

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

**August 10, 2017**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, I would ask at this time if there has been any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-170 that you please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. I see none. Thank you.

**Case 17-170**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of AMW Investment Properties, LLC (owner) for approval of PD zoning and associated PD plan to be known as "Sidra Subdivision PD Plan". The 0.86-acre site is located at the northeast corner of Primrose Drive and North Stadium Boulevard. (This item was tabled at the July 20, 2017 meeting.)**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the "Sidra Subdivision Plat 2 - PD development plan."

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Commissioners, any questions of staff?  
Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. Mr. Palmer, the neighbors have had any input on this, good, bad, indifferent?

MR. PALMER: Just questioning what the intent is here and whether or not, you know, the typical stuff about viewing patios, you know, the rear patios. There actually are no patios on the -- one the plan as proposed.

MR. MACMANN: I missed this PIM. Was it well attended or not attended?

MR. PALMER: Just the neighbors to the north there, the one single-family neighbor was in attendance, or the two of them. And I think their -- their main concern was -- was seeing the neighbors and -- and in response to that, the developer gladly added the screening.

MR. MACMANN: The buffer. Okay.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Which is not required.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? Mr. Palmer, it seems like a lot of parking lot. Is that just -- it's in excess of what would be normal for a single-family. Right? You said a two and a half would be normal, so it would be more like 13, 15 stalls versus 20-some?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It's actually two for a single family, so that would be ten. And then they're offering, so double is twenty.

MR. STRODTMAN: They're doubling the parking?

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Is there any reason for that?

MR. PALMER: Just in an effort to offer substantial parking so that there's not parking on the street and so on because I think that's already an issue in that neighborhood.

MR. STRODTMAN: So there would be a concern with multi-families living in one of these units, or somehow with all that parking, it seems like it's an overkill of parking for single-family homes.

MR. PALMER: Well, I mean, it is single-family. They're intended to be owner occupied. That's not necessarily something that -- that can be dictated up front.

MR. STRODTMAN: I understand. I understand.

MR. PALMER: But, yeah. There's nothing really --

MR. STRODTMAN: It seems like there's more opportunity for some green space, if you would take half that parking lot out, so --

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Chairman, if I may point out.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. ZENNER: If this were a more traditional single-family scenario with individual driveways, you would probably have storage capacity for the additional vehicles that are accommodated within that parking lot on each individual lot. So given the characteristic of how this is an in-common parking environment, the paved area may be equivalent to what you would have had as individual private-driveway'd lots. So while it does seem excessive, it's because it's striped, whereas on a private driveway, you wouldn't have these spaces striped. And if we go back to the aerial photography that is here and you look at the duplex parking areas, those duplex parking areas probably have anywhere between three spaces or more per half of the duplex.

MR. STRODTMAN: Probably, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: So that would explain a little bit also as to why it would appear as though there is more pavement being provided on the plan that would otherwise be necessary. It has to deal with a little bit of the -- the unique nature of the land use and the configuration.

MR. STRODTMAN: Good point. It makes -- it makes good sense, so thank you for that. Any additional questions, Commissioners, of staff? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I noticed that in their written statement of intent, they mention six lots. Is it --

MR. PALMER: It actually was decreased.

MS. RUSHING: To five?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. The initial plan did not include the full 25-foot setback on each side as required of a PD development. And so when they revised that, they had to drop a lot in order to fit all that in or a drop a unit.

MS. RUSHING: I think you covered this, but I just want to make sure. That is a sidewalk all the way around that outside?

MR. PALMER: Correct. And -- and connecting directly to the intersection.

MS. RUSHING: And those little dots are trees. Right?

MR. PALMER: Correct.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: Pretty trees.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Rushing, if I may, also I appreciate your identification of the statement of intent increase in the units. The plan is depicting and the plan will govern for development. However, in an effort to ensure that there is congruency between the two, we will request that the statement of intent be revised prior to forwarding this item to Council.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any additional questions, Commissioners, of staff? I see none. I'll go ahead and open this.

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STRODTMAN: It is a public hearing for Case 17-170, so please come forward. Give us your name and address and limit your discussions to three minutes.

MR. CROCKETT: Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I believe Mr. -- Mr. Palmer did a good job with the staff report, covered it really well. Ms. Rushing, you are correct. Their original proposal did have six units. I believe this is the reason why this project was tabled at the last meeting was because there was some discrepancy between the six and setbacks and how we were going to address that and how we desired to move forward, and I don't think we had staff support in what we were looking for, so we reduced it from six to five. I will note that the project is currently zoned R-2, and if we were to develop it, we could develop it -- could ask for a preliminary plat that showed three R-2 lots that would have three duplexes or six total units. So really we wanted this configuration -- it really limits or reduces our density slightly. It is a little bit larger parking lot than normal, but I think when you look and weigh it out with what could be done, I think we're pretty similar. We have ramped up our landscaping across the board, across the entire development. If you will look also, the development slides from the north to the south, so the units themselves will sit below -- slightly below the property line to the north. So that in itself is going to help buffer or give a line of sight screen from the neighbor to the north. That, along with the additional landscaping, we think will -- will enhance that area. So again there is a lot of sidewalk on this property. We are bordered by three -- three streets. We understand that we were supposed to front onto the street in which we have access from, but we think that this configuration really suits the -- the intent of the regulations a little better. You're -- the majority of the traffic as they come down is going to see the front of the units as opposed to the rear of the units, and so we think that's going to be more pleasing than -- than flipping them around and the bulk of the traffic -- you know, 98 percent of the traffic is going to look at the back of the units. And so we think that this is a -- a better configuration for this site. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Crockett, I understand these are zero lot line --

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: -- described, but there's no -- is there any private outdoor space for the units, just out of curiosity?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, I mean, we have the -- the entire exterior is going to be common space. It's going to be owned in common ownership. And so, you know, we have a detention basin down there, but that will be relatively shallow. It's going to be relatively dry at most all times. And so there's going to be common space down there. There will be common space behind the units themselves. So yes, there are some exterior common spaces, but it is just that, it's common. So all the units share.

MS. RUSHING: So are there patios or decks or anything like that on the rear of those buildings?

MR. CROCKETT: There will probably be small patios would be all that there would be. It would be just a minimal concrete pad for a patio. There will be no decks, I don't believe.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners, of this speaker? Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Anybody else like to come forward and speak on this matter?

MR. CLARAHAN: Good evening. I'm Rob Clarahan; I live at 2011 Iris Drive. So if you could follow Primrose on down the street a little bit, about a quarter of a mile, I live out there. Lovely neighborhood. I only have a few questions in regards to the site. The density issue, I think, is a concern for a lot of people of our neighborhood because the traffic that comes from Stadium turns into the neighborhood pretty heavy at times. The same traffic that comes from Stadium to the south is heavy at times. And even though there are a couple of places to come into the neighborhood, Primrose from Stadium is a main thoroughfare there. And to have additional housing right on that site, it -- it can bottleneck because people come from the north and slide in. There's a yield sign. It's barely a yield sign. They're coming at a pretty good clip. It's, I would say, 20, 25, 30 miles an hour coming through there. So people trying to get out -- additional people coming out could be an issue. But that's not as -- probably as important as -- I guess I'm looking for a definition for the water-retention pond. Is that concrete or is that just soil, because what's in that spot that would be located as a retention pond, it's an eroded piece of soil and there's a tree there, and that's really about it. So is it -- does that stay the same or is there plans to make that better because a water-retention pond sounds like a terrible eyesore coming in.

MR. STRODTMAN: It would be -- it would not be concrete, it would be a soil-contained structure that would have to be maintained, you know, per the regulations that would come along with that. So that it would be -- it would be an improvement from what's there today.

MR. CLARAHAN: Oh, that would be good.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. And there's a pipe that runs at the bottom to take it to some other storm sewer. If we had the -- yeah. Look up there. See where the pond, there's a pipe coming out of there, so it's --

MR. STRODTMAN: It'll be dry -- it'll be dry most of the time.

MR. STANTON: Photo up there of the pipe -- yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: It'll be dry most of the time.

MR. CLARAHAN: Okay. So it's going to be any worse than it is right now?

MR. STANTON: Like a rain garden would be the best way kind of to --

MR. CLARAHAN: Third thing is is there -- and I really can't see on there. Is there a plan for a sidewalk on the Stadium side?

