

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

DATE: August 23, 2012

TIME: 6:30 pm

The regular meeting and public hearing of the Planning and Zoning Commission was held on the above date and time in City Council Chambers, third floor of City Hall with the following members and staff in attendance: Shelby Lawhon (Chair); Jay McClelland, Jim Hansen, Tom Baird; Jason Ray; Michael MacPherson, Principal City Planner; Matt Schaefer, Planner; Thomas Rykowski, City Attorney; Cody Marshall, Public Works, Dawn Gardner, Traffic Division; Judy White, Executive Secretary. Absent: Matt Edwards, Gloria Roling, King Coltrin, and Phil Young.

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of August 8, 2012, of the Planning and Zoning Commission were approved with a correction.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. MacPherson stated that the applicant for Relinquish Easement 783, Consent Item Number 1 on the agenda, has requested the item be tabled indefinitely. There was an e-mail sent to Commission with regard to the American Planning Association Bi-State Conference which will be held on October 10th through the 12th at the Marriott Country Club Plaza in Kansas City, Missouri. It has been quite some time since anyone has attended but those who have attended in the past have said it is a very worthwhile experience and educational and an enjoyable experience seeing what other communities do. The City is prepared to send all members of Commission for those who are interested and the cost of registration and lodging would be provided and all members are invited to attend. Mr. MacPherson encouraged all members to attend.

CONSENT ITEMS

1. **Relinquish Easement 783**
(2640 West Republic Road)

Jeknie, LLC

Mr. Baird **motioned to table** Relinquish Easement 783 indefinitely. Mr. Hansen **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Lawhon, Baird, Ray, McClelland and Hansen. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Roling, Coltrin, and Young.

HEARINGS:

2. **Hickory Hills Market Place Phase 1, FP Conformity Review**
(NE Corner US Hwy 65 and Chestnut Expressway)

Larino Properties, LLC

Mr. MacPherson stated the purpose of the case is to approve the final plat for Hickory Hills Marketplace Phase 1 that could not be approved administratively due to its lack of conformity to the approved preliminary plat. The Final Plat could not be administratively approved because the final plat is not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plat. The approved preliminary plat showed a common area/detention basin (approximately 2 acres in size) on the northeast corner of the subdivision. The approved preliminary plat, also, showed a Lot 1 that was only 16 acres in size. The applicant has submitted a Final Plat (Exhibit A) that would create a Lot 1 that

encompasses the common area/detention basin which increases its lot area to approximately 17.98 acres. The applicant is proposing an off-site regional detention basin that will satisfy the stormwater requirements for the entire subdivision. This allows the common area/detention basin that was shown on the approved Preliminary Plat to be combined with Lot 1 to form a larger lot. The Planning and Zoning Commission review is to determine if the proposed Final Plat (Exhibit A) merits approval despite its lack of conformity to the approved Preliminary Plat (Exhibit B). If the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the proposed Final Plat merits approval, the Final Plat will complete the normal Final Plat review process. All conditions of the review of this proposed Final Plat, including any required public improvement plans, must be satisfied prior to the recording of the Final Plat. Mr. MacPherson pointed out the previous detention area on the overhead display map and the proposed 1.98 acres that would be added to the Lot 1. The detention basin would be located off-site and would be a regional detention and would use a certified drainage channel as a conveyance to get the water to it. Mr. MacPherson pointed out the difference in the original preliminary plat that was filed and the current proposal. Findings for staff recommendations are the final plat lacks substantial conformity to the Preliminary Plat because the proposed common area/detention basin is located off-site and the excess area is being added to Lot 1 on the approved Preliminary Plat. The proposed Final Plat is acceptable because the proposed change does not have any impacts over what was proposed on the Preliminary Plat. All conditions that result from the staff review of the Final Plat, including any required public improvement plans, must be met before the final plat can be recorded. Staff is recommending approval.

Mr. Baird asked for an arial map display so Commission could get a good overhead view of the site and asked to be shown where the proposed detention would be.

Mr. MacPherson pointed out the detention area.

Mr. Lawhon commented that you are calling this a regional detention basin so will it serve properties in addition to this one site and the previous detention basin that was on the north side of the property, where was that elevation wise from Chestnut Expressway.

Mr. Marshall stated that yes it will, it will serve approximately 94 acres total. It was elevated considerably from the site so they were going to have to excavate twenty (20) foot or better to be able to provide the volume.

Mr. Lawhon opened the public hearing.

Mr. Paul Larino, 1508 Melton, Ozark, Missouri.

Mr. Hansen asked Mr. Larino asked if he owned the property the detention is located on owned by someone else.

Mr. Larino stated that would be done through a public easement through public works so it will be owned by another property owner who will also be a beneficiary of the runoff water.

Mr. Hansen commented that if the final plat is approved, then you will get an easement from the owner of this property.

Mr. Larino said yes, they are working through Public Works and the Law Department to get all the necessary easements to make it a regional detention that qualifies under Public Works.

Mr. Hansen asked about the certified channel stating that there is none that exists there except the one that is going directly north and south, the certified channel that conveys the water from your property to the detention.

Mr. Marshall corrected that this is the easement that Mr. Larino will be obtaining and you can see it, it is very faint on the picture, that area where the arrow is right now is where the drainage easement will be obtained from the third party.

Mr. Hansen asked how it would be conveyed.

Mr. Marshall stated underground.

Mr. Hansen asked if this will detain 90 plus acres of area to the north.

Mr. Marshall stated that is correct; Hickory Hills Marketplace has approximately forty-eight (48) acres and this will collect some area from the freeway, also some area to the north, and slightly to the north east. The basin would be designed for a fully developed ninety-four (94) acre watershed.

Mr. Hansen asked where the water flows to from the detention.

Mr. Marshall said it flows south under Chestnut, that's Farm Road 132, through a box culvert and then continues down to the south to Pearson Creek.

Mr. Larino stated that as opposed to having multiple detentions in the area and doing multiple holes to collect the water from the region it worked good for them economically and worked good for the neighbors and through this process we are collecting water from several locations and many will benefit from this regional detention. It is also designed in a way to make certain there are no flooding issues downstairs. They are held to a higher restrictive standard because they worked with the county in releasing water and the detention size is a little bit bigger because of that because they have to pay special attention and make certain they release water at a slower rate than what normally would be accepted under the City of Springfield standards.

Mr. Marshall stated the County felt that based on rainfall observations and looking at the downstream condition that there was very little runoff on a normal one to two inch rain so essentially it held the development to one cubic foot per second discharge rate on those size storms. It exceeds the ordinary requirements but it was based on the observations of actual rain events.

Mr. Lawhon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hansen motioned to **approve** Hickory Hills Marketplace Phase 1 Final Plat, Conformity Review. Mr. Baird **seconded** the motion. The motioned **carried** as follows: Ayes: Lawhon, Baird, Ray, McClelland and Hansen. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Edwards, Roling, Coltrin, and Young

ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS:

3. Emergency Shelters Revised Amendment (City-Wide)

City of Springfield

Mr. MacPherson stated the purpose of this is a Text Amendment to amend certain portions of the Emergency and Transitional Service Shelter ordinances through varying chapters from the various zoning districts. The City Council approved a resolution (G.O. 9921) on December 12, 2011, initiating amendments to the Zoning Ordinance regarding the operation and location of emergency shelters. A primary concern was what happened in Joplin, Missouri with regard to the tornado that occurred. It was determined that we were not prepared to be able to respond to that type of need quickly so one of the items that is mentioned in this amendment to Replace the term "emergency" shelter with "overnight" shelter to distinguish a shelter used in time of natural disaster or fire emergency shelter (which Red Cross or Greene County Emergency Management would respond to) and a short-

term cold weather shelter. The term "overnight" is a standard term used by other entities for a shelter that provides meals and lodging for less than thirty (30) days. It also adds and requires a minimum distance of one thousand (1,000) feet between any new emergency and transitional service shelter or soup kitchen and an elementary or secondary school as measured from property which will be discussed in greater detail. It would also remove the existing requirement for fifty (50) or less residents at an emergency/overnight and transitional service shelter and allow City Council the ability to review and set the number of residents allowed based on the characteristics of the site and surrounding neighborhood; the availability of services and infrastructure; and a review, by the appropriate departments, to determine the application of the various City codes including, but not limited to, fire, health, zoning and building codes. The Planning and Zoning Commission will review and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the maximum number of residents permitted which would make it specific to the site being proposed as opposed to some arbitrary figure that was chosen. In the staff report information, there is a graph that shows the sites of the six Service and Transitional Shelters. Each shelter has a two-thousand foot distance requirement between them and the reason for that is that when you have too many of those particular services in the same areas causes stress and other issues in that area. That was one of the issues that occurred with establishing the Commercial Street Zoning District to get that distance established and also dispersal and this is also an effort to move those throughout the city. This would expand the Emergency Overnight Shelters that are allowed by right with a maximum occupancy of the fifty (50) beds in the general manufacturing, HM Districts. With this amendment the new emergency shelters would also be allowed by Conditional Use Permit in the HC, Highway Commercial, CS, Commercial Services, RI, Restricted Industrial, LI, Light Industrial, GM, General Manufacturing, HM, Heavy Manufacturing and IC, Industrial Commercial, Districts if applicable spacing requirements are met. Staff is not requesting to expand these uses to any other districts. A key element of this was a Joint Resolution (Res. 9574) was made and adopted by the Board of Education of the School District of Springfield R-12, the City Council for the City of Springfield and Greene County Commission in April of 2008, and resolved, in part, that the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and the applicable regulations set forth pursuant to federal law being amended to prohibit the location of a homeless program or homeless shelter at a location within one thousand (1000) feet of a secondary, postsecondary or elementary school and the local governing bodies enact legislation to place into effect such restrictions. There was considerable research done with benchmark cities throughout the country to and found there are these types of restrictions in some form as evidenced in the staff report. You can see from the map attached to the staff report in light blue the distance from the schools and you can also see all the areas throughout the city where these types of services can occur. There are orange areas on the map where a conditional use permit would be required because of the less intensity of the zoning district, meaning that it's one of the commercial districts that require a conditional use permit. It expands the ability to create a rapid response recognizing that if there was a situation similar to Joplin, to have that ability to react in such an emergency and that the Red Cross and the Greene County Emergency Management teams would be able to respond to that immediately without having to go through conditional use permits. They would be able to use the fast regulations they have to implement that. Instead of having a fifty (50) bed rule the actual limitation on the facility would be based upon the ability and infrastructure of the site to determine the number of people that can be served. This particular amendment has been run through the Continuum of Care (COC), Development Issues Input Group (DIIG), Environmental Advisory Board (EAB) and all registered Neighborhood Associations were notified of these amendments. Staff has not received any concerns from any of these organizations regarding these amendments to date and Staff is recommending approval.

Mr. McClelland asked to clarify that the portion of the map in orange is where there could be possible places these people could go in case of emergency, is that correct. Will there be some kind of a standing order in place that states this is now in effect.

Mr. MacPherson stated yes, but in order to establish those there it would require going through the conditional use permit process. The Continuum of Care and another group has been working on that and they have established a lot of this already in churches and the Salvation Army and Greene County Emergency Management would be able to respond to those. They have churches and other places that have already been pre-approved for this type of thing.

Mr. Hansen asked what the background is for increasing the maximum occupancy at these sites. Have they had problems of there not being enough capacity with the fifty bed maximum limit.

Mr. MacPherson stated that several months ago representatives from the Kitchen and the Continuum of Care spoke that because of the economy that they had significant shortages of places available. This is a proactive venture to try and make sure that there are ways to deal with those issues in a much more rapid fashion than there is currently available.

