



City of Springfield

Minutes

City Council Meeting

Ken McClure, Mayor

Zone Councilmembers

Monica Horton, Zone 1

Abe McGull, Zone 2

Brandon Jenson, Zone 3

Matthew Simpson, Zone 4

General Councilmembers

Heather Hardinger, General A

Craig Hosmer, General B

Callie Carroll, General C

Derek Lee, General D

January 27, 2025

6:30 PM

**Regional Police-Fire
Training Center
2620 West Battlefield Road
Room 101, 102, and 103**

1. ROLL CALL.

Present: Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Hardinger, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, and Mayor McClure. Absent: None.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

- 2.1. Approval of Minutes. January 13, 2025, City Council Meeting, January 14, 2025, Special City Council Meeting, and January 21, 2025, Special City Council Meeting.

Councilmember Hosmer moved to approve the minutes of the January 13, 2025, City Council Meeting, January 14, 2025, Special City Council Meeting, and January 21, 2025, Special City Council Meeting as presented. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson seconded the motion, and it was approved with the following vote: Ayes: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Hardinger, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, and Mayor McClure. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

3. FINALIZATION AND APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDAS.

CITIZENS WISHING TO SPEAK TO OR REMOVE ITEMS FROM THE CONSENT AGENDAS MUST DO SO AT THIS TIME.

The Consent Agenda was approved as presented by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Hardinger, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, and Mayor McClure. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

4. CEREMONIAL MATTERS.

5. CITY MANAGER REPORT AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RAISED AT THE PREVIOUS CITY COUNCIL MEETING.

Collin Quigley, Interim City Manager, noted the deadline for applying to serve on the Citizens' Advisory Board was Friday, January 31, at midnight. He further noted details and a link to the application were available at springfieldmo.gov/springforwardsgf.com. He added the City Council Committee of the Whole was scheduled to meet March 4 to review applications.

Mr. Quigley noted the Springfield, Missouri Police and Fire Departments would face off in the 6th annual Police vs. Fire Charity Ice Hockey Game at Brightspeed Ice Park on Saturday, March 8, at 5:30 p.m. He added the proceeds would benefit the Greene County 100 Club, a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization providing immediate financial support to spouses and dependent children of law enforcement officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty in Greene County, Missouri. The fee was \$10.

Mr. Quigley noted passenger numbers set another record at the Springfield Branson Regional Airport. In 2024, a record 1.4 million total passengers used the airport, an increase of 10.4 percent from the year before, and 68 percent from ten years ago. Mr. Quigley further noted growth was expected to continue in the new year with four improvement projects: new flooring in the terminal, replacement of five of the airline terminal's ten jet bridges, expansion of the airline terminal apron, and expansion of the terminal parking lot.

Mr. Quigley noted the Springfield Fire Department, CoxHealth EMS, and Mercy EMS would provide free hands-only CPR training on four Saturdays in February in celebration of American Heart Month. There would be two sessions per Saturday from 1:00 p.m. to 2 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. He added early application of bystander CPR and rapid defibrillation with an automated external defibrillator (AED) had been proven to be crucial in improving a person's chance of surviving sudden cardiac arrest.

Councilmember Jenson thanked Mr. Quigley for the update and thanked staff for allowing Restore SGF to present to City Council the previous Tuesday. He expressed his belief housing was a critical issue in the community and that a diverse range of housing options needed to be supported. He asked if there was a procedure for stakeholders to submit proposals to the Citizens' Advisory Board. Mr. Quigley responded there was not yet a process and the Committee of the Whole would be selecting members initially on March 4. Mayor McClure noted the committee would be named and informed, then set up its process.

6. SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE.

Citizens Have Spoken. May Be Voted On.

6.1. Council Bill 2024-286 (Horton)

A special ordinance authorizing the City Manager, or designee, to enter into an agreement with BNSF Railway Company ("BNSF") for the purpose of accepting funds not to exceed \$40,000 for evaluating the feasibility of proceeding with additional services to raise the Jefferson Avenue Footbridge as part of the Rehabilitation of the Jefferson Avenue Footbridge project; and approving a budget adjustment amending the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 budget of the Department of Public Works in the amount of \$40,000 to appropriate the BNSF Railway funds for design services.

