

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
DECEMBER 10, 2020

Case Number 201-2020

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of Hemme Construction (owner), seeking rezoning from R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to PD (Planned Development) and approval of the development plan to be known as "The Cottages of Northridge". The intent of the PD is to enable cottage-style dimensional standards for 16 single-family structures without allowing duplexes. The 2.45-acre property is located north of the intersection of Northridge Drive and Wayside Drive. (This item was tabled at the November 5, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.)

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning from R-1 to PD and the associated PD plan.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Before we move to Commissioner questions, I would like to ask Commissioners if they've had any ex parte related to this case to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information on behalf of the case in front of us. I see none. Are there any questions for staff? Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Just as an inquiry, given that this is a PD plan, could we, as a Commission, if we saw fit, if there was agreement to ask for alterations to the plan such as landscaping or additional vegetative barrier?

MR. KELLEY: You could.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. The closest bus stop to this?

MR. KELLEY: I don't recall. I don't think there is one within walking distance.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. MACMANN: Whoever just said that, when you get a chance to come up, you can let us know.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? If not, we will open up the floor for public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you have public comment, please come up and give your name and address for the record. We will be limiting comments to three minutes tonight.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. And I will go through my information relatively quickly if I get three

minutes. Overview, I think that Mr. Kelley did a very good job in his staff report and then going over this site. We -- we have proposed to go PD route with cottage-style zoning for this piece of property. The idea there was we never wanted duplexes. The intent was always, always to build homeowner -- owner-occupied units. We want units for sale. We do not want to have any rental units in this community, so that was the intent. That was the reason why we asked for the PD, even though it's a little -- you know, uncommon to see it that way, we didn't feel that it protected the neighbors or the -- or the area if we asked for the R-2, and then got the cottage on top of it. Again, there's the location map. I will state when I talked to -- before you tonight about this piece of property, I know it very well. There's two pieces of property that are highlighted. I lived in those two homes for the first 30 years of my life, so I'm very familiar with this area. I've backed up to this area. I've lived in it for quite some time. I no longer live there now, but I am familiar with it. Again, here is the PD plan and it is a little bit different, a little unorthodox compared to what we typically see, and that is due to a conflict in the fire code with regards to the street standards. And so this was a compromise, this was the reason why the plan was tabled at the last meeting was to work out those issues, and this is what -- what meets the fire code, as well as Public Works. Here is the surrounding zonings for the property. I think Mr. Kelley kind of touched on this a little bit. You can see the yellow zonings, which is R-2. You can see that the orange districts are multi-family. So putting in a diverse different type of housing option in this location really isn't anything different than what the area has already seen. They're seeing many types of housing, different types of housing stock in this area, and we're providing something just slightly different. Our site, again, on this piece is in blue. Here it is again, a little bit, it's hard to tell. Again, we're asking for a density of about 6.5. The duplexes to the northwest is a density of about 4.5. And, of course, the duplex and multi-family range from ten or eight-and-a-half to ten units per acre to the west. So we're right in line with -- with the other types of multi-family in the area. And, of course, we're not asking for multi-family, but wanted that -- to look at that and see that we're not out of character. Storm water is going to be an issue. It had been -- been discussed tonight. I will say that our development sits downstream of a 45-acre watershed. And when I say 45 acres, many times you have a development that has hundreds of acres. This only has 45. It's -- it can be managed. All development on this site would be in full conformance, in accordance with the City regulations for storm-water management. So we're going to do detention, we're going to do water quality, and we're going to handle it appropriately. No flooding, ponding, or other drainage problems will be passed to neighboring properties. I think that was a concern that some of the neighbors had talked about, and so we want to assure them that we're not going to exasperate any existing issue that's out there and certainly not going to create a problem on their property. And, again, the tract does not lie within the 100-year flood plain. That's been commented several times, but it certainly does not, and we've gone back till 1981 looking at the maps. Traffic, we are discharging onto Northridge Drive, which is an improved City street. Many times, new developments do not discharge onto improved roads. This does. Northridge is an improved City street, curb and gutter, 32-foot wide. It would be classified as a neighborhood collector with ADTs ranging from 1,500 to 3,500. I don't think Northridge Drive has