Mr. Hansen stated that increasing the maximum to whatever the situation will bear, would seem to have the effect of centralizing instead of dispersing like we have been doing so far. If you can increase the amount to any great degree in one spot then that is what is going to happen.

Mr. MacPherson stated that what potentially would happen is by disbursement throughout the city that a more open opportunity is created because there are churches throughout the city and other places of assembly that could be used and the Greene County Emergency Management Center as well as the Red Cross is much better suited to handle these things and they have the rules and restrictions to be able to handle those issues and move forward. It is important to note that what the capacity might be is unknown. This hopefully will help speed that time up.

Mr. Hansen commented that what we are talking about now then is not the established overnight facilities, but the emergency facilities, like in case of weather emergency.

Mr. MacPherson stated in part, yes. We are talking about adding to the Emergency and Natural Disaster issue. There is already an amendment for the Economic Calamity where they can allow that. There is one geared toward temperature and there are those that are transitional service shelters that are available for over thirty (30) days. The restrictions on that are as they develop these new facilities they have to be 2000 thousand feet from one another and 1000 feet from a school. The map was created to show you what that would look like and how much area of the city would be available for that and it's a significant amount.

Mr. Hansen said this is talking about at least two or three sorts of different facilities.

Mr. MacPherson commented is it confusing with all the different facilities available, and reviewed the types of facilities and the types of service provided at each.

Mr. Hansen asked if all these different facilities fit into this amendment and if this would apply to permanent places and emergency places.

Mr. MacPherson said yes; 1000 feet from the school and 2000 feet from each other.

Mr. Baird commented that this would be better served to separate out the emergency natural disaster and such places as the Victory Mission, Missouri Hotel, and the Kitchen for Commission and the Community to have them as two separate items, because a natural disaster is something completely different than someone who is having a difficult time in a transitional stage. Was there any thought given to making these two separate ordinances.

Mr. MacPherson said it is the ease of establishing a facility of this nature if an emergency occurs, that we are able to move very quickly if it is in any of these zoning districts. It can be set up through the management of the Red Cross, Greene County Emergency Management, and they are specifically mentioned. The codes are somewhat relaxed but under the inspections by the appropriate people, they can determine occupancy numbers and move more rapidly than a zoning case than you would have with the transitional shelters like you are talking about. That would take seventy (70) to ninety (90) days. That is where the distinction lays.

Mr. Baird asked in a natural disaster fire situation where you need to open up shelters, would those have the same distance restrictions; could you have two facilities within 1000 feet of each other.

Mr. MacPherson said no, there is 1000 feet between schools and asked Mr. Rykowski if the 2000 feet apply for these also.

Mr. Rykowski stated that when they went through this they found that over the years they had defined a lot of shelters and there were conflicting definitions. One of the reasons this was done was because of the Missouri Hotel fire when faced with fifty (50) or sixty (60) displaced families. The director of Building Development Services asked what they were going to do with them and Red Cross said they have two-hundred (200) shelters in the City, which surprised them because they are not zoned to have that many shelters. What the City discovered was they had been doing this on their own, and they had a list of approximately two-hundred (200) locations in the City that could be available at times of disaster, so that is where sub-section eight (8) for the emergency natural disaster came from. It was not put at thirty (30) days because they learned from the Joplin experience that sometimes it takes a lot longer than thirty (30) days to relocate. The emergency shelter could operate within the 1000 feet if it was deemed appropriate in the measure. This is the one you are asking about how do we respond and we are not getting involved in it and not going to have to worry about the zoning as Building Services would get out quickly. One of the listings for example was Parkview High School, and how many people could be put there. It would have to be inspected, get there quickly with an emergency team and say yes, you can put six-hundred (600) people there or whatever is appropriate in the location. It would be flexible and responsive to a disaster and could be used to house people who come up from a natural disaster. In that regard there is some flexibility in that because it is short term and we have separated those out. That is why we have all the definitions. The definitions we have for overnight soup kitchens are not topped down. Mr. Neal with the Planning Department met with the Red Cross and several shelter operators to find out what they do. We found that some of them, by their own plans, expect for these people to move on within thirty (30) days. That is why there is the thirty (30) day cut off. The definitions are based upon what was found existing in the community after working with the Continuum of Care and their various participants. There is some flexibility in the Emergency Natural Disaster as a general rule they will follow the limits, but if there is a situation for example, there is a private school and facility that would allow a temporary shelter, an exception has been built in which would allow the shelter to come in even though they are technically within the 1000 feet, a private school would not be prohibited from participating, but we do allow with the consent of the governing body that exception to protect the schools. That is very limited only in the short term emergency shelter type deal. We have tried to clean it up which is why you see so many sections of the ordinance being dealt with because there are these shelters available in many zoning districts. It is designed to be very responsive, short term and well monitored by Building Development Services and the Health Department will be involved in getting the temporary certificates of occupancy. The American Red Cross which will give us that first list, they have one-hundred sixty-seven (16) criteria points that these facilities have to satisfy to get on their list, that far exceed according to the Building Development Services Director what the City requires and are comfortable working with them hand in hand in the event of these disasters and maximum flexibility is built into this in several sub-sections.

