

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MARCH 8, 2018

Case No. 18-41

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of Delta Tau Delta Association of Columbia, Missouri (owners) for approval of a replat of La Grange Place to be known as La Grange Place Plat 4, and design adjustments waiving the requirement that subject property have direct access to public sewer and to reduce the amount of right-of-way dedicated with the plat. The replat combines Lots 3 and 4 of La Grange Place into a single lot. The .58-acre site is zoned R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) and is located at 506 Rollins Street. (This item was tabled at the February 22, 2018, meeting.)

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff's recommendation indicates the proposed replat has been reviewed by staff and found to comply with the provisions of the UDC with the exception of the requested design adjustments. As described, staff cannot support the second design adjustment. The plat may be approved by the Commission without the approval of one or both of the design adjustments and recommends the following:

1. Approval of the final plat for La Grange Place Plat 4.
2. Approval of the design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(c)(4)(ii) regarding the dedications of road right-of-way.
3. Denial of the design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(g)(4) regarding the sanitary sewer design.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. Commissioners, are there any questions of staff?
Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Bacon, the RE, the right-of-way, the design adjustment, the neighbors, if we give them the 25 feet that they request rather than the 33, that will match what the neighbors have currently with their new construction?

MS. BACON: So there --

MR. MACMANN: The west, specifically?

MS. BACON: -- is a varying -- varying right-of-way up and down the corridor.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MS. RUSHING: I think the portion --

MR. MACMANN: To the west, they have -- do we know what the current -- the new building to the west was given?

MS. BACON: I don't know that offhand, but you can also see here where the parcel lines are shown in purple.

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh. Yeah, but --

MS. BACON: So it's probably pretty close.

MR. MACMANN: That's what I was thinking. That's what -- I was just trying to verify that. Thank you.

MS. RUSHING: That was what -- we were addressing the same issue, so -- yeah. It doesn't look like the property to the west has -- would have significant room or sufficient room to make that dedication if it were required to.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions of staff? I see none. This is not a public hearing, but as in past practices, we would allow anyone that's in the audience that is here for this case, you're welcome to come forward and speak upon Case 18-41. We would just ask for your name and address before you start.

MR. DARR: Hi. I'm Cody Darr, at A Civil Group, engineer; offices at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court, representing the owners of this lot. I don't have too much to add. I will answer any questions you have specifically. But regarding Mr. MacMann's question about the right-of-ways, what's triggering us to actually dedicate this right-of-way in the first place is the UDC requirement that redevelopment over a lot line requires subdivision platting. To the -- to the east and to the west and to the north on the other side have all been redeveloped recently, but they did not have to plat, so they were not triggered to -- they all still have the substandard 20-foot half-width along that whole area. And when you take into consideration the recent improvements that the City did for Providence, which the CATSO Plan has not taken into account, in my opinion, which has a full-access intersection at Turner, it actually makes traffic more likely to -- to go at Turner instead of Rollins, which is now right-in/right-out. So it's not as likely that Rollins in the future would be a collector -- you know, function as a collector. And I think that's what City staff was agreeing with us that -- and if it wasn't a collector, it would be required to be a local residential-type street, which would require a 50-foot half-width, or 50-foot width and a 25-foot half-width, which is what we are providing. So that's kind of where we got to the five feet additional as opposed to the 13 for a collector, which we didn't think this road -- it does -- it definitely doesn't function like that now and with the improvements and the routing of traffic more towards Turner, wouldn't be in the future either. Does that answer -- if you have other questions?

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, are there any questions of this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Real quickly. This is just a replat in the -- this is a paperwork shuffle. Do you guys plan to do any construction on site, any other changes?

MR. DARR: Yeah. We're going to tear down an existing building and build a brand-new building.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I was getting into the parking -- the driveway.

MR. DARR: Oh, the drive -- the existing driveway?

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. DARR: Yeah. There will be an existing driveway where the one is right now, and then there will actually be another driveway.