anywhere near that kind of average daily traffic. Living on that street for many years, we didn't encounter anything along those lines. Of course, staff is -- has stated that the increase in traffic over the existing R-1 is seen as negligible. So what's the purpose? It's to provide a small pocket of affordable small lot infill cottage-style development, and then it's also to develop in conjunction with the surrounding areas, and then, of course, use the UDC as its intended purpose. So why here? This site is within walking distance, 1,000 feet of Blue Ridge Elementary School, about two blocks away -- less than two blocks away is the elementary school. The site is within walking distance, less than a half a mile, to Oakland Middle School. And, of course, the site is within a third of a mile of MU Health Care's Smiley Lane location. So middle school, elementary school, and health-care facilities are all within walking distance, as is the City's proposed 30-mile trail loop. Now that's under design in various phases, but eventually it will get here, and we're going to be within a third of a mile of a major trail network. And then, of course, Albert Oakland Park is only about a half-mile away. This is -- you can see our blue site in the middle. The yellow sites of school sites. The pink site just added, that's the MU Health Care, and then the park and the trail network. So we're essentially located right in the middle of all those facilities. I think that is a great opportunity for affordable units. Not many times do we see that type of opportunity. Many times, that's used for other type of developments -- apartments, town homes, and the like. In this situation, we're looking for something a little bit different. Again, I think Mr. Kelley touched on this, but Columbia Imagined supports our request tonight. And I believe that some of the comments that Ms. Bacon talked about in the Status Report supports this tonight, as well. There was some public engagement. Due to Covid, no public information meeting was held, so those -- that started off with no public engagement, but flyers were sent to over 100 neighboring property owners. There was some correspondence that got back through the developer, to the developer via phone calls and e-mails, and he responded to those. There was also at the last P & Z meeting, when it was tabled, I believe some folks said, well, we never got it. Well, I don't know where they live and if they were nearby, we don't know why, but we did send over 100. So there was an in-person meeting that was held this past weekend to discuss it with any of the residents, as well. So, in conclusion, we believe that the development is appropriate for the area and that it fits well within this area. We believe that it truly fulfills the -- the intent and the obligation of an infill development. All the utilities are there. They're in place. We don't have to go do offsite infrastructure improvements to -- to serve this site. Everything is currently there to serve this site. We're going to be in full conformance with the storm-water standards for the City of Columbia. We are an affordable and walkable community, and that what we want to provide here. And, of course, the request comes to you with the recommendation from City staff. And I hope I came pretty close to three minutes. I don't know, but I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quickly. Mr. Crockett, you did storm-water mitigation planning for Cullimore Cottages?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. For which one? Yes. Cullimore Cottages.

MR. MACMANN: For Cullimore Cottages, which is a slightly smaller, slightly denser more property, but many similarities. My question to you, and a couple of us may have familiarity, that site had its own unique storm-water issues.

MR. CROCKETT: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: Will this site be more or less of a problem than Cullimore Cottages?

MR. CROCKETT: This site will be less of a problem. And the reason why the Cullimore was so unique --

MR. MACMANN: Because of the soil. Right?

MR. CROCKETT: It was the soil and the fact that we had -- we had very little depth for discharge. At this location, we have a waterway that lies to the north of the site that allows us some depth. And so what we're looking for here is where Cullimore was -- was a relatively more dense type of development, we had to sneak in, try to get -- kind of work those. By retention cells in here, we have a little more room for that here, so this will be less complicated than Cullimore.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. For those who are questioning, I go up there all the time. The property that we're referring to is near the Business Loop. The water stays on that property, just FYI.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. And in all due fairness, the water kind of stays on this property, as well, and that's just due to the flatness of the ground. And, of course, through development of this property, we can allow that water to get away. And so, yeah. There's -- there's some flat areas and there's some areas of pond currently on this piece of property, no doubt, but that will all be rectified through development.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Thanks. I was wondering, would you be able to suggest a range that you intend to sell these homes at?