Mr. Lawhon asked what steps would need to be taken to get approval or a permit to become a registered facility to be prepared in such an event.

Mr. MacPherson stated they would have to meet the standards set out in the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Lawhon asked if this is a disaster that has to be declared by City Council; what is the trigger that makes these overnight shelters available.

Mr. Rykowski said the emergency shelter you are talking about would vary considerably. This ordinance right now would automatically allow the City to start working in conjunction with the American Red Cross Disaster Services to place people. These are basically limited short term shelters so there is discretion there as to how to use it. If

you want to be a host facility for a short term disaster and you call the City, we will tell you to get in touch with the American Red Cross Disaster team. They are the ones to approve you to be on the short term list. Some churches are already on the list and are also calamity shelters. Once you have made their list essentially, the City is letting the Red Cross handle that because that is what they do and we learned in our meetings they do it very well.

Mr. Lawhon commented that it can be a rapid, quick response, because it is already set in place.

Mr. Rykowski said yes.

Mr. Hansen said his concern would be that this includes the permanent facilities like the Salvation Army, Missouri Hotel, and Victory Mission. The tension between these facilities and the surrounding neighborhoods is to keep that centralization from happening. If this amendment includes the permanent facilities they would be tempted to increase their capacity and it becomes the same argument they have had in the past, and I think that would be a step backwards. Mr. Hansen commented that he wants to confirm what particular facilities and what type of facilities these refer to; not to transitional shelters but to emergency facilities.

Mr. MacPherson stated what the amendment actually proposes is removing the requirement for fifty or less residents at an emergency overnight and transitional service shelter and allow the City Council the ability to review and set the number of residents allowed based upon the characteristics of the site and surrounding neighborhood, the availability of the services and infrastructure and a review by an appropriate departments to determine the application of the various city codes including but not limited to fire and health. What you are talking about, Mr. Hansen is a conditional use permit and that is exactly what was done on Commercial Street. If one of the existing facilities wanted to expand they would have to go through a conditional use permit process and pass all the criteria.

Mr. Hansen said the emergency shelters make perfect sense, and would encourage that, but would not vote on this amendment the way it is stated because it has the opposite affect that we are seeking.

Mr. Rykowski said the fifty (50) bed number when away in some of the discussions because it was a little arbitrary. You could put fifty-five (55) or in other places forty-five (45). The control mechanism is the conditional use permit. Someone might come forward and say we have been approved for fifty (50) and we want to have seventy-five (75), but if it does not fit it would come before proper review boards to get approval of the conditional use permit. The arbitrary number of fifty (50) was replaced with a more flexible standard. It gives us more control to set standards as appropriate based on the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Hansen said that if this is passed the scenario he sees is that someone with a transitional facility would come before us and say we need one hundred (100) beds because the demand is so great and we end up compromising at seventy-five (75) beds and then the next year we get that again. There is the real possibility of one facility growing over time into something that none of us wanted us to see. What is called the arbitrary number of fifty (50) would just as easily be described as the compromise number of fifty (50) coming out of all the past discussions with the transitional facilities that have come before Commission and Council; the endless battling over the centralization that the facilities want because it is economical and the dispersion that the City and the community want because it is more aesthetic.

Mr. Rykowski said where this leads is the opportunity for someone to ask, and it would be up to Commission and Council to say no. It will not happen unless there is an approval. It allows us the ability to look at a situation two or three years from now and say yes, fifty-five works here. If the facts change or the environment changes maybe it is appropriate in the future that that facility be at one hundred, or not at all.

Mr. Lawhon said they are not given carte-blanche to anyone because there is an established process that has to

be followed and Commission and Council will have to give approval as well as other interested parties before any of that could happen.

Mr. MacPherson read through the standard requirements from the report.

Mr. Lawhon opened the public hearing.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Lawhon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hansen commented that he feels like he understands the amendment and what it applies to, and to include the transitional facilities in this would not make sense in keeping with the rest of the purpose of this amendment in keeping the facilities dispersed throughout the community. If the transitional facilities are included in this that there is the real possibility they will want to increase their capacity and there have been many heated discussions, and community discussions in the newspaper about these facilities and it seems it was settled by having this fifty (50) bed maximum. To do away with that would open this issue up again. Mr. Hansen stated he would not vote for this amendment as written. If it excludes the permanent transitional facilities, then he would vote his approval.

Mr. Lawhon asked if the transitional shelters are included in this.

Mr. MacPherson stated the transitional shelters have more than fifty (50) beds. The words that are deleted are on the emergency shelters and a lot of the emergency shelters in addition to the transitional service shelters, which is what is confusing, are the ones with the limitations. The emergency shelters, not to be confused with the transitional shelters, in this proposal, have been expanded to include not just the cold weather, not just the economic calamity, but include a natural disaster or fire. That is why the definitions were reviewed to distinguish the difference.

Mr. Baird referred to section 3-3310, line 127 and 128, appears to be a distinction and asked where the transitional does not have to adhere to the fifty (50) beds, is that correct.

Mr. MacPherson said that is correct.

Mr. Rykowski said when reviewing this they found that just about everything was called an emergency shelter because everyone brought their own emergency so that's why even though this is in the conditional use permit for overnight and transitional, which used to be called emergency, we had to distinguish and redefine that. That is why it reads fifty (50) beds for emergency shelters in all districts, but if you look at the title of 3-3310, emergency has been crossed through and replaced with overnight. Emergency should be short term, restrictive thing. This would be for the conditional use permit to be issued. Previously, everything was called emergency but the fifty bed requirement that was previously there as a condition of the conditional use permit has been removed for overnight and transitional service shelters. That limitation has been removed but there is no carte-blanche as to what will be given.

Mr. Baird stated he is not certain he is prepared to vote to approve this at this time. It seems like we are trying to put too many things under one ordinance. Several people have said this is confusing and it has muddied the waters somewhat so he is not prepared to pass this.

Mr. Lawhon said that there are two things that he is comfortable with which is a positive move of trying to establish a mechanism so an immediate response can happen without having to go through the bureaucracy. The other issue is the safety net, because if an existing facility wants to increase their capacity they have to go through the process.

Mr. MacPherson commented that since there are a couple of Commission who are not comfortable with what they

are seeing in the amendment, to table the issue till the next meeting and staff can provide clarification in a memorandum and build a matrix of what is allowed and list each option and define it more clearly.

Mr. McClelland commented that he is quite impressed with the amount of thought that has gone into this through the American Red Cross and the criteria that is required to meet Red Cross standards. The five locations of the Kitchen, Harbor House and the others in his opinion have nothing to do with this amendment to the ordinance and commented that they should vote it in, but there are others who are against it, so it should be tabled till there is a larger quorum on hand.

Mr. Ray stated that if there will not be enough votes to pass the case this evening, it should be tabled and get more clarification in the process.

