

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
May 8, 2025

Case Number 154-2025

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Donna Jean Armstrong 2016 Unitrust (owner) for approval to rezone the southern 2.56-acres of 6.80-acres from M-N (Mixed Use - Neighborhood) to M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) to allow more intense commercial use on the portion of the property closest to I-70. A concurrent request (Case Number 155-2025) seeks approval of a seven-lot preliminary plat on the overall 6.80-acre site. The subject site is located west of St. Charles Road and Clark Lane and includes the address 5320 Clark Lane.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning from M-N to M-C along the southern 2.56 acres of the subject site. Approval of the recommendation above would require technical corrections to correct the legal description of the subject site.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of the public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I have a couple of questions about the relocation of the hotel site. While I understand being close to I-70 would be, I suppose, an advantage for a hotel, but it also looks like this places the hotel closer to residential than to Schnucks, which is a commercial use. And also it looks like maybe these graphics are a little bit rough, but it also looks like more damage to the forest that is mentioned in the staff report. Can you talk about balancing those things?

MR ORENDORFF: Sure. And the climax forest that exists there on the site, we'll get two more in the -- in the actual subdivision because that was accounted for by the City Arborist. Those were taken into consideration, the location relative to the residential site to the west there, given the gap between the structures that exist and their property line, in addition to the screening and the setbacks requirements in M-C, it was determined that we have the capacity to mitigate the adverse outcomes, and, like I said, the 45 feet is the maximum there, and I tried to illustrate that, and, you know, as I said, that's a little bit rough. But we did do our analysis. We -- we looked at the Code, and it seems to be supportive. We are supportive of that.

MR. ZENNER: One other issue to add to that, Ms. Placier, is that if you'll notice on the graphic that's on the screen in front of you, along the on-ramp onto I-70, that is M-C zoned property, as well. That

is currently an undeveloped, but available tract for redevelopment purposes. And so a use there that may not be nearly as intense as the Schnuck's Grocery store, but still retail in nature, is a likely outcome on that property. That is not a parcel that we are aware of that would be impacted by the I-70 project. And so it is likely that over time, that commercial piece will fill in. It does have access off of St. Charles Road to be able to get to that parcel at this point. And so the interaction of -- of this particular pocket along the interstate all being zoned M-C just is, from a land-use perspective, seen as a more appropriate buffering between what goes further back into the residential portions as you head north on the property. So while there is an immediate impact at that southeast corner with the M-C, from a land-use planning perspective, all of the M-C along the corridor that is to the east of this site is what is also a justification for why we believe that it would be appropriate here, coupled with all of the other points that Mr. Orendorff has brought up.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If you are a member of the public who came here tonight to speak on this case, please come forward. State your name and address for the record. We allow six minutes for the applicant and groups, three minutes for members of the public who are individuals, and with that, please come up. And I will say, I'm running a timer tonight, so if you hear it go de, de, de, that means your time is up, and we'll use the little red button.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, offices at 1000 West Nifong. I will not take my six minutes tonight. I believe that the staff has done a pretty good job on the staff report. We originally came in with our concept review or not -- or informal meeting with the staff, and really inquired about the whole tract being M-C. And then staff kind of came back and said hold on, we don't need to do that. Let's start paring this back and maybe we can give you a piece of it or recommend for a piece of it, but not the whole tract. And so that's when we started looking at the best location for the hotel. We obviously had it located at a different location, Ms. Placier, but I believe that staff, as well as my clients, came to a conclusion that we believe the property along I-70 is probably the better location for that -- for that hotel, and so that's the reason for the location that's -- that's before you tonight on the rezoning. So, again, we can talk about the rezoning and the preliminary plat will be the next item. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for Mr. Crockett? I have one, and I assume that the other M-C portion or the other M-C parcel is not owned by the same --

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: We do not own the other M-C portion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do you know if there is going to be, as you build out, any contemplating of

doing a connector to that property?

MR. CROCKETT: With that M-C tract?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: The owner of that piece actually reached out to us and asked if we had any finite plans for our -- for our tract that's being rezoned, and we don't at this time. We have some conceptual, but they talked about potentially wanting to have inter-connectivity as well as utilities kind of pass through there, as well. So we're very open in, you know, having communication with them to -- if it works and it's beneficial to everybody, we absolutely want to do that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Wonderful. That's all. Final call for questions. Seeing none. Thank you very much, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other member of the public here to speak on this case tonight, please come forward.

MR. BOUGASH: Good evening, Commission. My name is Don Bougash [ph.]; I'm a resident of The Links apartments that are right there, and actually one of my -- I live in 5030, which is the corner apartment on there, so -- and my back would be along the -- the barrier that you put up -- that you're talking about putting up there. Even though I'm not speaking officially for the management there, I've talked with them about this and I said I was coming to the meeting and I'd -- I'd express my opinion on this. One of the things that I am concerned with is that even though you're talking about a setback and fences and that, right now it's an open field and there's a fence there and there's a hill and it's got nice greenery there. Now you're looking at taking that away and you're also looking at putting potential cars and traffic and there's going to be other people in that area. That area that I know that I live in, there's a family below me and next to me that have children. Two buildings around me, they have a lot of children. The building in front of us, they have children, also. And with that extra traffic that is going to be brought in because of the car traffic and such like that, not that, you know, I don't know what is going to be brought in there, but it still brings another element of people and, you know, objects in there that could be, you know -- adversely affect the lifestyle of the people in that area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Thank you for coming here tonight. Appreciate it.

MR. BOUGASH: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment. Any Commissioner comments on the rezoning case? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Make a motion to approve Case 154-2025, a proposed rezoning from M-N to M-C along the southern 2.56 acres of the subject site.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Brodsky, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. I don't like to see something approved without discussion. I think -- now, one, we're supposed to be looking at this solely just for the rezoning piece, and not the secondary matter, which is coming up. And so given what's outlined here, and what City staff presented, I think it makes sense that this would continue on the track that's to the east of it of M-C and just continue that -- that direction. So I intend to vote to approve for that reason.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would add that the zoning is already commercial in nature. It's not set up as an open zone, nor is it set up as a residential zone. So I don't find the move from M-N to M-C to be particularly much of a increase in intensity. I think that we're likely to see this be a commercial corridor, which is why I asked about the pass-through between the M-C districts or M-C plats. I think that this is a growing area of commercial activity. Anyone else? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. Voting No: Ms. Placier, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-2.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is six yeses and two nos. The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Our next case of the evening, Case Number 155-2025 is on the same property.