MR. CROCKETT: We are -- yes, ma'am. We're looking -- we want to get them to about \$150,000 if we can. It's not that \$120,000, \$130,000 that the City really sees as "affordable", but, in the private sector, without -- unlike some of the other projects that are done, being unsubsidized, it's extremely difficult to get it down lower than that. So we want to get to the \$150,000. It's probably going to be \$150,000 to \$175,000, but we're trying to get it as low as possible. We're really targeting that first-time home buyer and, you know, that's what we're really trying to do. We understand there is a need for that. Part of that's part of the reason why we want to go the cottage style is that it allows us to drop our development costs a little bit. It's not about profitability, it's about how can we hit that price point that's being neglected or not being able to be achieved really, how can we hit that. And the reason -- one of the things we have to do is we have to cut our costs incrementally. And by gaining a few extra units allows us to get that and allows us to hit that price point.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thanks for sharing.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? I don't see any at this time. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments on this case?

MS. ANDERSON: Hi. My name is Robin Anderson, and I live at 2601 Northridge Drive, which is the property directly east adjacent to the subject site. And I want to state first off that the only reason a public meeting was held was because the residents requested it and we had it in -- in my front yard. And we were told a couple of things that conflict with what the information that was just presented, and that was that the starting price of the homes would start at \$175,000, and a couple of other things. But my main beef is with the density. So I think that this is more in line with something that you would see downtown and, obviously, multi-family dwelling sites, based on the figures in Columbia Imagined. I know those have changed since 2013. But for infill development of single-family homes, this developer has said up front that the reason he wants to put more homes on the property is because he can't develop it as is and make money. In terms of neighborhood input, a park or a pool, he has said, would bankrupt him, and that's a direct quote. So he wants to pull full-size home lots on less -- or full-size homes on lots that are less than half the size of a regular R-1 dwelling with a ten-foot rear yard setback. So that means that all of the residents of Cannon and Pine and us are going to be faced with seven or eight walls of homes ten feet from our property with no buffer other than the proposed utility sign -- utility easement on the west side. So Chapter 29 of UDC also states that the maximum size of contiguous area that may be replatted to permit cottage lots without such lots being within a cottage subdivision is one acre. I'm not a developer and I don't know what that means, but it seems like that's in direct conflict with the goals of Columbia Imagined. So I don't understand why this can't be developed as is at a reasonable density other than to benefit the developer. And the goals of Columbia Imagined also stated that infill development should focus on schools and affordable housing and be developed in conjunction with existing neighborhoods, and he has cited revenue as the main reason for wanting to put more homes on this property. He's also said that he wants to put an HOA for a street right in the middle of an existing property, and that's going to exclude current residents from micro amenities, which is one picnic table, one bench, and a dog waste station. And those go against the goals of Columbia Imagined, which also says that "the City should provide incentives that support redevelopment projects which are consistent with neighborhood plans and/or establish compatibility criteria" and we haven't seen those until just now. So the options to be -- should be considered to introduce density and alternative housing options in established neighborhoods and strategies to achieve this goal may -- this is still quoting Columbia Imagined. "Strategies to achieve this goal may include accessory dwelling lots, which can accommodate minor density increase," and we haven't been told what is considered a minor density increase. All we see is what's in Columbia Imagined, which, seven years ago, for R-1 dwellings was two -- was two. So we look at a number seven and how can we consider that a minor increase? So I don't really see how this proposed use of his land is also going to attract, if we're thinking about schools, how it's going to

attract families with children. There's no yards. The starting prices of those homes are not affordable by the poverty level definition. And while you guys -- while it might not be impactful or more into a traffic study, we have to live there. And 17 to 34 more cars on the street, assuming that there's going to be 17 homes on there -- or 16 -- 16 or 17 homes is going to feel impacted and we're going to feel those circumstances based off of numbers on the street. I mean, there's only 16 houses along Northridge, so you're doubling the traffic. There's also no things right now that accommodate the three schools within walking distance. There are no speed bumps, there are no crosswalks, there is no stop signs. There is nothing at -- there's no speed detectors. There's only one speed limit sign in one direction, and creating that is actually going to be creating what is essentially a four-way intersection where the only sign is a yield sign on Wayside. So I know the developer isn't responsible for these things, but I want to know what the City is going to do to assume that -- to assure that our traffic problems won't get worse because we do have children and we have toddlers who want to play in our front yards. And according to the developer, there's going to be kids there, too. So there's also a lot in Columbia Imagined on pages, like, 124 and 125, that say that neighbors need to be involved in the planning process -- this is a quote -- "well before proposals are submitted". And that on affordable housing, "the neighborhood will get to build consensus about its collective values and what direction it would like to develop in the future." And I don't see how we've been involved in that process other than to push the developer for a meeting that I had to have in my front yard.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Anderson. Are there any questions? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: The goals of affordable housing -- if the goal was affordable housing and this was your land and your dime, what would you change with this?