MR. MACMANN: It wasn't really related. I just wondered because that driveway is terrible.

MR. DARR: Yeah. It'll be rebuilt.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Darr.

MR. DARR: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Anyone else like to come forward to speak on this matter? I see none. Commissioners, any further discussion, questions, motion? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Well, the last speaker did bring up the issue that the representation of Rollins on the CATSO plan may not be accurate, and that was mentioned in the report. I was wondering is there -- are there any further comments from staff on -- the report says a separate action to revise the roadway classification shown on the CATSO plan for Rollins may be warranted? I mean, if it -- if it is misrepresented or if we are making decisions based on a representation that's different or a use that's different than how it's represented, I think I would agree with that.

MR. ZENNER: And I think you are. Either the point -- the response that I can give you, Ms. Loe, and to the Commission is that CATSO has a Technical Committee and they have a Coordinating Committee that is -- is charged with the responsibility of monitoring our road infrastructure planning. As this project has come in after we have done the improvements to Providence, relocated the traffic light from Rollins, basically, to Turner, it has not come to their attention yet that we may need to consider a reclassing of this roadway. That's why it's structured as a separate action in the staff report. We wanted to -- we wanted to acknowledge the fact that, yes, the Commission's action here would be contrary to what is designated on the CATSO plan, however, is supported from our traffic engineering division as well as our staff that given the changes and the unlikely nature of additional redevelopment potentially further east, which is where we would likely then receive additional road right-of-way, the action is supported given the context in which this piece is being proposed to be redeveloped. So the Board -- the CATSO Coordinating Committee would have to have its Technical Committee recommend that this map -- this road classification be reclassified. It is possible we, staff, our Community Development Department does staff CATSO, and it may be an item that we will take up with our senior transportation planner to bring to the Technical Committee should they feel that they need to do some cleanup to the map itself. I think this action really at this point is one of the -- one of maybe less than a half a dozen properties that are left to maybe redevelop. The parcels that are directly across the street from this are really the only remaining ones that may. Therefore, when you look at the utility of any additional right-of-way, given what CATSO requires, it just doesn't seem to -- in our mind, there is no real benefit. Getting it to the half-width, which we really should have, should the road function at a lesser standard, is what the applicant is proposing, and that's what our traffic engineers and we, from a staff perspective, believe is the most appropriate dedication needed in order to accommodate the flow of traffic and that would also accommodate a

revision in the CATSO plan.

MS. LOE: Right. I mean, I think the arguments made sense and we shouldn't have to go through the same exercise should the remaining properties --

MR. STRODTMAN: Change.

MS. LOE: -- go -- yeah. Need another revision. So I wasn't sure if you needed anything from us to take that forward. All right.

MR. ZENNER: I think your -- if your desire as a Commission is to support the request for the variance -- or the design adjustment, that sends a message forward to CATSO or that our senior transportation planner can take to CATSO Tech indicating that the Commission is acting this way. We probably need to consider modifying the map.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional discussion, Commissioners? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Do you need this to be two separate motions, or can it be one?

MR. ZENNER: Dependent -- it depends --

MS. RUSSELL: Depending on what I want?

MR. ZENNER: It depends on how the Commission is feeling tonight. If you would like to probably take two separate actions, that would be much cleaner probably as it moves forward, even though they will come together to the Council.

MR. CALDERA: More efficient.

MR. ZENNER: More efficient as one is what I'm being told by our attorney. So if you're inclined to approve -- approve as a joint motion. Otherwise, make your motion clear as to what your intention is.

MR. STRODTMAN: So one motion is okay?

MR. ZENNER: One motion will be fine.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell, would like to try that one motion?

MS. RUSSELL: Oh, sure. I'd like to move regarding Case 18-41, approval of the final plat for La Grange Place Plat 4, and approval of the design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(c)(4)(ii) regarding the dedication of the road right-of-way.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Russell. Do we have a second?

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, we have a motion that has been made and has its proper second from Mr. MacMann. Is there any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns.