MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Springfield, Missouri

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session December 4, 2014 in City Council Chambers at Historic City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Matt Edwards.

Roll Call: Present: Matt Edwards (Chairman), Tom Baird, (Vice-chair), Jim Hansen, Shelby Lawhon, Phil Young, Melissa Cox, and David Shuler.
Absent: Jason Ray and Gabrielle White.

Staff in attendance: Ralph Rognstad, Director Planning & Development, Mary Lilly Smith, Director Economic Development**,** Bob Hosmer, Principal Planner, Sarah Kerner, Assistant City Attorney, Matt Schaefer, Senior City Planner, Olivia Hough, Senior City Planner, Dawne Gardner, Public Works, Rodney Colson, Public Works, and Sandy Goddard, Administrative Assistant.

Minutes: The minutes of November 6, 2014 were approved as presented.

Communications : Mr. Hosmer reviewed City Council's actions from the meetings of November 10, and November 24, 2014.

The Consent Agenda items were approved as presented.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Preliminary Plat Sportsman's Park — Bass Pro, Inc.

Mr. Hosmer stated this is a request to approve a preliminary plat to subdivide approximately 9.74 acres into a one (1) lot subdivision with a subdivision variance for property located at 2100 N. Barnes Avenue. The Final Plat will not be approved until an updated Sinkhole Evaluation Report is submitted to address the proposed filling activities and to quantify any changes to the sinkhole storage volume, discharge rate or 100-year flood elevation. Sidewalks are required along the property fronting the subdivision however Traffic will support a fee-in-lieu of this. This was an illegal lot split and this is to clarify and clean this up and make it a legal conforming lot of record. The applicant is requesting a subdivision variance; the lot does not have a full frontage on a public street and staff is in support of that.

Mr. Hansen asked about the building on this lot and the restrictions.

Mr. Hosmer stated the applicant is proposing to build a guard shack and an entry way into the Bass Pro warehouses with limited access due to the sinkhole.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Neil Brady, Anderson Engineering, 2045 W. Woodland, commented they are attempting to fix a problem that was created twenty (20) years ago when the tracts were illegally split. Bass Pro is attempting to secure their facility and as part of that will eliminate some entrances into the facility and create an entrance at this site. The intent is to create an access off of Barnes, fence off the entire area, have gates with a guard shack that would control access. There will be an access off Turner as well as Barnes.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hansen motioned to **approve** Preliminary Plat of Sportsman's Park. Mr. Young **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Vacation 774 Kensington Park Apartments, LLC

Mr. Hosmer remarked this is a request to vacate the remaining right-of-way of the 1600 block of West Meadowmere Street west of Kansas Avenue. Twenty-four (24) property owners are within three hundred (300) feet of this site and have been notified. There is one property owner that submitted a protest petition residing at 1226 Kansas Avenue. Mr. Hosmer confirmed he has spoken with this person who has now withdrawn the protest petition request; she misunderstood what the vacation was all about. The City has required the vacation of this right-of-way as a part of the rezoning and preliminary plat of Kensington Park Phase III; otherwise, the extension of West Meadowmere would be required. Staff supports not extending West Meadowmere because there is not enough dedicated right-of-way and the extension does not serve a useful purpose since the plat of Kensington Park Phase III will extend Lexington Avenue to the north and provide access to adjacent properties. The proposed vacation meets the approval criteria for vacating right-of-way and staff supports the request.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dana Edwards, 1402 S. Devon Road, stated he represents the applicant and is available for questions.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lawhon motioned to **approve** Vacation 774. Mr. Hansen **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Conditional Use Permit 414 One House, LLC

Mr. Hosmer commented this is a request to allow a reduction of the front yard setback along Jefferson Avenue within an R-HD, High Density Multi-Family Residential District which will allow the building to be constructed closer to the street to utilize more of the lot area for the development. In 2010 City Council passed General Ordinance 5861 to allow a reduction in the front yard setback along collector and higher classification roadways with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant is requesting to reduce the front yard setback along Jefferson Avenue, a secondary arterial roadway, from twenty-five (25) feet to ten (10) feet. The reduced setback will allow the proposed building to be placed closer to Jefferson Avenue which will permit more of the land to be used for the proposed development. The proposed setback is consistent with the existing development along Jefferson and does not create any sight or safety issues for travelers on adjacent roadways. City Council has approved other similar requests for reduced front yard setbacks in this area. Conditional Use Permit Numbers 404 and 405 were approved by City Council in September 2013 to reduce the front yard setback along Kimbrough Avenue from twenty-five (25) feet to ten (10) feet for multifamily development at the northwest and southwest corners of Kimbrough Avenue and Bear Boulevard. Staff has reviewed the applicant's request for a Conditional Use Permit and has determined that it satisfies the standards for Conditional Use Permits outlined in Section 3-3310 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Derek Lee, Lee Engineering, 2101 W. Chesterfield Blvd commented the ten foot setback lines up more with the rest of the developments on Jefferson in that area. None of the other developments are currently setback at twenty-five (25) feet and this would align more closely with current development. Mr. Lee commented he followed Commissions request for meetings closer to the neighborhood and he scheduled another meeting closer to this site, adding that is why there are two (2) neighborhood meeting notifications in the packet.

Commission members expressed appreciation to Mr. Lee's for his gesture on behalf of the neighborhood.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Baird motioned to **approve** Conditional Use Permit 414. Mr. Young **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

RV Occupancy in R-MHC District Text Amendment City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer stated staff would like to request Commission table this item indefinitely to do more research and get more information.

Mr. Hansen motioned to **table indefinitely** RV Occupancy in R-MHC District Text Amendment. Mr. Baird **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes:

Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Community Garden Annual Fundraising Sale Text Amendment City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer noted this is a request to amend Section 5-3000, Community Gardens, in the Springfield Zoning Ordinance to allow an annual two-day fundraising sale in legally established community gardens. City Council initiated amendments to allow an annual fundraising sale in legally established community gardens at their meeting on November 24, 2014. Currently, community gardens in the residential, office, government and institutional and some commercial districts (R-SF, R-TH, R-LD, R-MD, R-HD, R-MHC, O, GI, UN, LB, and GR) prohibit retail and wholesale sales on-site. A request to City Council was made by a citizen involved in community gardening to allow an annual on-site fundraising sale for community gardens. Staff is proposing to add an exception to the current community garden performance standards to allow an annual two-day fundraising sale for legally established community gardens in districts where retail and wholesale sales were previously prohibited. This annual sale will allow these community gardens to promote the benefits of gardening, sell unused produce, and to generate funds for the next growing season. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Hansen asked about the number of community gardens in the city and if there are permits for them.

Mr. Hosmer stated there are five (5).

Mr. Edwards asked who initiated this request.

Mr. Hosmer stated it was a representative from the Community Gardens adding this request has gone through City Council to initiate.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Richard Napieralski, 800 W. Calhoun Street, commented he is Vice-president of the Springfield Community Gardens stating their focus is to create as many community gardens as possible in the city of Springfield. The gardens are not allowed to sell anything off of community gardens grounds so there are a lot of plants given away. Their purpose is outreach and encouraging others to grow gardens at home. Mr. Napieralski stated that they do need money and the way things are set up now, they rely on donations adding they would like to do an annual fundraiser once a year or in this case they could have a spring and fall fundraiser. Mr. Napieralski requested two words be stricken from the language in Section 5-3002 of the ordinance, paragraph A, the second sentence, citing a provision there for a “no or minimal cost permit is required to be issue.” Mr. Napieralski stated what they have found in practice is that if there is an option of charging fees or not, they will charge the fee and unfortunately the minimal cost is one hundred (100) dollars. This is a significant amount of money for the gardeners’ because a typical fundraiser raises approximately forty (40) dollars through small donations. Mr. Naperalski asked to strike the words, or minimal, from the regulations.

Mr. Edwards asked staff what their position is on the permit cost.

Mr. Rognstad commented this issue just came up today and there has not been sufficient opportunity to discuss it with Building Development Services as they are the ones who do the review and provide the permit. Since this is new and has not been advertised it is really not something Commission can take up and make a decision on at this time. Mr. Rognstad commented they could amend the request, open the public hearing with it amended and then that could go to Council for recommendation and staff can do more background research between now and then.

Mr. Edwards put that forward to Commission to determine if they wish to amend the request.

Mr. Baird asked who makes the determination if there is no cost or a minimal cost.

Mr. Rognstad commented that ultimately City Council would decide that, adding every year there is a fee study done to look at what the cost is to issue a permit and that is typically what would be charged, but there are permits that do not require fees even though there is a cost to the City and there are permits where the City does not recover the full cost. There are issues with people who would not come in and get a permit as well as safety issues and the City would want to insure that an unsafe situation is not created.

