

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
APRIL 19, 2018

Case No. 18-91

A request by GRAM Engineering (agent) on behalf of AHJ, LLC (owner), seeking approval to rezone their 18.8-acre property located at the current terminus of Jenne Lane at Jenne Hill Drive, from PD (Planned District) to M-OF (Mixed-Use Office District). The owner intends to divide the property and develop Lot 1 with a residential care facility. A preliminary plat of the property (Case No. 18-90) is being considered concurrently with this rezoning.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, sir. Just one quick follow-up. You had mentioned the public notification. Did you get any public feedback and, if so, what was it?

MR. PALMER: I received none.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: We've discussed what the use will be on the smaller parcel, but are we also looking at rezoning the larger parcel to --

MR. PALMER: The entire parcel is to be rezoned, but, at this point, the Lot 1 is the only one we have a proposed use for.

MS. RUSHING: And the access is directly where it meets --

MR. PALMER: Where it meets Jenne Hill?

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh.

MS. RUSHING: That's going to be the access?

MR. PALMER: An access -- we'll get to this later, but access to Lot 2 is via the stem along the north edge there.

MS. RUSHING: Right. They're just issues because there's not -- it doesn't look like there would be a second exit available off of that that --

MR. PALMER: That is true. It is completely surrounded by unaccessible property except to the north, which is already developed out and there is no way to connect to that. So, the site is limited to that one location of ingress and egress, unfortunately.

MR. ZENNER: And that -- that limitation, Ms. Rushing, will also have an impact as to the development intensity of the property. What you see here on the southern -- or on, I should say, this boundary here is the old COLT Railroad right-of-way which has been relocated to this location on the new overpass. So, the cul-de-sac that is here that would access Lot 1 and then the stem, the stem is going to restrict the balance of the property from its -- if it were to be developed residentially to a maximum of 30 units, the stem has been designed and Rusty will get into this in Case 18-90, which is the platting action, as to how that stem conforms with our other requirements for the purposes of having access and why staff's recommendation to the applicant as we went through the review process, it was made to recommend the creation of the stem lot, not an extension of the public street. Extension of the public street wouldn't have provided any additional access anyways, so even if we did a loop, we have no way of getting out to Paris Road from the back side of this property to provide through access.

MS. RUSHING: And the property to the north --

MR. ZENNER: Yes.

MS. RUSHING: -- it has a stub, but are there any plans to build a second access?

MR. ZENNER: This street right here, Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: No. The stub is kind of right in the --

MR. ZENNER: Oh. You're talking right in here?

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: Dunhill Court, where it's coming up into this parcel here?

MS. RUSHING: Right.

MR. ZENNER: At this point, we are unaware that there is any development that has been

proposed for that acreage tract. Again, it's a linear -- that's a linear parcel, and I would imagine double stack single road in and probably lots on either side of it, but I can't tell from this aerial what the --

MS. RUSHING: It's a mess.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah, it is. And based upon what our standard requirements for the development would have required as a stub to undeveloped property to the north where the R-2 label is, that is why that connection is there. But not sure if that would ever yield an actual connection or if there's an intention of taking the existing improvement that's on that northern lot north of the residential subdivision and redeveloping. We just don't have anything at this point.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions of staff? Mr. Zenner, you -- just for clarification, you said that 30 units would be allowable to be built on that second parcel?

MR. ZENNER: As Mr. Palmer pointed out, the -- the M-OF does allow a residential component.

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: So, it could be single, two-family.

MR. STRODTMAN: Multi.

MR. ZENNER: It could be multifamily up to a maximum of 30 units off of the single point access.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: As an office development, circulation and square footage would drive how much intensity of an office use would be allowed on the property per the fire code. So, while -- as Rusty indicated also, the planned district, which currently restricts it really to an office project and the M-OF are very comparable. One has a plan, obviously, and one does not. And that's where probably the major difference in the zoning side of this exists. But the land uses really would be highly compatible with each other in either direction -- office use, residential care facility, or even the residential use on the balance of the remaining acreage that's not being developed.

MR. STRODTMAN: Got you.

MR. PALMER: And as is typically the case, just real quick, the fire department representative has already pointed out that turnaround or a loop road would have to be developed, or a loop drive access for that second lot whenever it is built out.

MR. STRODTMAN: All right. Last question, and you may not know. Who owns -- the COLT

property, I assume, is owned by the City or by the COLT --

MR. PALMER: MoDOT. Part of it is owned by MoDOT and part of it -- I believe the -- the -- maybe it is all owned by the City now. I can't --

MR. ZENNER: I believe it is, and the rail line -- COLT, which is a division of the City, owned the rail line, if I am understanding correctly. And then the portion that is here --

MR. STRODTMAN: The A?

MR. ZENNER: -- it's got the A on it, I believe was MoDOT property which has been recently, I think, conveyed to the City. That was something, as we were going through the review process, on this particular project that was brought to our attention by our Public Works review staff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Maybe it's our chance for the City to sell it to this landowner and combine them and get some value out of it.

MR. ZENNER: That is possible. It, however, still probably would not address Ms. Rushing's concern and observation that access to another public street is really still quite challenged here, which is going to limit the ability for this isolated pocket of property to be effectively developed with a high-intensity use.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. And that's kind of what I said, that this -- that agricultural -- that A property should be combined because they're going to have even less of an access. And if it's City owned, it's you and I paying for it, so -- anyway. Any additional comments, Commissioners, or questions of staff? We'll go ahead and open it up.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: This is a public hearing, so if anybody would like to come forward, we would welcome that at this time. We just ask for your name and address. And no one is required. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional information, discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'd like to entertain a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: And we will entertain it.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 18-91, I move to approve the rezoning from PD to M-OF.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: We're going for a roll this evening. We have a -- Commissioners, we have a motion that has been made by Mr. Stanton and has received its proper second by Ms. Russell. Do we have any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS:

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