MR. STRODTMAN: There's sidewalks on three sides, so it would be on the Stadium, the corner. It would be on three sides all except for the back of it --

MR. STANTON: The north, yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- or the north side.

MR. CLARAHAN: I understand. Well, all right. Those are my questions. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, sir, for coming this evening? Any additional speakers?

MS. COY: My name is Maureen Coy, and I live at 2208 Iris Drive. I -- I have some concerns just about the look of it as driving into the subdivision. My concern is that when you drive -- I drive down the hill of Stadium, and then I turn onto Primrose. The first thing I'm going to see to the right is a parking lot with 20 cars in it along with a water-retention pond. So I have some concerns about that being the first thing you see when you drive into Valley View Subdivision is that parking lot. I think it's going to be pretty big. I think, too, that -- well, so that -- that is my main concern is just the aesthetics, the look of it as you come into the subdivision. A lot of people in Valley View take a lot of pride in their homes and I understand that these will be owned, but over time, I could see these being owned and then rented out, and so I have some concern about that, too. The storm water, right off, I don't know too much about that, but you've got the -- you're taking a lot -- you're taking up a lot of surface there that was ground, and you're making it impervious, you know. And you've got the roofs for the townhouses. You -- to me, it almost seems like two-thirds of that lot will now be impervious. And so I'm curious as to whether that water-retention pond really could in a flash flood or some of the crazy four, five, six inches of rain that we've had in the past, if it can really hold that water and not cause flash flooding at the corner of Stadium and Primrose.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. I'll try to answer a couple of your questions. You know, obviously, the landscaping is taken into consideration and is up to the standards and requirements that are required in this particular case. So a lot of what you -- you know, there would be quite a bit more landscaping installed than what is there today, so it's going to help minimize some of what your concerns would be. As mentioned earlier, this -- this location could or would or it could have up to six units on it, so this site, even though -- or this plan, even though you may feel it's too dense, it actually could even be higher density and still be within legal -- you know, legal code. Engineering or the storm-water related, we trust the engineers know what they're doing and they've been paid to calculate how much flow would be related to this project and that retention pond would be based on those calculations. And so I think we've

come a long, long ways in the last how many years in our storm-water control within the City of Columbia, and I trust that they've done that -- their homework and that it will accommodate it.

MS. COY: Now -- well, when you say this is not going to be concrete, that it's going to be ground. So explain what it looks like.

MR. STRODTMAN: It's -- it's a retention basin. You see them throughout the City, a lot of them. They're grass. They sometimes will have some cattails, potentially, depending on if it's holding water. Most of them are made to not hold water, it's to pass through. It's a retain it for a short term and then release it, it's not to hold water in the sense of a pond. So maybe the pond would be a bad word. So that pipe in the bottom of it is to get water out of it, and it's just to slow it down, let the soil take a lot of the minerals and -- or a lot of the nutrients or the things out of the water, as well as absorb a lot of water, and then what is left goes out the pipe and it goes on down. So it maintains it so we don't have these flash floods of water when all these parking lots dump off at the same time. It can -- it stops it, slows it, some of it is absorbed, cleaned up. What's not is passed on at a slower rate.

MR. PALMER: Mr. Chairman, I can expand on that, if you don't mind?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. Palmer.

MR. PALMER: Basically, what you'll see there is just a depression in the ground that's designed to -- to slow the flow of water across the site. And as you stated, engineering calculations have to be made in order to make sure that it's mitigating the runoff that's being created by the development. So we have to trust that the engineers are doing their job there and we also check those calculations when they come in with further building permits.

MR. ZENNER: That's exactly it. Predevelopment flow rate must be controlled with postdevelopment flow, meaning what crosses this site as an undeveloped tract of land cannot be exceeded in a developed state, so the pond itself or this retention area and the control devices that allow the water to be moved through that retention pond have controls within them that ensure that the metering of the water as it leaves the site is no greater. Our storm-water ordinances, as our Chairman has explained, have advanced greatly over the years. The engineer and design professional associated with this actual formal development will have to run a series of different calculations based on a number of different types of storm events in order to ensure that this particular BMP or this -- this feature will function properly under those varying conditions in the postdeveloped state, which has to take into account all of the impervious surface that is being created. So what's depicted here may not necessarily be what gets built. It may be slightly larger, it may be configured a little bit differently. That all is yet to be determined based upon final engineering design plans.