Mr. Baird commented he is not comfortable with the cost issue simply because there is staff time allocated to that and without BDS available to speak to the issue he is not comfortable voting for an amendment to that effect. However, there seems to be some confusion on the wording on item D. It appears it is written as one (1) two (2) day sale per year, asking if staff could clarify that. Would it be two (2) consecutive days or one in the fall and one in spring.

Mr. Hosmer stated he thinks the intent was to have one in the fall and one in the spring.

Mr. Edwards commented he tends to sympathize with the applicant about a one hundred (100) dollar permit for a plant sale. Mr. Edwards asked if they could look at tabling this issue and getting the answers to these questions and come back as it would be worth investigation if it would help out the applicant.

Mr. Rognstad suggested Commission table the item and continue the public hearing to the January 8, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Napieralski expressed concern about tabling the request.

Mr. Edwards noted to clarify that if this request is tabled it will be taken up in short order at the next Commission meeting adding that he believes people are sympathetic to Mr. Napieralski's position and to get something Mr. Napieralski can work with.

Ms. Cox clarified this request can be tabled and come back corrected at the next meeting.

Mr. Rognstad stated that is correct.

Mr. Lawhon motioned to **table** the Community Garden Annual Fundraising Sale Text Amendment to the January 8, 2015 meeting. Mr. Hansen **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Mr. Edwards noted to staff that Commission will look for clarification on the permitting and also on the days available for the sale at the next meeting.

Preliminary Plat The Hill John & Nancy Price

Mr. Hosmer said the purpose of this request is to approve a preliminary plat to subdivide approximately 12.89 acres into a ten (10) lot residential subdivision with subdivision variances and common area located at 2915 S. Lone Pine Ave. There is also a request for two (2) subdivision variances. The lots will be accessed by a private street system with a gate which will be dedicated as common area. The common open space requirements of Section 5-2300 and gates across private street requirements in Section 5-2800 of the Zoning Ordinance must be met. The applicant is also requesting a subdivision variance for a lot without full frontage on a public street and two subdivision variances from the Public Works Design Standards for Street Design. Staff supports the subdivision variance requests. If Planning and Zoning Commission approves the preliminary plat, then the plat will be forwarded to City Council for acceptance of public streets and easements. An approved preliminary plat is active for two (2) years.

Mr. Hansen asked if the streets are dedicated to the City.

Mr. Hosmer stated they are private streets but they are built to city standards in case they were to be dedicated at a later date.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Price, 5008 E. Stonegate Court commented he and his wife Nancy are the applicants. They are proposing to put ten (10) lots of an one acre or more on this property. Mr. Price noted he has contacted all the neighboring property owners either by letter, telephone, or in person and has received a lot of support and no objections from anyone.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lawhon motioned to **approve** Preliminary Plat the Hill. Mr. Baird **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Subdivision Variance 350 Jewell Schweitzer

Mr. Hosmer stated the applicant is requesting a variance at 2935 East Sunshine Street from Section 407(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, which requires all lots to abut by their full frontage on a publicly dedicated street. The proposed administrative re-plat will allow a portion of Tract 2 of AS3685 to be reconfigured with Lots 6 and 7 of Forest Hills Center Final Plat.

Mr. Edwards asked if there is a better site plan available in line with what the applicant wants to do.

Mr. Hosmer put the site plan on the overhead display adding that staff is in process of reviewing the subdivision regulations on the definition of a frontage.

Mr. Hansen asked if there would be an entry or exit on lot one (1) to the street.

Mr. Hosmer said lot one (1) will have access to University Street and lot two (2) will have access to Sunshine Street.

Mr. Hansen asked if they will have connectivity.

Mr. Hosmer said there will be no connections between the two lots.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Neil Brady, Anderson Engineering, 2045 W. Woodland commented they are correcting some issues that occurred a long time ago and that’s why lot one is included in this request.

Mr. Hansen asked if there is a prospective project for the site.

Mr. Brady stated there is a commercial facility that is looking at lot two (2), pointing out that it would be on the long piece of property with stormwater facilities being in the elbow shape area.

Mr. Hansen asked about the elevation.

