

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

DATE: October 13, 2011

TIME: 6:30 pm

The regular meeting and public hearing of the Planning and Zoning Commission was held on the above date and time in City Council Chambers, third floor of City Hall with the following members and personnel in attendance: Shelby Lawhon (Chair), Jay McClelland, Jason Ray, Gloria Roling, Jim Hansen; Thomas Baird, IV; Nancy Yendes, City Attorney; Ralph Rognstad, Director of Planning and Development; Mike MacPherson, Principal Planner; Matt Schaefer, Senior City Planner, Chris Straw, Director, Building Development Services, Sandy Goddard, Administrative Assistant; ABSENT: Coltrin, Young, and Edwards.

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

COMMUNICATIONS:

FINALIZATION AND APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS:

(These consent cases will be approved by Commission unless a Commissioner or someone else wishes to speak to them. If so, those cases will be moved to the appropriate place on the agenda and they may be spoken to, and voted on, at that time.)

Consent Items: None

HEARINGS:

Zoning Text Amendments:

1. **Signs Amendment**
(City-Wide)

City of Springfield

Mr. MacPherson presented the history and background of the Signs Amendment Case.

City Council approved a resolution (G.O. 9428) on October 16, 2006, to initiate amendments to the Zoning Ordinance concerning regulation of signs and other amendments that may result from the considerations of these sign amendments.

In 2007-08, a citizen's task force met to prepare recommendations on the amendments to the sign code. May issues were addressed, however, some major items could not be agreed upon between staff and task force members. Proposed amendments were sent to the members of the task force for comment and a meeting of the task force was held on May 24, 2011 for review and comment. After this meeting, the sign amendments were sent to City Council's sub-committee, Plans and Policies, on July 7, 2011. Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the proposed amendments at their meeting on September 1, 2011, and voted 6 to 2 to deny the proposed amendments, due in part, to testimony at the hearing from members of the sign industry, objecting to the language addressing automatic changeable copy signs, and secondly, that a new task force was to be formed in 2012 to further study the existing sign code ordinance.

On September 29th, by memorandum (Attachment B) dated September 22, 2011, and signed by Deputy City Manager, Fred Marty, the city requested a reconsideration of the sign code text amendment bill. The memorandum states that members of the sign code industry who had testified against the bill had been interviewed by staff, and it was discovered that the primary objection to the amendments was the automatic changeable copy sign section. That section has been removed from the bill, thus providing the basis for a reconsideration of the bill.

The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the memorandum on September 29th, and by a vote of 6 to 0 agreed to reconsider the text amendment bill on October 13, 2011.

Mr. MacPherson stated the proposed amendments cover a variety of issues. The modifications of most significance include the following changes:

1. **Definitions** (Section 2-1100) – Definitions within Section 5-1400, Signs, have been moved to the general definitions section of the Zoning Ordinance for easier reference.
2. **Exempt Signs** (Subsection 5-1402.) – A new section for political signs is being added to clarify their exempt status, location and size. The Address Numbers and Name Plates section has been removed because address numbers and plates are already regulated as part of the building code. Neighborhood Identification signs (that are exempt from permits) are to be located only within the R-SF and R-TH Districts so this exemption cannot be misinterpreted to include commercial businesses. Hiring signs are limited to a size of six (6) square feet, where before there was no limit on the size. Inflatable objects have been moved from the exempt signs section to the General Sign Provisions, 5-1403, because they typically have advertising signs on them.
3. **Parking Lot Light Pole Banner** (Subsection 5-1402.J.2) - The amendments will allow light pole banners a minimum of 50 feet from any right-of-way, with an effective area not to exceed 10 square feet. This is similar to what the City allows on its light poles in the right-of-way. Numerous property owners have requested the ability to display banners on-site that are attached to the existing parking lot lighting poles. This amendment would permit these types of signs.
4. **On-Premise Signs In Business Areas** (Subsection 5-1404) - The Zoning Ordinance currently requires that space must be provided on the on-premise sign for each tenant unless the tenant signs an agreement giving up the right to advertise on the sign. Staff submits this should be a business decision made by the owner/developer. Each premise owner should have the ability to determine which of his on-premise tenants may advertise on his sign. If you require all businesses to be included on the sign, it could cause each sign to be small enough that someone could not see any of the signs clearly. A tract identification sign shall be considered the same as an on-premise detached sign. Other amendments to this section include limiting outdoor ground signs advertising retail and personal service uses located in an office building in the O, Office District, which currently have no size limitations for enforcement and could be as large as seventy (70) feet in length. The temporary signs in the business areas section have been amended to clearly state the limit for each permit we have issued in the past. This will accommodate businesses with weekend sales without requiring a permit for a full thirty (30) days.
5. **Projecting Signs/Center City** (Subsection 5-1404.C.5) - Currently, the premise rules allow only one projecting sign on a building frontage in the Center City District. These amendments will allow each business in the Center City District the ability to have a projecting sign. These signs shall not exceed 10 square feet of area.
6. **Applications for Sign Permits** (Subsection 5-1404.F.10 & 5-1411.C) - All applications and required information shall be established by the Director of Building Development Services. The

current language is very specific regarding what must be submitted. This would allow staff to be more flexible regarding what must be submitted for review.

7. **Detached Signs in Non-Business Areas** (Subsection 5-1405.2) – The amendments will an increased sign face area as follows:

- One hundred (100) square feet on local and collector streets
- Two hundred (200) square feet on secondary arterial streets
- Two hundred fifty (250) square feet on primary arterials
- Two hundred fifty (250) square feet of frontage streets between the site and a freeway

Current language allows only fifty (50) square feet per sign. This will allow uses such as schools and churches to have a larger sign based on the street classification.

8. **Structural Alteration of Legal Non-Conforming Signs** (Subsection 5-1406.D) - The amendments will allow these signs to be structurally altered if the following conditions are met:

- If the non-conformity of the sign is the height of the sign, the sign shall be reduced in height to conform
- If the non-conformity of the sign is the allowed effective area, the effective area shall be reduced to conform
- If the non-conformity of the sign is the spacing, the sign shall be relocated to conform, or reduced to 75% of the allowed effective area. The sign shall remain non-conforming, but structural alterations will be allowed.

Currently, legal, non-conforming signs cannot be structurally altered and the signs become an eye sore due to the age and style of the sign. These amendments will allow legal non-conforming signs to exist with improved conditions.

Mr. MacPherson added that the Planning and Development staff recommends **approval** of the proposed zoning and reviewed the findings for staff recommendation. First, the amendments to the existing sign code ordinance will eliminate current restrictions and allow uses for re-occurring issues that are city-wide. Second, the amendments will allow non-conforming signs to continue and promote maintenance and updates to improve appearances of the existing sign stock. Third, issues that remain shall be addressed in a new task force which shall be convened in 2012.

Mr. Hansen asked for clarification regarding the “Applications for Sign Permits,” and an example.

Mr. Straw stated that with the current language, we would receive a sign application that will not need all the criteria identified in order to obtain a permit. As the language is currently written, there is still the requirement that all the criteria be met. I do not have the latitude of saying you do not need this specific item. The new language will establish the flexibility to establish more closely what is needed for a particular application and if there is an unusual case, then the City would have the authority to waive specific elements of the application. This will make the application process easier for the developer and the sign company.

Mr. Straw gave an example of an existing sign that needs modification, which requires a licensed surveyor prepare a sight plan with dimensions, boundaries, property lines and legal descriptions. While the modification request meets all the requirements, is there a need for all this information when it is an existing conforming sign. With the advanced technology we have today of aerial photographs and the ability to locate signs and site triangles, having the authority to be flexible will be a great advantage.

Mr. Lawhon asked about the structural alterations of legal non-conforming signs; if the owner of a sign, knowing his sign is legal but non-conforming wants to change something, this would allow this to happen

within what you are trying to establish here tonight. The City would not exert the alteration be done, it would be up to the owner of the sign to initiate the change.

Mr. Straw said yes.

Mr. Lawhon asked for the Center City boundaries.

Mr. Rognstad stated it is primarily centered on the down town area. It extends to Hammons Parkway, on the south, around Elm, although it does extend further south as you go west, then over to Grant and up to Chestnut Expressway and then a corridor up Boonville.

Mr. McClelland asked Mr. Straw about the sign owners who spoke at the previous meeting regarding the signs amendment and when asked if this was something they could live with till 2012, the answer was no; he asked where they stand with this issue, can they accept this as it is written now.

Mr. Straw stated that he spent several hours with the individual and went through each item and discovered that the automatic changeable copy issue is what drove his entire decision of the statement he made. He met with the other sign companies that were present that evening and they concurred with what has been presented to Commission tonight. They indicated no problem with the amendments with the removal of the automatic changeable copy issue.

Mr. Baird commented on Section 5-1403, page A-6, of the staff report, striking out Exempt Operations; it appears that Business owners cannot change copy or clean or do general maintenance on the sign without a permit, asking if that is correct. It appears that language is being removed since they are crossed out.

Mr. Straw stated that general maintenance, repairing a broken element, painting, repairing a broken weld does not require a permit. He added the Exempt Operations has been moved to a latter section, now found on page A-29.

Mr. Lawhon opened the public hearing.

Mr. Lawhon closed the public hearing.

Mr. McClelland **motioned to approve** the Sign Amendments. Mr. Hansen seconded. The motion **carried** as follows: AYES: Lawhon, McClelland, Hansen, Roling, Ray and Baird. NAYS: None. ABSTAIN: None. ABSENT: Edwards, Coltrin, and Young.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Plan**
(Southeast corner N. Summit Ave & East Webster Street)

Bryan Properties, VI, LLC

Mr. MacPherson introduced Matt Schaefer, Senior Planner, who will be making a presentation on the O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Schaefer presented to Commission the Power Point Presentation, summarizing as follows:

**Redevelopment Plan for the O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Area
Planning and Zoning Commission
October 13, 2011**

Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority Law

Sections 99.300 to 99.715, RSMO

Provides incentives to encourage investment and removal of blight and blighting conditions within designated redevelopment areas.

Defines blight

Requires adoption of Redevelopment Plan

Projects consistent with the Redevelopment Plan are entitled to 100% abatement on increase in assessed value for 10 years

Process

Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority reviews Blight Report and Redevelopment Plan and makes recommendation

Planning and Zoning Commission reviews Redevelopment Plan and makes recommendation

City Council makes finding of blight and approves Redevelopment Plan – Council must consider whether blight exists but not how blight was caused or responsible party

Developer applies to LCRA for property tax abatement

LCRA finds project to be consistent with Redevelopment Plan and authorizes abatement

Role of the Planning and Zoning Commission

Review proposed redevelopment plans for conformance with the *Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan*.

O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Area

Located at the southeast corner, North Summit Avenue & East Webster Street

3 parcels (1.25 acres)

Owned by Drury University

Zoning

Currently GI (Government and Institutional) and R-SF (Single-Family Residential)

Request to rezone entire area to GI is pending (Zoning Case Z-05-2011)

Existing single-family residential structures

Katrina House (1134 N Summit Ave)

Rose O'Neill House (1126 N Summit Ave)

**O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Plan
Objectives and Strategies**

Remove blight and redevelop area

Demolish the Katrina House (1134 N Summit Ave)

Construct 3-story, 72-unit student housing facility
18 fully furnished 4-bedroom apartments with private bedrooms and bathrooms leased by the bedroom
Facility will be located on the south side of Redevelopment Area
Rehabilitate the Rose O'Neill House for use as a community center for Drury students, faculty, and staff.
Provide off-street parking adjacent to student housing facility and north of the Rose O'Neill House.
No land acquisition required
Drury University will retain ownership of the land within the Redevelopment Area
Developer will lease the land and construct/rehabilitate the improvements

O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Plan

Plan objectives/proposed redevelopment
[site plan/rendering]

Findings for Staff Recommendation

The Redevelopment Plan is in conformance with the *Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan*.
Center City Plan Element
Describes the general area as one that could use revitalization and new investment
Drury University Campus Plan
Outlines the University's plans for future growth and establishes common campus boundary
Identifies area for future campus expansion
Redevelopment Area is located within campus boundary
Mid-town Neighborhood Plan
Redevelopment Area is located in an area that is designated for future university expansion

Benefits of the O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Plan

New investment in the Mid-Town Neighborhood and greater Center City.
Removes blight
Facilitates rehabilitation of the Rose O'Neill House
Provides additional student housing on the Drury University Campus
On-campus location will generate less vehicular traffic. Students can walk to class.

Mr. Schaefer concluded his report by stating that LCRA reviewed and approved the plan and staff is supporting the request and asked for comments or questions.

Mr. McClelland asked if the height of the building have anything to do with the angle, the thirty (30) to forty-five (45) degree angle since it is in GI, the bulk plane.

Mr. Schaefer commented that would be a site planning issue. The new facility would be required to conform to all regulations under the Government & Institutional Zoning District. He cannot speak to the bulk plane or height requirements in that district, but added that it would come later when plans are submitted to the City for review. It will have to comply even though it is GI.

Mr. Rognstad commented that it would apply where the single-family zoning is and if you look at the overhead display, the zoning is north of Webster and east of Clay. With the development being on the southern part of the lot, it is quite a distance from the building to the single-family zoning.

Mr. Lawhon asked where the O'Neill house is located asking where the facility would be located, asking where the residential area is located, adjacent to the property.

Mr. Schaefer stated the facility would be located on the south side and the residential area is to the north, adding there will be some separation.

Ms. Roling asked which of the lots are currently zoned residential single-family.

Mr. Schaefer pointed to the display map to show the lots, stating it was the bottom two lots, and added that the zoning case is currently pending. The zoning case was heard in March, 2011. It was tabled, but will be brought off the table Monday at Council.

Mr. MacPherson commented that the case was heard earlier in the year and Commission recommended approval of the zoning case; it went forward to City Council and was tabled, because after the Planning and Zoning hearing, but before hearing it at City Council, Drury determined that they wanted to look into the possibility of doing a re-development plan So it was tabled at City Council, prior to public hearing. It will be presented again with the re-development plan and the zoning case together as companion cases on Monday night.

Ms. Roling asked Mr. Schaefer to outline the University's boundaries for their future growth. Mr. Schaefer reviewed the Drury University Campus Master Plan which was adopted as an element to the City Compressive Plan and showed the boundaries on the display map.

Mr. Lawhon commented that looking at Benton Street and west, that is not Drury property.

Mr. Schaefer said yes.

Ms. Roling commented that Drury owned the property and Bryan Properties will be leasing the property, asking who will get the tax abatement.

Mr. Schaefer said yes, commenting that Drury is tax exempt so there are no property taxes being generated on the property currently. Bryan Properties will be leasing the land and building the student housing facility which will be owned by Bryan Properties, so the improvements will be subject to property taxes as well as a lease hold interest that the developer will be subject to taxes on because he is leasing the land. Also if the re-development plan is approved and the proposed project constructed, they would be subject to one hundred (100) percent property tax abatement on the new improvements and the increase of the assessed value of the property for ten (10) years. Mr. Schaefer added that the entire site will be leased from Bryan Properties who are not tax exempt, so there will be a lease hold interest.

Mr. Lawhon stated that essentially Major's Development would be the one to benefit from the property tax abatement.

Mr. Schaefer said yes.

Ms. Roling asked how long Drury has owned the O'Neill house.

Mr. Schaefer said it was purchased in 2005.

Mr. MacPherson commented as a point of clarification, there is University and private development partnerships appearing all over the country. With the economy as it is, oftentimes, Universities don't have the resources to do these types of projects so they partner with private developments to allow these types of opportunities to exist. This supports the University growth and yet the University does not have to have the direct capital to get the investment made. Similar things have been done with Missouri State.