MR. PALMER: And the actual application of the vegetation within that area, it can vary from they might just plant it with grass. They might plant it with native grasses. It just depends on kind of the application they're trying to achieve here. Like Mr. Strodtman mentioned, sometimes they're used to filter contaminants, such as sediment and everything out of the water before it's passed on to the broader storm-water system. That's not indicated at this point, so the best description I can give you is that it's a

depression in the ground and it may or may not have some kind of native plants in it or it may just be grass -- a grass bottom depending on whether they want to make it a double-use area. Like, it's adjacent to the largest chunk of their usable open space, so they may try to incorporate it as part of that open space when it's dry so that they can use it for whatever, you know. So I don't anticipate you seeing some garish thing out there.

MR. STRODTMAN: There's standards that have to be maintained, you know. They just can't be -- it has to work.

MS. COY: And then why is it being changed from an R-2 to a PD? Why -- why do we have zoning laws or zoning things? Why, if that was determined that that was the best zoning for that corner, why are you proposing that it be changed?

MR. STRODTMAN: I mean, that was the way it was -- the City staff will work with the applicant to find the best route to develop this project. And as they mentioned, it could have been three separate duplexes, and so you would have had three separate driveways, separate parking lots, you know, three probably separate back -- back paths because you would have really chopped up this lot quite a bit more probably than the way it is now. But, staff, I'll let you speak on the actual reasoning for the plan.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Even -- even in the R-MF zoning district, as I stated in the staff report, the -- the orientation of the building would have to be towards Rashid, and then that, in effect, ruins your open space. You don't have a large contiguous open space to use, so that -- that's part of it. But again, as Chairman Strodtman stated, you're looking at one access point instead of three or even more potentially. If it's in this configuration, but a different design, you would have potentially all five or six units having their own access point onto Rashid. Then also the aesthetic of it, instead of looking at the rear of the house along Stadium and probably also a parking lot -- I haven't laid it out myself, but ostensibly you could imagine. If -- if the buildings are turned to the -- the street frontage, the parking would potentially have to go somewhere if it's still required. So on the east side, you'd be looking at probably the back of a building and potentially some parking area back there, and that's based on the fact that the storm-water detention pretty much has to be at the south side because that's the way the topography flows, but that's kind of the --

MR. STRODTMAN: With this layout as planned, you're getting a front view. As you're coming south, going down the hill and you're going to turn into your neighborhood, you're looking at the front of these homes. In the -- in the other way, you would have been looking at the rear of these homes.

MS. COY: And the parking lot.

MR. STRODTMAN: And the parking lot, too. So I think you really -- and then on the north side, it's kind of being built into the hill a little bit, so the rear of the homes are kind of being taken care of by the topography as well as all the increased landscaping that you can see there. So I think it's a much better improvement than what could be legally put there under its current zoning.

MS. COY: The only thing I -- I would have to say is most duplexes don't have a parking lot, they have a driveway and -- and garages, so people, you know, either use the garage or use the parking lot.

And I think part of the reason that this has been decided is there's probably no availability of parking on Rashid.

MR. STANTON: Well, you could put –

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, and you don't want -- I mean, you want them to park in that parking lot and not be on Rashid, and -- and -- and garages are not required, so you don't have to have a garage. And really, ma'am, you really, honestly, you don't want three driveways coming onto Rashid, three individual driveways with their own parking lots, the back of the buildings facing -- you know, the back would be on Stadium, so as you go by that golf course and as you turn into the neighborhood, you would look at the back, the barbecue grills, the bicycles, whatever is in the backyard -- swimming pools, you know, whatever people do. Then you pass into your -- into your neighborhood and go home. I think this, you -- sure, you're seeing some concrete, but I think it's -- you know, it's a much better example. And I was questioning the number of stalls because I was looking at it from a stall count as opposed to I'm not counting a driveway into the garage, which they don't have in this case, but you might, so you would have that much concrete. You probably have just as much -- if you were to take six homes -- or five homes of your -- where you live, and you put five homes together and your driveways and your parking spaces, you probably have just as much or more than they do here in front. They just have it all together, so it's a little more deceiving. That's why I questioned it, too. So I think with that retention pond on the corner, more landscaping, you know, this topography is tough. It's at the bottom of the hill. It's a challenge, you know. You're not going to probably find a single home that wants to live in that location because of, one, what it's zoned, and, two, is this amount of traffic that's on that corner. I would say someday, you're probably going to see a light or something at that intersection. I don't think that it'll be ever -- forever like that, because you have a lot of traffic, not from this -- these five homes, but there's a lot of homes back in there that are feeding into this, that someday that intersection, it'll be a roundabout or a light or something, but I have no knowledge of that at this point.

