

June 7, 2018
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Springfield, Missouri

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session June 7, 2018 in the City Council Chambers. Chairman Randall Doennig called the meeting to order.

Roll Call - Present: Randall Doennig (Chairman), King Coltrin (Vice-Chairman), Dee Ogilvy, Joel Thomas, Britton Jobe, Melissa Cox, Cameron Rose, David Shuler, and Natalie Broekhoven. Absent: None. Staff in attendance: Bob Hosmer, Principal Planner, Mary Lilly Smith, Planning Development Director, Thomas Rykowski, Asst. City Attorney.

MINUTES: The minutes of May 10, 2018 were approved.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Bob Hosmer reported on City Council meeting actions.

CONSENT ITEMS:

Acquire 523
2715 West Sunshine Street

Applicant: City Utilities

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** consent item, Acquire 523 (2715 West Sunshine Street). Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Conditional Use Permit 434
2330 West Grand Street
Applicant: Cowskin Broadcasting, LLC

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to allow a 195 feet radio tower at 2330 West Grand Street in a GM, General Manufacturing District. The request is to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow a 195 feet self supported tower on a 10-acre lot. The Growth Management and Land Use Plan supports the use. There is no residential district or uses adjacent to the property. This application meets the approval standards for a Conditional Use Permit and is in conformance with the intent and purpose of standards for towers. The site will require a 5 feet row of evergreen shrubs to screen from the street. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rex Hansen, 2330 W. Grand Street, here to answer any questions about the tower.

Mr. David Rahmoeller, 2330 W. Grand Street, here to answer any questions about the tower.

Mr. Jobe asked if there is an existing tower and if this replaces that tower.

Mr. Rahmoeller stated that this is an additional tower, the existing tower belongs to another radio station and it is a 180' tower and we require a tower that is higher, but just below 200'.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Conditional Use Permit 434 (2330 West Grand Street). Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Vacation 794

Alley between 2300 blk North Kansas Expressway and Bolivar Road

Applicant: Kansas & Kearney Intersection, LLC

Mr. Hosmer asked that this case be TABLED and presented at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on July 12, 2018.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **TABLE** Vacation 794 (Alley between 2300 blk North Kansas Expressway and Bolivar Road). Ms. Broekhoven seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Vacation 795

Alley in the 1800 blk North National Avenue

Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to vacate right-of-way of an alley located in the 1800 block of North National Avenue. The City of Springfield Public Works Department is requesting to vacate an un-improved alley. The City will retain public utility easements. Owners of two-thirds of the property adjacent to the public right-of-way petitioned for the vacation. The requested vacation meets the approval criteria. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Howard Feagan, 1215 S. Arcadia, stated that he owns the property next to the Vacation and sees no problems.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Vacation 795 (Alley in the 1800 blk North National Avenue). Mr. Shuler seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Vacation 796

Alley in the 1800 blk North Ramsey Avenue

Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to vacate right-of-way of an alley located in the 1800 block of North Ramsey Avenue. The City of Springfield Public Works Department is requesting to vacate an un-improved alley. The City will retain the right of way as a public utility easement. Owners of two-thirds of

the property adjacent to the public right-of-way petitioned for the vacation. The requested vacation meets the approval criteria. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Vacation 796 (Alley in the 1800 blk North Ramsey Avenue). Ms. Broekhoven seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Vacation 797

510 & 514 North Main Avenue

Applicant: Island Park Properties, LLC

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to vacate right-of-way located at 510 and 514 North Main Avenue. The applicant is requesting to vacate public right-of-way of Main Street that lies under two existing structures. There are no utilities in the requested vacation. Owners of two-thirds of the property adjacent to the public right-of-way petitioned for the vacation. The requested meets the approval criteria. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rick Wilson, 1835 S. Stewart, representing the owner. The main portion of the property is under an additional owner to the north and representing both. County survey's in the 1940's showing the building about 20' in the right-of-way, all the streets in this area have been realigned.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Vacation 797 (510 & 514 North Main Avenue). Ms. Broekhoven seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Z-13-2018

4058 South Lone Pine Avenue

Applicant: LowerDeck94, LLC

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to rezone approximately 0.42 acres of property generally located at 4058 South Lone Pine Avenue from a R-SF, Residential Single Family to a GR, General Retail District. The applicant intends to expand the parking lot for the business located directly to the west of the subject property. The Growth Management and Land Use Plan identifies this area as appropriate for low-density housing. The GR district is consistent with the Plan which recommends neighborhood-scale businesses near intersections of arterial and collector, or higher street classifications. The Major Thoroughfare Plan classifies Lone Pine Avenue as a secondary arterial roadway. There is a required 20 feet wide Type F bufferyard between the R-SF and GR districts. All structures must remain below a thirty (30) degree bulk plane measured from the boundary of the R-SF district. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jared Davis, 2045 W. Woodland, representing the owner and here to answer any questions. No one showed at the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Z-13-2018 (4058 South Lone Pine Avenue). Ms. Ogilvy seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Z-14-2018 w/COD #150

1712-1718 South Plaza Avenue

Applicant: Sunshine & Plaza Investment, LLC

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to rezone approximately 0.31 acres of property located at 1712-1718 South Plaza Avenue from a R-LD, Low Density Multi-Family Residential District with Conditional Overlay District No. 120, to a GR, General Retail District, and establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 150. The applicant is intending on using the property for commercial parking for a restaurant on the lot to the south. The Growth Management and Land Use Plan designates this area as appropriate for Medium Intensity Retail, Office or Housing. The GR, General Retail District is an appropriate zoning districts recommended for this area. The Major Thoroughfare Plan classifies Plaza Avenue as a collector roadway which supports the proposed use. Traffic Impact Study was not required. Buyout in lieu of stormwater detention will be allowed due to its downstream location in the watershed. A 10 foot wide Type "F" bufferyard will be required adjacent to R-SF property. Perimeter and S1 landscaping along front and no parking with 25 feet of the street for 100 feet. The proposed Conditional Overlay District will:

- Only permit a commercial parking lot,
- Require a sidewalk to be constructed along the entire length of the property frontage,
- Require a lower intensity lighting standard for the parking lot and reduce light pole height from 60 feet to 25 feet; and
- Increase evergreen plantings from 4 to 5 evergreens per 100 linear feet along Lot 8 (residential lot to the east).

Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Cox asked about previous rezoning and if this area was to be a stormwater detention area and the second question is about going straight from General Retail to Residential-Single Family, noting that it is not much of a step-down.

Mr. Hosmer stated that it was initially left as a residential multi-family and was to be used as a detention area. The restaurant needs extra parking and they will be taking care of stormwater, the applicant will need to explain how. Staff has looked up and eliminated every other use except for a parking lot with a bufferyard, which is like what would be allowed in an office district.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

Mr. Shawn Barry, 830 E. Primrose Street, here to answer any questions.

Mr. James Tillman, 6301 S. Riverglen, Ozark, here to answer any questions.

Mr. Doennig stated that this property has previously been rezoned and what is the change that requires additional land for the parking lot versus stormwater detention.

Mr. Barry noted that the property is the highest point on the lot and the property is adjacent to a major stormwater channel and by putting in a stormwater detention it increases the peak flow from the property. He also stated that they talked with stormwater staff and are pursuing a stormwater buyout in lieu of detention for the property.

Mr. Doennig asked them to explain how the detention basin increases the flow from the property.

Mr. Barry stated that sometimes when the site is close enough to a major drainage way, holding back the stormwater flow and releasing it later, it delays the time it comes off the property until the actual peak flow gets to that point, so when those two flows combine it increases the stormwater run-off at the point of discharge.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

Ms. Cox acknowledged disappointment in the approach, not normally allowing General Retail right up against Residential-Single Family, that it allows encroaching upon more than she is comfortable with and feels the need for a step-down level into a residential area.

Mr. Hosmer stated that he would agree if this was straight General Retail zoning, with multi-family you could build a 45' structure with a parking lot in that area, so the parking lot is the only use that is allowed and believes it is less intrusive into the neighborhood.

Mr. Jobe stated that he understands previous concerns, but wanted to commend the applicant and the City for working with the neighborhood on their concerns that were addressed at the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Coltrin asked what if the applicant came in and wanted Limited Business zoning with conditional overlay that only could be a parking lot, would that reduce the bufferyard requirements.

Mr. Hosmer stated that they can do a commercial parking lot in Limited Business.

Mr. Doennig has an issue stating that Commission has approved site plans in the past where the stormwater retention areas sit at the highest point on the property and it is illogical to assume that water flows up-hill, but we are still creating a standard where we are giving lip service to stormwater detention. In this case we do nothing for stormwater in the process and I have a problem and I am surprised given the problems that already exist there, that we are not holding to tougher standards. I believe that a situation where 5/10/15 years the City will have to spend a lot of money to do stormwater work and I believe that this is one of those situations and will vote against it.

