

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
SEPTEMBER 20, 2018

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Mr. Rusty Strodtman
Ms. Tootie Burns
Ms. Sara Loe
Ms. Lee Russell
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Ms. Joy Rushing
Mr. Dan Harder
Mr. Michael MacMann

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Mr. Brian Toohey

MR. STRODTMAN: Moving on to our first public hearing of the evening.

Case No. 18-173

A request by Lueck Surveying (agent), on behalf of Melissa M. Williams (owner), to rezone 0.2 acres from R-1 (One-family Residential) to M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The subject property is located on the south side of Heriford Road southeast of the terminus of Burlington Street and addressed as 1804 Heriford Road.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 request to rezone the property M-OF (Mixed-Use Office).

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Appreciate the staff report. Commissioners, questions of staff? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Were there any public comments? You mentioned how many cards were sent out, but --

MR. PALMER: There were, I believe, two phone calls and they were more questions than comments, and it was just, you know, what's happening and just informational, and there were no substantive comments.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Palmer, just a context question. I'm glad you mentioned the Honda R-1 property. Is -- the way I understand the bio-retention center, that cannot be developed; is that a correct statement?

MR. PALMER: I believe unless the entire property were redeveloped, that's true.

MR. MACMANN: All right. And then the second question is also a context question. We have

that wedge, as you called it, that sliver of I-G property back there. Is that really three separate I-G lots; is that what that is?

MR. PALMER: Yes. I believe that's true.

MR. MACMANN: And that doesn't look like -- well, two of them don't look like they have the size to be anything, but --

MR. PALMER: No.

MR. MACMANN: I just wondered about -- for future context here.

MR. PALMER: I believe, like I said, they were -- they were what was left of lots that got almost completely consumed by the road right-of-way for I-70, and they're under separate ownership and everything, so yeah.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PALMER: An odd situation.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Palmer, I've got a couple of questions. How -- how do we handle parking? Did we look at number of stalls in this -- I drove through there and it's not really a parking -- I mean, it's gravel.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: It's a driveway.

MR. PALMER: We have discussed that at the concept review meaning, and I honestly don't remember what we discussed. But I know that there's -- there is room there for at least two cars, if not three, and I know that the size of the -- of the home or the office is going to be limiting in the number of folks that can be there at one time anyway. So you'll probably see the -- the counselor there and then also maybe a short overlap of patients as they come and go, but it should probably never be more than three people there at any one time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Kind of in that same vein, what about lighting? Do we -- do we hold this to the same standard that we would other M-OF zoning and mandate lighting standards of some type?

MR. PALMER: I don't believe lighting was discussed.

MR. ZENNER: Lighting would not be. We'd have signage restrictions as it relates to it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Can you keep -- that was one of my questions, too. What is that? There's no signage or --

MR. ZENNER: In the M-OF district, yes. We do have signage requirements and hold on here, I'll get to those. I was trying to get to the parking first, but let's handle lighting. As part of the neighborhood protection standards, if any lighting were to be placed on this property, it would have to be reduced because the adjacent properties are both R-1. That does require that light heights go down to a minimum of -- a maximum of 20 feet for neighborhood protection. Again there is nothing that mandates any type of security lighting or anything else, so the lighting issue is not going to come into play. And then as it relates to signage, that is going to be driven by business sign -- business use signs outside of our M-DT -- that's the wrong one. Hold on here. In the M-OF district on a collector or nonresidential street, which is, I

believe, what Heriford would probably be classified as, maximum of a ten-foot-tall sign, freestanding sign. It would have to be permitted. Must -- must be located ten feet off of the public right-of-way. You'll notice this does not have a sidewalk on it. It would not be required to put a sidewalk in unless the parcel were redeveloped, hence the support that staff has for it, the characteristics of this property are going to be still unnoticeable as an office use. A ten-foot monument-style sign that would be a maximum of 48 square foot would probably be overkill for this small home. It does have the opportunity for wall signage and our wall signage standards within the M-OF district for the same road class, local nonresidential, would be a maximum of 48 total square feet. So, I mean, that's an eight-by-six sign, which would be pretty significant based on the size of the structure.

MR. STRODTMAN: And if any of those items were going -- it sounds like right now the applicant is not interested in doing any of those items, but I'm just thinking long term. If -- if the lighting was -- you know, someone wanted to increase the lighting or the signage to, you know, ten-foot pole or the wall pack, would they come back through the City to get some type of permitting so that we could protect that resident that's next to them?

MR. ZENNER: The signage and the lighting which would -- the signage would require a sign permit to be issued, so yes, we would review that.

MR. STRODTMAN: We would.

MR. ZENNER: Lighting would likely require some type of electrical permit if it was a freestanding pole light. If it was a wall pack, which wall packs are, if I'm not incorrect, prohibited within our Code, we wouldn't allow that, unless it was a security light for a residential property.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right.

MR. ZENNER: This is no longer going to be in that zone classification to where a farm shed light or some type of barn light-type scenario, this isn't -- it doesn't fall into that category anymore if it is rezoned. So we do have commercial -- commercial and office general design requirements that would potentially be applied to anything that would be modified on the structure. The applicant is here, as well as their agent. I would imagine they can answer very specifically what their intent is.