Mr. Hansen motioned to table the Emergency Shelters Revised Amendment until September 6, 2012, for further clarification. Mr. Baird seconded the motion. The motion carried as follows: Ayes: Lawhon, Baird, Hansen, McClelland, and Ray. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Young, Roling, Edwards, and Coltrin.

Mr. Lawhon asked Commissioners what kind of direction they can give to staff so they can come back with clarifications that will be helpful because he does not want Commission caught in an impasse when the case comes back to them again.

Mr. Baird stated he wants to know how the existing transitional shelters would be impacted by the changing of the ordinance, and an explanation of what their current capacity allowances are.

Mr. Lawhon asked for a more precise explanation of exactly what this refers to.

Mr. Hansen asked what the requirements would be after this amendment for the expansion of the transitional facilities and what would keep them from increasing the capacity standards.

Mr. McClelland commented that you cannot keep out the Kitchen, Harbor House, Missouri Hotel, Lifehouse, The Salvation Army, and Victory Mission in the amendment as an exemption to the adjustment.

OTHER BUSINESS:

4. **Lantz Housing Redevelopment Plan**
(1137 and 1141 East Elm)

Lantz Housing, LLC

Mr. Schaefer stated that Lantz Housing, LLC has filed an application for approval of a redevelopment plan pursuant to Sections 99, RSMo, of the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority Law located at 1136 and 1141 East Elm Street. To give you a refresher, Chapter 99 provides incentives for redevelopment of blighted areas and the incentive it offers is 100% abatement on new improvement for ten years; that would be property taxes. It required the area be blighted and a redevelopment plan be approved. The purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Lantz Housing Redevelopment Area is to clear blight and redevelop the area to accommodate a new house for a Missouri State University sorority. The Redevelopment Area consists of two parcels of land (0.46 acres) that are currently occupied by three vacant residential structures. The Redevelopment Area currently consists of two (2) two-story houses and one (1) one-bedroom studio. Mr. Schaefer referenced a photograph which was taken in April 2012, showing the houses he is discussing. The Redevelopment Plan proposes to demolish the existing structures and construct a new three-story sorority house that will serve as the residence for approximately 42 students, as well a location for chapter meetings and activities. Mr. Schaefer showed the proposed site layout and discussed the access of the site. Staff findings for recommendation are that the Growth Management and Land Use Element of the comprehensive plan designates this area for medium and high density housing which is consistent with the plan, and also identified Missouri State

University and the vicinity as a Major Activity Center. Mr. Schaefer discussed the benefits of the redevelopment plan. Staff is recommending approval of the plan.

Mr. Hansen asked if there is a rendering of the proposed sorority house.

Mr. Schaefer said no. What was provided in the redevelopment plan was a preliminary site sketch and if approved, when they go to redevelop they would have to redevelop in a manner that is consistent with that site plan as well as the use.

Mr. Lawhon opened the public hearing.

Ms. Sarah Wilson, 901 St. Louis commented she is representing the developer, and stated she has not seen an actual picture of the building, or actual plans. That is something the client is working on with the architect. More detailed plans will have to be submitted to the LCRA for review and approval before they can go forward.

Mr. Lawhon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hansen motioned to **approve** Lantz Housing Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Ray **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Lawhon, Baird, Hansen, McClelland, and Ray. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Young, Roling, Edwards, and Coltrin.

Mr. Baird asked if there could be a separate meeting, since several Commission members are absent, maybe a luncheon to discuss the emergency shelter meeting and get everyone on the same page.

Mr. MacPherson commented that would be a good idea to have an informal discussion and will instruct staff to develop a matrix to distinguish the differences between the different shelters and the distance requirements, because we want to make certain that everyone is clear on what is being sent forward. Mr. MacPherson said he wants the information to more precise before sending it on to Council as there were more questions than staff had answers for.

ANY OTHER MATTERS UNDER COMMISSION JURISDICTION:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:12 p.m.

Michael MacPherson
Principal Planner

