

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**SEPTEMBER 8, 2016**

**VI) PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Case No. 16-170**

**A request by The Crossing-EPC of Columbia (owner) for approval of a C-P development plan to be known as "Lot 7, Red Oak South Plat No. 1". The 0.75-acre subject site is located on the southeast corner of Grindstone Parkway and Grindstone Plaza Drive.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the C-P development plan and associated Design Parameters, subject to prior approval of a consolidation plat to combine the subject site with the principal church lot which it serves.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Do we have any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Director Zenner, after the replat, this is going to be one piece of property?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct --

MR. MACMANN: I mean --

MR. ZENNER: -- with two zonings on it.

MR. MACMANN: -- with part of this property that's not platted will be C-P?

MR. ZENNER: It is platted. The C-P lot is platted today. We're combining two platted lots. The church lot was platted at the time that they did their most recent expansion, so the entire church boundary has been platted as a legal lot, so we are combining two legal lots together which is considered an administrative action and legal. There is nothing within our regulations that precludes an individual from being able to join two differently zoned parcels. We generally do not -- we generally frown upon that action. However, given that the ownership is the same in this particular instance and the need to not create an off-premise advertising sign, it is something that we are -- we will allow to occur. Split-zoned property, which is what we would term this as after it's combined as one lot is normally something that is more challenging to track, especially if you're in an area that is intending on being redeveloped. Now, that's one reason why we -- we frown upon combining split-zoned parcels into a single lot. In this particular instance, given that this is for the church, the church's purpose is for being able to put the advertising signage to get way-finding to the road that they've created, we do not see this as really the platting action as an issue, nor the split zoning in the same light as we would if it were some other area.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: So to follow that -- his -- Mr. MacMann's questions, if the church decided that there was a better use for this site than their sign and they decided to sell it, then it would come back, obviously, through to us with the new ownership for a -- to split it off?

MR. ZENNER: We would be resubdividing the property at that point. And to resubdivide the property and have a new development plan on it, that would require a final plat, yes. I would probably tell you that if the church wants to retain the ability to advertise on whatever monument-style sign or whatever signage that they place -- leave on this lot if it's redeveloped, we would probably advise them that they need to retain the ownership of it; otherwise, you can't have your church sign on that property even --

MR. STRODTMAN: And my assumption was that the sign would go away and, you know, they would sell it.

MR. ZENNER: Somebody would be rebuilding it for commercial use.

MR. STRODTMAN: Be developed. And under my assumption or scenario, then the -- would the zoning -- there wouldn't be a little sliver left over of -- you know, of C-P, the lot that they sold off, and then the A-1? I mean, because --

MR. ZENNER: We would --

MR. STRODTMAN: -- you would lose that line. Right? You lose that property line?

MR. ZENNER: -- we would -- you will lose the property line that divides the A-1 and the C-1 -- or the C-P through the administrative combination plat. We would probably, if you came back to resubdivide the property, we would require the property to be divided where the original lot line was. There would be no harm in, however, not having that property line overlapping in some nature. We would probably see no reason for that, and I would imagine the church would not, either. Why would they want a piece of C-P that they could do nothing with?

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. Right.

MR. ZENNER: And the sign's location is what the sign's location is. It's out on the corner. Now, this particular tract of land just in general is an extremely challenging tract of land to develop partially because of the environment features that are up along its Grindstone Road or Grindstone Parkway frontage with some stream buffer and some other environmental features that are on the front portion that you see in the hatched-in area, so it makes it a challenging site for development. This was -- it was a remnant parcel that could have a very small building on it, but I -- and obviously, with the church acquiring the property, the small building could still be there. It could be a bookstore of some nature or something, but, likely, it would serve no value. It would serve value only to somebody that wanted to build a small retail business or some other business permitted. And the signage, if it's more important for the church to have way-finding is probably going to overshadow the need to sell the property for other purposes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. Any additional questions of Mr. Zenner? I see none. We'll go ahead and open up the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STRODTMAN: And anyone that would like to come forward to speak on this matter, please do. Just please give us your name and address.

MR. SHY: Chairman and Commission, my name is Ron Shy, and I live at 5600 South Highway KK. To answer your question a little bit about the sign, I think it's the idea of the church purchasing this

lot and putting the signage there is because there is a traffic light there, and that is going to be a very good situation for people to come to the church and exit the church. So this is very straightforward. I do have the director of development here with me, Mr. Bayte, if you have any questions for the church particulars, but as far as a technical part of this, I'd be glad to try to answer any questions you might have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions of Mr. Shy? I see none, so thank you, sir.

MR. SHY: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. Would anyone else like to come forward and speak on this matter? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing on this case.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any discussion?

MS. BURNS: I'll make a motion at this time --

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Burns? Yes. Yes.

MS. BURNS: I'll make a motion at this time for the Case No. 16-170, Lot 7, Red Oak South Plat No. 1. It's a development plan. It's a request by The Crossing-EPC of Columbia, they're the owner, for approval of a C-P development plan to be known as Lot 7, Red Oak South Plat No. 1. It's a .75-acre subject site and it's located on the southeast corner of Grindstone Parkway and Grindstone Plaza Drive.

MS. RUSHING: Subject to filing of the plat?

MS. BURNS: Subject to filing of the plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Mr. Stanton seconds. We have a motion that has been made and seconded. Is there any questions or comments on this motion? I see none. May we have a roll call, Ms. Secretary?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. LOE: We have eight votes for, zero against. Motion carries. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe.