her children roam the area due to sinkholes, stating that a geotechnical study will only be done after the land has been rezoned. She also voiced her concern for the density and traffic problems.

Mr. Paul Logsdone, 1375 N. Lennox Court went over previous commissioner's comments from earlier meetings and wanted to correct their responses, i.e., density, band-aid solution, and the combability with the neighborhood and asking the commission to vote no.

Mr. Jim Abromovitz, 4556 E. Cromwell Street spoke about the concerns voiced at the September 25, 2025 meeting regarding the density, apartments, and traffic and the proposed traffic light and that there are many unanswered questions still need to be resolved.

Ms. Yelena Popov, 3538 E. Cooper Blvd noted her concerns regarding the traffic, high density, overcrowding for the schools and that the proposed development does not fit with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Larry Summers, 4620 E. Kentbrook Drive and has lived in the area for 15 years and asked rhetorical questions. "Will Council Resolution 10188 from 2014 be required?" "The street was designated an Industrial Street and does this fit with a proposed 10.5 density of residential and does this annexation meet with RS Missouri 71.012 criteria?"

Mr. Ken Albin, 4441 E. Sherwood Avenue asked about the clarity of the meaning in the terminology of step-down, and it appears step-down has a variety of documented definitions throughout the country and gave out examples.

Ms. Maricela Burleigh, 1342 Rosedale Court and spoke about the missing middle housing initiative and its traditional definition, she also noted affordable housing alternatives and that there is a deficit of 14,000 living units and asked where the missing middle fits in this development and believes the proposal violates character of the area.

Ms. Shelia Forsyth, 1465 N. Bristol Avenue stating that she is counting on the Commission to safeguard their community and culture of their neighborhood and that Forward SGF emphasizes the revitalization of neighborhoods. She also voiced her concern for lack of walkability and that the proposed development does not fit and how would the Commissioners feel that if it was their homes being impacted.

Ms. Miranda Myrick, 1662 N. Oakfair Place stating that the Springfield Daily Citizen noted that Springfield is at a tipping point and encourages investments in projects and that the city provide a better quality of life. She asks for consideration of the many possibilities for the land and what is the plan to expand fire and police services. She also noted that the city wants to protect wildlife habitat and natural resources through property acquisition, conservation efforts and ecological restoration and dropping a thousand plus people onto the corner of LeCompte Road and Division Street does not protect wildlife or natural resources.

Mr. Kevin Ausburn, 4105 E. Brookdale Terrace stated that he is a big proponent of economic development of Springfield when done properly and the proposal is out of character with the surround neighborhood of high-quality owner-occupied homes, noting the rental development proposition.

Mr. Ernest Curry, 851 N. Summercreek Court voiced his concern over community ownership and that nearly every home is owner-occupied and that rental properties do not meet the same sense of responsibility regarding maintenance and treatment of neighbors. He also stated that homeowners are more likely to be long term contributors to the fabric of the community.

Ms. Esther Wood, 1365 N. Chapel Drive and asks the Commission to strongly consider the concerns of thousands of standalone residential single-family homes in the area and that the proposal would change the landscape of their east Springfield community. Concerns were density, school overcrowding and traffic issues.

Mr. Greg Box, 4427 E. Pearson Meadow Lane, stated that the stormwater runoff and sinkholes are a major concern and that there are increasing volumes of runoff in recent years and gave examples.

Mr. Brandon Corn, 801 N. Thornapple Lane stated that this development is not about quality of life, safety or responsible progress and is about dollars and profit. He noted that the developer has not addressed or corrected the concerns regarding the density and safety, and it should be the forefront of every planning and zoning decision regarding Springfield's future growth.

Mr. Andy Bennett, 771 N. Summercreek Court, stated that the proposed density is one of the biggest issues and that the developer has not chosen to rectify it.

Commissioner Lebeck asked for background information from Mr. Bennett, and it was noted that he has practiced law as a real-estate attorney in the past and that the potential development or rezoning will have a very significant impact on vehicular and pedestrian traffic for the area by lowering the values of the homes and it will be harder to get out on LeCompte Road.