Councilmember Horton asked if there was an update or additional information provided by the railway company to City staff to be considered before a final decision was made. Dan Smith, Director of Public Works, responded a meeting would be held the next day to discuss the project. He added with the proposed agreement, the railway company would only commit to paying for the feasibility study and was not making a commitment at this time to pay for the raising of the bridge.

Councilmember Hosmer asked if the railroad was paying the full cost of the feasibility study with no cost to the City. Mr. Smith responded affirmatively.

Ordinance 28096. Council Bill 2024-286 (Horton) was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Hardinger, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, and Mayor McClure. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

6.2. Council Bill 2025-006 (Jenson)

A special ordinance authorizing the City Manager, or designee, to enter into a Grade Crossing Signal Installation Agreement with BNSF Railway Company in an amount not to exceed \$459,908 for the purpose of installing new signal equipment at Boonville Avenue.

Ordinance 28097. Council Bill 2025-006 (Jenson) was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Hardinger, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, and Mayor McClure. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

6.3. Council Bill 2025-007 (Jenson)

A special ordinance authorizing the City Manager, or designee, to enter into a Grade Crossing Signal Installation Agreement with BNSF Railway Company in an amount not to exceed \$73,500 for the purpose of installing new signal equipment at Campbell Avenue.

Ordinance 28098. Council Bill 2025-007 (Jenson) was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Hardinger, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, and Mayor McClure. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

7. **RESOLUTIONS.**
8. **EMERGENCY BILLS.**
9. **PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS.**
10. **GRANTS.**
11. **AMENDED BILLS.**
12. **COUNCIL BILLS FOR PUBLIC HEARING.**
Citizens May Speak. Not Anticipated To Be Voted On.

12.1. Council Bill 2025-010 (McGull)

A special ordinance granting Conditional Use Permit No. 478 for the purpose of permitting an adaptive use of a nonresidential structure, generally located at 3080 East Cherry Street, within the R-LD, Low Density Multi-Family Residential District. (By: Franklin Partners, LP; 3080 E. Cherry Street; Conditional Use Permit No. 478)

Bob Hosmer, Planning Manager, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Hosmer noted the proposed would permit an adaptive use of a non-residential structure located at 3080 E. Cherry Street, to establish a pet grooming business, with the future possibility of other low impact commercial uses. He added the applicant would have to follow the 21 standards submitted in the staff report. Mr. Hosmer noted overnight stay of pets, breeding or sale of pets, veterinarian services, and outside activity other than approved supervised activities would be prohibited. Mr. Hosmer further noted the hours of operation would be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views. With no appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

12.2. Council Bill 2025-011 (McGull)

A general ordinance amending the Springfield Land Development Code, Section 36-306, 'Official zoning map and rules for interpretation,' by rezoning approximately 4.86 acres of property generally located at 3697 and 3703 North Glenstone Avenue (State Highway H) from GR, General Retail District with Conditional Overlay District 182 to R-LD, Low-Density Multi-family Residential District; establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 263; and adopting an updated Official Zoning Map.(By: South Valley Apartments, LLC and Mike Seitz; 3697 and 3703 N. Glenstone Avenue (State Highway H); Z-29-2024 with Conditional Overlay District No. 263)

Bob Hosmer, Planning Manager, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Hosmer noted the proposed would allow development of a multi-family apartment complex in north Springfield at 3697 and 3703 North Glenstone. He added a preliminary plat would be submitted within the same boundaries of the proposed zoning district. Mr. Hosmer noted the Conditional Overlay District would limit the maximum density to 18 units per acre and a maximum of 87 dwellings. He further noted pedestrian amenities included a swimming pool, picnic area, benches, and a walking trail.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views.

Tim Schowe, a representative of the developer, spoke in support of the proposed. Mr. Schowe noted there would be three buildings, each three stories tall, for a total of 72 units. He added there would be stormwater detention at the southwest corner.

With no further appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

12.3. Council Bill 2025-012 (Jenson)

A general ordinance amending the Springfield Land Development Code, Section 36-306, 'Official zoning map and rules for interpretation,' by rezoning approximately 0.36 acres of property generally located at 3505 South Campbell Avenue from R-TH, Residential Townhouse District to HC, Highway Commercial District; and adopting an updated Official Zoning Map. (By: Westport Management LLC; 3505 South Campbell Avenue; Z-31-2024)

Councilmember Lee recused himself from Council Bill 2025-012 and left the dais.