MR. STRODTMAN: You know, and I believe -- I agree with the staff report that, you know, I plan on supporting it. I think that, you know, long term, that at least those three residents on the south side of Heriford -- I probably was incorrectly saying it earlier -- will be something besides residential and long term probably because it's not probably ideal, but, you know, that house right next door is R-1, so I feel like we need to protect that residence because they are a resident and they think they have a residence next door that's -- you know. And I could see some value of some signage to I-70, and might take advantage of, you know, putting some signs there if I -- if I owned it as a business. And lastly, trash. Is there any differences in trash or is that just the bag out at the curb?

MR. ZENNER: Likely, it would be bag at the curb, same type of trash collection that currently exists.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Okay. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for doing some follow up. Speaking in the future, how -- this lot is 8,000 square feet, something like that. How big of a building could they, if they were to receive their M-OF, and say in ten years they want to develop it into a larger M-OF facility, how large could that building be?

MR. PALMER: So the first impact to that property when they redevelop would be right-of-way dedication, and it would match the right-of-way on the -- to the west there. So that's going to be a significant drop --

MR. MACMANN: They're going to lose 500 feet anyway?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. And so that, of course, would further limit the size of -- of an office building there. And so I would --

MR. MACMANN: And the setbacks change because of R-1. We'll assume it's going to be R-1 20 years in the future.

MR. PALMER: And your R-1 -- you're adjacent to R-1 still, so those impacts would have to be mitigated through the area protection standards. So you're looking at a very small office building, I think.

MR. MACMANN: So potentially -- I'm trying to remember here. Mr. Zenner, I'm sure, will help me. The building could be 36 feet tall and maybe 30 by 30, 40 by 40, something like that?

MR. ZENNER: Not unless -- it could be. It could be 35 feet tall in the M-OF. You'd have to set -- at that point, you would have to either step the building down within 25 feet of the property line so your adjoining R-1 was no higher than the adjoining R-1 property line. Add a new structure greater than 24 feet, and increase your setback --

MR. MACMANN: Twenty-four, then twenty-five --

MR. ZENNER: -- or increase your side-yard setback from the residential use by an additional ten feet, which would mean you would have, I believe, a 25-foot side-yard setback on the east side of this property further shifting the building -- any future building to the west. The likelihood and I would -- I would stand to agree with Mr. Palmer, the likelihood of this building in and of itself being torn down and redeveloped into something more intense is remote to almost nonexistent. You have parking, storm-water, platting, none of which would be able to be accommodated, plus the structure. The remaining two lots possibly to the east and the property that's zoned I-G would probably need to be merged to create something that was more substantive.

MR. MACMANN: More economically viable. I'm just -- I'm thinking for -- I'm glad the Chairman brought that up, thinking about these neighborhoods. I travel through this area somewhat, and while I may agree with the long-term analysis, I -- I just want to take into consideration that we're not creating the conditions to drive the neighbors out.

MR. STRODTMAN: I one hundred percent agree, Mr. MacMann. Any additional questions, Commissioners? If not, we'll open this up to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: If you would like to come forward and give us name and address, we would

welcome you.

MR. LUECK: Members of the Commission, I'm Ron Lueck; I'm the land surveyor for this request for rezoning, offices at 914 North College here in Columbia. The -- well, Mr. Palmer stole most of my thunder there. He's given you guys a preview of everything that's going on with the place there. You know the zoning across the road is still R-1. There's six lots remaining out of this 1956 subdivision that are residences. The one directly across the street is a rental. The one to the east is a rental, and northeast, at the corner of Burlington and Heriford is a rental. Three rentals, there's three owners of which my client, Ms. Carter -- or Williams is one of the owners. She bought this in 19 -- or in 2007, lived there for four years. And as a counselor, she's looking at having this for her office. About the most signage that she is proposing would be a plaque on the garage or on the side of the door as you enter the place. And as far as lighting, there is no intention of -- at this time of any sort of exterior lighting other than what's there right now from street lighting. Her office hours are to be over by 6:00 p.m., so, you know, evening lighting is not really a desired change to the property. The driveway will accommodate two cars, and if she has two people there at one time or two vehicles traveling there at one time, they'll -- one would have to wait until the counseling with one couple is finished. And as far as anything else, staff has pretty well covered it. If you've got any questions, I will be happy to entertain them, see if I can answer you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lueck. Commissioners, do you have any questions for this speaker? Real quick, Mr. Lueck, will there be weekend hours -- Saturday?

MR. LUECK: Not at this time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lueck. Appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. LUECK: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion, additional questions of staff, a motion?
Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a motion if we are at that point.

MR. STRODTMAN: I think we are.

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of Case 18-173, rezone from R-1 to M-OF zoning, I move that we approve.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. We have received a motion to approve Case 18-173 by Mr. MacMann. It has received its proper second from Ms. Rushing. Do we have any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call, please?

MS. BURNS: Yes. Thank you.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder,

Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Ms. Burns. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Our recommendation for approval of Case 18-173 will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration. Thank you all.