Ms. Cox asked stormwater why it was zoned previously with the intention of detention when it is going straight into Galloway Creek, what is the reason for the change.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she believes the original intent was for them to hold back water upstream because this site is the furthest downstream point. Since we are rezoning and it does not serve any purpose and they are going to add impervious, we are going to allow them to do a buyout.

Ms. Cox asked about the original intent was to maintain upstream and not managing the current property, but was intended to manage upstream properties, why is this being allowed to be rezoned and not a detention because we are not doing anything above this property at this point.

Ms. Hawkins stated that previous statement is correct.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Jobe motioned to **approve** Z-14-2018 w/COD #150 (1712-1718 South Plaza Avenue). Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Ayes: Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, and Shuler. Nays: Doennig, Cox, Ogilvy, and Broekhoven. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Pearson Creek Urban Service Area (USA) Amendments

Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer stated that these are the Urban Service Area Amendments for the Pierson Creek Basin Urban Service Area Amendment. The Springfield's Urban Service Area (USA) Policy was established in April 1984. The Comprehensive Plan states that "the Urban Service Area concept should continue to be used by Springfield and Greene County to indicate the areas in which municipal sanitary sewer will be available. The intent of the geographic boundary and policy is to provide for sewer services as available resources allow. Amendments to the Urban Service Area Policy must be reviewed by the Springfield Planning and Zoning Commission, the Greene County Planning and Zoning Board and the Watershed Committee of the Ozarks, and must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the Springfield City Council and the Greene County Commission. The Department of Environmental Services requested the amendment to include the existing Pierson Creek trunk line. The trunk line was built outside of the Urban Service Area to serve an area further upstream. The proposed amendment was approval by the Watershed Committee of the Ozarks on May 8, 2018 and will be considered by the Greene County Planning Commission on June 19, 2018. The Greene County Commission and the Springfield City Council will consider the amendment on July 2, 2018. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Rose asked if this requires existing homes to convert to using the City sewer or does this just make it available.

Mr. Hosmer stated that this makes it available to sign an irrevocable consent to annex and have sewer connections. Public Works is here to answer any questions.

Ms. Cox asked they will be required to pay for their own connection.

Mr. Hosmer stated that there is a fee, but believes that there is a cap on the fee.

Mr. Knuckles, Public Works/Environmental Services, when the sewer was extended north to the subdivisions, we crossed an area that was not inside the Urban Service Area, this adds additional area in the amendment and is served by existing sewer. This make sewer available in that area that we are adding. When people are ready to connect there will be a connection fee.

Mr. Thomas asked about following the property line and Mr. Knuckles stated that the sewer is by gravity, so normally it runs along the ridge lines.

Mr. Doennig open the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Pearson Creek Urban Service Area (USA) Amendments (Citywide). Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Maximum Building Coverage & Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Amendments

Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer stated that these are the Maximum Building Coverage and Floor Area Ratio Text Amendments: Request to Amend various sections of the Zoning Ordinance relating to Maximum Building Coverage and Floor Area Ratios. City Council amended the Zoning Ordinance to Maximum Building Coverage and Floor Area Ratios on January 13, 2014. Planning and Zoning Commission initiated amendments to clean-up language regarding Maximum Building Coverage and Floor Area Ratios on June 9, 2015. The FAR and building coverage requirements are covered with other bulk, area and height requirements. The bulk plane, height, bufferyards, open space and off-street parking requirements dictate the size and height of buildings and cover the FAR and building coverage requirements. The FAR and building coverage duplicate these other requirements and do not provide any additional protections to the public. Staff is requesting amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to remove and modify language that remained after maximum building coverage and floor area ratios (FARs) were removed from each zoning district by Ordinance in 2014. Most changes only removed references to maximum building coverage and floor area ratios without any new wording, however the accessory structure section had to be rewritten as:

Sec. 36-450. - Accessory structures and uses.

(5) Bulk, setback, and spacing regulations. All accessory structures shall comply with the following regulations:

(a) Residential districts.

3. Maximum floor area:

- a. ~~The maximum floor area for accessory structures shall not, singularly or in total, exceed 25-percent of the permitted maximum building coverage for principal structures, with n~~No more than four accessory structures are permitted on a lot, and
- b. No single accessory structure may exceed two-thirds ~~of the building coverage of the principal structure's footprint square footage.~~
- c. None of the above shall result in authorization to exceed the permitted maximum impervious surface area building coverage allowed per lot.

Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Cox asked for an example regarding the “no more than four accessory structures..., are they garages, etc.” and Mr. Hosmer stated that they could be garages, sheds, and etc.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Maximum Building Coverage & Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Amendments (Citywide). Mr. Jobe seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Initiate Landmarks Board Amendments

Citywide

Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer stated that this is an Initiate Text Amendment: Request to initiate amends to Section 36-353 (2) Landmarks Board Membership. Staff is requesting amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to change membership qualifications for an architect.

The current language: Membership for the landmarks board shall consist of nine members. Membership shall include at least one architect. This position has historically been hard to fill. Staff is proposing the minimum professional qualifications for the architect i.e., ...have a professional degree in architecture plus at least two years of full-time experience in architecture; or a State license to practice architecture. This is consistent with the National Parks Service requirements. Staff requests that Commission initiate amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to consider modifications as specified. If approved, staff will prepare and draft changes to the Zoning Ordinance and schedule a public hearing at the next available date for both the Commission and the City Council. The changes will be reviewed by the Landmarks Board with their recommendation prior to the Commission public hearing. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Initiate Landmarks Board Amendments (Citywide). Mr. Rose seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Redevelopment Plan for the Talmage Redevelopment Area

Generally bounded by Interstate 44 to the north, West Talmage Street to the south, North Fort Avenue to the east, and North Kansas Expressway to the west.

Applicant: Greenway Studios North, LLC

Mr. Joel Thomas recused himself.

Mr. Schaefer stated that the Talmage Redevelopment Area is generally bounded by W Evergreen St & I-44 to the north, W Talmage Street to the south, N Fort Avenue to the east, and N Kansas Expressway to the west. It is 36 parcels, and approximately 46.6 acres and is predominately zoned GR, General Retail District and R-SF Single-Family Residential District and a portion recently rezoned to R-MD, Medium-Density Multi-Family Residential District.

The redevelopment plan is to remove blight and redevelop the area with a mixture of commercial and residential uses per the Growth Management and Land Use Element of the Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan. The project requirements:

- Similar level of quality and architectural finish on all sides of buildings visible from nearby properties and roadways and have consistent building setbacks.
- Multi-family housing shall satisfy at least half of the applicable items in each category under the design guidelines set forth in the Revised Multi-Family Location and Design Guidelines.
- Project costs must be $\geq$ \$100k.

The Redevelopment Plan conforms with the Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan and the Growth Management and Land Use Element identifies the area as an appropriate location for low-density housing, medium- or high-density housing, and medium-intensity retail, office, or housing and targets the intersection of I-44 and North Kansas Expressway and surrounding area as an Activity Center.

It also supports the following goals in the Community Physical Image and Character Element:

- To improve the visual appearance of the urban area by reducing visual blight caused by new development that is out of character with its surroundings.
- To ensure high-quality development utilizing good design and quality materials.

The redevelopment plan is consistent with one of the Comprehensive Plan's overall policies to increase density and encourage infill development where public investments have already been made. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Doennig open the public hearing.

Mr. Matthew Wine, 102 E. 69th Terrace, Kansas City, representing the applicant. We worked closely to make sure the plans conform to the Comprehensive Plan and happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Cox asked we are just talking Low-Density up to High-Density housing with Commercial separate. Mr. Wine stated that is correct and this is a mixture.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Ms. Cox motioned to **approve** Redevelopment Plan for the Talmage Redevelopment Area (Generally bounded by Interstate 44 to the north, West Talmage Street to the south, North Fort Avenue to the east, and North Kansas Expressway to the west). Ms. Ogilvy seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. Mr. Joel Thomas recused himself.

Redevelopment Plan for the Kearney Street Corridor Redevelopment Area

Generally located along a 3.5-mile section of Kearney Street that extends east from the intersection of North Albertha Avenue and West Kearney Street to a point approximately 900 ft. west of the intersection of North Barnes Avenue and East Kearney Street.

Applicant: City of Springfield

Ms. Olivia Hough stated that the Market Study identified opportunities and recommended incentives for Kearney Street

Retail opportunities: food and beverage, clothing, and placemaking and recommended Chapter 99 Redevelopment Plan as incentive for private development. City Council accepted Report and directed Staff to prepare the Redevelopment Plan.

