

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
February 6, 2020
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Burns, Carroll, MacMann, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey,
Commission Members Absent: Loe
Boone County PZC Guests: Kurzejeski, Martin, McCann, Mings, Poehlman
City Staff: Bacon, Smith, Caldera, Teddy, Zenner
County Resource Management Staff: Mach, Yonke

TOPICS DISCUSSED

New Business –

- West Area Plan

Vice-Chairman Toohey opened the meeting the meeting and requested that each of the attendees introduce themselves. Following introductions Mr. Zenner provided a general overview of the meeting's purpose and what was intended to be accomplished. He noted that tonight's meeting was really to introduce the Commission members to each other and to talk about the general framework of the future West Area Plan with a focus on first trying to define the Plan Area boundaries.

Mr. Zenner utilized a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate and guide the discussion. He began by displaying a proposed Plan Area boundary map that showed an approximate 26 sq. mile area broken into three potential sub-planning areas. Mr. Zenner explained the boundary and how its boundaries were derived. He noted that the western boundary was generally following that of the CATSO MPO area, the eastern boundary followed generally the existing City limits, the northern boundary was following Route 40 to Route J, and the southern boundary generally followed Route K and the Katy Trail to Route O. Mr. Zenner also described the sub-area boundaries and how they were derived.

Following these descriptions, Mr. Zenner asked the Commissioners if the boundaries were appropriate or if changes to them were necessary. Mr. Yonke pointed out that the use of the roads and trails as the boundaries should be considered "fuzzy" and not perceived as being "hard" edges. He stated that it was likely that the edges would be modified to capture both sides of the roadways to account for development impacts generated on lands immediately adjacent to such roadways. He and Mr. Zenner noted that such an approach was taken in the preparation of the East Area Plan and that the extension for such natural boundaries was generally one-half (1/2) mile.

Mr. Zenner further noted that after preparing the map it appeared modification of the Plan Area boundary along its southern edge was likely warranted. He noted that it should go all the way to the river and include the Bur Oak Loop south of the Katy Trail. Commissioners agreed that such an expansion was appropriate given the public improvements (the City well-field recharge area) and significant site such as the Bur Oak were located nearby. Mr. Zenner further noted that there were internal staff discussions about potentially a fourth sub-area being needed to address the interchange/future commercial locations along the I-70 corridor.

Having given this additional background on the boundary and how it could be changed from staff's perspective, Mr. Zenner asked the Commissioners to consider the following (1) if changes were made to the boundary how would such a change add value to the planning area, (2) if they were reduced what impact would that create, and (3) should they consider adding a fourth sub-area or redefine in what sub-area the interchange locations should be contained.

Commissioner's provided comments in a "round-robin" format and generally agreed that the basic boundary of the study area should remain as presented with modifications to its edges to include both side of outside roadways.

They generally agreed that the boundary between the northern sub-area and central sub-area should remain with I-70 and that the interchange locations could be addressed within the future Area Plan as potential “focus” areas where additional attention on planning goals and objectives needed to be offered. There was discussion about potentially extending the Plan boundary west to the Rocheport interchange; however, given the limited added value that inclusion of such land would provide Commissioners felt that the current western boundary at Routes O/J was adequate.

There was significant discussion about the boundaries becoming too “firm” without first considering where the infrastructure systems are presently located or could be reasonably installed. Mr. Zenner responded that an analysis and presentation of the utility networks was anticipated at the March 5 meeting as part of a “data-dump” once staff had opportunity to meet with its utility partners. He also noted that mapping would be prepared identifying the other factor’s impacting physical development such as floodplain and floodway locations. Mr. Zenner noted that the March 5 meeting would likely help further inform the basic boundary information on the sub-areas as well.

There was additional discussion on the boundaries of the overall area and the sub-areas. Mr. Zenner and Mr. Yonke indicated that they had a sense of what the Commissioners were seeking and recommended that they be permitted to go back and “tweak” the boundaries based on the discussion. Commissioners agreed that this was acceptable and indicated that they would look forward to seeing the revised map at the March 5 meeting.

Having addresses the general topic of the Plan Area boundary, Mr. Zenner proceeded into the second segment of the meeting which included providing an overview of the future Area Plan’s contents. Mr. Zenner noted that with the agenda packet he had attached a link to the adopted 2010 East Area Plan. He noted that staff envisioned the West Area Plan to be very similar in content; however, due to the limited development activity in the west and other infrastructure investments there would be some obvious limits to the depth of coverage on certain topics. He noted that the chapter outline would generally be identical and that there would be a chapter dedicated to plan implementation that would include goals, strategies, and objectives. Mr. Zenner noted that such a chapter has become a staple of more recent City plans as a means of tracking plan success and effectiveness.

Mr. Zenner noted that while the East Area Plan provides a template of content that can be followed, he and other staff wanted Commissioners to provide their thoughts on if there should be additional topics covered in this new plan given any unique characteristics of the plan area. Commissioner’s offered comments relating to this matter suggesting that Fire/Police/School sites be considered in the land use allocation process. The plan include a comparative table of City vs County land uses/densities to illustrate what could be excepted if a property were to annex into the City or were rezoned. It was also suggested that the plan address how development “at the seams” of City-County growth would be addressed and what was the “hand-off” process going to look like as well as giving consideration as to how to engage the public with nature effectively within the Plan’s boundaries.

There was discussion about providing some background on how the City-County differ in their development philosophies and how they have worked together in the past to resolve challenges at both the staff and elected levels. There was also a recommendation that a “Plan Objective” be defined which would provide over-arching guidance for the development of the West Area Plan as well as a summary of “lessons learned” from the prior joint planning effort. Commissioner’s agreed that these suggestions should become a part of the upcoming work session to set the tone correctly for what would be the next in the plan development process.

Mr. Zenner thanked the Commissioners for their participation in the evening’s events and looked forward to working with them in the future. He indicated that the staff’s would meet in near future to pull together the requested materials and prepare for the “data-dump” meeting in March.

ACTION(S) TAKEN: Motions to approve the agenda and January 23 work session minutes, as presented, was made and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:58 p.m.