MS. COY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you for coming, ma'am. Commissioners, any questions of that speaker? I see none. Thank you, Ms. Coy. Any additional speakers that would like to come forward?

MR. PASLEY: Filmore Pasley, 2105 North Stadium Boulevard. My sister and I own the home -- house to the north. We're very concerned about the way this lays, that we will be landlocked. If you look at where our house is, there's another lot to the north of us owned by someone else. If eventually something happens to Stadium, we're -- we're not going to have an entrance to our land there, so we're concerned about that. Everybody has talked about these being built down the hill. I'll guarantee you it's not more than a five-, ten-foot drop till you get halfway down that hill, then it falls completely off. So saying it's going to be down a hill, maybe five foot off there or something like that. I'm kind of concerned with the two-story house going all the way across there. All five of these put together, it's going to block everything from like everybody else says, looking to the north for us, looking to the south. It just seems kind of strange you would put it that way when you've got a nice park and a lake right across the street



that everybody could look at there. So kind of concerned about the way it -- it lays. We're the ones that are going to be looking at all those grills and all that stuff on the backyard and stuff. So we've been there over 50 years and it seems like us paying our taxes for all these years, we don't get the same weight that the contractors get when they come in. You all look at it as -- it says in here, Technically meets the requirements, so we build it. I don't understand that, why it's always that. Is that really what's best for the land, to put two-story buildings through there where nobody can see by and all that? It says here -- article down, They moved the units to the rear of the busy street where may be seen as an eyesore. Well, we're the ones seeing the eyesore. It's not just somebody driving down the street that's not really paying attention. It says in the paragraph up here, Their intent is to sell it. They're going to come in, make some money off this. It's great for the City, for taxes and stuff like that, but the contractor comes in, builds these all right next to one another, because it's cheaper for them, and we kind of let them get away with that and they're gone. And so that's some of the concerns we have.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll try to answer a couple of your questions. I may -- I won't be able to answer all of them. But -- and I may have forgot a couple of them in order, so bear with me. One is we -- we cannot take your entrance away. You'll always have access to your property. It is illegal for you not to have access to your property. Okay? So if Stadium or -- is widened or changed or whatever, there would be modifications to your driveway. I don't know what that would look like, you know, but there could be modifications, but you'll always have a driveway. You'll always have access to your home and to your property. It would be illegal for them to take access away from your property. So now your driveway may be different than it is today, but you'd still have access to that. What the grade is today and what the height is, that five, six foot that you referenced may not be what the grade is going to be when they're done, so those homes could easily dropped down and built into the hill and some of the dirt brought out and built into -- for the parking lot to be raised up and flatten out that hillside for the parking lot. So don't completely visualize it today the way it is and the houses are just going to be built on the hill that's there today because there's going to be grading done. And I -- I'm not an expert engineer, didn't know what the grading feet is, but there will be grading done, so those homes will be built in and dropped down a little bit. Obviously, if you look at the plan, and it's not in front of us, but they've -- they've put a lot of landscaping on the north side which is to address you -- your home. So they're trying to help with the landscaping, you know. And if -- if -- if it is, you know, five feet or greater of a drop, you're not going to be seeing the barbecue grills, you're going to be seeing the deck or the rooftops of the homes, the back of them. You're not going to be seeing down below because that's going to be into the hill or at least how I visualize it. Again, I'm not an engineer. Lastly, and I probably forgot a couple of your items, and I apologize for that. If -- if they would done the duplexes for a couple thoughts. Typically, the duplexes are going to be rentals. You have a much better likelihood these are going to be homeowners that live in these homes because they're single-families that are bought that way. So it doesn't have to be that way, but more than likely, it is going to be like that. You can still own a duplex, too, and live there, too. I'm not saying that it wouldn't be the case. Also, if they did the individual driveways with three duplexes, you're

required to front the -- your front door has to front the street that your address is on. So even though you have a beautiful golf course across behind you, they would not be able to face that direction because their entrances, their exits are behind them. Their street is behind them, so the house would have to face the street that your address is on, if that makes sense.