The Land Use Plan:

Frontage on Kearney, Kansas, National, or Glenstone (Rehabilitation of existing buildings on other streets also qualifies). Landscaping (Bring up to current standards for new construction). Building Material (Must be quality, durable materials. Generally, no vinyl siding, cinder block, plain concrete, or sheet metal). Curb Cuts (One driveway per lot. Shared access drives are encouraged to reach 330-foot spacing standard).

Excluded uses are:

Adult motion picture theaters	Adult stores	Auction sales	Boarding houses
Cabarets	Duplexes or two-family dwellings	Emergency overnight shelters	Lodging houses
Pawn shops	Resource recovery collection centers, household	Rooming and lodging houses	Self-service storage facilities
Short-term high-interest lending (e.g., consumer installment loans, pay day loans, title loans, predatory lending, etc.	Shelters	Single-family detached and semi-detached dwellings	Soup kitchens
Swap meets	Towers (e.g., telecommunication	Transitional service shelters	Vehicle storage and towing

	towers)		
--	---------	--	--

Other required plan elements:

Zoning (No re-zoning requested in Plan. Will be considered by City Council on case-by-case basis).
Public Facilities (Facilities improvements will be made as private investment and public funding allow expanding sanitary sewer, improved accessibility and pedestrian safety, and tree planting and landscaping).
Schedule (Projects will be constructed as private investment and public funding allow).
Eminent Domain (City not delegating power of eminent domain to developers. No use of eminent domain anticipated).

Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan

Staff finds the proposed Redevelopment Plan in conformance with the Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan:

- Land Use is consistent with Comprehensive Plan (Exhibit III).
- Kearney Street shares many characteristics and challenges associated with transitional roadway corridors. The Growth Management and Land Use Element recommends use of economic development incentives to encourage private redevelopment to help remediate problems associated with these transitional roadway corridors.
- The Growth Management and Land Use Element targets intersections of Kearney and Kansas Expressway, and Kearney and Glenstone as Activity Centers.
- A goal of the Community Physical Image and Character Element is to ensure high-quality development utilizing good design and quality materials.
- The Kearney Street Plan is consistent with the overall policy to increase density and encourage infill where public investments have already been made.

Staff Recommends the Redevelopment Plan for the Kearney Street Redevelopment Area be approved. The Plan will allow future applicants to request partial real property tax abatement pursuant to the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Law ("Chapter 99, RSMo"). Staff prepared a study that demonstrates the Redevelopment Area qualifies as a blighted area, per the LCRA Law. The Redevelopment Plan will encourage blight removal and redevelopment, which will help revitalize transform the Kearney Street Corridor back to its former role as a vibrant commercial and retail destination serving north Springfield. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Cox asked about the streamlined application and do not have to come before Commission.

Ms. Hough states that they will go directly to LCRA to get approval on their application.

Mr. Jobe asked about lodging houses being excluded, is that intentional to exclude hotel development or a lodging house a different category.

Ms. Hough that lodging houses are different, i.e., longer term stays.

Mr. Hosmer stated the previous statement is correct.

Mr. Doennig asked about the zoning process for the area.

Ms. Hough stated they are not proposing any changes to the zoning or the process for rezoning and it would follow the existing process.

Ms. Smith stated that the previous statement is correct and commented that the slide is confusing. This plan restricts the uses that will be able to receive the incentive and does not change any of the permitted uses. If you want to receive the incentive there are certain uses that you can not do.

Mr. Rose asked if there needs to be a redevelopment plan for each project.

Ms. Hough stated that there no redevelopment plan for each project. Ms. Smith said that this would operate a lot like the downtown redevelopment area which was adopted in the 1980's and when an individual project comes forward for abatement, it just goes to LCRA.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed he public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Mr. Rose motioned to **approve** Redevelopment Plan for the Kearney Street Corridor Redevelopment Area (Generally located along a 3.5-mile section of Kearney Street that extends east from the intersection of North Albertha Avenue and West Kearney Street to a point approximately 900 ft. west of the intersection of North Barnes Avenue and East Kearney Street). Mr. Jobe seconded the motion.

Ayes: Doennig, Cox, Coltrin, Rose, Thomas, Jobe, Ogilvy, Broekhoven, and Shuler. Nays: None.

Abstain: None. Absent: None.