

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MAY 23, 2019

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Ms. Sara Loe
Ms. Tootie Burns
Mr. Rusty Strodman
Ms. Lee Russell
Mr. Dan Harder
Mr. Brian Toohey
Ms. Joy Rushing
Mr. Anthony Stanton

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Mr. Michael MacMann

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I'd like to call the May 23rd Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns, may we have roll call, please?

MS. BURNS: Yes. We have eight; we have a quorum.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, are there any changes to the agenda for this evening?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Can I get a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the agenda.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Stanton.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Strodman. Thumbs up approval of the agenda.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received the minutes from the May 9th regular meeting. Were there any additions or changes to the meeting minutes?

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the minutes for the May 9th, 2019, regular meeting minutes.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Motion by Mr. Stanton, second by Ms. Russell. Can I get a thumbs up approval of the minutes?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous. Thank you.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

Case No. 122-2019

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of HJRJ Investments, LLC for a major amendment to the existing Copperstone Commercial C-P Plan to allow for a mixed-use development to include commercial, office, and residential uses, to be known as the Copperstone Lot 102A PD Plan. The subject project is located on the west side of Frontgate Drive, approximately 300 feet south of Vawter School Road, and is commonly addressed as 4015 Frontgate Drive. (The applicant has requested that this item be tabled to the June 6, 2019, Planning Commission meeting.)

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, may we have a staff report, please.

MR. ZENNER: Yes. There won't be much of one. The map here on the screen is the location of the subject site. It is just south of Frontgate Lane, which is a private drive accessed off of or addressed off of Frontgate Drive, 4015, as said, 2.2 acres. This is a planned district property and it will have a unique mixed-use project on it when we do discuss it in greater depth at our next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. This will be a mixed commercial-residential PD, the first that we will have seen here. I think they will be using single-family attached housing actually as the residential component, not integrated multi-story residential. So due to the unique nature of it and a desire of the applicant to sell the residential units and that became more graphically depicted on the second round of comments. We had some additional internal staff comments that needed a little bit of extra time to be addressed between the applicant and staff. And as a result of that, the applicant would like to request a tabling of the project for a single meeting cycle to the June 6th meeting in order to allow us to fully address the comments and be able to look at potential compromises that may be able to be arrived at as it relates to some of the comments. It is still a little bit of a fluid situation. The two weeks, which is a question that often gets asked of us, will it be enough? We do believe it will be. The comments were relatively narrow in their focus and just required some additional discussion internally as to what staff was concerned about and what the applicant could potentially do in order to address that. The time frame when we came to the point of making those final revision comments just became too tight to our actual packet production schedule and, therefore, the request to table was submitted. So we are supportive of the request. We believe it will yield an opportunity for us to work out those issues with the applicant and do not believe that the two weeks is too short a period of time in order to do so. So June 6th is the applicant's requested tabling date and we support that.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Are there any questions for staff? Would we have comments from the public?

MR. ZENNER: This was a publicly advertised item, so if there are residents here from the public or if the applicant's representative would like to speak from Crockett Engineering in regards to their

request, it would probably be appropriate. Otherwise, there is no material that we will present this evening other than the request to table.

MS. LOE: We will open up the floor for public comment, if anyone would like to make any comments on this case. Seeing none, we'll close public comments. Commission discussion?

Ms. Russell? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I can yield the floor to my colleague.

MS. LOE: You're going to yield to Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: I'd like to make a motion.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 122-2019, I move to table until the June 6th, 2019 Planning meeting.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second my Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion? Seeing none. May we have roll please, Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for tabling will be forwarded to City Council.

VI. SUBDIVISIONS

Case No. 117-2019

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Show-Me Central & Missouri Habitat for Humanity (owner) for a preliminary plat to be known as "Boone Prairie". The 50.28-acre site is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling) and IG (Industrial). The proposed development would contain 143 single-family residential lots and 13 common lots used for water quality on the R-1 zoned portion of the property, and one lot presently improved with a cell tower on the IG zoned portion of the property. The site is generally located to the southeast of the intersection of U.S. Highway 63 and Brown Station Road.

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

Staff report was given by Ms. Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for Boone Prairie.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. Before we move to Commissioner questions of staff, I would like any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to Case 117-2019 to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case.

Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Ms. Chair, I'm just being very cautious. I'm involved with the Land Trust and would may have something to do with this in the future. So just to play it safe, I probably will recuse myself from this to just be safe.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Anybody else? Seeing -- oh. Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I had a discussion with some friends regarding a previous development by Habitat that some of the comments that were made would probably apply to this development also. I believe that I can hear the evidence and make a judgment on what's before us without being prejudiced by those comments.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Anybody else? All right.

MS. RUSHING: I'm checking with our attorney to see if he disagreed with me.

MS. LOE: He has given you full approval to remain. Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: I have a question for staff. Are we at that point?

MS. LOE: I -- yes. Yes. All disclosure of ex parte is completed. It's questions for staff.

Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: Can you go back to your second slide. I think one of them might have said Arbor Pointe. Maybe not. Maybe I missed something.

MS. BACON: Yes. This this -- yes. I apologize. I didn't change the heading.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. Just making sure. Does that matter at all?

MR. ZENNER: The slide show was provided only for the purposes of information.

MR. TOOHEY: All right. Just making sure.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff?

MS. RUSHING: All of the detention-retention areas, are they tied into a storm sewer system or are they free-standing? Do you -- do you see what I'm getting at?

MS. LOE: Crockett may be able to answer that question.

MR. ZENNER: Crockett Engineering is here, and I think that would be a question better asked and answered by -- by Crockett's office itself.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. TOOHEY: I've got one more question. Just looking at the -- at the plat, I was under the assumption with the UDO that this would have required three entrances and not two. Am I wrong in that?

MR. ZENNER: Anything that is over 30 lots requires a secondary point of access. I don't believe -- and that access -- so the two points of access actually are coming to a collector or an arterial roadway, and I believe that is one of the conditions or criteria that's within it. So if this was a standard residential street and it had this number of lots, I believe -- and I haven't slept with the ordinance enough to know the detail, but I believe, if I recall correctly, it refers to collector and arterial streets. So if your accesses come out to one of them, the necessity for a third entry point when you get to this level of lots is waived because it is deemed that the road capacity of the connecting streets, the two points of access will allow for the distribution of the traffic. Within the development, we do have a requirement as it relates to

street segment loading and, as Ms. Bacon pointed out, the street segments themselves was verified and was found compliant with the Code itself. So, again, I can defer to Crockett's office to answer that question in greater detail if you would like, but based on our staff analysis, which goes through a lot of internal analysis, not just by our staff, it was not found to be noncompliant.

MS. BACON: I will say we spent a lot of time on this because of the curvilinear nature of the development is a little bit different than what we normally see, so we spent quite a bit of time doing our analysis with the Public Works Department.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. I just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? I see none. We will open up the floor to public comment. If there's anyone that would like to come forward and address the Commission on this case, we would welcome that information. If you can please give us your name and address for the record.

MR. GREENE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering at 1000 West Nifong Boulevard, Building 1, Columbia, Missouri, 65203. I'm here representing the applicant, and I would see before you a pretty straightforward request, all zoned R-1, so staff report was pretty thorough. To answer your question about the storm water, so the -- the pocket water quality lots basically in the backyards, they're all tied to storm sewer, so they're all going to eventually make their way down to the detention basin on the north side -- basically, City storm water manual on design, so I'll be happy to answer any questions anybody has.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for Mr. Greene? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I'm back on the -- I'm still on those detention basins.

MR. GREENE: Okay.

MS. RUSHING: The plan indicated that the homeowners association would maintain those. What about access? You know, each basin is in the backyard of multiple homes.

MR. GREENE: Yeah. It's basically in their backyard. So in previous versions of the Code, they would have been required to have stem lots to access those, actually fronting on the street right-of-way. But the UDC, if I'm correct, is what changed, basically. It's got an access easement that follows the lot line, a common lot line between two neighboring lots, and they're -- they're actually shown on here, but --

MS. RUSHING: Is that what those darker --

MR. GREENE: Those are the pocket bioretention cells. It's basically a place holder. But the actual access easement, just for an example, I'm looking at Lot 24 and 25 on the top of the page, basically, on the east side of the property. So between that, it's -- there's a dash line that shows an access easement, and that's typical for the other lots.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. GREENE: So it's -- it's not public right-of-way, but it is allowed by an easement for public, I guess, City maintenance, if they had to, to get back there to maintain those should the owner not maintain them themselves.

MS. RUSHING: And is it anticipated these would be planted or unplanted in, say, a rain garden or --

MR. GREENE: Yeah. Bioretention is typically the most common water-quality feature that we design. They give you the most bang for the buck as far as quantity and quality and ease of construction and maintenance, as well as providing good drainage. So one thing to consider with all these in these backyards, bioretentions are favorable to get, basically, storm water out of there as opposed to a rain garden, which is more marshy, if you will, and kind of allows water to pond there for more -- more amounts of time. But bioretentions have a larger overflow, and so they're better at draining, which is better for the backyards.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for Mr. Greene? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Greene. If you have any comments, please come up to the podium. And please give us your name and address for the record.

MS. JEFFERSON: My name is Barbara Jefferson, and my address is 305 North Fifth Street. So on this project, you're going to bring -- am I hearing that you're just going to have a way to get in from the back -- a driveway from the back; is that correct or not? I mean, I'm just trying to get it clarified.

MR. ZENNER: The road frontage for the project is on Brown Station Road. And so there -- the primary road that goes in front of the project, Brown Station, as you are probably aware, there's two entrance points.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Here and here. There -- the rail line is on the backside of the property here, so there is no access from Route B. And then this is Highway 63, if I'm not incorrect, here on the northeast side of the property. And, again, there is no access from there, either. So all of the access is back out onto the existing City public street at the two entry points. The street, as Ms. Bacon pointed out, does require some additional road right-of-way to be dedicated, should the City decide at some point in the future to widen that roadway to a larger number of travel lanes. But what is being proposed here is traditionally the way that subdivision development is proposed to be accessed and is compliant with the Code.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. I was just wondering. I'm just thinking about the traffic -- traffic and all that pretty natural route, truthfully, especially with the emergency situations and things like that.

MR. GREENE: Thank you.

MS. JEFFERSON: And the question about drainage.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MS. JEFFERSON: You know, that -- that -- has -- how would that be done again? Would you like to -- would they be able to have their own drainage area? How would that work?

MR. ZENNER: You all need to come up to the microphone, please.

MR. GREENE: (Inaudible)

MR. ZENNER: To the Commission, please.

MS. JEFFERSON: They really don't want -- I believe he's answered my question. Okay.

MS. LOE: Mr. Greene, if you can give us your name and address again.

MR. GREENE: Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering at 1000 West Nifong Boulevard, Building 1, here in Columbia, 65203. So in a residential subdivision like this, you're required to basically treat for the water quality component of storm sewer. And so, basically, in these backyards, there are these bioretention cells, is what's typically installed, and they basically filter the water, if you will. And then that -- that's -- it's basically a requirement of the City as far as development and storm-water management.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. I'm just -- so, okay. I'm just thinking, you know, because we really have been getting some heavy rain a lot, so these little things are going to take care of these -- this area?

MR. GREENE: Yeah. That's correct. So a typical storm-sewer system, and you're required to have up to the 100-year rainfall event. It's supposed to be designed, and so there will be adequate ways for the water to get out of here and not flood homes, basically, when significant storm systems come through.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.

MS. LOE: Mr. Greene, those retention cells are tied to the City system --

MR. GREENE: Right.

MS. LOE: -- which it goes back to Ms. Rushing's question.

MR. GREENE: Right.

MS. LOE: So those systems are tying into the City storm-water system, so the water isn't just collected there, but the water is directed there from the backyards and then taken away?

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, if there's been a lot of flooding going on and there's concern, and I think about the older part of Columbia, you know, and the way the water will run.

MS. LOE: Can you speak into the microphone?

MS. JEFFERSON: Oh. When I think about the older part of Columbia, and we're already having problems, but you're talking about this is already going to be into a drainage system already that should not be affecting other areas of Columbia. It's going to be adequate enough to take care of things like that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct. And I'll just add a little bit. You know, this is -- this is managed to prevent that. And what -- what happened in the older part of Columbia is we did not have the rules that we have in place today. And so we've learned from the past, and what the City has done with storm water for the last few years is addressing all of the past problems or, you know, making sure that we don't repeat the past and keep continuing to develop homes that flood the basements or have problems when it has large amounts of rain. So I think we've done a really good job the last number of years on addressing to make sure storm water is not a problem like it has been in the older parts of Columbia.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. DOKKIN: Dee Dokkin, 804 Again Street, and I just have a statement. If climate realities are going to force density into my traditional single-family central city neighborhoods by denying downzoning requests, that same reasoning should apply to all neighborhoods, even this very worthy project. I think it's time to consider eliminating R-1. I know you don't have the power to do that tonight and in general, but it's -- it's just an equity issue, plus it makes sense for density to be everywhere in the City.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Dokkin. Are there any questions for Ms. Dokkin? I'm -- have some downzoning requests been denied?

MR. ZENNER: Not that I'm aware of, ma'am.

MS. DOKKIN: No. There was just talk of it.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. DOKKIN: And I expect that -- (inaudible).

MS. LOE: Are there any additional public comments? Seeing none, I'm going to close the public comment period.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: If I may, I want to follow up on Mr. Toohey's question. I have slept long enough to know that the old Code had the provisions I was referring to where we had a threshold of multiple entry points with a waiver if you were -- for a third entry point if you were along a collector or an arterial. The current UDC actually specifies a maximum number of lots off of a single -- a maximum number of lots off of a single entry to be no greater than 30, and I think I -- I understand part of what the concern or question was. There's 143 lots here. Roughly, there should be, if you used the 30 lots, four points of entry. That is not -- it doesn't empirically equate that way. The fire service, as well as our -- our traffic engineering staff evaluates how do the lots -- how many options do the lots have within the development to be able to get out. So with the curvilinear street network and with the intersecting streets that come in, no greater than 30 lots off of a single road segment have less than one point of access to be able to get in or out of the development out of the two primary entry points. If we had something that was created where we would have created a cul-de-sac, for example, that would have had only a single point of entry to those lots, and that was over 30, we would have required the cul-de-sac to be shortened to lessen those total number of lots. In this, the overall circular road pattern actually helps to eliminate from a fire and a traffic circulation perspective the necessity to build more entry points into the development than what are shown on the plan. So, again, I go back to my initial statement. We reviewed it, we do find it to be in compliance with the access standard, and it does not necessarily -- it's not a one-for-one application where for every 30 lots, you expect to see an entry point into the project. Unique to this is that there are no abilities to stub to the northeast or directly to the east due -- or to the south, for that matter, due to the existing development that is around this project site. If there were opportunities to do that, we'd have stub streets being shown, which would then allow for future connectivity and other entry points. Just wanted to provide that clarity.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: Can I ask Mr. Greene another question? Do you mind coming back up?

MS. LOE: I'm going to reopen the public hearing.

MR. TOOHEY: So, now, since the density had to get brought up, I was wondering about that as I was looking at this, and I talked myself out of asking the question because of who the applicant -- oh, my knowledge of how they develop these subdivisions. So did you guys think about doing any increased density in any of this at all or is that not capable based upon how the applicant will develop this area? Is that not feasible to have this type of affordable housing, I guess, was my question.

MR. GREENE: Andy Greene. Once again, I don't know if I've got to say that. Unfortunately, Tim Crockett might be the best to answer that question. I was not too involved with the initial discussions as far as density, number of lots, arrangement of sorts with the -- our client. Unless -- I do have a representative from Habitat for Humanity here if he wants to comment on that, but I'm sorry, I can't --

MR. TOOHEY: I mean, if you want to. I'm just -- just a curiosity, so -- since density is becoming an issue, so --

MR. CALDERA: Madam Chair?

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. CALDERA: Just to make sure that everybody is aware, now that the public hearing has been opened back up and the applicant was given an opportunity to speak, we should open -- allow anyone else who wants to give additional comments also.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Caldera. Are there any additional public comments? Any comments about the density of the project? I see none. I'm going to close public hearing. Return to Commission discussion. Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to make a motion. In the case of 117-2019, Boone Prairie Preliminary Plat, I move to approve the preliminary plat for Boone Prairie.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Strodtman. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, may we have a roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder. Recused: Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 7-0, with Mr. Stanton being recused.

MS. BURNS: Seven to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That closes our subdivision and takes us to public comments.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Are there any public comments to be made at this time? If you can give us your name and address again for the record. Thank you.

MS. JEFFERSON: My name is Barbara Jefferson. I'm 305 North -- I live at 305 North Fifth Street. I was watching that five -- the February -- no, no. It was the work session you had on the 9th. Okay. About medical marijuana. So my -- overall, my question has to do with, do you have a certain time limit to get back to Council; is that -- because it seemed like that meeting was kind of rushed and it was -- it just -- it just seems like a lot of people really wasn't on --

MS. LOE: We -- that was our public hearing for the medical marijuana -- for comments on the medical marijuana, and we did have a -- a time -- I mean, we were providing comment at that meeting back to them. There was no time limit on the public comment.

MS. JEFFERSON: No. I was just wondering if there was a time limit on when you had to get back to -- does it -- didn't it have to go back to the City Council or something like that?

MS. LOE: Yes. It's on their agenda -- it was on their agenda Monday.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. Okay. And so, what came out of that meeting on the 9th, your decision making? Did it -- did you agree to have the stands and all that to be downtown or where are they going to be located at?

MS. LOE: So there was a proposed addendum --

MS. JEFFERSON: Proposed. Okay.

MS. LOE: -- that this language is what we were reviewing, and I think we made about 20-odd motions to go through different line items within that addendum, and there was different votes on each of those motions. So the Commission -- there was a variety of recommendations with that -- for that addendum. And then the addendum was forwarded to City Council with all of those recommendations.

MS. JEFFERSON: So those are recommendations?

MS. LOE: We're a recommending body. We don't make decisions.

MS. JEFFERSON: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: The City Council makes the final decision.

MS. JEFFERSON: And so when does -- when the City body makes -- the City Council make the final decisions and they have the right to -- to alter things? I mean, you recommend things, but they have the right to rearrange it at different levels; am I correct with that?

MS. LOE: Correct. Correct.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. CARROLL: Valerie Carroll, 13 West Boulevard. Yeah. I wanted to comment generally on the density issue. I am in favor of the City's aim to increase density. However, I do see the equity issue that Dee Dokkin mentioned earlier in that there are areas that have been zoned differently to allow for density. And I'm wondering if they're -- and sometime in the future, anticipating the need to increase density for our climate action plan if we could add some kind of zoning classification for in-law apartments and secondary structures. I've seen this used in other cities effectively.

MS. LOE: We do have an accessory dwelling unit category, yes.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. I'm learning.

MS. LOE: So, good idea, and it's one that is allowed in R-2 and above and is conditional in R-1.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. That was a very active public comment period for us. Thank you all. If there's no additional public comment, I'm going to close the public comments, and move to staff comments

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: Your next meeting will be June 6th. We will be having Ms. Carroll join us as a Planning Commissioner, so we will introduce and welcome her at that point again. However, unfortunately, we are having three of our members leaving us -- and I almost said departed. They will be leaving us, two potentially on a tentative basis. We have not finally filled all of our vacancies. We did have three. Mr. Harder and Ms. Russell, as well as Ms. Burns, are Commissioners that service has expired at this point, and will not be rejoining us for the June 6 meeting, so that's the first point. We will have only, at that point, seven of our nine Planning Commissioners, so if you are going to be gone, I would like to know that before we wrap up this evening to ensure that we have a quorum because you do have business on your June 6th agenda, and that will consist of these five cases. You have the My Backyard final plat. This is a final plat behind the existing My House. This is their concert venue location presently where they set up their tents off of Sixth, so this will have a design adjustment associated with it -- three design adjustments, I'm being told, along with the final platting action. You have then three -- three public hearing items. The first public hearing item was anticipated to be on tonight's agenda. Unfortunately, we were waiting for an accompanying final plat that actually goes directly to Council; that is why it's not showing on your agenda, before we could introduce this -- the Harris rezoning request, which is up off of St. Charles Road. Copperstone Commercial, which is what we tabled this evening. Lake Broadway Lot 4A. This is at the corner of Pershing and it's the medical offices that are there on Pershing, right at Pershing and West Broadway. And the Shoppes, the Broadway Shoppes, this is a statement of intent revision in order to amend the statement of intent to incorporate medical marijuana dispensaries as a permitted use within the use list, as well as other uses that will bring the SOI up into contemporary standards with our current UDC. Just so you can familiarize yourself with the parcels, the My House, My Backyard. The My Backyard is where the vehicles are parked. My House is up there on the front on Seventh. Our Harris rezoning request here on the right-hand side, and then the Copperstone Commercial plat there south of Frontgate Lane. Lake Broadway Lot 4 PD amendment. And finally, our Broadway Shoppes, a major planned district amendment to amend the statement of intent. Those are the projects for the upcoming meeting. It is my great pleasure to thank our Commissioners that are leaving for their service and their commitment to this body, as well as the goals and the objectives of the City in trying to improve the environment in which we all work, live, and play. We wish you the best of luck as you either move into your retirement off of the Commission and enjoy family and other opportunities that may lie ahead. Don't be a stranger. But I please ask if you come back, be polite and keep your time.

You only get three minutes to speak, unless you're representing a neighborhood association and then you get six minutes to speak. So our adept Chair will definitely gavel you because you are accustomed to that. But other than that, we do definitely appreciate your service. From the staff's perspective, it has been my pleasure to work with each of you for the period of time, even though I don't always show it. So you all have a good evening. That is all we have to offer tonight, unless I have other staff that want to make comments.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, it's been an interesting five years. This is an incredible body to work with, and I've appreciated learning and getting to know everybody. We have spent late nights here working on the UDO, and I am going to be very sad if -- if I'm not reappointed for another term. So to this body, thank you very much. To the staff, thank you very much for educating and listening to complaints and hanging in there with us. You have been professional, and I truly appreciate you. Thank you. And I'll be sad if I don't see you later. So thank you. And I'll bring my coffee cup back.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I'd like to echo what Ms. Russell said. I -- five years has been a long time. I've made new friends. I've gotten in fights with a few of you over different issues, but we've always resolved it. I'm very proud of this group and the way that it works together. I think that we are respectful of each other and we come to conclusions with the best interests of the City at heart, and I'm proud of that. And I can say that with the cases that we hear and the UDC that we developed, and I want to commend my fellow Commissioners on all of their efforts over the past five years or however long they've been on the Commission. I really enjoyed working with you. Staff, you never cease to be completely prepared, answering good questions and maybe not the best questions with the same affection, so I appreciate that. Mr. Zenner, if I'm not reappointed, I'll be disappointed and I'll be -- I'll probably come and sit in the audience because that's what I've done for the past five years, so --

MR. ZENNER: We need to get you an extra hobby.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. HARDER: I just want to thank the staff for everything. It's been a great experience. I appreciate all the information. They always make everything extremely clear and I've really enjoyed working with everybody on the Commission. It's been an enjoyable experience.

MS. LOE: We've enjoyed working with all of you. Thank you for your camaraderie and your service and we will miss you, Mr. Harder, and we hope to see you back Ms. Russell and Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

X. ADJOURNMENT

MS. LOE: So with that, we will move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We are adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.)

(Off the record)