MS. ANDERSON: I'm not a developer.

MR. STANTON: I'm asking -- let's say you are. Let's dream. What -- what's your solution to this problem?

MS. ANDERSON: A park. Smaller homes on bigger lots, lower real estate prices. I mean, in terms of square footage of the surrounding homes, it seems like the homes on Cannon Court and Northridge and Wayside are all between, like, 1,600 and 1,800 square feet, and these homes are a little bit smaller, so build smaller homes on larger lots. Put some of those things in that are going to attract families with schools -- with school-aged students. I'm not a developer, so I don't know. I don't know. I mean, I've been told that lumber costs have tripled. I understand that, so wait. Wait it out. You know, there's no reason that it needs to be developed at this density.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none at this time. Thank you. Oh, Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: What's your opinion of this change if there were families in those homes?

MS. ANDERSON: My opinion is that I'm not against development. In fact, we knew that the property would be developed when we purchased our home in July and moved in. We did not know that

it was going to be rezoned, and we did not sign up to have 17 homes next door. Does that answer your question? Say it again.

MS. CARROLL: If there were families in those homes, would your opinion change?

MS. ANDERSON: No. I'm a family. I have a two-and-a-half year old.

MS. CARROLL: I understand. You suspect that there would not be children in those homes. If there were, would you feel differently?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. BROOKS: Michael Brooks on 3908 Cannon Court. Ms. Anderson pretty well said it all, but the City wants density, but the City don't want this kind of density in the residential area. You want to build three-bedroom starter homes at \$175,000, but you've got to put them on a lot. Are you just going to lock the kids in the closet, because they'll have a four and a half -- 400-square-foot backyard. That's it. They've got to play in the street? You have to balance it all, and you can't stuff but so many homes in this area. It's zoned R-1. If he wants to build homes, I'll help him move the dirt for nine or ten homes, but you can't stuff 17 homes on two and a half acres and sidewalks and streets. There's just not room for it. You have to balance it. You have to -- and I agree he -- it's tough to build a house nowadays. It's -- you know, everything is expensive. I don't know what you're going to do there, but you can't just stuff them in there. It is not what the City looked for in density. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Any additional speakers on this case? If there's none, we're going to -- is there someone else? Please come up.

MS. HENDREN: My name is Elissa Hendren; I'm at 3900 Cannon Court. I'd like to echo what Mike and Robin said. I'm really concerned with the smaller property sizes and the families.

MS. LOE: Can you speak into the microphone. Sorry. Just the recorder can't quite hear you.

MS. HENDREN: Oh. I'm so sorry.

MS. LOE: That's all right.

MS. HENDREN: I am really concerned with the density. I know that it was -- it was approved by your staff. But with the infill and your all's talk of wanting to fit in cohesively with the surrounding properties, I do not think that 16 homes would -- would fit in that. I'm west and adjacent on that corner there and having two homes squeeze into what is our backyard would -- would be nice if you come from an apartment and want this. But it's -- there's a dog waste station, and there's not a yard for a dog. I'm just kind of confused on part of this. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. MacMann, and then Mr. Stanton.

MR. MACMANN: I'm going to speak to hopefully assuage some concerns from my personal experience, and I don't think I'm going to be very successful. I'm just going to give you hope for the future. I live in a neighborhood that's 1.95 acres big and has 15 homes on it. The average lot size is about 4,050 square feet. Two- and three-bedroom homes, we only have two families -- two families on the street. It certainly is enough room, and to -- Mr. Stanton can speak more -- to this more -- to this next point I'm going to make. But the affordable homes that we're building right now are -- are being built for \$170,000 to \$185,000. The subsidy cost brings them down much more inexpensively. Ms. Carroll had an interesting point. One thing that my neighborhood has, because it's so small, and the neighbors are close. And I -- we all love it, as a matter of fact. We do have -- essentially, everyone has their own eight-foot fence around everything. It's so close, the front yards are very sharing oriented, but it's a little too close for backyard sharing, if you know what I mean. But most of us do have eight-foot privacy screens around our homes. It's very functional, it's very walkable, it's very livable. It is denser than what we're used to in subdivisions, but I think it's very doable. You know, the proof -- the proof will be in the pudding, you know, how it plays out, but I know it can be done. And my neighborhood was strictly accidental, you know. I live downtown, so that's all I have to say for the moment. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. MacMann. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Kind of biased on this subject. I'm very involved with the Community Land Trust and we function in density and cottage-style buildings, and currently developing Cullimore Cottages at this time. I do -- so I'm looking through this objectively. I do understand density in a place that's not used to that much density. And the reason why I asked the question what would you do if this was your land, I try to look at this through the other person's perspective. We all want parks, we all want half-acre backyards, we all want all that. The late Mr. Cullimore often said that affordability is in direct relationship to size. And if I'm right, Mr. MacMann -- and to address this affordability issue, we have to address the size and density. I'm not going to call Mr. Crockett -- I wouldn't say -- his marketing might be off, but I'm sure his intent is for starter homes. I don't know if that's the market that might buy these; you know what I'm saying? This -- when I looked at it, this might be empty nesters, this might be older -- older couples. This may be -- you know, the market will determine who buys these homes, and the market will determine, hey, I've got two kids that are rambunctious and I need space. This might not be where I need to be at. But I might be a retired professional and I'm, like, oh, yeah, I don't want to cut too much grass. I want to hang out and, you know, I want a nice home with a lot -- with a lot less grass I have to maintain. You know, I think the market will determine who buys these. I do understand the density. I mean, like I said, I'm kind of biased. I think this is a good project. I do understand the neighbors. It sounds like it probably could have been a little better communication between the surrounding neighbors and the developer. I like it and hopefully the developer does right by the neighbors and takes this feedback in. I haven't heard from the developer. I don't know if he's out there. But the neighborhood concerns definitely need to be heard and hopefully, you know, they can be addressed if this goes through.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. We have Ms. Burns, then Ms. Rushing, then Ms. Carroll.

MS. BURNS: I have -- I believe there needs to be more conversation on this project. What I'm hearing from the neighbors is that conversation has been recent and maybe not complete. I have problems with the setback issues. I question if it truly is affordable housing, and I'd like to see this truly owner occupied, but with the rezoning, we are impacting existing property owners, and I think that has to be a big consideration. I don't plan on supporting this.

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I understand the concerns of the neighbors with regard to density, and this is a small piece of property, and I was concerned about that myself. But when I went to view it, it's hard to explain, but the location of the property is somewhat down, and it lends itself to being a development onto -- into itself. So it would be a neighborhood like Commissioner MacMann was talking about. And I think it would, in reality, have a low impact on existing properties. And as described by Mr. Crockett, it is near a whole lot of amenities that are close by that would be meaningful to families. And I am particularly happy that this is a development that is projected for individual homeowners to buy their own home and not an affordable duplex development for investors, which we see a lot of. So I plan to vote in favor of this development.

MS. LOE: Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I don't often find myself disagreeing with a large group of community members that speak out. I see where you're at. I have been in your shoes, actually, and I do understand. On the other hand, I like this project. It meets goals of Columbia Imagined. I like that it serves the school district well. I like that it is for ownership. I believe that this falls in the range of workforce housing. This type of application is rare. Columbia Imagined, which is a plan that the entire City engaged with seven years ago, specifically calls out the desire to use cottage specific standards and they don't come up that often, especially not in this context. It's meaningful to the City as a whole, and I think you may find that it's meaningful to your neighborhood, as well. I think the communication on this project sounds absolutely tragic, and I hope that can change. I do plan on supporting this.

MS. LOE: Any additional -- Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I don't want to make this long, I know we've got a long night. The thing with this I'm kind of -- kind of reaching out to Crockett here. This project is very important that it's successful if it goes through, because if it doesn't, it affects this happening in other places. Like I said, I'm very -- I'm going to say I'm the president of the land trust -- the Columbia Land Trust, so I build these exactly. I build this kind of situation all the time, and we deal with old versus new, density versus no density. We deal with -- and most -- and most of my projects have been inner city. But the thing with affordable housing, number one, the spirit of it. If you're not blowing sunshine up my behind as a developer and you truly intend to do this for real, that's number one. Number two, we have to disperse affordable housing, not just in the hood, not just in my neighborhood, not just in Mr. MacMann's neighborhood. It needs to be dispersed; that's called mobility. I don't want all the affordable housing in one place. It pigeon-holes everybody in one place. When we spread out affordable housing across the City, we have diverse

neighborhoods that people are exposed to, that's the intent. This project does all of that as long as the developer is not blowing sunshine up our behind and he does what Mr. Crockett says he's going to do. So I hope that is. It's very important that this project is successful and that the developer is truly in the spirit of what he's talking about. This will be watched. This will have a direct impact on what I do, so I hope the developer and the owner of this property is true and has a true spirit of affordable cottage development in mind.

MS. LOE: Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: So I'm going to go ahead and support this. The price point is impossible to predict at this point because of construction costs, so to throw out a number right now is -- is impossible to hit. So as someone already mentioned, lumber has gone up a huge percent, copper is going up a huge percent, so who knows what these are going to come out. If you add additional buffering, that's just going to increase the cost for the final homeowner also. And really, you really can't compare these with Cullimore Cottages because these are being funded by a private developer, where the Cullimore Cottages were -- those are being subsidized as \$100,000 a unit.

MR. STANTON: The building -- the building costs are still the same. It's still going to cost me the same amount it costs you.

MR. TOOHEY: Right.

MR. STANTON: It's just how we sell it maybe different, but it's -- lumber costs me the same as much as it costs you.

MR. TOOHEY: My point is, those are being subsidized; these aren't being subsidized.

MR. MACMANN: Right.

MR. STANTON: They could be.

MR. MACMANN: Fifty to eighty, Mr. Toohey, to answer your question.

MR. TOOHEY: Eighty thousand?

MR. MACMANN: Fifty to eighty, depending.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Commissioner Loe, unless you have some comments to make?

MS. LOE: I -- I fully support the intent of this project, but I'm extremely disappointed with the communication. So I'm -- I think I agree with Ms. Burns on this in that I -- I understand nimbyism, but I do believe in neighborhoods, and I believe that upzoning needs to be supported by the neighborhood. And at this point, I don't feel like we've had one single support for this from the neighborhood, and because of that, I can't support the project.

MR. STANTON: I'd like to entertain a motion. As it relates to Cottages of Northridge rezoning and PD plan, Case 201-2020, I move to approve the requested rezoning from R-1 to PD, and the PD plan The Cottages of Northridge.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Rushing. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that

motion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just really quick. Folks, I know you're not happy. What Mr. Stanton said, it's really important this is done right. Mr. Crockett, you need to keep us in the loop, if this falls through or goes bad. Now it's -- you know, the Council has the final say. It's truly important to everyone that it matters -- that it works; all right? That's all I have to say.

MS. LOE: Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: You need to keep the neighbors in the loop, particularly as it goes to Council next.

MS. LOE: Any other discussion on the motion? May we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Toohey, Ms. Carroll, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing. Voting No: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-2.

MS. CARROLL: The vote is six to approve. The motion carries.

MS. LOE: Six to approve, two to deny. Motion carries. Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. ZENNER: And just so the public is made aware, the vote pursuant to the consent agenda provisions for the City Council, this is at 75 percent, which means it will show up under old business on the Council agenda, which does automatically open this item for public discussion when it reaches Council for consideration, and that would be at its second reading, which, if I am correct, is scheduled for --

MR. KELLY: The 19th, second read.

MR. ZENNER: January 19th would be the second reading of this time, so there will be no further correspondence from our office, so if you do keep note of that, it is January 19th, 7:00 p.m. here in this room again. And the Council agenda will be posted the Friday prior to that meeting.