Michael Sparlin, Senior City Planner, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Sparlin noted the proposed was a request to rezone to Highway Commercial. He further noted the application would consolidate the existing lot under one zoning district.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views. With no appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

Councilmember Lee returned to the dais.

12.4. Council Bill 2025-013 (Horton)

A general ordinance amending the Springfield Land Development Code, Section 36-306, 'Official zoning map and rules for interpretation,' by rezoning approximately 0.27 acres of property generally located at 2409 North Boonville Avenue from HC, Highway Commercial District to R-LD, Low-Density Multi-family Residential District; establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 264; and adopting an updated Official Zoning Map. (By: Locust Investments LLC; 2409 North Boonville Avenue; Z-30-2024 w/ Conditional Overlay District No. 264)

Michael Sparlin, Senior City Planner, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Sparlin noted the proposed would allow rezoning to Low-density Multi-family Residential District with Conditional Overlay District No. 264. He added the applicant intended to develop the property for a residential development. Mr. Sparlin further noted the application would allow for continued development and investment in the housing stock in the area. He added the proposed was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Conditional Overlay District would limit the dwelling units to 11 per acre.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views.

Rick Wilson, a representative of the applicant, spoke in support of the proposed. Mr. Wilson noted the lot was currently vacant, and the applicant intended to build a single-family home.

With no further appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

12.5. Council Bill 2025-014 (Horton)

A general ordinance amending the Springfield Land Development Code, Section 36-306, 'Official zoning map and rules for interpretation,' by rezoning approximately 4.5 acres of property generally located at 910 and 920 South West Avenue from O-1, Office District to GI, Government and Institutional Use District; and adopting an updated Official Zoning Map. (By: Greene County; 910 and 920 South West Avenue; Z-33-2024)

Michael Sparlin, Senior City Planner, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Sparlin noted the proposed would allow rezoning to Government and Institutional Use District. He added the applicant intended to use the property for a residential treatment facility. Mr. Sparlin further noted the proposed was identified as a Mixed Residential placetype which identified government, healthcare, and institutional facilities as supporting land uses within the category.

Councilmember Hosmer asked which street was the north and south running street. Mr. Sparlin responded West Avenue. Councilmember Hosmer asked where the existing single-family properties were. Mr. Sparlin responded to the north and west of the proposed. Councilmember Hosmer asked what type of treatment facility was planned for the property.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views.

Stephanie Ireland, a representative of the applicant, spoke in support of the proposed. Ms. Ireland responded the facility would be a treatment facility for children that would live at the facility. She added the children need more direction and psychiatric treatment. Ms. Ireland noted there would be a school inside the facility. She further noted the facility was Lakeland Psychiatric Hospital.

With no further appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

12.6. Council Bill 2025-015 (Simpson)

A general ordinance amending the Springfield Land Development Code, Section 36-306, 'Official zoning map and rules for interpretation,' by rezoning approximately 29 acres of property generally located at 851 East Primrose Street from Planned Development No. 21, 7th Amendment, to GI, Government and Institutional Use District; establishing Conditional Overlay District No. 266; and adopting an updated Official Zoning Map. (By: Lester E. Cox Medical Center; 851 E. Primrose Street; Z-34-2024 with Conditional Overlay District No. 266)

Councilmember Hardinger recused herself from Council Bill 2025-015 and left the dais.

Bob Hosmer, Planning Manager, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Hosmer noted the proposed would allow rezoning of the property at 851 East Primrose to Governmental and Institutional Use District with Conditional Overlay District No. 266 with the intent of using the property for a new pediatrics clinic and future hospital uses. Mr. Hosmer further noted the proposed was located at the intersection of secondary arterial and future collector roadways. He added the Conditional Overlay District (COD) would include perimeter landscaping and bufferyard requirements, internal sidewalk connections to public sidewalk, access restrictions, and a traffic study at the time of development.

Mayor Pro Tem Simpson disclosed that he lives in the area but not within the notification or signatory just outside the area. He asked what the change was that was made by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Hosmer responded the Commission recommended approval with the following amendment: Kimbrough Avenue shall be constructed from the north edge of the subject property to within 300 feet of Primrose Street to a width of 29 feet, and the remainder of the distance to Primrose Street to a width of 37 feet with a taper between the two street widths approved by the City Traffic Engineer; and the developer shall contribute to the construction of Kimbrough Avenue north of the subject property an amount equal to the difference between the 29-foot street width and the 37-foot street width that would have been constructed adjacent to the subject property.

Councilmember Lee asked if staff was in favor of the original proposal for the traffic study to make the determination and did staff consider the model where improvements were required based on a traffic study to be the current standard. Dan Smith, Director of Public Works, responded they were supportive of the original proposal for the traffic study to make that determination. He added the standard could vary by development. Mr. Smith expressed his belief City Council would be on solid ground either way.

Councilmember Lee noted the basis for his upcoming motion was his belief that construction of the road should be based on a traffic study as reviewed by City engineers and not based on a requirement from 20 years ago. Councilmember Lee expressed his belief if the road was not needed, it would be beneficial to use those funds for healthcare, particularly the pediatric care unit.

Councilmember Lee moved to amend Council Bill 2025-015 (Simpson). Councilmember Carroll seconded the motion, and it was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, and Mayor McClure. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmember Hardinger. Abstain: None.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views.

Rod Schaefer addressed City Council in support of the proposed. He noted CoxHealth was committed to expanding care in the region, and the proposed would allow them to meet community needs by fully utilizing the property for future growth. He added through listening sessions, it was made clear the community needs comprehensive pediatric care. Mr. Schaefer added the rezoning would allow CoxHealth to prepare for future growth of pediatrics and to develop the final piece of the flagship campus. He noted they were supportive of the language amendment to return to a standard traffic study.

With no further appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

Councilmember Hosmer asked if with the amendment the traffic study showed a need for the road that it would become a part of the development. Mr. Smith responded that would not come to City Council but would require that improvement within the development.

Councilmember Hardinger returned to the dais.

13. FIRST READING BILLS. Requiring One Reading.

14. FIRST READING BILLS. Requiring Two Readings.

Citizens May Speak. Not Anticipated To Be Voted On.

14.1. Council Bill 2025-016 (Hosmer)

A general ordinance amending the Springfield City Code, Chapter 96, 'Storm Water,' Article I, 'Flood Control and Water Quality Protection,' by adding three new sections regulating access to, and the creation of obstructions in, underground stormwater infrastructure.

Chris Dunnaway, Principal Engineer, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Dunnaway noted the proposed would address a growing problem in the stormwater systems where homeless individuals were beginning to inhabit them. He further noted the underground stormwater system was classified as a confined space and individuals should have proper training and equipment to enter. Mr. Dunnaway added the system was subject to flash flooding. Mr. Dunnaway noted debris taken into the system had caused businesses to flood.

Councilmember Jenson asked who was identified as an authorized person. He added The Watershed Committee of the Ozarks conducted tours at times. Mr. Dunnaway responded they would review the language and expressed his belief it gave latitude for City staff or contractors. Mr. Paul expressed his belief the language would not prohibit authorized tours or staff.

Councilmember McGull noted other municipalities generally cover these structures and asked if that was considered. Mr. Dunnaway responded they had considered that and could possibly apply that in some areas. He noted this could collect debris and may cause flooding in areas.

Councilman Hosmer noted there were a great deal of shopping carts left around the City and the City should work with the retailers to resolve the issue. Mr. Quigley responded retailers were working with the City to remedy the issue, and he could get an update from the Police Department on this issue.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views. With no appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

14.2. Council Bill 2025-017 (Simpson)

A special ordinance approving and authorizing the Director of Planning and Development to accept the dedication of public streets and easements to the City of Springfield, Missouri, as shown on the Preliminary Plat of Chimney Rock Subdivision, generally located at 3040 South Arcadia Avenue, upon the applicant filing and recording a final plat that substantially conforms to the preliminary plat; and authorizing the City Clerk to sign the final plat upon compliance with all the terms of this Ordinance.