Mr. Brady stated there is a significant amount of water coming from the north so they will compensate and hold the water and allow the other water to go so the net impact to Sunshine would be less than what is there now.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Baird asked if there is an issue in allowing access to University Street from lot one (1) even though it is zoned General Retail.

Mr. Hosmer said no. There is access from Dillon's at that location so they have access to University.

Mr. Baird stated they also have access to Meadowmere and Sunshine and that is the concern. This business would only have access to University and not cross access.

Mr. Hosmer pointed out there are already two (2) lots that are adjacent to this property zoned commercial and they only have access to University.

Mr. Hansen motioned to **approve** Subdivision Variance 350. Mr. Lawhon **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

So-El District Lofts Redevelopment Plan So-El District, LLC

Mr. Schaefer explained So El District, LLC has filed an application requesting approval of a redevelopment plan pursuant to Sections 99.300-99.715, RSMo, the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority (LCRA) Law, for a redevelopment project. The Redevelopment Area consists of three parcels of land (0.63 acres), which are currently occupied by three multi-family residential structures, two of which were constructed in1896 and 1904 (430 and 438 E Elm St) for single-family occupancy and later converted into fourplexes. The third structure (444 E Elm St) is a triplex that was constructed in 1981 for multi-family occupancy. The Plan proposes to demolish the existing structures within the Redevelopment Area and construct a new four-story mixed -use building that will contain a combination of commercial space and multi-family residential dwelling units on the first floor and multi-family residential dwelling units on the upper floors. The project will include up to 50 dwelling units consisting of a mixture of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and four-bedroom units, which will accommodate up to 64 residents. Off-street parking will be provided onsite as required by the existing zoning (CC, Center City District with Conditional Overlay District No. 80). The Planning and Zoning Commission is required by Statute to review the proposed Redevelopment Plan for conformance with the City's general plan for the development of the City as a whole. The Plan mentions the Center City area suffers from physical deterioration and economic obsolescence. It also states that although there are several properties within Center City that have been well maintained or recently constructed, the overall tone is one of an area that could use revitalization and new investment. One of the Plan's objectives relating to Activity Centers is to promote additional or new employment, intensified retail business, higher density housing and convenient transit service. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kevin Hoffmeyer, 3259 E. Ridgeview Street, commented he is the applicant's representative and highlighted some of Mr. Schaefer's comments, namely the property being blighted in 1964 while adding the plan conforms to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Baird asked staff once the property is redeveloped if the blight designation automatically goes away.

Mr. Schaefer stated the blight remains; once an area is declared blighted, the blight designation remains in place until City Council declares the area to be not blighted.

Mr. Baird asked if that process is consistent with other cities and municipalities adding that it is his understanding that there is tax abatement for this piece of property. If the developer develops the property and at the time the tax abatement goes away he does a new addition or something like that; is that a possibility.

Mr. Schaefer stated that technically yes there could be a new development reapproved however the City would discourage that. There is discussion about modifying the City's policy with regard to renewing abated properties. The abatement is intended to encourage removal of blight and if the redevelopment occurs and the blight is removed and a developer wants to come in and do a new project they have to go through the application process. Mr. Schaefer clarified that the blight is not automatically removed.

Mr. Edwards asked when was the last time City Council went through the blighted areas and removed the blight designation on what has now been redeveloped.

Mr. Schaefer commented there have been a couple of cases approximately two (2) years ago on Downing Street and Hammons Tower Redevelopment area; both of those were successfully redeveloped, staff requested the plan be repealed and the area declared not blighted.

Ms. Mary Lilly Smith added staff does look at all the areas that have been blighted on an annual basis and it's much easier when it is a single site blight, like with a Chapter 353 and when it's been redeveloped we can definitively say the blight has been remediated. In these bigger areas, you have the same tests you have when you first blighted the property. In order to declare it no longer blighted we would have to prove that blight predominance no longer existed. That would require an extensive study so that has not been done in these broad older areas and right now what we are looking at is there are pockets in those areas that have been redeveloped. We could go in and shave those off, but there would still be a large area that still has a predominance of blight.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Baird motioned to **approve** So-El District Lofts Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Young **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

The One House Redevelopment Plan One House, LLC

Mr. Schaefer stated One House, LLC has filed an application requesting approval of a redevelopment plan pursuant to Sections 99.300-99.715, RSMo, the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority (LCRA) Law, for a redevelopment project generally located at the northeast corner of the intersection of South Jefferson Avenue and East Madison Street . The Redevelopment Area consists of two parcels of land (0.36 acres) that are currently occupied by two vacant residential structures, both of which were constructed in 1927. The structure at 405 East Madison Street was originally constructed for single-family occupancy, but was later converted into a triplex. The structure at 415 East Madison Street is a single family residential structure. The Plan proposes to demolish the existing structures within the Redevelopment Area and construct a new multi-family residential development consisting of two, four-story structures. Each structure will contain six units. Combined, the 12 proposed units will accommodate up 36 residents. The development will include off-street parking as required in the R-HD, High-Density Multi-Family Residential District. The Redevelopment Area is located within the South Central "A" Urban Renewal Area. City Council declared the Area a blighted area in 1964 (Resolution No. 4282) and adopted an Urban Renewal Plan for the Area in 1967. The location of the proposed multi-family residential development will offer its tenants convenient access to public transit and designated pedestrian and bicycle routes. The Redevelopment Area is located within 200 feet of a Missouri State University Bear Line Shuttle stop (southwest corner of South Thomas Avenue and East Madison Street) and a City Utilities bus stop (southwest corner of South Jefferson Avenue and East Madison Street). The Redevelopment Area is also served by sidewalks and is located adjacent to a designated bicycle route running along East Madison Street. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kevin Hoffmeyer, 3259 E. Ridgeview Street, commented he is available for questions.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lawhon **motioned** that The One House Redevelopment Plan is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and be forwarded to City Council for approval. Mr. Baird **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Greenways Studios Redevelopment Plan Greenway Studios, LLC

Mr. Young recused himself from the public hearing.

Mr. Schaefer stated Greenway Studios, LLC has filed an application requesting approval of a redevelopment plan pursuant to Sections 99.300-99.715, RSMo, the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority (LCRA) Law, for a redevelopment project

generally located along the south side of East Webster Street near the intersection of East Webster Street and North Texas Avenue. The Redevelopment Area consists of two parcels of land (approx. 1.61 acres) that are currently occupied by a single-family residential dwelling and a church (formerly the Timmons Temple Church of God in Christ), both of which are vacant. The church was constructed in 1932 and has historic and architectural significance worth preserving. With the help of private donations from both concerned citizens and the developer, the church will avoid demolition and be relocated to nearby Silver Springs Park prior to redevelopment. After the church has been moved, the Plan proposes to demolish the remaining structures and construct two, three-story multi-family residential structures containing micro efficiency studio apartments and/or multi-family apartments in accordance with Planned Development District No. 344. Planned Development District No. 344 was adopted by City Council on March 10, 2014. It allows construction of micro efficiency studio apartments and multi-family residential apartments with maximum densities of 60 dwelling units per acre for micro efficiency studio apartments and 30 dwelling units per acre for multi-family apartments, provided all other applicable regulations are met (e.g. off-street parking, minimum open space, building setbacks, design requirements, etc.). The Developer's current plans include constructing 84 micro efficiency studio apartments (52.17 dwelling units per acre). The Redevelopment Area is located within the Mid-Town Neighborhood Plan
Area and the Neighborhood Plan identifies actions aimed at protecting and improving the single-family character of the neighborhood, improving safety, preserving architecturally significant structures, and managing the expansion of institutional uses in the neighborhood. Staff believes the proposed Redevelopment Plan conforms to the Neighborhood Plan. The proposed redevelopment will not damage the neighborhood's single-family character, since it is located on the edge of the neighborhood along a railroad track and faces a street with apartments located on the other side. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Baird questioned a map of the redevelopment asking if the two outlines for Greenways Studios are two lots.

Mr. Schaefer stated yes, that is highlighting the two parcels that comprise the area.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kevin Hoffmeyer, 3259 E. Ridgeview Street, commented this proposed site is located in the Center City activity area and doesn't have a lot of housing options around the Drury and OTC area and one of the goals of being the Center City activity area is to promote student housing and this will do that for both institutions.

Mr. Baird commented that when this property was discussed in March, there was a lot of opposition with the majority of that from the folks at Timmons Temple, and asked Mr. Hoffmeyer if there are neighbors that still object to this proposal.

Mr. Hoffmeyer stated he is not personally aware of any objections.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Baird motioned to **approve** Greenways Studios Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Lawhon **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: Young. Absent: Ray and White.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Moon City Creative District Strategic Plan & Initiate Rezoning City of Springfield

Mr. Rognstad explained that the Moon City Creative District Plan has been discussed before Commission on two previous occasions. This is a project that staff has been working on with neighbors in the Woodland Heights Neighborhood for a couple of years now. Mr. Rognstad referred to the map display showing the neighborhood, which is north of the railroad tracks, or north of Commercial Street, and reviewed an outline of the boundaries of the area. The neighborhood put together the strategic plan and outlines what the vision of the plan is which is to establish the Moon City Creative District as a *vibrant, unique* and *livable* area that provides a wide range of arts, cultural, employment and living opportunities for artists, artisans, residents, workers and visitors and supports the continued revitalization of the Woodland Heights Neighborhood. Mr. Rognstad reviewed the goals of the Moon City Creative District, the action plan and the specific action steps that will be initiated over the next three years to accomplish those goals and to realize the Vision for the District. The Action Plan can be amended if necessary during the next three years. This is to accept the plan, not to adopt the plan because most of the actions in the plan are things that the neighborhood needs to do. Mr. Rognstad asked Commission to recommend City Council initiate the rezoning as those are the major steps the City will take to support the creation of this district. Mr. Rognstad stated the City is proposing two (2) rezonings, outlining the proposed areas on the display map, and use the new Live/Work Overlay District that was adopted a few months ago for the area. Mr. Rognstad mentioned that during this process the property owners were told that the City would try to maintain the existing uses that are allowed there but through a planned development the City would allow commercial uses that would be supportative to the artists and also allow residential uses. Mr. Rognstad stated they are trying to accommodate the industrial and commercial service uses particularly along Chase Street that are currently already there. Mr. Rognstad reviewed the differences between the Live/Work District from a home occupation.

Mr. Rognstad clarified that what Commission will be doing is accepting the plan and then recommending City Council accept the plan and initiate the two zoning cases. If this is accepted by Council and they initiate the zoning cases the neighborhood meeting would be held at the end of January, 2015 and Commission will see the zoning cases in March, 2015. Mr. Rognstad said he is available for questions.

Mr. Baird asked for a clarification regarding the residential verses the non-residential floor area and percentages.

Mr. Rognstad remarked the ordinance sets up this basic criteria so you could have up to a maximum of three thousand (3000) square feet of the whole building and up to fifty (50) percent of it could be the non-residential floor area.

Mr. Baird noted that it limits the area to fifteen hundred (1500) square feet.

Mr. Rognstad said yes with the thought being that there could be homeowners or renters who would have small galleries, and with the success of the district, people who choose to do larger studios or dedicated galleries, that would occur along Chase Street.

Mr. Young asked about the governing or policing of the potential studio or gallery.

Mr. Rognstad stated the City would need to know about it and potentially a ticket could be issued. The City would not do systematic inspections, it would be the same way the City does anything else, if there is a complaint then the City would investigate.

Ms. Cox asked if there are any blighted areas in the boundary area that has been discussed that would provide incentive.

Mr. Rognstad stated he does not believe there are any official blighted areas.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Ms. Phyllis Ferguson, 1920 N. Robberson, commented this project has been in the works for two (2) years. The Woodland Heights Neighborhood Association Board of Directors tried to think of a way to make Woodland Heights Neighborhood a better place to live, safer, healthier, reduce crime, and be fun. They came up with Moon City and the Moon City Creative District is in the heart of the original north Springfield which was called Moon City. Ms. Ferguson stated she hopes Commission will support the Moon City Creative District.

Mr. Hansen stated he would like to compliment Ms. Ferguson and her Board for coming up with such a comprehensive and well written plan. Mr. Hansen stated he enjoyed reading about the proposed district.

Mr. Edwards extended congratulations to Ms. Ferguson and Mr. Rognstad for their hard work on this project adding it’s been fun to watch this proposal move forward adding he is pleased to see the project move forward.

Mr. Steve Miller, 1865 N. Jefferson, expressed his support for the Moon City Creative District and his pleasure at how the neighborhood is supporting this plan with the creation of a district like this within Woodland Heights.

Mr. Kevin Dwight Richardson, 707 S. Orchard Crest Avenue, commented that as a creative professional and an artist himself, he sees this as a real extension of how the City has embraced the arts with things like Art Walk and the Art Festivals and to put this in a permanent commitment to creativity is an affirmative, positive thing for the community, for people who come here or want to move here. Mr. Richard expressed his support of Moon City.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hansen expressed that this will be a positive project adding he cannot see any negative aspects to this project as it will be a positive asset for the community and the City of Springfield.

