



City of Springfield

Agenda

Administrative Review Committee

June 13, 2024

3:30 PM

Via Zoom/ Development Review
Conference Room 199
840 Boonville Avenue
Springfield, MO 65802

1. ROLL CALL.

2. MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING.

2.1. May 16, 2024

3. HEARINGS.

3.1. ARC2024-00028

3471 W KEARNEY ST ~ Echo Suites by Wyndham ~ ARC

Applicant: MICHAEL LIGIBEL

Work Type: 04.Planned Development - Final Development Plan (Administrative)

3.2. ARC2024-00027

1249 E SAINT LOUIS ST ~ Fee in Lieu of Constructing Sidewalks 1249 E St. ~ ARC

Applicant: BUTLER ROSENBURY AND PARTNERS

Work Type: Fee-in-lieu of sidewalk

4. JOIN ZOOM MEETING.

4.1. Meeting ID: 912 8621 5381

Passcode: 334931

In accordance with ADA guidelines, if you need special accommodations when attending this meeting, please notify the Planning and Development office at 417-864-1611 as soon as possible to accommodate your needs.

May 16, 2024
MINUTES OF THE Administrative Review Committee (ARC)
Springfield, Missouri

The Administrative Review Committee met in regular session in Development Review Conference Room #199 and/or via Zoom.

ARC2024-00025

3638 W DIVISION ST

Applicant: DEVELOPMENT REVIEW OFFICE/PLANNING CITY OF SPRINGFIELD

Work Type: Land Development Code Unclear

ATTENDANCE: Brock Rowe, Steve Childers, and Chad Zickefoose. Staff: Laura Vales, Bob Hosmer, and Samantha Payne.

REPRESENTATIVE: None

MINUTES:

Bob: Noted the memo that was passed around and what is being proposed. He suggests that the memo be changed (development occurred kind of midway between 1304 - more than 50% of lot).

Steve: What percentage is it.

Bob: Probably around 70%

Steve: Letter for berm and ditches was talked about with Aaron (shown on the display) and functions as a storm water area and can't be planted.

Bob: Sometype of planting or screening (shown on the display) at this location.

Steve: Developer going back out to site and if there is room for a fence.

Bob: Their first submittal showed plantings - can't go from 35' to 75' with less planting.

Brock: Can they plant inside the detention.

Steve: Want fair and balance to the request - guidelines.

Chad: Should be able to put a fence and possible room in the channel.

Further discussion - ruling is fine per Steve (located within 50' of building, recreational... does this need to say detention basin/area size/location of berm/note lower portion/southern portion?)

ARC ACTION:

Steve motioned to approve ARC ruling as written. Brock seconded. 3/0 **Approved**

Will need to get with Aaron to resubmit.

Result: Approved