Mr. Lawhon opened the public hearing.

Peter Radecki, Vice President of Campus Operations of Drury University, 900 N. Benton. He stated that half of Drury's students live on campus, and they want to provide that to a greater number of students, which is an important driver. It was part of a strategic plan approved by the Drury Board in May, 2011, and this will move them in that direction. Additionally, there is a wide ranging strategy called a sustainability action plan. One of the elements of that is to try and find ways to reduce the transportation impact on the environment, so by more students living on campus there are more students walking rather than commuting. He continued by recognizing the cooperation they have had with the City, being able to enhance the infra-structure for alternative transportation such as the link project, and others that are an important element of how this all evolves together and how, ultimately how really ties back to the question of the re-development being consistent with the Greene County-Springfield Plan.

Mr. Hansen asked about the existing parking lot north of Harrison Stadium and why it only enters and exits off Summit.

Mr. Radecki stated that he may need to defer to the City Staff as this plan was started before his employment with Drury. However, when the lot was put together it was the time that the Mid-Town, Drury ten (10) year agreement was being put in place. There was concern at the time that there would be cars parking up against residential houses. He referred to the display map showing the back of the parking lot being discussed, showing the residential houses. In constructing the parking lot, a berm was installed west of Clay, so headlights would not be panning the front windows of the homes. If you had a drive way that exited to Clay, then there would be traffic coming and going and impacting the neighborhood. The second issue was security. It is much easier for Drury Security Staff to control and manage the lot if it doesn't have several exits. The third challenge was, pointing to the map and showing two driveways that exit on Summit; had there been an opening on Clay Avenue it would have become a short-cut street cutting across the parking lot making the parking lot unsafe. Also, at the time the lot was built, there was a cedar fence build along the west side of the lot and again that was to alleviate headlights shining back into the residential housing, and that was prior to the case at hand today.

Mr. Hansen commented on the berm, adding it is an amenity to the neighborhood. He added that Summit being narrow and feeding into the residential area on the north, the traffic is more concentrated because of the parking lot. He suggested if there were a drive that left in the south east corner that was slanted just as the side walk is currently, with a one way drive, it would relieve to some extent the traffic on Summit, asking for Mr. Radecki to comment.

Mr. Radecki stated that the idea of alleviating traffic on Summit Street, particularly the south part of Summit Street adjacent to the parking lot and the re-development area, is something that would be helpful to everyone, further more whether you had another exit on and off Clay probable would not have a lot of

impact on traffic going north. In looking at the over-all issue of traffic impact, in relationship to this particular project or in general; there are more students attending OTC and a lot of increases to traffic in the general area and there are efforts going on to look at that and what things can be done to help ease the impact, particularly in the residential areas of mid-town. They are adding housing units and parking spaces related to the housing units, they are not changing the character of the lot by virtue of this particular project. There have been discussions on campus about reviewing the overall needs for parking and exploring the open areas to the south of campus, closer to Chestnut Expressway. There is not a specific plan that is being actively pursuing at this time, but if you review cases that came before this group, the Vacation of Summit and Bob Barker Boulevard, those were first steps for Drury at looking at how they can do a better job of handling parking and moving more to the south end of the campus.

Mr. Hansen asked where people park that go to the new O'Reilly Family Center.

Mr. Radecki said this is one of the "it depends," answers. It depends primarily on the size of the crowd. Previously, Basketball games were held in Wisner, pointing to the map and pointing out the O'Reilly Center. The bulk of the crowds for basketball games are essentially parking in the same places now as they were before. He showed on the maps the parking lots being utilized as well as lots further south. To date, they have not had a capacity crowd in the arena. When O'Reilly Center was proposed if they met a certain number, they would provide a shuttle service to the parking lot at Cox North, and that was before Tindle Mills was torn down and that parking lot built. There are five hundred (500) new spaces located where the old mill was. There is a good cooperative relationship with OTC and the use that parking lot during the off peak time, which is evening, when the events are being held.