Andrew Menke, Senior City Planner, provided a brief overview of the proposed. Mr. Menke noted the proposed was a request to approve a preliminary plat as well as accept the public streets and easements. He further noted the area was 8.69 acres and currently undeveloped. Mr. Menke added it was currently zoned General Retail with Conditional Overlay District #151 and Single-Family Residential. Mr. Menke noted the largest lot in the subdivision was .32 acres and the smallest was .14 acres in size.

Mr. Menke further noted the transportation plan identified Arcadia Avenue, Mimosa Street, Carson Avenue, and Watson Street as local roadways and sidewalk was required along the front edge of all the roadways. He added the property was not located in a FEMA floodplain or within a stream buffer area. Mr. Menke noted a fee in lieu of onsite stormwater detention would not be allowed, and detention would be required.

Mr. Menke noted the western portion would be dedicated as right-of-way. He added the Planning and Zoning Commission denied the application on December 19, 2024, and the applicant requested an appeal. He further noted if City Council approved the preliminary plat and accepted public streets and easements, the preliminary plat would be active for two years.

Jordan Paul, City Attorney, provided a brief overview of the proposed regarding the law. Mr. Paul noted City Council wore many hats, mainly legislative as the local government legislative body. He further noted this would be the case for a rezoning. Mr. Paul further noted City Council had a lot of discretion for legislative matters. He added plats were a form of subdivision and had both legislative and administrative components. Mr. Paul noted when enacting the general subdivision regulations, City Council wore the legislative hat and considered overarching rules such as lot size and setbacks. He further noted when those rules were applied to a particular property, such as the proposed, the hat was administrative of ministerial. He added the role of City Council in reviewing a plat was to administer those rules and question whether the plat met the lot size requirements, not to determine whether the requirement was good or bad. Mr. Paul further noted the owner of the property, which may have included a developer, must be able to look at the subdivision ordinance and know what standards apply for the plat to be approved. He added, unlike zoning, the review of a subdivision plat was a relatively black and white technical analysis and subject to limited discretion. Mr. Paul noted in a relatively recent decision, the Missouri Supreme Court directly addressed this issue in Furlong Company Zinc versus City of Kansas City and determined the City Council did not have authority to refuse to approve a subdivision plat that complied with the subdivision ordinance.

Mayor Pro Tem Simpson noted the proposed originated from his zone and added he had been involved in conversations regarding the issue. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson further noted having a list of questions to ask and expressed his belief everyone interested could benefit from hearing the answers. He added the Supreme Court ruled that when proceeding under the Subdivision Ordinance, Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council were acting in an administrative capacity and the law did not permit administrative bodies to exercise arbitrary and subjective authority over the granting or denying of subdivision plots. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson added if the plat complied, then it was the ministerial duty of the Commission or Council to approve. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson asked if the proposed involved any change to zoning and if not, what were the relevant standards to be reviewed. Mr. Paul responded there was no change to the zoning and the standards, including lots, lot size setback, street width, and traffic were checked by staff. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson noted concern was expressed about the existing streets and street width and asked if that was a consideration when looking at a preliminary plat. Mr. Childers responded Mimosa was an adjacent street and would not be part of the preliminary plat being considered. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson asked if the proposed being consistent with Forward SGF and desirability of the development was a consideration. Mr. Paul responded these were not a reason to vote no. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson asked if the item could be delayed or a traffic impact study could be required. Mr. Paul responded the item could not be delayed without exposure and a traffic study could not be required if not typically required by the subdivision regulations. Mr. Paul noted the only restrictions would have to be consistent with the subdivision regulations.

Councilmember McGull asked if the preliminary plat would be active for two years and if it were a temporal limitation on construction. Mr. Childers responded once a preliminary plat was approved, the applicant had two years to act upon the preliminary plat.

Councilmember Hosmer asked why the Planning and Zoning Commission voted against the proposed. He expressed his belief it was odd the only vote City Council could make was an affirmative vote. He further expressed his belief it was important to consider the issue thoroughly. Mr. Paul responded he was not aware of any law to the contrary of anything he had presented. He noted the choice was to determine whether the proposed was compliant with subdivision regulations or not. He added the choice of what to do, or not do, was a State requirement. Councilmember Hosmer expressed his belief neighbors and developers should be treated equally. Mr. Quigley responded the question of whether the proposed met the Code requirement could be answered. He noted this information was not a required element at the preliminary plat stage. Mr. Childers noted the preliminary plat phase included lot sizes and dimensions, road widths, curb and gutter locations, and general locations and the general density of things.