Commissioner Lebeck asked if this would impact his quality of place and Mr. Bennett stated that it would.

Ms. Barbara Brozowski, 3836 E. Brookdale Terrace, stating that the development does not fit into the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Gave out information regarding apartments, villas and duplexes and asking if the Springfield rental market needs 428 new apartments and that most will be of the upper price range. She noted that the traffic light needs to be installed before development starts.

Commissioner Scott asked if she is in favor of the development if the traffic light is in place and she stated, "no" and that traffic is already an issue.

Mr. Ben Shantz, 2144 E. Republic Road here on behalf of the Bristol Park Community Association and went over the eight criteria and code that the commission is tasked with. He stated, "I do think this proposal as presented does not comport with the Comprehensive Plan. One need not look any further than the predominant single family residential neighborhoods that the code under chapter five says need to be built out in the east side of town. There's been some suggestion that the use of the word predominantly allows for flexibility and decisions whether we're going to have units other than traditional single-family post-war houses in this area. Looking at criteria five, the impact of the uses which would be permitted if the property were rezoned would have upon the volume of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. I think the clear answer is that it would be a negative impact. Number six is whether the proposed rezoning would correct an error in the application of the article as applied to the property. There's no allegation of that that does not support approval here. Criteria seven is an interesting one, whether there's a reasonably viable economic use of the subject property that would be precluded by the denial of zoning. I think that differing minds can agree on whether that allows for this commission to place themselves in an economic use evaluator. That thankfully, we don't have to do that because paragraph 20 of the staff report says that the city's own staff has concluded that there is not a reasonably viable economic use that is precluded."

Commissioner Lebeck asked about place types and Mr. Shantz stated, "The way I view the traditional neighborhood place type, and I believe the way the Comprehensive Plan reads it, is that there must be a predominance of that very type of single family detached housing throughout the zoned area. What we see from the application is it's 9% single family detached."

Commissioner Lebeck asked if Mr. Shantz thought that the infrastructure should be in place before this is considered. Mr. Shantz stated, "I would agree with that and think that it is especially important in light of the fact that we have admittedly three or four additional major developments happening around the area that we need to make sure that what we're building in infrastructure accommodates all of that additional traffic."

Commissioner Scott asked if he supports a moratorium on the houses of Wild Horse and others and Mr. Shantz stated that he does not believe a moratorium would be appropriate.

Further discussion on traffic studies and moratoriums.

Mr. Ryan Walker, 828 N. Summercreek Court, stated that his HOA has done a great job keeping them informed of the proposed development and if the capacity of the influx will handle this monstrosity, noting that the police department is already shorthanded. He said his priority is safety and believes that the influx of apartments does not fit and asked if rental developments add value to the city.

Mr. Brock Jacobs, 3905 E. Brookdale Street and believes that single family homes would be the most consistent and logical use of the property and that the current rezoning is a lose-lose for everyone.

Mr. Manuel Gonzales, 4582 East Fox Run Road stating that they are political refugees from the People's Republic of California and that he believes the first and most important responsibility of every elected official is to protect their constitutional rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. He noted that this project, is a savage attack on those rights and that people are going to die in traffic accidents on these roads.

Discussion of options for the Commissioners:

1. Hold the public hearing open and not take a vote.
2. Close the public hearing and not take a vote, but it starts the recommendation to City Council within 30 days.
3. Entertain a motion and close the public hearing for both cases.

Commissioner Colony asked to be reminded about the amendment and what is the agreement, asking if the City Attorney agrees that the amendment protects them from the development moving forward if an agreement is not reached and officially signed.

Mr. Duke McDonald, Assistant City Attorney that he would not overrule what Laura Vales, Assistant City Attorney has already said.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Colony comments were, "The sinkholes are just not germane to this issue. It's a developer risk situation. Sinkholes exist everywhere in this part of Missouri. The city has requirements to address sinkholes and how they must be sealed up if one has occurred, it's really the developer's risk to develop property that may have sinkholes in it.

The missing middle, there seems to be a lot of misconception that missing middle is somehow some kind of an economic threshold or economic place type, and it's not. It's simply a range of multi-unit or clustered housing that is compatible in scale with single family homes and I believe that the missing middle housing that we have in this development is definitely compatible with the, the single family homes that it is across the street from and I think it will be a, a great addition to have some different types of housing thrown into the higher end single family universe out there.

Compatibility, I'm a big proponent of compatibility. I do believe that a new development should be compatible with the surrounding development. I don't think it's okay to put 25 cluster homes next to a 5 acre subdivision or a subdivision full of 5 acre lots, I but in this case I believe that the transitional approach the developer has taken with putting the single family homes around the south and west perimeter, the transition through the missing middle homes that are there to this higher density apartments which are going to be nice upscale apartments. I think they're going to attract a nice younger apartment dwelling type of folks, and I think that that compatibility is therefore met through this transitional approach.

Walkability, I applaud the fact that somebody brought up walkability. It's the most unique and interesting conversation to have especially with a bunch of gated communities and no sidewalks out there except for those that are contained within their own subdivision. It would be great if we could figure out how to connect all these subdivisions together so folks could walk around and get places, but it is a guiding principle. One of the guiding principles of a comprehensive plan which is what the plan is. There is no requirement that new developments have mixed use components but would be great if we could get somewhere someday and that was the kind of development that people wanted to put in. I think it would be fantastic, but it's not a requirement and do support the fact that it was brought up. I support the fact that this development has so many sidewalks and walking trails within it, and I hope that one day they're all connected to my backyard. The several speakers have asked that we vote as if this were next door to our house or it was in our backyard or our neighborhood and I'm certain that that is not a criterion.

It's not one of the eight things that we're supposed to consider, but for the record, I would welcome this development in my backyard, especially if it would take place at the public golf courses at the end of my street. So, I still think the most viable and restrictive aspect of this development was the traffic concern and

believe that the turn lanes, the right ins, the right outs, the traffic studies, all the things that the city, the developer and traffic engineers have gone through have resolved this issue.

The last missing component is, is some sort of traffic control, signal control at LeCompte Road and Division Street and believe we have an amendment in place that will relieve that obligation, that will alleviate that situation, I should say, and therefore I'll be supporting this tonight."

Commissioner Doennig stated, "It is very important that for the record, that the Commissioners feel comfortable stating why they support or do not support these issues."

Commissioner Lebeck stated, "Like Mr. Gonzalez, I, too, am a California refugee. The reason I bring up California is because I lived in Southern California and Northern California as a kid, and I'm familiar with these types of what I would call a master plan development. This, quite frankly, is a great development with a lot of positive pieces. The simple problem is it's in the wrong place in our city.

It's the wrong type of zoning as a planned development for this place, type of residential neighborhoods, and traditional neighborhood as a planned development, it simply does not fit the surrounding area. If we want people to continue to live and thrive in the city limits of Springfield, we need to start showing respect to the established neighborhoods of the city and respect the entire area and honor those individuals that have invested in our community. When we look at this, it doesn't fit the comprehensive plan and there are traffic issues out there now. By basically putting this square peg in a round hole, we're going to amplify those traffic issues, and several speakers talked about it based on their experiences in the area and a single traffic light, a single intersection is not going to have the type of impact on the traffic for this area. If we look at this in the bigger picture in the broader area, and it's amplified by a lack of suitable transportation infrastructure, both vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

If the city wants something like this to work, we've got to look at putting the infrastructure in first before we do this, so it's the traffic reason, it's the fact that this doesn't fit the comprehensive plan is why this development, this rezoning fails on three of the eight things we must consider as a board. It is not consistent with the Springfield Comprehensive Plan; the range of uses are not compatible with the uses permitted in other property in the immediate vicinity and the impact the uses have on the volume of vehicular and pedestrian traffic cannot be ignored. If our comprehensive plan that the city works so hard on is to be something more than just a bunch of written bouquet of flowery-feel-good language, then we need to follow it and honor it. A planned development of this magnitude in this area of our city that does not fit the place type does not do that, so I'm going to be voting against it."