MR. PASLEY: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: So even though I agree with you that it's a shame that that beautiful golf course isn't what they look out their front window, but at least they see that out their back window of their homes because they're not -- they're required to have their front door facing the street that their address is on. So sorry I didn't maybe answer all your questions.

MR. PASLEY: Oh, that's fine. We did put an offer out that we might be willing to sell what we had. We didn't hear anything until tonight, and thought that might help them out in a way, but --

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah. We don't touch or look at the financial side at all.

MR. PASLEY: Sure.

MR. STRODTMAN: We just try to look at what's legal and right for that -- that property to do and that's what we try to look at. We try to minimize your concerns and exposures because we do understand that you've been there for many, many years, and it's going to be a different view than there is today, but the golf course across the street is still a golf course, so that's the best for you and I can't speak for what Stadium is going to be like in the future other than it will probably be different. Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? Thank you for coming, sir. We do appreciate it, and thanks for the questions. Any additional speakers?

MS. GARRETT: Hello.

MR. STRODTMAN: Hello.

MS. GARRETT: My name is Marilyn Garrett, and I live at 4188 Tara Lake Drive. That's my brother. I do want to question a couple of things. When you talked about this screening that runs along our property line, it -- they told us in the first meeting that it -- that the back of these buildings would be 35 feet high, so that's what we're basing that on is that we're going to look at this bank of 35-feet high, and that the patios -- my concern is we were told they're four bedroom, at least four-bedroom units or whatever you want to call those. So from a density standpoint, my concern, because today I had two or three people, they just walked through the middle of our yard. If their back doors open out with their patio, how many people, you know, are we going to be seeing? We already see so many people because the folks that are behind at the back of our property, they already all walk through there, and they all have patios that look out, so we get to hear everything they say and everything they do, every fight they get into. So again, I guess that's my concern about that, that, you know, how many more people are we just added in those five units?

MR. STRODTMAN: A couple -- a couple thoughts, and again, I'm not an architect or an engineer. I just, you know, do this for a volunteer thing, but a couple of thoughts. One is the 35 feet I think you referenced or 30-some feet that you -- did you reference 35 feet?

MS. GARRETT: They're tall, yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Again, it's -- it's not from a grade that's there today, and it's not taking 35 feet from here straight up. Again, there's -- there's -- you know, there's a topography issue. There's -- you know, there's a little bit of hill there. So it's -- you know, I wouldn't go to the highest point and go 35 feet up and -- you know, it's not going to be that -- that way. It's going to be -- and again, you know, you're welcome to get an engineer to help give you the feed of how much different -- you know, what it is you're truly going to see is not going to be 35 feet of a house from your home.

MS. GARRETT: That's what we were told by Crockett Engineering at the last meeting, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: Again, I'm not an engineer, so I'm not going to --

MS. GARRETT: I'm -- base it on what we were told.

MR. STRODTMAN: I understand. Also, if you look here, the back of the homes, there's -- it's -- it's -- there's not much -- there's -- it's a fairly tight area, so there's not going to be a large -- and Mr. Crockett kind of referenced this earlier in his question I think Ms. Rushing asked about the back deck -- patios. They're fairly small. There's not a lot of depth back there, so I don't think that you're going to find large patio decks that are built up and -- and large because there's just not that much room before they get into the landscaping and the trees and things, and so, you know, there's just not that kind of --

MS. GARRETT: Could somebody talk to us about the landscaping and the trees because there's just a lot of people coming out their back doors at us.

