

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
July 8, 2021

Case Number 186-2021

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants, LLC (agent), on behalf of CJCA Development, Inc. (owner), to replat six lots and parts of two lots identified as parcel #17-115-00-03-016.00 to be known as "Eastwood Hills, Plat No. 2". The 3.29-acre site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Business Loop 70 and Eastland Circle and is commonly addressed 2518 E. Business Loop 70.

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 final minor plat of Eastwood Hills, Plat No. 2, subject to minor technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Kelley. Before we move on to Commissioner questions, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to the meeting related to this case to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to ask this of Mr. Crockett, too. Does the southeast corner of this flood?

MR. KELLEY: I am not aware of it flooding. I just know that this generally floods to the southeast. I believe Hinkson Creek is -- oh, what did I say in staff report -- 600 feet, something like -- pretty short distance.

MR. MACMANN: Some of those houses have a lot of water in their backyards, so that's kind of why I'm wondering. It drops off. I'll ask Mr. Crockett. Thanks.

MS. LOE: Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: With the significant trees on the property, does that mean that they'll have to be a preservation plan before they can start demolish and construction?

MR. KELLEY: I know that they will go tree preservation with the building permit, and they'll have to comply with the regulations there. So it would be -- depending on what they want to do, I haven't seen that part yet, but they will have to go through and comply with -- you know, go with the recommendations of the arborist in terms of what that they're going to get rid of, and then how those would need to be replaced.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Great. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I have basically the same concerns about this development and then the other one that's on our agenda in that they both about single-family residential. In this particular situation, it's pretty -- I would say environmentally sensitive. And I was curious what restrictions might apply to protect the property to the south of this development when it's developed?

MR. KELLEY: Are you talking about the property, let's say, to the southwest that's kind of between the main part of the property and the puzzle piece? You're talking about that -- that property?

MS. RUSHING: Well, if -- if you drive down in that residential area on -- on both sides, both of those streets, it's heavily wooded and I saw, like, deer actually in people's front yards. And -- and so, if this is a development that's going to have a lot of traffic coming off of that one street or development that is going to -- I don't know -- be negatively -- impact the southern portion of that property, I was curious what restrictions there might be to protect that area?

MR. KELLEY: Got you. Yeah. So to begin with, generally, there would be the screening and landscaping provisions, so depending on what the development is, I believe. So it's MC, so commercial property will depend on -- the height of it will kind of depend on where it lies on what screening provisions they'll be needing to provide. In addition to that, this property is MC, and these adjacent properties are R-1, so the neighborhood protection standards would apply in terms of screening, step-downs, things of that nature.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none, we will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you have any comment, please give your name and address for the record. We do limit you to three minutes if you're speaking for yourself, and six minutes if you're speaking for a group.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair. Members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Again, this is a consolidation plat of six lots and partial of lots, and so we're going to try to get into conformity with a legal lot status for the City of Columbia for redevelopment on this property. And to answer some of your questions, Mr. MacMann, with regard to flooding, I don't believe the property itself floods. There may be some downstream water concerns and issues, but all those are addressed in the stormwater management plan that would come forward as the site redevelops. Those standards don't apply to the site as it currently sits, given its current status, but any redevelopment would conform to the current stormwater regulations, so that would help mitigate those items. With regards to the significant trees on the property, we can demo the site without needing any issue with the significant trees. We can't remove any of the trees without filing a land disturbance permit or land disturbance plan with the City. My client is very cognizant of those trees. We have to develop the site. We have to lose a few. They are extremely -- how do I want to put it -- given me, you know, very clear direction to save as many of those as possible, not just the minimum, but as many as

possible. And they see the benefit, not just for the area themselves, but for this piece of property. This development, my client is the -- the owner the owner of New Horizons, which has various properties in town, and so what they're looking for is kind of an interim location for a residential facility. So what they have is they provide 24-hour care at a lot of their facilities, and what they are experiencing is that they're preparing them to get back into normal lifestyle, however, that middle step is missing. And so that's what they want to prepare and that's what they would like to have this site for. So they have a specific use in mind and so that's what they're looking for. Ms. Rushing, with regards to your comments, the UDC is very clear with regards to a MC zoned property that abuts a residential zoned property such as this, with regards to buffers, with regards to setbacks, how wide those setbacks are, how wide those buffers are, how tall those buffers are, and then how far buildings need to be back off of that given the various heights of the building. And so all that is very clear in the UDC, and very set up for the specific reason just like this. And so that is something that the old zoning code didn't have, but the new UDC -- I call it new -- the current UDC has that we didn't have before was for specific situations like this. And so I think that the UDC covers that very well. Again, I believe it's a fairly straightforward request, and I'm happy to answer any other questions that the Commission may have.

MS. LOE: Any questions for Mr. Crockett?

MS. RUSHING: Are they -- do you know whether they're planning on demo-ing those existing buildings?

MR. CROCKETT: They are. They would like to build new. They're in rough shape.

MS. RUSHING: They are. I noticed --

MR. CROCKETT: But they -- yeah. I mean, when they -- when they originally -- originally bought the property, the intent was to keep them and try to rehab them, but I think after further review and gone through with architectural review, they -- it just wasn't really worth -- they couldn't salvage them. It was too far gone.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crockett, will this be one of these federally licensed facilities? Is it a hospital?

MR. CROCKETT: No, it's not a hospital.

MR. MACMANN: So it's not like the Landmark facility on the old highway?

MR. CROCKETT: No. No.

MS. RUSHING: Transitional housing; is that --

MR. CROCKETT: I don't want to speak out of turn exactly what it is, but it's my understanding is what they have now is they have several -- they have several of these facilities throughout, and they provide 24-hour care in these facilities. And they -- and they prepare individuals to get back to be able to take care of themselves and, you know, watch their medication and all of that all by themselves, and they introduce them back into -- into regular housing. However, what they see is they see those individuals are coming back through the process again because they don't have someone to call or someone -- you

know, that intermediate need. They don't need 24-hour supervision or 24-hour care, but they do need some services in case in they need some help, they have a concern, have a problem, they need, you know, somebody close by that they can rely on, but they don't need the 24-hour services. And so I believe that's -- it's my understanding that's what -- what this facility will -- will fill.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none. We'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: This might be a question for staff. So if we continue with the replat, would this come back before us in a development plan?

MR. KELLEY: No, I don't believe so. It's open zoned, so they would just need the land disturbance and building permit on the staff side.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Madam Chair, thank you. This is for Mr. Kelley, and I guess for all of us. It would seem that, you know, we've all expressed concerns about the flooding -- this area has some floodings, south of it, it certainly does. That's why I asked the question. We have the trees; we have the natural aspect of it, as well. If they can preserve the trees, and I know they're not obligated to be as forthcoming as they can be on that, and they are going to focus on the protections that are afforded by the UDC -- UDC, particularly the storm aspect of it, and keeping the trees should make -- actually better than it is. It should make the property a better neighbor to that neighborhood than what's currently there. Am I -- do you guys think I'm missing something by making that assessment, because it does -- the water does run off like crazy to the south. I just didn't know if it pooled up. I mean, what are your all's thoughts? I mean, I think it's -- it's better than Eastwood. I admire you guys from thinking that you could do something with that building, but I have been in it.

MS. LOE: We've received a letter in support of developing the property from an adjacent neighbor.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. I have some friends who live all the way down --

MS. LOE: More than ready to have that property developed. I -- my understanding is this is the support -- is representative of what the neighborhood would like. So I'm just following up on your comments, Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: I have received that indirectly, once that property was abandoned. It has chronic temporary occupants, and it's -- it is somewhat problematic, so that I -- and most folks down there would be positive -- view it positively.

MS. LOE: And to add to your list is Ms. Rushing's concern, and I agree the UDC now includes neighborhood protections which, given that these are single-family properties, would be --

MR. MACMANN: They'll have the maximum buffer.

MS. LOE: Yeah. Right. Would be awarded the maximum level three buffer.

MR. KELLEY: I think it may depend on how tall it is, if it's, like, one to three stories, I think, in the screening table.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. KELLEY: But, yeah, potentially.

MS. LOE: Right. But depending on how it is developed --

MR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. LOE: Right. So if it is more residential care and a lower development that is more compatible with the residential, then as -- maximum buffering may not be necessary. Correct? All right. Any additional discussion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners have no other comments or questions, in the matter of Case 186-2021, a request by Crockett Engineering on behalf of CJCA Development to replat all of six and part of two lots into one lot, into a development called Eastwood Hills Plat No. 2, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Ms. Rushing, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. CARROLL: Nine votes to approve; the motion carries.

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