Commissioner Pauly comments were, "I understand the importance of owner occupied within our city, I think that is very important, but I also must respect those that do not want to own their own property and would prefer to be a renter, that's just reality of it. I live amongst the 40% to 50% of renters that we have within here within the City of Springfield and we have a very high rental population. We would like to see, of course, that changed over to more of a 60/40 split with owner occupied as opposed to renters and I will be voting no, because there are so many reasons not to go ahead and support this."

Commissioner Scott comments were, "One of the things I've struggled with is and we've been beat up by testimony saying this is extremely high-density development by numerous speakers and it's just not. In fact, our existing zoning code says this would qualify and I'm not relating this just to the apartments, but as well as the development, that this would qualify for low density, not high density, not extremely high density, but low density multifamily. Low density multifamily allows 11 units per acre up to 18 units per acre with a conditional overlay district and we are below the baseline of 11 with this proposal. Secondly, this is not going to be built all at once. The applicant's representative has indicated that they're hoping for a best-case scenario that they're built in six years and absorbed in 10 years. As I recall his testimony, we're not going to throw all this at the surrounding neighborhoods or the roads or the signals or the schools all at one time. There will be an

adjustment period, and the absorption will allow this to become the common pace of life for this area of the city.

Step-down approach at edges and as we look at all these neighborhoods that are represented here tonight as the context of the traditional neighborhood in this area of town, this step-down transition is at an edge. Across the street there is going to be another apartment complex and an office building and behind will be an industrial area that includes marijuana cultivating and processing. This development meets that step-down goal; Is it too much for this area? Too big? No, that's why I remarked about the step down as well as the 10-year absorption period that will allow this to meld into the everyday course of the lives of the neighborhoods around it.

Traffic is the second big issue, if not the biggest issue, besides density. The traffic study that's been reviewed by multiple engineers has indicated that with this development is only at about 25% capacity of LeCompte Road and Division Street. Sure, it's busy in peak times, but that's going to be helped by the regulation of the two traffic signals, one added at Eastgate Avenue and one added at Lecomte Road and that will provide an opportunity with traffic modulation for people to be able to get out of their neighborhoods or their driveways if they have direct access to one of these two roads. There are three turn lanes, and street widening that allows an additional left turn lane off LeCompte Road. These are great improvements.

There's also a great gift being given to all the neighbors from a single developer who is not required to put in a traffic signal because he has not created all the traffic that you're dealing with at this time, because right now it's a hay field. But he's providing a contribution that he does not have to make to help all the neighbors as people travel in on Division Street.

Finally, I didn't see or hear any testimony that any of the other neighborhoods wanted to be part of the solution regarding traffic. Has that been talked about in any of the neighborhood meetings, at Wild Horse, at any of the others? That maybe the developer should be asked, asked to not develop anymore until roads were improved and apply the same criteria to your current developer for your neighborhood as you're trying to put on this development. I didn't hear any comments about that. I didn't hear anyone comment that they've been trying for months or years to try to talk to their county commissioner to try to put a moratorium on development out on East Division Street to help mitigate the traffic challenges. It has been noted that there's approximately 1,000 or more living units going to be developed and half of those will come from this development. That means half of the additional problems coming down Division Street are coming from other developments. But the testimony that I'm hearing is that it's all this developer's problem and I don't think that is a fair assessment from the neighborhoods. I believe that this is compatible with comprehensive plan as edge development with a step-down from surrounding neighborhoods. And the comprehensive plan doesn't say matching, it says compatible. I think that this accomplishes that and the goal of increased density in our housing stock for the city and our desire to have missing middle housing, which, is strictly talking about built form. It is not talking about income requirements; it is talking about built form in the comprehensive plan, and I will be supporting this proposal."