Councilmember Hosmer asked if City Council had discretion to table the proposed. Mr. Paul responded there was probably not any case law directly addressing at what point that would effectively become a delay that would become actionable. Councilmember Hosmer noted his motion to postpone would be to get a good understanding of the proposed and expressed his belief the issue was important.

Mayor McClure asked if it would be subject to referendum if City Council were to approve this. Mr. Paul responded it would not.

Councilmember Jenson clarified that the proposed was a two-reading bill. Mr. Paul responded affirmatively. Councilmember Jenson asked what additional information City Council would be looking for. Councilmember Hosmer noted he would like to have more time to research the issue. Mr. Quigley noted this was possibly only the second time in twenty-five years a preliminary plat was recommended to be denied. Mr. Quigley asked, if postponed, for staff to be notified of any obligations so they could best respond to City Council.

Mayor McClure asked the neighborhood and developers to work together to find common ground if the item were postponed.

Councilmember Horton asked why the proposed would be tabled given the second reading would not be heard until February 10, 2025. Councilmember Hosmer responded it would give City Council more time to review the issue. The public hearing would also be extended to the February 10, 2025, City Council meeting.

Councilmember Lee asked the reason for wanting a delay. Councilmember Hosmer responded he would like to research the proposed and gain a better understanding of the information gathered from the developer and the neighborhood.

Councilmember McGull expressed his belief the process was orderly, and it was important to hear the citizen input without delay.

Councilmember Carroll asked if the neighbors and developers had meetings prior to this meeting. Mr. Childers responded a meeting was not required for a preliminary plat. He added some of the neighbors had met with the developers the previous week.

Mayor Pro Tem Simpson asked if the preliminary plat was a first step after the initial development review and if there would be additional development review work to ultimately result in a final plat. Mr. Childers responded affirmatively. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson asked if modifications could be made within the parameters. Mr. Childers responded affirmatively. He added any substantial modifications would likely warrant going back to Planning and Zoning.

Councilmember Carroll asked if the public hearing would be delayed until the next City Council meeting if the motion were approved,. Mayor McClure responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Hosmer moved to postpone Council Bill 2025-017 (Simpson). Mayor Pro Tem Simpson seconded the motion, and it failed by the following vote: Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hosmer, Councilmember Hardinger, and Mayor McClure. Nays: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Councilmember Carroll, and Councilmember Lee. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

An opportunity was given for citizens to express their views.

Ben Shantz spoke in support of the proposed. Mr. Shantz expressed his belief City Council had been well advised by staff. He noted the proposed met all the requirements.

Jared Davis, a representative of the developer, spoke in support of the proposed. Mr. Davis noted the developer had committed to making the project single-family, and they had met the requirements for the proposed. He added they made sure a traffic study was not warranted for the development. Mr. Davis further noted there would be approximately 40 homes, and improvements would be made for stormwater issues.

Councilmember McGull asked if the developers met with some of the residents. Mr. Davis responded he was out of town, but a meeting was held.

Mayor Pro Tem Simpson asked if lot size calculations were provided by the developer and reviewed by City staff. Mr. Davis responded staff checked all submittals for accuracy. Mr. Childers noted this was accurate, and submittals were verified to ensure the Subdivision Code was met.

Councilmember Lee noted Mr. Davis had mentioned they met with some neighbors and the regulations for a neighborhood meeting were defined. He added a preliminary plat did not require a neighborhood meeting.

Councilmember Hosmer asked what requirements had to be met. Mr. Davis responded the Single-Family Residential Code lists the requirements. These include minimums and subdivision regulations. Mr. Davis expressed his belief if all requirements were met, the preliminary plat would be accepted by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Davis added the general rules were followed for stormwater and there was a formula in the City Code that determined if a traffic study was required. Councilmember Hosmer asked the number of houses that were proposed, the acreage of the property, and the anticipated number of trips per house. Mr. Davis responded 40 houses, 8.69 acres, and approximately 9.5 trips per dwelling.

Tammy Fulk spoke in opposition to the proposed. Ms. Fulk expressed her belief there were public safety and legal reasons to reject the proposed. She expressed her belief Mimosa Street was 22 feet wide at the entrance of the proposed subdivision. She further expressed her belief Mimosa Street did not meet the requirements.