Mr. Lawhon stated that one of the things that satisfy him the most is having projects like this presented to Commission where it is a real example of grass roots action of the community seizing their own destiny and creating their own neighborhood and defining their own future adding he believes it is an outstanding project.

Mr. Lawhon motioned to **accept** the Moon City Creative District Strategic Plan and initiating rezoning. Mr. Young **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

REPORTS:

Jordan Valley Concept Plan Graphic Update City of Springfield

Mr. Baird recused himself from the public hearing.

Ms. Olivia Hough stated staff is asking Commission to adopt a resolution recommending City Council adopt the amended Jordan Valley Concept Plan Graphic. Ms. Hough reviewed the boundaries of Jordan Valley and gave an overview of its past history and current revitalization and implementation efforts. The vision statement says that Jordan Valley will "*… create a* "*sense of place*" *or* "*identity,*" *commemorate and reflect unique qualities of the region, integrate and connect amenities, revive a sense of civic importance, add value to the community, reinvent and re-energize itself with each generation, and remain timeless…*"

Ms. Hough presented 2014 aerial photography with an update addition of the CU Transit Transfer Station, IDEA Commons planning boundary, Route 66 Roadside Park and the Link as well as updates to the proposed greenway trail configuration. Ms. Hough asked Commission to approve the resolution recommending the Springfield City Council adopt the revised Jordan Valley Concept Master Plan graphic.

Mr. Hansen expressed interest in the solar powered methane mitigation system.

Ms. Hough explained how the system worked with a pipe system below the surface where the methane is supposed to ventilate upward and the solar powered system has an ignition switch and it will ignite and burn off any methane that collects within the pipe itself.

Ms. Cox questioned how long the monitoring time lines have been in place.

Ms. Hough stated the first phase of the project was completed in the fall of 2010 and so the site has had time to settle. The city surveyor installed monuments in April of this year, after the freeze and thaw cycle and it was installed and a baseline survey was taken and have shot surveys from a point that is near the corner of National and Trafficway and they are seeing no settling.

Mr. Edwards questioned how the remediation is progressing in the West Meadows.

Ms. Hough stated they have made significant progress. The site work has been completed for the cleanup, completed in two separate phases funded primarily through EPA Competitive Cleanup Grants which was funding for approximately eighty (80) percent of the cleanup. The match has been through the City's ¼ cent sales tax and some CDBG funds. Ms. Hough reviewed the project benefits from the environmental cleanup including the discovery of the historic Fullbright Springs and three natural springs.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing. As there were no speakers to the issue, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Lawhon motioned to accept and **approve** the Jordan Valley Concept Plan Graphic Update. Mr. Young **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follow: Ayes: Edwards, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: Baird. Absent: Ray and White.

ANY OTHER MATTERS UNDE R COMMISSION JURISDICTION:

Approval 2015 Planning & Zoning Commission Calendar

Mr. Hosmer noted an error on the Calendar for July 6, 2015 meeting; it should reflect August 6, 2015.

Mr. Baird motioned to **approve** the 2015 Planning & Zoning Calendar with the stated change. Mr. Hansen **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Elections 2015 Chair and Vice-chair

Mr. Edwards stated he would recuse himself from being nominated again so the gavel could be passed on to another member. Mr. Edwards asked for nominations.

Mr. Lawhon **nominated** Mr. Tom Baird as Chair. Ms. Cox **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Mr. Baird **nominated** Ms. Gabrielle White as Vice-chair. Mr. Lawhon **seconded** the motion. The motion **carried** as follows: Ayes: Edwards, Baird, Hansen, Young, Lawhon, Cox, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Ray and White.

Mr. Hosmer made a presentation of plaques acknowledging their service on the Planning and Zoning Commission to Mr. Shelby Lawhon, Mr. Jim Hansen, and Mr. Phil Young as their terms as members of the Planning and Zoning Commission end January 1, 2015.

Mr. Hosmer disclosed that this would be Mr. Ralph Rognstad last meeting as Director of Planning and Development due to his retirement in January. Mr. Hosmer introduced Ms. Mary Lilly Smith as the new Director of Planning and Development effective January 2015.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Bob Hosmer, AICP
Principal Planner