Commissioner Ridge stated, "The stoplight needs to be there, but there's already a traffic problem there, and I don't think that it's going to get a whole lot better with all the developments that's planned in the surrounding area, so stoplight or no stop light, the traffic is still a problem to me. I think this is a good plan, but I don't think it's in the right place currently. I think that the three problems I see are the number of housing units, the number of people, and the number of cars, it will put on a relatively small acreage and to me, that's just too much, doesn't work and it doesn't fit with the character of the surrounding area. I will not support this idea.

Commissioner Knuckles stated, "I was concerned about the density earlier but we're looking at 11 units per acre with this development and I would look at a duplex as being something as a step down, transitional. The traffic is a concern but knowing what is coming to the north, it's going to be beginning a lot worse whether this development goes in or not and it's coming. I don't see that much that we can do with the traffic other than if

the state increases the size of Division Street and the county increases the size of LeCompte Road and probably down at Chestnut Expressway/Mill Street, but I don't think it's the decision of this Commission to tell the state that they're going to have to do it.

There is a lot of contribution from other areas that need to be addressed through the state, but I don't think it's right to put it all on one developer to improve the wrongs that are out there now in the infrastructure. I think the developer has done as much as would be reasonably expected of someone to make those improvements to improve that and feel that the developer has gone a little bit above what would require other developers to do. I will be voting in support of this case."

Commissioner Doennig stated, "There are a lot of positive things about this development regarding the mix of housing types. Do I think it's potentially too much in one space? Yes. I had consternation about the density of this at our first hearing and not a lot has been done to change that. However, when you look at the density in the context of no real traffic improvements out there, it looks different to me with some traffic improvements. I do feel that the developer is contributing significantly to try to resolve problems that they didn't create and they're trying. It's unreasonable to ask this developer to do work beyond the boundaries of the property that they purchased, and we can't expect them to fix the sidewalks all along Division Street and do other things that need to happen, but it's not their job.

When I think about this corridor, yes, you look at it today and what you see are single family residences, and that's about it, but we've already zoned other parcels along this strip that are going to look very different and they're going to be very dense. Does this fit, well, it doesn't fit what's there today but is it compatible with all the development that is coming.

If we were really concerned about traffic along Division Street, we wouldn't have been okay with additional development that is happening in the neighborhood, so the fact that we're complacent about those, yet this is somehow a tipping point, I find that troublesome and I'm going to vote in favor of this despite shortcomings."

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

Subdivision Variance 360

3830 East Division Street

Applicant: East Division Development, LLC et al

The public hearing was held open from the September 25, 2025 Planning and Zoning meeting. See above for combined presentation.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Scott comments were, "In my own opinion on the matter is that the street to the south and at that point in time, the developer relinquished control and maintenance of that and in doing so quieted his voice on any future matter regarding that street. I can't see that it makes sense that somehow then the neighborhood gains a voice when the street that they're on has already been relinquished to city control. So, if the developer desires a connection, I think that it is valid to grant that."

Commissioner Knuckles comments were, "It's been my experience over a lot of years that in this case, as stated it has been a dedicated street and was dedicated when it was platted. I'll be voting against the variance."

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles motioned to approve Subdivision Variance 360. Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It was **Denied** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, and Commissioner Pauly. Nays: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, and Commissioner Knuckles. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS.

Z-19-2025

3907 South York Avenue and 4000 South Jonathan Avenue.

Applicant: Brenda Boehm / Boehm Family Trust and Wire Road Development, LLC

Applicant has requested this item to be postponed to November 6, 2025.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles moved to postpone Z-19-2025 to November 6, 2025; Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

Z-21-2025

426 North Warren Avenue

Applicant: Paul Mueller Company

Daniel Neal stated that this is a request to rezone approximately 0.22 acre of property from R-TH, Residential Townhouse District to LB, Limited Business District.

Commissioner Gunther asked about the current house, Mr. Neal stated that it will be demolished and made into a parking lot but with a 6-foot-tall solid fence.