Steve Berkwitz spoke in opposition to the proposed. Mr. Berkwitz expressed his belief people of Springfield were frustrated that new developments often did not fit the neighborhood. He expressed his belief it was important for neighborhoods to maintain quality of life. Mr. Berkwitz further expressed his belief the proposed would not fit the existing neighborhood.

Councilmember Jenson asked if Mr. Berkwitz believed Chimney Hills and Chimney Hills Place both contributed to the quality of place and if there was any difference between those two neighborhoods. Mr. Berkwitz responded affirmatively to quality of place and felt the two subdivisions were roughly comparable in quality. Councilmember Jenson noted Chimney Hills was developed at roughly four units per acre and the proposed would be developed at approximately seven units per acre. He further noted there would be a difference of approximately five lots and asked if Mr. Berkwitz felt this would significantly impact the quality of the neighborhood. Mr. Berkwitz responded affirmatively because it would add 60 to 80 more cars into the area. Councilmember Jenson noted a second access would be required if there were more than 30 lots in a subdivision. He asked if the neighborhood was connected to Neighborhood Association leadership and if they had discussed utilizing minor neighborhood improvement programs. Mr. Berkwitz responded not to his knowledge. Councilmember Jenson asked if a full stormwater analysis would be required and could it affect the number of lots. Mr. Childers responded affirmatively. Mr. Berkwitz noted he was pleased there would be a study.

Councilmember Hosmer asked who performs the detention study. Mr. Childers responded the developer's engineer was required to provide the study based on regulations adopted in the subdivision design guidelines. He added the study would be reviewed by City engineers for accuracy.

Sonja Shaw spoke in opposition to the proposed. Ms. Shaw noted she would reference the Comprehensive Plan regarding her concerns. Ms. Shaw expressed her belief the City Code involved more than lot size. Ms. Shaw further expressed her belief the Comprehensive Plan should guide coordinated development, and her belief City Council had discretion to deny the proposed. Ms. Shaw expressed her belief the proposed did not meet all the minimum requirements.

Karen Cantrell spoke in opposition to the proposed. Ms. Cantrell noted she loved her neighborhood for the proximity to parks and trails, the neighbors, and that it was an area where nature and city coexisted. Ms. Cantrell expressed her biggest concerns were safety, primarily traffic safety, and property values.

Councilmember Jenson expressed his appreciation that Ms. Cantrell noted several amenities she enjoyed and pride in her neighborhood. He noted it was important to understand that in a community with a housing crisis, those same 40 families would deserve access to the same amenities. He asked Ms. Cantrell if she were aware of any efforts to utilize available programs to make improvements to Mimosa Street. Councilmember Jenson further noted one of the best ways to slow traffic was through narrow streets.

David Cantrell spoke in opposition to the proposed. Mr. Cantrell noted there were many reasons he and neighbors oppose the proposed. He expressed his belief the number of homes would be too many for the area. Mr. Cantrell noted they did have a meeting with the developers and expressed his disappointment. He expressed his belief the minimum would not be enough. He expressed his belief there were safety concerns.

Frank Blohm spoke in opposition to the proposed. Mr. Blohm expressed his belief the proposed made no sense.

Barry Bruce spoke in opposition to the proposed. Mr. Bruce expressed his belief Arcadia Street did not conform and there should not be access to it. He further expressed his belief sprinkler systems and a fire gate could be used in homes to eliminate the need for access to certain residential roads. He noted the roads were small and residential.

Councilmember Jenson asked if there was precedent for use of a fire gate. Mr. Quigley responded it would have to meet certain criteria and the issue could be reviewed. He noted there would need to be two access points. Councilmember Jenson asked if that type of requirement would be outside the normal realms for a subdivision proceeding. Mr. Paul responded this would be reviewed and the information provided to City Council.

Councilmember Hosmer asked why the access to Arcadia Avenue was supposed to be blocked. Mr. Childers responded the access point was from a commercially zoned property to the residential zoned property. Mayor Pro Tem Simpson noted this was in relation to a property that was rezoned in a previous subdividing of property. It was a condition of the rezoning of that property to general retail with Conditional Overlay No. 151 in 2018.

