

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**May 9, 2024**

**Case Number 140-2024**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of LJ Land Company, LLC (owner), for approval to rezone 2.56 acres of property From R-1 (One Family Dwelling) to R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling). The subject site is located at 5301 St. Charles Road.**

MS. LOE: 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 requested rezoning to the R-MF district.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Planner Palmer. Before we move on to questions for staff, I'd like to ask any Commissioner who has had ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Commissioner Dunn?

MR. DUNN: What is the time line for the connector on Graceland to Stadium. Do we have --

MR. ZENNER: The time line associated with that is still unknown. There has been discussion of the large R-1 property that you see below the southern CGP. It's a development proposal that has been discussed internally that may precipitate the consideration of extending Stadium Boulevard further north because it goes through the center of that property. The roadway has a 400-foot cleared travel path. The EIS was done, significant resources were spent to -- to complete that EIS, and the vitality or the viability of the extension of Stadium north of WW, its intersection with WW has been brought into questions multiple times. So the reality of the development that's on the larger R-1 that's on the southern portion of this particular property may precipitate something at the elected level that may move to have that connection removed. There has to be some additional evaluation of that given what substitutes for it, how do we assure that we have appropriate movements from the southern end of the City, at Gans and Discovery Park, how all that plays together will determine how quickly this moves. There is no identified funding. The Improve I-70 project does nothing to make improvements to this interchange. All of those improvements are being focused at the U.S. 63-70 location, which is somewhat also troubling that as this particular area develops out, as we've seen along the Richland Road corridor, the connection and the availability to be able to connect with the extension of Stadium Boulevard so we can head further south may become more prominent and more important. but given that the project was quoted at about \$35 million when it was designed or contemplated ten plus years ago, and nothing has happened, your guess is as good as mine. And so --

MR. DUNN: Is that a State project then, or --.

MR. ZENNER: No. It was -- the state -- the State has -- the State -- there have been comments made by the State that they do not necessarily see the viability or -- the viability or the benefit north of WW, and it would likely -- if it did extend further north, it would maybe become a capital project between the City and the County. We have made investments further to the east of this -- or further to the west of this particular site for the extension of Ballenger across the interstate, so there are a lot of other factors that are in play here. The study that we are currently preparing an RFP for that we'll be partnered with the County on for the Richland Road corridor, our elected officials have asked that that be coordinated, may have recommendations for how we address this particular area. There are other improvements also planned at where Richland and St. Charles Road intersect that may improve traffic movement and flow. So without all of those pieces being understood, we're not quite sure. We, at least from a staff perspective, have to still refer to this as a planned corridor. And if anything is going to end up happening, the -- the greater impact is potentially further over the PD property closer to the intersection of Grace and St. Charles where Bull Run is, so there may be, if this ever does come to fruition, purchases of land and relocation of particular businesses in order to make that connection happen, and some of that I believe is also an impediment.

MR. DUNN: Would there be a widening that corresponds with the connection.

MR. ZENNER: There would likely be. St. Charles -- so Bull Run -- Bull Run is designed to actually go between the gas station and the commercial development that's to the southwest of it. It was intended to come back up to the outer road. So where the hook is in the outer road, that's would be eliminated and Bull Run would come up more on the backside of the gas station, a little bit further to the west of that to create a better intersection. And then Stadium extended would come back into that, so that extension of St. Charles, you would basically be making the movement to get onto the extension of Stadium, come down that way, and the realignment or interconnection of St. Charles into that alignment would potentially be done, but there is no formal design.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I might be orienting myself on the various maps wrong. The neighboring development housing on Talon Road, that -- is that duplex housing IG zoning?

MR. PALMER: It's planned district. I believe it's four-plexes. I -- I went out there and I forgot to look, but I think it's four-plexes, because there's -- there's multiple entries on those, if I remember correctly.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. So could you just show me where that is on the zoning graphic that was attached to the agenda?]

MR. PALMER: That -- I did not include it.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. PALMER: Or is that on here? No.

MR. MACMANN: They're both gray.

MS. CARROLL: They're both -- okay. I am going crazy.

MR. PALMER: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Yeah. PD -- PD and IG are both gray and -- that's an internal issue that even I have trouble with, not that I don't have trouble with lots of things, but --

MR. ZENNER: So the Talon development, to answer the question. The Talon development, the development that is on Talon, that is planned district. There was IG, if I recall correctly, because there's an ML here that's in the County, which is their industrial component. There may have been some IG in the City at one point, which has been since rezoned over time. A lot of the property up on the Frontage Road I-70 Drive Southeast, most of that zoning has changed within the last decade. Some from planned district to the M-C that you see now. So the concern -- the concern I think we've had all along is that we didn't want through M-C parcels coming down from the outer road. And then you have the M-C and M-N that are to the south of St. Charles next to the County seat GP, which is a planned commercial district. And as -- as Mr. MacMann had indicated at the last meeting when we prefaced this case, this is a jumbled environment of land uses plus zoning that maybe a road project will correct to the chagrin maybe of those property owners.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff, Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: So both of the ones labeled IG to the -- directly to the west and to the southeast are both PD. The one directly to the east that's lighter gray, is this County? Okay. Okay. It might need some technical corrections for the Council agenda.

MR. ZENNER: Well, the graphic you're looking at -- the graphic you're looking at is a graphic that we don't have in front of us, so I'm having -- our color graphic.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MR. ZENNER: So everything that's to the east of the subject site actually on the north side of St. Charles, those are County parcels. One is a planned County commercial planned district, a general commercial zoning district in the County, and to the east of it where Bull Run actually intersects St. Charles, that's R-S, which is single family residential in the County. And then immediately to the southeast of the subject site's corner at St. Charles, that's again that's a planned general commercial in the County.

MS. CARROLL: Got it. Thank you. Questions?

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quick comment. I know many in our society rave against organization - - (inaudible) -- planning. This area is an area that was not subject to planning or forethought. Thank you for your time, Madam Chair.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff. Seeing none. We will open up the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. CROCKETT: Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I'm going to forego my presentation. I believe that staff did a good job in -- in giving you all most of all of the information

that's out there. I think I'm just going to be reiterating, and I don't know what you are talking about, Mr. MacMann, this is a perfect planned environment.

MR. MACMANN: It's beautiful. I think they were handing out zoning designations at the County.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. Yeah. And no wonder why it's so hard to understand what zoning goes where because it's just a hodgepodge of a little of everything. You are definitely correct on that. And so yes. I mean, I saw that same depiction today, Ms. Carroll, with the IG and that didn't seem right. And I -- it was PD, and you look at the gray colors, they're very similar in nature. Again, we're looking to take this -- this former mobile home park and they would like to transition it into RMH -- or, excuse me -- R-MF. There is this power line that runs north and south in the middle of the property, so it really limits what we can do here. And so the intent here is my client came across this piece of property. He had some other smaller, older single-family units, and I don't want to call them cottages, and I don't want to call them tiny homes, but they're kind of blend mix of both of them, and he fixed them up. It's a little -- small, little county development, fixed them up, and thought he might be able to try to rent them. And he said the response to that was overwhelming. He said I can't -- you know, he goes I have people on a waiting list to get in because they're small and they're affordable. And so he saw this piece, and said, hey, I can do this here. With that power line in the middle, it's going to limit how we can develop it. We can't go in there with large buildings like a traditional RMH development, or you've got me confused now, R-MF. Yeah. I'm getting confused with R-MH. And so the idea there is is he -- you know, his intent and his desire right now is to go in there and see if he can't go in there with smaller single-family tiny homes. And of course they're not -- you know, they're not going to be brought in. They have to conform to all City standards. They're going to be structures built on site, but the idea there is something that's much smaller, that's more affordable in the rental market. And so, you know, it was kind of a surprise to him when he had those other ones, and they just -- and he has a waiting list. He said there's a huge need here and this kind of piece of property kind of fits it pretty well. And so that's the reason that we're asking for the rezoning to see what we could get to fit on the property. So, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any questions for Mr. Crockett? I see none. Good presentation.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: All right. We'll close public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion? Commissioner Dunn?

MR. DUNN: I just want to say, you know, right around the corner off of Grace Lane, that's where I live. This is my neighborhood, and I think that having, you know, multi-family housing here would make a lot of sense. You know, it's consistent with what's to the west of it. Yeah. I'm in support of this.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners don't have any other questions or concerns, I do

have a motion. Seeing none. In the matter of Case 140-2024, 5301 St. Charles Road rezoning, with minor technical corrections -- theme of the evening -- I move to approve.

MR. DUNN: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Dunn. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion. Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Dunn, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll. Motion carries 6-0.**

MS. CARROLL: We have six votes to approve; the motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. Thank you. That concludes our cases for the evening.