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Daniel Richards, 1200 E. Woodhurst Drive, representing the applicant and this is an extension of the previous rezoning from earlier this year and cleaning up non-conforming zoning and plan to turn it into a parking lot (15 additional parking spaces). Will be adding a landscape buffer for the neighborhood and here to answer any questions.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles moved to approve Z-21-2025; Commissioner Pauly seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

Z-22-2025
2404 East Sunshine Street
Applicant: Deckard & Ward, LLC

Michael Sparlin requested this to rezone approximately 0.87 acres from Planned Development 136 Amendment 1 to a GR, General Retail District.

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Aaron Hargrave, 3213 Southwest Bypass and representing the applicant and here to answer any questions.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles moved to approve Z-22-2025; Commissioner Colony seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

Preliminary Plat of Mercy Springfield South Campus 1st Addition
6375 South Innovation Avenue and 6217 South Southwood Avenue
Applicant: Tea Properties of Missouri II, LLC

Andrew Menke stated that this is a request to approve a preliminary plat for a 3-lot subdivision.

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ricky Haase, 550 E. St. Louis Street representing Mercy Hospital and they are planning on splitting up the property so they can develop on lot 1 (east side) and are planning to connect to the sanitary sewer using the grade area for drainage for phase 1 and no intentions of developing the rest of the property at this time.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles moved to approve Preliminary Plat of Mercy Springfield South Campus 1st Addition; Commissioner Colony seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, Commissioner Colony, Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: None. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

Preliminary Plat of J & M Tillman Center
1650 South Ingram Mill Road
Applicant: J & M Tillman, LLC

Andrew Menke states that this is a request to approve a preliminary plat for a 5-unit condominium plat.

Commissioner Scott asked about the parking and Mr. Menke stated that the applicant's representative is available.

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

Ms. Teresa Davison, 535 W. Battlefield and representing the developer and stated that they have a preliminary site plan which has been shared with the city staff for parking and drives, the city identified that they have donated Ingram Mill Road back to MoDOT back in 2022. They are visiting with MoDOT to look at reducing part of the guardrail along the road that is protecting the screen wall at the north end of the property so that a driveway may be placed there. The intent is to occupy them as business warehouse space and there'll be little traffic that would be generated from the business and little parking required but this is just the condo plat.

Commissioner Knuckles asked about common area and Ms. Davison noted that they have some ideas in mind but want to talk with city staff.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

OTHER BUSINESS.

Subdivision Variance 359
3303 & 3315 South Campbell Avenue
Applicant: Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 8721

After speaking with the legal department, Commissioner Pauly noted that his wife had worked at Walmart many years ago for full disclosure.

Daniel Neal stated that this is a request to vary from Section 36-251(4) of the Subdivision Regulations. The requested variance is to allow the existing access along South Campbell Avenue to remain.

Commissioner Pauly asked ingress and egress and if part of the original setup for the location. Mr. Neal noted that it has been there for the entire time approximately 30 years).

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Schebaum, 103 Elm Street, Washington, MO working with the client who is purchasing the property from Walmart and looking to separate it and going through an administrative replat which opens up the current land development regulations and would like to maintain the access.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Knuckles moved to Subdivision Variance 359; Commissioner Scott seconded the motion. It **Passed** with the following vote: Ayes: Commissioner Doennig, Commissioner Ridge, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Lebeck, Commissioner Gunther, and Commissioner Knuckles. Nays: Commissioner Pauly and Commissioner Colony. Absent: Commissioner Hunton. Abstain: None.

Initiate the Land Development Code Text Amendments

Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield

Bob Hosmer is requesting that the Planning and Zoning Commission initiate amendments to the Springfield Land Development Code pursuant to Sec. 36-367. - Amendments. As recommended by the adoption of Forward SGF, the City should perform a comprehensive review and update of its Land Development Code to establish regulations that support the desired type of development and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

Initiate the Update to the Official Zoning Map

Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield

Bob Hosmer is requesting that the Planning and Zoning Commission initiate amendments to the zoning map pursuant to Sec. 36-306. - Official zoning map and rules for interpretation. Forward SGF, the City should perform a comprehensive review and update of its Land Development Code to establish regulations that support the desired type of development and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Commissioner Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

ADJOURN.