MR. STRODTMAN: The process, ma'am, would be is that depending on what happens this evening, you would be -- you know, if it's approved and goes to City Council, you're welcome to go to a City Council meeting when this is going to be heard there and you can, you know, give your views there, too. City staff has worked with the police department, the fire department, the -- you know, the utility departments, all departments within the City staff have -- has looked at this plan and have given their approval of it before it gets to us. So we trust that they have taken a lot of those -- you know, things into consideration. And as such here, you would be welcome, assuming we approve it, to go to City Council. If we don't approve it, then there would be no need for -- well, you could still go to City Council because it would still go there. Mr. Anthony -- Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If you had a pencil, and I want you to put yourself in this person's perspective, as well --

MS. GARRETT: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: -- because they've got money on the table; you've got money on the table in your property. What would you do to fix your concerns if you were then?

MS. GARRETT: A fence.

MR. STANTON: A fence in the back?

MS. GARRETT: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: A privacy fence?

MS. GARRETT: I don't want people just walking out their back door through my yard. A

significant fence, you know. If you just throw some trees out there, that's not going to stop anybody.

MR. STANTON: Well, your brother just -- well, then -- then you just -- you'd rather just look a fence versus trees and --

MS. GARRETT: Well, we're already getting the 30-, 35-foot, we're already looking at that, and then my -- mine is safety. There's a safety issue here having that many people that just walk out their back door into your yard. Like I said, we've already experienced it with the duplexes behind us. There's been some nasty, ugly fights back there and, you know, people drinking lots of beer and throwing stuff around, and we hear everything they say. So, you know, it's just --

MR. STANTON: And I don't want to stereotype the neighborhood, but, you know, these would be homeowners.

MS. GARRETT: Those are homeowners.

MR. STANTON: These are like row homes or row houses.

MS. GARRETT: They own -- it's a duplex. They -- you have an owner on one side and rent out the other, so --

MR. STANTON: Okay. So a fence would make you happy?

MS. GARRETT: Well, I'm just saying --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GARRETT: -- I -- I'm -- there's safety issue here for me.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GARRETT: Because you're adding that many more people that -- and everybody goes up to the gas station. Okay? Everybody back there. There is a gas station right there, a huge one, and everybody is traipsing through the yard to get to that gas station because the place behind it is all fenced in, so you can't get through that way, so the only way you can get through is through us.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions?

MR. TOOHEY: Do you actually live on the property, because when you gave your address, it was a different address.

MS. GARRETT: Not right now. We -- we actually -- it's vacant right now. Like my brother said, we had offered it for sale, so --

MR. TOOHEY: Okay.

MS. GARRETT: No, I don't. I was -- I'm there, but --

MR. STRODTMAN: But don't reside there?

MS. GARRETT: Yeah. We haven't decided yet.

MR. STRODTMAN: No one is residing there currently? It's vacant, you said?

MS. GARRETT: Right now.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Ms. -- Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Are you part of a neighborhood association?

MS. GARRETT: No. I didn't even know there was one. We were there before Valley View

Gardens ever went in.

MS. BURNS: I would suggest you contact your neighborhood association and share your concerns and see what others' concerns might be and come when the City Council discusses this, have a plan that the neighborhood is behind. And whether that's asking for a fence or additional landscaping and possibly talking with the developer prior to that meeting and coming to some sort of agreement that there is an understanding that if additions are going to be made, that they will be made.

MS. GARRETT: Okay. Yeah. Because, I mean, it's just a high-traffic area through there. They just drop stuff, throw stuff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, ma'am.

MS. GARRETT: Uh-huh. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional speakers this evening on this matter? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Questions, discussions, additional information needed from staff?

MR. MACMANN: I had a quick question for staff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I think I know the answer, but you can verify for this for me, Mr. Palmer. This area belongs to or is represented by Councilperson Trapp; is that correct?

MR. PALMER: That's correct.

MR. MACMANN: The Second Ward. That may be other -- another option for the individuals.

MR. STRODTMAN: Another option for the folks here that do not like this project would be to reach out to your City Councilman, which would be Michael Trapp would your Ward 2. Additional questions, Commissioners, comments, thoughts, concerns? Motion? Lottery ticket winning number? I'm open. Yes, Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 17-170, I move to approve the Sidra Subdivision Plat 2 Planned Development Plan.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Russell, for that motion, and Ms. Rushing for that second. Commissioners, is there any questions on the motion for approval of Case 17-170? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns, for that. Our recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. And for you citizens that were here this evening, you're welcome, obviously, to

go to City Council and express your feelings to our City Council, also, or welcome to Mr. Trapp.