Ms. Roling asked about the parking spaces surrounding the proposed development, how many parking spaces are currently available and how many will be lost after the development or will any be lost; and inquired if a traffic study was done.

Mr. Radecki stated they will actually gain a net of approximately fifty-four (54) spaces. If every student has a car, and we are trying to discourage that, in the new housing complex had a car that would be seventy-two (72) cars. The studies done of that lot is that it is rarely full, the big L shaped lot wrapped around the south and east sides of the facility. He referenced the vacation of the alley way immediately behind the houses, which will allow adjustments to curb lines and get additional parking from that. Drury has not commissioned a traffic study, but would defer to City Staff about that.

Mr. Rognstad commented that typically, a traffic study is done with the zoning. Because Drury was rezoning two lots, the area was not adequate enough to be a requirement.

Ms. Roling asked if there were people living in the house, because when she drove by, it appeared someone may possibly live there.

Mr. Radecki stated that to his knowledge, it is vacant. Occasionally students or neighbors will park their vehicles there, adding that they use the house for storage. The house was in good shape, but was loaned out for free to some victims from the hurricane Katrina, which is why they called it Katrina House. When they left, they stripped fixtures, appliances, tore out the electrical system, and left it in a dangerous condition.

Mr. Hansen commented that without the tax abatement, the houses could be torn down and it would be

cheap to do.

Mr. Radecki commented that their desire for the last couple of years has been to increase their number of student beds. The economy has not allowed Drury to shoulder that kind of project on their own with their own financing. A party came forward and presented a plan to the University last spring which was the reason for the re-zoning request. The proposal did not meet the financial criteria needed for the project to work. Subsequent to that, Majors Properties came forward several months ago and said they would like to make a proposal. The tentative proposal Bryan Properties has made, looks attractive although it does contemplate the tax abatement. Without the tax abatement, it puts Drury in the same situation they were in last spring.

Mr. Hansen mentioned that the O'Neill house is in poor shape, but the Katrina house looks good compared to O'Neill. It seems to be the center piece of the proposed tax abated property. What assurance do we have that the O'Neill house, this historical house, will remain the center piece of the project.

Mr. Radecki stated there is a group of interested individuals, faculty, staff, students and the community that are passionate about preservation of the memory of Rose O'Neill, and leaving the home where it is at. The old trees will be saved, down to the brick walk going up to the front door. He gave a brief history of Ms. O'Neill accomplishments such as the Women's Suffrage Movement and the role she had as an internationally recognized illustrator of her day. They have been looking for a way to preserve the house for some time. The home will become a community center and somewhat of a museum related to Rose O'Neill. There is no intention by Drury University to tear down the house, and are not interested in entertaining a proposal to take it down and put in another fifteen (15) beds. The renovation of the house is part of the overall deal with Major's Properties. The renovation will be done by a contractor, independent of the contractor for the residential hall. The detail of the structure of the arrangement between Bryan Properties and Drury is still in development. Tentatively, Drury would have a master lease on the property. Major's Properties will build the facility and Drury then leases to the individual students. Drury will be responsible for all security and maintenance on the facility.

Mr. Rogstad added that the rehabilitation of the O'Neill House is part of the re-development plan, so if there was a change, they would be required to return to the City to amend the plan as a protection.

Mr. Hansen commented that Drury has built the O'Reilly Center which is a lot of added activity. The Harrison Stadium has been renovated and being used for more activities than the Central Bulldogs. Soccer games are putting more activity into the stadium than previously experienced, and there is the added parking lot to the north of Harrison that generates more in and out traffic than before. He has visited with residents on Summit to the north who says in addition to the cars, they have seen semi trucks coming in for the events, tour busses, all coming between Central and Division, up and down Summit Street. The Comprehensive Plan states that the Plan is to manage the expansion of institutional uses without negatively affecting the future of the residential portions of the neighborhood.

Mr. Hansen stated that he believes this project does not conform to the Comprehensive Plan, and since Commission's task is to decide that this re-development plan agrees with the plan, he is unable to see that it complies, unless there are plans or designs in the works to mitigate the traffic to the north between Calhoun and Division, this will be another burden on the neighborhood. Residents support Drury, but the neighbors feel they have kept quiet while project after project has been done and they have not had consideration from the University, for their neighborhood.

Mr. Radecki commented that the case in hand is about building the residence facility. The net result of the facility, in his estimation, is seventy-two (72) students that would otherwise be commuters will be living on campus. I would argue that would decrease the impact on the streets in proximity to campus for those students, adding they are not driving to class, two or three times a day. That is seventy-two (72) cars not coming to campus, not leaving and going back and forth to where they might live.

There is a difference in question in looking at the overall pressure on traffic in that part of mid-town than specific to just this one housing development project. He comments he has seen an increase in the traffic in that part of town, regardless of whether this housing project is built or not. He spent a couple of hours with a resident of Summit Street earlier in the week asking him what his experiences are, a gentleman who has lived on that street for twenty-three years and what he said is that they did not see much additional traffic after the opening of the O'Reilly Center. There has been a lot of traffic increase this fall term, not necessarily correlated to the O'Reilly Center. Living on Benton and working at Drury, the difference in last academic year and this academic year is the number of cars parked in the new Tindle Mills parking lot owned by OTC, which has a drive way coming onto Central. If you live up north, particularly northwest, from OTC, the paths you will take will run up Clay, Summit, and Benton. The resident suggested perhaps a four way stop at Lynn and Summit would make a difference

Mr. Radecki continued by adding the traffic is a larger issue that's really not so much on the table specific to the seventy-two bed development. We are not building an apartment complex for anyone that is going to want to live and work anywhere. It is being built for students that will attend Drury. Regarding the students, they will leave campus to shop, go to a movie or the mall, but the tendency for them to drive north is not there. Students have to buy a meal plan so they take the majority of their meals on campus so they are not running out to get groceries for the week as they do if they live in a house off campus. The tour buses may be team buses for soccer or basketball. The O'Reilly Center has events maybe once a month and they will unload at the loading dock at the south end of the O'Reilly Center. They are required to park on the south end of the campus, so they would not head north unless they are lost. There is not a continual stream of events where trucks and buses are coming in and out. He attributes the increase in traffic to the development in the area, unrelated to the case at hand.

Mr. Baird commented that he agreed with the last statement Mr. Radecki made. Regardless of whether Commission decides to approve or not approve the case, the semi-truck traffic will still be there and possibly the wording "tour bus," was not necessarily groups from Branson, it would be teams or musical performers. He added that it does fit the overall plan for Drury and believes it is great when you can put more students on campus and in addition to have someone else shoulder the investment in these economic times.

Mr. Lawhon asked if the facility would be exclusively for students of Drury and if Drury is confident that when the facility opens there will be a demand for the bedroom units.

Mr. Radecki stated yes, adding they have done a lot of work and feel they can fill the beds.

Mr. Shawn Whitney, 901 St. Louis, represents Bryan Properties. Mr. Whitney commented that he represents Bryan Property Six, and was involved in drafting the re-development plan that is being presented tonight. He quoted from the Center City Plan Element as well as the Drury University Campus Master Plan which is a part of the Center City Plan identifies the re-development area as an area for future

campus expansion including students housing. The re-development plan that has been submitted conforms to the Springfield- Greene County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lawhon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Rognstad returned to the parking lot question Mr. Hansen asked about previously. If the City were to look at providing access to Clay Avenue, Drury would need to have extensive discussion with the neighborhood. They did go through the process of setting the lot back farther so it would create a lawn and putting in the berm, and part of that was not having the access to Clay. There would not be a way to do a driveway at an angle coming in to the street. The requirements are that the throat of the drive-way and drive way come in at ninety (90) degrees, there is a detention there so it is not certain you could bring the drive down south and then turn in farther south so that it wasn't impacting the houses, and Staff would be willing to look at that, but it would require a discussion. The issue with the Plan and protecting the neighborhood, the major driver of the plan and protecting the neighborhood was to make sure areas were identified where Drury could acquire property and grow versus what has happen in the past. Some institutions were randomly buying property in the neighborhood and then the neighborhood was being eroded away in different directions, and was not appropriate.

That is the main reason for that statement regarding protecting the core of the neighborhood, which is to channel growth in the appropriate direction.

Ms. Roling commented that the Comprehensive Plan does not address the traffic flow issue, not just Drury Campus, but OTC and the whole area.

Mr. Rognstad stated that the Campus Plan dealt more with the boundaries of Drury. They had what was existing there, but do not know that the O'Reilly Center was ever envisioned at the time the Campus Plan was adopted. On the OTC Plan, there are some elements that address traffic flow because one of the items is taking Central and re-routing it so that it would go up to Pythian. The reason for doing that is Pythian goes all the way to Glenstone; Central goes across National and then ends, but the thinking was it would provide better circulation, and people could get from Glenstone over without having to use Chestnut and go through that intersection.

Ms. Roling commented that the reality is that there are two growing campuses side by side that the residents are caught in a cross fire, but it seems like you have like you have two positive thing going on, but they are dynamic and growing. Ms. Roling stated that she is disappointed that Drury has allowed the houses, which are part of the re-development plan, to deteriorate to what they are now.

Mr. Baird commented that he looked at the Architect's rendering of what the facility may look like, asking if the parking will be confined within the same parking lot when you add spaces or will it flow over to Webster, or Summit as it is now, asking if there will be two entrances to the parking lot.

Mr. Rognstad stated that it will come out on to Summit, south of Webster Street.

Mr. Radecki referred to the display and showed where the parking entrances and exits will be as a whole. He continued by adding that there would be a third exit. He pointed out the Rose O'Neill House, and the location of the proposed unit, and pointed out that parking on the north end would be related to the new O'Neill Community Center. He pointed out the drive way on Summit and that would connect to the parking on the backside of the property and to the larger lot as a whole. He pointed out an existing driveway that will be adjusted, stating that it will be serviced by one new drive way that connects into the overall lot, and

the two existing driveways.

Mr. Baird asked if adding an additional fifty-two (52) spaces would create an issue without adding an additional exit stating that the parking lot for O'Neill House would be primarily for activities at the O'Neill House and not residents of the housing facility.

Mr. Radecki said no, and expects some parking spaces to be designated for activities related to the house. The existing two driveways are adequately servicing the lot currently.

Mr. McClelland stated when he joined Commission Mr. Coltrin informed him that we agree to disagree adding the comments are not personal. He does not believe that the housing facility will not cause any additional traffic. The neighborhood needs to address the traffic issues to Drury and OTC. He stated Commission is here to make a determination to vote in a positive or negative manner and believes this is a good thing and will be voting in a positive manner.

Mr. Hansen stated that he feels it is a good project, but seventy-two (72) added housing units cannot help but add traffic to the area. He will be voting against the proposed re-development plan.

Ms. Roling added that she had hoped that if the residents of the neighborhood had concerns, they would have been here tonight. This is the format to voice their concerns.

Mr. Lawhon stated this will be brought before City Council Monday night which would be an appropriate arena to bring up the traffic issues. He continued by adding the zoning issue has already been decided. He believes the re-development plan before Commission is substantially in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. He commented that the plan before them is in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. It is not perfect, but we cannot hold this project hostage because of a traffic issue which may be beyond this particular plan. He believes the traffic will be minimal, that it will not be significant or annoying or a dangerous increase in the traffic. He believes the positives outweigh any negatives that might be related to the traffic. The traffic is not an important element of this redevelopment plan and he will support the request.

Ms. Roling **motioned to approve** O'Neill Suites Redevelopment Plan. Mr. McClelland seconded. Motion **carried** as follows: AYES: Lawhon, McClelland, Roling, Ray and Baird. NAYS: Hansen. ABSTAIN: None. ABSENT: Edwards, Coltrin, and Young.

ANY OTHER MATTERS UNDER COMMISSION JURISDICTION:

Meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Michael MacPherson
Principal Planner