Lorie Bruce spoke in opposition to the proposed. Ms. Bruce expressed her concern with water retention, and expressed her belief access to Arcadia Avenue would not be needed if other methods such as grass pavers or a fire gate were utilized.

Melanie Bach, President of the Galloway Village Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed. Ms. Bach expressed her belief the proposed was out of compliance with Forward SGF. She expressed her belief the spirit, purpose, and letter of the ordinance was to prevent access to Arcadia Avenue. Ms. Bach further expressed her belief without access to Arcadia Avenue, the preliminary plat must be denied. Ms. Bach noted they had applied to Neighborhood Works projects to increase safety in Galloway. She added one was a sidewalk gap project that was denied. Councilmember Jenson expressed his hope to see increased funding for the Neighborhood Works program.

Councilmember Hosmer asked for information on 6473 and the access issues. Ms. Bach responded it was Ordinance 2018-196. She noted the use limitations began on page six. She added the original ordinance was over the commercial portion and expressed her belief the red section was subject to the conditional overlay district. Mr. Quigley responded this information was sent to City Council.

Ricky Haase spoke in support of the proposed. Mr. Haase expressed his belief there should be certainty in the development process. He added developers take risks as they attempt to grow the community and expressed his belief the certainty of the process when the requirements were met was crucial. He expressed his belief the proposed met all compliance and regulatory standards.

Craig Fishel spoke in opposition to the proposed. Mr. Fishel expressed his concern that many things in the City's long-range plan conflicted with the proposed such as lot size and adjoining neighborhood compatibility.

Pat Scott spoke in opposition to the proposed. Ms. Scott expressed her concern for the development and its effect on surrounding neighborhoods. She further expressed her belief the proposed would cause stormwater and traffic issues.

With no further appearances, the public hearing was declared closed.

15. PETITIONS, REMONSTRANCES AND COMMUNICATIONS.

15.1. William Dixon wishes to address City Council. Mr. Dixon did not appear.

15.2. Steven Mueller wishes to address City Council. Mr. Mueller did not appear.

16. NEW BUSINESS.

16.1. As per RSMo. 109.230 (4), City records that are on file in the City Clerk's office and have met the retention schedule will be destroyed in compliance with the guidelines established by the Secretary of State's office.

17. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

18. MISCELLANEOUS.

19. CONSENT AGENDA – FIRST READING BILLS. See Item #3.

19.1. Council Bill 2025-018 (Simpson)

A special ordinance authorizing the Director of Planning and Development to accept the dedication of public streets and easements to the City of Springfield, Missouri, as shown on the Preliminary Plat of Spirit Filled Estates, generally located at 3114 East Sunset Street and 2658 South Hillsboro Avenue, upon the applicant filing and recording a final plat that substantially conforms to the preliminary plat; and authorizing the City Clerk to sign the final plat upon compliance with all the terms of this Ordinance.

19.2. Council Bill 2025-019 (McGull)

A special ordinance authorizing the Director of Planning and Development to accept the dedication of public streets and easements to the City of Springfield, Missouri, as shown on the Preliminary Plat of North Glenstone Heights, generally located at 3627, 3697, and 3703 North Glenstone Avenue, upon the applicant filing and recording a final plat that substantially conforms to the preliminary plat; and authorizing the City Clerk to sign the final plat upon compliance with all the terms of this Ordinance.

19.3. Council Bill 2025-020 (Hardinger)

A special ordinance authorizing the City Manager, or designee, to enter into a Sponsorship Agreement with Watershed Committee of the Ozarks, Inc for the purpose of continuing to support drinking water source protection and water quality activities.

20. CONSENT AGENDA – ONE READING BILLS.

21. CONSENT AGENDA – SECOND READING BILLS.

22. END OF CONSENT AGENDA.

23. ADJOURN.

Mayor Pro Tem Simpson moved to adjourn. Councilmember Hardinger seconded the motion, and it was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmember Jenson, Councilmember Horton, Councilmember McGull, Mayor Pro Tem Simpson, Councilmember Hardinger, Councilmember Carroll, Councilmember Lee, and Mayor McClure. Nays: Councilmember Hosmer. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

Prepared by: Michelle Kaasa


Anita J. Cotter, MMC/MPCC City Clerk